REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

To University of California, Riverside

October 23-26, 2018

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster
David Lassner, Chair
Interim Chancellor, University of Hawaii

Sharon B. Hamill, Assistant Chair
Professor of Psychology, California State University San Marcos

Thomas McCarron, Team Member
Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, San Diego State University

Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Team Member
Associate Provost for Institutional Analytics, San Francisco State University

Patricia Turner, Team Member
Vice Provost and Dean, Undergraduate Education, University of California, Los Angeles

Christopher Oberg, WSCUC Institution Liaison
Vice President/COO, WSCUC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

Description. Originally founded as a Citrus Experiment Station in 1907

(http://cnas.ucr.edu/about/history/ces.html), the University of California, Riverside (UCR) was

declared a campus of the University of California system in 1969, and is currently one of ten

campuses of the UC system governed by the Board of Regents. The main campus of this public

research institution is located in Riverside, a suburban, inland city in Southern California. A

small branch campus housing a creative writing program is located in Palm Desert, CA

(*Institutional Report, p. 6*).

The campus houses seven colleges and schools: the College of Humanities, Arts and

Social Sciences (CHASS), the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), the Bourns

College of Engineering (BCOE), the School of Business (SOB), the Graduate School of

Education (GSOE), the School of Public Policy (SPP), and the School of Medicine (SOM).

CHASS and CNAS serve the largest number of students, accounting for 75% of undergraduate

and 50% of graduate students. The BCOE and SOB both offer undergraduate degrees whereas

the GSOE, SPP and SOM focus primarily on graduate and professional degrees though GSOE

and SPP both now offer undergraduate degrees. In total, UCR offers 111 undergraduate degrees

and 52 graduate degrees.

Campus leadership includes the chancellor and a provost/executive vice chancellor. The

Provost's office is responsible for nine departments: Academic Personnel, Information

Technology Systems, Administrative Resolution, Undergraduate Education, Palm Desert Center,

International Affairs, Enrollment Management, the Library, and the Ombuds. Additionally, five

vice chancellors oversee campus administration: Business and Administrative Services, Planning

and Budget, Research and Economic Development, Student Affairs and University Advancement. All colleges, UCR Extension, and Graduate Division are led by deans (*Institutional Report, p. 6*).

The Institutional Report (*Table 1, p. 7*) indicates that student enrollment is currently at approximately 23,000 students, 3,000 of whom are graduate and professional students. Undergraduate students are primarily women (54.3%), Chicano/Latino (41.3%) or Asian (33.8%), and over half are first generation college students (57.2%). Graduate students are primarily men (55.8%), identify as White (29.9%), Chicano/Latino (15.4%) or Asian (9.6%); no data were presented on the percentage of students who are first-generation. International students currently comprise 2.9% of the undergraduate and 31.6% of the graduate populations.

In response to the Team's request for additional information on faculty and staff, UCR provided supplemental materials on the faculty/staff headcount prior to the OSR (*Supplemental Appendix*). Table 7 from these materials indicates that there are 1,142 instructional faculty (813 ladder-rank faculty, 329 instructional faculty) and 619 non-instructional faculty. UCR provided detailed information on their significant efforts to hire diverse faculty and staff (O*SR_III_2_Recruit and Retain Diverse Faculty and Staff.pdf*). There has been an increase in the percentage of new faculty from underrepresented groups hired since 12-13 (from 12.9% to 22.1% in 16-17; *Cohort Data_Faculty_Hiring.pdf*). UCR currently employs 3,077 staff personnel, 378 of whom are administrators (12.3%). The Team could not find a document summarizing a campus-wide breakdown of staff by underrepresented group status.

Although UCR adheres to the general Mission of the University of California system, it does not provide a statement on the mission or values that are unique to UCR, nor does it articulate institutional level learning outcomes characterizing a UCR education (*CFR 1.1; Note:*

this information was requested as part of the LOR but was not provided and no one made it available to the Team during the AV). UCR provides a broad statement regarding the culmination of a UCR education, noting that when students leave UCR they will "know ways of investigating, studying, interpreting and translating that set them up for a life of engaging relationships with a universe they increasingly understand in all its complexity" (*Institutional Report, p. 9*). However, it was difficult to discern the specific goals for what students should know, be able to do and value upon graduation; rather, the report emphasizes the efforts that the university makes to educate – and this is different from what students are expected to learn (*CFR 1.6*). Specifically, the report underscored university efforts focused on research, diversity and inclusiveness, interdisciplinarity, and engagement with the community. Their efforts to educate students in these areas are addressed in Component 3 of this report.

UCR highly values contributing to the public good *(Institutional Report, p. 14; CFR 1.1)* and they do so through curriculum such as the CNAS Science Ambassador program, which provides high achieving undergraduate students opportunities to serve as liaisons to the communities that CNAS serves. They deliver programming to schools and cultural centers in inland Southern California and Riverside through their Gluck Fellowship Program in the Arts. This program also affords outstanding UCR students opportunities to present their research through arts presentations, workshops, and performances; they have offered over 90 programs per year. Additional curriculum offerings that bring UCR students into the community include internship programs and service-learning courses offered through the Educational Initiatives program. UCR also provides significant service to the community outside of student coursework. This includes the free medical clinic, the CNAS Science Ambassador Program, the Gluck Fellowship Program, and their Engineering Day. The Center for Ideas and Society

provides community members the opportunity to engage in political discourse and activities. All of these activities illustrate UCR's firm commitment to contributing to the public good (*Institutional Report*, *pp. 14-15*).

Accreditation History. UCR has been accredited by WSCUC since 1956. The last comprehensive review was conducted in 2008 (CPR) and 2009 (EER). The 2010 Commission Action letter from that review reaffirmed accreditation with the next CPR scheduled at that time for fall 2018 and the EER in spring 2020, and an interim report on the issues cited in the 2009 EER report due in 2013. These issues included progress in student assessment and completion/implementation of a strategic plan. When the Interim Report Committee received the interim report in 2013, they requested a second interim report in 2015. In 2012, the new review process required that the OSR be moved to spring 2018 with the AV taking place in fall 2018.

Since the last accreditation review UCR sought, and obtained for, two substantive changes. In 2011, a substantive change proposal to establish a Doctor of Medicine, a new degree program, and launch a School of Medicine was submitted. The site visit occurred in 2011 and the Structural Change action panel approved the offering of the Doctor of Medicine Degree and the opening of the proposed medical school, subject to approval from the Liaison Committee on Medical Education. They obtained this approval and the medical school was opened in 2015. In 2016, the Substantive Change Committee gave interim approval to an online MS in Engineering program with final Commission approval given later that year (2016).

B.   **Description of the Team's Process**

The OSR/AV team was provided access to the UCR report and supporting documentation in January, 2018. Members' independent assessment of the documentation were compiled by the

assistant chair for use during the team phone conference, held in March, 2018; additional documentation needed and items to be discussed during the OSR were identified during this conference call. UCR largely provided the requested info just prior to/during the OSR (April 9-10, 2018) so the Team was unable to review these materials at that time. The team requested additional documentation while at the OSR and communicated this to UCR's ALO via the video conference on April 10th. UCR provided the requested information by August 15, 2018; team members completed independent assessments of these documents which were compiled by the assistant chair prior to a conference call (September 21, 2018), in preparation for the AV. Team members wrote sections of the draft report which were compiled by the assistant chair and distributed to the Team prior to the AV. The AV took place October 23 – 26, 2018. At this time, the team conducted interviews with various individuals (e.g., Chancellor, Provost) and groups (e.g., Chancellor's Cabinet, Senate Leadership, Staff). The Team reviewed documents relevant to federal requirements on-site. A confidential email account was provided to UCR during the visit and was reviewed throughout the duration of the AV.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

UCR's Institutional Report was created under the direction of the Office of Undergraduate Education; specifically, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the campus Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Director of Evaluation and Assessment, and a Faculty Reaccreditation Director (appointed for this task) led efforts to write the report. During this process, three different individuals served in the ALO position, each of whom worked on various parts of the institutional report. A working group of approximately 20 faculty and administrators from across campus was assembled in late 2016 and documented their initial conversations reviewing WSCUC policies and procedures. A Reaccreditation Workgroup comprised of

faculty, staff, and administrators (some members served on both groups) created the first draft of the report. Workgroup members met with other groups and offices on campus during winter and spring 2017 to obtain additional information/feedback which was integrated into the draft report. At the same time, another group of approximately 25 key personnel conducted the Review under the Standards by surveying administrators on campus, as was reported during the on-site visit; results were shared with the Reaccreditation Workgroup and integrated in the report draft. The draft was shared with the Academic Senate and Senate Committees which reviewed and provided feedback. The draft was made publicly available to the campus community with feedback provided through email. A town hall meeting was held in November 2017. The final self-study report was approved by the Reaccreditation Workgroup, the ALO, the Provost, and the Chancellor; the report was submitted to WASC in January 2018.

