



## WASC Preparatory Review Report

UC Davis has selected to use an on-line format for its reaffirmation of accreditation. At the web site, readers will find all of the components of the Preparatory Review Report, including:

- [Guidelines for Navigating the Preparatory Review](#)
- [Institutional Portfolio](#)
- [Reflective Essays](#)
- [Concluding Essays](#)
- [Appendix](#)

## Guidelines for Using this Website

### Welcome to the UC Davis WASC Preparatory Review Report

This on-line portfolio has been constructed to meet the requirements for the UC Davis WASC reaffirmation of accreditation, 2002-2003. It is to be used by the members of the visiting team charged with making a recommendation for our accreditation. It is open to other interested parties, but readers should consider that members of the external teams are the primary intended audience. We assume that these team members are familiar with WASC's expectations for campuses under review.

UC Davis is one of the first institutions to use the new standards and submit an on-line portfolio. In the absence of established templates, we created an organization for the portfolio elements that tries to balance the sometimes conflicting dictates of logic and convenience.

### Content

We recommend that reviewers familiarize themselves with the [information from WASC](#) about the Standards and the process for reaffirmation of accreditation and with other [UC Davis WASC-related information](#) before diving into this portfolio.

The UC Davis institutional portfolio systematically includes the required data sets and documents the UC Davis response to the four standards. It contains a rich array of references to relevant UC Davis resources. The reflective and concluding essays offer contextual information and analysis pertinent to the standards.

### Links

We are mindful of the time limitations of the visiting team, so as the WASC Handbook suggests, we have been selective in the elements we have highlighted. We have endeavored to supply adequate information that demonstrates our adherence to each standard and criterion without burdening the team with excessive documentation. Following the advice of the WASC staff, we have minimized the amount of new material specifically developed for this report and have instead identified a series of links to relevant already-existing documents that demonstrate our adherence to the standards. We have tried very hard to keep these current and accurate. However, given the scope and breadth of our institution, there are times when campus offices change their own website addresses, effectively "breaking" our links. We are routinely checking for this, but a reader may encounter a broken link. Please use the contact email or phone number to inform us of this problem, and we will try to rectify it as soon as possible.

### Navigation

Since the site has several layers, it takes a little practice to become familiar with its organization and navigation. The top level [homepage](#) of our preparatory report has links to the main part of the Institutional Portfolio and to our essays and the appendix. Following the Reflective Essays link leads to a list of the four essays. Each of those opens into a new browser window. When you are finished with it, close the new window.

Following the [Institutional Portfolio](#) link from the home page takes you to the main part of the our report. On this Institutional Portfolio page, there are links to the Basic Descriptive Data, the Prescribed Exhibits, and to the evidence we are presenting for each of the four standards. To view that evidence, follow the link with the title of the standard. For example, clicking on [Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives](#) takes you to the page associated with Standard 1. Each of these pages contains a statement of the standard, the guidelines, and the criteria for review. There is also a link to the associated reflective essay. To view the UC Davis evidence for a criterion, click on the statement of the criterion. A new browser window opens. In it there is a UC Davis Summary of Evidence. The summary text includes links to the evidence, and there are additional links to relevant evidence listed at the end of the summary. After

examining the summary and evidence, close the browser window, and proceed to the next criterion of interest.

When documents open into the current browser window, use the browser back button to return from them. When they open into a new browser window, close the new window and continue in the original window. It is best to use browser windows smaller than your full screen size. With full screen windows completely covering each other, it is difficult to navigate.

## Basic Descriptive Data

[Data](#) | [Prescribed Exhibits](#) | [Standard 1](#) | [Standard 2](#) | [Standard 3](#) | [Standard 4](#)

- **1. Admissions and Student Preparation**
  - 1.1 [Admissions Activities by Level](#)
  - 1.2 [Preparation/Selectivity Levels of Entering Students](#)
  - 1.3 [Admissions by Gender](#)
  - 1.4 [Admissions by Race/Ethnicity](#)
- **2. Student Enrollments**
  - 2.1 [Headcount Enrollments by Degree Objective](#)
  - 2.2 [Headcount Enrollments by Gender](#)
  - 2.3 [Headcount Enrollments by Race/Ethnicity](#)
  - 2.4 [Students Receiving Financial Aid](#)
- **3. Degrees Awarded**
  - 3.1 [Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program](#)
  - 3.2 [Cohort Graduation, Retention and Transfer Rates](#)
- **4. Faculty and Staff Composition**
  - 4.1 [Faculty Composition](#)
  - 4.2 [Faculty Headcount by Department/Program](#)
  - 4.3 [Staff by Gender and Race/Ethnicity](#)
  - 4.4 [Full-Time Faculty/Staff Turnover the Last 5 Years](#)
- **5. Information, Physical, and Fiscal Resources**
  - 5.1 [Information and Computing Resources](#)
  - 5.2 [Physical Resources -- Current Year](#)
  - 5.3 [Source of Revenue](#)
  - 5.4 [Operating Expenditures](#)
  - 5.5 [Assets and Liabilities](#)
  - 5.6 [Capital Investments](#)
  - 5.7 [Endowment Values and Performance](#)
- **6. Institutional and Operating Efficiency**
  - 6.1 [Key Undergraduate Educational Operations Ratios](#)
  - 6.2 [Key Asset and Maintenance Ratios](#)
  - 6.3 [Key Financial Ratios](#)
- **7. Assessment Activities**
  - 7.1 [Assessment Activities](#)
- **8. Proposal Table Formats (for updating)**

## Prescribed Exhibits

[Data](#) | [Prescribed Exhibits](#) | [Standard 1](#) | [Standard 2](#) | [Standard 3](#) | [Standard 4](#)

---

### Institutional Integrity

A widely disseminated, written policy statement of commitment to academic freedom in teaching, learning, research, publication, and oral presentation.

- [General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees - Academic Freedom \(PDF\)](#)

Due process procedures that demonstrate faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.

- [General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees - The Faculty Code of Conduct](#)
- [University Of California Policies Applying To Campus Activities, Organizations, And Students](#)
- 

Written policies on due process and grievance procedures for faculty, staff and students.

- [Academic Personnel Manual - Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances](#)
- [General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees - Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances \(PDF\)](#)
- [Privilege and Tenure](#)
- [Student Rights and Records](#)
- [Student Grievances](#)
- [Personnel Policies for Staff Members - Complaint Resolution](#)
- [Personnel Policies for Staff Members - Complaint Resolution - UCD PROCEDURE](#)
- 

A clear statement of institutional policies, requirements, and expectations to current and prospective employees.

- [Principles of Community](#)

Institutionally developed and published non-discrimination, equal opportunity, and affirmative action policies.

- [Affirmative Action Personnel Program Plan](#)

Clearly written policies on conflict of interest for board, administration, faculty, and staff, including appropriate limitations on the relations of business, industry, government, and private donors to research in the institution.

- [Personnel Policies for Staff Members - Conflict of Interest - UCD PROCEDURE](#)
- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Conflict of Interest](#)
- [UCD Sponsored Research Manual](#)
- [UC PATHWAYS - Information Center](#)
- 

A clear statement that the institution agrees to abide by WASC Policy on Substantive Change and the Policy on Distance and Technology-Mediated Instruction.

- [UC Davis - Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research: Conflict of Interest](#)
- 

---

## Research

Policies covering human subjects and animals in research, classified research, patent provisions, cooperative research relations with industry, and other similar issues related to the integrity and independence of the research enterprise.

- [Information for Researchers and Research Administrators](#)
- [Human Subjects Investigator Participants Form \(DOC\)](#)
- [Technology Transfer Center - Patent Policy](#)
- [UC Davis - Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research: Office of Human Research Protection](#)
- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Use and Care of Animals in Teaching and Research](#)
- [UC Davis - Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research: Conflict of Interest](#)
- 

Institutions that support applied research having the potential for producing significant revenue have clear policies on how faculty responsible for such research share revenue from patents, licenses, and sales. Institutions supporting entrepreneurial activity of faculty of institutionally sponsored research parks have clear policies covering the involvement of faculty in such ventures, the protection of basic research, and the publication of research results.

