



UCLA

WASC

Re-affirmation of Accreditation


Steering Committee Meeting
January 29, 2018

WSCUC

Looks like:
“wuhs-kuk”
(wəs kək)


WASC

Pronounced:
“wahsk”
(wäsk)




WSCUC: The Campus and the Visiting Team

- The campus engages in a self-review that is documented in the Institutional Report.
- The report is reviewed by the visiting team, who creates approximately five to seven Lines of Inquiry for the Accreditation Visit.
- The campus provides additional evidence requested by the team's Lines of Inquiry, and the campus arranges all Accreditation Visit meetings requested by the team.
- The campus hosts the team for a three-day visit, which culminates with the campus receiving the team's Commendations and Recommendations.
- The campus and the Commission receive the team's report.



WSCUC Overview

- The Standards and CFRs
- The Institutional Report
 - Scope
 - Format
 - Components
- Commission Action
 - Format and Outcomes
- Where We Are Now
- Timeline
- Next Steps
- Website



WSCUC 2013 Handbook

Standards are “general principles of good practice” in higher education

- Standard 1:
Mission
- Standard 2:
Academic Enterprise and Faculty
- Standard 3:
Resources and Decision Processes
- Standard 4:
Continuous Improvement Effort
 (“Learning Institution”)

Standards content areas

Criteria for Review (CFRs) are the embodiment of the Standards (39 CFRs are listed)


- 1.4 Diversity: policy, programs, practices
- 2.7 Program review includes student learning outcomes, graduation/retention data, external evidence and evaluators
- 3.4 Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources
- 3.10 Effective academic leadership by faculty
- 4.2 Sufficient institutional research capacity
- 4.3 Commitment to improvement based on data and evidence

Examples of CFRs

WSCUC Institutional Report

- Approximately 50 pages of text (double-spaced), plus figures, exhibits, and evidence citations (total: 75 pages at most)
- Eight required components (essays) prompted by the WSCUC template
- Appendices documenting federal compliance, self-review according to the Standards, and an Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators
- Evidence: Hundreds of files, hyperlinked in the document and organized into archives
- Lines of Inquiry response
 - Provides updates and additional evidence; no essay writing
- Read by WSCUC Staff Liaison prior to submission

Approach to the Institutional Report



Report Components (Essays)

1. Introduction: Institutional Context; Response to Previous Commission Actions
2. Review under the WSCUC Standards
3. Degree Programs
4. Educational Quality
5. Student Success
6. Quality Assurance and Improvement
7. Sustainability
Optional: Institution-Specific Themes
8. Conclusion: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

1. Introduction

5 pages
double-spaced

- Institutional background
 - UCLA history and responses to specific prompts
 - Strengths and challenges
- Last re-affirmation Action Letter review
 - How UCLA responded to the last Action Letter (Recommendations):
 - Assessment of Learning Outcomes
 - Sustaining assessment of the capstones and program learning outcomes
 - Expanding assessment of capstones into graduate programs
 - Using assessment (qualitative and quantitative) to improve program effectiveness and student learning
 - Bringing students into the discussion about student learning outcomes and assessment
 - Continued Progress in Implementing UCLA's Commitment to Diversity
 - Monitoring campus progress in achieving our objectives regarding diversity

2. Review under the WSCUC Standards

- Refers to appendices that include self-evaluation of compliance with the Standards and the federal requirements
- Provides evidence comprehensively with critical evaluation
 - All four Standards are listed with their Criteria for Review (39 CFRs)
 - Evidence is linked to each CFR to indicate extent of compliance
 - Guidelines for CFRs, suggested by the Handbook, are followed
 - Evaluation of campus success and campus plans for improvement are indicated
- Evidence provided in this component can be cited elsewhere as support in other component essays

5 pages
 double-spaced,
 plus list of CFRs
 and supporting
 evidence (5+
 additional pages)

3. Degree Programs

- Focuses on “meaning, quality, and integrity” of degrees
- Quality: “Rich, coherent, and challenging educational experience.”
- Integrity: “Assurance that students consistently meet the standards of performance [UCLA] has set.”
- Considers validation of institutional goals with student survey responses
- Must take into account our mission, values, and student populations
- Prompts:
 - What does it mean for a graduate to hold a UCLA degree in terms of distinct experiences and outcomes?
 - What processes ensure the quality and rigor of the degrees offered?
 - What was discovered in this examination of the UCLA degree?

5 pages
 double-spaced

4. Education Quality

5 pages
double-spaced

- Focuses on “student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation”
- Reviews alignment of key undergraduate learning outcomes with WSCUC’s Core Competencies:
 - Written Communication
 - Oral Communication
 - Quantitative Reasoning
 - Information Literacy
 - Critical Thinking
- Considers graduate program learning outcomes development
- Describes how learning outcomes assessment is performed and how performance standards are determined
- Connects improvements in teaching and learning to assessment findings

5. Student Success

5 pages
double-spaced

- Focuses on “student learning, retention, and graduation”
- Analyzes and interprets UCLA’s WSCUC Graduation Rate Dashboard data
- Describes learning and personal development dimensions of student success
 - Disaggregation of data “beyond demographic characteristics,” separating by program participation (curricular and co-curricular) and post-graduation outcomes
 - Co-curricular student outcomes assessment
- Defines and evaluates student success including completion and learning, considering mission, values, programs offered, and student population
- Reviews how programs promote student success
- Accounts for the role of program review
- Presents, by program, success in student completion and analysis regarding why

