



University of California, Riverside
900 University Avenue
Riverside, California 92521

WASC Senior College and University Commission Special Visit Report

Submitted: December 2, 2021

Contact:
Kenneth A. Baerenklau, Ph.D.
Associate Provost
Accreditation Liaison Officer
alo@ucr.edu

Table of Contents

Abbreviations Glossary	3
1. Nature of the institutional context and major changes since WSCUC reaffirmation visit in 2018 .	4
1.1. Institutional Background, Mission, and History	4
1.2. Recent Major Changes	5
2. Report Preparation	8
3. Issues Identified by WSCUC Reaffirmation Team	10
3.1. An enhanced and expanded assessment initiative.....	10
3.2. A stronger campus commitment to accreditation processes that promotes the relationship between accreditation reviews and such significant campus efforts as strategic planning and student achievement initiatives	19
3.3. A modified budget model that embraces current challenges to campus success	23
3.4. A re-calibrated Cash-Based Operating Performance Model	29
4. Other Changes or Issues the Institution is Facing	32
5. Concluding statement.....	34

Abbreviations Glossary

AAC – Assessment Advisory Committee
AACSB – Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
AAU – Association of American Universities
ABET – Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
ALO – Accreditation Liaison Officer
AVC CIO – Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer
AVCES – Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services
AVCIR – Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research
BAC – Budget Advisory Committee
BCOE – Marlan and Rosemary Bourns College of Engineering
CEP – Committee on Educational Policy
CFAO – Chief Financial and Administrative Officer
CFC – Campus Finance Committee
CHASS – College of Humanities, Arts, & Social Sciences
CNAS – College of Natural & Agricultural Sciences
DEA – Director of Evaluation and Assessment
DM – Deferred Maintenance
EVC – Executive Vice Chancellor (Provost)
EVP – Executive Vice President
FP&A – Financial Planning & Analysis
FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency
FTE – Full-Time Equivalent
GSF – Gross Square Feet
HEERF – Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund
ITS – Information Technology Solutions
KPI – Key Performance Indicator
MAC – Meta-Assessment Committee
MRB – Multi-disciplinary Research Building
MSAAR – Manager of Student Affairs Assessment and Research
PI – Principal Investigator
RED – Research & Economic Development
SAAR – Student Affairs Assessment and Research
SLA – Service Level Agreement
SOM – School of Medicine
TA – Teaching Assistant
UCOP – University of California, Office of the President
UCUES – University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey
VCDEI – Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (Chief Diversity Officer)
VCPBA – Vice Chancellor for Planning, Budget & Administration (Chief Financial Officer)
VCRED – Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development
VCSA – Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
VPAP – Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

1. Nature of the institutional context and major changes since WSCUC reaffirmation visit in 2018

1.1. Institutional Background, Mission, and History

One of ten campuses of the University of California System, the University of California, Riverside (UC Riverside, or [UCR](#)) is a public land-grant research university, founded in 1954 and initially accredited in 1956. UCR has two locations: the main campus sits on 1,900 acres in the city of Riverside, which is the county seat of Riverside County and the most populous city in inland Southern California. A smaller [satellite campus](#), established in 2005, is located about 60 miles away on 20 acres in the city of Palm Desert, which is part of the Coachella Valley. UCR respectfully acknowledges and recognizes our responsibility to the original and current caretakers of this land, water, and air: the Cahuilla, Tongva, Luiseño, and Serrano peoples and all of their ancestors and descendants, past, present, and future. We are grateful to have the opportunity to live and work on these homelands.

Mission Statement:

The University of California, Riverside will transform the lives of the diverse people of California, the nation, and the world through the discovery, communication, translation, application, and preservation of knowledge – thereby enriching the state’s economic, social, cultural, and environmental future.

UCR’s institutional history began in 1907, when the University of California Citrus Experiment Station was established in Riverside and subsequently relocated to the current site of the main campus. After World War II, during a time of increased college enrollments nationwide, California decided to expand its university system by building a new UC-administered liberal arts college adjacent to the Experiment Station. When the college opened in 1954, the plan was for a campus of only 1,500 students. Shortly thereafter, in 1959, the UC Regents designated the college as a general university campus with a capacity of 5,000 students.

UCR began rapidly expanding and rising in stature in the 1960s. A college of agriculture was founded, the graduate division opened, predecessors to the current UC Natural Reserve System were established, and plans were developed for engineering and professional programs. The attention garnered by regional air quality problems led to significant contractions of both the student body and faculty in the 1970s, and associated financial problems. This trend was reversed in the 1980s and 1990s, during which time curricular innovations as well as support from the UC Regents led to a high rate of growth for the campus. By 2004, 50 years after its founding, UCR enrolled more than 17,000 students.

Today, UCR is home to more than 26,000 students, 1,800 academic personnel, of which nearly 850 are ladder-rank faculty, and 2,900 staff personnel. The academic enterprise is organized into three colleges and four schools: College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS – the evolution of the original liberal arts college), College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), Marlan and Rosemary Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE), School of Business, School of Medicine, School of Education, and School of Public Policy. Certificate and other non-degree programs are offered through UCR Extension. A complete organizational chart is available [here](#). Campus statistics on enrollment, demographics,

graduation rates, degrees awarded, and personnel are available through [UCR’s Institutional Research website](#).

UCR’s [current strategic plan](#), adopted in 2010, set the goal of achieving the profile of an Association of American Universities (AAU) institution. The AAU focuses on metrics widely recognized as indicators of excellence among research-intensive universities, and consistent with those used by the UC Office of the President and Board of Regents in evaluating campuses. UCR has largely achieved this goal and now compares favorably with several AAU institutions – especially new members – and remains committed to the AAU metrics as important indicators of progress as we continue to grow our research profile. Equally important is our commitment to achieving this progress in a manner that is consistent with our mission to be a model of inclusive excellence through a deep dedication to underserved populations and their upward social mobility. This commitment can be traced back at least 25 years when UCR established itself as a leader among UC campuses for enrolling large numbers of under-represented, low income, and first-generation students, and proactively supporting their success. Today, UCR is widely recognized as a [national leader in social mobility](#).

1.2. Recent Major Changes

More than three years have passed since UCR last submitted documents to WSCUC for our 2018 reaffirmation of accreditation. As of fall 2021, enrollment has grown by 15% to 26,847, ladder faculty headcount has grown by 4% to 844, and staff headcount has declined by 5% to 2,922. Four-year and six-year graduation rates for first-year entrants are up 9.2 and 1.4 percentage points to 65.2% and 76.4%, respectively, and research awards have increased by 26% to \$182M (net of HEERF funding).

UCR’s national rankings also have increased dramatically during the past few years, rising 184 spots over five years in the Wall Street Journal/Times Higher Education rankings and 37 spots over three years in the U.S. News & World Report rankings. Forbes “Best Value Colleges” now ranks UCR No. 12 among public universities. Our campus is also home to 2 Nobel Laureates and 13 members of the National Academies of Science and Medicine. In 2021, 14 UCR faculty won NSF CAREER awards and 11 were named Fulbright Scholars.

Also during this time, UCR experienced turnover in several key leadership positions, as summarized in the table below.

Position	Changes	Current Status
Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor	Cynthia Larive stepped down to become chancellor at UC Santa Cruz in May 2019. Thomas Smith, Dean of the School of Education, served as interim provost until May 2021.	Elizabeth Watkins was appointed provost in May 2021.
Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services	Ron Coley retired in July 2018. Gerry Bomotti, Vice Chancellor for Planning & Budget, served in an interim role until January 2019.	Gerry Bomotti, who had been appointed Vice Chancellor for Planning & Budget and Chief Financial Officer in February 2018, added Business & Administrative Services to his portfolio in January 2019.

Position (cont'd)	Changes (cont'd)	Current Status (cont'd)
Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development	Michael Pazzani retired in April 2019. Gillian Wilson, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, served in an interim role until September 2019.	Rodolfo Torres was appointed VCRED in September 2019.
Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences	Milagros Peña stepped down to become president of Purchase College in May 2020. Juliet McMullen, Chair of the Department of Anthropology, served as interim dean until September 2021.	Daryle Williams was appointed dean in September 2021.
Dean of the School of Education	Thomas Smith stepped down in May 2019 to serve as interim provost, and then returned to fulltime faculty status.	Louie Rodriguez, associate dean in Education, was appointed interim dean in May 2019 and continues to serve in this role.
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel	Ameae Walker retired in July 2020.	Dan Jeske was appointed VPAP in July 2020.
Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution	John Andersen returned to fulltime faculty status in July 2019. Dan Jeske served as VPAR until July 2020, and as interim VPAR until September 2021.	Philip Brisk was appointed VPAR in September 2021.
Vice Provost for International Affairs	Kelechi Kalu returned to fulltime faculty status in July 2020.	Marko Princevac, associate dean in BCOE, was appointed interim VPIA in July 2020 and continues to serve in this role.
Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer	Danna Gianforte left for a position in private industry in November 2019. David Gracey, Deputy CIO, served as interim CIO until leaving for a position at Northwestern University in December 2020.	Josh Bright, Senior Program Manager, was appointed interim CIO in December 2020 and continues to serve in this role.
Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services	LaRae Lundgren retired in November 2019.	Emily Engelschall, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, was appointed interim AVCES in November 2010 and continues to serve in this role.
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research	Allison Cantwell left for a position at Colorado State University in June 2019.	Scott Heil was appointed AVCIR in June 2019.
Director of Evaluation and Assessment	Allison Cantwell, AVCIR at the time, served as interim DEA through January 2019.	Omar Safie was appointed DEA in February 2019.
Accreditation Liaison Officer	The position was moved from undergraduate education to the provost's office in January 2019.	Kenneth Baerenklau, Associate Provost, added the ALO responsibilities to his portfolio in January 2019.

