

UC Berkeley Institutional Proposal to the Western Association of Schools & Colleges (WASC) October 2001

Section 1: Institutional Context

A number of factors contribute to make this an extremely opportune time for the campus to be undergoing the WASC re-accreditation review. First, the campus is facing unprecedented growth over the next decade. The University of California Office of the President (UCOP) has targeted the Berkeley campus with an increase of 4,000 FTE for the 1998-2011 period, an enrollment expansion that has been colloquially dubbed Tidal Wave II. This expansion will take place in a challenging context, which includes an agreement with the City of Berkeley that places ceilings on both enrollment growth and space on the campus. In 2000-2001, the Chancellor convened a Strategic Planning Committee charged with recommending a framework that will be used to guide the campus's future growth and development in a way that is consistent with its academic vision.

The Chancellor has also recently completed a major restructuring of his Senior Management Group aimed at sharpening the administration's focus on the academic mission of the University and seizing opportunities in teaching, technology and research. As part of this reorganization two new Vice Provost positions were created that will be especially important in the upcoming WASC review. The Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Facilities is leading long-range planning efforts in the context of Tidal Wave II, as co-chair (with the Academic Senate Chair) of the Strategic Planning Committee, which includes a subcommittee on Near-Term Planning. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE) will provide a single point of vision and leadership for undergraduate education that spans all colleges, schools and departments. This new office will go a long way toward remedying the decentralization of responsibility for the University's undergraduate education mission, observed by the WASC visiting team a decade ago.

Since the last WASC accreditation team identified undergraduate education as an area of special challenge for the next decade, the campus has also witnessed a greater interest on the part of the California Legislature and Governor in our undergraduate mission. This interest was spawned in part by the declining resources available to the campuses during the recession of the early 1990s and the resulting need to do more with less. Legislation passed during the early 1990s was aimed at redistributing faculty workload to improve the quality of undergraduate education. In 1994, the campus entered into a UC Partnership agreement with then Governor Wilson, which called for the University to make a commitment to key initiatives and actions related to undergraduate education in exchange for a minimum level of state funding for the UC system. A similar agreement has been reached with Governor Davis, although the State was not able to support the compact for the 2001-02 academic year.

Increased selectivity at Berkeley has yielded an undergraduate student body of unprecedented caliber. A decade ago, following the last WASC re-accreditation, the campus admitted 40% of approximately 20,000 freshman applicants. In 2001, the number of applicants topped 36,000, while the percentage admitted dropped to 25%. As we enter what may well be a new period of retrenchment and fiscal conservatism, combined with a period of surging enrollment growth, it is clear that Berkeley faces a number of challenges in matching the standards of the education we deliver to the high quality of our student body. At the same time, as a pre-eminent public research university, Berkeley is also well-positioned to emerge on the cutting edge of undergraduate education, as underscored in a recently issued internal report by the campus Commission on Undergraduate Education (2000). Continuing to find new approaches to undergraduate education that capitalize on, rather than compete with, our historic strengths in research and graduate education remains the challenge for the next decade. Our goals and objectives for the WASC review, outlined in the subsequent sections, are designed to evaluate our past performance and to develop new teaching and learning initiatives and assessment tools to do just that.

Section 2: Description of Expected Outcomes

We hope to accomplish the following positive outcomes as a result of the re-accreditation process:

- Continue to strengthen our capabilities for capturing critical data and using it as part of our institutional decision-making processes. Since our last WASC re-accreditation review, we have made considerable strides in integrating and standardizing our data collection systems. However, we still need to continue to improve our ability to institutionalize integrated data collection systems related to the measurement of objectives and outcomes. We also need to find more effective ways to distribute that information to key constituencies in a timely fashion so it can become a regularized part of academic planning processes.
- Move the campus's undergraduate education agenda forward in relation to four key objectives: 1) enhancing students' academic engagement and interaction with faculty; 2) increasing opportunities for capstone experiences; 3) optimizing teaching resources to enhance educational quality and student learning; and 4) helping instructors teach with excellence.
- Regularize and institutionalize the departmental review process to ensure that both graduate and undergraduate programs receive distinct focus and attention. A joint Academic Senate/Administrative Program Review Task Force recently issued a set of recommendations concerning the improvement of the program review process. We expect this revision of the departmental review process will be considerably strengthened as a result of input from the WASC planning effort, particularly with regard to undergraduate education.
- Focus campus attention on how best to assess student learning outcomes. In addition to our own interest in this area, increasingly, we are being asked by key stakeholders, including the State legislature and private funding sources, to account for the educational effectiveness of our programs. In many cases, we are finding that we lack the kind of quantitative data that will permit us to do so. We expect that a key outcome of the self-study will be improved student learning outcome assessment tools, which will be useful in a broad array of contexts.
- Develop feedback mechanisms to involve Berkeley faculty more fully with the assessment and improvement of teaching and learning. The three self-study topics for the educational effectiveness review—enhancing academic engagement, rethinking the delivery of education, and improving undergraduate program review—are aimed at supporting faculty in becoming more effective, self-reflective teachers and facilitators of student learning. We plan to develop formal mechanisms that will disseminate the results of our self-study broadly, through faculty development opportunities, so that this WASC review can lead to meaningful changes.

Section 3: Description of How Constituencies Were Involved

In June 2001, the VPUE convened a WASC planning group, which met weekly over the summer to draft the institutional proposal. This initial planning group consisted of representatives from the chief units that will be involved in the subsequent review process, including the Office of Planning and Analysis and the Office of Student Research. Over the summer, the VPUE also met with key constituencies to solicit ongoing feedback about the proposal under development. These included: the members of the Chancellor's Cabinet, the Divisional Council of the Academic Senate, the Strategic Planning Committee and Near Term Planning Committee, the Provost's Advisory Council, and the Deans and Department Chairs at their annual retreat. Further input was sought from the President of the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC), the campus student government, and from the Chairs of key Academic Senate Committees, including the Committee on Educational Policy and the Graduate Council. In addition to

soliciting input from the Academic Senate leadership, the VPUE identified and met with other faculty from across the campus in order to involve them in the drafting of the proposal and the subsequent review process. Faculty in the Graduate School of Education with research specialties in the areas of teaching and learning were sought out for additional consultation. She also met with staff from units that will be involved centrally in the educational effectiveness review, including the Graduate Student Teaching & Resource Center, Educational Technology Services, and Student Life and Educational Development. Drafts of the proposal were also circulated to staff actively engaged in providing academic support to undergraduate students. The WASC planning group also developed a matrix of campus units who will be involved in the coordination of the institutional capacity review in the WASC re-accreditation process.

Next Steps

A guiding principle for the two year review process will be to solicit involvement from the campus community, including the following six key campus constituencies:

- Senior Administration
- Academic Senate Leadership
- Faculty
- Staff
- Students (Undergraduate and Graduate)
- Alumni

A variety of communication methods will be used to keep the groups informed and solicit their input, such as: 1) the establishment of a WASC website linked to the VPUE homepage; 2) reciprocal links to other key campus sites (e.g the Strategic Planning Committee); 3) presentations to campus groups and organizations representing the above constituencies; 4) e-mail updates to key listservs and electronic mailing lists; 5) articles in the *Berkeleyan* (a newspaper for campus faculty and staff); 6) open forums and town hall meetings, and the like.

Section 4: Description of How the Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews Will Be Staged

We plan to complete the self-study for the Preparatory Review by August 2002, in preparation for a November 2002 site visit. The self-study for the Educational Effectiveness Review will be completed by August 2003, in preparation for a November 2003 site visit. Although the preparatory site visit normally occurs two years after approval of the institutional proposal, we believe this accelerated timeline is feasible and are preparing to meet these deadlines.