- [Technology Transfer Center - Summary of Changes to the Patent Policy](#)
- [Technology Transfer Center - Comparison of Royalty Distribution Formulas](#)
- [Technology Transfer Center - Policy on Accepting Equity When Licensing University Technology](#)
- [Sponsored Research Manual - Award Acceptance Procedures](#)
- [Sponsored Research Manual - Patents](#)
- [Sponsored Research Manual - Publication Rights](#)

- 

---

## Educational Programs

Precise, accurate, and current information in printed material regarding a) educational purposes; b) degrees, curricular programs, educational resources, and course offerings; c) student charges and other financial obligations, student financial aid, and fee refund policies; d) requirements for admission and for achievement of degrees; and e) the names of the administration, faculty, and governing board.

- [UC Davis - Office of the Chancellor - Philosophy of Purpose](#)
- [UC Davis - Admissions](#)
- [UC Davis - Undergraduate Admissions and Outreach Services](#)
- [UC Davis - Student Life](#)
- [Academics - Advising Resources](#)
- [2000-2002 UC Davis Online General Catalog](#)
- [UC Davis - Office of Resource Management and Planning](#)
- [UC Davis - Finances](#)
- [Cancellation, Withdrawal and Fee Refunds](#)
- [Academics - Majors](#)
- [Chair List \(PDF\)](#)
- [UC Davis - Office of the Provost - Faculty](#)
- [The Regents of the University of California](#)
- 

Publications that make clear the status (e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct) of each faculty member.

- [General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees- Academic Personnel Definitions \(PDF\)](#)

Clearly articulated policies for the transfer of credit to ensure that students who transfer in with general education course credits meet the institution's own standards for the completion of the general education requirement.

- [Admissions - Apply as a Transfer Student](#)
- [Admission as a Transfer Student](#)
- [ASSIST - Statewide Student Transfer Information for California](#)
- 

Policies and procedures for additions and deletions of programs.

- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Establishment of Academic Units and Programs](#)
- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Units and Programs](#)

Requirements for continuation in, or termination from, academic programs, and a policy for readmission of students who are disqualified for academic reasons.

- [Types of Student Disciplinary Action](#)

Clearly stated graduation requirements that are consistently applied in the degree certification process.

- [Degree Navigator and Your Adviser](#)
- [Degree Requirements](#)
- [Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering at UC Davis: Undergraduate Advising](#)
- [College of Engineering Requirements](#)

---

## Faculty

Personnel policies governing employment of teaching fellows and assistants.

- [Appointment and Promioion - Student Teachers \(PDF\)](#)

Policy designed to integrate part-time faculty appropriately into the life of the institution.

- [UC Davis - Office of the Vice Provost - Academic Personnel - Professional Development Program for Academic Federation Members Annual Call 2002-03 Overview](#)

Explicit and equitable faculty personnel policies and procedures.

- [UC DAVIS Academic Personnel Manual](#)

Policies on salaries and benefits.

- [IV. Salary Administration](#)
- [V. Benefits and Privileges](#)

Policies for faculty and staff regarding privacy and accessibility of information.

- [General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees - Rights of Academic Appointees, Including Rights Regarding Records \(PDF\)](#)
- [General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees - Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of \(PDF\)](#)

---

## Library

Written library collection development and weeding policies, including the bases for accepting gifts.

- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Solicitation and Acceptance of Gifts](#)

---

## Students

Admission and retention policies and procedures, with particular attention to the application of sound admission and retention policies for athletes, international students, and other cases where unusual pressures may be anticipated.

- [Undergraduate and Outreach Services](#)
- [Special Programs](#)
- [UC Davis Fall 2002 Comprehensive Review \(PDF\)](#)
- [Admission as a Transfer Student](#)
- [Regulations of the Academic Senate University of California](#)
- [UC Pathways](#)

Clearly defined admissions policies attentive to the special needs of international students.

- [Admissions - Apply as an International Student](#)

Policies on student rights and responsibilities, including the rights of due process and redress of grievances.

- [Integrity](#)
- [The Disciplinary System](#)
- [Types of Student Disciplinary Action](#)
- [Standards of Conduct](#)
- [Students Grievance](#)
- [Student Judicial Affairs](#)

- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Procedures for Student Complaints of Prohibited Discrimination or Arbitrary Treatment](#)

Publications that include policies and rules defining inappropriate student conduct.

- [Student Conduct](#)
- [Office of Graduate Studies - Judicial Affairs](#)
- [Standards of Conduct](#)
- [Welcome to UC Davis Student Housing](#)
- 

A policy regarding fee refunds that is uniformly administered, and consistent with customary standards.

- [Fee Refunds](#)

---

## Finances

Policies, guidelines, and processes for developing the budget.

- [Campus Budget Processes and Resources](#)

Clearly defined and implemented policies with regard to cash management and investments, approved by the governing board.

- [UCbencom - Benefit News](#)

Policies and a code of ethics for employees involved in buying, bidding, or providing purchase orders.

- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Departmental Purchase Delegations](#)

Policies on risk management, addressing loss by fire, burglary and defalcation; liability of the governing board and administration; and liability for personal injury and property damage.

- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Vehicle Insurance](#)
- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Property Insurance - Equipment Lockdown Program](#)
- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Property Insurance Report](#)
- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - Property Insurance](#)

- [UCD Policy and Procedure Manual - University Liability for Personal Property](#)
- [General Liability Program](#)
- [Risk Management Services](#)
- 

Policies regarding fundraising activities that comply with sound ethical accounting and financial principles.

- [Student Programs and Activities Center - Fundraising](#)
- [UC Davis Foundation](#)
- 

---

[Statement of Affiliation Status](#)

## Institutional Portfolio

- [Guidelines for Using Website](#)
- [Basic Descriptive Data](#)
- [Prescribed Exhibits](#)
- **WASC Standards and UC Davis Response**
  - [Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives](#)
  - [Achieving Educational Objective Through Core Functions](#)
  - [Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures and Ensure Sustainability](#)
  - [Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement](#)
  -

## Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

### Institutional Purposes

- Integrity
- 

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with its purposes and character. It has a clear and conscious sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in the higher education community, and its relationship to society at large. Through its purposes and educational objectives, the institution dedicates itself to higher learning, the search for truth, and the dissemination of knowledge. The institution functions with integrity and autonomy.

### UC Davis Standard 1 Reflective Essay

#### ■ Institutional Purposes

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

**1.1-The institution's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character.**

#### **WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines, or are subject to peer review within the framework of generally recognized academic disciplines or areas of practice.*

### **1.1**

---

**The institution's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character.**

#### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

The recently updated UC Davis [Philosophy of Purpose](#) describes the mission of the campus. It connects the modern campus with its land-grant origins. The three elements are teaching, research, and service to society. The Davis campus of the University of California has a long tradition of special attention to undergraduate education. The elements of the mission are strengthened by the inclusion of programs of graduate education and professional education in veterinary medicine, medicine, law, and management.

The general descriptions in the Philosophy of Purpose take a more concrete form in the [Academic Plan](#). Finalized in 2001, it describes how the principles of the Philosophy of Purpose will be applied in the years 2000-2006 as the campus goes through another phase of major growth. The Academic Plan is the product of several years of discussions, proposals, and priority setting, which included extensive collaboration between the faculty

and administration. It describes detailed plans for the growth and priorities in each of the colleges.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Philosophy of Purpose](#)
- [Academic Plan 2000-2006](#)
- [National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges](#)

---

**1.2-Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives.**

### WASC Guidelines

*The institution has published educational objectives that are consistent with its purposes.*

**Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives.**

### UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

In April of 2002, the Academic Senate, by the action of the Committee on Educational Policy, adopted a formal statement of [Educational Objectives](#) for undergraduate students.