6. Quality Assurance and Improvement

- “Three basic tools of quality improvement” are emphasized:
 - Program review
 - Assessment of student learning
 - Data collection and analysis
- How program review results have been used to inform decision making and improve teaching and learning
- How the program review process has continuously improved
- How assessment processes have evolved while assessments have been carried out
- How effective the institutional research function is and how well it supports assessment of student learning

5 pages
double-spaced

7. Sustainability

- Describes UCLA’s “current status as a viable, sustainable organization”
 - Fiscal sustainability (resource adequacy): Describes UCLA’s current financial position and demonstrates that UCLA operations will remain financially sustainable over the next 6 to 10 years
 - Alignment with UCLA’s priorities: Describes the resource allocation to support educational effectiveness and “other activities that advance knowledge, develop human capital, and allow the institution to learn, adapt, and thrive”
 - Includes:
 - Role of program review
 - Determination of learning outcomes
 - Description of systems and processes ensuring educational effectiveness and demonstrating a “learning institution”
 - Evaluation of “resources... committed to assessment of learning and improvement of student performance”
- Evaluates how UCLA is “poised to address fundamental changes facing higher education in the decade to come”
 - Anticipation of potential need to change
 - “Vision of [UCLA’s] role in 21st century higher education”
 - Consideration of the global, national, and local changes ahead in higher education – what will have the greatest impact on UCLA in the next 7 to 10 years

5 pages
double-spaced

* Institution-specific Theme(s) (Optional)

- Very rarely undertaken by institutions in self-review
 - Represents additional work for the team and for the institution
- Must present the origins of the theme, analysis, recommendations for action, and related steps
- Must connect to the Standards and cite CFRs that are relevant
- Can be a separate section or woven into another component
- Must notify WSCUC Staff Liaison early if choose to pursue a theme component, to ensure the visiting team includes appropriate expertise for review

8. Conclusion

- Assess the impact of the self-study
- Reflect on what UCLA has learned during the self-study
- Discuss what UCLA plans to do next
 - Focus on what the campus has undertaken and intends to continue in our pursuit of excellence
 - Address areas where we see ongoing advancement in our CFR performance

5-10 pages
double-spaced



Commission Action


The Commission takes action and transfers the team's Commendations and Recommendations onto their Action Letter:

- Campus receives its re-affirmation interval.
 - Six, eight, or ten years.
- Campus receives news of any required interactions with the Commission before the next re-affirmation cycle.
 - Mid-Cycle Review: Required of all institutions and focuses on graduation/completion data and learning outcomes.
 - Progress Report: One or two issues addressed in a brief (~two page) report.
 - Interim Report: Addresses several Recommendations; more substantial than a Progress Report.
 - Special Visit: Requires a Special Visit Report and a team visiting campus; more substantial than an Interim Report.

Where We Are Now

- WSCUC Steering Committee
- Kelly Wahl joining our team from APB
- WSCUC Staff Liaison selecting the visiting team and inviting its chair to serve





Next Steps

- Decide timing of WSCUC Staff Liaison coming to campus
- Before our next meeting:
 - Review WSCUC materials (links to Box will be provided in email)
 - Guide Undergraduate Education accreditation team members to best sources of evidence for “March through the Standards” and component essays
 - Review draft materials distributed prior to next Steering Committee meeting and suggest additional evidence
 - Consider what is in UCLA’s future and how these endeavors can become Recommendations in the Conclusion component

UCLA
Reaffirmation of Accreditation by WSCUC

WELCOME | WSCUC ACCREDITATION | DATA RESOURCES | ARCHIVES

WSCUC ACCREDIT. DATA RESOURC ARCHIVES

Following a rigorous three stage review process, UCLA's WSCUC Accreditation was last reaffirmed in 2010. In the Commission Action Letter, UCLA was commended for the "exemplary way in which it has engaged in each stage of the accrediting process." This page provides the timeline for links to the most important 2010 reaffirmation reports and letters, as well as links to key reports and letters from UCLA's 1998 WSCUC Reaffirmation of Accreditation Process.

(Please note UCLA's 2003 and 1998 reports were prepared within the context of WSCUC Core Commitments and Standards of accreditation that differed from articulations and expectations reflected in the WSCUC 2003 Handbook of Accreditation.)

2010

Timeline for UCLA's 2010 Reaffirmation of Accreditation

- Institutional Proposal
Submitted: May 2008
Approved: Jan 2008
- Capacity & Proprietary Review
Submitted: Dec 2007
Site Visit: Dec 6-8, 2008
- Educational Effectiveness Review
Submitted: Dec 2009

<http://wscuc.ucla.edu>

Patricia A. Turner
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education
accreditation@ucla.edu

Jennifer A. Lindholm

WELCOME

Welcome.

The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) is accredited by WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC), the regional accrediting agency serving higher education institutions in California, Hawaii, and the Pacific Region. The U.S. Department of Education recognizes WSCUC accreditation as



UCLA
WSCUC

Re-affirmation of Accreditation

Thank you for serving.