Beginning in March 2020, UCR has been significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. We were the first (and only) UC campus to be ordered “closed” by our County Public Health Officer. Winter 2020 final exams were shifted online, most students left campus and moved back to their permanent residences, and instruction was primarily (>95%) remote from Spring 2020 through Summer 2021. During this time,

instructors and support staff made tremendous efforts to create and deliver high quality remote learning experiences to students. Fall 2021 returned to primarily in-person instruction with approximately 20% of all courses delivered remotely during this transition period. Research was initially limited to critical activities during the pandemic, but has since ramped back up as health conditions have improved and returned to normal capacity in June 2021. The vast majority of administrative and other supporting functions also were delivered remotely from Spring 2020 through Summer 2021, although some critical staff have remained on campus throughout the pandemic.

The total financial impact to the campus due to the pandemic, through the end of fiscal year 2020-21 (FY21), is estimated to be around \$150M in both pandemic-related costs and lost revenues. This includes \$62M in housing and dining revenue (net of expenditure savings), \$31M in state funds, and \$18M in student fees. California's state finances improved in spring 2021 and therefore the FY22 budget also improved. The state replaced all previous cuts and provided an additional 5% increment, effective in FY22. UCR also received a new \$25M permanent state funding increment for the School of Medicine which reduced pressure on central campus resources to subsidize those operations. However, the campus still experienced an overall budget shortfall, mostly due to fixed cost increases that accumulated over two fiscal years.

To help balance the campus budget, units receiving core funds (state and tuition dollars) for their operations initially received an average permanent core fund reduction of around 11%, with relatively smaller reductions for the academic units and larger reductions for the administrative units. These reductions were implemented in a step-wise manner, with a portion of the total pulled back midway through FY21 and the remaining amount implemented in FY22. With the improved FY22 budget outlook, these reductions were revised and reduced to around 7% on average. Units that do not receive core funds for their operations, such as Auxiliary Services and University Extension, experienced significant budget reductions due to revenue losses.

Like other campuses, UCR benefitted from the federal HEERF assistance, which provided multiple allocations of one-time funding totaling \$93.7M for campus needs and \$71.8M for student financial aid. We are also requesting FEMA reimbursements, although the exact amounts that will be reimbursed are not yet known.

2. Report Preparation

UCR's Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC) served as the steering committee for preparing the special visit report. The AAC is currently comprised of the following members:

- Kenneth Baerenklau, Associate Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer (co-chair)
- Jennifer Brown, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education
- Richard Edwards, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning
- Hayden Harris, Manager of Student Affairs Assessment & Research
- John Kim, Senate Graduate Council representative
- Thomas Kramer, Associate Dean for the Undergraduate Program, School of Business
- Meera Nair, Senate representative
- Constance Nugent, Divisional Dean for Student Affairs, College of Natural & Agricultural Sciences
- Marko Princevac, Associate Dean for Student Academic Affairs, Bourns College of Engineering
- Robert Ream, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, School of Education
- Omar Safie, Director of Evaluation and Assessment (co-chair)
- Susana Salazar, Non-academic unit representative (Financial Planning & Analysis)
- Kurt Schwabe, Associate Dean, School of Public Policy
- Annika Speer, Meta Assessment Committee faculty representative
- Jason Stajich, Chair of the Academic Senate
- Ertem Tuncel, Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, Graduate Division
- John Wills, Senate representative
- Bryan Wong, Senate Committee on Educational Policy representative

Report preparation began in January 2021 when the AAC co-chairs developed a schedule for writing the report, and discussed the schedule with the incoming provost. Around the same time, the co-chairs met with WSCUC Executive Vice President Christopher Oberg to discuss the nature, format, and length of the report. The co-chairs then convened the AAC in February 2021 to discuss the report writing process, and received the committee's endorsement of a proposal for the co-chairs to lead a small writing group and to use AAC as a steering committee that would review and help to expand and refine initial drafts. The co-chairs then developed a detailed outline that was circulated to the AAC, provost/EVC, chancellor, and EVP Oberg for comment in April 2021. The lead writing group was identified to include:

- Kenneth Baerenklau, Associate Provost and ALO
- Stephanie Flores, Director for Financial Planning & Analysis
- Hayden Harris, Manager of Student Affairs Assessment & Research
- Omar Safie, Director of Evaluation and Assessment

The lead writing group drafted sections of the report through mid-July 2021 with input from campus subject matter experts. Around the same time, the ALO and DEA began meeting with the Senate Executive Council, Staff Assembly, members of the Faculty Executive Committees in the schools and colleges to review the outcomes from the 2018 reaffirmation visit, explain the expectations for the Special Visit, and discuss the process for producing and reviewing the report. A first draft of the full

report was circulated to the campus leadership team (comprised of the [Chancellor's](#) and [Provost's cabinets](#)) and the Assessment Advisory Committee in early August for feedback. Comments were addressed and incorporated into a revised draft that was shared with the broader campus community in early September. Formal invitations for consultation were sent to the Academic Senate and Staff Assembly. The Associated Students of UCR and UCR's Graduate Student Association also were invited to provide feedback. Individual members of the campus community were invited to provide comments via email to the ALO. This feedback was collected through early November and incorporated into a final report that was submitted to WSCUC in early December.

3. Issues Identified by WSCUC Reaffirmation Team

3.1. An enhanced and expanded assessment initiative. *Commence a strong and coherent assessment initiative to include both undergraduate and graduate programs, professional development for faculty and staff in assessment best practices, and appropriate allocation of financial and human resources capital.*

3.1.1. Modified Campus Assessment Structure (CFR 2.6; 4.1; 4.3)

We continue to develop our [assessment structure](#) with notable additions and changes emphasizing the priority we are placing on assessment. Key pieces of our assessment structure include:

- WSCUC Assessment Liaison Officer (ALO): reports to the provost; supervises assessment and accreditation activities.
- Director of Evaluation and Assessment (DEA): reports to the ALO; implements and supports assessment and accreditation activities.
- Manager of Student Affairs Assessment & Research (MSAAR): reports to vice chancellor for student affairs, implements and supports assessment of co-curricular programs.
- Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC): joint Senate-Administrative committee; advises on all campus assessment and accreditation activities.
- Meta-Assessment Committee (MAC): comprised primarily of faculty with strong assessment experience; provides feedback to departments and programs on their assessment activities.
- Campus Finance Committee (CFC): comprised of vice chancellors, deans, chairs of the Academic Senate, Staff Assembly, Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, and a student leader; reviews unit-level Key Performance Indicators during the annual campus budget process.

Notable changes include the following: First, both the ALO and DEA have been moved into the Provost's Office. Prior to this change, these positions were located in the Office of Undergraduate Education, which contributed to the perception that assessment was focused on undergraduate programs only. Moving these positions into the Provost's Office has helped to establish the importance of assessment activities across the campus and at all levels. Related to this move, we centralized the institutional-level assessment of WSCUC Core Competencies and established a much stronger partnership for graduate-level assessment between the DEA and Graduate Division. More details on both of these assessment processes are provided in subsequent sections.

Second, the Manager of Student Affairs Assessment & Research (MSAAR) was created to oversee all assessment efforts in co-curricular programs that are under the purview of student affairs. This position focuses on developing, supporting, and implementing best practices for assessment policies and procedures in the student affairs unit, which is home to many co-curricular student support programs. The position also implements the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), administers additional campus-wide surveys, and evaluates survey findings for campus use.

Third, the Assessment Advisory Committee (AAC) has been reconstituted with a broader and larger membership to promote increased communication and collaboration on assessment activities across the

campus. This includes more Senate faculty representatives as well as staff from both Student Affairs and Planning, Budget & Administration. We hope and expect this also will lead to more cross-pollination of ideas and implementation of best practices. For example, discussions related to core competency assessment can be informed by extra-curricular support information from student affairs, senate leadership on academic preparedness through the curriculum, and faculty experience in directly working with students. The AAC meets at least quarterly, reviews both internal and external assessment reports, makes recommendations to unit leaders based on those reports, and opines on a range of assessment-related issues that arise.

Fourth, the membership of the Campus Finance Committee (formerly the Budget Advisory Committee) was broadened from 10 members to include 21 key leaders from across the campus. Among other responsibilities, this committee oversees the annual campus budget process which includes discussion of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for each campus unit. Greater use of evidence such as KPIs in budgeting decisions and in leadership appraisals has emerged as a significant theme in the ongoing work to [revise the campus strategic plan](#).

Finally, Provost Office staff regularly support the activities of the DEA and ALO and the implementation of assessment activities campus-wide. This includes development of the new UCR Assessment Website, drafting assessment-related communications, scheduling assessment meetings/workshops, and collecting and anonymizing assessment material for use in core competency assessment. These efforts allow the DEA and ALO to focus on building relationships and furthering assessment at UCR rather than just focusing on the logistics and implementation of assessment activities.

3.1.2. Improved Assessment Collaboration (CFR 2.4; 2.6; 2.7; 4.1; 4.3; 4.4)

These structural changes have created more time and opportunities for meaningful discussions about the purpose of assessment and its essential role in continuous improvement. Since January 2019, the DEA and ALO have discussed assessment and accreditation related topics with various members of the campus community on 269 separate occasions. These discussions include assessment workshops, committee meetings to share and discuss assessment findings/plans/next steps, individual faculty and whole department meetings to discuss and support program-level assessment efforts, and phone and email correspondence aimed at supporting individual faculty assessment implementation. All of these interactions help to increase awareness and strengthen partnerships across the campus.

Another important nexus of collaboration is the reconstituted AAC, which is [comprised](#) of Senate faculty, administrative leaders, and staff representatives from multiple units. The ALO and DEA serve as co-chairs of the AAC and use it to obtain feedback on campus assessment policies, procedures, and outcomes, including our annual program assessments, our WSCUC Core Competency assessments, and reports from disciplinary accreditors. In 2018-19, we discussed the report of the WSCUC visiting team and the action letter from our 2018-2019 reaffirmation visit, which led to the creation of our [long-term assessment plan](#). The AAC also has helped to guide campus efforts to identify and evaluate technologies to support assessment activities (e.g., Watermark, CampusLabs).