Although a broad consensus among faculty probably existed prior to that, nothing was documented at the campuswide level. Since educational objectives are central to the ideas about demonstrating educational effectiveness in the new WASC Standards, it was hard to imagine how we could continue in our reaccreditation without stated educational objectives. At the same time, the looming growth would bring with it the necessity to make many decisions about priorities for campus development. General objectives could serve to guide decision making. Thus for our own internal reasons and for the reaccreditation process, it appeared that the the adoption of educational objectives through campuswide discussion would be a useful exercise. An initial discussion of educational objectives was added to the agenda of the [2001 Chancellor's Fall Conference](#), the theme of which was undergraduate education. Out of that discussion, came the proposal for the educational objectives. After wide circulation and a long (but sparse) collection of comments and suggestions, the proposed objectives were adopted by the Committee on Educational Policy with very minor modifications.

Given the generality of the Objectives, future work must include discussions and improved practices that will give a more concrete and operational form to the objectives. Each program can consider how the general goals interact with its offerings of classes and course requirements.

The campus has an established system of [teaching program review](#). Over the next year, the criteria for reviews will be updated to include the newly adopted Educational Objectives. So

while there is a system to evaluate the effectiveness of all undergraduate (and graduate) programs, it does not yet contain elements that are specific to the Educational Objectives adopted in April of 2002.

To date, the [measures of success](#) have been largely the traditional ones of the research university: the quality of a program is measured through the quality of its inputs and through the career accomplishments of its students and faculty. In some ways, these are relative measures: how well are students and faculty doing relative to those of other institutions? We are just beginning to think about how we might tackle the more vexing problem of measuring educational effectiveness in ways that are deeper than the traditional ones of course grades, scores on graduate and professional school entrance exams, and career success. Now that the Educational Objectives have been adopted, we can hope to look at the success of our programs relative to the stated educational objectives for student learning.

The College of Engineering has established particularly strong program review criteria that include measures of educational effectiveness. This model will influence the direction of program review in the Colleges of Letters and Science, Agricultural and Environmental Science, and the Division of Biological Sciences.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Educational Objectives](#)
- [Teaching program review](#)
- [Student outcomes](#)

---

### **1.3-The institution's leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at all levels that is marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.**

#### **■ Integrity**

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

**The institution's leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at all levels that is marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.**

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

As a large institution, UC Davis has an extensive and complex system of academic and administrative leadership. The first four links below give an overview of that structure. It is characterized by the system of shared governance. By order of the Regents, the major academic administrative functions of the university: admissions, course approval, degrees, etc. are the responsibility of the faculty and are handled by them through the structure of the Academic Senate. In other matters such as budget, hiring, and promotion, the primary responsibility is with the administration. However, in most areas (including those just mentioned) that directly affect the academic mission, there is extensive consultation between the faculty and the administration. The significance of each aspect of the

organization is elucidated only through long experience on the campus.

The effectiveness of a large and complex structure depends upon accountability and performance review. The remaining documents show that there is such a system of review in place for administrative leaders. In other Criteria summaries, the review procedures for faculty, academic units, and administrative units are described.

Closely related topics appear in Standards 3 and 4, and we have provided additional evidence of the effectiveness of our leadership, organization, and decision-making there.

The leadership of the University and indeed its history and culture are very effective in articulating the traditional mission of the university: teaching, research, and service to society. This is very broadly understood on our campus and across the system. These values are central to the system of academic personnel review.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Academic Senate, Davis Division](#)
- [UC Davis Academic Senate Organizational Chart](#)
- [UC Davis Administrative Plan \(PDF\)](#)
- [UC Davis — Administrative Organizational Chart 2001-02\(PDF\)](#)
- [Appointment and Promotion - General\(PDF\)](#)
- [Appointment and Promotion - Deans and Provosts\(PDF\)](#)
- [Appointment and Review of Deans 6/12/95](#)
- [Appointment and Promotion - Department Chairs\(PDF\)](#)
- [Appointment and Review of Department Chairpersons 6/12/95](#)
- [Appointment and Promotion - Academic Administrator Series\(PDF\)](#)
- [Appointment and Promotion of Academic Administrators 10/14/98](#)

---

**1.4-The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and in their writing.**

### **WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has published or has readily-available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state conditions, and ensure these conditions are consistent with academic freedom. Due Process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.*

As codified in the [Academic Personnel Manual](#), the University is committed to the search for truth free from coercion. The Davis Division of the Academic Senate has a [standing committee](#) to monitor the status of academic freedom on the campus.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

- 
- [General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees - Academic Freedom\(PDF\)](#)
  - [Article 2 - Academic Freedom](#)
  - [Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility](#)

---

**1.5-Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices.**

**WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WASC Statement on Diversity.*

## **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

As a large and important institution of the state and the country, the University operates in a society in which the issues associated with diversity continue to be politically significant and constantly changing. Nevertheless the University has remained steadfast in its commitment to a diverse student body, faculty, and staff. The means by which those goals are achieved are a matter of constant discussion and modification. The [Principles of Community](#) state our commitment to a diverse and tolerant learning community.

In numerous more specific ways, the campus implements its commitment to effectively serve all the people of a very diverse state. For example, the [General Education requirement](#) includes a course in social-cultural diversity.

As one of its first high profile programs, the new [Office of Campus Community Relations](#), with an Associate Executive Vice Chancellor, has initiated the [Campus Community Book Project](#).

The Campus vigorously implements equal opportunity policies typical of large public institutions. These are documented in the other items below.

A more detailed discussion of the success of these programs is contained in the essay.

## **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [The University of California, Davis: Principles of Community](#)
- [Diversity in General Education](#)
- [Campus Book Project](#)
- [The Office for Campus Diversity Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity](#)
- [UC Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty](#)
- [Recruitment for Associate Executive Vice Chancellor](#)
- [Diversity Education Program](#)
- [Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty Hires](#)
- [Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty Separations](#)

- [Recruitment and Retention of Faculty \(pdf\)](#)

---

**1.6-Even when supported by or affiliated with political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.**

**WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has no history of interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by political, religious, corporate, or other external bodies outside the institution's own governance arrangements.*

## **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

While the Board of Regents governs the University of California, and has as one of its main functions the [insulation of the University](#) from the most capricious aspects of state politics, the University, as a major public institution, is occasionally in a central role in the major controversies of the larger society. Nevertheless through the turmoil of the last seventy years, the University has maintained its relevance to society and its independence. The setbacks that it has experienced have all proved to be temporary and have served to forge consensus on and commitment to its central values.

## **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [About the Regents](#)

---

**1.7-The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public; demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion; and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, and refunds.**

**WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has published or readily-available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. and has no history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts.*

## **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

(Summary for 1.7 and 1.8)

The programs and services of the campus along with its grievance procedures are extensively documented. The [General Catalog](#) is a key means of communication of established requirements and policy. In individual courses, departments, and deans' offices, these written policies are the basis for decisions on student requests. The [Office of Student Judicial Affairs](#) deals with students' rights and responsibilities. The Senate grade change

committee deals with requests from students and faculty for grade changes and is guided by very specific policies. Some of the less routine student petitions make their way to the Chair of the Academic Senate, who receives advice from the ad hoc student petitions committee.

The [Services to Schools](#) is an example of communication of the goals and opportunities of the university to the broader community.

There have been quick and vigorous campus responses to cases when structural problems made it difficult for some students to graduate within four years. An example is the expanded offerings of the [2002 summer sessions](#).

