

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM  
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To: University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)

Date of Visit: October 21 – 24, 2019

Team Roster

Chair: Ana Mari Cauce, President  
University of Washington

Assistant Chair: Jillian Kinzie, Associate Director, Center for  
Postsecondary Research  
Indiana University Bloomington

Team Member: Stephanie Kalfayan, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs  
Stanford University

Team Member: Pierre Ouillet, Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer  
University of California, San Diego

Team Member: Oliver O'Reilly, Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering  
University of California, Berkeley

Team Member: Patrick Sims, Deputy Vice Chancellor for  
Diversity & Inclusion  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

WSCUC Liaison: Barbara Gross Davis, Vice President  
WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	1
SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT.....	2
IA. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History.....	2
IC. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....	5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS.....	5
IIA. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions .....	5
IIB. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators .....	9
Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.....	11
Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions .....	14
Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability.....	18
Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement.....	20
IIC. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degree.....	23
IIE. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation.....	30
IIH. Component 8: Reflection and Plans for Improvement.....	46
SECTION III– COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	47
Appendix 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM .....	51
Appendix 2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM .....	52
Appendix 3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM.....	53
Appendix 4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM.....	54
Appendix 5 – DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW .....	56

## **SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

### **IA. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History**

In the 100 years since its founding as a small Southern Branch campus, the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) has grown to be the largest campus of the UC system with an enrollment of nearly 32,000 undergraduates, and nearly 13,000 graduate and professional degree-seeking students. In its 12 Professional Schools and the College of Letters and Science, the institution offers 140 undergraduate and 259 graduate degree programs. As a public research university, UCLA is committed to the creation, dissemination, preservation and application of knowledge for the betterment of global society. At more than 135,000 applicants annually, UCLA is the most applied-to university in the nation. The 2018-19 undergraduate profile indicates enrolled students from nearly all states and more than 80 countries. Since 2010, UCLA has averaged nearly \$1 billion annually in competitively awarded research grants and contracts. By all accounts, UCLA is a diverse, international university, powered by extensive resources and a renowned reputation.

Initial WSCUC accreditation was granted in 1949 and last reaffirmed in June 2010 for ten years. UCLA participated in the extended pilot of the Mid-Cycle Review in 2015. A few new offerings and changes to programs were launched over the past decade including expansion of the Master of Science in Engineering Online degree to add 10 distinct degree programs. A dual degree program in Financial Engineering with Peking University was approved by WSCUC's expedited Substantive Change review and continues its path through UCLA's degree program establishment process. UCLA identified several major accomplishments since the last comprehensive review, including the establishment of the Herb Albert School of Music in 2016, the achievement of a \$4.2 billion Centennial Campaign, and notable new leadership roles including the Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Vice Provost for Enrollment

Management, Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Native American and Indigenous Affairs, and Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Immigration Policy. The institution also achieved recognition for its commitment to community engagement and service through receipt of the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2015. Additionally, upgrades to student housing, support initiatives for veterans, and expanded teaching and lab spaces reflect the institution's dedication to enhancing education and the public good.

Over the past five years, UCLA has been renewing its strategic planning to guide the campus into its second century. Through a thoughtful process of deliberative discussions, all-campus reviews and retreats on key topics for the future of the institution, UCLA has committed to addressing three main objectives: education innovation; research and creative innovation; and civic engagement and global outreach. These three themes align with the campus mission and promise to help ensure that local, national, and international communities recognize UCLA as a dynamic hub of creative innovation and action. In addition, UCLA continues to pursue its Grand Challenges. These large, collaborative and transformative efforts connect faculty, staff, students, community members and field experts to solve society's most intractable problems including sustainability and mental health and depression.

#### **IB. Description of the Team's Review Process**

Members of the team began their evaluation work in advance of the Offsite Review (OSR) on March 6-7, 2019, by reading the UCLA Institutional Report and a variety of documents linked in the UCLA Reaffirmation of Accreditation 2019 Table of Contents document provided by the institution. The team analyzed the materials available and everyone completed worksheets to summarize information including strengths, weaknesses, and specific questions for further inquiry relative to the WSCUC Components and Standards. Once compiled, these worksheets helped the whole team focus on critical elements of UCLA's Institutional Report in

preparation for the team call on February 8, and ultimately the Offsite Review. The Offsite , Review included a 45-minute video conference call with key UCLA administrators in which the team shared the areas for further exploration (Lines of Inquiry) during the Accreditation Visit (AV), October 21-24, 2019. The Offsite Review (OSR) Summary of Lines of Inquiry Guide was provided to UCLA on March 15, 2019. UCLA provided a response to the team's request for additional documents by August 12, 2019.

Prior to the Accreditation Visit the team prepared a worksheet for the pre-visit accreditation conference call that summarized a review of evidence from the Lines of Inquiry and outlined specific questions and areas for further inquiry along with people or groups to interview. During the pre-visit conference call on September 27, 2019, the team reviewed and discussed the materials the institution provided at the team's request and finalized the visit schedule and assigned teams members to specific interview sessions. A final draft visit schedule was prepared by UCLA's Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and sent to the team prior to the actual visit.

A confidential email account was established to allow for greater participation from the campus community and to provide any information that might be deemed sensitive. It was monitored by the assistant chair and, ultimately, shared with all of the team members.

The Accreditation Visit began with a team executive planning session on Monday October 21, 2019 at which the team reviewed the final visit schedule and identified specific questions to be pursued during each group or individual meeting. The campus visit started on Tuesday, October 22, 2019 with a meeting with the chancellor, followed by a meeting with WSCUC Steering Committee. These meetings helped to set the context and identify the challenges and opportunities for UCLA. During the next two days, the team met with a range of constituencies and individuals and learned a lot more about the institution, its organizational structure, its values, and the faculty, staff and students. The visit ended on October 24, 2019 with a private

meeting between the team chair and chancellor followed by a public exit meeting during which the final commendations and recommendations were read.

The visit was extremely well-organized and every session was productive and positive. The team was impressed by the level of participant commitment in meetings and appreciated the high level of candor.

### **IC. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence**

UCLA's Institutional Report is a comprehensive and well-written document. A source of commendation from the team, the report provided a candid assessment of strengths and weaknesses and articulated the objectives UCLA wishes to pursue in the near term. Perhaps most importantly, the report also provided helpful descriptions of the campus culture and the approach undertaken by the institution's Steering Committee to conduct the self-study review and to produce the report. The report and complementary evidence were presented and organized in an accessible manner. The materials provided links to various documents and addressed how the institution is responding to each of the WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review (CFR).

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS**

### **IIA. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions**

The Commission in its 2010 letter reaffirming UCLA's accreditation identified two areas for the institution to address prior to its next review: (1) assessment of student learning outcomes, and (2) continued progress in implementing the institution's commitment to diversity. The Commission letter noted that UCLA had made significant recent progress in assessment activities, but urged deepening and expanding these efforts to improve program effectiveness and student learning. The Commission also encouraged UCLA to implement its strategic plan to maintain its longstanding commitment to diversity. UCLA's Institutional Report for reaffirmation outlines the progress made in these two areas.

Since 2010, UCLA has made steady progress on a range of assessment initiatives. The establishment of program learning outcomes and their promotion in the catalog is complete for all undergraduate degree programs and graduate level outcomes have also been detailed. The team reviewed the learning outcomes established at the program level. Although the establishment of learning outcomes is an achievement, the team found that some of the outcome statements were concentrated at low levels of proficiency. A review of the UCLA Catalog 2018-19 program learning outcome statements revealed that action verbs such as “understanding” and “familiarity” were perhaps too low for bachelor’s level attainment. The levels of achievement for learning outcomes are further discussed in Standard 2, Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions and Component 4 Educational Quality.

UCLA has made significant progress involving faculty, students and staff in the establishment of program learning outcomes and the creation of curricular maps. Notably, the inclusion of students in multiple discussions about the undergraduate learning outcomes and assessment activities including the creation of curricular maps is commendable, however, this started recently. The team encourages UCLA to sustain student involvement in this process. Given the team’s concern that the outcome statements may need additional review with attention to strengthening the action verb, the institution is encouraged to consider student input on whether the level specified is reflective of their experience.

The rationale for UCLA’s approach to assessment, which designates faculty as responsible for outcomes assessment within academic programs and provides them decision support, seems to appropriately serve the distinct needs of disciplines and programs. The decision to organize assessment in programs, and explication of five avenues for faculty to engage in learning assessment seems to respect faculty expertise and encourages their involvement in meaningful assessment including faculty-initiated assessment projects and assessment performed for

instructional development. The justification for a lack of annual assessment reporting is well-articulated. In particular, the emphasis on documenting evidence of student learning and providing accounts of changes implemented as a result of the assessment effort, which is a part of the Self-Review Report for the Academic Senate Program Review, is an essential component of assessment activities. UCLA also relies on several units, Student Affairs Information and Research Office (SAIRO), the Center for Educational Assessment (CEA), the Graduate Division, and institutional research, to provide assurances of institution-level learning outcomes and offer more centralized assessment functions, including regularly surveying all students and sharing findings and support for program review. However, the team encourages the institution to assess this approach to ensure it is providing regular attention to assessment evidence and is serving the purpose of assessment for accountability and improvement.

The description of the approach to assessment research and analysis performed in instructional development areas to support curriculum development and to ensure grant compliance through the Center for Education Innovation and Learning in the Sciences (CEILS) seems to be a thoughtful way to connect assessment data and instructional practice to evaluate learning improvement. The team encourages UCLA to consider if the CEILS model could be enacted in other Schools and Colleges to improve instructional quality and equity.

The team also discussed the ties between assessment and diversity activities. Specifically, the team was impressed with the institution's assessment of campus climate, diversity learning outcomes, and the examination of the influence of changes in instructional practice on climate and outcomes for diversity. The team encourages UCLA to continue to assess students' quality of educational experience and to examine equity in the achievement of learning outcomes.

On the topic of diversity, the institution has made significant progress, especially through the establishment of the Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, responding to



incidents, and furthering the examination of its climate for diversity as evidenced in the Moreno report, the Enhancing Student Success and Building Inclusive Classrooms report, and as enacted by the range of initiatives by the VC for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. The commitment to improving diversity and supporting an array of diversity programs is notable during a time of budgetary uncertainty and limited resources. The extensive development and initiation of highly tailored, culturally-responsive and inclusive programs is impressive. The fact that these programs are also highly visible on the campus website, in materials, and are widely promoted on campus and throughout the local and higher education community are important demonstrations of UCLA's commitment to diversity. During the visit the team learned more about how the UCLA Principles of Community are enacted and the updates to UCLA's policies and procedures to respond to incidents of racial bias and discrimination. Although more work is needed to address issues of diversity, equity and inclusion, the university has taken action to address recommendations in the Moreno report related to anti-bias training and hiring practices, among others.

