REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

To the University of California, Los Angeles

February 23-26, 2010

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

*Final Report*

Team Roster
William A. Ladusaw, Chair
Kelly L. Funk
William E. Kirwan
Susan E. Metros
Lester P. Monts
Ralph Wolff, WASC Liaison

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution under the WASC Commission Standards and Core Commitments and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

# UCLA EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW
# TEAM REPORT

## SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

### A. Description of Institution and Visit

Founded in 1919 as the second campus of the University of California (UC), the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) is the largest campus of the UC system by enrollment. UCLA includes a large College of Letters and Science and 11 professional Schools: Arts and Architecture; Education and Information Studies; Engineering and Applied Science; Law; Management; Public Affairs; Theatre, Film, and Television; Public Health; Nursing; Medicine; and Dentistry. It grants Bachelor's, Master's, and PhDs in many areas as well as ten professional degrees. Located in the Westwood area of Los Angeles, UCLA shares the general UC mission of teaching, research, and public service. Under the California Master Plan for Higher Education, it selectively admits highly qualified undergraduates as first year students or junior transfers. In Fall 2006 it enrolled nearly 26,000 undergraduates, 4600 Master's students, 4500 doctoral students, and 2000 graduate professional students.

The WASC Commission last reaffirmed accreditation in November 1998. The current review began with an institutional proposal submitted in May 2006. The Capacity and Preparatory Review visit was conducted in October 2008. The review was organized around three themes: Shaping undergraduate education via the capstone experience, Facilitating interdisciplinary education and research, and Using educational technology to enhance student academic experience. The team submitted its C&PR report to the Commission, which acted at its February 2009 meeting to continue UCLA's accreditation and to extend the schedule of the Educational Effectiveness Review visit to spring 2010.

UCLA submitted its Educational Effectiveness Review report in December 2009. The team visited UCLA on February 23-26, 2010. It based its preparation for the review on the report and supporting materials that were submitted or requested by the team. Shortly before the scheduled visit, the original team chair William E. Kirwan became unable to participate in the visit but did guide the team in preparing for the visit and reviewing this report prior to its submission to UCLA.

During the visit the team met with campus leadership, including Chancellor Gene D. Block and Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost (hereafter EVC) Scott L. Waugh, who provided an update on actions taken since the C&PR visit as well as an overview of the impacts of California's fiscal crisis on UC and UCLA. Over the course of the visit, members of the team met with various groups of faculty and staff who were involved in the inquiry reported in the essays. They also met with undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff in open meetings. A confidential e-mail account provided additional input for the team's consideration.

In all matters, UCLA was prompt, open, and frank in its communication with the team and responsive to all requests. The team wishes to express its gratitude to Vice Provost Judith L. Smith (ALO), Mitsue Yokota (Accreditation Coordinator) and the UCLA faculty and staff for arranging such a pleasant and productive visit.

There were no off-campus sites to be reviewed. The report on UCLA's two existing distance education programs is included in Appendix A.

**B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report**

UCLA's 2006 Institutional Proposal identified three themes as the foundation for its inquiry. These have been used effectively as guides for sustained campus self-review and resulted in several specific outcomes and improvements.

The first theme, *Shaping undergraduate education via the capstone experience*, complemented UCLA's work on General Education undertaken in the previous WASC comprehensive review. The intended outcome was the expansion of the use of undergraduate capstone major projects to integrate and assess students' learning at the culmination of their baccalaureate studies. During the C&PR review, the team found the faculty engaged in a very productive inquiry on the potential of capstone experiences for shaping and assessing student learning. A project to codify several majors as "capstone majors" was well underway. The outcomes of that work are surveyed in Essay C of the EER report: "UCLA's Capstone Initiative: Engaging Students in Creative Discovery." Thirty-four undergraduate majors in 27 departments and programs have been reviewed and formally designated by the Undergraduate Council of the Academic Senate as "Capstone Majors." Nineteen more are expected to submit applications for review in 2010. Designation as a capstone major includes publication of formal learning outcomes and an assessment plan (Cf. Exhibit 7.1A). In addition, several other programs are considering how they might provide a capstone experience to a substantial proportion of their graduates.

The proposal's second theme, *Facilitating interdisciplinary education and research*, aimed to assess and improve institutional structures, policies, and practices with the goal of providing a campus-wide vision and removing barriers to faculty and student participation in multidisciplinary education and research. The C&PR report overviewed UCLA's robust inventory of interdisciplinary programs and activities and during the C&PR visit the team found the campus actively engaged in analysis of the challenges and opportunities of setting standards for support and evaluation of future interdisciplinary work. Subsequent to the C&PR, the campus revised and posted a draft campus plan (*Excellence and Engagement: An Academic Plan for UCLA 2010-2019*) founded on four fundamental principles: Academic Excellence,

Civic Engagement, Diversity, and Financial Security.  (CFR 4.1, 4.2) The inquiry under the original theme of supporting interdisciplinary education and research is sustained in the campus plan's aspiration (p. 4) for UCLA to be "the leader in fostering new forms of collaborative, multidisciplinary research and teaching."  For the EER report, this theme was subsumed under the more pressing topic of academic planning in a changed fiscal environment.  This new theme provided the team with valuable context for the review and evidence bearing on CFRs 3.5, 3.8, and 4.2.  As noted in its introduction, the EER report (Essay A) situates the original theme within the broader context of understanding the strategic role that interdisciplinary work plays in sustaining UCLA's academic excellence.

The third theme, *Using educational technology to enhance the student academic experience*, aimed at improving the effectiveness of educational technology to support student learning.  The C&PR reported on the development of a common collaborative learning environment and case studies of technology-enhanced learning.   Essay D of the EER report presents the outcomes for those projects and describes other related activities.

The EER report was well organized, clearly written, and substantive.  It was accompanied by substantial documentation of UCLA's response to the C&PR team report (Appendix 2) and to the recent revisions to the Criteria for Review and the Institutional Review Process (Appendix 3).  It documents the breadth of campus engagement with the themes and the WASC process (Appendix 4).  The team found that the report was an accurate portrait of UCLA's inquiry, which was rigorous, grounded in evidence, and faculty-driven within a strong framework of shared governance.   It provided an effective foundation for the team's inquiry during the visit.

## C.  Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

The major recommendations from the final section of the C&PR team report, as well as several minor ones drawn from the body of the report, are listed in Appendix 2 of the EER report

along with a specific institutional response.  This section sets forth the C&PR team report's

major recommendations to the institution and describes the evidence gathered from the EER that

addresses them.