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [UC Davis - Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research: Office of Human Research Protection](#)
- [UC Davis Office of Student Judicial Affairs](#)
- [Services to Schools](#)
- [Summer Sessions 2002](#)
- [Alumni, Friends, and Visitors](#)
- [University Extension](#)
- [University Relations](#)
- [University Outreach](#)

---

**1.8-The institution exhibits integrity in its operations as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.**

### **WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has published or readily-available grievance procedures for faculty, staff, and students. Its finances are regularly audited by external agencies.*

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

See Criterion 1.7 summary.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Student Grievances](#)
- [Personnel Policies for Staff Members - Complaint Resolution March 1, 2000](#)
- [Personnel Policies for Staff Members - Complaint Resolution 12/21/99](#)
- [71. Resolution of Concerns--Managers and Senior Professionals, Salary Grades VIII and IX](#)
- [Resolution of Conflicts](#)
- [Procedures for Student Complaints of Prohibited Discrimination or Arbitrary Treatment](#)

9/25/98

- [General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees - Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances\(PDF\)](#)
- [The Associated Students of the University of California, Davis - Academic Affairs Office](#)

---

**1.9-The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.**

## **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

The campus WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee was established in the fall of 1999 and has been working continuously since then. All of its discussions and actions are open and recorded.

At the systemwide level, the University of California is also committed to the WASC reaccreditation process and to [open communication](#) with WASC. It played a crucial role in the process that eventually led to the new WASC Standards and procedures.

## **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [WASC Meeting Minutes](#)

## Standard 2

[Data](#) | [Prescribed Exhibits](#) | [Standard 1](#) | [Standard 2](#) | [Standard 3](#) | [Standard 4](#)

### Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

- [Teaching and Learning](#)
- [Scholarship and Creative Activity](#)
- [Support for Student Learning](#)
- 

The institution achieves its institutional purposes and attains its educational objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning. It demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively and that they support one another in the institution's efforts to attain educational effectiveness.

#### [UC Davis Standard 2 Reflective Essay](#)

##### ■ Teaching and Learning

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

**2.1-The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered.**

##### WASC Guidelines

*The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.*

### UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

This summary is a unified discussion of evidence related to Criteria 2.1-2.7. There are also sidebar summaries at 2.2 and 2.5.

The Teaching and Learning standards 2.1-2.7 cover a number of related topics. The central elements in the discussion are the course requirements for students. Are the course requirements well-documented and readily available? Are the courses and teaching programs that deliver the required instruction reviewed? Do the requirements and related courses reflect the educational objectives of the institution? Is the campus of a community on the purpose of the requirements and the courses? Do the faculty have ownership of this area? Are the courses delivered so that students engage the material and learn to an extent that the goals are met?

The highest level of aspiration for our students is described in the recently adopted [Educational Objectives](#). We are in the beginning stages of propagating the effects of this new approach through the institution. A central role in the process will be played by the new [Undergraduate Council](#), which was established by the Academic Senate Representative Assembly in June 2002. With these two elements, we expect to develop a more coherent

approach to undergraduate education policy.

The present requirements for graduation implicitly state the expectations for student learning. There are four levels of requirements. All of them are described in detail in the [General Catalog](#), which is taken by students and faculty as the highest authority on requirements. The University requirements are minimal and not particularly relevant to the present discussion. The Campus requirement is General Education. It includes the components of topical breadth, writing experience, and social-cultural diversity. At the college level, there are additional writing requirements. The general education requirement will be discussed in more detail in the essay as a response to our previous reaccreditation review. At Criterion 2.2, there are several items related to general education including a discussion of data on student course breadth that is relevant to the WASC general education guideline. These requirements are the operational form of the faculty consensus on expectations for students in GE, breadth, and English composition.

As preparation for university study, elaborate [admission requirements](#) are carefully described in the catalog. In addition, for transfer students, there are articulation agreements with the community colleges that facilitate the transfer process.

Admissions requirements, graduation requirements, and course approval are all matters within the purview of the faculty as represented in the various committees of the Academic Senate. Often a topic from one or more of these areas may become a subject of active discussion on campus. For example, admissions requirements received a lot of [attention](#) in the last year. Writing requirements and the delivery of English composition instruction are matters of [current debate](#).

The [undergraduate courses and degree programs](#) are described in detail in the General Catalog.

There are formal review processes by which the appropriate standards are maintained for courses and programs. Procedures for the review of proposed new programs can be seen [here](#).

Proposals for new courses and for changes to existing courses are reviewed by college and [campus courses committees](#) according to [documented procedures](#). It is worth noting that these are by no means *pro forma* reviews. Complaints about the pickiness and the strictness of these reviews are often heard.

Existing teaching programs are reviewed on a regular schedule according to [general campus guidelines](#). The major effort in review takes place at the college level. ([Letters and Science](#), [Agriculture and Environmental Sciences](#)) Recent examples: [History](#) and [Classics](#). Reviews with their recommendations eventually find their way to the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy and to the appropriate dean.

The guidelines for the program reviews are currently being revised. The goals are to connect the reviews more closely to the new Educational Objectives and to improve the post-review follow through.

Review of graduate programs is handled in a similar manner. Graduate program reviews include a review committee member from another institution.

The College of Engineering has an [assessment-based program review](#) process that is conducted in collaboration with their national accrediting body, the [Accreditation Board for](#)

[Engineering and Technology](#) (ABET). A recent example is the [report](#) from the [Chemical Engineering](#) review. The accreditation for engineering programs is done in conjunction with professional societies, as the societies define criteria specific to each discipline and they provide the program evaluators who visit the campus. The College of Engineering and several of its departments have industrial advisory boards that review and provide advice and guidance on undergraduate programs.

Courses at UC Davis engage students in learning and provide them with feedback in ways typical of research universities. Students receive feedback throughout the quarter in many ways. There are grades associated with problem sets, labs write-ups, quizzes, papers, and midterms. In addition, discussion sections and discussions with faculty members give more informal but very valuable feedback. While many courses are structured in these traditional ways, there are also some more innovative approaches. One example is [Physics 7](#). It is based on the idea that intensive discussion and immediate feedback are a more effective way to help students internalize the concepts of introductory physics. This restructured version of physics for biological science majors has moved the center of learning from the large lecture to the discussion/labs.

Although some departments are adopting a capstone experience for their majors, there is still little systematic, campuswide effort to *directly* measure the extent to which the overall, general learning of graduates meets our goals and expectations. The indirect measures of their development come from the statistics of their [impressive successes](#) in securing desirable employment and positions in graduate or professional schools.

Please see the Criterion 2.3 links for a varied sample of course descriptions and course websites.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Establishment of Academic Units and Programs - Summary of Information Required by the California Postsecondary Education Commission](#)
- [Establishment of Academic Units and Programs - Proposals for New Graduate Programs](#)
- [Establishment of Academic Units and Programs - Guidelines and Criteria for Reviewing Proposals for New Professional Programs](#)
- [Undergraduate Council](#)
- [Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee Review of the Undergraduate Program in the Department of History\(PDF\)](#)
- [Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs - Effective for Evaluations During the 2002-2003 Accreditation Cycle\(PDF\)](#)
- [UCD College of Engineering - Dean's Office: Accreditation](#)
- [UCD College of Engineering - Departments: Chemical Engineering and Materials Science](#)
- [College of Letters and Science Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee\(PDF\)](#)
- [College of Letters and Science Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee](#)

---

**2.2-All degrees - undergraduate and graduate - awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits.**

## **WASC Guidelines**

*Competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the major.*

**Baccalaureate programs** engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and a fulfilling life. These programs also ensure the development of core learning abilities and competencies including, but not limited to, college-level written and oral communication; college-level quantitative skills; information literacy; and the habit of critical analysis of data and argument. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster an understanding of diversity; civic responsibility; the ability to work with others; and the capability to engage in lifelong learning. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in the areas of cultural and aesthetic, social and political, as well as scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons in this society. Finally, students are required to engage in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study as part of their baccalaureate programs.