UCR chose to write this report in terms of four key parts rather than using the components; this choice made it difficult for the Team to discern where specific required components of the report were located. Although this approach allowed for some narrative continuity, in many cases, the organization was confusing and discussion of key information was inadequate (*CFR 1.8*). The report was shorter (45 pages) than those of most institutions. While the Team appreciated the impulse to be concise, the lack of information on key topics (e.g., accreditation history and response to previous Commission actions) was problematic. The Team had to ask for basic materials prior to the OSR (*March 24 Questions and Answers* folder) in addition to the requests for more information in the response to the Lines of Inquiry (LOI) document (*LOI responses* folder).

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

UCR's Institutional Report provided very little information regarding its accreditation history and did not clearly highlight issues raised in its last review or its response to the reviews. This required that the Team glean the information from a document provided by WSCUC and request this fundamental report information be included as part of the LOI to ensure the Team had it prior to the AV. Using this report and supporting documents, it is clear that whereas UCR is addressing the concerns that had been raised regarding strategic planning, issues regarding assessment of student learning remain. These issues have been evident in each review since 2009, with equivocal evidence of progress. This pattern suggests that some members of UCR's faculty and administrative leadership teams may lack the expertise necessary to establish robust assessment practices and in some cases, may underestimate their importance.

The most recent reviews were the 2008 CPR and 2009 EER visits/reports. As a response to the Commission's Action following the 2009 review, UCR was asked to respond to two items in an interim report: "(1) progress in student learning assessment, and (2) completion and implementation of a strategic plan, including planning in graduate programs, realistic financial projections, and measures related to student learning outcomes" (*Commission Action Letter 2009, p.1*). An interim report outlining their progress was received by the Interim Review Committee (IRC) in 2013; at that time, the Committee expressed its discouragement with the progress UCR had made and requested an additional interim report in 2015 with an update on assessment and strategic planning. In 2015 the IRC received the report and noted that UCR had "placed appropriate emphasis on the outcomes of assessment," noting specific actions that were currently underway (e.g., increase in faculty, additional buildings, and metrics required to qualify

for AAU membership; *IRC Action Letter 2015, p.1*). With regard to strategic planning, UCR appears to be well on the way to meeting their student enrollment growth target and increased numbers of faculty and campus buildings, despite significant turnover in administrative leaders. General impressions of UCR's responses to assessment and strategic planning issues raised in the interim reports are provided here, with more substantial evaluation contained in the discussion of the components.

   Assessment of Student Learning. The 2010 Commission Action Letter underscored the faculty's responsibility for assessment by stating, "The Commission expects that analysis of findings from assessment will be undertaken by the faculty in a systematic way, and that the results of this process will lead to improvement" (*Commission Action Letter, 2010; CFR 4.6*). This sentiment was also expressed more strongly in the first Interim Report, noting that "The panel was discouraged that more has not been accomplished by UCR since the Commission letter in 2010." Further, "The panel expects that by Spring 2015, all departments will have completed not only development of learning outcomes, assessment plans, and curriculum maps, but will have completed at least one round of assessment with evidence of the results being used to bring improvements to each program" (*IRC Action Letter, May 2013 p.1*). The *IRC Action Letter of 2015* (*p. 2*) expressed its understanding of the challenges facing UCR including the need to consider assessment as continuous improvement, the difficulties in changing a culture, and the slowdown of program review efforts due to lack of staff. At that time, the IRC was encouraged by the joint efforts between the Faculty Senate and administration to develop and implement institution-wide systems (*IRC Action Letter 2015, p.1*). They believed that "there is evidence of a coordinated and collaborative effort to expand the impact of assessment and achieve the goals of the strategic plan" (*IRC Action Letter, 2015*, *p. 2*). UCR responded to this

input in its most current communications by stating, "Faculty and departments have taken

ownership of the annual assessment processes and are actively engaged in periodic program

review" (*OSR III.1 Commission Action Letter Summary, p. 1*). This statement, however, is at

odds with the evidence they provided. UCR has not achieved the assessment goals called for in

the previous IRC Action Letters.

Evaluation of documentation provided by UCR indicates that whereas there are some efforts

underway to assess student learning, the enthusiasm they demonstrated in the 2015 Interim

Report has given way in some cases to complacency. At present, UCR is reconsidering their

efforts to create infrastructure. For example, after some effort to develop assessment for

graduate programs, they are now going back to thinking about what kind of process to use

(*Institutional Report*, *p. 37*). They established an Assessment Advisory Committee in 2015 and

were commended for it by WSCUC; however, the committee was "dormant" in 2016-2018

because they were working on their WSCUC self-study (*OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure

and Processes*, *p. 2).* They note that core competencies have been assessed but acknowledge that

no reports other than Written Communication (from 12-13;

https://ueeval.ucr.edu/assessment/core_competencies_2.html) were written until the Team

requested it as part of the LOI (*OSR III_5 Previous General Education and Core Competencies

Assessment.pdf*). The report submitted was vague, confusing, and cast doubt on the

nature/quality of the assessment process for the core competencies. Moreover, the summary of

the data has not been disseminated in a transparent fashion (*CFRs 1.7, 1.8, 2.4 and 2.6*). Finally,

UCR admits that "Assessment infrastructure and processes are currently in flux and evolving at

UCR" (*OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, p. 1*). The evidence examined by the

Team shows that, in many cases, UCR has not addressed the explicit requirements outlined in the

interim reports (e.g., all programs will have curriculum maps). Collectively, the evidence

indicates that whereas there are consistent efforts being made to assess student learning by some

programs at the undergraduate level, the graduate programs and core competencies are behind.

The data also suggest that these activities accelerate prior to a WSCUC visit.

Assessment leadership at UCR is lacking. Whereas there is clear evidence that the former

Director of Evaluation and Assessment appropriately used his expertise and expended

significant efforts to move the campus toward a culture of assessment, this is not a task that can

be completed by a single person -- it must have significant support from campus leadership.

Moreover, that individual is no longer at UCR, and the responsibilities have been assigned as

additional work to the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Institutional Research. Although she is

extremely knowledgeable and has provided outstanding support to assessment efforts, the Team

advises that this process is a team effort -- from the top levels of administration, to the Deans and

assessment committees, to the faculty conducting the assessments in their classrooms -- and

cannot be made the responsibility of any one person. Efforts are underway to hire a new

Director of Evaluation and Assessment. However, UCR must develop an infrastructure that

actively engages the multiple campus constituencies in the process of identifying learning goals,

mapping the courses and activities students undertake to those goals, consistently obtaining

direct and indirect assessment data relevant to those goals, and closing the loop by using that

information to improve programs. Given that many of the same issues regarding student

assessment that have been identified for the past nine years are still plaguing the campus, it

suggests that UCR has not yet made the transition to a culture of assessment as a means of

improving student learning rather than an exercise that must be conducted for accreditation.

Strategic Planning. The existing strategic plan, UCR 2020, mentioned in the Report and

available online (http://strategicplan.ucr.edu/documents/UCR%202020%20-%20Final.pdf),

outlines UCR's priorities as of 2010. The 2020 UCR Strategic Plan articulated four specific

Strategic Goals: (1) Academic Excellence – Developing a Preeminent Research University for

the 21st Century; (2) Access – Enhancing Opportunity for Graduate, Professional and

Undergraduate Students; (3) Diversity – Serving as a National Exemplar for Diversity, Inclusion

and Community; (4) Engagement – Shaping Our World (*Strategic Planning Overview, p. 1*).

They selected the Association of American Universities (AAU) criteria as a benchmark for their

efforts and identified specific targets such as establishing professional schools, increasing the

number of faculty, and growing student enrollment. However, UCR does not produce annual

reports outlining the status of their work on the annual plan, though they did provide an update

when requested to do so (*Supplemental Questions and Answers.pdf, March 24 Questions and

Answers* folder).   The Institutional Report contained few clear statements identifying the links

between UCR's current or future priorities and efforts underway to achieve those goals.

The Team did find some evidence illustrating success in meeting specific strategic priorities

linked to their aspiration to meet AAU benchmarks during the onsite visit. Metrics illustrating

progress on other aspects of the plan were more difficult to ascertain and UCR staff

acknowledged this during site visit discussions.

The *IRC Action Letter from 2013* (*p. 2*) noted that the UCR's enrollment growth plan was

based on the assumption that growth would take place and was highly dependent on adding a

medical school. The IRC underscored that this would be particularly challenging because of the

turnover in Chancellors. Despite this, UCR has managed to meet a number of its goals. For

example, the Schools of Public Policy and Medicine have been launched; formal accreditation

for the School of Medicine came in 2015. Based upon the current enrollment numbers provided

in the Institutional Report (*p. 4*), UCR appears well on its way to meeting its goal of increasing

student enrollment, accompanied by a growth in faculty. Their successes with hiring a large

number of faculty in pursuit of 300 new faculty positions and diversifying the student population

are particularly noteworthy. The report notes that "UCR will soon embark upon a new strategic

plan, as the previous strategic plan, "UCR 2020," focused on the period 2010-2020, and the

planning process for such a document will require several years to develop" (*Institutional

Report*, *p. 45*). The Report provides no information on current efforts underway to establish a

new strategic plan when the old plan expires in 2020 (*CFRs 4.6 and 4.7*). It was not clear from

campus interviews who will lead or be involved in that effort, though it is generally believed that

it will engage the whole campus community. The Chancellor noted that it will likely take place

sometime in Winter 2019.