With respect to the sufficiency of UCLA's responses to earlier WSCUC recommendations, the team determined that UCLA had satisfactorily addressed the recommendations in the 2010 team report and the Commission letter and had made an honest and transparent appraisal of its progress in the essays in its Institutional Report. With that said, these two themes will continue to demand UCLA's attention, and the team's concerns and comments in this section and subsequent sections of this report are intended to help the institution maintain its focus on these important elements of educational effectiveness. All in all, the team is impressed with the responsiveness of UCLA to the recommendations, and the university continues to strive toward its goals.

## **IIB. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

UCLA did a thorough job assessing compliance with the Standards and federal requirements and completed the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI). The IEEI is intended to provide assurance that every degree program has in place a system for assessing, tracking, and improving the learning of its students. The worksheet is intended to assist institutions in determining the extent to which they have effective assessment systems in place, and what additional components or processes are needed for continuous improvement. UCLA's IEEI forms show that the institution has not elected to develop institution learning outcomes, however it is making use of a variety of forms of direct evidence of learning outcomes including capstone courses, portfolio review, licensure examination, senior exit paper, project, or thesis, course-embedded work, and indirect evidence, including the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey. In addition, this evidence is being interpreted by program or department faculty, faculty senate, program chairs, among others. General Education outcomes were similarly reported. Again, UCLA described that it has assigned learning outcomes and core competencies to the Schools, College and programs, and discussions during the visit confirmed that this was indeed being practiced.

The IEEI for Program Learning Outcomes (PLO's) included records for 387 continuing programs, at the non-degree, bachelors, masters and doctorate levels, and three new programs. All have formal learning outcomes and include a link to learning outcomes published in a variety of places that are accessible to students, faculty, staff and the public. Programs appear to be using multiple forms of direct and indirect forms of evidence, however the list of forms of evidence is identical to the evidence indicated in the learning outcomes section above. Similarly, text in the sections on the processes for

interpreting and how the learning outcomes findings are used are the same for all programs. The IEEI worksheet was not discussed in UCLA's Institutional Report but was complete and included as an appendix.

The Review under the Standards was completed as a self-analysis using the Standards to identify and communicate campus strengths and areas of weakness and to identify areas and themes for improvement. A workgroup formed from the campus WSCUC Steering Committee completed the first draft of the inventory. The inventory draft was then reviewed and approved by the full committee, and was included as part of the evidence for the full campus review. The subcommittee identified documents, policies, and examples that demonstrated compliance with each of the standards, and this evidence was used to determine a rating. The institution provided its own self-rating (1-area of strength, 2-aspects that need attention, 3- needs significant development or 4-does not apply) for each Criteria For Review under the Standards, assessed the importance of each CFR to UCLA, made relevant commentary, and provided links to where the evidence could be found.

UCLA's self-ratings were at the 1 or 2 level for all CFR's except three: 2.4 student learning outcomes and standards of performance developed and shared, 2.6 graduate achievement of stated learning outcomes, and 4.5 appropriate stakeholders are regularly involved in assessment. On these three CFR's the institution rated itself a 3-needs significant development. In the summary section, UCLA identified increasing the learning outcomes assessment infrastructure and ensuring the alignment of curricula with outcomes as a concern to be addressed. Notably, UCLA awarded rating of A – "a high priority to address" for 21 CFRs. The team generally agrees with the institution's assessment of its performance and in particular, the three areas in need of greater attention.

In addition, UCLA has demonstrated compliance with all four federal requirements: credit hour policy and program length, marketing and recruitment, student complaints policy, and transfer credit policy. The team's reviews of these federal requirements are included in the appendices of this report.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCLA has provided evidence of compliance with all four of the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation and has demonstrated a strong commitment to use the Standards consistently. The sections below describe the results of the team's review of each Standard.

***Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives***

UCLA has provided strong evidence of its commitment to the WSCUC standards through its document, UCLA Evidence for Review According to the Standards.

Institutional Purposes (CFRs 1.1 and 1.2). UCLA has a strong mission statement and its values are reflected throughout the Institutional Report. As a public research university, its mission is the creation, dissemination, preservation and application of knowledge for the betterment of a global society (CFR1.1). The values of academic freedom, excellence and diversity underlie their three institutional responsibilities: (1) learning and teaching; (2) discovery, creativity and innovation; and (3) civic engagement. This mission is widely shared by the community of students, faculty and staff, was demonstrated in a variety of ways throughout the site visit, and is also evident in the themes of UCLA's Strategic Plan. Deepening this engagement and documenting how the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, will be important for UCLA and its greater community.

Of particular note is the impressive manner in which the Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (VC EDI) has created processes that target the structural challenges related to diversity and inclusion particularly in the space of faculty accountability. All faculty

as part of progressing through their tenure process must draft a statement on their engagement with diversity and inclusion. As a call to action that potentially has national implications, and at times has been met with great resistance, a major component of this type of success and the required diversity course is anchored in key partnerships among the senior leadership team, in particular with the VC EDI and the Vice Chancellors for Academic Personnel and Student Affairs. These efforts and others related to clarifying learning outcomes and engaging the broader Los Angeles community, truly give a sense of what it means to be a national research university that values its role in influencing the lives of its stakeholders at the local, national, and international levels.

Consequently, UCLA's educational objectives are widely understood throughout the institution and inform activities at the program level (CFR 1.2). Outcomes have been developed for degree programs and are accessible through their General Catalog. UCLA publishes dashboards that make information transparent both within the UCLA community and to the public. The accountability dashboards provide information about UCLA's graduation rates, student and faculty profiles, financial information, as well as other data accessible.

Undergraduate and graduate profiles provide a snapshot of the campus and the diversity and success of each group. Despite their considerable success, the leaders with whom the team met were not content to rest on past achievements. Their efforts at continued improvements in graduation rates and improvements in diversity are well documented. The undergraduate 4 and 6-year completion rates are particularly impressive: 80% and 90% respectively.

Integrity and Transparency (CFRs 1.3 – 1.8). The commitment to academic freedom (CFR 1.3) is a strong institutional value, articulated in UCLA's mission statement and also permeates many other policy statements. UCLA has a set of Principles of Community (CFR 1.4) that outlines the value of creating and maintaining a welcoming and inclusive environment for all

members of the UCLA community and for serving as a guide to behavior. These principles, created by the Chancellor's Advisory Group on Diversity, nearly a decade ago are not just part of a policy, but are reflected in the teaching and research found in academic units across the campus. They are also reflected in the documentation for academic personnel reviews and faculty commented on how their pedagogical style has benefited by these reflections. In addition, many different groups are engaged in scholarship on equity and diversity, as well as community engagement with off-campus partners.

Though UCLA is a state institution, there is no evidence of government interference in its activities (CFR 1.5). All of its governance documents outlining a strong tradition of shared governance are readily accessible. The transparency of program learning goals is commendable (CFRs 1.6, 1.7). The team was easily able to identify policies governing complaint and grievance processes for all members of the UCLA community. Policies concerning tuition and fees, financial aid, and graduation rates are also easily accessible. There is every evidence that UCLA complies with all reporting requirements to WSCUC as requested, and on an annual basis (CFR 1.8).

One additional matter of concern related to UCLA's operational integrity and timely and fair responses to complaints became known in 2019 as a result of the institutions involvement in fraudulent admissions practices at universities across the country (known as "Varsity Blues"). An athletic coach affiliated with UCLA was part of a scheme to help prospective students fraudulently gain admission to the university. During the visit the team learned more about the action taken by UCLA to address the matter including being truthful to students and the public by posting information on its website, auditing admissions practices, reviewing athletic credentials of applicant pool to confirm their legitimacy and taking action in any case of misrepresentation in admissions applications. The institution also had to respond to allegations

of misconduct by a former UCLA gynecologist. The institution has taken action to change policies and procedures because of these serious lapses in institutional integrity and has established appropriate safeguards (CFR 1.6, 1.7).

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1.

### ***Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions***

UCLA has established educational goals through core functions of the institution in a reflective and analytical way. As indicated above, UCLA has made extensive use of the Review under the Standards worksheet for organizing their evidence of achievement of standards and CFRs. The institution has conducted a candid assessment of the various CFRs and those that need improvement.

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7). UCLA's educational policies and academic degrees are concretely defined and delivered with appropriate processes and academic reviews to ensure integrity. The team determined that the content, standards of performance and rigor are appropriate. Syllabi articulate learning outcomes, grading standards and topics to be covered. Degree programs are subject to peer review when they are proposed and once every eight years during program review. The fact that a faculty committee reviewed all learning outcomes is laudable. Faculty members' qualifications are documented and faculty to student ratios seem appropriate (CFR 2.1).

UCLA has provided significant attention to entry level requirements and in the development of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for every major in the undergraduate level programs. At the graduate level, the meaning of the degree is defined by overarching PLOs for the Ph.D. and master's degrees respectively. PLOs and rubrics are used to define the levels of student achievement required for graduation. Notably, UCLA provides undergraduate students the

opportunity to culminate their baccalaureate education with a creative demonstration of their knowledge and skills in the capstone. As of fall 2019, 71 programs have been certified as Capstone Majors or Programs (a degree program that provides at least 60% of students with capstone opportunities) under the Capstone Initiative. Discussion among additional departmental colleagues is ongoing.

UCLA has a program of General Education (GE) that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major) (CFR 2.2a). Understandably, as a large institution, GE requirements vary among the College and Schools. A summary of campuswide GE requirements is publicly available, as is a GE course master list. UCLA's unique Cluster Program is an innovative initiative designed to help first-year students successfully transition to UCLA and fulfill four GE requirements in an interdisciplinary learning community. The Cluster Program has undergone extensive self-study and review by the Academic Senate and regarding the student outcomes associated with this innovative General Education program. The General Education program with reference to Core Competencies is discussed in Component 4: Educational Quality.

Most graduate programs have established clearly stated objectives and assessment plans, but this work is not yet complete (CFR 2.2b). As UCLA calls out in its self-review, areas for growth include student preparation for life-long learning and implementing program-level assessment processes for all core competencies to ensure attainment (not all core competencies have been assessed in every baccalaureate program).

Academic programs receive needed attention from faculty and administration. Assessment of student learning outcomes is integrated into a process of continuous improvement, and outcomes appear in the syllabi of most courses (CFRs 2.3, 2.4). However, although new and



revised courses require course outcomes on the syllabi, this may still need to be addressed in some existing courses. In addition, while it seems that UCLA has a reasonable academic assessment infrastructure, there is room for growth in terms of providing additional support for faculty assessment efforts and advancing faculty use of results to inform their teaching (CFR 2.4). UCLA evaluated its own performance related to demonstrating that graduates consistently achieve stated learning outcomes as successful. The institution has a regular program review process. Data are closely studied during review; however, there seems to be some inconsistency in the quality and quantity of learning assessment incorporated in self-studies. Greater incorporation of evidence may benefit the process (CFR 2.7).

