

graduate and professional program reviews and assessments, (3) detailed analysis of graduate and professional student performance at UCR, (4) surveys and other data collection efforts to identify financial and other challenges to more effective recruitment of graduate and professional students and development of strategies to overcome these challenges, and (5) development and testing of approaches to creating new graduate and professional programs and increasing the quality of students admitted to all graduate and professional programs.

The general procedure for review of graduate and professional programs is as follows: Information about the program, including a mission statement, program recruitment materials, program rules and regulations, faculty CVs, student statistics, degrees awarded statistics, and student placement data, is gathered by the Graduate Division in cooperation with the program under review. A three-member external review team is selected by the Graduate Council after consulting with the program under review and directors (e.g. Department Chairs) of comparable programs at other UC campuses. Typically, the external review team consists of eminent scholars in the discipline or profession under review, with at least one a member of the faculty at another UC campus. The information collected by the Graduate Division, along with the report of the previous external review team, is provided to the new external review team in advance of a three-day site visit. During this visit, the review team meets with students and faculty associated with the program, with College and Graduate Division Deans, and with the Graduate Council review committee. The external review team then provides a detailed evaluative report to the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council then issues a set of "findings and recommendations." The graduate program must then respond to this Graduate Council report, typically by proposing changes in program rules, procedures, or direction of development. When the Graduate Council is satisfied by the program's response, the review process is closed. Each graduate or professional degree program is reviewed via this process every five to seven years.

The above process normally involves the Educational Effectiveness indicators set forth in the document Required Data Exhibits to Support the Institutional Proposal, Special Visits, and Progress Reports, but those indicators may not be explicitly or separately identified.

(3) Improving Undergraduate Student Engagement, Experience, and Learning Outcomes

The first part of this theme involves defining the faculty's aspirations for undergraduates at the level of individual programs as these relate to aspirations at the university and general education levels; developing means of measuring the degree to which undergraduates are meeting these aspirations; and devising curricular and co-curricular means of improving the degree to which undergraduates are achieving these aspirations. The goal is to have learning outcomes clearly defined, measured and evaluated at the level of the institution, general education requirements of

undergraduates, and individual majors or programs at the undergraduate and graduate level.

The second part of this theme is improving the first year experience of the heterogeneous group of undergraduate students at UCR, with a particular focus on the difficult transition from high school to college. This includes such subtopics as assessing and refining summer bridge programs and other approaches to addressing deficiencies in student preparation for college-level work, especially basic writing and mathematics skills areas; improving the performance of students in entry-level courses in majors, especially majors in science and technical fields; assessing integrative approaches to breadth requirements and expanding the successful aspects of them; developing ways of engaging students more completely in curricular and extra-curricular activities; and assessing and improving academic advising for freshmen. It also includes refining the campus comprehensive review criteria for admission of freshmen to improve the success rate of those admitted, as well as defining the characteristics of the students most likely to succeed at UCR and for whom UCR would be the best UC campus for them to attend (including their response to campus efforts to smooth their transition and maximize their success), followed by establishment of ways to contact and attract such students as applicants.

The first part of Theme 3 (defining the faculty's aspirations for undergraduates at the level of individual programs and developing measures of attainment of the aspirations at all levels) is critical to subsequent assessment efforts and is the first priority in the Educational Effectiveness process. It will be accomplished through mutual engagement of the administration and the Academic Senate, including such activities as discussion in key Academic Senate committees, town hall meetings, and broad solicitation of faculty feedback at the level of individual programs, general education, and the institution as a whole, including the development of metrics for assessment and subsequent collection and analyses of data and the design and implementation of curricular and co-curricular strategies of implementation.

Researchable questions involved in the second part of Theme 3 include (1) identifying the activities and programs in which successful freshmen at UCR are engaged [e.g., role of freshmen discovery programs, the Learning Center, various extra-curricular activities], (2) identifying the impediments to freshman success at UCR; (3) discovering and developing strategies to overcome these impediments [e.g., encouraging students to complete the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (formerly known as the Subject A requirement) before enrolling as freshmen]; (4) discovering patterns of student success at UCR that can be used by the Undergraduate Council to refine the criteria used in the comprehensive review of applicants for freshmen admission, and (5) defining the characteristics of those students most likely to succeed at UCR and for whom UCR would be the best UC campus for them to attend and then developing ways of attracting them to UCR.

The methodology includes (1) a detailed review of the literature on the freshman experience and performance, (2) collection and assessment of data on freshman

student performance at UCR, (3) development and assessment of various strategies for improving freshman success at UCR, and (4) development and assessment of various strategies for attracting more of the students the campus can best serve.

The Educational Effectiveness Subcommittee will conduct a detailed review of the WASC Standards in parallel with that conducted by the Institutional Capacity Subcommittee, paying particular attention to the same Standards and Criteria. The Educational Effectiveness review of the Standards will focus particularly on the definition of student learning outcomes and the measurement of educational effectiveness, especially as discussed in Standard 4 [Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement].

There have been detailed campus reviews of graduate and professional programs, including external review teams, for many years, using the kinds of educational effectiveness indicators described in the document Required Data Exhibits to Support the Institutional Proposal, Special Visits, and Progress Reports. These educational effectiveness assessments are supplemented by specialized accreditation reviews in professional fields like business, engineering, and medicine. But UCR is just beginning a comparable system of review of undergraduate programs and majors. This effort will increase the quality assurance process for undergraduate programs.

The campus is still developing effective approaches to defining and measuring student learning for undergraduates, so it is premature at this point to indicate exactly how the campus will review and evaluate actual undergraduate student work and learning results and other key indicators in support of the undergraduate component of its Educational Effectiveness Review. The first part of Special Theme 3, above (fully defining the faculty's aspirations for undergraduates, developing means of measuring the degree to which undergraduates are achieving these aspirations, and devising curricular and co-curricular means of improving the degree to which undergraduates are achieving these aspirations) is a critical first step in that process.

The Educational Effectiveness Subcommittee will work closely with the Institutional Capacity Subcommittee, the Institutional Research Council, and Academic Senate committees in defining the Educational Effectiveness processes for undergraduates. The Subcommittee will encourage broader campus involvement in educational effectiveness by holding special workshops, scheduling visits by external consultants, showcasing successful campus efforts at defining and measuring educational effectiveness, and similar projects. The campus will also encourage departments to adopt or strengthen capstone courses and other summative, integrated processes for students completing the work in their major.

Expected outcomes of the Educational Effectiveness Review and Educational Effectiveness Report are set forth under Section 2. **Description of Outcomes**, above.

The Educational Effectiveness Report will be submitted eighteen months after completion of the Preparatory Review Team visit.