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, was that UCR demonstrated

sufficient evidence of compliance with each of the four WSCUC Standards of Accreditation.

Review of the UCR Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) revealed that

whereas some programs are assessed on a regular basis, some have not been reviewed in over 10

years (e.g., Biochemistry, Neuroscience, and History in 2006/07). Review of documents during

the AV indicated that UCR met the federal requirements for credit hour, marketing and

recruitment, student complaints and transfer credit policy.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.

In general, the Team observed that the campus meets most of the CFRs for Standard 1.   UCR

demonstrates its commitment to academic freedom (*CFR 1.3*), increasing diversity (*CFR 1.4*),

commitment to the public good (*CFR 1.1*), and education as its primary purpose through its

public documents and the related UC system policies and procedures (*Institutional Report*, p. 12; *UC Mission Statement,* https://ucop.edu/uc-mission/index.html). UCR has one of the most diverse undergraduate student bodies in the nation and has been named by The Education Trust a "top performing institution" for African American and Latino/a students (*Institutional Report*, *p. 5*; *CFR 1.5*). UCR truthfully represents its academic goals, services, and costs to students and the larger public (*CFR 1.6*).

There were some CFRs that do not appear to have been met. The team observed that the campus does not have a mission statement other than the general mission of the UC system (*CFR 1.1*) and that educational objectives for the General Education Program were not found (*CFR 1.2*). While not stated explicitly in a mission statement, UCR's educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, and are demonstrably achieved as evidenced by UCR's retention and graduation rates (*CFR 1.2*). The current strategic plan (UCR 2010-2020) is nearing its end without a clear timeline for developing the next plan. (*Institutional Report, p. 45*; *CFRs 1.1 & 2.2*).

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions. UCR has established educational goals through its core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success.

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7). UCR has clearly defined programs that ensure its ability to meet its core functions related to teaching and learning.

UCR has taken significant steps to improve its graduation rates which have increased from 39% for students entering in 2006 to 56% for those entering in 2013 (*Institutional Report*, p. 25). The related UC system-wide Challenge 45 Initiative added to this significant improvement by asking departments that had more than 45 upper-division units in the major to

reevaluate their requirements and make it more feasible for students to finish their degrees in four years. UCR's efforts have also improved the retention rates for undergraduate students from 83% in 2006 to 89% in 2017 (*Institutional Report, p. 21*; *CFR 1.2*) and narrowed the achievement gap (*Institutional Report, p. 25*; *CFR 2.13*).

There were some CFRs that UCR has not met. On-site review of course syllabi revealed that most do not include program student learning outcomes and many do not address course level learning outcomes (*CFRs 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4*). Although most undergraduate programs have created curriculum maps to assess alignment of the curriculum, graduate and general education (breadth) programs have yet to do so (*CFRs 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6*). Moreover, some of the undergraduate and graduate programs have not undergone systematic program review (*CFR 2.7*).

Scholarship and Creative Activities (CFRs 2.8 & 2.9). UCR follows the UC system policy on Appointment and Promotion *(Institutional Report, p. 7)*. Faculty also engage students in informal learning, mentoring and advising activities.

Student Learning and Success (CFRs 2.10-2.14). Surveys show that student perceptions of the campus are slightly higher than the UC system-wide average and that the various college based first-year learning communities are a significant factor in the increased retention rates (*Institutional Report, pp. 21-22*).

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability. UCR is experiencing a great deal of growth**.** Over the past ten years, student enrollment has grown by 36% and full-time instructional faculty increased by 29% (*Institutional Report, p. 4; CFR 3.1*). UCR is still planning for faculty growth to accommodate realized and planned growth in the student body and has increased hiring of underrepresented minorities (URM) to better reflect the overall student body diversity

(*Institutional Report, p. 25)*. There appears to be a disproportionate issue with retention of URM faculty; the team was impressed with the thinking about this challenge and campus planning to date to ensure UCR can retain the diverse faculty it is hiring (*OSR III 2 Recruit and Retain Diverse Faculty and Staff*; *Provost response to CoDEO separations request 081117*; *CFRs 3.1 & 3.2*).

UCR is financially stable and has its financial statements audited annually on a consolidated basis as part of the UC system (https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2018/audit3.pdf). UCR faces significant budget challenges given the steady reduction in state appropriations and lack of state funding for capital construction since 2006 (*Institutional Report, p. 44)*. The institution has demonstrated a commitment to capital construction by its investment in its new Multidisciplinary Research Building 1(MRB1) to provide space primarily for research labs and computational research and shell space for future growth (*Institutional Report, p. 42*). Given the lack of state capital funding, the 30 year debt service for the MRB1 will be paid by increased indirect cost returns, which is somewhat uncertain given federal research funding levels (*Institutional Report, p. 44*). Future expense increases, primarily salaries and benefits, are also assuming growth in revenues from non-resident students and state appropriations, also uncertain sources of revenue. Backstopping this relative uncertainty regarding future funding, UCR's overall fiscal conservatism and maintenance of prudent unrestricted fund balances provides the university time to react and adjust to financial changes on the horizon (*CFR 3.4*).

It was noted that Information Technology Services (ITS) is actively engaged in a comprehensive review of its services to support optimization of campus business operations (*OSR III 8 Evidence Illustrating How IT Resources Support the Campus Mission, p. 3-4*). UCR

recently completed the implementation and stabilization of the Banner Student Information System which resulted in improved self-service options, course planning/scheduling functionality, and access to more timely data (*OSR III 8 Evidence Illustrating How IT Resources Support the Campus Mission, pp. 11-12*). UCR has recently gone live on the UCPath system which provides a single payroll, benefits, human resources, and academic personnel solution. UCPath is now in a stabilization period and additional modules are scheduled for release in early 2019 (*OSR III 8 Evidence Illustrating How IT Resources Support the Campus Mission, p. 12*). The team suggests that UCR ensure ITS and other staff directly affected by this continuous technology change be supported and recognized for this enormous effort (*CFR 3.5*).

UCR has a full time Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and full time Chief Financial Officer and a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management (*CFR 3.8*)

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement. The report acknowledges that assessment is currently in flux and evolving at UCR with some programs actively engaged in the process and others not (*OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure and Process,* p. 1; *Response to previous Commission actions; see Components 3, 4 and 5).* While it is clear that the administrative leadership is committed to improvements in the assessment process, it is not as clear that this has been embraced by the university community (*CFR 4.1*).

Additional Items

 It also found that UCR met the federal requirements for credit hour, marketing and recruitment, student complaints and transfer credit policy.

C. Part 1: Degree Programs and Educational Quality: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees

    1. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees

Throughout UCR's Institutional Report, they focus on their values and the efforts they put into promoting those values (*Institutional Report, pp. 10-18*). However, the Team was concerned that UCR has not yet made the transition from thinking about what we do "to" students, to focusing on what students learn by the time they leave the institution. Though not required, there were no institutional level learning outcomes or a Mission statement for UCR as a unique institution in the UC system (*CFRs 1.1 and 1.2)* to guide the Team's evaluation here. However, the Team believes that their report reflects a "mission of access," as UCR devotes a great deal of time and resources to ensuring that all people, including those from underrepresented groups, have the opportunity to obtain a university degree. Whereas this is admirable and their passion for this goal clearly resonated in the report, they provide no discussion of what it is that they want students to learn while at UCR, supported by clear evidence from assessment of student learning. Consequently, the Team's focus here is on UCR's description of what they offer their students in the domains of research, diversity, interdisciplinary, and community.

Research is central to UCR's identity. They report that in fiscal year 2016, the faculty received 866 contracts and grants, worth more than $144 million. The faculty emphasize both graduate and undergraduate research education, with up to 20% of undergraduates conducting research in a given year, some of which is supported by small grants (*Institutional Report, p. 11*). This work is disseminated through the annual undergraduate research symposium and an Undergraduate Research Journal. It is clear that a great deal of their efforts are focused on

promoting research activities. However, it is not clear what percentage of students have the opportunity to participate in research outside of their classroom assignments. Students who complete independent research projects or work in a faculty member's lab have research experiences that are of higher quality than the typical in-class activities. As these opportunities allow students to build skill sets that will help them to get into graduate programs, it would be important to consider the demographics of those students who are taking advantage of this high impact practice (e.g., women and individuals from underrepresented groups).