The C&PR team report recommended (p. 32) attention to the evaluation of

interdisciplinary education and research and support for faculty development and assessing

student learning in interdisciplinary programs.  As noted in the institution's C&PR report,

interdisciplinary programs are reviewed within the program review process.  Under the revised

process they will be assessed and supported in a manner comparable to disciplinary programs.

Support for interdisciplinary research and education programs remains a central goal of the

campus strategic plan.

The C&PR team report recommended that the institution review the organizational

structure supporting the newly implemented Common Collaboration and Learning Environment

(CCLE) to ensure resources, leadership, and coordinated support of teaching and learning.

Approximately one year after the C&PR team's visit in October 2008, UCLA published a

comprehensive working document titled *IT Strategic Plan: 2009 – 2018* that successfully

addresses the majority of the team report's recommendations in this area. The plan lays out a

strategic vision for a new operating model for information technology with concrete operating,

funding, and governance recommendations requisite for achieving success. Most impressive is

UCLA's commitment to transitioning from a previous *unit* focus to a future vision of a balanced

*institutional and unit* focus.  Campus-wide support for managed change is highlighted in the

recently published *IT Strategic Plan*.  Central IT leadership assumes a role as trusted partner as

UCLA responds to the fiscal crisis by identifying ways to reduce and reallocate costs in IT

infrastructure and support.  The *IT Strategic Plan* also addresses the team's concerns (C&PR

team report p. 26) regarding a mixed array of distributed and centralized services with a

"Blended IT Infrastructure Services Model," that disaggregates IT capabilities into their component services, and systematically realigns these resources locally or centrally for a greater return to UCLA.

In the area of student learning, the team report (p. 32) recommended that the EER address how student learning would be assessed in undergraduate programs that did not incorporate some sort of capstone experience and that UCLA's infrastructure for assessment be further developed. Support for faculty development of program level learning outcomes and assessment plans is now being provided through two units in the Division of Undergraduate Education in the College as well as a special assistant to the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education. Work has been initiated with faculty responsible for non-capstone majors to map the program's learning outcomes to its curricular offerings so that assessment can be based on direct evidence drawn from required course work. (EER report, Essay B, p. 13)

Together with the Academic Senate's amended Program Review process, these address the remaining recommendations regarding institutionalization of the requirement of learning outcomes in all programs, assessment plans, and the use of assessment results as part of program review. The results remain most developed in the case of undergraduate capstone majors, but the approach for non-capstone majors and graduate/professional programs is systematically emerging.

## D. The Changed Fiscal Environment

A very salient backdrop to the EER visit is the state budget crisis and its impact on UCLA, both in terms of its ability to make progress on the themes identified for the EER and the University's capacity to fulfill its research and teaching missions.
Essay A of the institution's EER report notes that the effect of the California budget crisis has been an unprecedented 20% decrease in general funds to the University, funds which largely

support instruction and research, including faculty and staff salaries. Combined with unfunded mandatory increases in costs, and despite very large increases in students' educational fees, UCLA expects a shortfall in the 2009-10 budget of approximately $150m. Essay A describes (p. 4) a "Budget Toolbox" project which early in 2009 recommended options for reducing costs and reallocating resources within academic programs, options for administrative cost savings and efficiencies, and ideas for increasing non-state revenues. The team met with campus leadership, faculty and staff involved in this project, and with the deans of the Schools and the Divisions of the College to discuss the anticipated challenges and the differential impacts across the campus programs. The team found evidence of serious attention to instruction and capacity for educational effectiveness: attention to ensuring adequate capacity in the undergraduate curriculum despite a decline in the number of courses offered, a systematic review by the faculty of the number of required upper division courses in undergraduate majors in light of program objectives, and changes in budget management to preserve important foundational curricula. For a second year, campus leadership will provide temporary funding targeted to ensuring the capacity and effectiveness of the instructional mission.

The team found understandable anxiety among all campus constituencies about actual and potential negative impacts on academic programs, support services, and individuals. In general these concerns were focused on the near term challenges; one feared impact frequently mentioned was the possible loss of key faculty and staff if confidence is shaken in the ability of the University to maintain its high quality. For now, the actions taken by the University have been effective in maintaining the University's commitment to students, and there is a great deal of confidence that in the long run UCLA will adapt to the new circumstances and sustain its capacity for and commitment to excellence in education and research.

**SECTION II – EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS**

Essay B of the EER report provides a conceptual overview of the institution's general approach to evaluating educational effectiveness.  The framework is built around three complementary foci: evaluation of students' work, establishing and assessing outcomes at the program level, and evaluating the effectiveness of individual courses.  The framework is flexible enough to apply to all academic programs (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) as well as co-curricular programs (CFR 2.11).  It is responsive to WASC's expectation that assessment draw on direct evidence of student learning (such as faculty evaluation of students' capstone projects and data on students' use of educational technology) as well as articulating program-level objectives and outcomes. (CFRs 2.2-2.4, 4.6)

The framework also integrates indirect evidence from UCLA's extensive use of surveys of student perceptions and experiences, individual course surveys, and demographic and other data routinely collected through institutional research to provide indirect evidence of effectiveness (CFR 4.5).  For example, UCLA regularly administers national surveys, such as the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey, a UCLA-specific survey of entering transfer students (CFR 2.14), as well as a Senior Survey that has had in recent years a 60-70% completion rate for College seniors.  Information from this survey has been distributed to departments for review and to the Undergraduate Council for use in program review (p. 10) (CFR 4.4).  The longitudinal University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), a census, on-line survey, provides a wealth of information about students' perceptions, experiences, and use of services with correlations to demographic data.  Questions on recent surveys have been tailored to provide evidence for use by EER workgroups (p. 11).

Essay B (p. 11) illustrates how such evidence has been used to guide institutional action. (CFR 4.7) For example, the Undergraduate Council found in a review that data on senior student satisfaction with the quality of education in one undergraduate major program was below average. This led to a deeper inquiry into student opinion conducted by an outside consultant. (CFR 4.8) The results were provided to a faculty committee formed to consider revision to the curriculum. During the visit, the team found evidence that changes to the program were actively and publicly being considered.

Of particular note is the institution's systematic approach to developing learning outcomes for graduate and professional programs based upon its published expectations for direct assessment through qualifying examinations as well as the "capstone" products of post-graduate study: the Master's thesis and Doctoral dissertation. The Graduate Division's longstanding criteria (p. 16) serve as common outcome measures. These have formed the basis of an inventory of educational effectiveness indicators for all graduate and professional programs (Exhibit 7.1C). The discussion of graduate degree granting programs in the EER report does not provide examples of program level learning outcomes specific to individual programs. However a review of individual program websites reveals language that, while not specifically stated as learning outcomes, can serve as such. For example, Art History states "The qualifying paper will be approximately 30 pages in length (excluding footnotes, images, and bibliography) and should demonstrate the ability 1) to formulate a thesis 2) to carry an extended argument, 3) and to conduct original research." Similar descriptions were found on websites of other academic programs. The purpose, scope of learning, and the means by which students demonstrate their learning are well articulated and can serve as program level learning outcomes.

