



CHAIR
Sherwood Lingenfelter
Fuller Theological Seminary

VICE CHAIR
Linda Johnsrud
University of Hawaii

Bernard Bowler
Public Member

Jerry Campbell
Claremont School of Theology

Anna DiStefano
Fielding Graduate University

James Donahue
Graduate Theological Union

Jackie Donath
California State University, Sacramento

Aimée Dorr
University of California, Los Angeles

John Eshelman
Seattle University

D. Merrill Ewert
Fresno Pacific University

John Fitzpatrick
Schools Commission Representative

Harold Hewitt
Chapman University

Michael Jackson
University of Southern California

Roberts Jones
Public Member

Julia Lopez
Public Member

Thomas McFadden
*Community and Junior College
Representative*

Horace Mitchell
California State University, Bakersfield

Leroy Morishita
San Francisco State University

William Plater
*Indiana University –
Purdue University, Indianapolis*

Sheldon Schuster
Keck Graduate Institute

Eleanor Siebert
Mount Saint Mary's College

Carmen Sigler
Sau Jose State University

Larry Vanderhoef
University of California, Davis

Michael Whyte
Azusa Pacific University

Paul Zingg
California State University, Chico

PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Ralph A. Wolff

June 29, 2010

Gene D. Block
Chancellor
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90095

Dear Chancellor Block:

At its meeting June 16-18, 2010, the Commission considered the report of the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) team that visited the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) on February 23-26, 2010. The Commission also had available to it the materials prepared by the University for the visit, and your email response to the team report, dated April 16, 2010. The Commission appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and Judi Smith, vice provost for undergraduate education. The discussion with you was very helpful in learning more about the impact and effectiveness of the accreditation review process on UCLA.

The University is to be commended for the exemplary way in which it has engaged each stage of the accrediting process. The Institutional Proposal was submitted in May 2006 and identified three major themes for the review: shaping undergraduate education via the capstone experience, facilitating interdisciplinary education and research, and using educational technology to enhance the student academic experience. The Proposal Review Committee considered the Proposal to be well developed and organized, and an exemplar of how a research university might use the accrediting process for meaningful inquiry and improvement. The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) report, submitted to support the visit in October 2008, was well written, organized and documented, and demonstrated serious involvement of the University faculty and leadership in working to address the three themes. While progress in addressing these themes was not uniform, the institutional report and interaction with the team led to useful insights and recommendations for areas to address as the University continued to work on the themes for the Educational Effectiveness Review.

The Educational Effectiveness Review report developed by the University was similarly well organized and reflected significant improvement in several areas, even with the intervening budget reductions that the University was forced to implement. In its conclusion, the Educational Effectiveness Review team found 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 identified a significant number of outcomes resulting from the review process, including the definition of the capstone experience as a signature feature of the UCLA undergraduate experience and a way of establishing the educational effectiveness of undergraduate programs; initial development of outcomes at the graduate level; revisions to the program review process to include assessment of

student learning; establishment of the Common Collaborative Learning Environment to support teaching, learning and research; and development of strategic plans for technology and diversity. Most impressive has been the ownership and engagement of the faculty in each of these activities, and the thoughtful approaches that the University has taken to each. The University also used the extra time between the CPR and EER reviews to address budget cuts by developing a Budget Toolbox as a vehicle for developing new ideas to achieve financial stability and for more transparent communication about the challenging fiscal environment.

The Commission endorsed the team findings, commendations and recommendations and highlighted two primary issues for the University's continued attention:

Sustaining Progress in a Financially Challenging Environment. The team report amply demonstrates the seriousness and effectiveness of the University in addressing the themes for its accreditation review, and in responding to key areas arising under WASC standards. The Commission recognizes that funding for the University remains uncertain and that new resources will be needed for it to retain its preeminence as a premiere research university. The University has made significant progress in developing its capstone initiative, and in embedding assessment in other programs throughout the undergraduate curriculum. This progress is recent however, especially the assessment of the capstone and program learning outcomes which the faculty have identified for each program. The Commission urges that these efforts be sustained and expanded into graduate programs, and that assessment data (qualitative and quantitative) be used to improve program effectiveness and student learning. The team further recommends, and the Commission concurs, that there would be value in students being brought into the discussion about student learning outcomes and assessment.

Continued Progress in Implementing the University's Commitment to Diversity. The University has distinguished itself in its longstanding commitment to diversity and it has developed a strategic plan for maintaining this commitment to diversity. The Commission urges that implementation of this strategic plan continue as a priority and that progress in achieving its objectives be monitored.

The Commission acted to:

1. Receive the Educational Effectiveness Review report and reaffirm the accreditation of University of California, Los Angeles.
2. Schedule the Capacity and Preparatory Review for spring 2020 and the Educational Effectiveness Review for fall 2021. The Institutional Proposal will be due in spring 2018.

In taking this action to reaffirm accreditation, the Commission confirms that University of California, Los Angeles has satisfactorily addressed the Core Commitments to Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness, and has successfully completed the three-stage review conducted under the Standards of Accreditation. Between this action and the time of the next review, the institution is expected to continue its progress, particularly with respect to educational effectiveness and student learning.

In accordance with Commission policy, copies of this letter will be sent to President Mark Yudof and the chair of the UC Board of Regents in one week. The Commission expects that the team report and this action letter will be widely disseminated throughout the institution to promote

further engagement and improvement, and to support the institution's response to the specific issues identified in them.

Finally, the Commission wishes to express its appreciation for the extensive work that the University undertook in preparing for and supporting this accreditation review. WASC is committed to an accreditation process that adds value to institutions while assuring public accountability, and we are grateful for your continued support of our process. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this letter or the action of the Commission.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Ralph A. Wolff". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "W" at the end.

Ralph A. Wolff
President and Executive Director

cc: Sherwood Lingenfelter, Commission Chair
Judith Smith, ALO
Russell Gould, Board of Regents Chair
Mark Yudof, UC President
Members of the EER team