The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, consisting of a minimum of 45 semester credit hours (or the equivalent), together with significant study in depth in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a major).

**Graduate programs** are consistent with the purpose and character of their institutions; are in keeping with the expectations of their respective disciplines and professions; and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the several levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. Graduate curricula are visibly structured to include active involvement with the literature of the field and ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate high-level professional practice and training experiences. Additionally, admission criteria to graduate programs normally include a baccalaureate degree in an appropriate undergraduate program.

The institution employs at least one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered.

## **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

This discussion presents recent data on the behavior of UC Davis students in their choice of courses with regard to the breadth of those courses. The students in the study are those who graduated in the 2000-2001 academic year. It is related to the WASC Guideline on general education.

In the context of general education at UC Davis, each major is assigned to one of three topical breadth categories: Science and Engineering, Arts and Humanities, and Social Sciences. In this study, we assigned the units taken by each student to one of those three categories. We then considered the distribution of units as a function of the category of the student's major. The results are shown [here](#). For example, students with a major in one of the social sciences took 25% of their units in courses from departments in the category of science and engineering and 25% of their units from departments in the arts and humanities category for a total of 50% of their units outside of departments within the social sciences category. For students in the sciences and engineering and the arts and humanities, the corresponding totals are 29% and 36%, respectively. Overall UC Davis students took 38% of their units outside of the topical breadth category of their own major.

These results demonstrate that typical UC Davis students voluntarily select course programs with impressive breadth. While breadth should not be the only goal of a general

education program, it is certainly one of the most important desired outcomes.

Also of interest relative to general education are the Hewlett grant and the GE Scholars program, which were discussed in the essay.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Admission Requirements](#)
- [Degree Requirements](#)
- [Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum \(IGETC\)](#)
- [Community colleges and the partnership agreement](#)
- [Articulation: Supporting the Teaching and Learning Mission of the University \(pdf\)](#)
- [Educational Objectives](#)
- [Educational Objectives: Fall Conference Report](#)
- [GE Scholars Program](#)
- [Hewlett Grant](#)
- [Establishment of Academic Units and Programs 9/23/91](#)
- [Committee on Courses of Instruction Policies and Procedures \(General Procedures\)](#)
- [UCD WASC Assessment Subcommittee Working Portfolio](#)

---

**2.3-The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in its academic programs and policies. These include the organization and content of the institution's curricula; admissions and graduation policies; the organization and delivery of advisement; the use of its library and information resources; and (where applicable) experience in the wider learning environment provided by the campus and/or co-curriculum.**

### **WASC Guidelines**

*The use of information and learning resources beyond textbooks is evidenced in syllabi throughout the undergraduate and graduate curriculum.*

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

The most concrete expectations for student learning are contained in the classes that are actually delivered. Included in the links to evidence below is a growing list of UC Davis course websites and other material describing individual courses. They indicate the wide range of methods and learning resources that are used by instructors at UC Davis. We have attempted to present a cross-section of types of courses from large lower division lectures to graduate seminars. We have also tried to include courses from most of the disciplinary areas on campus. Before listing courses, we consulted the instructors of record. We will continue to add new courses to this list throughout the fall of 2002.

Please refer to the comprehensive summary at Criterion 2.1 for other comments relevant to this Criterion.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

- 
- [Application Center](#)
  - [UC Davis Student Affairs - Advising, Counseling and Health](#)
  - [Programs and Courses](#)
  - [Graduate Programs of Study at UC Davis](#)
  - [Graduate Groups](#)
  - [Website of lower division honors physics class](#)
  - [Website of an advanced graduate physics class](#)
  - [Nutrition 10: a lower division General Education course](#)
  - [Science in the News, lower division GE course sponsored by Hewlett grant](#)
  - [Geology 1 with Davis Honors Challenge discussion](#)
  - [Capstone courses proposed for Biological Sciences majors](#)
  - [Animal Science 1, a lower division General Education course \(to access: user=ans1, password=famula\)](#)
  - [Cosmology Galaxy Counter Lab](#)
  - [Lower division cosmology course](#)
  - [Engineering design projects and contests](#)
  - [Capstone Chemical Engineering Course](#)
  - [Special Programs and Courses in the Department of History](#)
  - [A General Education Art History Course](#)
  - [An upper division General Education Anthropology class](#)
  - [Capstone Course in Geology](#)

---

**2.4-The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution's faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.**

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

See comprehensive summary at Criterion 2.1.

### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [Academic Senate bylaw establishing the Undergraduate Council](#)
- [Committee on Courses of Instruction](#)
- [UC Davis Academic Senate - Educational Policy](#)

---

**2.5-The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.**

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

UC Davis faculty actively engage students in teaching and research, clearly communicate high expectations for performance and provide prompt and effective feedback in compliance with WASC criterion 2.5. Indication of the importance given this measure can be found in its prominence in the UC Davis Philosophy of Purpose, its inclusion as a principal component of undergraduate program review criteria, the effort made by the University to assess this objective using survey methodology, and the extent to which relevant information at all levels has been shared with and is shaping the University's general education standards and program review criteria. Here we will highlight results from a spring 2001 census survey of the undergraduate population and from our recurrent survey of recent graduates.

Results from these studies formed the core of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Dr. Carol Wall's [plenary address](#) at the 2001 Chancellor's Fall Conference at Granlibakken. The information she reported informed discussion regarding general education and the principal components of UC Davis's WASC proposal: research and information technology. A full presentation of results is available through links listed below but one item from each survey will be featured here.

## Spotlight

---

**High Expectations:** When asked how frequently they understood that faculty had high expectations for their performance, 3 of every 4 undergraduates said often or very often. Reported on a four-point scale where 4 was "very often" and 1 was "never," the mean and modal response was a 3.0, "often." A result showing high level of faculty expectation for student performance was not surprising at UC Davis and, while admirable, would not warrant special attention here. What was remarkable was the uniformity with which that expectation was perceived. Whether they majored in one of the humanities, a physical science, or an engineering field made very little difference. In fact, there was very little variance across college and division of major, student class level, or student status at matriculation (began at UC Davis as freshman or transfer). There was also very little difference by race and ethnicity or sex of student (Chancellor's Fall Conference handout p. 25). In sum, high faculty expectation for academic performance is a part of the UC Davis culture.

**Engagement in Research:** UC Davis has long recognized that an undergraduate student performing research alongside a faculty mentor is a very important and special opportunity that is unique to the research university. Over the past 16 years, alumni have expressed their appreciation. Since this is a core tenant of our Philosophy of Purpose, we are constantly striving to increase and enhance these experiences for students.

When we asked baccalaureate recipients of 1983 how often they had worked on research projects with faculty, the majority said, "Never" (56%), and only 18% said "Very often or often." The same question was asked of the graduating classes of 1990, 1993, 1996 and 1999, and the proportion of alumni whose undergraduate experience included doing research with faculty increased sharply in 1996 and again in 1999. Of the class of 1999, 27% reported that they engaged in research with faculty "Very often or often," and an additional 34% reported doing so at least "Occasionally." Over those 16 years, the proportion of alumni who said that they never worked on research with faculty has been reduced by 17% or an improvement in learning outcome for one of every six graduating

students.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Undergraduate Research Activities at UC Davis Survey of June 1999 Baccalaureate Degree Recipients\(PDF\)](#)
- [College of Letters and Science - Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee](#)
- [From the Student Affairs Vice Chancellor's Presentation at the Chancellor's Fall Conference \(September, 2001\) - Handout\(PDF\)](#)
- [A comprehensive index, with active links, to survey data available by division of major](#)

---

**2.6-The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

See comprehensive summary at Criterion 2.1.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Survey of June 1999 Baccalaureate Degree Recipients: Educational & Occupational Outcomes \(SARI Report #203\)\(PDF\)](#)
- [Postgraduate Outcomes Of Students Who Transfer to UC Davis - May 2001\(PDF\)](#)
- [Postgraduate Outcomes of Students Who Transfer to UC Davis - March 2000\(PDF\)](#)
- [Committee on Courses in Instruction](#)

---

**2.7-In order to improve program currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such reviews.**

### WASC Guidelines

*The institution incorporates in its assessment of educational objectives results with respect to student achievement, including program completion, license examination, and placement rates results.*

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

See comprehensive summary at Criterion 2.1.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Program review](#)
- [Committee on Educational Policy of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate](#)
- [Administrative Unit Reviews 8/27/99](#)

### Scholarship and Creative Activity

■  
Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

**2.8-The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovation, and creative activity, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution's purposes and character.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

UC Davis is a major research university and thrives to the extent that it does value and [promote research](#) and other creative activity. As a land-grant institution located in California's central valley and with its historic ties to agriculture, the dissemination of new knowledge is central to its [public service](#) mission. Research productivity is not just valued and promoted it is expected, and it plays a key role in hiring and advancement. As the link to the [Annual Call](#) and the associated link to [APM 210](#) make clear, "... superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions."

