diversity is imbedded in the campus Mission Statement. It underlies the seven areas of focus in the current strategic planning process. The campus is trying to achieve a transformative shift in how it thinks about, acts on and organizes itself around the issue of learning in a diverse environment. It is a process and a journey, but one the campus is very excited to make. Transformational change is incremental; the campus is committed to the process for the long haul. Institutional outcomes the campus aspires to are:

1. Establish a culture of evidence around diversity in the broadest sense, to familiarize the campus (at all levels) with the process.
2. Understand the student acculturation process.
3. Understand the value-added aspect of diversity to the campus (for staff, students and faculty).
4. Develop theories and practices for measuring student, and institutional success.
5. Determine how the campus can take those promising practices that concretely support student success (both undergraduate and graduate) and institutionalize them.
6. Become the national model to help other research universities understand how to leverage diversity and excellence.
7. Become a model for underrepresented minority and women undergraduate and graduate students to be successful, especially in the STEM fields.

Section 3. 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 outcome. It is expected that the process will be sufficiently implanted for the institution and the team to sample current program review reports (self-studies and 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.

The Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is the committee charged with conducting undergraduate program reviews. The reviews are done in partnership with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. Packets of recent reviews – including self-studies, external review reports, and findings and recommendations – will be made available to the WASC visiting team during their visit to campus.

Formal undergraduate program review is relatively new to UCR, having been initiated in 2006. The CEP will undertake a self-study of the effectiveness of the review process during the 2009-2010 academic year and report the results to Academic Senate. Since approval of the review procedures by the Senate in 2006, the CEP has instituted a number of changes. Arguably the most important of these is to formally incorporate assessment of learning outcomes into the review procedures; this was done in November 2008. Departments undergoing review are now required to submit the learning outcomes associated with their majors, the assessment measures they use to evaluate whether these outcomes are being achieved, assessment results, and efforts such as curricular reforms that have been undertaken to “close the loop” on this process. This

1 See Appendix A, Item 2, pp A-1 to A-2.
2 See Appendix A, Item 12, pp A-12 to A-14.
review requirement guarantees that learning outcomes assessment at the departmental level will be effective.

Undergraduate program reviews have resulted in specific changes. In the review of life sciences undergraduate programs, the student survey revealed that undergraduate advising had several shortcomings, the most pressing of these being long waits for advising help. This finding accelerated the reorganization of advising in the life sciences into an advising center with greater numbers of advisers and faster service. The review of life sciences also launched a major reorganization of the life sciences undergraduate programs that is still underway and not yet complete. Changes still being negotiated are the creation of a premajor and the formation of interdepartmental majors. In general, undergraduate program reviews result in addressing curricular issues, such as course sequencing and the need to update or expand course offerings. The reviews also frequently result in a recommendation to hire additional staff or faculty, and improve building or laboratory space. When appropriate the CEP recommends to the EVC/Provost specific actions by the administration, based on the results of the review.

The Graduate Council and Graduate Division conduct an external review of each graduate program every five to seven years. The process has resulted in strengthening and expanding promising programs, closing enrollment for programs with significant problems, discontinuing a few programs, and improving good and excellent programs.

Changes have been implemented recently to improve the effectiveness of the review process and to enhance diversity within graduate programs. These changes include a revised and greatly shortened faculty survey (15 questions rather than 44) that is now conducted online and a similarly revised and shortened online survey for current and former graduate students. Two graduate programs, currently undergoing external review, have used the new surveys. The participation rate for each program is around 75%, substantially greater than the typical 30% participation rate with the old survey. In addition, the results of the revised questionnaire are better formatted for the external reviewers. Accordingly, the reviewers now receive a much more representative survey of the graduate program under review and come to campus more knowledgeable about the program and how it perceives its own strengths and weaknesses. This focuses the review team’s efforts on issues that can contribute to strengthening the program. The Graduate Council and Graduate Division have also revised the questions provided to the review team for consideration during the review, including directing the review team to examine the efforts the program has undertaken to increase its diversity during the period under review.

In addition, the Graduate Dean, the dean of the college and the EVC/Provost are establishing a mid-term review of graduate programs to evaluate the progress they have made in meeting the findings and recommendations of the Graduate Council. Since the typical time

---

3 See discussion in Section 2, pp 16-17.
4 For details on the revisions of Committee on Educational Policy procedures that require explicit attention to learning outcomes and assessment, see Appendix B, pp B-14 to B-15.
5 Further information is found in Section 2, Graduate Theme, pp 20-21.
between program reviews is 7 to 8 years, a program would be reviewed in year 3 or 4 to assess its progress.

A future consideration is to better link the results of program reviews with resource allocations, particularly in situations where a review identifies a critical need in a program. While senior administrators – deans and the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost – play an important role in the process of undergraduate program review at UCR – e.g., meeting with the external review team and receiving the program review materials, including the self study, external team report, and findings and recommendations – the link between program review results and decisions regarding resource allocations should be less tenuous. The campus understands that WASC intends to adopt new, best practice standards for program reviews which include recommendations on the link between program review results and resource allocation decisions. The campus eagerly awaits the dissemination of that document, and intends to act on the recommendations at that time.

Section 4. 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 of graduation and retention rates, year to year attrition, campus climate surveys, etc.

Student success is discussed in detail in Section 2, and in Appendix A. Discussions of analyses of student success are also found in Section 5, below.

Section 5. An updated Data Portfolio and supporting evidence, expanded to include elements relevant to the EER, including a plan, methods, and schedule for assessment of learning outcomes beyond the Educational Effectiveness Review. Building on the Data Portfolio developed for the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the institution should present additional evidence and exhibits that support its analysis of Educational Effectiveness and student learning. The institution should provide an updated version of the Summary Data Form, Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, and the Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation, as well as listing current assessment activities, such as the one originally submitted as part of the CPR Review. In addition, the institution might include selected results of assessment studies, results of any summative learning measures deemed important by the institution (e.g., pass rates for licensure examinations, capstone courses, etc.), surveys of graduates and current students, and employer feedback on former student performance. Institutions should comment on a summary of the data analysis and expectations for improvement, including milestone targets, for specific groups of learners as reflected in graduation and retention outcomes.

As UCR comes to rely more and more on a “culture of evidence” approach to decision making, the generation and analysis of data become key. The Data Portfolio included in the Preparatory Review Report has been updated and is found in File 4, one of the electronic files supplemental to this EER Report. It includes an updated Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (Table 7.1) and an updated Concurrent Accreditation listing (Table 8.1). The updated Summary Data Form is found in File 3, another of the electronic files supplemental to this EER Report.

---

6 See the second focus of the Undergraduate Theme, (pp 8-17).
7 See Item (4) (pp A-2 to A-5) and Item (11) (pp A-11 to A-12).