The WASC planning group, which has been charged with drafting the institutional proposal, will be broadened and reconfigured to tackle the next two phases of the re-accreditation process. The Committee structure will consist of the following:

- Steering Committee: charged with guiding the overall WASC re-accreditation process and with developing and implementing Educational Effectiveness Review-Topic #3
- Working Groups: charged with a specific phase of the review process
 - 1) Institutional Capacity (Preparatory Review)
 - 2) Academic Engagement (Educational Effectiveness Review-Topic #1)
 - 3) Delivery of Education (Educational Effectiveness Review-Topic #2)
- Distinguished Advisory Group: made up of some of our most prestigious and stellar faculty and campus leaders, and charged with providing oversight and consultation

Membership in the Steering Committee and Working Groups will be selected to ensure representation from senior administration, Academic Senate, faculty, staff, and students, both undergraduate and graduate. The Chairs of the working groups will also serve on the Steering Committee, to ensure effective communication among all of the groups working on the review process.

Section 5: Preparatory Review

For the Preparatory Review, we will organize the institutional data display according to the four commission standards. As part of the development of the institutional proposal, the planning group has already developed a matrix of key units charged with responsibilities associated with each of the standards. Work is underway to assemble relevant data, policies and procedures as evidence in support of the standards and related criteria and questions. Reflective essays will place the institutional portfolio in the context of both the preparatory and educational effectiveness reviews.

A key element of the preparatory review will be the development of a web-based data portfolio. The campus already provides access to several institutional data sources via the web. As part of the re-accreditation process, the campus will develop a dedicated web site, linked to the VPUE's homepage, which will include all information related to the WASC review (proposals, committee memberships, committee reports, policy and data portfolios, and background material).

The website will also contain links to the institutional data gateway--
<http://himalia.chance.berkeley.edu/opa/gateway/> -- that is currently under development and will allow the user to access the following data sources:

- **Cal Profiles:** This web-based report provides resource, workload, performance indicator, and outreach information on all campus departmental units, eventually rolling up to a campus total. For the financial data, it also provides the same data adjusted for inflation, to facilitate trend analyses. The resource information includes general ledger and adjusted budget detail, budgeted faculty and staff FTE, sponsored projects office awards, and space data. The workload information provides research expenditures, assigned majors, course enrollments, student credit hours, sponsored project office proposals, and graduate application summaries. The performance indicator section provides information on degrees awarded, allocated student FTE, and budgeted faculty FTE ratios. The outreach section provides information on majors and degrees by gender and ethnicity. In addition to this central information, units can provide additional quantitative data or an executive summary that describes the unit's mission, comments on central data, describes unit provided data, and links to other references. Cal Profiles data and information can be downloaded either to Word, Excel, or in some cases a graphic format.
- **Performance Metrics:** Performance Metrics is a draft website that provides campus trend data and a one-year snapshot of peer comparisons. The metrics cover the following categories: (1) undergraduate programs, (2) graduate programs, (3) faculty, (4) staff, (5) research programs, (6) diverse and inclusive community, (7) external ties, (8) academic support, and (9) financial operations. The campus trend data go back to 1988-89, when available. The peer comparison data are for the most recent year and cover the following institutions: Harvard, MIT, Princeton, Stanford, Illinois at Urbana, Michigan, Texas at Austin, Virginia, Wisconsin, UCLA and UC San Diego.
- **Common Data Set:** The Common Data Set is an initiative to promote peer institutions providing consistent answers to a standard set of survey questions. The Common Data Set provides information on the following categories: (A) general information, (B) enrollment and persistence, (C) freshmen admission, (D) transfer admission, (E) academic offerings, (F) student life, (G) annual expenses, (H) financial aid, (I) faculty and class size, and (J) degrees conferred. Currently, there are two years with information available: 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

- **Other Campus Data:** The institutional data gateway provides links to a variety of other campus sources (e.g., Office of Student Research, Space, Sponsored Research). The Office of Student Research is responsible for compiling data on undergraduate surveys, along with maintaining campus data on undergraduate applications, graduation rates, students' GPAs, time to degree, persistence and other valuable data. The Space Management and Capital Programs is the official campus source on space data (e.g., assigned square feet by function and unit). The Sponsored Projects Office maintains a COEUS database system that provides information on research proposals and awards processed through their office.