The team commends UCLA for this systematic approach to articulating outcomes for programs at the graduate level.

**A. Evaluation of the Institution's Educational Effectiveness Inquiry**

The general approach to educational effectiveness described above is further illustrated in the three themes of the EER report.

**Theme 1: Academic Planning in a Changed Fiscal Environment**

As noted above, UCLA's 2006 institutional proposal included a theme on "Facilitating Interdisciplinary Education and Research," aimed at development of a campus-wide vision and framework for facilitating interdisciplinary collaboration in both research and instructional programs.

Because of the impacts of the current California budget crisis, the EER report has replaced the expected essay on the original theme with Essay A: "Academic Planning in a Changed Fiscal Environment." The team found this a useful substitution because it provided financial background for the discussions during the visit. In early 2009 the campus leadership initiated a project to develop a "budget toolbox" to guide the response to the reductions in state funding. The group produced recommendations in three areas: reducing the cost of academic programs, reducing administrative costs, and increasing non-state revenues. The team met with several members of the project task forces as well as the academic deans to explore the issues raised by the situation.

The new theme also provided insight into the influence of the educational effectiveness inquiry on the institution's approach to aligning resource allocations with campus priorities and goals. (CFR 4.3) For example, Essay A (p. 12) notes that "within the changed fiscal environment, UCLA has been challenged to reexamine core elements of all academic programs," and that "in a few units, faculty are beginning to use the process of articulating learning outcomes to help frame discussions about the nature of the revised curriculum." Cf. also Essay

C, p. 31. The "toolbox" report on *Academic Programs Task Force* (April 24, 2009) states (p. 3) that "Academic Senate program review recommendations as well as quantitative measures such as workload should be considered when making decisions for strategic investments (and divestments)." (CFR 4.3)

**Theme 2: Shaping Undergraduate Education via the Capstone Initiative**

In both the institutional proposal and the Capacity and Preparatory Review UCLA envisioned a "model for capstones that builds on a curriculum with core requirements and a progression of electives that lead to a culminating experience" (EER, page 19). The five criteria identified for the capstone experience are designed to allow students to demonstrate knowledge and integration of the discipline by creating a tangible product. The institution began this process in Fall 2007 when the Undergraduate Council endorsed the capstone initiative and criteria. The institution then began to identify four levels of capstone options, representing different expectations for student engagement and independence. Such experiences range from senior seminars or project courses to individually designed majors. Programs were invited to review their existing curriculum to identify courses and experiences that met the capstone criteria. (CFRs 2.5, 2.6)

Capstones are required to be certified as such, thus insuring an element of academic review for appropriate depth and rigor. By the end of Fall 2009 twenty-eight programs had been reviewed and certified as Capstone Majors. This group represents 27% of the total baccalaureate degrees awarded in 2007-08, an impressive beginning for such an institutional initiative. The institution has continued to move forward, identifying twenty-four more degree granting programs that are interested in becoming Capstone Majors, with half of those programs already engaging in the certification process.

The assessment of student learning has been built into the capstone model for these programs. An academic program wishing to be certified as a capstone major must develop learning outcomes, identify the ways in which data about learning will be collected, and discuss how the data will be analyzed and used for programmatic improvement. The capstone is a sustainable and viable means of assessment and an integral part of the institution's strategy to expand current assessment processes to include a focus on direct evidence of student learning. The results and impact of assessment of student learning in capstone majors should be visible in future academic program reviews. (CFR 2.7)

As might be expected at an institution the size of UCLA, not all academic programs have the capacity to guarantee that every student in a particular major can participate in a formal capstone experience. Nonetheless these programs strive to provide such experiences to students who can most benefit from them. The institution has addressed this capacity challenge by expanding the capstone initiative to allow an academic program to receive a designation as a "Capstone Program" rather than a "Capstone Major." The program must be certified and the capstone, while not required, must be completed by at least 60% of students majoring in that program. The institution should be commended for an approach that is at once reaches a large majority of students but remains flexible enough for faculty to determine a scope that they deem appropriate for the particular character and situation of the program. Conversations with members of the Academic Senate, the Undergraduate Council, and program faculty in capstone majors indicate a high level of enthusiasm for both the capstone major and the capstone program.

While the capstone provides an effective strategy for shaping the educational experience of the students as well as assessing student learning, undergraduate academic programs that are not participating in the capstone initiative are assisted in developing other means to assess student learning. The team reviewed the well written handbook Guidelines for Developing and

<u>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate Majors</u> that is provided to assist faculty in developing learning outcomes and effective and valuable means of assessment. In addition the institution provides direct support for faculty developing assessment strategies in the form of peer mentoring and facilitation by an experienced consultant.  (CFR 3.4)

A review of the institutional effectiveness indicators for academic programs indicates that many programs have published learning outcomes (Exhibit 7.1A, C). However, the analysis and use of data for program improvement is not as developed.  In Exhibit 7.1A, the descriptions of the process of interpreting and using the results of assessment conform to a framework approved by the Undergraduate Council.  The use of the framework in pending assessments is tied to the program review process.  The team is confident that the assessment of student learning on campus will move forward in a systematic and sustainable manner.  The program review process incorporates a specific timeline for implementation of assessment for all programs, whether they include capstones or not.  (Cf. Exhibit 7.1B)  The process includes a systematic means of follow up with programs whose evaluation methods require departmental attention.

The institution has a well developed program of survey assessment.  Utilizing the regular senior survey, questions about capstones have helped the institution understand more about how students define and think about what a capstone experience is (Essay C, p. 26).  They have used this data to inform their own thinking, particularly in the ways in which they communicate with students about the requirement.  For example, explanations of the capstone now appear in course syllabi and catalog listings in several programs.  The team encourages broader publication of approved learning outcomes in the catalog and through the web (CFR 1.2. 2.12).

**Theme 3: Using Educational Technology to Enhance Learning and Teaching**

Essay D, *UCLA's Educational Technology Initiatives: Enhancing Learning and Teaching,* reports out on the third theme: understanding how the application of educational technology can enhance learning and teaching. The institution's overarching goals for adopting educational technologies are to support and improve learning and teaching and to create digital UCLA citizens who are IT-literate, but who also understand the responsibilities of being IT-users in a community and an institution. UCLA has identified three thematic outcomes and reported activities as evidence of progress in each of the areas.