We also have enhanced collaboration between the Meta-Assessment Committee (MAC) and our undergraduate programs. This occurs annually when the MAC reviews their Annual Assessment Reports. Using the new [Undergraduate Annual Assessment Report guidelines](#) and [rubric](#), the MAC provides formative feedback to programs as can be seen in these [examples](#). The goal is to encourage programs to extract meaning from their assessment findings by being more reflective. In addition, the MAC has provided feedback on the Annual Assessment Report tool, template, rubric, and timeline for submission. This feedback has led to several changes: The Annual Assessment Report was revised and moved online in 2020. The rubric also was revised and has been in use, in its current form, since 2020. The template was refined to minimize inclusion of student outcomes and maps that have not changed, so that greater emphasis can be placed on assessment as opposed to document collection. And the timeline was revised such that the annual reporting deadline would be in May, so that the MAC can provide feedback to programs at the beginning of Fall quarter.

The active engagement of these joint administrative-faculty committees has contributed to increased collaboration with Academic Senate standing committees, especially the Committee on Courses (Courses) and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). Perhaps the best assessment-related example of this collaboration is related to the core competencies. In 2020, CEP reviewed [our first institution-level core competency assessment report](#) and invited the ALO and DEA to discuss outcomes and next steps. CEP members expressed a desire for more regular engagement on core competency assessment, during both the planning and evaluation stages. As a result, the DEA shared our Written Communication core competency assessment plan for 2020-21 and received valuable feedback from CEP on the methodology and rubric. Going forward, we will continue both pre- and post-consultation with CEP for all core competency assessments. More examples of increased collaboration are provided later in this report under the accreditation processes section.

Lastly, it is worth noting that the DEA and the MSAAR meet regularly to discuss assessment efforts and to align assessment practices. These collaborative efforts have resulted in similar [Annual Assessment Report templates](#) and submission process through Qualtrics. Also, one of the primary groups participating in the Assessment Workshop Series have been personnel from student affairs programs. This has helped to increase student affairs' capacity to conduct assessments, and to establish a common assessment language and expectations across the campus.

All of these collaborative efforts are helping us build a campus-wide culture of assessment with a common message about the value of continuous improvement.

3.1.3. Increased Assessment Capacity and Resources (CFR 2.6; 4.3)

We have implemented a two-pronged approach to building student outcome assessment capacity at UCR. First, to expand professional development opportunities for individuals and increase assessment capacity at the program level, we implemented an [Assessment Workshop Series focusing on best practices](#). For 2020-21, 45 individuals representing 18 different units/departments attended at least one workshop, and 12 people from 12 units/departments attended two or more. Attendance at the workshops for the prior year was similar, demonstrating an ongoing investment in building UCR's assessment capacity. Going forward, we will continue to offer the workshop series and encourage

attendees to share information about best practices with their department colleagues. We also plan to make the most current version available online for those who are unable to attend synchronously.

Second, building on the assessment workshop series, the focus of the [Annual Assessment Report workshops](#) is to help programs complete their annual assessment reports. While there is overlap in expectations, there is enough variation between the [undergraduate and graduate assessment reports](#) to justify two separate workshops. For 2020-21, which was the first year we offered separate workshops, 29 faculty from 18 different departments participated in the undergraduate workshop, and 23 faculty from 17 departments participated in the graduate workshop.

Also, starting in the 2021-22 academic year, the DEA will be meeting with the chair and assessment liaison in undergraduate and graduate programs needing the greatest support to discuss assessment practices. These conversations will provide targeted guidance at the program level, and will highlight best practices in assessment from other UCR programs.

Access to all of these different types of professional development support is available through our revamped [UCR Assessment Website](#). The website provides tools to make assessment easier, including all workshop recordings, templates, assessment processes, and our UCR Assessment Handbook. Links to these online resources are included in all program-level emails, our assessment handbook, templates, instructions, and workshops materials. The website is constantly updated, and we are committed to continuous improvement of our digital assessment resources. To that end, the Director of Evaluation and Assessment has partnered with our Teaching and Learning Center ([XCITE](#)) to develop graphically-oriented “quick sheets” to help programs better understand the various aspects of assessment found in the Assessment Handbook and improve their own assessment practices.

To help build assessment capacity more broadly, we are working to provide campus units with access to data dashboards beginning in winter 2022. Initially we contracted with a third party to provide this resource but were unable to complete the project due to system incompatibilities. We then pivoted to an internally-led effort to build these dashboards using Microsoft Power-BI. This effort is an ongoing partnership between the Provost’s Office, Institutional Research, Information Technology Solutions, and campus stakeholders including Research & Economic Development, Undergraduate Education, and Graduate Division. Examples of the kinds of data that are currently available for academic units can be found [here](#), and screenshots of some preliminary Power-BI dashboards can be found [here](#).

3.1.4. Program-Level Assessment Progress: Undergraduate Programs (CFR 2.2a; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5; 2.6; 4.1; 4.3; 4.4)

As was the case in 2018, we have a robust outcomes-assessment process at the undergraduate level. Programs are asked to assess at least one program-level outcome annually, document the assessment process using the [Annual Assessment Report template](#), and reflect on the implementation of any recommendations during the following year. Programs then use their annual assessments as part of the periodic Program Review process to reflect on their current status in relation to their future goals.

Since our WSCUC reaffirmation visit in 2018, our undergraduate outcomes assessment process has continued to be refined. A big part of this has been the emphasis our new DEA has placed on the importance of programs tailoring the annual assessment process to their needs and using it as an opportunity to be reflective. This emphasis has contributed to high report completion rates of 90% in 2019-20 and 91% in 2020-21.

In addition to monitoring completion rates, we also review the quality of program-level assessment activities via the Annual Assessment Reports (see overview [here](#)). From 2019-20 to 2020-21, undergraduate programs demonstrated considerable improvement in using better aligned assessment evidence, and moderately improved their student outcomes, maps, and multi-year assessment plans. However, there was little change in the quality of assessment in other areas. Overall, undergraduate programs did very well in identifying evidence for outcomes assessment and analyzing that evidence, but could still improve in reflecting on assessment results, creating targeted recommendations, and closing the loop. Given these results, greater emphasis will be placed on helping programs improve in these areas. To specifically improve sharing/collaboration, we have created a two-step reporting process that asks chairs/directors to share and discuss findings at a faculty meeting before finalizing the report.

As we gain more insights from the data on how our undergraduate programs perceive and conduct annual assessment, we will continue to use the information to revise our assessment workshops and tools to meet program needs.

3.1.5. Program-Level Assessment Progress: Graduate Programs (CFR 2.2b; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5; 2.6; 4.1; 4.3; 4.4)

Compared with undergraduate program outcomes assessment, graduate program assessment is relatively newer and was identified by the 2018 visiting team as in need of more attention. When the new DEA was hired in early February 2019, he began working with the Graduate Dean, Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, and Director of Graduate Academic Affairs to establish a path forward. It was also during 2019 that the Academic Senate Graduate Council began requiring outcomes assessment as part of program review.

An important first step was to foster greater buy-in among graduate programs. We discovered that buy-in had been limited, in part because the language used to present assessment expectations to programs did not adequately reflect the diversity of work and training that is associated with graduate education. By adjusting this language, it became more apparent to programs that they had flexibility to tailor assessment activities in ways that go well beyond standard coursework – for example, by including conference presentations, lab/fieldwork, and the development of performances and exhibits. This flexibility can be seen in the graduate assessment [instructions and template](#) where the “curriculum map” has been replaced by the “student experience map.” This meaningful change was subsequently adopted for undergraduate programs, as well. This slight shift in language is helping to reframe what assessment can accomplish with a more holistic view of education and an appreciation for the diversity of work across disciplines.

Next, graduate programs were asked to re-examine their student outcomes and create the student experience map. Both of these steps were supported by a focused workshop in the Spring of 2019 and individual meetings by the DEA with programs as needed. Graduate programs worked on their outcomes and maps through the summer of 2019 and nearly 90% of all programs submitted revised outcomes and maps during the Fall of 2019. The DEA reviewed all student outcomes and maps, and provided formative feedback to support their continuous improvement.

After outcomes and maps were submitted, a graduate assessment process was developed based on the undergraduate process but with some modifications to the timeline and templates. Graduate programs were afforded additional time to complete their 2019-20 annual assessment reports, both due to the pandemic and also because graduate programs had less experience conducting annual assessments. The [Annual Assessment Report template](#) also was adjusted to better meet the needs of our graduate programs. Throughout this process, graduate programs were supported by the DEA with program-specific workshops on the Annual Assessment Report and individual program meetings as needed. This process was completed in summer of 2020, at which time the DEA reviewed the annual assessment reports and provided [formative feedback](#) to help support and improve graduate assessment.

Although nearly 90% of graduate programs submitted outcomes and maps and were engaged at the beginning of the assessment process in Spring 2019, only 55% submitted a full Annual Assessment Report for 2019-20. However, this improved to 100% for 2020-21. To assess report quality, we use the same [rubric](#) as for undergraduate programs (see overview [here](#)). From 2019-20 to 2020-21, the quality of student outcomes and mapping improved slightly. This is due to most programs having now been through three rounds of outcome and map creation and revision. Graduate programs demonstrated moderate improvement in using assessment results to make recommendations. Programs improved the most in their ability to identify well-aligned evidence for assessing their outcomes and analyzing that evidence in a way that provides them with actionable information.

Looking ahead, areas where greater emphasis will be placed include sharing/collaboration, reflecting and closing the loop, and creating a multi-year assessment plan. The latter two areas were included in the report for the first time this year, so we expect to see improvement next year in response to the feedback provided. To specifically improve sharing/collaboration, we have created a two-step reporting process that asks chairs/directors to share and discuss findings at a faculty meeting before finalizing the report. Just as with undergraduate program-level assessment, as we gain more insights from the data on how our graduate programs perceive and conduct annual assessment, we will use the information to revise our assessment workshops and tools to meet program needs.