The Institutional Report provides clear evidence that UCR has been long-committed to diversity and inclusiveness (*p. 12; CFR 3.1*). UCR has a number of offices focused on addressing the needs of underrepresented groups including African Student Programs, Asian Pacific Student Programs, Chicano Student Programs, Native American Student Programs, a Veterans Resource Center, and both a Women's Resource Center and a Women's Faculty Association. They were the first public institution to establish a LGBT Resource center and a Middle Eastern Student Center. They joined ten other public research universities in 2014 to establish the University Innovation Alliance (UIA); this partnership formed around their commitment to accessibility in higher education for low-income and first-generation students.

Despite these significant efforts, there are enrollment patterns that raise some issues with regard to diversity at UCR. Table 1 from the Institutional Report (*p. 7*) shows that there has been a shift in the ethnic composition of the campus with increases in the percentage of undergraduate Chicano/Latino students (25.9% to 41.3%) and decreases in Black (7.4% to 3.5%), White (17.7% to 11.5%), and Asian (41.8% to 33.8%) students between 2007 and 2017. There is a somewhat similar pattern of change in the graduate population. Ethnic composition of graduate students shows an increase in the percentage of Chicano/Latino (9.1% to 15.4%) and Black (2.1% to

2.5%) graduate students and declines for White (36.2% to 29.9%) and Asian (10.4% to 9.6%)

students between 2007 and 2017. Coupled with the data that show that females comprise 54% of

the undergraduate population but only 44.2% of the graduate population, it is important for UCR

to reflect on these trends and what they mean for UCR's diversity and aspirational goals.

UCR offers interdisciplinary programs in every college (*Institutional Report, p. 12*). For

example, there are a number of CHASS programs housed in the Multidisciplinary Programs Unit

and administered by the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies. In the STEM colleges and schools —

CNAS, BCOE and SOM — interdisciplinarity is integral to contemporary research. Their

professional schools (GSOE, SPP, and SOM) also integrate information and research from

multiple disciplines. Thus, it appears that students are exposed to interdisciplinarity at both the

undergraduate and graduate levels. However, without direct assessment of student learning, it is

unclear whether students internalize this message and utilize it in their own thinking and actions.

UCR's commitment to the public good clearly illustrates the important role that

community plays in students' educations. Through their innovative community programs

(discussed previously), they illustrate their efforts to put their values into action by ensuring that

students have opportunities to engage with, and give back to, their community partners.

In sum, UCR is committed to values reflecting research, diversity, interdisciplinarity, and

community. However, the institution's public documents do not link these values to a guiding

mission statement. A clearly defined mission statement in which their specific values can be

tracked would contribute toward establishing the unique identity that UCR desires (*Institutional*

Report, p. 6) and perhaps lead to more students attending UCR as a first-choice university.

2. **Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation**

Evidence regarding the educational quality of degree programs at UCR was explored through examination of program student learning outcomes (PSLOs) for the undergraduate, graduate, and General Education Programs online and in course syllabi. This review indicates that, as has been the case since 2010, UCR struggles with the assessment process. Current evidence indicates that there is much work to be done in order for UCR to be able to evaluate student performance at graduation.

Student Learning Outcomes: Undergraduate. UCR provides student learning outcomes for each of their majors online and curriculum maps are included in some assessment reports at the undergraduate level. Relevant PSLOs (i.e., those PSLOs with which a specific course aligns) are not included on most course syllabi (rather, they list course objectives which may or may not align with PSLOs). It is not clear how the PSLOs connect to the mission or the core competencies *(CFR 2.3).* For example, UCR notes that interdisciplinarity is a key component of a UCR education, however few, if any, majors list that as a learning outcome. Additionally, most majors include written communication as one of their PSLOs while other core competencies are not included (e.g., oral communication, information literacy), so it is unclear how the curriculum supports student mastery of the core competencies. Moreover, the PSLOs varied a great deal in quality with some departments doing an outstanding job (e.g., Psychology) and others indicating that they are in need of additional training in assessment so they can revise PSLOs to ensure they are measureable

Review of UCR-selected undergraduate program assessment reports shows that in recent years, programs have created curriculum maps. However, rather than using a template for maps

which would create some consistency across programs, each department uses its own method, perhaps contributing to confusion about the process. While respecting the academic aversion to "one size fits all," there are shortcomings to this approach. For example, some of the maps show that courses within a department do not contribute to any of the program student learning outcomes (e.g., *2015BACH_publ_poli_assessment_report.docx*, *UCR Folder, Assessment Reports*), others show that a PSLO is not introduced in any courses but students are expected to show development and mastery (*2015_BACH_soc_curr_map_xls, UCR Folder, Assessment Reports*), and some programs use I, II, and III to denote mastery expectations whereas others use Introduced, Practiced, Demonstrated (e.g. Earth Sciences), check marks or Xs (Chemistry and Biochemistry assessment reports, respectively).

Student Learning Outcomes: Graduate. All graduate programs have created program student learning outcomes and they are available online; in most cases program level PSLOs do not appear on syllabi and most programs have not created curriculum maps (*CFRs 2.2b, 2.5 and 2.6*). Consequently, there is limited evidence demonstrating how the curriculum aligns with program level learning outcomes *(CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.5)*. Upon examination of the PSLOs provided by graduate programs it is clear that in many cases, the PSLOs are not measureable. Clear statements about what students should know, be able to do, or value when they complete the degree should be clearly stated in terms that make them assessable. Phrases such as "students will understand" or "students will be familiar with…" are not measureable. Faculty are using grades, oral/written exams, and progress in the program as assessment evidence – there is little direct assessment of student performance on specific learning outcomes *(CFR 2.6).* Examination of their graduate programs' assessment plans supports this observation (*Graduate Program Assessment Plans*). The assessments they are conducting provide gross metrics on student

performance in courses and across the program or satisfaction with the program, but little direct evidence that they have met the specific learning outcomes outlined by faculty in the program. The materials provided by UCR indicate that, despite directions from previous WSCUC reviews to do so, they have not yet established annual assessment activities at the graduate level, a sentiment stated in the *Institutional Report (p. 37)* and verified by comments during interviews on campus. Moreover, it is important that PhD and MA degrees reflect distinct levels of expertise in the field and that the various programs housed in a single major (e.g., Languages) articulate the unique PSLOs for each program; review of these documents suggest that they would benefit from revisiting this issue within their programs.

Student Learning Outcomes: Core Competencies/GE. UCR has changed its approach to assessing core competencies multiple times. Currently, they select a core competency to focus on each year. They note that most programs have PSLOs that reflect core competencies (although this was not observed across programs when examining PSLOs) and programs report on them as part of their annual assessment. UCR has not clearly articulated campus-wide learning outcomes for the core competencies; rather, they provide a definition of "WASC Core Competencies" and assume each program will define it for themselves. While there is merit in allowing programs to do so, there needs to be a clear statement – and common understanding -- about what any student will be able to do/know/value with regard to the core competencies upon graduation if they are to be evaluated. Ideally, the PSLOs will reflect, from a disciplinary standpoint, what the core competencies look like for them.

The report provided very little information about assessment of the General Education Program (UCR refers to this as breadth requirements) and the Team was not able to find GE learning outcomes articulated anywhere (*CFRs 2.3a, 2.4, 2.7*). At the request of the Team, UCR

provided a supplementary document that explains their assessment processes and infrastructure in response to the Lines of Inquiry (*OSR III_3Assessment Infrastructure and processes.pdf*, p. 11-12). They note that when programs do not have a core competency addressed in their curriculum, it is addressed in the breadth courses. However, it does not appear that UCR has clearly defined PSLOs for its GE program, there is no evidence of curricular alignment, nor is consistent assessment of GE PSLOs or core competencies taking place. They report that the Academic Senate is leading a review and "potential reshaping" of the campus GE curriculum in 2018 and this process will be "driven by a framework of pedagogical goals for the GE curriculum" (*Institutional Report, p. 11-12*). While on campus, the Team was given a document outlining a proposed procedure for conducting this comprehensive review of breadth/general education by the Academic Senate. The Team was encouraged by this proposal as it will move UCR's assessment of breadth/general education in the right direction.

It is critical that each program – degree programs and GE, at the undergraduate and graduate levels – have clearly defined student learning outcomes, stated in measureable terms, mapped to the curriculum, and aligned with the mission to ensure the integrity of those degrees (*CFRs 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, and 2.3*). There was equivocal evidence presented to indicate that UCR has successfully done so. By clearly stating their goals, UCR can design and implement assessment processes – in all programs – to ensure that the degrees awarded meet institutional standards of quality and consistency and can be demonstrated in their program review process (*CFR 4.3*).