1.  Creating effective teaching spaces

Essay D describes detailed planning efforts and standards that ensure that UCLA's learning environments are equipped and updated on a regular basis to meet the growing educational technology needs of both faculty and students.  The team reviewed the findings of the College Library Information and Computing Commons (CLICC) student satisfaction surveys, the BruinCast Survey findings, and other survey results linked to within the essay. The CLICC is one of UCLA's specialized physical environments built for instruction. BruinCast is a web streaming service that provides supplementary instruction and virtual access to podcast content.

2. Understanding student perspectives on educational technology issues

Additional data on student perspectives on educational technology issues is collected through the freshman survey, the annual CLICC lab survey, and the Senior Survey. The team reviewed these documents along with meeting with numerous advisory board members, IT leadership and staff and both graduate and undergraduate students.

3.  Developing a cohesive instructional technology environment

The institution's success in developing a cohesive instructional technology environment is best demonstrated in the *UCLA Common Collaboration and Learning Environment (CCLE) 2008–2009 Annual Report*, which includes major milestones, statistical data, user survey results, and near to long term planning data. The institution's measures its success in educational technology research not only in student learning metrics, but also monitors rates of adoption, increases in use of services, and surveys of student practices and satisfaction. The ways that UCLA has chosen to demonstrate progress and measure success should serve as a model for other institutions undergoing WASC review.

Essay D provides evidence from a variety of sources, including two case studies of faculty-initiated efforts to engage students more actively in course content through the use of technology-enhanced instruction. In addition, it links to numerous website resources, studies, policies, surveys, and reports describing recommendations and plans to support educational technology efforts within the units and across the campus. Finally, it cites longitudinal data gleaned from a variety of student surveys and faculty focus groups.

These sources of evidence are appropriate, thorough, and of high quality. The blend of qualitative and quantitative methodologies is very effective in demonstrating progress. In addition, the institution should be commended for its exceptionally inclusive planning, governance and evaluation processes with representation from a broad base of constituents.

The team also commends the expeditious implementation of the Common Collaboration and Learning Environment (CCLE). The careful planning, staff support, adoption rate, and faculty acceptance over the 18 months since the C&PR team's visit is impressive. Faculty have opted in with more than 1,300 courses. The system hosts an additional 450 research and administrative sites. The number of discrete course management system implementations on campus has been reduced by half. Academic units that were accustomed to running their own

systems have come together for the greater good of the institution to maintain and continue to improve this campus resource.

While the *IT Strategic Plan* is targeted, cohesive, and has impressive campus buy in and the attention of the leadership, it is ambitious and will be costly to implement. UCLA should develop an assessment strategy for this plan to periodically measure success based on both quantitative and qualitative indicators. (CFR 3.7)

The *IT Strategic Plan* calls for online and distance education accessibility. The institution is cautiously moving forward on large-scale distance learning initiatives with concerns about compromising academic rigor and compromising the UCLA brand. The Faculty Committee on Educational Technology (FCET) is currently studying the pros and cons of expanding UCLA's distance learning options and adding "e-sections" in response to student demand, space constraints, and the economic crisis.

The UC Office of the President launching a systemwide cyberlearning initiative. UCLA has voiced concerns over this approach. In a letter to the UC President dated January 10, 2010, UCLA's Information Technology and Planning Board criticized this plan for what they perceived as "the wholesale replacement of campus courses with distance education." The Chancellor noted that increasing out-of-state student enrollment is one way to increase revenue to offset cuts to state funding. Distance learning can also bring in new revenue. UCLA might benefit from looking at newer models for online degrees that partner with third party companies. These distance-learning integrators provide full-service online program design and development, marketing, and enrollment and technology support services while preserving the institution's brand and the program's academic rigor.

Essay D showcases several good practices across the campus that link to specific learning results. The following are of particular note.

- The CCLE's three-tiered shared governance model that distributes responsibilities for overseeing operational and pedagogical needs campus-wide. This improves student learning by providing easy access to a universally adopted learning management system and sophisticated functionality to support active and collaborative learning environments.

- The Case Studies demonstrating faculty-initiated efforts to engage students more actively in course content through the use of educational technology tools and to enrich technology-enhanced instructional efforts. Using valuable class time for essential face-to-face interactions and off-loading course work that can best be completed online enhances student learning. Not only did the pilot assessments prove that grades improved, but that students were more satisfied with the overall learning experience.

- The Innovator Developer's Program (IDP): The CCLE Innovation and Development Program (IDP) seeks to encourage innovative CCLE enhancements, including new Moodle tools and services that can be contributed to the Moodle community. IT professionals from across the UCLA campus are incentivized to submit proposals to help modify or augment the system in order to meet their and others' particular course management needs. Student learning benefits by an improved system that offers better access and advanced feature sets.

The team notes several other accomplishments in this area. The Office of Instructional Development publishes a *Classroom Technology Business Plan* that adheres to a five-year management strategy for the upgrade and renewal of technology-enhanced classrooms and which includes prioritization and assessment plans. Graduate students are supported along with undergraduates and have equal access to educational tools, library resources, and academic facilities. Additional IT support is provided in specialized labs operated by departments and specific Organized Research Units. The team heard from a group of graduate students who were satisfied with the quality and amount of IT resources, with access to these resources, and with training and support options.

There are several groups on campus to help faculty incorporate educational technology tools and processes into their teaching practices. UCLA also supports a variety of faculty incentive funding programs to support both technological advancement and pedagogical innovation for teaching and learning. These programs all have strong assessment and research

components.  In addition, the *IT Strategic Plan* necessitates strengthening and expanding research and educational technology environments.

The plan also notes (p. 29) that the UCLA Library is considered an exemplar for digital collections. Librarians are responsible for coordinating access and prioritizing acquisition. Furthermore, the creation, storing, protection, and sharing of content are underlying themes throughout the *IT Strategic Plan*.  In one of the on-campus meetings, the library representative described the library's successful, in-kind support program designed to assist faculty in digitizing, building, preserving, and sharing their digital collections. The EER Essay D describes UCLA's efforts to develop and assess information literacy through the Library's Information Literacy Program.

Essay D also reports (pp. 43-45) on a multiyear research and assessment project in an introductory Statistics class that supported the conclusion that the blended instruction provided to an experimental subject group fostered student reflection and higher level learning, with the result that blended instruction has been extended to all sections of this large foundational course.