3.1.6. Future Directions for Program-Level Assessment (CFR 2.2; 2.6; 2.7; 4.1; 4.3)

It is important to note that the last two reporting cycles have been greatly impacted by the pandemic. Many programs felt significantly challenged to fully implement their assessment efforts given the negative impact of COVID on research, teaching, and the personal lives of faculty, staff, and students. Nevertheless, we have continued to conduct program-level assessments and to make progress towards a more enhanced and expanded assessment initiative. Future directions include the following:

- **Alignment of annual assessment procedures and applications.** We have worked to create procedures and timelines that are very similar for undergraduate, graduate, and student affairs programs. This helps to create consistency of expectations across the campus, and provides a common language when members of the UCR community discuss assessment and student outcomes. We plan to continue working to create and support this coherent campus-wide assessment structure.
- **Rolling-up graduate student progress reports into annual outcomes assessment reports and periodic program reviews.** In partnership with the Graduate Division, we are [building a process](#) that will explicitly link all of the individual student progress reports in a given program to that program’s annual outcomes assessment and to its periodic program reviews. The goal is to have graduate programs utilize an online data collection tool to track individual student progress towards desired outcomes. The collected information will then be provided to programs to use during the completion of their annual outcomes assessment reports. Ultimately, the annual assessment reports will be incorporated into their program reviews so that graduate programs can focus on reflection and planning for the future, rather than collecting evidence for assessment. We will begin piloting this process in 2021-2022.
- **Technology support for assessment activities.** Just prior to the pandemic, we were in the process of obtaining an outside technology solution to make assessment procedures more efficient and thus free up more time for reflection. However, COVID-related financial challenges forced us to delay this investment. In the meantime, we are utilizing Qualtrics for Annual Assessment Report submission and to develop the graduate student evaluation solution mentioned above, in order to streamline the assessment process and allow more time for reflection. The DEA is also working on the development of a Power BI dashboard to house and share Annual Assessment Report data and feedback.
- **Emphasizing “closing the loop.”** The most important aspect of assessment is using the information to reflect and make changes. This aspect features prominently in the Annual Assessment Report process. While some programs are using this process to make deliberate changes ([examples](#)), there is still room for improvement at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Other ideas under consideration include an online workshop, or series of workshops, on using Excel for assessment data analysis; expanded use of dashboards to display a broader range of campus assessment results; using UCR’s new Canvas learning management system for core competency and program-level assessment; and incorporating UCUES data for core competency assessment.

3.1.7. Core Competency Assessment (CFR 2.2a; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5; 2.6; 4.1; 4.3; 4.4)

Core competency assessment was another issue identified by the 2018 visiting team as needing attention. In the past, core competency assessment was relegated to programs. Annually, programs were asked to assess their own program’s outcomes as well as one core competency. While this worked for some programs, especially those that aligned their program-level student outcomes to the core competencies, the additional workload led to low completion rates among programs. This produced inconsistencies across the campus, both in terms of which programs were conducting assessments and

in terms of the methodologies used, which made it challenging to broadly understand student achievement in the core competencies.

In 2019, we created a [long-term plan](#) (more details [here](#)) for assessing core competencies in a consistent manner across UCR. This entailed moving the core competency assessment activities out of the programs and adopting a campus-wide juried assessment approach. This provides a more complete picture of how the core competencies exist at UCR and to what degree all UCR students are meeting core competency expectations. It also creates more time for programs to focus on program-level outcomes – especially reflecting on results and implementing improvements. This new approach was discussed with the AAC and approved for implementation in 2019-20. As described in the supporting documents, the process entails data collection in Year 1 of a core competency assessment cycle, scoring/analysis/reporting in Year 2, and sharing/collaboration/closing the loop in Year 3. Thus, at any point in time after full build-out, three core competencies are in the process of being assessed.

The first core competency we assessed was Information Literacy in 2019-20. Over 300 samples of student work (artifacts) were collected from across the campus, and a 10-member team of faculty and staff experts (in this case, librarians) scored the artifacts. Analysis of the results led to a specific set of recommendations that are summarized in the [final report](#). These recommendations were discussed with the provost, deans and associate deans, librarians, and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. A subset was prioritized and is currently being implemented, including a plan to update our core competency curriculum maps to better understand how the core competencies exist within the identified courses. The library also is prioritizing the hiring of four additional librarians who will focus on information literacy education across the campus.

We have been pleased with the level of support for this new approach to core competency assessment, and have welcomed discussions about how to increase collaboration and improve the process going forward. As mentioned previously, one unanticipated outcome of this process is that the Committee on Educational Policy requested a larger role in future core competency assessments. The DEA has since returned to CEP to share the plan for assessing our 2020-21 core competency, Written Communication, and has incorporated the committee's feedback into the assessment process.

A potentially significant development related to the core competencies is a recently released draft proposal from the Academic Senate's General Education Review Committee. This committee has proposed a new general education structure that adopts the five core competencies as "skill development features" of a new curriculum, and utilizes common UCR-specific rubrics for assessing progress towards learning goals in these areas. This is an exciting development but there will be much discussion within the Academic Senate before decisions are made about the proposal.

3.1.8. Student Affairs Program Assessment (CFR 2.3; 4.1; 4.3)

The Division of Student Affairs has a critical role in supporting student success at UCR. Prior to 2019, assessment within this division was limited. While there was support to Director-level positions in the form of survey creation and data analysis, a formal and systematic assessment process did not exist. Student Affairs Research and Evaluation provided this support, but its focus was not the systematic

assessment of outcomes. To address this gap in assessment, as part of the new five-year strategic plan for Student Affairs, the VCSA included an objective to establish and staff an assessment office to support best practices in assessment. In conjunction with the creation of the assessment office, an assessment committee was formed to identify additional needs, develop recommendations, and create a handbook (to be released in 2021-22). The [Student Affairs Assessment & Research](#) website was created as a place where student affairs units could go to for information about assessment and reports. In addition, an internal facing website, the Student Affairs Assessment & Research Collaboration website, aimed at increasing cross-unit assessment discussions, is being developed as a place for student affairs staff involved in assessment to share reports, tools, and findings across units (also to be released in 2021-22).

To further support this effort, the Student Affairs Assessment & Research (SAAR) office was formed to create a culture of assessment in Student Affairs. This office is headed by the Manager of Student Affairs Assessment & Research (MSAAR), a newly created position in Student Affairs. To establish a baseline, the MSAAR surveyed program directors' assessment knowledge and found that 96% of directors were interested in creating a culture of assessment and 92% were motivated to make changes to their assessment methods. To build capacity, the MSAAR provided a series of ["Assessment 101" presentations](#) throughout 2019-20 to educate on topics such as the assessment cycle, research methods, and student learning outcomes. The goal of these workshops was to support program completion of the division's newly established annual assessment report requirement, and resulted in a 100% completion rate for both the inaugural 2019-20 year as well as 2020-21. Using a [student affairs oriented rubric](#), which is based on the [rubric](#) used to evaluate academic programs, the MSAAR evaluated all program annual assessment reports. As can be seen in the [2019-20 Year End Student Affairs Assessment Report](#), student affairs programs did well with their student learning outcomes with 95% being scored as developed or highly developed, followed by 85% in analysis of evidence, and 80% in the use of assessment results. While there is room for improvement in analysis of evidence and the use of assessment results, student affairs programs overall did very well.

In addition to focusing on creating assessment resources and processes, the MSAAR helped Student Affairs programs develop their evaluation toolbox with an emphasis on quantitative survey data. The MSAAR developed a [Student Affairs Program Evaluation template](#) to help Directors create tailored assessment/evaluation tools that use standardized questions, assess learning outcomes, and identify which strategic plan themes are being assessed. To promote the use of the type of data produced from the evaluation template, the MSAAR models use of similar data produced by the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), which is a systemwide survey that assesses students' experiences on campus. The MSAAR shares UCUES findings, publishes reports on the [UCUES website](#), discusses results with program Directors, and helps program directors develop their capacity to analyze and evaluate data obtained from UCUES and the program evaluation template. The MSAAR also provides many online assessment resources and infographics, and publishes additional campus-wide survey research findings on the [SAAR Assessment Website](#).

Student Affairs is committed to creating and maintaining a culture of assessment. Going forward, the MSAAR plans to implement a program in which interested staff will be trained as assessment liaisons who will then educate their departments on best practices in assessment. Additional enhancements will

likely include developing an assessment advisory board, increased education and consultation, enhanced website resources, and expanded staffing.

3.1.9. Broader Campus Assessment Activities (CFR 4.1; 4.3)

Assessment in other campus units, through the Key Performance Indicator aspect of the annual budget process, is the most nascent aspect of our campus assessment structure. Units have been submitting KPIs through the annual budget process for several years, but there has been limited reflection on and use of this data in decision-making. During the ongoing work to update the UCR campus strategic plan, and consistent with comments received from the 2018 visiting team, the need to better align the strategic plan with unit-level implementation plans, and to be more explicit about objectives, goals, and metrics in all of these documents – as well as in leadership appraisals – emerged as a significant theme.

As a first step towards maturing these assessment activities, and with the strategic planning process still ongoing last year, the deans of the schools and colleges were asked to develop annual unit reports utilizing the dashboard data mentioned previously. The intent was to pilot these reports with the academic units before expanding to other units and incorporating the reports into the campus budget process (in place of the KPI structure) and leadership appraisals. A template was provided that demonstrated how the dashboard data mapped onto key areas such as research and creative activity, education and student success, and administration (e.g., budget, philanthropy, staffing, and diversity, among others). Despite the challenges presented by the pandemic, each college/school completed a draft report and shared it with our new provost. As the strategic plan is finalized and the new Campus Finance Committee gets fully underway, we plan to continue building-out this reporting process and formalizing its role in budgeting and appraisals.

