

**Addressing the Revised Criteria for Review (CFRs), Revised Guidelines, and the New Requirements in the Institutional Review Process
(Elements of Table A)**

Criteria for Review (CFRs) and Guidelines that have been revised are listed in italics below, with the revisions indicated by underlining. Comments regarding CFRs are presented after the title "Comment."

CFR 1.2: The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.

Comment

The faculty at UCR established a set of Goals of an Undergraduate Education; they are found on page 47 of the 2008-09 UCR General Catalog [see <http://catalog.ucr.edu/>]. They guide education at both the campus-wide and general education levels.

The Academic Senate established an *Ad hoc* Committee on General Education Reform, which proposed a pilot program for reform of the UCR breadth [general education] requirements. The pilot program was approved by the Academic Senate at its meeting February 17, 2009 [see http://senate.ucr.edu/senate_site/cms.php?node=agenda_090217_full for a copy of the agenda for that meeting]; the pilot program will be implemented in fall 2009, providing implementation details are approved by the Executive Committees of the colleges. It includes establishment of capstone courses, which will be used to assess the success of the pilot program. For more discussion of this program, see the EER Report, Section 2, Undergraduate Theme (pp 13-14).

The professional programs in the Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE) and the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) conduct regular cycles of defining learning outcomes, assessing student attainment, and making program adjustments; these cycles are required by their professional program accrediting agencies. The Anderson Graduate School of Management is accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Some of the AACSB standards concern assurance of learning standards, including defining learning goals and measuring achievement of learning goals (Standards 16, 18, and 19). However, until this year there had been little formal learning outcomes assessment in the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS) or the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), especially at the undergraduate level. In 2008-09 the campus developed learning outcomes assessment for undergraduate programs in these two colleges. The results of this effort are stored in the On-line Assessment Tracking System (OATS). By the end of 2008-09, 55 of 56 degree programs in CHASS had developed and loaded learning outcomes into the OATS database, as had 12 of 14 degree programs in CNAS. Associated assessment mechanisms were developed for the learning outcomes in all but one of the majors in each college, and 2/3 of

majors have multi-year assessment plans. On-line access to the full contents of the OATS database will be made available to the WASC review team. The data portfolio file includes OATS Report 2008-09, which is a complete listing of the content of OATS at the end of the 2008-09 academic year. The learning outcomes assessment process is described in more detail in the EER Report, Section 2, Undergraduate Theme (pp 4-7).

The Academic Senate Committee on Courses is responsible for review and approval of new courses and significant changes in existing courses. The General Rules and Policies Governing Courses of Instruction are found at <http://senate.ucr.edu/Committees/courses/gdl%20changes%2011-18-08.pdf>. For any new course, restored course, or course with a substantive change the Rules and Policies require submission of a syllabus that outlines the course by week, date, or topic and includes weighted grading criteria; it should include a reading list that is linked to a week, date, or topic. However, at this point, there is no requirement that learning outcomes be specified for the course.

The primary source of institutional data on students is the Office of Strategic Academic Research and Analysis (formerly the Office of Institutional Planning), which posts a wide variety of student information data on its website (see http://apb.ucr.edu/inst_plan/). Most of the data are taken from records maintained by the Office of the Registrar. Other institutional data are maintained by other offices, including those in the Student Affairs area. The Institutional Research Coordinating Group (IRCG) is composed of data analysts, faculty and administrators from different areas of the campus who deal with institutional data. It meets regularly to share studies and analyses, to plan and review studies designed to acquire additional institutional data, and to reconcile differences in data definitions, collection methods, and interpretations. If data and analyses beyond those available on the Office of Institutional Planning website are needed by a given office or administrator, the data and analyses are collected and prepared by special analysts, often one of the members of the IRCG.