**B.  Institution's Systems for Enhancing Educational Effectiveness and Student Learning**

The actions taken by UCLA to improve educational effectiveness clearly align with its primary purpose as a public research university that embodies the creation, dissemination, preservation, and application of knowledge for the betterment of a global society. Toward that end, the team was impressed by the quality of UCLA's presentation on institutional systems for enhancing educational effectiveness through the adoption of creative and innovative approaches to methods of assessment and student learning outcomes.  The report reveals that the faculty and administration have worked collaboratively to initiate these action oriented plans, all to benefit the quality of undergraduate and graduate education.  While not all of the developed plans are fully implemented, systems are in place, timetables have been set, faculty awareness of the issues

has been increased, and infrastructure to support faculty and accommodate new developments is in place. UCLA successfully demonstrates the evaluation of educational effectiveness by using evidence derived from student surveys, class evaluations, and program review.

<u>Systems for Improving Teaching and Learning</u>

The campus leadership and the Academic Senate take seriously the evaluation and improvement of teaching and learning programs. The institution has implemented a major campus-wide curricular review of undergraduate program requirements, driven by the twin goals of providing assessment frameworks for student learning and responding to the fiscal crisis. As noted above, direct assessment of student learning is required as part of the regular program review process. The institution also draws extensively on data derived from a number of student surveys to gather evidence about student perceptions of the quality of teaching and the overall value of their educational experiences.

Much of the data on student perceptions of their education are derived through the administration of an array of campus-based, statewide, and national survey instruments, including the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), UCLA Transfer Student Survey, University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), and UCLA Senior Survey. To cite one survey in particular, CIRP, which is administered to first-year students "covers a wide range of student characteristics: parental income and education, ethnicity, and other demographic items; financial aid; secondary school achievement and activities; educational and career plans; and values, attitudes, beliefs, and self-concept." The longitudinal nature of these studies continue to assist in improving programs in both Student Affairs and undergraduate education programs to reflect changes in student life and career aspirations.

The senior survey has been adapted annually to provide data for specific areas of focus as well as information that is provided to faculty for their use and for use in program review. The

longitudinal data from UCUES and CIRP can provide a comprehensive portrait of the changing

character of entering and enrolled students.  The team, however, raised questions about the

degree to which the institution brings this data to the attention of faculty to help in the redesign

and reshaping of their approaches to teaching and personal interactions with students.

The team was impressed that as part of inquiring into educational effectiveness, UCLA

faculty are engaging in new dialogue, with each other and with students, about ways of teaching

and establishing new pedagogical priorities.  (Essay B, p. 10)   Faculty are improving teaching

and learning through innovative methods and a commitment to encouraging students' active

engagement and as scholars through work on capstone projects as well as interactive technology.

Quality Assurance Process

Through its Academic Program Review (APR) process, the institution has made

commendable progress in incorporating evaluation of teaching and learning. Under its auspices,

the APR requires that "all undergraduate degree granting programs at UCLA now must establish

learning outcomes and develop corresponding assessment plans." As noted above, faculty use

capstone projects that represent the culmination of the knowledge and skills students acquire

during the undergraduate educational experience. Evaluation of the projects provides direct

evidence of learning outcomes, in creative and innovative ways in several programs.

For the purposes of systematically assessing learning outcomes in undergraduate majors

without capstones, plans to draw on direct evidence from assignments embedded in required

courses are being developed.  The team found that a common understanding among faculty about

how learning outcomes and capstones should be evaluated is emerging.

Realizing that improvements on learning and teaching are on-going exercises that require

sustained attention, the institution has developed written materials like the *Guidelines for*

*Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes for Undergraduates* to guide faculty

engagement with methods of assessment and learning outcomes.

The office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education provides individual

consultation with program faculty and encourages collaboration among faculty across

disciplinary boundaries and from disciplinary accrediting agencies to develop modified in-house

assessment and learning outcome tools. Further, Instruction Improvement Grants administered

by the Office of Instructional Development may be used for these purposes.

The institution's foundational method of UCLA's evaluation of teaching is the individual

student course ratings system administered through the Office of Instructional Development's

Evaluation of Instruction Program. Other approaches to course and teaching evaluations were

absent from the report; namely, the use of teaching and course portfolios, midterm student

feedback, and peer evaluation through class visitations.   Given the emphasis on the evaluation of

capstone projects, the report does not contain information on how student feedback evaluations

might be gathered in this one on one, single teacher/student setting.  For these purposes, the

methods similar to those used in studio courses in music, art, and architecture or senior exit

interviews (p. 10) might prove useful.

Strategic and Operational Planning

In revising the guidelines for program review, the Undergraduate Council and the

Graduate Council sought ways to develop common expectations across majors, to construct a

clear articulation of learning outcomes, and to enhance the role of assessment in program

evaluation.  The guidelines have not been in place long enough to determine their sustainability.

Concern was expressed by the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils that the emphasis on

methods of assessment and learning outcomes could come to dominate the Program Review

process to the detriment of its other functions.  The parties involved have agreed that creating

balance within the reviews will be the topic of ongoing discussions.

**C. Student Success**

UCLA tracks undergraduate retention and graduation rates separately for entering

freshmen and for upper-division transfer students.  Results for one-year retention and 4-, 5-, and

6-year freshman graduation rates and comparable rates for transfer students are provided at the

institution level and also disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and financial aid status (e.g. Pell

grant eligibility) (CFRs 2.10, 2.14).   UCLA provides data on student success through its campus

profile (http://www.aim.ucla.edu/profile/main.asp) and retention and graduation rates are

published in the Undergraduate Student Success chapter of University of California's

accountability report (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability), where they can be

benchmarked against the rates for the University of California as a whole, and averages

calculated for public and private institutions that are members of the Association of American

Universities (AAU).

UCLA's results for these measures of student success are excellent, consistent, and with

trends of gradual improvement.  The 6-year graduation rate for the 1999 entering first-time

freshman cohort was 89%, comparable to that of AAU private institutions, at the top of the range

for UC campuses, and 9 percentage points above the UC system-wide rate of 80% (which is

itself 6 percentage points above the average for AAU public institutions).   The one-year

retention rate of 97%, highest within the UC system, is 5 percentage points above the UC

systemwide rate of 92%.

The one-year retention rates for upper division transfer students who entered UCLA

between 1997 and 2007 fell in the range 94-96%, which out-performs the universitywide (UW)

rates by 3 percentage points.  The entering transfer cohort of 2004 had a 2-year graduation rate of 57% (cf. UW 52%) and a 4-year graduation rate of 90% (cf. UW 86%).

The average time to degree for students graduating in 2007-08 was 12.2 enrolled quarters for freshman entrants and 6.7 enrolled quarters for transfer entrants.