3.2. A stronger campus commitment to accreditation processes that promotes the relationship between accreditation reviews and such significant campus efforts as strategic planning and student achievement initiatives. *Develop a stronger and more meaningful campus commitment around accreditation that provides campus-wide understanding of the processes and expectations.*

Prior to our last reaccreditation visit, important activities associated with accreditation were not well-integrated into UCR's fabric nor were they well-integrated with each other. The need to improve these processes was apparent to us while preparing for and going through the last visit, and was an area of concern noted by the visiting team. To address this, we have made several changes that have strengthened our commitment to accreditation.

3.2.1. Revised Organizational Structure

As mentioned previously, both the ALO and DEA positions have been moved into the Provost's Office. The ALO job responsibilities were incorporated into the associate provost position, and the DEA reports directly to the associate provost. Prior to our last reaccreditation visit, both positions were located in Undergraduate Education. Although the ALO was, at the time, also a direct report to the provost, the associate provost has a closer working relationship with the provost (serving as the chief of staff and being part of the same unit rather than leading a separate unit) which brings accreditation activities

“closer” to the provost and also avoids the impression that assessment and accreditation are primarily undergraduate program concerns. This change has contributed to our progress not only with regard to assessment activities outside of undergraduate programs, but also with accreditation efforts broadly.

Also mentioned earlier, the MSAAR position was established in student affairs to oversee assessment efforts within student affairs. This position has been crucial in the development of an annual assessment process for student affairs programs, with the MSAAR providing individual program support and feedback. With the MSAAR and DEA positions located in the two vice chancellor units with the greatest focus on students, a close collaboration has emerged between the two positions. The MSAAR and DEA meet monthly to discuss assessment efforts, alignment of expectations, and collaborative support opportunities through workshops that serve multiple constituencies. These two positions have been crucial in doing the work to get student-focused assessment implemented across the campus and meeting accreditation requirements.

3.2.2. Improved Administrative Processes (CFR 1.8)

Beyond simply reorganizing, we have implemented substantial changes to processes that affect accreditation both directly and indirectly. The first of these was requested by our chancellor, who established quarterly assessment and accreditation update meetings. These meetings include the chancellor, associate chancellor, provost, associate provost (ALO), and DEA, and cover a wide range of topics related to assessment and accreditation. These discussions have been crucial in making sure that campus leadership is aware of, and involved in, decisions that affect programs and units. They also help to foster a common understanding of assessment and accreditation, and to achieve better alignment of related activities and expectations, throughout the organization.

Also shortly after the 2018 visit, the Assessment Advisory Committee was reconstituted with a [new charge](#) from the provost that more clearly connects its responsibilities for oversight of both assessment and accreditation activities. For example, for this Special Visit, the AAC has served as the main venue for discussion and feedback on drafting the report and preparing for the visit. While the group is not new, the expanded oversight role for accreditation activities is a more recent change, and also appropriate given its broad membership that includes Senate leaders and representatives, campus leaders, and staff members.

The more concerted focus on accreditation at the executive and oversight levels has produced a renewed emphasis on improving specific processes in various units. For example, during the completion of the 2019 WSCUC annual report, we noticed some discrepancies between the WSCUC list of inactive degree programs and our campus list. While not a major concern, this prompted the DEA to implement a full review of UCR programs, which resulted in the identification of a short list of issues that need to be addressed. Further investigation revealed that an administrative disconnect had developed between the Academic Senate and ALO/DEA, and information was not being shared in a timely manner. The ALO, DEA, and Senate office worked together to develop a simple solution to avoid this problem going forward and ensure that the ALO and DEA are notified of all approved changes to programs at the time of approval. This ensures we are able to determine which changes require WSCUC Substantive Change, change of status on the WSCUC program list, or notification to WSCUC of a new program before

implementation of the changes. This process was implemented in the fall of 2020, and as of this writing, the DEA has reviewed 139 Senate approvals for program changes/creation of new programs, and has reported changes that required notification to WSCUC in a timely manner.

Another example of process improvement is our collaborative work with our schools that maintain discipline-specific accreditation – specifically engineering (ABET) and business (AACSB). For programs in these schools, we have provided flexibility to modify certain campus assessment requirements to account for their disciplinary-specific accreditation responsibilities. For example, our School of Business uses their own school-specific annual assessment template that meets both campus and AACSB accreditation requirements. They also follow a shifted submission timeline for their campus annual reports that better aligns with the AACSB schedule. For our Bourns College of Engineering, we are similarly collaborating on a college-specific annual assessment template and submission timeline that balances their ABET requirements with our campus requirements. All of these changes have resulted from outreach by the DEA to the individual schools/colleges regarding campus annual assessment with the specific goal of streamlining accreditation processes and efforts.

3.2.3. Increased Collaboration (CFR 1.8)

Previously in this report we presented some examples of enhanced collaboration across campus in the context of assessment. These included workshops, meetings, and other support for assessment efforts; a reconstituted Assessment Advisory Committee; feedback to undergraduate programs from the Meta-Assessment Committee; increased engagement with Senate standing committees; and collaboration between the DEA and MSAAR positions. All of these collaborative efforts benefit our accreditation activities, as well. Some additional examples include the following:

- At the request of the ALO and DEA, the Academic Senate Committee on Courses has proposed a change to their Course Request Checklist which, pending approval from the Academic Senate, will require submission of course learning outcomes when new and revised course syllabi are routed for Senate approval.
- The ALO and DEA also discussed the benefits of a campus-wide [Syllabus Repository](#) with both the Committee on Courses and CEP, and obtained helpful feedback as well as support for launching the repository in 2020. When fully subscribed, this searchable database of our instructional activities will help our faculty improve curricular design, our students make informed course selections, and our staff better advise students and meet accreditation requirements.
- While CEP has required undergraduate programs to incorporate outcomes assessment into the regularly recurring program review process, this was not required of graduate programs prior to our reaffirmation visit. Subsequently, Graduate Council incorporated outcomes assessment into program review beginning in 2019. By rolling-up annual assessment outcomes into program reviews, assessment becomes more meaningful and program review provides an efficient way to evaluate assessment results over the longer term. This integration also enables assessment to directly inform curricular and co-curricular changes that derive from program reviews.
- Lastly, we noted above that the ALO and DEA visited with the Senate Executive Council, Staff Assembly, and members of the Faculty Executive Committees in the schools and colleges while

preparing the report. These meetings often broadened in scope beyond the report and special visit, to include discussions about accreditation generally. Faculty members shared perspectives that will help with future messaging about accreditation, and the ALO and DEA were able to share perspectives that helped to address misunderstandings and to explain the rationale for accreditation as a form of collective self-governance that promotes continuous improvement.

3.2.4. Greater Engagement with WSCUC (CFR 1.8)

In addition to increased internal collaboration, UCR also has expanded its collaborative engagement with WSCUC in the following ways:

- Shortly after the visit, the ALO and DEA initiated twice annual meetings with WSCUC Executive Vice President Christopher Oberg to provide progress updates, received feedback, and become more familiar with WSCUC accreditation expectations.
- Our chancellor became a WSCUC Commissioner in 2020. His participation gives us the opportunity to learn more about WSCUC, assessment, and accreditation, as well as to provide the UCR perspective to help shape the future of WSCUC and higher education policy.
- Our ALO served as a WSCUC panelist and is serving as a member of a WSCUC visiting team.
- Our DEA completed the WSCUC Assessment Leadership Academy, has presented at multiple ARC conferences, and recently partnered with other UC Assessment Colleagues to lead a Special Interest Group on Assessment Language at the 2021 Accreditation Resource Community (ARC) conference.
- We have broadened our participation in the ARC conferences by inviting groups of faculty leaders involved in assessment activities to attend. This allows us to share the UCR perspective with other ARC attendees, and helps to bring the greater WSCUC community perspective back to UCR.

3.2.5. Alignment with Planning and Major Initiatives

Beginning in 2019, we embarked on our current strategic planning process, which produced a [penultimate draft](#) in February 2021. Themes of accountability and aligning resources with objectives were prominent discussion topics during the planning process, and were emphasized in a section titled *Ensuring Accountability* on pages 20-21 of the draft. The main ideas in this section of the draft plan are to establish better alignment between campus-level strategic directions, unit-level goals, and implementation plans; to better utilize evidence to assess progress towards goals; to reflect on progress more regularly; and to establish stronger connections between these assessments, the campus budgeting process, and leadership appraisals. As described above, a first step towards implementation of this framework was for the colleges and schools to develop annual reports utilizing the new dashboard data.

Another major effort, also still underway, that demonstrates a renewed emphasis on alignment is the ongoing review of our General Education curriculum. Also initiated in 2019, by the Academic Senate, this review has been led by an ad hoc committee charged with a full re-examination of the structure and goals of general education at UCR. The committee recently produced a [report](#) that proposes centering

the five WSCUC Core Competencies in the General Education curriculum. The work of the committee included identifying what general education means for UCR, defining each of the core competencies, and creating rubrics for evaluating student outcomes that match those definitions. It is worth noting that the development of UCR-specific definitions and rubrics was also a recommendation produced by the Information Literacy core competency assessment. Although the Academic Senate has not yet discussed the committee's proposal (review is scheduled to take place in 2021-22), the report demonstrates a deliberate, thoughtful, and thorough effort to achieve better alignment of a major initiative (in this case our General Education program) with accreditation expectations in a way that reflects our campus mission, vision, and values.