In sum, as in its candid self-appraisal, UCLA indicated that its areas for growth include the development of the assessment infrastructure for both undergraduate and graduate programs. Progress has been made in articulating learning outcomes for undergraduate programs, and efforts are underway to articulate graduate program requirements into learning outcomes. However, additional progress needs to be made in supporting faculty in assessment efforts. The institution also recognizes that more consistency is needed in the reporting of assessment activities during program reviews. For example, while core competencies have been aligned to program learning outcomes, not all core competencies have been assessed. In recent years, UCLA has embedded the collection of course-specific learning outcomes/objectives for all new courses and course revisions and the assessment of program learning outcomes during the academic program review process. The institution has also started including curriculum maps for all new program proposals. However, greater progress must be made to develop systems and processes to deepen learning outcome assessment practice. The team encourages the campus to act on its plans to dedicate additional resources toward assessment for faculty participation in the systematic evaluation of program-level learning by supplying tools, increasing training

opportunities, and reinforcing good practices in assessment (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.7).

Scholarship and Creative Activities (CFRs 2.8, 2.9). Scholarship and creative activity is viewed as a priority and a strength at UCLA. Faculty engage students in informal learning, mentoring, and advising activities, and instructional and curricular innovation is encouraged. The team heard from faculty that curricular innovation is supported at the institution.

Student Learning and Success (CFRs 2.10-2.14). Assessing and improving student success is an important goal at UCLA. At the undergraduate level UCLA endeavors to ensure the highest quality curricular and co-curricular learning and development. Ample evidence exists of student involvement in the co-curriculum, and assessment data about the quality of the student experience has been regularly reported by Student Affairs Information and Research Office (SAIRO) and acted upon when necessary (CFRs 2.11, 2.13). The team learned more about recent advances in evidence-based teaching, and in particular, efforts to adopt inclusive teaching practices. A great deal of institutional support from the Center for the Advancement of Teaching to work with faculty on inclusive practice, and notable efforts by the Center for Education Innovation and Learning in the Sciences (CEILS) to use data from course evaluations, and interviews with students, promise to improve teaching in the life sciences as (CFRs 2.10, 2.12).

The December 2015 Report to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, “Enhancing Student Success and Building Inclusive Classrooms at UCLA” provided a comprehensive analysis of equity and obstacles to degree completion and offered recommendations to improve the success of all students in the classroom. A recommendation from this report included the creation of dashboard system to monitor student progress, identify courses with high fail rates, and target responses to improve student success. Faculty with whom the team met during the visit discussed the value of the “Grade Performance Disparity Tool” dashboards to explore and act on grade differences by race-ethnicity, Pell status and gender.

These data and assessment initiatives seem to be positively influencing changes in instructional practice and ultimately, student success (CFR 2.10). In addition, the success of transfer students is a priority that UCLA persistently addresses. According to the Transfer Resource guide, 85% of transfer graduate in just over two years and significant resources including the Transfer Student Center and one year of guaranteed university housing help students transition to and be successful in their new academic and personal environment (CFR 2.14).

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

***Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability***

UCLA supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. Combined, these elements help promote the achievement of institutional purpose and create a high-quality environment for learning.

Faculty and Staff (CFRs 3.1-3.3). UCLA has a world-class faculty which justifies its reputation as one of the finest institutions of higher education in the world (CFR 3.1). It has well documented policies, practices, and evaluations (CFR 3.2). Furthermore, the campus has invested in professional development for both faculty and staff (CFR 3.3). Because of the State funding challenges and restrictions on tuition increases, UCLA has held ladder faculty recruitment flat during a period where enrollment increased by 20%. As a result, the campus has increasingly engaged nontenure track faculty for instruction.

UCLA is to be commended for facing issues of equity, diversity and inclusion head-on, through the articulation of thoughtful “principles of community,” dedicated leadership,

integrated processes, curricular requirements, and a commitment to assessing climate. It has developed a comprehensive set of dashboards that are very helpful to measure progress. Despite such focus, UCLA recognizes that progress has been uneven, particularly in terms of faculty diversity, with some areas making little to no progress. Consistently sharing best practices and effectively using dashboards to create a culture of accountability will help further improve diversity and inclusion (CFR 3.3). The team recommends that UCLA continue its efforts to recruit and retain faculty of color (CFRs 1.4, 3.3).

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5). UCLA has fully mitigated external financial pressures and balanced its budget through a combination of revenue diversification and efficiency measures, a remarkable accomplishment discussed in more detail in Component 7 (CFR 3.4).

At the same time, UCLA has made critical investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources. Generous donor support has enabled the campus to continue investing in physical infrastructure despite the decline in State funding, but space remains a scarce resource in a landlocked campus. The efforts under way to build additional housing for students and faculty are impressive. Such efforts are crucial to mitigate the high cost of housing for students, faculty and staff. The team also commends the investments in transformational pedagogical initiatives and in technology, including the current replacement of the financial information system (CFR 3.5).

As discussed in Component 7, the emerging strategic plan and the introduction of a new budget model will give UCLA the opportunity to map future sources and uses of resources, an essential exercise to maintaining its current momentum.

Organizational Structure and Decision-Making Processes. (CFRs 3.6-3.10). After years of very stable leadership, UCLA has recently made some substantive leadership changes (with a

new EVCP and a new CFO) (CFRs 3.6, 3.10). This change presents the opportunity to re-evaluate strategies and operating models from a new perspective. Not surprisingly, there is anxiety and apprehension about the many changes underway, including plans to introduce a new budget model.

UCLA benefits from strong Senate and faculty engagement over curricular and academic issues. This engagement includes regular reviews of academic programs and faculty, a rigorous approval process for new degree programs, and prominent campus-wide teaching awards (CFR 3.7). However, the approval process for self-supported degree programs has been challenged by some differences in expectations among deans and department chairs, the administration and the Academic Senate.

The richness of the UCLA ecosystem translates into a diversity of programs that support teaching (Instructional Development, Institutional Research, Information Technology). The fragmentation is most acute in IT. Unless actively managed, this decentralized approach could limit the impact and effectiveness of the various units. The issue of organizational effectiveness is further discussed in Component 7.

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3

***Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement***

UCLA leaders in partnership with faculty and professional staff have implemented robust processes dedicated to quality assurance and the promotion of self-reflection about how effectively the institution is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives.

Quality Assurance Processes (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). The university has developed and engaged campus constituents in quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review,

assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. The Program Approval Process and the undergraduate and graduate level are clearly outlined, and policies and procedures for the Academic Senate led Academic Program Review and the review schedule are documented (CFR 4.1). The program review for student affairs units is well-done. Although UCLA noted that it hoped that its review processes, and in particular learning outcomes and assessment results were further along, it has established processes for reasonable data collection, and for systematically evaluating and improving curricula and instructional practice.

The quality assurance processes at UCLA are connected to multiple units at the institution. Institutional research functions are largely decentralized, but the networked model seems to be working and influencing institutional planning and decision-making. During the visit the team learned that the institutional research effort conducted by IR professionals positioned throughout the campus seems to be supplying data and analysis to support decision making at all organizational levels and that it enjoys collaboration among the offices (CFR 4.2). The decentralization seems to be coordinated and UCLA sees advantages in having IR distributed across the institution. The office of Institutional Research and Decision Support was viewed by faculty and administrators as having capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. However, a campus review of IR is currently underway and some staff expressed a desire for greater use of data to inform decision-making. A staff member described the need for greater institutional leadership for assessment and institutional research, commenting: “assessment is more than just collecting data, it is about influencing decisions and changing things as a result and this requires administrative leaders to support this approach.” Overall, data seem to be disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-

making (CFR 4.2).

Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFR 4.3-4.7). UCLA's institutional reports demonstrates that the university has sustained a campus climate in support of strategic thinking, planning, and visioning exercises guided by empirical evidence and analyses, and annual and periodic assessment of academic programs, student affairs programs and administrative services. The use of quantitative evaluation of programs, such as the campus climate and diversity reports in student affairs, and the public accountability reports, and critical self-evaluation (i.e. the Moreno report) are used to understand and address institutional problems (CFR 4.3).

The extensiveness of resources and support for inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning at UCLA is enviable. Recent attention to culturally-inclusive pedagogy demonstrates the responsiveness of these resources. Formal structures including the Academic Senate Committee on Teaching, Undergraduate Council – Committee on the Curriculum, Graduate Council- Committee on Degree Programs, among others seem to be actively involved in assuring standards of performance. Faculty development units are also active in using results from learning assessments and other information to improve student learning to design workshops and materials and to program guidance to campus educators (CFR 4.4).

UCLA engages relevant stakeholders in assessment in educational programs and in planning processes to define the future direction of the university. The establishment of several Advisory Boards and involvement of alumni in more recent partnerships for Bruin Academy is a good start for involving stakeholders in assessment, however, these efforts are minimal. The institution has demonstrated the involvement of constituents in other ways, notably planning for IT, strategic planning for the Library and the Anderson School of Management (CFR 4.5).

Again, UCLA points out a few areas in need for further development on CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5. The team agrees with this appraisal and is encouraged that UCLA has a well thought out and documented approach that will over time, likely position the university as a national exemplar for peer institutions.

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4.

**IIC. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degree**  
(CFRs 1.2, 2.2-2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.12, 4.3)

Upon review of Component 3 for which the institution must define the meaning, quality and integrity of its degrees, the team finds UCLA continues its excellent work in preparing students to make meaningful contributions to society. In keeping with its mission, "UCLA endeavors to integrate education, research, and service so that each enriches and extends to the other," this strong emphasis on interdisciplinary education has served the institution well as it looks to strengthen the relevance of a UCLA education in an individualized context for its students. In addition, it is maintaining its national and international prominence as a major research institution committed to inquiry and discovery.

Interdisciplinary Foundation. The breadth and scope of educational offerings that underscore interdisciplinarity is impressive, particularly when viewed in the context of dedicated research through one of the 18 Organized Research Units (ORUs), growing engagement with study abroad experiences, and entrepreneurial and collaborative partnerships. In all of these aspects, what it means to receive an education at UCLA can be summed up as a strong commitment to providing an education that values the totality of the human experience.

In the pursuit of cutting-edge research, the quest to be a national leader can sometimes overshadow why the research is conducted in the first place. With all of the success UCLA has with securing over a billion dollars in federal funding, there is a genuine sense that the faculty



at UCLA are equally committed to mentoring future researchers and scholars, as they are their own research. This entrepreneurial approach to “developing the pipeline of future scholars” continues to enrich and provide value to all members of the campus and surrounding community. Opportunities to present during the Undergraduate Research Week, coupled with strong collaborations between business, science, engineering and medicine, UCLA continues its path of excellence to developing future generations of critical thinkers. In meeting with student leaders, they praised the institution for its amazing faculty and their scholarship with firm commitments to excellence and academic rigor. In similar fashion, both students and senior administrators in student affairs shared encouraging insights into the importance of the educational experiences that happen outside of the classroom. Dedicated cultural spaces that provide opportunities for meditation and reflection as well as foster a general sense of well-being through the Depression Grand Challenge underscore the important synergies of experiences that further enhance the meaning of the actual formal disciplinary studies. This integrated approach to completing the various degree requirements is arguably contributing factors to UCLA’s laudable graduation rates.