D. Part 2: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

   1. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

   In its framing statement UCR notes that:

"UCR is committed to the success of all of our students. We think about success in a number of ways. From a student's perspective, success means finding a welcoming environment in which to study and develop, persisting through their studies, growing and recognizing their potential, and graduating on time. From the perspective of parents and recent alumni, success is likely to focus on affordability, career success and quality of life." (*Institutional Report*, p. 20)

The Team finds these comments telling in that, in spite of the initial reference to *UCR*'s commitment to student success, it limits its examples—admittedly well-accepted ones—to the definitions held by students and external stakeholders with no unique or additional institutional standards for success. Neither here nor elsewhere is there a cogent statement summarizing an actual institutional definition of student success. This omission may explain an unevenness in the institution's reflection on its commitment to student success. The Team notes that UCR does not have an articulated campus-wide student success plan that embraces the institutionalized efforts in improving retention and graduation rates (*CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 2.13*).

To be sure, UCR has made significant financial, space, and human resource investments in student success and these investments have had a positive impact on its ability to attract, retain, and support students through the attainment of their degrees (*CFR 2.11*). Based on or campus conversations, the Team notes that there is more potential for integrating the efforts of student affairs professionals such as those who work in housing (in addition to the partnerships in learning communities detailed below) and counseling services into plans for even more robust support for student success (*CFR 4.3*).   If UCR continues to build on the foundations they have established and further augments some of its practices, their students will be well-served during the time before the next review cycle.

Undergraduate Student Success. UCR's commitment to undergraduate success is evident in decision-making at the facilities, programmatic, and budgetary levels.   In light of the many pressing physical plant demands on their campus, the decision to make the construction of a $60 million Student Success Center is particularly noteworthy (*Institutional Report*, *p.21; CFR 2.13*).

UCR has long supported first year learning communities and has determined that participants generally have a 5% higher retention rate higher than non-participants (*Institutional Report*, *p. 22*; *CFR 2.13*), noting that "Learning communities provide a sense of belonging, boost confidence and help make the classroom experience more meaningful for students," (*Institutional Report*, *p. 21; CFRs 2.8, 2.13*). These data would suggest that as many members of their incoming class as possible should be in the communities, hence the decision to expand them as part of their North Campus development is entirely appropriate (*CFR 4.1*).

UCR places an emphasis on engaging undergraduates in significant research projects including capstone projects within the major and undergraduate research projects. (*Institutional Report, p. 10*) It is impressive that "About half of our undergraduates report that they have participated in faculty mentored research or creative activity during their undergraduate careers (*University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey [UCUES], 2016, p. 27*) and institutional records show that 20% do so in a given year (*Institutional Report*, *p.11*; *CFR 2.11*)."

The campus's commitment extends to its transfer student population, as well. By establishing a Transfer Success Zone, UCR is providing a support system for a sometimes overlooked student population (*Institutional Report*, *p. 27; CFR 2.14*). Transfer students who attended the open student meeting were appreciative of the campus's efforts to support their academic success.

In 2013, UCR's provost convened a graduation rate task force to study patterns of student progress towards degrees, identify patterns and work to address them (*Institutional Report*, *p. 21*: *CFRs 4.3, 4.6*). The current metrics of the campus reflect a desirable trajectory:

Improved student progress toward degree (*CFR 2.10*)

- 1st year retention (83% in 2006 to 89% in 2012) (*Institutional Report*, *p. 21*)

- 4-year graduation rates for first-time freshmen (42% in 2010 to 56% in 2013) (*Institutional Report*, *p. 24 -25*)

Improved 2-year graduation rates for new UG transfers (60% graduate within two years; *Institutional Report*, *p. 26*).

Core competencies. By 2015, UCR had developed a process and an infrastructure for collecting and measuring core competencies. This process, however, does not lend itself to the kind of scrutiny expected of a WSCUC review team. The report notes that, "With the exception of Written Communication and Quantitative Literacy, we have not written comprehensive reports on the data and information submitted each year" (*OSR III 5 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, p 2; CFRs 2.6, 4.1*). The Team was only able to locate the summary of Written Communication assessment online. Without actual written reports it is difficult for the Team to determine if the campus is appropriately evaluating *direct* evidence of student learning.

Like other UC campuses, UCR has the benefit of a highly respected system-wide survey that tracks and aligns with the WSCUC core competencies (*CFRs 2.6, 4.1*). As the campus acknowledges, the University of California Undergraduate Education Survey (UCUES) constitutes *indirect* evidence but it is a valuable tool. After the team posed queries regarding core competencies assessment, the institution did supply several relevant graphs, all which show positive trend lines. They conclude by noting, "The survey evidence strongly suggests that

during their studies at UCR individual students improve their proficiencies across all core competencies as reported by graduating seniors. Core competencies in quantitative literacy and information literacy with particular skills have much room to grow. All remaining areas have reached at least a 90% proficiency rate as reported by seniors" (*OSR III 5 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, p. 20*). UCR should be encouraged to "test" this indirect evidence as highlighted in UCUES against its own internal evaluation of direct evidence.

Graduate Student/Success. There are examples of very good practices within UCR's graduate programs and some areas for improvement.   On the positive side, UCR's graduate division has developed several programs "aimed at success and retention for our diverse graduate community." (*Institutional Report*, *p. 28*; *CFR2.5*) The GradSuccess program incorporates the Graduate Writing Center, Grad Quant and the Graduate Student Mentorship Program (GSMP; *Institutional Report*, *p. 28; CFR2.5*) The team was provided with six graduate assessment reports, three from 2014 and three from 2017. While the team is pleased that these six departments endeavored to assess their graduate curricula, we suggest that the incoming assessment specialists work with graduate programs throughout the campus so that they can better deploy best practices in graduate assessment (*Institutional Report*, *Appendices, Graduate Assessment Reports*). In response to the team's queries regarding graduate program assessment information, the campus offered a very candid review of delays that have stalled the campus as it has endeavored to establish and assess student learning at the graduate level (*OSR III 4 Difficulties with Graduate Assessment, p 2; CFR 2.2B*).

The campus could be encouraged to heed its own mandate:

"Looking ahead to the future of graduate assessment at URC, we are committed to supporting faculty members in developing criteria-based rubrics to assess graduate

student learning at the program level. This support will be led by the Graduate Division
in collaboration with the Office of Evaluation and Assessment and Graduate Council. In
doing so we aim to enhance our faculty member's ability to gather and utilize information
that can inform and improve their programs. Our current plan is to support the programs
slated for graduate program review in 2020 in producing rubrics related to their key
program milestones. By tying individual student learning assessment to program review,
we hope to further emphasize how documenting assessment in this way can lead to
valuable program improvements" (*OSR III 4 Difficulties with Graduate Assessment*, *p. 2*).

In the past, processes such as these were unevenly mandated. We encourage the institution to
develop strategies to ensure that faculty and departments undertake these steps thoroughly and
regularly.

    Improvement/Student Success. Although the campus is rightly proud of the strides it
has made, it does acknowledge that it is "not yet satisfied with our current degree completion
rates" (*Institutional Report*, *p. 26*). It further notes that it is now "working on ways to identify
when and where students are likely to struggle and how to best intervene when they do"
(*Institutional Report*, *p. 26*). The self-study goes on to note that it is turning to third-party
solutions in order to remedy this situation. While there is merit to some externally designed
apparatuses, they can be costly and not tailored to the specifics of an institution. The team does
not suggest they abandon these enterprises, however, we suggest that the program reviews be
mined for data regarding what pedagogical approaches are working well and which ones are
missing the mark.

    Overall, the Team finds evidence that UCR takes student success seriously but has erred
in the direction of inconsistent implementation and inadequate planning.

Part 3: Quality Assurance: Program Review; Assessment; Use of Data and Evidence

1. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review,

Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

UCR provided a useful summary document outlining the program review and assessment

processes after the OSR (*III_3Assessment Infrastructure and processes.pdf*, *p. 15*). The

Institutional Report provides a link to a list of all programs reviewed from 2008/2009 through

2016/2017 in which 31 undergraduate and 50 graduate programs were studied (*Institutional

Report, p. 30*). They use two slightly different processes for program review and two different

time frames, although it is not clear why they have elected to do so. As outlined, the protocol to

conduct the program review processes for undergraduate and graduate programs are appropriate

and become more systematic through shared governance *(OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure

and Processes, Figure 1*, *p. 2; CFR 4.4*). However, it appears that the implementation of

program review and assessment of student learning outcomes has occurred unevenly across the

campus in that some programs are actively engaged in the process and others are not (*CFRs 2.7,

4.3*). The institution also recognizes the need for additional analytic capacity to support robust

assessment processes (*CFR 4.1*).

