

OFFSITE REVIEW (OSR) SUMMARY OF LINES OF INQUIRY
University of California, Riverside

| OFFSITE REVIEW (OSR) |
|---|
| Institution under Review: University of California, Riverside |
| Date of Offsite Review: April 9-10, 2019 |
| Team Chair: David Lassner |

| |
|--|
| <p>The Offsite Review team recommends the following actions be taken:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proceed with the Accreditation Visit scheduled in: October 24-26, 2018</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reschedule the Accreditation Visit to: _____</p> <p>The reason(s) the Team recommends rescheduling the visit is/are:</p> <p>_____</p> |
|--|

| |
|--|
| <p>Due date for institutional response to Section IV (specify exact date):</p> <p>August 15, 2018</p> |
|--|

Outline

Overview of the lines of inquiry

This document identifies 13 lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit (AV) that are derived from the institution's report. In addition, this document includes questions or issues the team discussed during the Offsite Review (OSR) that may be pursued during the visit. The team does not expect or invite a written response to these questions posed in the Lines of Inquiry (Section II) before the Accreditation Visit. The only written materials that the team expects from the institution before the visit are those listed in Section III.

- I. Commendations. The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and practices:
 1. Growth in Research: UCR reported an impressive 43% increase in federal research awards from 2012 to 2015 at a time when total federal research funding dropped by 8%.
 2. Retention and Graduation: UCR demonstrates a strong improvement in student retention and graduation and efforts in narrowing achievement gaps.
 3. Student Well-being: There is significant evidence that UCR is clearly attentive to the well-being of its students. Examples include, at the undergraduate level, the investment in student success center and at the graduate level, the development of the GradSuccess program.
 4. Operating Reserves: UCR has accumulated significant operating savings which provides it the opportunity to fund \$110 million for faculty expansion and other institutional priorities.
 5. Social Mobility: UCR's commitment to the education of historically underrepresented groups, including first generation college students, in support of students' pursuits to improve their social and economic standing (social mobility) is laudable.
 6. Medical School – UCR has contributed significantly to the public good by undertaking the formidable task of starting a Medical School to help address the health care needs of the community you serve.

- II. Lines of inquiry. The team has identified the following lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit:
 0. **Comment:** Perceived Disconnect Between Report and Review: The Team observed a significant disconnect between the "Institutional Report" (Report) and the "Review Under WSCUC Standards" (Review). With regard to the Review, in some cases the disconnect was reflected in the self-review ratings; in other cases, the comments provided in the "important to address" column within the template did not reflect considerations and issues the Team found in the Report. Moreover, there were multiple instances in which the Team could not understand the basis for comments contained in the "Synthesis/Reflections" sections of the Review,

relative to either the Report or other comments made in the preceding “self-rating/important to address” sections of the Review.

1. Mission and Strategic Planning: The Team observed that the campus does not appear to have a mission statement other than the general mission of the UC System and that the current strategic plan (2010-2020) is nearing its end. Comments in the Report (“the campus will “soon embark” on a new strategic plan but that the “planning process for such a document will require several years to develop”) suggest the apparent lack of strategic planning, even in light of concerns from previous WSCUC teams. During the AV, the team will attempt to evaluate the progress that has been made on the existing strategic plan, and learn more about UCR’s current strategic planning activities as they relate to the mission of the university.
2. Response to Previous Commission Action Letters: Although there was a brief mention of the recommendations from previous Commission Action Letters in the report, the Team did not get a clear picture on how UCR responded to each of the specific items. At the time of the AV, the Team will be exploring campus responses to those issues raised in previous action letters (e.g., assessment and strategic planning).
3. Diversity of Faculty and Staff: The Team would like to understand the quantitative progress that has been made over the past years toward increasing diversity among faculty, staff and administration to reflect the composition of the student body. In particular, the Team will be considering the steps that UCR is taking to address this issue.
4. Assessment and Program Review: The Report acknowledges that assessment is “uneven” across the campus in that some programs are actively engaged in the process and others are not. We would like to learn more about the assessment infrastructure and the role that the Center for Teaching and Learning or other offices play in supporting assessment of student learning. During our visit, we will be examining the progress that has been made in obtaining direct assessment of student learning at both the undergraduate (including General Education) and graduate levels, and identify existing obstacles to developing a campus-wide culture of data-driven assessment and evidence-based decision making.
5. Degree Completion: The Team would like to better understand the method to determine average time to degree completion. In addition, the Team would like to have the most recent graduation rates broken down by colleges.
6. Faculty/Staff Hiring: The Report makes several references to an increase in faculty but we find limited explanations of what metrics or considerations, if any, were deployed to determine where the hiring should take place (e.g., did the decisions consider student/faculty ratios within programs?). At the AV, the Team will be evaluating available evidence to better understand how decisions are made to make new faculty and staff hires.
7. Information Technology: The primary references to IT in the Report and Review concerned the Banner Student Information Systems. It was noted that the Information Technology Systems Office (formerly Computing and Communications) is also actively engaged in a comprehensive review of information technology services to support optimization of campus business

operations. The Team found no evidence of this work in the materials submitted nor on the campus web site, so was unable to determine the extent to which campus IT resources support the holistic mission of the campus in at least the core mission of teaching & learning, research and administration.