The UCR campus participates in the nationwide College Portrait Program. Participating institutions provide basic institutional data, including retention rates, graduation rates, financial aid levels, etc., in forms that allow students and potential students to compare different institutions easily. UCR College Portrait is found at: http://collegeportrait.ucr.edu/pdf/ucr_college_portrait.pdf.

Systematic program reviews are conducted for undergraduate programs by the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy and for graduate programs by the Academic Senate Graduate Council. Both processes involve review and analysis of student achievement. For more discussion of the program review process at UCR see Addressing New Requirements in the Institutional Review Process, Section on Program Review (below) and see the EER Report, Section 1 (p 2); Section 2, Graduate Theme (pp 20-21); and Section 3 (pp 35-36).

The most comprehensive example of institutional action in response to collection and analysis of retention and student performance data is the establishment of the Student Success Task Force, its Report, and the follow up to that Report. The process and results are discussed in detail in the EER Report, Section 2, Undergraduate Theme (p 8; pp 14-18), and Section 5 (pp 37-41).

The campus has established a special task force, headed by Gretchen Bolar, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business Operations, to develop better ways of getting better data into the hands of decision makers. Key to this effort is the development of a Management Data System (MDS), which will provide decision makers throughout the campus with actionable information. This involves streamlining the data verification process, improving and connecting disparate systems, and implementing a reporting solution. Until the MDS is developed the campus will continue to rely on individual analysts to prepare data and analyses for decision makers. For more discussion of the special task force, see Appendix A (Detailed Responses to Concerns of the WASC Visiting Team of March 2008) Items (1) (pp A-1 to A-7) and (11) (p A-18).

CFR 1.9: The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution.

Comment

Vice Provost David Fairris is UCR's Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). He discusses with the deans and other campus officers the WASC regulations and processes that they need to be aware of and encourages them to contact him if they have any questions. He says in close contact with Teri Cannon, for example, with respect to Substantive Change review for the proposed School of Medicine.

CFR 2.2b: GUIDELINE: Institutions offering graduate-level programs demonstrate sufficient resources and structures to sustain these programs and create a graduate-level academic culture.

Comment

The campus has a strong commitment to graduate-level programs and has sufficient resources and structures to sustain these programs, as discussed in the Preparatory Review Report of December 20, 2007, and in Appendix A (Detailed Responses to Concerns of the WASC Visiting Team of March 2008) Items (12) (pp A-19 to A-21) and (15) (pp A-36 to A-37). However, the current budget crisis is slowing dramatically the process of initiating the School of Public Policy and School of Medicine.

CFR 2.3: The institution's student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated at the course, program and, as appropriate, institutional level.

Comment

See comments under CFR 1.2, above, for information on student learning outcomes and expectations at the institutional, program, and course level.

CFR 2.7: All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.

Comment

Systematic program reviews are conducted regularly for undergraduate programs by the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy and for graduate programs by the Academic Senate Graduate Council. For more discussion of the program review process at UCR see Addressing New Requirements in the Institutional Review Process, Section on Program Review (below) and see the EER Report, Section 1 (p 2) and Section 3 (pp 35-36).

CFR 2.8: GUIDELINE: Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.

Comment

The policies and practices on hiring, promotion, and tenure of faculty at UCR require significant contributions in research, teaching and learning, and community service. The criteria and processes for merit, promotion (including promotion to tenure), and hire of faculty are found in a document entitled The Call; it is found at <http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/academicreviews/FacCall/index.php>. The Call does not explicitly address scholarship related to assessment or co-curricular learning. The possible role of these issues in the promotion and tenure process will be explored in future years.

CFR 2.10: The institution collects and analyzes student data disaggregated by demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and campus climate to support student success.

Comment

Disaggregated and aggregated student data are available on the Institutional Planning website: http://apb.ucr.edu/inst_plan/.