3.3. A modified budget model that embraces current challenges to campus success. *Assure that the current activity to modify the campus budget model addresses issues that challenge campus success, including staffing, facilities, and the differential costs of varied instructional modalities.*

The current campus budget model elevated the role of the deans in determining funding priorities for their schools and colleges, streamlined and improved financial management processes, and helped foster university-wide collaboration and stakeholder engagement. While the current model has many benefits, it was always assumed that some adjustments would be needed after implementation. To identify strengths, weaknesses, and proposed refinements, an in-depth review of the budget model kicked-off in fall 2018 (prior to UCR's last reaccreditation visit) with broad consultation and the sharing of a draft of the [UCR Decentralized Budget Model Key Considerations and Questions](#) with campus stakeholders. This document noted the background and history that led to the development of the current model, and provided an inventory of ideas that had emerged to change and improve the model. The following groups were consulted for feedback on the draft, to help determine priority areas and recommended refinements: (CFR 3.1)

- Senate Committee on Planning and Budget Committee
- Senate Committee on Research
- Senate Committee on Physical Resources Planning
- Senate Executive Council
- Senate Committee on Educational Policy
- Senate Graduate Council
- Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare
- Senate Committee on Courses
- Senate Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity
- Senate Committee on Library and Information Technology
- Campus Senior Leadership
- Academic Department Chairs and Program Directors
- Chief Financial and Administrative Officers (CFAOs)
- Student Leadership (graduate and undergraduate)

In addition, open forums were held with faculty and staff, and a budget model survey (sent to subject matter experts including former Senate committee members, department chairs/directors and CFAOs, and other management and financial staff) were conducted to collect additional input. (CFR 3.1)

Overall, the vice chancellor for planning & budget and the Office of Financial Planning & Analysis (FP&A) participated in 25 meetings and forums during fall 2018 to receive input and discuss possible refinements after the initial draft was shared. In December 2018, the administration shared an [updated version](#) of the UCR Decentralized Budget Model Key Considerations and Questions. This document represented consolidated feedback from senior leadership, School/College leadership teams, Academic Senate committees, faculty, staff, and students, and included preliminary recommendations for moving forward. A public comment period followed, during which time the Academic Senate provided formal written consultation. In early 2019, following consultation with the campus community, 22 recommendations and process changes and an implementation timeline were [finalized and approved](#) by the chancellor. Updates on these recommendations and actions taken to-date to address challenges to campus success are provided below.

1. **Salary and benefits.** Annual salary and benefit cost increases on central core funds (tuition and state funding) exceeded \$15M in FY19 and were continuing to increase at an unsustainable rate. Effective in FY20, a sliding scale was established whereby central core funds would cover salary and benefit costs to the extent of available revenue, and units would cover any remainder. To date, central funds have been sufficient to cover 100% of the cost increases. (CFR 3.1; 3.4)
2. **Recharge rationalization.** The previous “recharge rationalization” process, which had attempted to streamline operations by converting recharge services to central funding in order to reduce the transactional workload, had produced excessive demand for some services by removing the marginal cost associated with the service. Certain services in ITS, Facilities, Human Resources, and International Affairs were returned to recharge status with new rates approved by the Budget Advisory Committee. Base funding was withdrawn from these units and returned to the “client” units that now pay the new rates for these services. (CFR 3.4)
3. **Facilities renovations and support.** The budget model originally provided a central funding allocation for faculty lab renovations under \$50,000 but no central funding for projects over this amount (which require bidding out to private firms by state law). This has been adjusted such that central campus will cost-share projects above \$50,000 to address building code and other main building infrastructure issues, given that the age of the building can materially impact the cost of the project. Additionally, the campus has been more successful in obtaining deferred maintenance (DM) funds from the state. UCR received about \$7M in FY20 and \$20.5M in FY22, both significant increases over previous years’ allocations that never exceeded \$3.5M. Each year, the campus facilitates a process to prioritize DM projects in each unit and address areas of greatest need. (CFR 3.4)
4. **Rapid growth of assessments to auxiliary units.** The budget model introduced a new employee FTE-driven methodology for calculating indirect cost assessments. For some units, such as the student recreation center and housing and dining operations, which employ large numbers of student employees, this led to rapid and unsustainable cost increases. This indirect assessment methodology was replaced with an Administrative Cost Recovery model effective 7/1/19. The charges to the auxiliaries are now based on prior year expenditures, similar to how the UCOP Funding Assessment model charges the UC campuses. A sliding scale was established which

taxes the first \$1M in expenses at a rate of 9.7%, the expenses between \$1M and \$8M at a rate of 8.1%, and anything over \$8M at a rate of 7.2%. This methodology is predicable for planning purposes and incentivizes prudent spending. (CFR 3.4)

5. **Old budget model structures.** Consistent with the campus goal of delegating more decision-making authority to unit heads, and especially to the deans, the budget model moved substantial amounts of resources out of central campus accounts and into the units. However, old budget model structures for central campus commitments persisted which created a structural deficit for the center. These central campus commitments have been reviewed through the lens of the budget model principles, and adjustments have been made to align costs with revenues. A number of commitments for academic (dean and faculty) searches that had historically been covered by the center have been shifted to the schools and colleges. Similarly, misalignments of severance cost responsibility and salary differentials (i.e., caused by turnover) also have been addressed. All of the above changes were effective 7/1/19. Faculty research startup funding will be realigned beginning in FY23. (CFR 3.4)
6. **Undergraduate non-resident tuition.** Central campus funding of non-resident tuition scholarships and discounts had led to deficits in this activity because of how the non-resident tuition revenue was being shared between the center and the units. The distribution was modified to cover scholarships off-the-top, and the split between central resources and colleges was adjusted so the center now receives 70% and the schools/colleges receive 30%. The deficit has been erased, and this adjustment has bolstered the ability of the central campus to fully fund salary and benefit cost increases (see item 1 above). (CFR 3.4)
7. **Credit hour weighting.** The tuition allocation components of the budget model give the same weight to each student even though the cost to educate a student varies greatly across disciplines. The Ad Hoc Committee on Credit Hour Weights was formed to investigate and make recommendations as to whether the campus should develop non-uniform weights for teaching workload that more closely align with disciplinary costs as well as level of instruction. The committee considered multiple approaches to developing evidence-based non-uniform undergraduate credit hour weights. Two approaches emerged as most preferred in the committee's [March 2020 report](#). One utilizes UCR data and one utilizes data from other campuses that have been compiled by the Delaware Cost Study. The committee considered that the UCR weights describe our costs as they are today but not necessarily what our costs should be, and recommended against allocating resources solely based on the UCR weights. The Delaware weights could provide a useful external benchmark, so the committee instead recommended averaging the UCR and Delaware weights to produce hybrid weights. (CFR 3.4)

This approach was endorsed by the provost and the vice chancellor for planning, budget & administration, but implementation was delayed due to the pandemic. UCR subsequently joined the Delaware Cost Study in order to access more granular data from other R1 peer institutions identified as most similar to UCR based on an analysis of multiple institutional attributes. Discipline-specific Delaware study costs will be combined with UCR's own cost averages and a new proposed funding weight by college/school will be submitted for review by the Campus

Finance Committee and ultimate approval by the provost. We anticipate that these weights will be applied to the tuition calculation in FY22.

8. **Graduate funding (Masters level incentives and Ph.D. support).** The initial focus of the graduate component of the budget model was to incentivize Master's level growth, in order to bring UCR's proportion of Master's students closer to those at other UC campuses and produce additional graduate tuition income that would go to support PhD students. The budget model did not provide a direct financial incentive to increase PhD enrollments, and the incentive for Master's growth was getting blunted at the college level because growth in one program could be off-set by reductions in another, leaving no net surplus available to reward program growth. Discussions during the budget model refinement process focused on developing a broad plan to meet targeted graduate enrollment growth by expanding Master's programs (both state-supported and self-supporting); expanding professional school enrollment; and developing annual priorities for investment in PhD enrollment growth. In Fall 2019, the provost established the Graduate Program Finances Workgroup to develop specific recommendations in these areas as well as any other related areas that the committee deemed important. The committee issued an [interim report](#) in April 2021 that offered preliminary recommendations and suggestions for next steps. This item is on the Campus Finance Committee agenda for 2021-22. (CFR 3.4)
9. **Performance funding.** The budget model allows for temporary, one-time funds to be used as an incentive to colleges and schools that meet performance goals (e.g., graduation rates). This component has not yet been fully developed or implemented due to the lack of an identified source of funds. (CFR 3.4)
10. **School of Medicine under-capitalization.** The UCR School of Medicine (SOM) was established in FY13 with a \$15M annual investment by the state. UCR, the UC Office of the President (UCOP), and the County of Riverside also made annual cash commitments in start-up funds. While the \$15M base funding was critical to the establishment of the school, it was not sufficient to sustain ongoing operations or the planned expansion and maturation of the school. Campus leadership successfully worked with UCOP and State Legislators to increase the base funding by \$25M, to \$40M annually beginning in FY21. Because this is a fixed allocation, campus leadership is currently working with UCOP to allow for cost adjustments to this base funding when the state increases the UC base budget. (CFR 3.4)

The additional \$25M permanent increase was restricted from budget cuts taken in FY21, and thus those cuts had to be taken elsewhere on campus. However, receipt of those funds relieved the central campus of \$8.5M in expenses that were being covered on behalf of the school. Also, and despite positive pre-pandemic revenue growth, the SOM clinical operations have not yet reached maturity and so there is still a deficit in that enterprise that was exacerbated by the pandemic. The State Budget Act of 2021 allocated \$25M in one-time funding in FY22 which will help stabilize the clinical enterprise and move toward a self-sufficient, sustainable operation that is aligned with the SOM mission by 2025.