In addition to presenting the data needed to establish compliance in a web-based format, we will identify the data necessary for the educational effectiveness review and set in place the process to assemble and capture data as described further in the next section.

Section 6: Educational Effectiveness Review

Our broad vision for an undergraduate education at UC Berkeley is characterized by four goals for our students:

- Academic and Intellectual Engagement: opportunities to master new bodies of knowledge and to develop new skills
- Research and Discovery: opportunities to work with, and be mentored by, leading researchers and scholars
- Service to the Community: opportunities to link academic studies to real-world issues
- Creative Achievement: opportunities to engage in a scholarly, scientific or artistic capstone project as a culminating experience

In pursuit of these educational goals, we are proposing to undertake three focussed self-study topics. Topic #1 is concerned with enhancing academic engagement at a large public research university. We have prioritized two key objectives, among many, that will help us achieve the goals above. The first objective is to increase the array of opportunities for faculty-student interaction (e.g. small seminars, mentored research and service-learning opportunities, and faculty advising), especially for lower division and transfer students. The second objective is to increase the opportunities for capstone experiences for upper division students, including research, design, creative or service-based formats.

Topic #2 will help us achieve our objectives for student learning by rethinking the mechanisms we use to deliver education. The first objective is to examine who delivers education and how best to optimize the use of all of our existing and available teaching resources, not just ladder-rank faculty. The second objective is to help instructors teach with excellence under new conditions such as expanded enrollment, active learning, and instructional technologies.

Finally, Topic #3 focuses on long-term institutionalization of our achievements in the areas of student learning and faculty development, through improvement of the departmental review process. Our objective is to ensure that procedures and criteria for assessing educational effectiveness, developed as part of the WASC self-study process, become a lasting feature of our institutional decision-making.

Our three self-study topics are elaborated fully below.

Topic #1: Enhancing Academic Engagement at a Large Public Research University

Research literature demonstrates that students' levels of engagement in college are critical to students' long-term achievement and success (Astin, 2001; Kuh et al., 1991; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Interest in assessing student engagement has spawned projects such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which measures key benchmarks, including level of academic challenge, active and collaborative

learning, student interactions with faculty members, enriching educational experiences, and supportive campus environment. The available evidence suggests that while residential liberal arts colleges may have an edge in providing students with opportunities for engagement, levels of faculty-student interaction are lower across all institutional types than research suggests is optimal (Kuh, 2001).

Although we know that faculty-student engagement is a critical benchmark for educational effectiveness, creating such opportunities remains a challenge in higher education generally. It can present an even greater challenge for a large public research university such as Berkeley, where student-faculty ratios are high and where a long-standing institutional culture has tended to prioritize research and graduate education in the competition for faculty time and attention. But these special challenges are also offset by our tremendous comparative advantages as an institution, such as our world-class faculty and top-notch research and library facilities. The Boyer Commission's "Re-inventing Undergraduate Education" (1998) suggests that the most valuable aspect of attending a research university such as Berkeley is the opportunity to participate in the discovery of knowledge, mentored by cutting-edge researchers in all fields. In particular, the report highlighted the importance of small lower-division seminars, mentored research apprenticeships, and capstone courses as important locations for faculty-student engagement in its recommendations. Similarly, a study of Harvard undergraduates found a strong correlation between the number of small classes and mentored independent studies students enroll in and their overall satisfaction with their academic experiences (Light, 2001).

The Boyer Report's emphasis on enhancing opportunities for mentored inquiry-based learning was underscored in an internal report by the Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE, 2000). In addition to calling for increased opportunities for faculty-student engagement in the lower division through small seminars and research apprenticeships, CUE recommended that every Berkeley student—not just honors students—be offered the opportunity to undertake a culminating capstone project. The report further urged instituting and regularizing assessment of how well we are meeting our educational effectiveness goals.