An equally important tenant of an interdisciplinary education at UCLA is the idea of strong civic engagement. Programs such as Community Engagement and Social Change provide critical crosscutting learning opportunities that enable students to fully understand the larger context of their communities (and the world) in which they live. The fact that the institution has a vibrant volunteer center as a stand-alone entity to serve the greater Los Angeles community, as well as the Public Service and Civic Engagement Living Learning Community, further emphasizes the uniqueness of the institution’s holistic approach to education. Key efforts such as "Project Brainstorm" are to be commended as inspirational outreach programs to K-12 schools. These efforts enable student teams to meet with faculty, staff and K-12 students

to expose them to the wonders of science. This collaborative experience, along with a host of others, is just scratching the surface of what is possible. The team was informed of the 2000 students per year who volunteered at UCLA's hospital. This presents a unique set of challenges with needing to certify the number of volunteers for the clinical programs in a timely manner. These service-learning and volunteer experiences are excellent pathways to enhancing one's critical understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusive excellence.

Embracing Difference (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion). UCLA has taken a number of important steps in recent years to more readily address the epistemologies that undergird how students understand difference as it relates to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, class, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, age, language, nationality, citizenship status and place of origin. Recent efforts by some Schools and Colleges to institute a diversity requirement as a component of the baccalaureate degree requirement is a step in the right direction. For Schools that have yet to adopt the requirement, some have found innovative ways to incorporate meaningful diversity experiences in core classes such as the ethics course in Engineering. As learning outcomes are further refined, it would be all the more impressive for future review teams to witness how foundational learning experience related to diversity, equity, and inclusion have become part of the core General Education requirement regardless of major or discipline.

Co-curricular Experiences. It is clear that the institution has given much thought to the question of why inquiry and discovery are so important outside of the traditional classroom as it is inside. Students are being prepared to identify solutions to some of the nation's most vexing social challenges and one program worth noting is the Healthy Campus Initiative (HCI). Encouraging students to pay attention to their social, physical, and mental well-being is an incredibly complicated, yet necessary, process for universities to steward. UCLA has managed

to build an infrastructure of support that reinforces the ideas of wellness through dedicated curricula and service opportunities. What remains unclear for the moment is the role advisors, and by extension the broader advising infrastructure, play in these processes. Given the current and potential increases in class size of future incoming cohorts, the student advisor ratio is an area that will require additional strategies to ensure student success.

**IID. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3)**

UCLA has had a strong tradition of excellence in education and research. Work since the 2010 Commission review has further strengthened this area. The institution has published program level learning outcomes in their General Catalog for their degree programs across the board and in program requirements for the graduate division. Seventy-one of 140 undergraduate majors have been certified as Capstone Majors under the initiative of the same name, meaning that roughly one-third of undergraduates at UCLA receive a degree with a capstone project or experience. The descriptions of these programs are readily available on websites and have been provided as part of this review in the IEEI forms.

UCLA has mapped the WSCUC Core Competencies to Undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes. This map reveals the institution's expectations for the development of core competencies in written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking, in programs. Program learning outcomes indicate that all undergraduate majors have learning outcomes that address critical thinking outcomes; more than 90% each have written communication and information literacy outcomes; 84% have outcomes that address oral communication, and 50% have outcomes addressing quantitative reasoning. In addition, the UCLA general education requirements provide further avenues for core competency development in all of these areas.

The map connecting WSCUC Core Competencies and program learning outcomes is an

impressive demonstration of alignment. However, as UCLA indicated in its Institutional Report, not all WSCUC Core Competencies have been evaluated through the direct assessment of capstone or culminating student projects. Indirect evidence via surveys (University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey and the UCLA Senior Survey) that measure student self-reported learning at all degree levels and for a wide range of outcomes is routinely examined and considered by academic programs to determine if action is needed. This evidence demonstrates that at the end of their undergraduate program, students consistently self-assess a high level of accomplishment for each Core Competency, and results over time show an increase in self-reported skill attainment by student cohort. The team encourages UCLA to explore greater use of direct evidence of students' achievement of Core Competencies to complement the robust indirect evidence to inform changes in pedagogy, curriculum or assessment.

During the site visit, the team learned that the process of documenting learning outcomes at the graduate level was a useful experience to demonstrate to faculty that the outcomes were indeed present. It brought the Graduate Council together which was viewed positively.

Program Review Process and Assessment Paradigm. The assessment process at UCLA is to evaluate learning where it occurs by providing tools and pathways to faculty to conduct assessment within their academic programs. The faculty can avail themselves of five different pathways for assessment: 1) survey research (see below); 2) assessment for instructional development; 3) faculty initiated projects; 4) assessment for specialty accreditation; and 5) learning outcomes assessment for program review.

The academic program review process is overseen and managed by the Academic Senate. The requirements for program review are to state program learning objectives and

describe student performance of these learning outcomes. Self-study reports are expected to provide several forms of assessment-based evidence such as information from surveys as well as direct assessment of student work. While perhaps not as far along as they had hoped, 16 of 33 recent program reviews included assessment as part of the self-study. The Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE) is continuing to focus attention on increasing use of assessment. They have developed toolkits and additional resources to enable more faculty to incorporate direct assessment of student work into the program review process.

There is a large team of staff available to support assessment activities dispersed among many academic and service units across UCLA. An excellent example of support for assessment, and continuous improvement is in the example UCLA provides of the program review for the Geography Department. Student papers at lower level were compared with work from upper level students to track skill development. In response to results from the assessment, instructors participated in workshops to help improve their assignment prompts to further build writing skills.

Another form of quality assurance is the course approval process. The UCLA Academic Senate is responsible for approving new courses and substantial revisions of courses. As part of this process, course learning objectives and competencies must be stated on the course syllabi. This is yet another example of UCLA's commitment to the core competencies expected by WSCUC.

UCLA has an extensive portfolio of survey research including:

- CIRP Entering Freshman Survey
- Transfer Student Survey
- University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES)
- Senior Survey

- Doctoral Exit Survey and Report Sample
- Career Competencies Dashboard
- Student Self-Assessment

The evidence from the data gathered is that both first-year entrants and transfer students of successive cohorts report positive competency gains on the UCUES in the areas of quantitative skills, writing, preparing and making presentations, information research skills and analytical and critical thinking. UCLA also reports that the Senior Survey shows similar findings.

UCLA's Center for Education Innovation and Learning in the Sciences (CEILS) as well as the Center for the Advancement of Teaching are instrumental in supporting faculty with innovation in pedagogy and assessment of such. CEILS has helped identify courses where improvements in pedagogy could be beneficial. The team learned from many constituents that the impact of workshops and programs through CEILS are being utilized by faculty as they engage new pedagogical techniques.

The extensive investment in survey research provides UCLA with abundant information to couple with assessment reports in order to make a substantial impact on meeting needs of students between this review and its next accreditation review. Examples of where UCLA has used data collection to drive change is on work with students with dependents, and the graduate division dashboards which have surfaced information on student funding across different source types. In addition, the graduate student exit surveys have been useful in program reviews mandated by the Academic Senate.

Continuous Review and Improvement. In the arena of assessment, the Division of Undergraduate Education evaluated the consistency and quality of learning outcomes assessment that supports the program review process. They found that there was uneven engagement, and they are working toward greater engagement in this area. The team believes

that UCLA will achieve its goals.

UCLA has a strategic planning process that launched in 2015 to coincide with their centennial in 2019. There are five areas of planning: Education Innovation, Research Innovation, Civic Engagement and Community, Global Outreach and Institutional Effectiveness. The goals, particularly of Education Innovation fall directly into this area of the review. Plans to strengthen and transform pedagogy through hybrid courses look promising. The area of Research Innovation has been expanded to include Creative Innovation where it will embrace a broader spectrum of disciplines. The Vice Chancellor for Research has plans to incentivize research in multiple areas.

The third area for the strategic plan is Civic Engagement. During the campus visit, the team learned that UCLA has a great deal of engagement with its local communities, but that frequently because of the vast number of programs across this large campus community who work independently, the quantity, quality and impact of the effort is hard to measure. The strategic planning committee intends to coordinate activity, elevate and increase the scale of UCLA's existing civic engagement efforts, emphasize reciprocity and mutuality in community partnerships, and develop more effective communication about accomplishments to alumni and to the local community. The review team applauds these efforts and believes that documentation of efforts will reveal the current strength of engagement and will also allow for more strategic investments.

**III. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation**  
(CFRs 1.2, 2.7, 2.10, 2.13, 2.2 4.3, 4.7)

The Institutional Report and associated evidence document UCLA's significant commitment to student success. With a graduation rate of 80%, UCLA demonstrates a strong overall graduation outcome. The steady increase since 2000 in the percentage of students earning a degree in 4 years, and similar rise in 2-year graduation rates for transfer students, is

notable. Appropriately, UCLA engages in ongoing study of what contributes to these increases. For example, a study was conducted in DUE to assess whether students directed to “Tassels to the Left”, where students can find degree pathways toward completion in as few as three years of undergraduate study and a map to remain on schedule for an early or on-time graduation, demonstrated faster time to degree. Although the equity of graduation rates for student subpopulations is admirable, completion rate gaps persist. To address these disparities, UCLA has committed to a variety of programs and services that are proven to influence undergraduate students’ success (CFRs 1.2, 2.13, 4.3).

WSCUC’s Graduation Rate Dashboard (GRD) has provided UCLA with additional opportunities to explore the specific courses that put students at risk of not completing. The institution made extensive use of the undergraduate student credit hour (SCH) totals in a campus institutional research project that mined these totals to identify that the greatest number of unredeemed SCH were taught in the sciences, and students receiving the lowest grades in particular combinations of science and math courses were likely to leave UCLA after only a few terms of study. These findings helped influence departmental implementation of active and inclusive learning techniques in the specific courses identified by this study, and has promoted criterion-referenced grading (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 4.3).

The foundation of a culture that supports student success is a fundamental understanding of who students are and what they are experiencing. UCLA has studied its enrolled population extensively, and attends to how all groups including underrepresented minorities (URM) and Pell recipients, and the approximately one-third of the undergraduate population who enter as transfer students, mostly from California community colleges, are doing. During the visit the team learned that the analyses by URM status and associated attention to equity, diversity and inclusion has helped lead faculty in life sciences to embrace active learning, flipped



classrooms, and inclusive practices that have fundamentally motivated faculty to think differently about teaching. Of note, is a course in statistics that analyzes various data sets related to diversity and inclusion that has a strong writing component, requires students to examine the data and surrounding challenges, and aims to inform students thinking about DEI in nontraditional spaces. UCLA has also invested in necessary tools for generating and reviewing statistical indicators of retention, graduation, and time to degree that are reported by demographic group and by degree program. They also make good use of The UC Information Center undergraduate graduation rate dashboard (CFRs 4.3, 4.7).