The most comprehensive example of institutional action in response to collection and analysis of retention and student performance data is the establishment of the Student Success Task Force, its Report, and the follow up to the recommendations. The process and results are discussed in detail in the EER Report, Section 2, Undergraduate Theme (p 8; pp 14-18) and Section 3 (pp 35-

36). Other analyses of student satisfaction, campus climate, or student achievement are found in the EER Report, Section 2, Undergraduate Theme (pp 18-20); Section 2, Graduate Theme (pp 20-21); Section 2, Diversity Theme (pp 26-31, pp 33-34); and Section 5 (pp 37-41).

The program review process in the Academic Senate contains important measures of achievement at the program level. Independent student satisfaction surveys are conducted as part of the program review process. The results lead to significant changes; for example the major changes in academic advising policy and process.

CFR 2.11: Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and assesses its co-curricular programs.

Comment

The evaluation process for student service units has been expanded, and a comprehensive model for the whole Division of Student Affairs is being developed.

[need to put item below in a blue box]

CFR 3.2: GUIDELINE: The institution systematically engages full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.

Comment

The role of full-time non-tenure, adjunct, and part-time faculty is still determined largely by individual departments. The rights and responsibilities of non-ladder teaching faculty are set forth in Sections 140, 280, 283, 285, of the Academic Personnel Manual (see <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/welcome.html>). Many of these faculty are members of UC-wide Unit 18, and as such, are represented in their dealings with the University regarding working conditions and other issues of employment. The campus will continue to review this issue in the coming year.

Departments with significant numbers of lecturers, such as the Mathematics Department or the Writing Program, involve lecturers extensively in course assessment. They also participate in faculty development programs.

CFR 3.3: Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives.

Comment

The campus has regularized the orientation of ladder rank faculty this past year through establishment of formal programs in the schools and colleges. Consideration will be given to regularization of orientation of full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty as well.

Each department with full-time non-tenure track, adjunct and part-time faculty takes its own approach to orientation for such faculty. Normally this involves meeting with the department chair or unit head, being assigned a mentor from among the experienced faculty, and being introduced to staff and other campus resources. In units with a large number or percentage of full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty (such as English Composition or the Graduate School of Education) there are more comprehensive and structured orientation sessions. Approaches to orientation in a sample of departments are discussed below, including supplemental efforts for new ladder rank faculty.

In the Writing Program: The program has an orientation for all non-Senate faculty every fall before classes begin. It includes two and half days of meetings (general orientation to the program policies and procedures, course-specific staff meetings, and norming sessions related to System-wide grading standards). There is a specialized meeting, in addition, for the new non-Senate faculty. At the end of every quarter, non-Senate faculty teaching in the entry-level portion of the program also participate a staff meeting preliminary to grading the final examination by committee. Any non-Senate faculty joining the Program for the first time in winter or spring are provided special orientation. All new non-Senate faculty members' classrooms are visited by the University Writing Program Director in their first quarter of teaching. There is a follow-up meeting with the Director for up to an hour. In addition, new non-Senate faculty can consult informally with writing program associate directors during the quarter.

In the Graduate School of Education (GSOE): GSOE has an annual orientation for all Supervisors of Teacher Education, consisting of day-long updates on state certification procedures and campus policies. New ladder faculty participate in the UCR orientation program for new faculty.

In Mathematics: All Visiting Assistant Professors (VAPs) have a regular faculty member as a mentor. The mentor shares the research of the VAP and is expected, whenever necessary, to assist in the mentoring of the VAP as an instructor. About two weeks before the start of the Fall Quarter, there is a weeklong orientation that all VAPs are expected to attend. The intent is to help them understand the teaching mission of the department and to give them the tools needed to be successful in the classroom. The orientation is organized by the chair, vice-chair and a retired faculty member who is on administrative recall to assist with such activities. Meetings are held between VAPs, Lecturers and Teaching Assistants at the orientation to discuss all aspects of the undergraduate instructional program. Continuing VAPs discuss their experiences and concerns with incoming VAPs. There are smaller meetings between VAPs, Lecturers and Teaching Assistants who are scheduled to teach particular courses, and everyone is encouraged to be fully informed. During the year the Vice Chair meets with all VAPs involved with each

calculus course to discuss testing and other aspects of the course. These sessions provide opportunities for VAPs to bring up any concerns or issues regarding their teaching duties.