This topic proposes to assess the strides we have made since the 1990 WASC Visiting Accreditation Team identified undergraduate education as a major area of challenge for the next decade, and to move our undergraduate education agenda forward by meeting two key objectives recommended in the CUE report:

A. Increasing opportunities for faculty-student interaction, especially for lower division and transfer students

What opportunities currently exist for small seminars, mentored undergraduate research and service learning opportunities, and faculty mentoring and advising, especially for lower division undeclared students, and how might these be expanded? How can we build and strengthen mentoring communities that include undergraduates, graduate students, post-docs, academic and research staff, under the intellectual guidance of Berkeley faculty? How can we create informal as well as formal opportunities for Berkeley undergraduates to engage with faculty in and outside the classroom? How do we know that opportunities for faculty-student interaction are leading to improved student learning?

B. Increasing opportunities for capstone experiences

What are the full-range of capstone experiences (research, design, creative or service-based) currently available and desirable? How can we encourage the development of new opportunities that provide structure and mentored community to students undertaking both individual and team projects? What are some of the obstacles and potential solutions to implementing this goal? How do we know that a capstone experience contributes to meaningful student learning?

Topic #2: Re-thinking the Delivery of Education

Since the last WASC review, changes in the national higher education landscape and on the Berkeley campus are making it increasingly imperative that we rethink who delivers instruction, the methods they employ to do so, and the training and support necessary to ensure their success. Over the last decade, economic forces have reshaped the national academic job market in dramatic ways, increasing the use of part-time and temporary instructors as a supplement to tenure-track faculty. At the same time, as graduate

student enrollments decline partly as a result of these changes, the University of California is facing a dramatic undergraduate enrollment expansion in the next decade. This shift in the graduate-undergraduate student ratio on the campus is forcing us to face critical questions about how best to use graduate student instructors and other personnel in the teaching enterprise. As a large public university with a higher student-faculty ratio and fewer resources than comparable private universities, we face on-going challenges in ensuring our students access to the courses they need to declare a major and to graduate in a timely manner. Meanwhile, the rapid growth of new instructional technologies provides both opportunities and obstacles. If we are to make effective use of new methods of delivering education that may help solve some of these problems, we will need to train and support instructors at all levels to make effective use of emerging technologies and other innovative teaching and learning tools.

Parallel to these institutional challenges, we also find ourselves in a new higher educational climate, one that is increasingly student-centered rather than faculty-centered, learning-centered rather than teaching-centered. The traditional model of education, in which faculty deliver instruction to students in lecture classrooms, is gradually shifting toward a more active, collaborative model in which faculty facilitate student learning (Barr & Tagg, 1995). Acquisition of skills, such as critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, effective communication and the ability to gather and evaluate evidence, are increasingly valued alongside mastery of specific bodies of knowledge as the goals of education. This new paradigm for undergraduate education requires faculty members, even in large lecture classes, to take on new and sometimes less familiar roles, involving collaboration, inquiry-based learning strategies and ongoing formative assessment.

Given an increasing undergraduate population, a decreasing graduate student population, rapid growth of new technologies, and an institutional desire to strengthen opportunities for active, inquiry-based learning, this topic will examine ways we might more effectively deliver instruction by meeting two key objectives:

A. Optimizing teaching resources to enhance educational quality and student learning

Who delivers instruction, at both the lower-division and upper-division levels? Who should be delivering instruction in order to maximize student learning? How can we rethink sections to make better use of graduate student instructors? Part-time lecturers, undergraduates and other academic personnel already play a part in undergraduate education, too often on an emergency or ad hoc basis. In what creative and educationally useful ways can we integrate them as a regular part of the delivery of education? What role can peer teaching (student to student) play in the undergraduate enterprise? Should we be expanding post-doctoral teaching opportunities and, if so, how? Finally, how do we make best use of our permanent faculty, both in delivering instruction and in mentoring others who do so to ensure that student learning is maximized?