As UCLA described in its Institutional Report, the largest portion of students who leave without a degree (3% to 4%) depart before their second fall term. In 2018-19, DUE introduced the Undergraduate Persistence Program to collect information from the divisional equity advisors and the undergraduate programs that have lost the greatest number of students after their first year. Information about departing students from the prior year, their demographic characteristics, academic performance, and evidence of experiences on campus will be reported annually, and the analysis will indicate one of several interventions to promote higher first-year retention rates for the program's current cohort of entering undergraduates. Interventions such as reaching out to students experiencing difficulty in particular courses or establishing peer study groups, are just some of the actions to undertake (CFRs 2.2, 2.10, 2.13, 4.3).

The institution has developed a plethora of tailored and individualized programs that serve unique student populations. UCLA has assessed aspects of students' experience that hinders their success, for example, food insecurity and a lack of availability of meals during spring break, which led the campus to establish a food closet and expanded dining hall hours. By all accounts, these programs seem responsive to and enjoyed by their respective student

populations. However, there is considerable and understandable redundancies across programs and it might be worthwhile to consider greater coordination and centralization of some aspects of these programs (CFR 2.13).

UCLA's emphasis on improvements in the classroom climate for diverse students and to analyzing courses that negatively impact students' progress toward completing their degree in the major of their choice, has been an essential aspect of a comprehensive approach to increasing equity in student success. The report, *Enhancing Student Success and Building Inclusive Classrooms at UCLA*, describes several analytic techniques to highlight the characteristics of courses that award a higher count of low grades. The study emphasizes how courses that compromise the success of UCLA's underrepresented students pose the same difficulties for other student groups; therefore, implementing pedagogical change where it is needed should benefit all undergraduates. The Institutional Report detailed how this information and the Course Outcome Dashboard for Education (CODE) have helped deans, chairs and faculty make revisions to instructional techniques and modify grading policies. During the visit faculty noted lessons learned from the dashboard and the changes initiated. A faculty member commented, "when I saw the dashboard results I was floored. I was then committed to making a change." Another faculty member described the magnitude of instructional changes as: "the advances in teaching and the shift to evidence-based decisions has been the difference between night and day." An administrator added that there is now considerably more interest in doing things better to support student success, including improved pedagogy, knowledge about attainment gaps, and attention to students' mental health. UCLA has demonstrated an enduring commitment to continuous improvement through recognizing where change is needed and by employing evidence to pursue the campus vision for equity in undergraduate student performance (CFRs 2.2, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4). The team

recommends that UCLA continue its work in this area with a focus on eliminating equity gaps in retention and graduation rates and strengthening collaborations between the office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and the cultural, educational, and resource support services for students across the campus (CFRs 1.2, 14, 2.10, 2.13).

UCLA invested in advising and the enhancement of educational goal planning and academic support. The team observed a vibrant peer tutoring program as part of the Academic Advising Program in Campbell Hall. During the visit, the team met with staff from the Student Advising Group and was impressed by the dedication of the staff and the efforts they have made to accommodate the surge in UCLA's enrollment in the past decade. Staff expressed appreciation for the Professional Development Program developed by the campus, but raised concerns about retention and burnout of advisors. Although the quality of academic advising seems sufficient, the team encourages the institution to assess the effectiveness of the current advising processes and resources. In addition, during the visit, discussion about student support and advising turned to the notable attention that UCLA has paid to addressing mental and physical well-being and assuring basic needs including food insecurity. Institutional action to build innovative treatment networks and support for students is a noteworthy undertaking at UCLA (CFRs 2.13, 4.7).

Given space constraints and the sheer inability to bring on more staff, peer teaching and advising is a significant source of support for student success. Despite the potential challenges with over-reliance on peer-to-peer models of instruction and advising, UCLA has done a remarkable job at taking advantage of this supportive structure. For example, the Bruin Resource Center was highlighted by administrators, students and faculty as a model for peer tutoring. In addition, the long-standing Academic Advancement Program (AAP) includes peer learning (tutoring) in its array of academic services that support students from groups

historically underserved in higher education and the Learning Assistants (LA) program in the sciences is an evidence-based strategy for improving student performance. The writing center has seen dramatic increases in appointments and the use of peer tutors and all indicators suggest this is working well for students. The use of expert peer tutors is a student success strategy that UCLA should be applauded for thoughtfully implementing and supporting (CFR 2.13). Additionally, the institution has demonstrated a great deal of flexibility in rethinking the sequencing and delivery of content to strengthen the relevancy of material. One student support professional stated “there’s a new approach to teaching key courses like calculus which is part of the biology major – no longer is the course taught for the sake of its beauty from a traditionalist point of view, instead it’s taught to underscore its relevance to the natural environment.”

UCLA takes understandable pride in its students’ accomplishments after graduation (Success after Graduation) and in their diverse graduate student population’s success. Data from the First Destination Survey demonstrates that nearly 50% of graduates reported that they found work or were immediately enrolling in graduate study.

UCLA’s focus on graduate student success has emphasized increasing diversity and this has recently paid off, with more than 20% URM for new graduate students in fall 2018. A variety of graduate student support programs are in place to address graduate student career needs and to build community. The commitment to improve graduate student success has increased in recent years. UCLA has been exploring time-to-degree requirements and benchmarking student completion to be more transparent about timelines for reaching milestones and to analyze disparities by student demographic characteristics. Data demonstrate some concerns about extended time to degree. During the visit the team learned of some graduate students’ concern that time to degree may be lengthened by intense workload

expectations for graduate students, particularly in labs. This observation from students was not substantiated with evidence, but workload equity, approaches to addressing grievances, and the quality of graduate students experience is something UCLA will want to examine as it studies graduate student success. The team encourages UCLA to continue its focus on graduate student success and to examine issues of equity and quality in the experience (CFRs 2.2b, 4.3).

Although the theme of space has emerged both as an opportunity area as well as a key focus for future improvements in student success, the team would be remiss to not mention it as a critical component that will require further innovation and attention to meet the needs of students. Housing insecurity was major concern among student leaders, and it undoubtedly has an adverse impact on how students perform academically. The team fully acknowledges the constraints under which the university is operating and its future plans for expanded graduate housing and train station access.

### **IIF. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1-4.7)**

UCLA celebrates its centennial year in 2019. To help prepare the campus for its future, in 2015 the campus identified five strategic planning themes: education innovation, research innovation, civic engagement & community outreach, global outreach and institutional effectiveness. The resulting plans were formulated with the help of input and feedback from the campus' stakeholders and are accessible to the public. The plans show ample evidence of a thoughtful appraisal of areas of growth and development for the campus. The final phases of the vision for the strategic plan have been completed and they are set for discussion with the new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP) in the short term.

As with all campuses of the University of California system, UCLA conducts regular reviews of its degree programs. These reviews are conducted by the administration with the assistance of a review committee comprised of external reviewers and faculty members of

UCLA (representing the UCLA Division of the Academic Senate). The UCLA campus provided the review team ample evidence of departmental and program reviews:

1. 2006-2007 Review of the Department of Applied Linguistics;
2. 2014-2015 Review of the Italian and 2015-2016 Review of the Germanic Studies and Scandinavian Section;
3. 2015-2016 Review of Neuroscience Interdepartmental Graduate Degree Program;
4. 2016-2017 Review of the International Development Studies (IDS) Interdepartmental Degree Program;
5. 2017-2018 Review of Life Sciences Core Program;
6. 2013-2104 Review of Musicology; and
7. 2016-2017 Review of the Department of Social Welfare.

The review of the Department of Applied Linguistics is notable in that it led to the disestablishment of the department in 2014. On the other hand, the response to the concerns raised by an earlier review of the IDS program led to a transformation of the program. All of the reports provided to the team were exhaustive in detail and showed a robust system of self-reflection and inquiry that has served the UCLA campus well. The team was impressed by the thoughtfulness and effort that programs placed on their reviews and responses to issues raised by the reviewers. The review process has been amended over time and now includes components on equity, diversity, and inclusion. With increased emphasis on student learning outcomes (SLO), the team anticipates that UCLA will include additional data on SLO in future reviews.

Typically, each program is reviewed every eight years and the review process provides the program with the opportunity to perform a critical self-evaluation and assemble a self-review report. This self-review includes peer comparisons, climate surveys, data from student exit surveys, a detailed study of data on a wide range of metrics including graduation rates, teaching

effectiveness, and faculty promotion, retention, and research productivity. The self-review is also distributed to standing committees of the UCLA Division of the Academic Senate for their commentary and feedback. The standing committees include Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and the Council on Planning and Budget, among others. The final report of the review committee is written after a site visit by the review committee and identifies areas of concern, growth, and future focus for the program. The final report and the self-critical evaluation are made accessible to all students and faculty in the program for their feedback and response. The program is then given an opportunity to respond to the findings and recommendations of the review committee and draft a plan of action to address issues that the review uncovered. Even for programs that are among the top ranked nationwide, it is typical for these reviews to raise issues that need to be addressed. The program is given the opportunity to address these concerns and make changes to the program. A progress review report that summarizes these changes is presented to the Academic Senate one year following the review. The response to the review is then used to determine the next review cycle for the program or department.

Courses of instruction at UCLA must be approved by the Academic Senate's Committee on Curriculum. In addition, proposals for new graduate and undergraduate degree programs are reviewed by the Academic Senates, Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, respectively. The team heard some concerns about the efficiency of this process from different stakeholders but nothing that detracts from its integrity.

The campus is also in the process of constructing curriculum maps for all programs (2018-2021). The previous WSCUC review mentioned that "there would be value in students being brought into discussion about student learning outcomes." In response to this suggestion, the Division of Undergraduate Education organized a Learning Outcomes Student Forum in the Fall

of 2017. Learning outcomes are available for all courses and can be accessed online. UCLA's Center for Education Innovation and Learning in the Sciences (CEILS) provides assistance to faculty in the sciences to formulate student learning outcomes, design inclusive syllabi, and develop assessment strategies. It is not clear if similar support programs are available to faculty in other areas.

To assess teaching, since 2016, the evaluation of teaching is conducted using an online system. The system is supported by the UCLA Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning's Evaluation of Instruction Program. This program also provides help to faculty wishing to use Scantron's to evaluate their instruction. Examples of the forms, which are customizable for instructors and teaching assistants, used to evaluate instruction are available online at a portal supported by the center. This resource is also helpful to instructors wishing to conduct mid-quarter evaluations of their courses and instruction. Excellence in teaching is promoted by the campus with the help of the annual distinguished teaching awards. The awardees are selected by the Academic Senate's Committee on Teaching. Additionally awards are also presented in non-senate faculty and teaching assistants. Recipients of this award include some of the most distinguished faculty on the campus. While the annual number of senate faculty recipients of the teaching award is comparable to other campus' the annual number of awards for graduate student instructors is small: only five are given out each year.