Program Review

Undergraduate Programs. The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) sets the review

schedule so that every undergraduate program is required to undergo program review every eight

to ten years (*Institutional Report, p. 30*), quite a lengthy time span between reviews. Programs

undergo self-study in the year prior to the review which includes creating a report that describes

the program's goals, evaluates the program's strengths and weaknesses, reviews PSLOs and

assessment results, and examines data relevant to facilities/instructional support and survey data

from students and faculty. This information is shared with external reviewers and program

review results are sent to the Academic Senate where a Findings and Recommendations (F & R)

report is created as a guide/action plan for programs. Campus leadership attends the External

Reviewer exit interviews and receives the summary reports. The CEP works with the programs

to develop the Implementation Plan based on the evidence from the review team reports. To

close the loop, the programs must take appropriate actions to fulfill the recommendations on the

Implementation Plan within a requested timeline. UCR notes that they have "expanded program

review at the undergraduate level by increasing the number of programs reviewed each year,

partly in response to feedback from previous WASC visits" (*Institutional Report, p. 30*). UCR

reports that they have 50+ undergraduate programs yet only 31 have been reviewed since

2008/2009 so it is unclear why some programs are exempt from review (*CFR 2.7*). Moreover,

information provided by the ALO during the AV indicates that there are actually 101

undergraduate programs offered; a schedule for program review was not provided so it is unclear

why only 30.7% (31/101) of programs have undergone review. The Team was not provided with

a clear schedule identifying the timing for program reviews for all programs offered by UCR.

Graduate Programs. The review of graduate programs, drawing upon data provided

through annual assessment, has not been widely adopted but there have been some attempts to

make it more systematic in the recent years. Due to the limited training, there had been some

resistance in conducting the reviews. The Graduate Council reviews graduate programs and

includes external review every 5 to 7 years (*CFRs 2.7, 4.1*); no reason was provided for the

different timeframe as compared to that of undergraduate programs. The report does not state

whether a schedule of program review for the 52 graduate programs exists. At least one year

prior to review, programs conduct a self-study that describes "the graduate program's endeavors,

its philosophy, and short- and long-range educational goals" (*Institutional Report, p. 30).* UCR notes that the self-study identifies the program's strengths and weaknesses, outlines any changes since the last review, and uses data regarding instructional facilities/support and student/faculty data from surveys. The Graduate Council takes the place of the CEP for graduate programs. UCR states that "It does not develop an Implementation Plan document, but it monitors implementation of the final F&R by program to ensure actions are taken before closing the loop" (*OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, pp. 15-16; CFR 4.3*). The report asserts that "Since the establishment of graduate program learning outcomes in 2012, learning outcomes assessment results are also evaluated and discussed" (*p. 30*). However, given that UCR admits they are not collecting systematic assessment data on graduate programs, the evidence they are using to evaluate their programs is equivocal (*CFR 2.6*). Moreover, the manner in which appropriate changes are implemented as a result of the review is not clear.

General Education. UCR does not have an established GE program *per se*. Rather, students fulfill breadth requirements such that students in the various colleges meet breadth requirements with different courses. Consequently it is unclear if the courses that satisfy the requirements are subject to a review that would determine if the campus's goals for student learning are being met. Although the Institutional Report does state that they are considering revising the "program" through Academic Senate review to occur in 2018, this will be difficult to do without some articulation of what the program entails.

The Team was unable to find breadth/GE PSLOs to determine the role that general education plays in a UCR degree. It is critical that faculty determine the PSLOs for general education and align the curriculum such that students will attain those learning goals.

Direct Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

  The Assessment Process. In response to the LOI, UCR outlined its assessment process

(*OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, Figure 1, p. 2*). UCR views assessment as a

fundamental responsibility of faculty and the process begins with the Programs. Meetings with

various assessment groups during the AV (e.g., CEP, Graduate Council, individuals involved

with the breadth requirements) indicated that annual assessment is taking place at the

undergraduate but not graduate levels. Program Chairs/Directors, Advisors and Faculty

Committees produce/maintain learning outcomes, collect assessment data, and conduct program

reviews. This information is first submitted to the Office of Evaluation and Research where it is

reviewed by the Meta-Assessment Committee and feedback is provided. It should be noted that

in the last round, only the Director reviewed reports "due to time constraints" (*SOB Feedback

Letter 16-17*). It appears that only program review reports (not annual assessment data) are

submitted to the Academic Senate, the next level in the system. The Assessment Advisory

Committee is responsible for oversight of campus assessment and reviews reports, ensuring that

assessment is continually improving. This Committee went "dormant" in 2016-2018,

immediately after the 2015 Interim Report. Campus Leadership (Provost, Vice Provost, Deans)

are expected to receive the summary reports for all yearly and program reviews to ensure that

assessment is a consistent priority for the campus. A meeting with the Deans during the AV

revealed that they do not receive annual assessment data. It is clear from the evidence gleaned

during the AV that the process UCR outlined is not currently operating.

  It was encouraging to see the assessment materials and quality feedback that the Director

of Evaluation and Assessment provided to undergraduate programs as he laid out issues for the

programs to address. Each assessment report is evaluated with a rubric so that programs

understand whether they are emergent, developed, or highly developed on each component of the

assessment process: student learning outcomes, alignment of learning opportunities, evidence of

learning, analysis of evidence, documentation, use of assessment results, assessment plans, and

addressing one of the core competencies identified for that year *(OSR III 3 Assessment*

Infrastructure and Processes, p. 6*; CFR 4.4)*. The annual assessment template is clear and guides

programs in what they need to do. Given that the previous Director has left the position, it is

important that the future Director be attentive to the ways in which the departments may be

interpreting the document (*Rubric for Department Feedback 17-18 document*). The term

"emergent" may be being used too generally in some instances where the program in question is

actually non-compliant. Additionally, the data summary table provided on 36 departments does

not match the rubric as UCR uses a 3 point scale (emergent, developed, and highly developed;

Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Programs 16-17, p. 3) then reports on data using a 6

point scale, suggesting a more positive state of assessment than the evidence indicates. This

sends the wrong message to faculty and may be contributing to the lack of compliance with

assessment activity requirements.

Examination of UCR's assessment infrastructure shows that the data and digestion of

information yielded from that data never reaches the decision-makers in the manner outlined by

UCR. The Assessment Advisory Committee was to have included these decision makers, but it

has not been meeting. This means that departments generate data, often do not summarize the

data in useful ways, and the information assessment yields may never make its way to the people

who make resource decisions (e.g., the Deans). Consequently, it appears there is little support

for evidence-based decision making (*OSR III-3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes.pdf*).

Assessment of Undergraduate Student Performance. Review of the UCR's assessment documentation failed to provide clear evidence that there is a systematic, consistent, ongoing review of student learning. There have been many changes in reporting over the past 10 years and it is important that UCR move to an established, consistent set of required documents (PSLOs, curriculum maps, multi-year assessment plans, and reports on data collected) for all of its programs. Moreover, some of the assessment evidence that was provided for the Team's review was from 10 years ago and many are from 2015; it is not clear why more recent reports were not included. The overall impression is that when the Assessment Advisory Committee was suspended, the tasks of monitoring and encouraging assessment activities were left largely to the Director of Evaluation and Assessment, leading many departments to become lax in their efforts. Importantly, this compromises the ability of campus leadership to make evidence-based decisions regarding academic programs *(CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.4, 4.6).*

Assessment of Student Performance in GE. It appears that in some places in the report, UCR suggests that GE/breadth and core competencies are synonymous and that the core competencies are a WSCUC requirement, rather than a fundamental component of students' education. The WSCUC core competencies were adopted as learning outcomes for the breadth requirement and faculty believed that they would be addressed in the courses that support the breadth requirements. That way, students would be assured of exposure to the core competencies, even though their major may not address it. For example, though a given program may not teach quantitative reasoning, students in that program achieve the quantitative reasoning core competency through the completion of their breadth requirements *(OSR III 5 GE and Core Competencies Assessments*, *pp. 2, 4-5; CFRs 2.6, 4.1, 4.4).* However, there are no curriculum maps to show whether breadth courses address these core competencies, or how faculty know

that every UCR undergraduate has had the opportunity to develop and display mastery of the

core competencies. In addition, indirect assessment through UCUES is incorporated by asking

how undergraduates rate themselves on each of the five core competencies both at the time they

started college and at the time they complete the survey (*Institutional Report, p. 34; CFRs 4.1,*

4.4). Best practices in assessment suggest direct assessment of student learning rather than

student impressions of whether they have mastered core competencies.

The assessment of core competencies occurred on a rotating basis that did not appear to

be a priority. UCR reports that one core competency is selected each year and is incorporated

into program annual assessment and that core competency assessment has occurred each year

since 2012. Both Written Communication and Quantitative Literacy were assessed by the Office

of Evaluation and Assessment in 2012-13 and 2013-14. Oral communication was the focus in

2014-2015. Information Literacy was assessed by programs in 2015-16 and Critical Thinking

was assessed by programs in 2016-17. With the exception of Written Communication, no written

comprehensive reports on the data submitted each year have been provided. Instead, UCR's

Meta-Assessment Committee, a subset of faculty assessment coordinators, reviews all reports

(the Team was not given these reports) and provides feedback on the quality of assessment being

conducted by each program. (*OSR III.5 Previous General Education and Core Competencies*

Assessments, p. 2). It is puzzling why they did not aggregate and disseminate findings from these

reports. UCR's Institutional Research Office did summarize the program reports from 2017-

2018 to get an idea about performance on the core competencies across programs. However, this

summary was not included in the Institutional Report and had to be requested; it also appears that

this work was completed because of the request (*OSR III.5 Previous General Education and*

Core Competencies Assessments, p. 3). The quality of the summary of the data is inadequate due

to its general nature. How did they assess written documents? Was a rubric used? How did they

get to 66-88% achieving some standard (not specified)? A sample quote from the report states

that "several small programs elected to use qualitative methods and reported that faculty were

satisfied with their students' written competency" (*OSR III.5 Previous General Education and*

Core Competencies Assessments, p. 3). Even with qualitative data available, there appears to be

no real reflection on the nature of that data. The report also notes that some programs achieve

100% of students meeting some standard; in one case, a program did not meet a standard at all.