The success of campus policies on support for research are evident in the forty year rise of UC Davis from a relatively small campus with its greatest research strengths concentrated in agriculture and related fields of biology to a large campus with AAU membership and producing first class research across the spectrum of academic fields.

Specific examples of programs to promote curricular and instructional innovation are the [Summer Institute on Technology in Teaching](#) and the [Undergraduate Instructional Improvement Program](#). More generally, [MediaWorks](#) and the [Teaching Resources Center](#) provide support for faculty innovation in instruction.

The role of technology in teaching and learning is a component of our educational effectiveness self-study.

## Spotlight

---

Science 1 is an example of curricular and instructional innovation. It also happens to be a General Education course.

[Course announcement](#)

[Course home page](#)

## [Report](#)

### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [Summer Institute on Technology in Teaching \(SITT\)](#)
  - [Chancellor's Teaching Fellowship](#)
  - [Undergraduate Instructional Improvement Program \(UIIP\)](#)
  - [Distinguished Teaching Awards](#)
  - [2002 Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award](#)
  - [Outstanding Graduate Teaching Awards 2002 Call for Nominations](#)
  - [Academic Federation Award for Excellence in Research](#)
  - [Academic Federation Award for Excellence in Teaching](#)
  - [Davis Honors Challenge](#)
  - [Undergraduate Research Conference](#)
  - [Salary Increases/Merit\(PDF\)](#)
  - [Academic Senate Annual Call for Merit and Promotion Actions Information for 2002-03](#)
  - [Association of American Universities](#)
  - [UC Davis Teaching](#)
- 

---

#### **2.9-The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.**

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

The campus strongly supports and encourages the integration of research, student learning, and service. A very prominent example is the UC Davis Prize for Undergraduate Teaching and Scholarly Achievement. It is presented by the UC Davis Foundation to a member of the faculty in the belief that excellence in undergraduate teaching combined with distinguished scholarly achievement sets great universities apart from good universities. In addition, other links give additional examples of recognition for outstanding teaching by faculty and graduate student scholars. Academic federation members, who make extraordinary contributions to undergraduate instruction, are also encouraged to contribute to the scholarly life of the campus.

However, the centerpiece of the linkage is the seamless integration of teaching, learning, and research in the academic lives of undergraduates, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and faculty. Many research projects, especially in the experimental sciences, will find scholars at all those levels collaborating on the same project.

A large number of undergraduates are involved in research through research courses, senior theses, internships, and paid work. Statistics on this involvement and on students

reactions to it are documented in [SARI studies](#).

The linkage between student learning and community service is often established through internships. At UC Davis, internships are sponsored through the [Internship and Career Center](#) (ICC), which has a faculty Director. Considered an academic support unit rather than a student services unit, the ICC reports directly to the Vice Provost Undergraduate Studies and indirectly to the Vice Chancellor Student Affairs.

There are three levels of internship that vary in terms of their academic rigour. At the lowest level are internships that do not carry academic responsibilities. At the intermediate level are internships that carry transcript notation written certification of that the student has met certain requirements in the course of completing the internship. These requirements include working under the guidance of an experienced mentor, identifying specific learning objectives, and mutual evaluation and feedback. At the highest level of rigor are courses with the 92 and 192 designations. Widely distributed across campus, these combine work in the internship setting with specific academic requirements. Depending on such factors as time commitment and additional academic requirements, students can earn up to 12 units for graduation. The Internship and Career Center places approximately 6,000 interns annually. Roughly 80% of these internships involve service by the Human Corps definition.

Two particularly noteworthy programs are the [Human Corps](#) and the [Washington Center](#). Often freshman seminars and Davis Honors challenge courses are structured along research lines. Many research opportunities for undergraduates are in the listed links.

There are several awards for undergraduate research including the [Chancellor's Award](#).

Each year the [Undergraduate Research Conference](#) is held in April.

For Ph.D. candidates, research is the primary focus of their UC Davis experience. The key requirement for the degree is the Ph.D. thesis, which is an original scholarly work. Our faculty take graduate student mentoring in research as well as preparing graduate student teaching assistants for their future in the classroom very seriously. In addition, many graduate students participate formally in TA training and programs like Professors-for-the future.

Since the integration of research and undergraduate education is a topic of our educational effectiveness review, we will have much more to say about it there.

## Spotlight

---

Internships: Service, learning, and research

In Psychology alone somewhere on the order of 120 students annually complete PSC 192. In this course, advanced students relate experiences in the field to research and theory in the field of psychology and then compare their actual experiences with expectations based on their coursework and outside readings. Almost all of these internships involve service: students work in schools, domestic violence shelters, prisons, homes with autistic children, police departments, and psychiatric facilities of all types. Some of these internships do not involve service the way we normally think of it (for example, working in the human relations department of a large high tech firm) but the service component is the rule, rather than the

exception.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Summer Institute on Technology in Teaching](#)
- [Chancellor's Teaching Fellowship](#)
- [Undergraduate Instructional Improvement Program \(UIIP\)](#)
- [Distinguished Teaching Awards](#)
- [2002 Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award](#)
- [Outstanding Graduate Teaching Awards](#)
- [UC Davis Academic Federation Awards - For Research](#)
- [UC Davis Academic Federation Awards - For Teaching](#)
- [UC Davis Honors Challenge](#)
- [Undergraduate Research Conference](#)
- [Salary Increases/Merit](#)
- [Annual Call for Merits & Promotions](#)
- [Committee on Research](#)
- [Academic Review Process--Deferrals 10/1/99](#)
- [Academic Review Process--Appointments 10/1/99](#)
- [Appointment and Review of Graduate Group Chairs 2/5/92](#)
- [UC Davis Washington Center, Academic Internships](#)
- [Human Corps, community service](#)
- [UC Davis Peace Corps Office](#)
- [Explorations, a journal of undergraduate research](#)
- [Undergraduate research opportunities](#)
- [Graduate Studies](#)
- [Professors for the Future](#)

## ■ Support for Student Learning

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

**2.10-Regardless of mode of program delivery, the institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students and assesses their needs, experiences, and levels of satisfaction. This information is used to help shape a learning-centered environment and to actively promote student success.**

### UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

Student Affairs Research & Information (SARI) has three primary goals:

- To conduct comprehensive, student-centered institutional research and evaluation activities that support the academic mission of UC Davis.
- To maintain databases and produce information that meets the needs of campus decision makers, workgroups and committees and that addresses the information requirements of external requesters (e.g., federal and state agencies, accrediting agencies, reporters, AAU institutions, college guide publishers).
- To provide analytical support to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and other campus entities (e.g., Undergraduate Advising Council, Undergraduate Associate Deans, Academic Senate Committee on Education, Vice Provost Undergraduate Studies, Analytical Studies, and College Academic Review Committees).