B. Helping instructors teach with excellence

How can we best help faculty and other instructors teach under new conditions, such as expanded enrollment, active learning, and the increased availability and demand for instructional technologies? How can we strengthen the use of technology as an enhancement to traditional modes of delivering education? What incentives can be created to encourage departments to establish a culture of teaching and a concomitant emphasis on a culture of student learning? How can we support partnerships between academic instructors and academic support personnel? In what other ways can we enhance educational development and create more incentives and accountability for instructors to incorporate inquiry-based learning strategies into their courses?

Topic #3: Improving Undergraduate Program Review

Topics #1 and #2 focus on some core educational goals for Berkeley students, and the educational process by which these can be achieved. A necessary third element is a formal mechanism to support, maintain and institutionalize what comes out of our work on Topics #1 and #2. We believe the campus departmental review process can serve as that mechanism.

The campus departmental review process is organized and overseen by the Graduate Division and the Academic Senate Committee's Graduate Council. As a result, the focus has been more on graduate

programs and the research enterprise. Although undergraduate programs are included in the review, there has been concern about the lack of clear criteria, of comprehensive evaluation, and of subsequent accountability. A joint Administrative/Academic Senate Program Review Task Force submitted a report in Fall 2001 on the campus' departmental review process. One of the key recommendations focused on the need to establish better criteria and better procedures for reviewing undergraduate programs. The Task Force charged the VPUE to work with the Academic Senate to develop this improved program review, and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is taking the lead in working with the VPUE on this topic.

The VPUE and CEP Chair will both serve on the WASC steering committee, along with the chair of the Graduate Council. As a result, all key institutional players charged with improving the departmental review process are represented on the steering committee. They will be well-positioned to meet the following objective:

A. Incorporating into the guidelines for departmental program reviews the criteria for assessing the quality of undergraduate education generated as part of the WASC self-study process.

How can information and findings derived from WASC self-study Topics #1 and #2 become part of the departmental review process on an ongoing basis? What kinds of benchmarks and evidence that emerge from the self-study can be used to evaluate undergraduate programs? What kinds of criteria that emerge from the study can be used to judge undergraduate programs? What recommendations can we make to better link undergraduate program reviews to institutional decision-making?

Proposed Implementation and Outcome Assessment for the Educational Effectiveness Review

For Topics #1 and #2, the general process for implementation of our self-study will be similar. We will begin with an assessment of the current situation (programs, practices, policies), with special attention to the impact of our efforts on student learning. We will also be seeking out best campus practices in each of the topic areas that we can disseminate and share across departments and disciplines. In addition, we plan to use existing campus wide data and gather new information to help inform our self-study.

More specifically, we plan to do the following:

Topic #1: Enhancing Academic Engagement at a Large Public Research University

- A. Increasing opportunities for faculty-student interaction, especially for lower division and transfer students
- identify opportunities for students and faculty to engage formally and informally inside and outside of the classroom
 - develop measures of the adequacy and effectiveness of these opportunities, particularly their impact on student learning
 - explore ways to expand successful or innovative efforts that strengthen academic engagement
- B. Increasing opportunities for capstone experiences
- define “capstone experience” so that there is a common understanding across campus
 - identify capstone experiences currently available to students
 - develop measures of the adequacy and impact of capstone experiences, particularly on student learning
 - explore new models for capstone experiences, as appropriate

Topic #2: Re-Thinking the Delivery of Education

- A. Optimizing teaching resources to enhance educational quality and student learning

- identify the current contributions of faculty, GSIs, part-time lecturers, post-docs, and undergraduates to the teaching enterprise
- assess, if possible, the impact of "who" delivers instruction on student learning outcomes
- explore how technology is currently used in teaching
- examine some new models for teaching and their applicability for Berkeley

B. Helping instructors teach with excellence

- initiate a campus dialogue to begin to define teaching excellence so that there is a common understanding across campus
- identify current efforts to help instructors enhance and assess student learning
- revise academic personnel criteria to better recognize achievement in undergraduate teaching and mentoring, research scholarship in teaching, and creative scholarship in educational technology

Beyond the specific data-gathering efforts around these two topics, we will be making use of several campus-wide assessment projects. Some are long-standing assessment activities and others are new. The information from these assessment projects will give us a fuller understanding of our successes and shortfalls in undergraduate education.