8. Campus Communication: Noting the concerns expressed in the synthesis and reflections on Standard 1 in the Review (page 4), the Team would like to better understand the present systems for communication and the plans to improve them.
9. Shared Governance: Comments in the Review indicate that at least some members of the campus have concerns about the effectiveness of shared governance processes. This is not evident in the Report, and the Team would like to understand the extent and nature of those concerns and what, if anything, is being done to address them.
10. Assessment in Non-academic Units: The Team noted a description of quality assessment of student affairs but no other references to assessment of quality in other non-academic programs. The Team is interested in what work is being done in other non-academic units such as the library, IT, research support, facilities, and institutional research.
11. New budget model: We would like to know the details of the new (2016) budget model and its impacts, including the outcomes associated with incentivizing such as increasing graduation rates, recruiting/instructing additional students and effect of features such as rolling unspent funds.
12. Financial Assumptions Underlying the Multi-Year Campus Financial Plan: We would like to validate the assumptions that underlie the multi-year financial plan as outlined on the last page of the Report. Of particular concern are assumptions such as constant increase in tuition and fees, philanthropy and research. Also of interest is the significant drop in Realized Income from the prior six years, starting in 2018.
13. Leadership Churn: A number of comments noted the substantial leadership churn that has taken place on campus. The Team would like to understand the causes of that churn and whether the campus community feels the period of instability has passed and the campus is now stabilized. If not, the Team would like to understand any measures under way to address this.

III. Request for additional documents and information. The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information before the Accreditation Visit:

1. A document that addresses the specific items outlined in the previous Commission Action Letters and how the campus responded to each of them.
2. Documents that illustrate UCR's efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty and staff.
3. Documentation that illustrates the infrastructure and process for assessment of undergraduate, graduate, and general education programs.

4. Documents illustrating the difficulties UCR experienced in assessing graduate programs.
5. Reports on the findings of the previous General Education assessments of the Core Competencies (currently only written communication is provided on the website).
6. Documentation showing how degree completion rates are calculated. Additionally, the Team would like to see graduation rates disaggregated by College.
7. Documentation of faculty and staff hiring plans.
8. Evidence illustrating the extent to which campus IT resources support the holistic mission of the campus in at least the core mission of teaching and learning, research and administration.
9. Assessment documents for non-academic units (other than Student Affairs).
10. Documentation outlining the new budget model.
11. Documentation to support claims regarding the multi-year Campus Financial Plan.

The Team requests that the Institution supply the following additional documents and information **in the team room at the time of the Accreditation Visit:**

1. Program student learning outcomes and curriculum maps for all degree programs.
2. Student Grievance Records from the past six years.
3. One syllabus from a core course in each degree program and General Education (A through E requirements).

The only written documents and information the team expects before the visit are listed in this section. The team does not expect or invite a written response to any of the questions posed or issues raised in other sections of this form.

IV. **Individuals and groups to meet during the visit.** The team requests that the following groups and individuals holding the specified positions be included on the schedule for the Accreditation Visit. The Team assistant chair will work with the UCR ALO to create a final schedule that responds to the issues identified in this Summary.

1. Members of the WASC Reaccreditation Workgroup and the key personnel involved in the Review Under the Standards.

2. Individuals responsible for assessment of the undergraduate, graduate, and GE programs including the Director of Evaluation and Assessment.
3. Program Review Committee
4. Chancellor
5. Chancellors “cabinet” or other executive body
6. Chief Financial Officer
7. Chief student affairs officer
8. Open meeting with students
9. Open meeting with faculty
10. Open meeting with staff
11. Academic Senate leadership including the current and past chairs of the Senate as well as the Chair and past chairs of the grad council.
12. Faculty Executive Committees, including past FEC chairs in each college or school with undergraduate enrollments.
13. Senate Committee on Planning and Budget

In developing the schedule for the visit, the team may identify additional individuals or groups with whom they wish to speak.