Two comprehensive and influential recent studies are the survey of 1999 alumni and the 2001 survey of enrolled students.

At the 2001 Chancellor's Fall Conference on undergraduate education, SARI data were used to anchor and center many of the discussions. Vice-Chancellor Wall undergirded her presentation, later made available to the full campus community, with SARI data and then compared UC Davis specific trends with the most recent data from comparison institutions.

### Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Student Affairs Research and Information](#)
  - [Chancellor's Fall Conference](#)
  - [Advising Services](#)
-

**2.11-Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs, and supports student professional and personal development.**

## **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

The range of co-curricular activities available at UC Davis is far too broad to allow for even an overview in a small space. In the discussion of Criterion 2.9, we have already mentioned that the Internship and Career Center runs an extremely ambitious and effective internship program. It is worth emphasizing again that these co-curricular activities are among the most important ways that undergraduate students can get involved in research on campus, in industry, or in government agencies. An internship or job that involves research can lead to a presentation at the Undergraduate Research Conference. See the discussion in Standard 2.9 for the related links. We will discuss this much more extensively in our Educational Effectiveness report.

We turn now to another program that is particularly closely tied to our educational objectives: the [Student Leadership Development Series](#) which has the following stated objectives:

- Students will learn the value of campus and community involvement and develop an ethic of service.
- Students will develop a personal philosophy and set of operating principles based on an ethic of fairness, integrity, responsibility to self and others, and personal accountability.
- Students will develop demonstrable competencies in support of and related to their futures. These competencies include: oral and written communication, empathy, persuasion, and listening; appropriate means of conflict resolution and decision-making; and skills related to effective membership in groups and teams, including collaboration, compromise and consensus-building.
- Students will reflect upon their personal talents through appropriate training, coaching and mentoring; actual workplace experiences on and off-campus; and formal opportunities for self-assessment and purposeful feedback.
- Students will develop organizational and situational acumen as well as learn strategies to manage and effect change.
- Students will develop an appreciation for the complexities and richness afforded by pluralism along with the capacity to understand and respect the differences and commonalities brought by all members of the University community, the state and nation, and the world at large.

Since this program predates our new Educational Objectives but is closely tied to them, it reinforces our view that the statement of the Objectives merely codified priorities long shared by our faculty.

The links below give just a small sample of the wide variety of co-curricular programs at UC Davis.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Student Programs and Activities Center - UC Davis](#)
- [The WK Kellogg Foundation Summer Leadership Institute](#)
- [Leading Roles: Enabling Excellence in Leadership Education](#)
- [Welcome Prospective Students - Internship Opportunities](#)
- [Tandem Properties Alternative Housing Options](#)
- [Multicultural Immersion Program](#)
- [Biology Undergraduate Scholars Program](#)
- [Mentorships for Undergraduate Research in Agriculture, Letters, and Science](#)
- [Mentorships for Undergraduate Research Participants in the Physical and Mathematical Sciences](#)

---

**2.12-The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements.**

### **WASC Guidelines**

*Recruiting and admission practices, academic calendars, publications, and advertising are accurate, current, disclosing, and are readily available to support student needs.*

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

Our extensive advising programs are described in the essay. Some of the related links are listed below.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Getting Academic Help\(PDF\)](#)
- [Learning skills Center](#)
- [Degree Navigator](#)
- [Academic Advising](#)
- [Tutoring and Learning Resources](#)
- [Academic Information\(PDF\)](#)
- [Message from the Dean](#)
- [UC Davis Student Handbook - Academics\(PDF\)](#)
- [Academic Peer Advising](#)
- [New student orientation](#)
- [Advising Services](#)
- [Advising, Counseling, and Health](#)

---

**2.13-Student support services including financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, computer labs, and library and information services are designed to meet the needs of the specific types of students the institution serves and the curricula it offers.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

As a major university with a large student body, UC Davis has an extensive array of support services for students. As a public institution, we are particularly concerned with affordability, and financial aid is a topic worth mentioning. In spite of up and downs in the state economy, in-state student fees have remained remarkably stable for the last eight years. We are heartened by this steadfast commitment to California's students. In addition to our relatively low cost, the range of financial aid available is a further incentive for a university education. In the 2001-2002 school year, 63.8% of all UC Davis students received some form of financial aid; total financial aid awarded totaled \$141.6 million dollars. UC Davis also awarded \$2.8 million in scholarships to undergraduates and over \$2 million in scholarships was awarded to UC Davis students by outside agencies.

Before establishing our expectation of computer ownership a faculty/staff committee spent nearly two years developing a proposal. A key participant in these discussions was the Director of Financial Aid, whose knowledge of the rules and regulations enabled the campus to develop an expectation with minimal financial burden to the students. Since the cost associated with the expectation for computer ownership is included in student expenses, it can be funded with financial aid.

A discussion of advising can be found in the essay, and links related to advising are listed in Standard 2.12. A sampling of other support services is listed below.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Financial Aid and Scholarship](#)
- [UC Davis Financial Aid Office](#)
- [Undergraduate Financial Aid](#)
- [Graduate Financial Aid](#)
- [Career Help Index](#)
- [Career Services for UC Davis Undergraduates](#)
- [Student Computing Guide: Computer Rooms: Open Access Labs](#)
- [Computer Rooms - Locations, Hours, Software & Hardware Guide](#)
- [The University of California, Davis: Libraries and Exhibits](#)
- [Student Computing Guide: Home Page](#)
- [Student computer ownership](#)
- [Financial aid for computer purchase](#)
- [Library orientation](#)

---

**2.14-Institutions that serve transfer students assume an obligation to provide clear and accurate information about transfer requirements, ensure equitable treatment for such students with respect to academic policies, and ensure that such students are not unduly disadvantaged by transfer requirements.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

UC Davis has joined the governor in the UC Partnership. It includes a [commitment](#) to increase the number of community college transfers. We believe they deserve as strong a UC education as native students. We have thoroughly researched outcomes with this group.

As indicated by the links included, we give extensive attention to transfer students. This includes SARI studies to determine the success of these efforts. One [recent study](#) finds a remarkable level of success. Its conclusion states:

"Although transfer students enter UC Davis further along in their academic careers than students coming directly from high school, they resemble high school admits on most descriptive measures. Both groups graduate at similar rates with comparable grade point averages, go on to graduate and professional schools at equivalent rates, and earn comparable salaries. In so far as there is a problem, it centers on the lower levels of satisfaction with UC Davis in general reported by transfer students. That lesser satisfaction seems to stem more from weaker social integration for transfer students and a differing sense about the level of preparation received in key areas than from failures in instruction or academic advising. The data indicate that areas requiring our attention include: (1) helping transfer students develop interpersonal skills, skills in leadership and cross-cultural competencies, (2) increasing their opportunities for social interaction class-related and otherwise, and (3) finding ways to increase the involvement of transfer students in campus activities and processes."

## **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [Programs for Transfer Students](#)
- [Transfer Admission Agreement](#)
- [Admission as a Transfer Student](#)
- [Transfer curriculum](#)
- [Transferring to UC Davis from a California Community College](#)
- [More transfer student outcomes](#)
- [Transfer student outcomes](#)
- [Apply as a Transfer Student](#)
- [Transfer Student: Special Admissions Program](#)
- [A Transfer Student's Planning Guide](#)
- [The Transfer Program: A Gateway to Priority Admissions](#)
- [Transfer Students: Myths and Reality\(PDF\)](#)
- [Characteristics of Students Transferring To UC Davis From California Community Colleges 1998-1999\(PDF\)](#)
- [Transfer Students 2001 Focus Group Summary\(PDF\)](#)
- [Take the Community College Route to a Selective Public University Degree\(PDF\)](#)
- [Postgraduate Outcomes Of Students Who Transfer to UC Davis\(PDF\)](#)
- [Transfer Student Report Generator](#)
- [Enrollment and Graduation Patterns of Undergraduates Transferring to UC Davis: 1984-1999\(PDF\)](#)

## Standard 3

[Data](#) | [Prescribed Exhibits](#) | [Standard 1](#) | [Standard 2](#) | [Standard 3](#) | [Standard 4](#)

### Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

- [Faculty and Staff](#)
- [Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources](#)
- [Organizational Structures and Decision-making Processes](#)
- 

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high quality environment for learning.