University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) is conducted on every UC campus every other spring. The quantitative data from 2004, 2006-2014, are publicly accessible from the UCLA Student Affairs Information and Research Office. A dashboard system has also been incorporated by the University of California's Office of the President to facilitate viewing of this extensive data set. This data is used to monitor campus climate issues both at UCLA and systemwide. The issues and topics surveyed include affordability, academic



engagement, educational experiences, co-curricular activities personal safety, tolerance to diversity, political, gender, socio-economic, and religious biases. In all of the survey data presented, UCLA shows a remarkable similarity to the systemwide norms. Given, the size of the student population at UCLA, the overall satisfaction of students with the campus is remarkable.

In addition to the UCUES data, a campus climate survey was recently commissioned by the University of California's Office of the President. This survey was conducted on all 10 campuses by an independent consultant, Rankin & Associates, and surveyed students, staff, faculty, and postdoctoral researchers. A report was issued in 2014 for the UCLA campus. For the campus, the report raised three areas where opportunities for improvement were present. However, the findings were consistent with nationwide data the consultants performing the survey have found. It is not clear if this extensive system-wide survey will be repeated or if the response by campuses to the survey will be monitored.

During the visit the team met with many staff engaged in assessment and institutional research activities. It is clear that these units provide a great deal of support to the efforts to collect and disseminate information that can be and is used to improve pedagogy and climate for students. The team also noticed an emphasis on the desire to develop and implement self-supported degree programs in a timely manner and plans to expand the educational footprint through UCLA's Extension Program. The team concluded that UCLA has a well-developed set of processes to maintain program quality and integrity.

### **IIIG. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment (CFRs 3.4, 3.7, 4.1,4.3-4.7)**

From a financial standpoint, UCLA operates from a position of relative strength for a number of reasons:

- It continues to enjoy very strong student demand due to the quality and diversity of its programs;

- It has effectively used non-resident tuition making up for some of the reduction in State funding and the negative impact of re-benching;
- Self-supporting programs and IP commercialization have also experienced successes, culminating with the \$1.1 billion Xtandi monetization;
- The Centennial Campaign achieved a remarkable fundraising amount of \$5.2 billion by the time of the site visit. Of particular notice were the \$585 million raised for student support, which could augment or replace core funding with gifts and endowment revenues;
- Efficiency measures ranging from asset utilizations, some administrative consolidations and technology enabled workflows have also contributed to UCLA's resilience.

These remarkable strengths and accomplishments have allowed UCLA to consistently invest in its academic mission. They also give UCLA the ability to make thoughtful investments in areas that will contribute to its financial sustainability going forward.

UCLA can also be commended for thinking more holistically about sustainability. Ecological sustainability is also an important campus priority, and the report provides evidence of significant impact in both energy management and water conservation. The academic engagement from both students and researchers on operational issues is also commendable.

Financial levers used to date may however not be able to carry UCLA in the future:

- State funding is subject to competing priorities;
- Enrollment growth is limited by both academic and physical considerations, as the campus is landlocked;
- Tuition is currently frozen across the University of California system;
- Non-resident enrollment has been capped at 23% of California enrollment;
- IP commercialization revenues are unpredictable;

- The Health System's ability to contribute to the Health Sciences academic enterprise may be impacted by industry-wide margin compression.

In addition, UCLA recognizes the need for further investment in both ladder-rank faculty (in select areas) and in graduate student funding.

In this context, UCLA's Strategic Planning Initiative and the Institutional Effectiveness Task Force have focused on how to make UCLA more agile and more able to respond more quickly and effectively to changes in the external environment, particularly changes in resources. Its findings should help UCLA tackle the need for more revenue diversification and further improve its organizational effectiveness.

From a revenue standpoint, the team encourages UCLA to keep looking at new revenue sources, both from academic program innovation and from business or financial income. Such efforts will benefit from the excellent work under way in several areas. First, UCLA appreciates that more self-supporting programs will allow the institution to expand its teaching mission, respond to market and employment demands, and explore new modes of instructional delivery. The approval process for self-supported degree programs has been challenged by some differences in expectations between the academic and administrative leadership and the Academic Senate. Department chairs feel caught between the demands of the administration and the Academic Senate, slowing down innovation. All parties are looking for increased engagement. Their suggestions for consideration included a town hall meeting of the chairs with the Senate leadership, more regular consultative meetings between the chancellor, the EVCP and the Senate leadership. Such interactions might be beneficial in improving relations and in encouraging a wider diversity of faculty to participate in Senate leadership positions. The team recommends that UCLA strengthen communication on approval processes and expectations for new programs among department chairs, deans, the Academic Senate, and the administration

(CFRs 3.7, 4.7).

Another new revenue consideration includes on-line or flexible learning, certificates, or summer programs, which would provide new revenue sources within the physical constraints of a land-locked campus. UCLA Extension could play an important role in such strategies if appropriately integrated with the rest of the institution. The development of a new budget model can be instrumental in providing appropriate incentives to local academic units while still contributing to the financial health of the campus as a whole. Budget models are key enablers of a successful strategic plan. Not surprisingly, there is anxiety and apprehension about the new model which is still not broadly understood. Clearly articulating its benefits, actively and iteratively engaging academic and financial leaders and watching for unintended consequences will be essential to its success. It is also worth noting that while activity-based models are common amongst UCLA's peers, none are under the constraints imposed by the outside. The ability to set compensation and raises is one of the important levers in activity-based budgeting, and these are not entirely within UCLA's control. This will present some challenges that will require special attention.

From an effectiveness standpoint, the UCLA campus enjoys a culture of fairly extensive decentralization. While local empowerment has created a rich ecosystem and fostered local innovation, it creates a risk of duplicative or suboptimal infrastructure and presents an opportunity to better drive synergies to ensure that "the total is greater than the sum of the parts". For example, several offices support UCLA's transformational initiatives in pedagogy such as the Center for the Advancement of Teaching, the Center for Education Innovation & Learning in the Sciences, and the Center for Community Learning. As another example, institutional research (IR) at UCLA is decentralized across 12 offices. The fragmentation is most acute in IT: most administrative and academic units have their own IT organization.

UCLA has been actively thinking on the balance between centralization and decentralization, a challenge faced by many large universities. During 2018, a campus institutional research capacity evaluation assessed the alignment of IR resources to better support local campus decision makers. The Institutional Effectiveness Task Force also recommended empowering a group to create and implement a standard set of criteria and process for determining what campus functions should (and should not) be centralized. It also recommended implementing a UCLA “Lean Team” that identifies opportunities for improving processes across campus, develop plans for addressing them, and facilitates their implementation. More recently, a cross-functional team of administrative and academic leaders implemented a robust governance system to foster collaboration and harmonization across the multiple IT units. Yet during the visit, many staff members lamented the lack of progress and expressed frustration with duplicate functions, lack of shared data and the resulting pervasiveness of multiple shadow systems with their associated risk on data integrity and cybersecurity. IT and HR were seen as primary areas of concern.

Acting selectively but decisively and actively managing change will be important for the success of the campus. IT remains a priority area in response to the new data-driven IT landscape. While the new governance model will improve coordination, the team strongly encourages UCLA to formally integrate its fragmented IT units for a number of reasons, including:

- The importance of system integration and data aggregation for student success analytics;
- The need for cost-effective and optimized business processes to improve service to students, faculty and staff;
- The opportunity to optimize systems selection and licensing costs from a campus-wide perspective;

- The development of coherent and scalable institutional responses to cybersecurity threats and increased compliance demands;
- The need to tightly and measurably integrate IT with the university strategy;
- The importance for skill development and promotion of scarce IT talent.

The team recommends that UCLA continue to actively optimize its organizational models, and particularly integrate its fragmented IT units, to make the total greater than the sum of its parts (CFRs 3.5, 3.7, 4.7). Developing a campus-wide culture of continuous improvement that extends well beyond the scope of a “Lean Team” will be equally important.

At the same time, careful change management and deep engagement at all levels will be critical in an organization operating under a certain amount of stress. After years of very stable leadership, UCLA has recently made some substantive leadership changes (with a new EVCP and a new CFO). This change presents the opportunity to re-evaluate strategies and operating models from a new perspective. Not surprisingly, there is anxiety and apprehension about the many changes underway, including the planned introduction of a new budget model as mentioned above. The UCPath implementation has tested the resilience of the UCLA community, and continues to present challenges and frustration. As an unfortunate result, many staff members expressed anxiety with respect to upcoming system implementation efforts.

On the positive side, there is tremendous commitment to the mission across the UCLA community. The caliber of talent, passion and proven ability to adapt gives much confidence in the campus’ ability to successfully implement its strategic intent. The team recommends that UCLA deeply engage with key stakeholders, adjust pace to reflect change readiness and the multiplicity of initiatives, ensure transparency, and respond to feedback as needed (CFRs 3.7, 4.7).

### **III. Component 8: Reflection and Plans for Improvement**

UCLA's centennial celebration is a significant marker in the maturation of a diverse, international university powered by extensive resources and a renowned reputation. The Institutional Report comprehensively depicts the institutions deep foundation in educational effectiveness, commitment to the academic mission, and recent advances to assure greater emphasis on attaining a diverse, equitable and inclusive educational community. UCLA has dedicated appropriate attention to issues of concern including assessment of student learning and diversity raised in its previous reaffirmation review. Student success measures including completion rates and post-college outcomes are particularly impressive. Of course, the Institutional Report and meetings with UCLA faculty, staff and students during the team's visit pointed out new challenges raised by state funding gaps, a lagging IT infrastructure, a proposed new budget model, and pending changes in administrative leadership.

UCLA's comprehensive and self-reflective Institutional Report thoughtfully discussed plans for improvement. With regard to quality assurance and WSCUC standards, UCLA conducted a complete review that demonstrated appropriate institutional self-analysis and the identification of strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention. The institution described the topics to which it aspires to greater accomplishment in four areas that represent both institutional achievements and plans for further growth: strategic planning, assessment of student learning, exploration of new budget models, and attainment of equity, diversity and inclusion.

UCLA appropriately reflected on its strengths in the assessment of student learning, namely the generation of knowledge through assessment research that informs the science of teaching and learning. However, areas for growth include more formal assessment of culminating student work in academic programs at all degree levels. This requires greater investment in learning

outcomes assessment infrastructure, building of curricular maps and stronger program learning outcomes, and greater connection between assessment and faculty development.

The team wholeheartedly encourages UCLA to invest in its plans to strengthen and transform pedagogy via cross-campus support for teaching needs to create an imaginative range of activities to advance classroom practice. This effort and others to enrich civic engagement promise to deepen students' experience of living and working in Los Angeles, and to assure the institution's longer-term vision for pedagogic advancement and a place that inspires acting locally while thinking globally. The team recommends that UCLA continue to deepen its investment in the Los Angeles community and to better document its impact and outcomes (CFRs 1.1, 4.6).