In Hispanic Studies: The Department will have a new non-ladder faculty member (a VAP), who currently serves as a part-time instructor. The Chair has already met with her to talk about her teaching for next year, her role in the Department, and how the Department functions in general. She will also speak with the departmental academic personnel specialist regarding all of the formal parts of her appointment. Since she has been on campus part-time for 2 years, that is all.

In Art: The Department has an informal orientation process for new faculty. New ladder faculty and new non-ladder faculty meet with the department chair and with faculty from their specific area of teaching. New ladder rank faculty are assigned an informal mentor from the senior faculty of their area. New non-ladder faculty are assigned a ladder faculty member in their specific area of teaching as a direct contact person.

Regular orientation of staff is provided by Human Resources.

CFR 3.4: GUIDELINE: The institution provides training and support for faculty members teaching by means of technology-mediated instruction.

Comment

The campus has two units within the Department of Computing and Communications that provide training and support for faculty members teaching by means of technology-mediated instruction, Multimedia Technologies and Instructional Technology. Both units work as a team to provide support to faculty in use of the technology in the classroom. The hardware and software are supported by Multimedia Technologies, while Instructional Technology addresses pedagogical issues. Of particular significance for the campus is that all general assignment classrooms are similarly equipped at a baseline level of a 'smart classroom' (see: <http://classrooms.ucr.edu> for specific details of each room). Workshops are conducted at the beginning of each quarter to help faculty understand the capabilities and use of the multimedia equipment in these general assignment classrooms.

The Instructional Technology group presents best practices at these workshops, usually tailored to the specific configuration of each room. Supporting materials are provided to attending instructors, which address such teaching and learning issues as effective use of PowerPoint, teaching a large class, use of discussion sections, etc. Technology support is provided in the use of all the equipment and supporting software available in the classrooms. At the conclusion of these workshops, follow-up appointments are made with faculty. During these face-to-face meetings discussion is centered on use of enhanced learning tools as support components to real-time instruction.

General requests from faculty for training in technology-mediated instruction are referred to the appropriate unit, either Multimedia Technologies or Instructional Technology. Simple consultations are usually handled immediately, while more complicated requests may require

more lead time to develop the required training. Every attempt is made to provide the support requested of the faculty, subject to the resources available in the two units.

Consultation is provided to all faculty who wish to have a significant online teaching component, advising them regarding the prevailing best practices, modified by and dependent on the achievable goals of the instructor and expected student outcomes. The effectiveness of technology-mediated instruction has been assessed in departments where there are direct outcome measures to assess student engagement and outcomes. Examples include the Biology Department use of Calibrate Peer Review and the Physics Department quarterly implementation of the Force Concept Inventory. Many instructors in large classes also use clickers (electronic feedback devices students can use to respond to specific questions) to track whether students are achieving desired learning outcomes. Workshops are held on the pedagogical value and effective use of clickers in the classroom.

CFR 3.5: The institution has a history of financial stability, unqualified independent financial audits and has resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability.... If an institution has an accumulated deficit, it has realistic plans to eliminate the deficit.

Comment

The campus has a history of financial stability. Unqualified independent financial audits are conducted annually of the UC system as a whole and of the individual campuses. Campus resources are sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Even in the current period of budgetary challenges the campus is managing to reduce expenditures to match available resources while protecting the academic programs.

CFR 3.6: The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. These information resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes.

Comment

The campus information resources are comprehensive, including the extensive campus library holdings and access to other library materials via interlibrary loan, the student information system, the financial and accounting systems, and the general resources of Computing and Communications and the Office Academic Planning and Budget. Information from the student information system is used in the review of undergraduate and graduate programs and is used by individual departments and deans offices in their assessment of their programs. Faculty, students and staff have wireless access for their computers virtually throughout the campus, and there are hard-wire connections for computers in the libraries and individual offices.