There also have been important recent investments in physical infrastructure for SOM. The

State Budget Act of 2019 approved \$100M in FY20 for the construction of a new 90,000 square-foot SOM academic facility. Construction is currently underway next to other SOM facilities and will allow the school to meet student instructional needs and expand their cohort size up to 125 students. In FY21, the campus also finished renovating the Orbach Library basement into a 14,000 square-foot state-of-the-art simulation lab to fully support SOM academic needs. And in FY22, the state budget included an additional \$10M in one-time funding for the SOM, with a focus on investigating hospital arrangements that would benefit the school in the long-term, including potential ownership. (CFR 3.4)

11. **Need for increased central funds and “reserves.”** Several modifications listed in other parts of this section serve to increase central campus funds. Financial Planning & Analysis reviews cash balances, both current and three-year trend, in the schools and colleges annually. FP&A also worked with the schools and colleges to track obligations on carryforward funds in order to establish true “reserves”, but during the pandemic this focus necessarily shifted to tracking and reporting COVID impacts to address FEMA claims and prioritize use of HEERF funds. (CFR 3.4)
12. **Viable ways to grow UCR’s total new revenue.** This effort was delayed by the pandemic, when the exigencies of continuing the mission remotely consumed the time and attention of both leadership and faculty. More recently, our new provost allocated half of the fall 2021 all-day leadership retreat to discussions of new revenue generation, with specific foci on summer session enrollment, new Masters degrees, non-resident enrollment, and extramural funding and indirect cost generation. Other discussions considered an expanded online presence, greater flexibility in educational offerings (e.g., micro-credentials), a broader role for University Extension, and campus-based summer activities beyond instruction. The provost is working with the deans and vice chancellors to implement many of the recommendations developed during the retreat. (CFR 3.4)
13. **Budget process interaction with campus strategic plan.** In preparation for the FY20 budget call, midway through the 2019-20 academic year, the Budget Advisory Committee discussed campus priorities and budgeting principles and shared these with campus units in the call materials. The call was subsequently canceled due to the pandemic, as it was again in FY21, when the focus had to shift to implementing budget reductions. Campus priorities guided the budget reduction process, resulting in relatively smaller cuts taken by academic units and certain administrative units with direct impacts on instruction and research such as RED and ITS. Alignment of strategic direction, implementation plans, and resource budgeting also has emerged as a significant theme during the ongoing work to develop a new campus strategic plan, as was mentioned earlier in this report. This is anticipated to be an important outcome of that ongoing process. (CFR 3.1; 3.4)
14. **Multi-year budget model.** The campus transitioned to two-year budget projections for the FY20 budget process. The ongoing replacement of the campus financial system will include a tool that facilitates these multi-year projections, beginning in FY23. (CFR 3.4)

15. **Fixed cost increase computation.** For the FY20 budget process, a template was added to report fixed costs increases outside of salary and benefits (e.g., utilities, periodicals, software licenses, etc.) that would not otherwise receive allocations from the budget model to cover those increases. (CFR 3.4)
16. **Service level agreements.** Service level agreements (SLA), which functioned as contracts between units, were largely eliminated in the FY20 budget process and replaced with a simplified document defining authority and responsibility for specific goods and services. However, some units, including Facilities Services and ITS, had spent significant effort developing detailed SLAs which helped clients understand the services they were purchasing. These units were allowed the autonomy to continue using the SLA if they preferred. (CFR 3.4)
17. **Funding schedule for enrollment growth.** To avoid large swings in the tuition distributions to the schools and colleges which can be caused by discrepancies between estimated and actual student counts, a new funding schedule was implemented in FY19. The initial calculation is now based on official third week enrollment in October. Half of the estimated total allocation based on these numbers is provided to the units at this time. The remaining allocation is based on final three-quarter average headcount in May. (CFR 3.4)
18. **Budget related activities during the fiscal year.** Previously, a substantial amount of budget activity occurred outside of the annual budget process and there were concerns about how these decisions were being communicated to the campus. Initially this was addressed through semi-annual letters to the campus from both Financial Planning & Analysis and the provost. Subsequently, as more central funds were transferred to the units, the amount of activity happening outside of the annual budget process was reduced. Campus updates are still provided as needed, and even greater transparency and communication is expected with the formation of the new, expanded Campus Finance Committee in May 2021. (CFR 3.4)
19. **Tracking of “permanent” positions/commitments funded on cash.** A new template was introduced for the FY19 budget process that allowed units to separate permanent positions on permanent funding from those on temporary (cash) funding. Use of template revealed that this issue, which was thought to be problematic, was not as widespread as initially thought. To address workload concerns, the template was modified for the FY20 process, but the process was canceled due to the pandemic. Going forward, beginning with the FY23 budget process, a new financial system is being implemented with a module that will facilitate easier tracking. (CFR 3.4)
20. **Campus core research facilities.** In consultation with the deans and core facility directors, the vice chancellor for research & economic development established the Shared Research Core Facilities Committee to inventory UCR facilities and instrumentation, understand and prioritize equipment needs, and identify opportunities for increasing operational efficiencies. This committee recently proposed a set of research facilities that would be considered “core” facilities with broad campus operations. Next, the committee will administer a survey to the core facility directors and collect detailed financial information on these facilities from the units

currently supporting them before considering financial models which may lead to a centralized reorganization. This work is ongoing and is expected to produce recommendations later in the 2021-22 academic year. (CFR 3.1; 3.4)

21. **F&A distribution.** The budget model incentivized efforts to obtain extramural research funding by allocating a portion of F&A (indirect cost recovery) to various units, including the PI and department. The distribution was as follows: 5% to the PI, 10% to the department, 25% to the unit (typically a school or college), 10% to Research & Economic Development (RED), and 50% to central campus resources. At the time, the central campus was responsible for a majority of start-up package funding, research support commitments, as well as the debt payments and operational costs for the new Multidisciplinary Research Building (MRB) for which F&A had been committed as a funding source. Effective 7/1/2020, the F&A distribution model was modified to increase the distribution to Research & Economic Development from 10% to 20% and to decrease the distribution to central resources from 50% to 40%. This shift in funding will allow the VCRED to secure much needed software for many of its functions including compliance, fill staff vacancies including in the Office of Sponsored Programs which provides critical support for extramural research contracts and grants, and provide seed/matching funding for researchers. In October 2021, the Campus Finance Committee decided to allocate an additional 26% of F&A to the schools and colleges for faculty start-up packages, reducing the F&A distribution to central resources to 14%. This revised allocation provides deans with greater control over resources for faculty recruitment. (CFR 3.4)

In 2021-22, the Campus Finance Committee will undertake a re-evaluation of existing “base budgets” that are treated as fixed in the budget model, with an eye toward accounting for enrollment growth in the colleges and schools over the last five years. Going forward, and consistent with the original recommendations, the Campus Finance Committee will conduct quinquennial reviews of the budget model to assess performance and discuss additional refinements that will be linked to progress on strategic initiatives and responsive to evolving campus priorities.

3.4. A re-calibrated Cash-Based Operating Performance Model. *Review the multi-year “Cash-Based Operating Performance Model” provided in the institutional report to assure that revenue projections are realistic, and make modifications to expenditure projections as necessary.*

UCR’s operating model was initially developed by UC Berkeley in 2013-14 and subsequently distributed by UCOP for use by the other UC campuses for making financial projections. The model is based on actuals pulled from UCOP’s Corporate Financial System which consolidates the financial data from all of the UC campuses and locations into audited financial schedules. The model incorporates faculty-to-student ratios, TA-to-student ratios, and staff-to-student ratios into future projections, as well as anticipated fixed cost increases, which help to determine whether projected revenue covers projected expenses. The model incorporates over forty unique assumptions, and adjustments can be made to any line in the model. This provides flexibility in developing financial scenarios that leaders can use to make strategic decisions to allow the campus to sustain its financial viability. However, it is difficult to project finances far out into the future, as issues like COVID, regental decisions on tuition (although see below

for a positive change in this area), and state funding allocations are not possible to predict with certainty. However, the model is a useful planning tool, especially in the near-term.

The operating model is updated annually in the fall for prior year actuals, current and projected enrollment, F&A model projections, and the fall faculty and staff FTE counts. The operating model is used to prepare the financial data in templates for UCR's annual meeting with the UC President, to update the campus Debt Affordability Model which is used for all Capital Approval Items, and to provide projections to senior leadership. Other campus models for specific areas such as Housing and Dining, Parking, School of Medicine, and central campus resources are integrated into the campus operating model in order to provide a consolidated view for the entire campus based on historical actuals. As major decisions or events occur during a fiscal year, the model is updated accordingly. The most recent core funds forecast used in the annual meeting with the UC President can be found [here](#). (CFR 3.4)

Review and re-calibration of the operating model was underway before 2020, including adjustment of revenue projections to more attainable levels based on past enrollment growth rates, but the financial impact of the pandemic in early 2020 quickly became the main focus of these efforts. Going into early 2020, projections for UCR looked quite good. These projections quickly reversed in March 2020, and the campus had to consider permanent budget cuts on the order of 10-15%. After a partial implementation of these plans, the projections again changed dramatically due to a very healthy state budget that ultimately returned all of the FY21 cuts and provided a 5% augmentation to the UC base budget for FY22. Other significant events, actual and potential, with implications for the operating model include: (CFR 3.4)

1. **Systemwide re-benching.** UCOP distributes most state funding to campuses based on weighted enrollment, where health science students and Ph.D. students are weighted more heavily than undergraduate and other graduate students. This means that each campus receives the same amount of state funding per weighted student but not per enrolled student. One outcome of this approach has been that campuses like UCR that serve large numbers of undergraduates, many of whom are under-represented, low income, and/or first-generation students, receive less state funding per enrolled student compared to other UC campuses that enroll more health science and Ph.D. students. UCR's senior leadership initiated discussions with UCOP and other campuses to update this funding distribution model (referred to as "re-benching"), and was recently successful. In FY22, UCOP is beginning a process to bring UCR (and other UC campuses in similar circumstances) up to at least 95% of the unweighted average student funding level of the entire UC system. This change will be implemented over three years, and has already increased UCR's permanent state funding by \$6.7 million for FY22. Based on these budget augmentations, the Campus Finance Committee approved \$5.6M in permanent funding to address critical staffing, security, and infrastructure needs in ITS. We expect similar increases in each of the next two years. At the September leadership retreat mentioned above, the group spent time discussing possible areas for investment for FY23 and FY24.
2. **Tuition stability plan.** In July 2021, the UC Board of Regents approved a multi-year Tuition Stability Plan that affects Tuition, the Student Services Fee, and Nonresident Supplemental Tuition for undergraduates and graduate students. The plan will implement cohort-based tuition

for new undergraduates starting in fall 2022. This will guarantee each entering student a fixed level of tuition for up to 6 years while pursuing their degree, with each subsequent cohort paying slightly more than the cohort before it. Annual adjustments between cohorts will be tied to inflation. Graduate student tuition will remain uniform (no cohorts) but also will be tied to inflation. This approach will reduce the financial uncertainty faced by both students and campuses when planning over multiple years. Starting September 2021, FP&A will produce initial estimates of the policy's impact on tuition revenue for the first five years of the plan, and will reexamine these estimates annually.