UCLA's longstanding efforts to create a campus environment characterized by equity, diversity, and inclusion, is an essential commitment to ensure future growth. The institution has an outstanding record of creating equitable and just processes, conducting groundbreaking research regarding diversity, and to addressing inequities. Leadership for diversity, equity and inclusion will be important to maintaining these strengths and to advance campus plans to capitalize on empirical scholarship to design and implement localized student-centered interventions that ultimately close achievement gaps. UCLA is well positioned to develop national models for using data to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion.

### **SECTION III– COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

UCLA has conducted a thorough examination of its practices, policies and programs to fulfill the intended outcomes of a WSCUC reaccreditation review. The institution's comprehensive approach to produce an Institutional Report, to provide the team additional evidence, and to ensure a wide range of faculty, staff and student participation in site visit, reflects the institution's commitment to standards and more importantly, to strengthening its



educational effectiveness. This closing section discusses the team's commendations and recommendations.

Commendations. The team commends UCLA for the following accomplishments and practices:

1. Preparing a thorough, comprehensive Institutional Report that reflects an engaging process of widespread involvement in a long-term process of critical self-reflection and innovation. The team also commends UCLA for the warm welcome at the site visit, and the participation of so many stakeholders who came out to meet with the team.
2. Facing issues of equity, diversity and inclusion head-on, through the articulation of thoughtful "principles of community," dedicated leadership, integrated processes, curricular requirements, and a commitment to assessing climate.
3. Supporting faculty to expand their capacity to teach in more inclusive, culturally relevant ways and to enact active, engaging pedagogy that supports students and their learning and makes a demonstrable improvement in the quality of teaching. What is impressive is the extent to which faculty genuinely engage in their own capacity building experiences as a result of these efforts and are committed to creating sustainable long-term change.
4. Focusing significant attention and care for undergraduate students and their success. Sustaining a high six-year graduation rate of 91% during a 14-year period where the number of undergraduates increased from 27,120 to 31,346. During this time period, the four-year graduation rate increased in a remarkably monotonic manner.
5. Responding to the needs of an impressively diverse and talented student body through a variety of programs and support services. The team was impressed with the emphasis on student health and wellbeing, particularly the Healthy Campus Initiative and the Depression Grand Challenge.
6. Establishing a data-rich, evidence-informed culture through systematic surveys,

dashboards, analyses, and a commitment to using information to assess and improve the student experience, faculty diversity and pedagogical practice.

7. Successfully mitigating the reduction in state funding and the negative impact of re-benching through use of non-resident tuition, revenue generation from self-supporting programs and IP commercialization, and targeted efficiency measures. The Centennial Campaign achieved a remarkable fundraising amount of \$4.4 billion by the time of the report. These efforts have enabled UCLA to work from a position of relative strength and to make thoughtful investments in areas that will contribute to its financial sustainability.

Recommendations. The team makes five recommendations.

1. After years of very stable leadership at the top, UCLA has recently made some substantive leadership changes that present the opportunity to re-evaluate strategies and processes with a new perspective, which can be very positive. Not surprisingly, there is anxiety and apprehension about the many changes underway, including plans to introduce a new budget model that is still not well understood. The team recommends that UCLA deeply engage with key stakeholders, adjust pace to reflect change readiness and the multiplicity of initiatives, ensure transparency, and respond to feedback as needed. (CFRs 3.7, 4.7)
2. UCLA has made significant progress to advance equity, diversity and inclusion. The team recommends that UCLA continue its work in this area with a focus on eliminating equity gaps in retention and graduation rates and in recruiting and retaining faculty of color. The team also recommends that UCLA strengthen more formal collaborations between the office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and the cultural, educational, and resource support services for students across the campus. (CFRs 1.2, 1.4, 2.13)

3. The strategic plan has called for educational, research and strategic innovation as a priority for UCLA. The team recommends that UCLA strengthen communication on approval processes and expectations for new programs among department chairs, deans, the Academic Senate, and the administration. (CFRs 3.7, 4.7)
4. UCLA's strategic plan calls attention to advancing civic engagement. The team applauds UCLA's effort to further develop, coordinate and highlight its civic activities and programs. The team recommends that UCLA continue to deepen its investment in the Los Angeles community and to better document its impact and outcomes. (CFRs 1.1, 4.6)
5. UCLA has operated as a decentralized campus, fostering innovation through multiple local initiatives and ecosystems. While this model has evolved over time and has greatly benefitted the campus, it may create inefficiencies, confusion and shadow systems. The fragmentation is most acute in Information Technology. The team recommends that UCLA continue to actively optimize its organizational models, and particularly integrate its fragmented IT units to make the total greater than the sum of the parts. (CFRs 3.5, 3.7, 4.7)

**Appendix 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM**

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where is the policy located? <b>University of the President Academic Senate – Regulations of the Academic Senate Part III. Colleges, Schools, and Graduate Divisions - Chapter 4. Credit in Courses – Number 760:</b> <a href="https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/regulations/rpart3.html">https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/regulations/rpart3.html</a> Online <a href="https://catalog.registrar.ucla.edu/index.html#accred">https://catalog.registrar.ucla.edu/index.html#accred</a> and as PDF <a href="https://www.registrar.ucla.edu/Portals/50/Documents/catalog-archive/2001-2049/ucla-catalog2019-20.pdf">https://www.registrar.ucla.edu/Portals/50/Documents/catalog-archive/2001-2049/ucla-catalog2019-20.pdf</a> Comments: For undergrad and graduate hours
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO ? Comments: Reviewed at new course approval and through program review.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 5 What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? face-to-face, 2 summer online courses - EPS SCI 16: Major Events in History of Life (Session C) ; PHILOS 3: Historical Introduction to Philosophy What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral What discipline(s)? Psych, Econ, Health Policy Management, Environmental Health Sciences, Department of Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences; Philosophy, History Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Comments: appropriate
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1- 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 3 What kinds of courses? Applied Field Project, FILM TV 194 “Internship Seminar”, 195CE Internship Course, MLIS Internships What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral What discipline(s)? Health Policy Management, Film, Education, MLIS Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Comments: Interesting Film internship requires co-enrollment in weekly course.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 3 What kinds of programs were reviewed? Dept of Information Sciences; Geography, Economics What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral What discipline(s)? Information Sciences, Geography, Economics Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Comments: standard descriptions

Review Completed by: Jillian Kinzie  
November 1, 2019

## Appendix 2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: This policy is in place. However, UCLA was implicated in the Varsity Blues scandal in 2019. UCLA has put new measures and procedures in place to ensure the situation is not repeated.</p> <p><b>University of California – Undergraduate Recruitment Practices:</b>  <a href="https://policy.ucop.edu/doc/2700628/UndergraduateRecruitmentPractices">https://policy.ucop.edu/doc/2700628/UndergraduateRecruitmentPractices</a></p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p><b>Undergraduate Time to Degree:</b> <a href="https://www.apb.ucla.edu/campus-statistics/graduation-ttd">https://www.apb.ucla.edu/campus-statistics/graduation-ttd</a></p> <p><b>Graduate Time to Degree:</b> <a href="https://grad.ucla.edu/academics/graduate-study/program-requirements-for-ucla-graduate-degrees/">https://grad.ucla.edu/academics/graduate-study/program-requirements-for-ucla-graduate-degrees/</a> (see “Program Statistics” after looking up a program)</p> <p><b>Cost of the degree:</b> <a href="http://www.admission.ucla.edu/prospect/budget.htm">www.admission.ucla.edu/prospect/budget.htm</a></p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO (this is uneven across fields)</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments: Great variety of sources of information about employment post-graduation</p> <p><b>First Destination Survey:</b> <a href="https://www.sairo.ucla.edu/2017-first-destination-survey-data">https://www.sairo.ucla.edu/2017-first-destination-survey-data</a></p> <p><b>Main AMCAS Storyboard:</b>  <a href="https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/CombinedAMCASData2015-2017-ALLDATA2/Story1?iframeSizedToWindow=true&amp;:embed=y&amp;:showAppBanner=false&amp;:display_count=no&amp;:showVizHome=no">https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/CombinedAMCASData2015-2017-ALLDATA2/Story1?iframeSizedToWindow=true&amp;:embed=y&amp;:showAppBanner=false&amp;:display_count=no&amp;:showVizHome=no</a></p> <p><b>MCAT Storyboard:</b>  <a href="https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/CombinedAMCASData2015-2017-MCAT/Story1?iframeSizedToWindow=true&amp;:embed=y&amp;:showAppBanner=false&amp;:display_count=no&amp;:showVizHome=no">https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/CombinedAMCASData2015-2017-MCAT/Story1?iframeSizedToWindow=true&amp;:embed=y&amp;:showAppBanner=false&amp;:display_count=no&amp;:showVizHome=no</a></p> <p><b>Mapping/Med School Storyboard:</b>  <a href="https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/CombinedAMCASData2015-2017-SCHOOLMAP/Story1?iframeSizedToWindow=true&amp;:embed=y&amp;:showAppBanner=false&amp;:display_count=no&amp;:showVizHome=no">https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/CombinedAMCASData2015-2017-SCHOOLMAP/Story1?iframeSizedToWindow=true&amp;:embed=y&amp;:showAppBanner=false&amp;:display_count=no&amp;:showVizHome=no</a></p> <p><b>UCOP Dashboard with EDD Data:</b>  <a href="https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/uc-alumni-work">https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/uc-alumni-work</a></p>