The vague nature of the report makes it difficult to determine what these data mean *(CFRs 2.7,*

4.1, 4.4, 4.6).

Assessment of Graduate Student Performance. The assessment of graduate program

learning outcomes has not been conducted systematically and only conducted in recent years.

The Annual Research Progress Evaluation (ARPE) form was used to collect the metrics of the

program learning outcomes (individual student assessment, program learning outcomes

assessment, and academic program reviews). Graduate students also worked with advisors to

prepare the Individual Development Plan (IDPs) to outline their development plan, professional

data, and intellectual contributions. To assess graduate student learning, faculty members were

required to complete the first four steps of the learning outcomes assessment cycle: 1) articulate

program learning outcomes, 2) identify milestones when students demonstrate their

competencies, 3) select milestones to assess student learning, and 4) develop rubrics and

collected assessment data *(OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, pp. 12-15).* A

primary issue with these data is that they largely focus on the progress of individual students and

provide little information about the performance on learning outcomes across students in the

program.   Program improvement efforts should be guided by such an analysis. UCR seems to

recognize these inadequacies in that it has identified the areas for the improvement in graduate program learning outcome assessment to include: a) uniform assessment process through the support of Office of Evaluation and Assessment, b) a shift from compliance to criteria-based program assessment, c) efforts to improve ARPE to include program-specific rubrics, and d) implementation of the electronic database and associated reporting infrastructure required for program-level assessment *(OSR III 4 Difficulties with Graduate Assessment, pp. 1-2).*

It appears that the Graduate programs have equated program review with annual assessment, rather than using annual assessment data to inform program reviews. Moreover, the quality of the evidence used for program review largely draws upon grades and progress through the program, two indices that provide little evidence of student achievement in terms of stated PSLOs. Graduate programs note that they use comprehensive exams, proposals, defenses, number of publications as indicators of program quality. For example, the Biomedical and Public Policy graduate programs are using grades to assess graduate students. The Management program states "All students should meet expectations in all annual reviews" and the Education program indicates that completion of coursework demonstrates that students have met the PSLOs. While these data certainly could be informative if they clearly related to specific learning outcomes, this does not appear to be the case. Moreover, there was some concern that UCR only provided 3 graduate program assessment documents for 2017 (the others are from 2014), which suggests that they may not have more recent reviews upon which to draw. In fact, many of the campus reports regarding student success contain very old reports (e.g., 2010; *http://ueeval.ucr.edu/reports.html*). Collectively the evidence suggests that there is a real need for faculty education regarding assessment – and adoption of annual assessment practices – in order to produce data that will be useful for evidence based decision making.

Institutional Research

Currently, the Office of Institutional Research is staffed by an Assistant Vice Chancellor, three IR Analysts, and a Student Affairs Research and Evaluation. This is near the average staff resources for a centralized institutional research and planning operation at a university of this size. One IR Analyst position is vacant. The Office reports to the CFO. It is unclear how IR is currently involved in supporting student success.

Prior to the summer 2018, the Office of Institutional Research had provided *indirect* support for student learning assessment *(Institutional Report, p. 40; http://ir.ucr.edu/ ; CFR 4.2).* The Office fulfills reporting mandates and provides official statistics about student, faculty, and staff to support and inform decision making and program review process. The information is publically available, including retention and graduation rates, enrollment, student-to-faculty ratios, and inventory of faculty and staff.

The Office of Evaluation and Assessment is responsible to support the undergraduate program assessment process and to provide feedback to departments and programs on the quality of their assessment work (not assessment results). Although information provided by UCR indicated that the Director of Evaluation and Assessment would move to the Office of Institutional Research with an extended role to support Graduate academic assessment in summer 2018 *(OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, p. 5)*, interviews during the AV revealed that the Provost recently decided to move that position to her office. It is critical that assessment experts on campus have ample opportunity for sharing information and obtaining support, no matter where the position resides.

Use of Data and Evidence

The assessment processes for undergraduate, graduate, and general education (breadth) programs should incorporate the review of direct and indirect evidence of student achievement of learning outcomes. Evidence from annual assessments and programs' self-study, including program goals, strengths and weaknesses, learning outcomes, and how they are related to core competencies, should be a fundamental part of program assessment (*Institutional Report, pp. 32-34; OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, pp. 6, 11, 14, 15)*. However, it appears that the program review and assessment of student learning outcomes occur unevenly across the campus in that some programs are actively engaged in the process and others are not (*CFRs 2.7, 4.3*). The institution also recognizes the need for additional analytic capacity to support robust assessment processes (*CFR 4.1*). Due to lack of systematic review of core competencies and graduate programs, evidence for these programs has not been sufficiently collected *(Institutional Report, p. 37; CFRs 2.6, 4.1, 4.5).*

Conversely, the assessments in Student Affairs and Professional Schools had been conducted based on both direct and indirect evidence *(Institutional Report, pp. 35, 38-39; CFRs 2.3, 2.13, 4.1, 4.5)* thereby illustrating a best practice in assessment. The university data (e.g., enrollment, retention/graduation rates, faculty workload, and student/faculty/staff profiles) and other student outcomes are disseminated by the Office of Institutional Research and incorporated into campus planning and decision-making *(Institutional Report, p. 40)*, a best practice in assessment.

Summary

Although the protocols designed to conduct the program review processes for undergraduate and graduate programs are appropriate and become more systematic through

shared governance *(OSR III 3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes, Figure 1, p. 2; CFR 4.4)*, it appears that the implementation of program review and assessment of student learning outcomes occurs unevenly across the campus (*CFRs 2.7, 4.3).* Of particular concern are the following:

- Undergraduate programs are required to undergo program review every eight to ten years *(Institutional Report, p. 30)*, quite a lengthy time span between reviews.

- Not all programs provide assessment data or undergo program review.

- The review of graduate programs has not been widely adopted. Due to the limited training, there had been some resistance in conducting the reviews. The quality of the evidence used for program review largely draws upon grades and progress through the program which provide little evidence of student achievement in terms of stated PSLOs.

- The assessment of GE/breadth and core competencies occurred on a rotating basis that did not appear to be a priority. With the exception of Written Communication, no comprehensive reports on the data submitted each year have been produced.

- The curriculum maps were not provided to show courses that articulated learning objectives. It is unclear if the courses that satisfy the requirements are subject to a review that would determine if the campus's goals for student learning are being met.

- Based on the examination of UCR's assessment infrastructure, it shows that the data and digestion of information yielded from that data never reaches the decision-makers *(OSR III-3 Assessment Infrastructure and Processes.pdf)* as the Assessment Advisory Committee has been dormant since the last Interim Report was filed in 2015. This suggests that programs generate data, often do not summarize the data in useful ways, and the data may never make their way to the people who make resource decisions.

G. Part 4: Sustainability: UCR's Role in the Future of Higher Education

  1. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

  UCR has been in a period of planned growth during the past several years highlighted by the establishment of their medical school and strong commitment/focus on building their student base (*Institutional Report*, *pp. 4 & 18; CFR 1.4*). This growth in the student base is supported by UCR's significant investment in major capital initiatives and the faculty expansion program (*Institutional Report, pp. 10 & 42; CFR 3.1*). The investment in the Multidisciplinary Research Building 1 (MRB1) is aggressive and critical to support the continued growth of UCR's research enterprise (*Institutional Report*, *p. 42*).

  UCR has identified many potential revenue sources for future sustainability which is important given the changing higher education environment and the impact of state and national policies (*Institutional Report, p. 43; CFR 4.7*). California's travel restrictions regarding several other states and shifting national policies on immigration may have a negative impact on future non-resident enrollment. California has consistently reduced its on-going investment in higher education (CSU and UC systems), eliminated funding for capital projects in 2006, and pressured the systems not to raise tuition to cover the accompanying funding shortfalls (*Institutional Report*, p. 44; *CFR 4.7*).

  UCR has been prudent in pursuing other areas of revenue including growth of the non-resident student base and facilities and administrative (F&A) / indirect cost returns (*Institutional Report*, p. 43; *CFR 3.4*). These potential revenue sources, however, are speculative and the increased debt service for MRB1 and projected salary and benefit costs in the Cash Based Operating Performance Model (*Institutional Report, appendix after p. 45*) are more certain. The

team recommends that the campus review and revise this plan to include updated realistic revenue projections and bring expenses into alignment with those projections (*CFR 3.4*).