A special work group has been formed to improve the processes by which information and analyses are provided to key decision makers on the campus and the ability of key decision makers to access information they may need in connection with their work.

The campus is in the process of developing its strategic plan. As the program review process proceeds there is an intention to require that senior leadership making resource allocation decisions take into account the results of program review, thereby better aligning information resources with learning outcomes.

CFR 3.8: GUIDELINE: The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority, which are reflected in an organization chart.

Comment

The campus recently responded to the resignation of the Vice Chancellor for Administration by eliminating that position and distributing among the remaining vice chancellors and the EVC/P the units reporting to that person. Organizational charts are being redrawn accordingly. Employees have clear roles and responsibilities and individual positions have specific job descriptions.

CFR 3.9: GUIDELINE: The governing body regularly engages in self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.

Comment

The Regents of the University of California adopted the "Policy on Board Education and Assessment" in March 2008. The policy, consistent with best practices advocated by the Association of Governing Boards, provides various elements of training and orientation. Although the Board routinely performed some of these elements previously, adoption of the policy codified and formalized the practice. Among other things, the policy has resulted in:

* A two-part, mandatory orientation program is provided to all new Regents and faculty representatives to the Board. (A separate session is also offered regarding investments issues.) The orientation sessions are co-chaired by a Regent and the President. The first day typically consists of a discussion of the roles of the President and The Regents presented by the Co-Chairs, an overview of the University presented by the Provost, a discussion of shared governance presented by the Chair of the Academic Council, fiduciary and legal responsibilities of Board members presented by the General Counsel, Board structure and policy presented by the Secretary and Chief of Staff to The Regents, and the University's budget presented by the Executive Vice President for Business Operations. The second day consists of an overview of the specialized programs of the University - Research, Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Health Care - led by the Vice President responsible for each area. The remainder of the second session covers current key topics before the Board.

* Each new appointed Regent is assigned a continuing Regent to serve as a mentor and assist

as needed. (The non-appointed Regents and faculty representatives serve staggered terms which provide for a natural mentoring structure for them.) In addition, the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to The Regents is available to assist and staff all new Regents as necessary.

* The most recent Board retreat was held in September 2008 at the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center. This two-day retreat focused on governance and planning issues and was attended by the top level of UC management and the vast majority of Regents. Presentations included a review of strategic challenges for the future, institutional accountability and performance, University funding models, a proposal for a new financial aid program, and closed with a session on governance roles and on board structure, effectiveness and process.

The members of the UCR Board of Trustees are also provided with annual training.

CFR 3.10: The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibility is to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.

Comment

The Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, and chief financial officer (Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business Operations) are all full-time employees and are assisted by a sufficient number of other qualified administrators.

CFR 3.11: GUIDELINE: The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty.

Comment

The ladder rank faculty (assistant professor, associate professors, full professors and equivalent ranks) are all members of the Academic Senate. The Duties, Powers and Privileges of the Academic Senate are set forth in the University of California Regent's STANDING ORDER 105.2. :

- Authorize, approve, and supervise all courses (except those of certain graduate professional schools).
- Determine the conditions of admissions, certificates and degrees.
- Recommend the hiring and promotion of faculty members.
- Approve the publication of manuscripts by the University of California Press.
- Advise on the administration of the UC libraries.
- Assist in the searches for deans, chancellors, and presidents.
- Advise the University President and the Chancellors on budget and administrative matters under the rubric of "Shared Governance."

The rights and responsibilities of faculty are set forth in the Faculty Code of Conduct:
http://senate.ucr.edu/senate_site/cms.php?node=faculty_code_of_conduct.