\*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

\*\*Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed by: Jillian Kinzie

Date: November 1, 2019

### Appendix 3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where?</p> <p><b>A. If claim is <u>against faculty</u> –</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Academic Personnel Office (APO)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflict Resolution – <a href="https://apo.ucla.edu/conflict-resolution">https://apo.ucla.edu/conflict-resolution</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <b>Academic Senate</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grievances and Charges (how to file) – <a href="https://senate.ucla.edu/grievance">https://senate.ucla.edu/grievance</a></li> <li>• Charges Committee – <a href="https://senate.ucla.edu/committee/charges">https://senate.ucla.edu/committee/charges</a></li> <li>• Judicial Committee Documents and Forms – <a href="https://senate.ucla.edu/content/pt-forms-and-documents">https://senate.ucla.edu/content/pt-forms-and-documents</a></li> <li>• Grievance Advisory Committee (GAC) – <a href="https://senate.ucla.edu/committee/gac">https://senate.ucla.edu/committee/gac</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b>Office of Instructional Development –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Teachers Guide Professional Behavior – <a href="http://www2.oid.ucla.edu/publications/teachersguide/policies/behavior/probehavior">http://www2.oid.ucla.edu/publications/teachersguide/policies/behavior/probehavior</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>4. <b>Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion – <u>Discrimination Prevention team:</u></b>  <i>Discrimination based on protected class.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="mailto:dpo@equity.ucla.edu">dpo@equity.ucla.edu</a> – (310) 794-1232</li> <li>• Complaint Form – (<a href="#">word version</a>)   (<a href="#">PDF version</a>)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Investigation Fact Sheet</a></li> <li>• In certain cases, the DP team investigates discrimination claims against entities and individuals who are not faculty. This could occur, for instance, when non-faculty conduct is reasonably likely to have a substantial negative impact on campus climate.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>B. If claim is <u>against staff</u> –</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>Campus Human Resources – Staff Diversity &amp; Compliance:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chandra Bhatnagar, Director – <a href="mailto:cbhatnagar@chr.ucla.edu">cbhatnagar@chr.ucla.edu</a> – (310) 794-0691 <a href="#">Filing an EEO complaint</a></li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>C. If claim is <u>against students</u> –</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b><u>Office of Dean of Students:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="mailto:dean@saonet.ucla.edu">dean@saonet.ucla.edu</a> – (310) 825-3871</li> <li>• <a href="#">Student Conduct</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Student Code of Conduct</a></li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>D. <u>To report violent behavior or threats of harm affecting the workplace – Campus Human Resources – Behavioral Intervention Team:</u></b>  <i>The team depends on referrals and reviews situations involving faculty, staff and others that have raised concern they may be at risk of harming themselves or others, or pose a significant disruption to the campus environment. Behavior does not need to be illegal to be of concern.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chris Silva, Behavioral Intervention Coordinator – <a href="mailto:ccsilva@chr.ucla.edu">ccsilva@chr.ucla.edu</a> – (310) 794-0422</li> <li>• <a href="#">Reporting tool</a></li> <li>• Not imminent or immediate danger – <a href="http://www.adminpolicies.ucla.edu/APP/Number/132">http://www.adminpolicies.ucla.edu/APP/Number/132</a></li> </ul> </p> <p><b>E. If claim is <u>against UCPD</u> –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Commendations &amp; Complaint Procedures</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">UCPD Complaint from Member of the Public</a></li> </ul>
Process(es)/	<p>Comments: UCLA has a variety of outlets for student complaints.</p> <p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly: Policies are spelled out in areas outlined above.</p>

procedure	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Comments:
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO          If so, where? Again, distributed based on area and topic.</p> <p><b>Discrimination Prevention Office (DPO)</b> – since inception, Fall 2014</p> <p>DPO keeps digital files relating to complaints we receive on a shared computer drive and in our digital case management system. Where matters also have paper files they are kept in a locked cabinet in a locked suite, and older paper files are moved to a locked storage unit in the building. DPO generally receives complaints against faculty members, including complaints by students against faculty members. DPO keeps digital files relating to complaints we receive on a shared computer drive and in our digital case management system. Access to these digital records is limited to DPO staff members. These records have never been purged/deleted since DPO began. Where matters also have paper files they are kept in a locked cabinet in a locked suite, and older paper files are moved to a locked storage unit in the building.</p> <p><b>Title IX Office</b> –</p> <p>They use Advocate (case management system) to keep track of all of the incident reports that they receive. Advocate has existed for approximately three years, and before that, previous coordinators used paper files which are in the Murphy Hall attic in locked areas. A Title IX legal intern has been working on getting those older matters inputted into Advocate as well. As far as they know, paper records are not purged.</p> <p><b><u>Dean of Students</u></b></p> <p><b>Student Code – <a href="#">Privacy and Records Retention</a></b></p> <p>Student conduct records are confidential. The disclosure of information from such records is subject to section 130.00 of the University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations and Students (<a href="http://policy.ucop.edu/doc/2710533/PACAOS-130">http://policy.ucop.edu/doc/2710533/PACAOS-130</a>), UCLA Policy 220 – Disclosure of Information From Student Records (<a href="http://www.adminpolicies.ucla.edu/app/Default.aspx?&amp;id=220">http://www.adminpolicies.ucla.edu/app/Default.aspx?&amp;id=220</a>) to the California Information Practices Act, and to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.</p> <p>In cases where the final disposition is Dismissal, the Office of Student Conduct retains student conduct records for <b>fifty years</b> from the date of the Notice of final disposition.</p> <p>For cases that do not result in dismissal but which are required to be included in the <a href="#">UCLA Jeanne Clery Crime Statistics Report</a>, the Office of Student Conduct retains student conduct records for <b>seven years</b> from the date of the Notice of final disposition. Student conduct records in all other cases are retained for <b>five years</b> from the date of the Notice of final disposition. <u>When there have been repeated violations of the UCLA Student Conduct Code</u>, all student conduct records pertaining to an individual student will be retained for <b>five years</b> (<b>seven years</b> for cases which are required to be included in the UCLA Jeanne Clery Crime Statistics Report) from the date of the final disposition in the most recent case.</p> <p>Upon receipt of a request from professional schools, graduate programs, employers, or others, for the disciplinary records of a student, after the student provides an appropriate confidentiality waiver (where applicable), the Office of Student Conduct will only report and/or release records where violations resulted in a sanction of suspension and/or dismissal, either imposed and deferred.</p> <hr/> <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO          If so, please describe briefly: Units tracks complaints in different ways</p> <hr/> <p>Comments: For the most part yes, but tracking and communicating across units is something that most continually be attended to.</p>

\*§602-16(1)(ix) See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.  
 Review Completed By: Jillian Kinzie  
 Date: November 2, 2019

Under federal regulations\*, WSCU is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</b>
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where? <a href="http://www.admission.ucla.edu/trcredit.htm">http://www.admission.ucla.edu/trcredit.htm</a>
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Comments: UCLA has outlined specific policies and issues associated with transferring from a community college, another UC, and other institutions.	

\*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Jillian Kinzie

Date: November 2, 2019



## Appendix 5 – DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW

Institution: University of California, Los Angeles

Type of Visit:

Name of reviewer/s: Oliver M. O'Reilly

Date/s of review: September 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs<sup>1</sup> and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Programs reviewed:

1. M.S. Engineering- Mechanical
2. M.S. Engineering- Aerospace
3. M.S. Engineering- Materials Science
4. M.S. Engineering- Computer Networking

Courses reviewed

1. Electrical and Computer Engineering 235A  
LEC 80 - Mathematical Foundations of Data Storage Systems
2. Engineering 206  
LEC 80 - Engineering for Systems Assurance
3. Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering C296A  
LEC 80 - Mechanical Design for Power Transmission
4. Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering 250D  
LEC 80 - Computational Aerodynamics
5. Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering 156A  
LEC 80 - Advanced Strength of Materials
5. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

UCLA's Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (HSSEAS) began offering an online coursework-based Master of Science in Engineering (MSE) degree starting in the Fall of 2007 and offered students certificates of completion in areas of study. The program was first reviewed by the Academic Senate in 2012. One of the recommendations was to change the program to offer designated degrees by discipline. Subsequently in the Fall of 2013, 10 designated degree programs were established, and the programs were implemented in the Fall of 2015. The degree programs are

---

<sup>1</sup> See Distance Education Review Guide to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

- A. MS in Engineering-Integrated Circuits
- B. MS in Engineering-Signal Processing and Communications
- C. MS in Engineering-Electrical
- D. MS in Engineering-Aerospace
- E. MS in Engineering-Mechanical
- F. MS in Engineering-Manufacturing and Design
- G. MS in Engineering-Structural Materials
- H. MS in Engineering-Electronic Materials
- I. MS in Engineering-Computer Networking
- J. MS in Engineering-Materials Science

In addition, 5 programs with certificates of specialization are offered:

- K. MS in Engineering with Certificate of Specialization in Mechanics of Structures
- L. MS in Engineering with Certificate of Specialization in Systems Engineering
- M. MS in Engineering with Certificate of Specialization in Engineering Management
- N. MS in Engineering with Certificate of Specialization in Sustainable Water Engineering
- O. MS in Engineering with Certificate of Specialization in Data Science

Programs of this type are considered to be a self-supported degree program (SSDP) and while there are no faculty FTEs directly associated with the program, 68 HSSEAS ladder-rank faculty and instructors and 17 non HSSEAS faculty currently participate in the MSOL program and each of the 15 programs has a designated faculty lead. By way of comparison, the number of participating faculty was 54 in Fall 2013. Faculty involvement in the program ranges from 24 instructors in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering to 6 instructors in Civil and Environmental Engineering.

The student enrollment show a steady increase from 57 students in the Fall of 2007 to 198 in the Fall of 2012, and 359 students in the Fall of 2018. The average GPA for incoming students is 3.5 and the cost per unit of the program of \$1000 makes this program one of the most affordable of its kind. The number of alumni for the program is close to 700. In contrast to many SSDP's in Engineering, enrollment in the MSOL program is primarily domestic; only 3% of students identified as international. For the 2018 year, the largest number of students, 123, were enrolled in Programs K-O, followed by Program E. with 91 students. Programs B, G, and J, had the lowest enrollment with 8 students in each of these programs. On average, approximately 20% of students enrolled in the program are female.

6. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Examined lectures for the five courses listed previously. Read the "Self-Review of the Engineering Master of Science Online (MSOL) Program" dated April 2019.

## **Observations and Findings**

<b>Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)</b>	<b>Observations and Findings</b>	<b>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</b>
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	The program is consistent with the mission, operation, and administrative structure. Operation, planning and funding of the program follows standard practices.	
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Most of the students in this program are employed full-time as engineers so integrating them into the life and culture of UCLA is challenging. However, the Student Affairs Officer (SAO) reaches out to each student by email and coordinates student orientations. While in the program, students are given a faculty advisor and they participate in lectures and discussion sessions online. Exams are given using a standardized proctoring system. According to the documents provided, plans are underway to organize alumni events	What efforts are underway to organize outreach to the alumni of the MSOL program?
<i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	The Echo360 learning platform is well suited to the interaction of students and instructors. This is the platform used by most instructors. Many of the discussion sessions with Teaching Assistants didn't use this system – instead the discussion sessions were posted on YouTube.	Why don't all instructors and teaching assistants use the Echo360 system?
<i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	The institution is well-equipped to provide these services. The facts that the average number of terms taken for students to complete the program is 9 terms and the decreasing rate of students withdrawing from the program is good evidence for the effectiveness of the services.	
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	Over 80% of the instructors are regular HSSEAS faculty. The faculty teach regular courses and are compensated separately for their work in the MSOL program. Faculty are fully involved in curriculum development and student assessment.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	Faculty design the programs and courses. The proposed programs and courses are then reviewed by the Academic Senate. The courses and programs are comparable to their on-ground offerings. Students need to take 9 courses (36 credit hours and at least 5 of these courses must be graduate level. The remaining 4 courses are upper division undergraduate level) which is the same as on-campus students.	

<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>The data shows a decrease in the number of students who need to withdraw from the program, an average graduate period of 9 terms. I have no concerns about these statistics.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>Student performance is assessed using exams and homework assignments. I didn't find any discrepancies between these assessment methods and those used for on-campus offerings.</p>	
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>	<p>Echo360 system is used as a delivery system.</p>	<p>Does ECHO360 comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>The program has ranked among the top two nationwide for the past 6 years. This is the main evidence provided for the effectiveness of the program.</p>	