3. **State-funded enrollment growth.** UCR currently enrolls approximately 1200 more California resident students than we receive funding for from the state. The FY22 state budget includes intent language for funding more than 6,000 additional California residents throughout the UC system beginning in FY23. UCR is eligible to receive some of this funding to cover these “over-enrollments” and possibly additional in-state students, as well.
4. **Contract and grant expenditures.** Since 2015, UCR has grown the number of ladder-rank faculty by more than 20% and total contract and grant awards (net of HEERF funding) by around 30% (from \$140M to \$182M). This increase helps to offset the debt payment and operational costs for the Multidisciplinary Research Building which would otherwise need to come from core funds.
5. **Higher Education Emergency Relief Funding (HEERF).** UCR received a total of \$165.5M in federal aid due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Around \$71.8M of this amount was directed to financial aid, per federal policy, leaving \$93.7M for other campus needs. Of this \$93.7M, the Campus Finance Committee allocated \$47M to directly support students, faculty, and staff (e.g., funding unanticipated expenses for remote teaching, learning, and working, and mitigating COVID-related learning loss and temporary declines in research productivity), and to help offset some of the FY21 budget cuts to core funded units including the schools and colleges. The remaining \$40M was used to help offset revenue losses in non-core funded units such as housing, dining, and university extension. These federal funds helped stabilize campus operations despite the financial instability created by the pandemic, and reduced the need for future fee increases to cover accumulated deficits in self-supporting and auxiliary units.

4. Other Changes or Issues the Institution is Facing

COVID-19. Like all campuses, UCR continues to address the considerable challenges created by the pandemic. In addition to financial challenges, the broader nature of the pandemic's impact on the campus includes:

- **Impacts on students.** There was a quick and sustained shift to remote learning. Nearly all students moved back to their permanent residences, some of which were not conducive to learning due to insufficient technology, distractions, or new responsibilities such as supporting and caring for family members whose lives had been upended by the pandemic. The campus initially assisted through the “Loan 2 Learn” technology rental program; the keeplearning.ucr.edu website; and temporary changes to Academic Senate policies. The Campus Finance Committee also approved the use of HEERF funds to increase financial assistance to students, including an expansion of the campus dissertation year fellowship program; expand tutoring and supplemental instruction; improve information and instructional technologies across campus; expand peer mentoring and advising; enhance orientation programs for first- and second-year students who are new to campus; and offer more research experiences for undergraduates. We continue to assess impacts, on both new and continuing students, as we return to in-person learning.
- **Impacts on faculty.** Our instructors had to quickly migrate their courses to a fully remote environment, which required a considerable amount of work. The campus was able to help by quickly upgrading and expanding remote instructional technologies including Zoom, Canvas, Yuja, and Gradescope; establishing a [KeepTeaching](#) website; developing remote proctoring solutions; and offering support and guidance through [XCITE](#). Many faculty also experienced delays in their research and scholarly activities due to stressors such as: spending more time on teaching in the novel remote environment; being unable to fully staff their labs, access archival materials, travel to field sites, or interact face-to-face with collaborators or research subjects; and juggling significant new personal responsibilities while working from home. Adjustments to the academic personnel review process have been implemented in response to these challenges. The Campus Finance Committee also provided additional funding for graduate student employment or research expenses specifically for assistant professors who do not yet have security of employment.
- **Impacts on staff.** Most staff transitioned quickly to remote work and continued working remotely from Spring 2020 through Summer 2021. They faced challenges similar to students and faculty, and some were further impacted by staffing reductions caused by pandemic-induced budget cuts. Staff who continued to work on campus due to the nature of their jobs faced greater virus transmission risks and had to work under new constraints intended to reduce those risks. The campus has worked to support all staff by investing in the hardware, software, and furniture needed for remote work, establishing more flexible leave programs, managing finances to reduce layoffs in accordance with the systemwide job protection initiative, and providing training and personal protective equipment for on-campus work. The Campus Finance Committee also approved funding for an expansion of various health and wellness resources and professional development opportunities for staff.

Although we have returned to more normal operations in the 2021-22 academic year, the pandemic has raised new questions about the future definition of “normal” for institutions of higher education everywhere – and in particular the prevalence of remote teaching, learning, and working.

Racial Justice Movement. The senseless killings of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, and other Black Americans ignited a racial justice movement in 2020 with still-unfolding implications for the country and institutions of higher education. This is especially true at campuses like UCR that educate large numbers of historically under-represented students and are heavily invested in their success. To begin addressing these critical issues, UCR appointed a [Campus Safety Taskforce](#) which recently issued its [report](#). The guiding principles and recommendations of the taskforce were accepted by the chancellor. An immediate first step resulted in the creation of a new Division of Health, Well-being, and Safety that incorporates the Campus Police unit with CARE (Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education), Basic Needs, and those departments previously organized under Student Health & Wellness Services— Student Health Services (SHS), Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), The Well, Student Affairs Case Management, and the Student Disability Resource Center (SDRC). This division is broadly charged with enhancing overall campus safety while being more responsive to the full range of needs of UCR’s diverse campus community. The provost leads a campus safety workgroup to (i) align the Campus Safety Task Force’s recommendations with UC Presidential guidelines and feedback from other UCR campus constituencies, (ii) begin implementation of the recommendations, (iii) establish criteria and processes for monitoring and evaluating implementation, and (iv) establish a standing committee that will monitor and evaluate implementation, in light of an ongoing review of best practices and research literature on campus and community safety.

Strategic Planning. UCR began our [latest round of strategic planning](#) in 2019, and chose to continue at a slower pace during the pandemic. Five faculty-led workgroups and a steering committee chaired by the interim provost, comprising more than 100 individuals, engaged the campus community in the planning effort and produced a [penultimate draft](#) in February 2021. The draft includes a renewed emphasis on goal setting, implementation, outcomes assessment, and accountability, in order to achieve the institutional mission. Feedback on the draft has been robust, and our new provost is being deliberate and consultative about determining next steps.

New Leadership. Leadership turnover is mentioned earlier in this report (see *Recent Major Changes*). Turnover can be viewed as a challenge, but it is also a source of new talents and fresh perspectives. Relevant to this report, three of our new incumbents have recent direct experience with assessment and accreditation: our new provost oversaw the successful 10-year reaccreditation at UC San Francisco in 2020-21; our new Accreditation Liaison Officer participated in UCR’s 2018 reaccreditation visit; and our new Director of Evaluation and Assessment held a similar position in our School of Education before assuming the campus role, and has completed the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy.

5. Concluding statement

UCR's actions in response to the issues raised during the 2018 reaccreditation visit have already impacted the institution in a variety of positive ways and will continue to do so over the longer term. Foremost, the institution is in a much stronger position to be actively engaged in accreditation activities. Campus accreditation accountability has been appropriately relocated to foster more broad-based, campus-wide engagement and to avoid the misperception that accreditation pertains exclusively to undergraduate programs. Key leadership roles with accreditation responsibilities have become much more actively involved with both on-campus constituencies and WSCUC, thereby helping the campus to stay better informed as well as providing opportunities for UCR to help shape the future of WSCUC. Improved accreditation processes also have been implemented, making them more efficient and robust.

Our assessment capabilities and practices also have improved greatly, thus providing more opportunities for reflection and evidence-based decision making. We have expanded and enhanced support for assessment activities campus-wide; ensured that rigorous peer feedback on annual outcomes reports is provided promptly to encourage higher quality reflection; greatly improved the quality and regularity of graduate outcomes assessment and connected graduate assessment to program review; implemented a campus-level juried assessment approach to the core competencies; and allocated new resources to the assessment of co-curricular programs in student affairs. Importantly, all of this was accomplished through a stronger partnership between the administration and the Academic Senate, including the reconstituted Assessment Advisory Committee as well as through improved engagement with Senate standing committees.

A long list of significant changes and improvements also have been made to the campus budget model. These include major improvements to the School of Medicine finances with associated benefits for central campus resources, adjustments to improve the regularity and predictability of assessments to auxiliary units, adjustments to the F&A distribution to better support the research enterprise, and ongoing modifications to the tuition distribution component of the model to better reflect differential instruction costs. The cash-based operating model also has been reviewed and updated multiple times, especially to address the financial whiplash caused by the pandemic.

Looking ahead, there are several opportunities to continue institutionalizing these changes. The draft strategic plan and general education proposal represent significant opportunities to further align objectives, resources, and accreditation expectations, and to further commit to and develop our capacity for assessment, reflection, and continuous improvement. The ongoing dashboard project has tremendous potential as an assessment support tool across all campus units and at all levels of the institution, and we are committed to bringing that effort to a successful conclusion. The innovative plan to link individual student progress reports, annual program assessment reports, and periodic program reviews at the graduate level also has great potential to advance assessment practices while also capitalizing on synergies and efficiencies across multiple processes.

UCR looks forward to meeting with the visiting team to discuss our progress to date and future directions for our continued success.