CFR 4.4: The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

Comment

The current strategic planning process is expected to include assessing the effectiveness of campus programs and efforts, tracking results over time, and relating campus data to comparable data from external sources. The program review processes, learning outcomes assessment processes, and other efforts at the departmental and college and school levels will lead to improvements in structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

Systematic program reviews are conducted for undergraduate programs by the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy and for graduate programs by the Academic Senate Graduate Council. For more discussion of the program review process at UCR see Addressing New Requirements in the Institutional Review Process, Section on Program Review (below) and see the EER Report, Section 1 (p 2) and Section 3 (pp 35-36).

At UCR the establishment of courses or new degree programs, or any significant subsequent changes to courses or degree requirements must first complete a multi-step approval process. First the course, degree, or change proposal must be approved by the executive committee of the department's respective college or school. Next, courses must be approved by the Academic Senate's Committee on Courses (on the recommendation of the Graduate Council in the case of graduate courses); undergraduate curricula must be approved by the Committee on Educational Policy; and graduate curricula must be approved by the Graduate Council. Finally, the changes must then be approved by the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate by majority vote.

Institutional research staff are located in a number of units, including Institutional Planning, Student Affairs, and Undergraduate Education. The efforts of these staff are coordinated through the Institutional Research Coordinating Group (IRCG), which meets at least monthly. The main source of institutional data for the campus as a whole is the Institutional Planning website, http://apb.ucr.edu/inst_plan/.

A special work group has been formed to improve the processes by which information and analyses are provided to key decision makers on the campus and the ability of key decision makers to access information they may need in connection with their work.

CFR 4.5: The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and objectives. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included in the institutional research function is the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the research function and the suitability and usefulness of data.

Comment

Institutional research staff are located in a number of units, including Institutional Planning, Student Affairs, and Undergraduate Education. The efforts of these staff are coordinated through the Institutional Research Coordinating Group (IRCG), which meets at least monthly. The main source of institutional data for the campus as a whole is the Institutional Planning website, http://apb.ucr.edu/inst_plan/.

A special work group has been formed to improve the processes by which information and analyses are provided to key decision makers on the campus and the ability of key decision makers to access information they may need in connection with their work.

Addressing the New Requirements in the Institutional Review Process (Elements of Table B)

***STUDENT SUCCESS:** Further development of student success efforts. Based on the findings of the institution and the team at the CPR review, the institution will be expected to further its analysis of student success, deepening its analysis of its own and comparative data on graduation and retention rates, year-to-year attrition, campus climate surveys, etc.*

Comment

The EER Report contains extensive discussion of the further development of student success efforts, particularly in the discussion of the three special themes in Section 2 of the Report.

***PROGRAM REVIEW:** An analysis of the effectiveness of the Program Review Process. Institutions should analyze the effectiveness of the program review process, including its emphasis on the achievement of the program's learning outcomes. It is expected that the process will be sufficiently implanted for the institution and the team to sample current program review reports (self-studies, external review reports) to assess the impact of the program review process and alignment with the institution's quality improvement efforts and academic planning and budgeting.*

Comment

There have been decades of program reviews at the graduate level and three years of reviews of undergraduate programs. Examples of the results of these reviews will be made available to the WASC visiting team. As is discussed in Section 3 of the EER Report, the undergraduate program review process explicitly addresses the need for learning outcomes and appropriate assessment by the programs under review. The graduate program reviews address this issue in a more implicit manner and rely on the candidacy, thesis, dissertation, and comprehensive examination processes.

SUSTAINABILITY OF EFFECTIVENESS PLANS: A plan, methods, and schedule for assessment of learning outcomes beyond the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Comment

Undergraduate programs in the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences and in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences were required to establish learning outcomes and assessment methods for those learning outcomes and to develop a multi-year assessment plan to evaluate the learning outcomes. Virtually all undergraduate programs in the two colleges have established learning outcomes and assessment measures and most have developed multi-year assessment plans. In addition, the undergraduate program review process of the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy requires explicit information on learning outcomes assessment.