- Undergraduate Education Commitments. After the last WASC accreditation, the campus developed an indicator system to measure longitudinally our progress in strengthening undergraduate education, based on Twelve Commitments. Some 65 indicators reflect both quantitative and qualitative assessment of undergraduate education. These indicators, begun in 1988, are updated every four years, and provide a historical look of where we have been and identify where we need to go. The Commitments will be revised this year to reflect our current thinking about undergraduate education.
- Surveys of students' undergraduate experiences. The campus routinely collects data from a sample of new students, current students and graduating students. These data will be reviewed for information relevant to our proposed topics.
- Email survey of current students. In May 2000, the campus experimented with a new assessment strategy: an email survey was sent to 4000 students to learn more about their undergraduate academic experiences. Replies were received from 1363 students, a response rate of about 37% after adjusting for flawed email addresses. In addition to numerical ratings of the undergraduate experience, this survey yielded extensive open-ended data that will provide a rich contextual framework for our self-study.
- UC-wide Academic Experience Study. UC is currently funding a joint faculty-institutional research project called SERU21, Student Experience in a Research University in the 21st Century. As part of this project, a new survey instrument will be developed and administered in Spring 2002 to all new undergraduates and a large sample of continuing/returning undergraduates across all UC campuses. The instrument will emphasize five domains of student engagement including academic engagement. We anticipate that the results of this survey will be helpful to our self-study.

Topic #3: Improving Undergraduate Program Review

- A. Incorporating into the guidelines for departmental program reviews the criteria for assessing the quality of undergraduate education generated as part of the WASC self-study process.
- set up effective communication mechanisms between the WASC Steering Committee and the individuals, committees and units charged with revising the departmental review process
 - ensure that the criteria, guidelines and processes for assessing the quality of undergraduate education as part of the departmental review process are informed by WASC self-study topics #1 and #2
 - pilot the new process with a departmental review in 2002 and evaluate the results
 - make recommendations to better link the departmental review process to institutional decision-making

Section 7: Basic Descriptive Data

See attached Basic Descriptive Data Profile.

Section 8: Off-site Programs

None.

Section 9: Institutional Stipulation Statement

- UC Berkeley is using the review process to demonstrate its fulfillment of the two Core Commitments; we will engage in the process with seriousness, and data presented will be accurate and will fairly present the institution.
- UC Berkeley has published and publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission for this purpose in Appendix 1 of the WASC Handbook. Such policies will be available on request through the period of accreditation.
- UC Berkeley will abide by procedures adopted by the Commission to meet Department of Education procedural requirements (USDE) as outlined in Section VI of the WASC Handbook.
- UC Berkeley will submit all regularly required data, and any data specifically requested by the Commission during the period of Accreditation.

Robert M. Berdahl
Chancellor

References

- Astin, A.W. (2001) *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barr, R.B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm for Undergraduate Education. *Change*, November/December, 13-25.
- Boyer Commission (1998). *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blue Print for America's Research Universities*. Stonybrook State University of New York.
- Kuh, G.D. (2001). Assessing What Really Matters to Student Learning: Inside the National Survey of Student Engagement. *Change*, 33(3), 10-17.
- Kuh, et al. (1991) *Involving Colleges: Successful Approaches to Fostering Student Learning and Development Outside the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Light, Richard J. (2001) *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Pascarella, E.T. & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How College Affects Students: Finding and Insights from Twenty Years of Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Basic Descriptive Data Profile Attachments

- Chart A-1: Headcount Enrollment by Level (Fall Term)
- Chart A-2: Headcount Enrollment by Status and Location (Fall Term)
- Chart A-3: Degrees and Certificates Granted by Level (Academic Year)
- Chart A-4: Faculty by Employment Status
- A-5.6: Financial Ratios Chart
- Mission Statement
- Organizational Chart
- List of Academic Programs Currently Offered
- Financial Audits for the Last Two Years
- Catalog