The *Campus Strategic Plan for Diversity* includes a report on goals for undergraduate education (*C.  Educating Leaders for Diverse and Global Communities*, pp. 51-53) that analyzes student success measures that are disaggregated by ethnicity.  It cites several national studies and rankings that recognize UCLA for high performance in graduation rates, particularly relative to the economic demographic profile of its student body.  The report notes (p. 53), however, that graduation rates for some groups fall well below the average for all students in the cohort, citing in particular the graduation rates for African American (73%) and Chicano/a and Latino/a (82%) freshman and for African American transfer students (83%).   (The report does not note, but it can be seen from the published data, that the percentage point gap between the campus rate and the rate for these two groups is less at UCLA than for the University of California as a whole.)

The *Campus Strategic Plan for Diversity* (p. 53) sets a goal of raising (6-year) graduation rates for all undergraduate students to levels above 90%.  The action plan calls for research to support the development of programs that will increase African American and Chicano/Latino graduation rates, requests deans and chairs to set goals for improvement of graduation rates for majors and student cohorts that are appreciably lower than 90%.

UCLA has not used standardized measures to report graduation rates by academic program because entering undergraduates are not screened and formally admitted to degree programs at admission.  Instead, on-going analysis of patterns of "major migration" are used to provide a lens on differential success rates in major programs.

In sum, the team finds that the performance in student success measures is commendable and notes that the institution has set goals for improvement and inquiry in this area.

D. **Program Review**

UCLA has a well established process of program review that is characterized by a high degree of faculty ownership. (CFR 3.3)  The policy and procedures for program review are clearly stated and available on a public website.  Both internal and external reviewers are utilized in the process.  A review of the policies and procedures shows that student representatives serving on the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council have access to program review materials.  Students enrolled in the program under review may also provide information and input into the process through the appropriate student representative.

Institutions are now required to incorporate the assessment of student learning into the program review procedures.  UCLA has made much progress in meeting this standard and the team commends the institution on the thoughtful and systematic way in which it is moving forward.   The team has no doubt that most academic programs are engaging in assessment in some fashion; the challenge is to make the engagement more articulate, systematic, and ongoing for both graduate and undergraduate programs.

Essay B discusses UCLA's strategy for identifying outcomes for graduate degree granting programs. However, it is unclear how evidence is collected to assess these outcomes or how the results of analysis are used to improve programs.  Because of the expectation that learning outcomes be reflected in program review, graduate programs must state more clearly and explicitly learning outcomes, articulate how those outcomes are demonstrated and systematically measured, and how the information gained from analysis is used for program improvement.  The team commends the institution for this approach to a comprehensive inventory of educational effectiveness indicators at the graduate level.  (CFR 2.2b)

At the undergraduate level remarkable progress has been made since the C&PR review. The expectation for establishing learning outcomes and the assessment of those outcomes is developing. The timeline adopted seems to be reasonable given the scope of this project.  By 2012 departments undergoing program review will be expected to "articulate learning outcomes, summarize their assessment efforts and, as applicable, discuss changes implemented as a result of each program's assessment process."  All programs undergoing review thereafter will be expected to incorporate this into the program review process.

Though not documented in the EER report, the team confirmed that Student Affairs regularly reviews and assesses co-curricular programs for effectiveness relative to their objectives and expected outcomes.  (CFR 2.11)

The development of learning outcomes and assessment strategies at an institution such as UCLA is a challenge and the team commends the institution for its progress and accomplishments.  However, the team is impressed with the way in which the institution has developed a comprehensive and systematic plan for incorporating assessment into the program review process.  Because the review process is already well established and respected on the campus, the team is confident assessment will be held to the same high standards already established for other components of program review.  Given the work that has already been done, the team has no concerns about the institution's ability or intention to follow their own timeline and to fully develop, implement, and sustain this process in ongoing program review.

During the course of the visit, the team was provided information about a past program review of a department revealing significant issues, with a request that the review process be further investigated.  The team requested, and obtained from the University, a detailed response to the concerns identified, and found that the University had acted over several years to address these concerns. In addition, policies on conducting program reviews were revised to avoid

problems that had arisen in some reviews.   Of particular importance, the University expanded

the participation of students in the program review process and took steps to protect the

confidentiality of student feedback.  Given that the effectiveness of the program review process

was one of the major themes of this visit, other comments regarding the process are found in

other parts of the team's report.

**E.  Other Issues Arising from the Standards and CFRs**

Diversity

Diversity and inclusion were labeled major institutional priorities as part of the Capacity

and Preparatory Review and during the team visit in 2008.  The team found that the institution

had made excellent progress in this area and seeks to appropriately prepare its students, faculty,

and staff for full inclusive participation in the global society of the 21st century.

UCLA is located in one of the nation's most culturally and demographically diverse

urban areas.  In carrying out its role as a major public research university, campus leaders strive

to create a campus environment that is a reflection of the greater Los Angeles area and the State

of California.   Beyond the representational diversity, the University's teaching, learning, and

research enterprise is enriched with world-class programs and practices that set UCLA apart

from many other higher education institutions.

Campus leaders acknowledge that not all aspects of the University's diversity goals and

objectives have yet been achieved.   The effects of Proposition 209, a chilly fiscal climate, and

stalled efforts toward diversity in some sectors of the University's programs and activities are

among the factors that hinder progress.  Given these constraints, however, UCLA has nurtured

and maintained a culture of diversity and inclusion.  They have created high functioning

oversight groups, developed a strategic plan for diversity, and engaged faculty and students in

comprehensive efforts to foster diversity and inclusion and integrate them into the core mission of the University.

Recent progress in the area of diversity and inclusion is due in large measure to the Chancellor's leadership and the cadre of campus leaders he has assembled to maintain high standards of excellence throughout the University. Unlike the marginalized role diversity councils occupy on many college and university campuses, Chancellor Block has personally taken on the lead role of the Chancellor's Advisory Group on Diversity (CAGD). Quite remarkably, the membership of the CAGD consists of vice chancellors, deans, senior professors, and elected student leaders. It is commendable that Chancellor Block chairs the CAGD, making it more than symbolically clear to the campus and beyond that diversity is one of the University's highest priorities.

In the 2008 Capacity and Preparatory Review Report, UCLA demonstrated a clear commitment to diversity. A major set of actions that were in progress during this interim period resulted in the draft *Strategic Plan for Diversity*, which the team believes is a more mature and systemic approach to institutional diversity. The EER along with an emerging yet well articulated strategic plan demonstrates that the institution has established a course of action that is widely recognized as a way to link social diversity with academic excellence.

The judicious use of demographic data constitutes a major portion of each section of the *Strategic Plan for Diversity*. Lead administrators of UCLA's various constituent units who oversee diversity have mined and analyzed institutional data effectively, thereby providing the means to stay abreast of any major changes in diversity categories.