UCR has also addressed future financial sustainability via a new incentive based budget model with a focus on better aligning funding with graduation rates, increasing budgets for colleges that recruit more students, and encouraging cost reductions by allowing units to roll over savings from year to year (versus a "use it or lose it" approach) along with other changes that provide greater control at the college / unit level (*Institutional Report*, *p. 42).* While the early results of the new budget model resulted in greater allocations than anticipated based on FTE and incentives, leaving less funding for overall university strategic priorities, changes have already been implemented to rebalance the funding (*OSR III 10 Documentation Outlining the New Budget Model, p. 6-7; CFR 4.6*). The team recommends these revisions continue in order to address the issues that challenge campus success including staffing at multiple levels, routine investments in facilities as a campus (rather than by each college) and funding of differential costs of instruction in different programs (*CFR 3.1, 3.4*).

Backstopping this relative uncertainty regarding future funding, UCR's overall fiscal conservatism and maintenance of prudent unrestricted fund balances provides the university time to react and adjust to financial changes on the horizon (*Institutional Report, Cash based Operating Performance Model as of Nov. 2017, appendix after p. 45*).

H. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

Component 9 asks the team whether it believes the institution summarized the findings, interpretations, conclusions, and plans as a result of its self-study and institutional report. It further asks the team to assess what the institution has learned about key areas of exemplary institutional performance.

The team frankly observes that the institution's initial preparation for this review was lacking. The institutional process to develop its report did not fully engage the campus and the report submitted showed this. That said, following the feedback provided after the team's Offsite Review, the institution engaged much more specifically and meaningfully. But by then, real opportunities had been lost for significant institutional introspection and self-improvement around the specific areas on which the accreditation process focuses, particularly assessment.

The team has provided a recommendation that the institution develop a much stronger institutional culture that weaves the requirements of accreditation into academic processes including program development and assessment with an emphasis on student learning and program outcomes. We believe this will further strengthen the institution and the work it is doing to serve its students.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

The team believes that the reaffirmation process and the visit provided the institution with essential input and important learning opportunities about some of its remarkable strengths as well as areas in real need of attention. The team was satisfied that, as of the time of its departure, institutional leadership as well as a broad selection of campus representatives were appreciative of the input. In that spirit, the team offers the following commendations and recommendations:

COMMENDATION 1: (CFR 1.1)

We applaud UCR for its values and extensive work to advance the public good. It is clear that institutional commitments to social mobility and diversity are deep-seated and impactful across the institution. The establishment of a community-based medical school is another example of

that commitment to the region UCR serves. This could be strengthened even further if UCR

adopted a distinctive campus mission statement that embraces these values.

COMMENDATION 2: (CFR 1.4)

As noted, the commitment to diversity is a core value for UCR. For students, campus success in

providing access and closing achievement gaps for economically disadvantage and under-

represented students is remarkable and represents a concerted and successful campus-wide

effort. At the level of senior administration, the team was also struck by the diversity of the

Chancellor's Cabinet. Efforts in hiring a more diverse faculty have been thoughtful and

effective. However, the campus clearly recognizes that it is not retaining diverse faculty as well

as it needs to. The campus is working to develop a faculty retention program that supports the

recruitment program, and the team was impressed with the thinking about this challenge and

campus planning to date to ensure UCR can retain the diverse faculty it is hiring.

COMMENDATION 3: (CFR 2.8)

The UCR strategic plan emphasizes building up to be a stronger research university; the campus

reports a truly impressive increase in federal awards from 2012 to 2018 of over 62% and an

increase of over 39% in total extramural awards. This is evidence of the positive impact of the

aggressive faculty hiring plans. It should be noted that the large number of faculty hires have

also come with some cost; the facilities needs associated with these new hires have not all

been addressed, and there has not been a concomitant increase in the staff necessary to support

these faculty. As a related matter, many on campus noted with concern the lack of resources

to provide adequate numbers of academic advisors within the staff to support campus growth.

COMMENDATION 4: (CFR 2.10)

The campus has made remarkable and laudable improvements in degree completion and time to

degree. This has clearly been a campus-wide effort and the widespread pride in this

progress across the campus, including at the elimination of student achievement gaps, is well-

placed.

RECOMMENDATION 1: (CFRs 2.2-2.7; 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4)

The team recommends a strong and coherent initiative to move assessment

efforts forward. Although UCR has made some progress in assessment of student learning at the

undergraduate level, assessment of graduate programs and core competencies have not been

conducted annually and consistently. More broadly, UCR must invest in the professional

development of faculty and deans regarding best practices in assessment, must build a

sustainable assessment infrastructure at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and must

devote adequate financial and human resources to ensure that UCR is able to demonstrate the

quality of its programs through measurement of student achievement of learning outcomes,

not just grades and graduation rates. The loss of the Director of Evaluation and Assessment has

hindered efforts, despite having a strong leader in the Assistant Vice Chancellor of

Institutional Research. We positively note that UCR is beginning to establish a procedure for the

review of general education, which is timely. To bring the campus in alignment with WSCUC

requirements, this effort should ensure the campus has a sustainable plan for identifying

General Education learning outcomes, aligning these outcomes with the university mission, and

measuring achievement of the outcomes annually. Assessment of core competencies

must, necessarily, also be a part of this effort. Given the assignment of responsibility for

curricular review at UCR to the Academic Senate, that body must be diligent in setting

expectations for application of best practices in assessment for all the degree-bearing programs under its purview.

RECOMMENDATION 2: (CFR 1.8)

We recommend that the campus develop a stronger and more meaningful campus commitment, "infrastructure" around accreditation that provides campus-wide understanding of the processes and expectations. This should ensure full responsiveness moving forward to all aspects of accreditation and WSCUC requirements on a continual basis, including for periodic actions such as substantive changes.

RECOMMENDATION 3: (CFRs 3.4, 3.1)

We recommend that the work underway to "tweak" the new campus budget model strongly address the issues that challenge campus success. This includes the need to address staffing at multiple levels, to maintain and make routine investments in facilities as a campus (rather than by each college), to recognize differential costs of instruction in different programs and at different levels, and more.

RECOMMENDATION 4: (CFR 3.4)

The team remains concerned about some of the revenue assumptions (tuition and fee rate increases, non-resident student enrollment increases, state revenue increases, clinical revenue increases) underlying the multi-year "Cash-Based Operating Performance Model" provided in the institutional report. The team recommends that the campus immediately review and revise this plan to include updated realistic revenue projections and bring expenses into alignment with those projections, painful as this may be.

APPENDICES
A. Federal Compliance Checklists
1. Credit Hour Review
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
3. Student Complaint Review
4. Transfer Policy Review

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? [x] YES ❑ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/8/Courses%20Guidelines%20-%2006-20-16%20Approved.pdf
	Comments: Appropriate
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? [x] YES ❑ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? [x] YES ❑ NO
	Comments: The process is addressed in the program review process.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? [x] YES ❑ NO
	Comments: http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/8/Courses%20Guidelines%20-%2006-20-16%20Approved.pdf
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 14
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? ❑ AA/AS [x] BA/BS [x] MA ❑ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Engineering; History; Microbiology; Earth Sciences;
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? [x] YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Appropriate
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 5
	What kinds of courses? Labs, Independent Study
	What degree level(s)? ❑ AA/AS [x] BA/BS [x] MA ❑ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Chemistry; Biology; Anthropology; Biological Sciences
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? [x] YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Appropriate
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 15
	What kinds of programs were reviewed?
	What degree level(s)? ❑ AA/AS [x] BA/BS [x] MA [x] Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Bioengineering; Chemical and Environmental Engineering; Computer Engineering; Computer Science; Comparative Literature; Critical Dance Studies; English; Ethnic Studies; Psychology; Plant Pathology; Business Administration; Finance
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? [x] YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Appropriate

Review Completed By: *Sutee Sujitparapitaya*
Date: *10/26/2018*

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? [x] YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Appropriate
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? [x] YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? [x] YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Appropriate
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? [x] YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? [x] YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Appropriate

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: _Sutee Sujitparapitaya_

Date: _10/26/2018_

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? [x] YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? help@ucr website
	Comments: Information about grievance and complaint procedures is publicized in various ways, including website above and through student orientation programs.
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? [x] YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: UCR adheres to the University of California Policy on Student Grievance Procedures, Policy 110
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☐X YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Appropriate
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? [x] YES ☐ NO If so, where? Individual college offices
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? [x] YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: Individual college offices track and monitor
	Comments: Appropriate

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: _Patricia A. Turner_
Date: _10/26/2018_

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? [x] YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy publically available?　[x] YES ☐ NO If so, where? http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/counselors/files/Transfer_Credit_Practice.pdf
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? [x] YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: _Tom McCarron_

Date: _10/26/2018_