The plan clearly articulates a vision and a set of overarching goals. Several challenges derived from the CAGD deliberation are set forth followed by an accompanying set of actions to

relieve or eliminate the challenge. The plan contains five integrating themes that serve to guide the University's approach to diversity and inclusion:

1) Communicating the Commitment to Diversity
2) Promoting an Inclusive Campus Climate
3) Facilitating Education and Research
4) Building the Academic Pipeline
5) Fostering Assessment and Accountability

The institution has successfully integrated many of the core values surrounding diversity and educational effectiveness strategies and made them an important component of its overall academic framework. It would be very easy on a campus as large and decentralized as UCLA for diversity efforts to become fragmented and ineffective. Contrarily, diversity and inclusion is a multi-dimensional, multi-layered process, and a part of an enriching educational experience for students, staff, and faculty.

Under the leadership of the current Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development, UCLA has made diversity a hallmark of campus life. As she steps down from her position to return to teaching and research, the team encourages the University leadership look for a successor who possesses a shared sense of commitment and responsibility to diversity within the faculty.

The administration is aware of the shortfalls the University has experienced in the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority faculty and students. This condition is not likely to change in the near future due in large measure to the prevailing fiscal climate. While funding for faculty hiring continues to grow scarce, the chancellor and provost have been successful in attracting individuals from underrepresented groups to leadership positions in the Schools and the College.

Overall, the team recognizes that the programs and practices at UCLA demonstrate an active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity and inclusion. Learning and

teaching, research and creative activity, curricular and co-curricular, and engagement with the

broader community, all are uniquely melded into the emerging strategic plan for diversity. The

team is confident that with these efforts and the culture of inclusiveness that has been

established, UCLA will continue to make progress by recognizing its diversity challenges and

taking the necessary actions toward reconciliation and resolution.

**SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW**

The team finds that UCLA has fulfilled the objectives of the full comprehensive review.

The themes of the original proposal were developed extensively through the two stages of the

review, with progress in each area resulting in clear outcomes of value to the institution that

reflect the WASC core commitments.

The team found that the comprehensive review resulted in institutional action with broad

impact that realized the intended outcomes of the review. Among these are:

- Modification of the guidelines for academic program review to include assessment of student learning in undergraduate programs as well as graduate and professional programs. (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.7)

- The definition of capstone experiences as a signature feature of UCLA's approach to undergraduate educational effectiveness. (CFR 2.5)

- Initiation of development of approaches for sustainable assessment in undergraduate programs that are not able to support a broad capstone experience.

- Initiation of discussion of the role of dissertations, theses, and other staples of graduate education as reflections of the learning outcomes of graduate and professional programs. (CFR 2.2b)

- Adoption of a Common Collaborative Learning Environment (CCLE) for supporting teaching, learning, and research.

- Development and adoption of a strategic plan for information technology to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of delivering IT services to a broad and diverse range of campus constituencies. (CFR 3.7)

- Development of a strategic action plan on diversity, which addresses goals for faculty, staff, and students at all levels. (CFR 1.5)

The team also found evidence that UCLA has embraced a culture of evidence in assessment that is embedded in UCLA's strong tradition of the faculty role in shared governance. The team found high levels of loyalty and pride in UCLA as an institution among faculty, staff, and students. The team also found evidence of concern and attention to the potential negative impacts of the budget crisis on educational effectiveness as well as optimism about UCLA's ability in the longer term to sustain its academic quality and commitment to excellence even in the changed fiscal environment.

<u>Commendations</u>

The team commends the frankness and openness of the report and the discussions during the visit and the responsiveness of the institution to all of our requests. (CFR 1.9) The discussion during the visit effectively conveyed the intelligence and commitment of the faculty and staff's engagement with the themes as well as the development of their thinking and their current challenges and issues.

The team commends the strong faculty commitment to and ownership of academic program review. The team commends in particular the symmetrical attention given to graduate and undergraduate programs, and the acknowledgement of the interaction between them in terms of the role of graduate students in supporting undergraduate education and the participation of undergraduates in the research mission of the University.

The team commends the sustained investment in supporting faculty initiatives in using educational technology as well as the current investment supporting the faculty's work in developing learning outcomes and assessment plans.

The team commends the initiation of the Budget Toolbox project as a means of developing new ideas for organizational change to achieve financial stability as well as a framework for more transparent communication about the fiscal situation.

<u>Recommendations</u>

The team recommends that UCLA ensure the timely completion of the scheduled implementation of the incorporation of learning outcomes, assessment plans, and reports on inquiry as routine parts of both undergraduate and graduate program review. (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, and 4.4)  The work under the capstone theme has resulted in a number of undergraduate programs with approved plans that are built around capstone requirements.  This represents UCLA's most developed practices in this area.  The initiation and emergence of comparable work in other undergraduate programs as well as graduate and professional programs depends upon a phased increase in the expectations for program reviews over the next three years. (Exhibit 7.1B)   The full outcomes of the comprehensive review should be visible in program reviews initiated in 2012-13.

The team recommends that the faculty consider broader engagement with students (graduate, professional, and undergraduate) as they develop statements of learning outcomes for their academic programs.  A clear strength of UCLA's approach to this process has been the ability to engage groups of faculty in productive discussion both within and across programs. Ultimately statements of learning outcomes should also be useful in conveying to prospective students and other interested parties the educational objectives and distinctive character of the programs.  (CFR 2.4)  Drawing on student perspective from the beginning of the process may facilitate the faculty's work.

The team recommends that UCLA strengthen accountability for action at all levels on campus goals for diversity and inclusion.  (CFR 1.5)  This recommendation essentially echoes the fifth theme of the recently released Diversity Plan.

The team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution under the WASC Commission Standards and Core Commitments and respectfully submits this Report to the

Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of

Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

**Appendix A: Report on Off-campus and Distance Education Programs**

There were no off-campus programs to be examined.

In this appendix the team reports on its review of the educational effectiveness of UCLA's distance education programs, including evidence of the achievement of the stated learning outcomes for the program. Findings are based on the "UCLA Distance Education Programs" document and on campus discussions held with UCLA leadership, faculty, IT staff, and students during the WASC review team's February 2010 EER visit.

The institution has a very limited distance-learning program that offers two fully online degrees:

1. Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science - Master of Science in Engineering Online Program

2. School of Nursing - Online Delivery of the Master of Science Specialty: Nursing Administration

This review evaluates each degree based on WASC's "Two Lenses" document and the *Framework for Evaluating Educational Effectiveness and the Good Practices Guide*. The review assesses the educational effectiveness of the distance education programs, including evidence of the achievement of the stated learning outcomes for each program by considering four attributes listed in Standard 4:

1. Learning outcomes

2. Assessment results

3. Student advising and support

4. Effectiveness of the quality assurance process for distance education program

**Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science: Master of Science in**

**Engineering Online Program**

The primary purpose of this program is to enable employed engineers and computer scientists to extend their technical education beyond the Bachelor of Science level and to enhance their value to the technical organizations in which they are employed.

The program consists of nine courses. The final course serves to satisfy the University of California requirement for a capstone event. The program is structured in a manner that allows employed engineers/computer scientists to complete the requirements at a "part-time" pace. Courses are scheduled such that the total time to complete the program will be at most two academic years plus one additional quarter. The program is "self-supporting"; that is, state funds are not allocated for the program's operation. The current fee for the nine-course program is $30,000, or $3333/course.

**1. Learning outcomes**

The program learning outcomes are the same as the residential departmental program outcomes and correspond to the professional accreditation standards for ABET a-k items. ABET requires that engineering programs must demonstrate that their students attain:

(a) An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering

(b) An ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data

(c) An ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints such as economic, environmental, social, political, ethical, health and safety, manufacturability, and sustainability

(d) An ability to function on multi-disciplinary teams

(e) An ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems

(f) An understanding of professional and ethical responsibility

(g) An ability to communicate effectively

(h) The broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions

in a global, economic, environmental, and societal context

(i) A recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in life-long learning

(j) A knowledge of contemporary issues

(k) An ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice.

In reviewing these learning outcomes, along with the program outcomes listed on a sampling of UCLA's Electrical Engineering Department's program websites, the Master of Science in Engineering Online Program fulfills WASC requirements for publishing outcomes that provide clear and succinct descriptions of learning.

## 2. Assessment results

UCLA's Electrical Engineering Department has established a comprehensive assessment process, and a collection of assessment tools to monitor and measure program outcomes and student learning. For the Master of Science in Engineering Online Program, the director reviews course evaluations and has performed e-mail surveys of students asking what has worked well in the online medium and what has not worked as well. Based on these findings, courses have been revised and even discontinued. This informal process has been effective for a small number of courses, however the program director plans to implement a more formal assessment now that the program enrollment has increased to over 200 students. The team did not view specific student assessment results or talk with students in the program.

## 3. Student advising and support

The program director and Student Affairs Office (SOA) review proposed programs of study for consistency with degree requirements and certificate requirements. Each Area Director provides technical advice to students with respect to more detailed area requirements and prerequisite knowledge. The SAO reviews student progress and checks against degree and certificate requirements. Advising is predominantly handled through e-mail and telephone,

although students do have the option of coming to campus. Faculty and TA's provide instructional and technical support on an as needed basis.

**4. Effectiveness of the quality assurance process for distance education program**

UCLA's online programs come under the same scrutiny as their resident programs. No systematic review on this online degree program has been performed by the Structural Engineers Association (SEAS) or by ABET, either of the professional engineering accrediting organizations. The team has no reason to question the quality of the program. No major issues or student complaints surfaced during the onsite visit.

**School of Nursing (SON):**
**Online Delivery of the Masters of Science Specialty: Nursing Administration**

The overall mission and goals of the SON is to advance nursing science through the conduct and dissemination of research and expand its national and international leadership in educational preparation of nurses. The school is committed to preparing scholarly and highly qualified nurses at all levels for the provision of quality nursing care for a diverse multicultural society.

The SON's long-standing specialty offering in Nursing Administration is aimed at preparing advanced practice nurses for administration, case management, consultative, and entrepreneurial roles in a variety of settings. Course offerings, which address core concepts, include administration, business, finance, leadership, organizational theories, research, professional issues, teaching, and electives selected from courses offered primarily in business, public health, public policy, and public administration. Supervised practicum and residency experiences are designed to apply knowledge in a variety of health-related settings including ambulatory care, medical group practice, public health, home care, hospice, long term care,

36

insurance, occupational health, industry, consulting practices, managed care and HMO (health-maintenance organizations) offices as well as in traditional, inpatient acute care settings. Eighty-two students graduated since the inception of the program in 2000.  Note:  In February 2010, the School of Nursing decided to suspend the online delivery of the ongoing MSN in Nursing Administration due to the need to clarify rights to use certain video materials.

## 1. Learning outcomes

The learning outcomes for the MSN online Nursing Administration program were identical to the traditional MSN Nursing Administration program but aimed to serve the needs of the working professionals interested in nursing administration. The outcomes were to prepare advanced practice nurses with an extensive body of knowledge in finance and administration as well as leaders who can support the professional practice of nursing in a variety of settings and roles. As such, this program of study was developed to enhance administrative practice, education, research, and professional leadership.

## 2. Assessment results

Students found the courses convenient, were better prepared for comprehending the content, and they enjoyed mastering computer technological skills. Most felt the help desk response was prompt, that faculty provided quick feedback and that the online courses supported adult decision-making process in allowing students to work at their convenience. Furthermore, students felt their writing skills improved and they gained analytical skills.

Students suggested some changes to the delivery of the content, such as improvement in online presentations, more realistic timelines for content due dates, and placing the exams online. They also suggested additional courses to be placed online.

Overall, quantitative rankings were quite high between Fall 01 and Winter 03. Every quarter both sections (on ground and online) of the course and faculty were evaluated using the

standard School of Nursing methodology. During the subsequent quarters, the online vs. on ground scores were similar and in some respects, exceeded on ground scores.

**3. Student advising and support**

Entering students were assigned a faculty advisor who was available in person, on e-mail or by telephone throughout the entire program. Furthermore, the Associate Dean for Student Affairs and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs were likewise available by all these modalities. In addition, technical support was available to students 24 hours a day through the eCollege help-line desk

Student Affairs staff (Student Services Coordinator, Financial Aid Coordinator, Admissions Coordinator and Director of Student Affairs) were available by telephone or e-mail to answer questions for prospective and current students. Links to important UCLA and School of Nursing sites (bookstores, libraries, schedule of classes, university calendars, university fees, etc.) were available through the SON's main and online websites

**4. Effectiveness of the quality assurance process for distance education program**

UCLA's online programs come under the same scrutiny as their resident programs. The team has no reason to question the quality of the program. No major issues or student complaints surfaced during the onsite visit. The suspension was based solely on legalities, not program quality. It was stated that this action is unfortunate as the students very much valued this delivery format.

**Conclusion**

The two distance education programs that UCLA put forth to evaluate as a component of the EER Review meet WASC's Standards and are consistent with the *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs*.