#### [UC Davis Standard 3 Reflective Essay](#)

##### ■ Faculty and Staff

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

#### **3.1-The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives.**

### UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

We are extremely fortunate to have outstandingly talented and dedicated faculty and staff. In this time of rapid enrollment growth, we strive to hire faculty and staff at a ratio that is appropriate to the workload of both groups. Although fluctuating budgets can make it difficult to realize that ideal at all times, we have maintained a high level of quality in teaching and research and in support for those missions.

The student/faculty ratio is about 19/1, which is on the high end of the range for other UC campuses, in the high part of our own historical range, and above average for other public research universities. It is probably about as high as it can get without significantly compromising the quality of instruction. During the boom years of the late 1990s, there was some hope that it would be possible to bring the ratio back closer to what it was before the budget problems of the early 1990s. With the current difficulties and rising enrollment pressure, it seems unlikely that any improvement can be expected in the near term.

UC Davis has given serious and sustained attention to matters of staff workload and work/life balance for staff. A summary of these efforts can be found [here](#). UC Davis is a [Model Employer](#) and a "[Family Friendly](#)" university.

In 2000, the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor created the Senior Advisors Group and charged it to review staff workload issues in preparation for a sustained period of campus

growth. At the same time, deans, vice chancellors, and other senior campus administrators prepared administrative service plans that identified needs and strategies for putting staff and other resources in place to support the five-year campus academic plan established in 1999. The Senior Advisors Group conducted its review in cooperation with staff constituency groups and major central administration units. It recommended and won approval for a number of initiatives aimed at streamlining campus work processes and addressing various staff compensation issues. The campus took advantage of the relatively good budget years of 1999-00 and 2000-01 to add staff in areas particularly hard-pressed by the pace of growth in enrollment and extramural support: human resource services, technology support for instruction, research compliance, financial aid processing, and student services generally. Even in recent, less positive financial times, maintenance of adequate staff support for the campus's mission remains a high priority for the campus. The campus, for example, is an active participant in the University of California New Business Architecture initiative, a concerted effort to bring technology and other tools to bear on the problem of making University business process easier to navigate for staff and more effective. The campus [principles for budget reduction](#) further demonstrate the administration's commitment to recognizing the critical contribution that staff make to sustaining the research, instruction, and public service missions of the campus.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Model Employer Report](#)
- [Work/Life Balance](#)
- [Budget Planning Principles](#)

---

**3.2-The institution demonstrates that it employs a faculty with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve its educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever and however delivered.**

### WASC Guidelines

*The institution has an instructional staffing plan that includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty with appropriate backgrounds by discipline and degree levels.*

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

The faculty hiring and advancement policies of the [academic personnel process](#), which were already discussed to some extent in Criterion 2.8 and also must be mentioned in the next Criterion, ensure the very highest faculty quality. The [program reviews](#), which were also noted in Standard 2, include consideration of faculty staffing for each program and for important specialities within programs. At the level of the colleges and the campus, the recently completed [Academic Plan](#) lays out the strategy for adding new faculty over the next five years.

Progress in faculty diversity is discussed in our essay and in [remarks](#) to the State Legislature by Provost Hinshaw. Policies and data on diversity in faculty hires are included

in the links below.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Academic Plan](#)
- [Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty\(PDF\)](#)
- [Academic Recruitment Guidelines - 3/23/98](#)
- [Report of the Chancellor's and Provost's Task Force on Faculty Recruitment UC Davis\(PDF\)](#)
- [UC Davis - Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty Hires effective 11/1/1996 through 10/31/2001](#)
- [UC Davis - Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty Separations effective 11/1/1996 through 10/31/2001](#)
- [Remarks to the State Legislature by Provost Hinshaw](#)

---

**3.3-Faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and, for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

The University of California [academic personnel process](#) is nothing if not well documented and bureaucratic. Evaluation begins in the departments and progresses upward through Senate and administrative levels. The short version is that every case for faculty advancement must include evidence of excellence in teaching, research, and service. For merit actions, student evaluations are primary evidence of teaching effectiveness. For promotions, there is additional peer review of teaching.

In spite of being an established and cumbersome process, it remains vibrant. There are periodic reassessments of its appropriateness. The most recent one is documented in [Special Committee on Academic Personnel Processes](#) and [Special Committee on Personnel Processes Reform](#). Part of the follow through can be read in [Directive 02-099](#).

It is possible that the implementation of the Educational Objectives will lead to additional adjustments in emphasis in this incentive structure.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Personnel Policies for Staff Members: Recruitment](#)
- [Personnel Policies for Staff Members: UCD TABLE OF CONTENTS 12/1/01 \(revised 4/11/02\)](#)
- [Academic Recruitment Guidelines 3/23/98](#)
- [Academic Review Process--General Policy and Procedures 10/1/99](#)

- [UCD Directives: Recruitment of an Academic Assistant to the Vice Provost - Academic Personnel](#)
- [Appointment and Reappointment of Unit 18 Members 6/12/95](#)
- [Merit Increases for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers 6/12/95](#)
- [Lecturers and Senior Lecturers 6/12/95](#)

---

**3.4-The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purposes.**

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

As mentioned in Criterion 2.8, the [Teaching Resources Center](#) (TRC) provides support for faculty [instructional improvement](#) and [innovation](#). The TRC itself was recently reviewed, and a plan to strengthen its activities is being implemented.

[MediaWorks](#) and its unit [The Arbor](#) are also devoted to faculty support for the use of technology in instruction.

The evidence presented here demonstrates capacity for the educational technology part of our educational effectiveness self-study.

### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [Improvement of teaching- Videotaping](#)
- [Faculty Development Program 2002-2003\(PDF\)](#)
- [Mediaworks ET Partners Program](#)
- [Teaching resources](#)
- [Summer Institute on Technology in Teaching](#)
- [Teaching Resources Center](#)
- [TRC Resources for teaching improvement](#)
- [MediaWorks](#)
- [The Arbor](#)

## ■ Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

### **3.5-Fiscal and physical resources are effectively aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives, and are sufficiently developed to support and maintain the level and kind of educational programs offered both now and for the foreseeable future.**

#### **WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has a history of financial stability, appropriate independent audits, and realistic plans to eliminate any accumulated deficits and to build sufficient reserves to support long-term viability.*

#### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

Financial and physical resources are allocated in response to priorities and processes established by the 2000-06 Academic Plan. The plan identifies an academic vision for the campus including new initiatives and detailed academic plans and priorities for each school and college. The plan's guiding principles address faculty position allocations, facility needs, staffing and infrastructure. Importantly, the academic plan also describes implementation strategies to achieve the plan's objectives.

In addition to the overriding direction provided by the academic plan, the campus employs other strategies to ensure financial and capital resources are available to support campus programs. Operating funds utilize a five-year planning horizon to ensure that executive leadership is fully knowledgeable of trends and consequences that result from certain alternatives. As another component of the operating budget, the campus utilizes a system of annual block grants to academic and support units that are weighted to reflect workload and productivity. To ensure capital needs are anticipated, the campus has published a ten-year all-funds capital improvement plan-the first in the University of California system.

To ensure adequate budgetary control, policies have been established and are enforced that address deficits within operating units. Major fund areas have reserve standards to promote flexibility as new opportunities or challenges arise. The university system and the campus employ independent auditors to review financial controls. In addition the campus administers an Internal Audit Services unit to review financial and policy compliance as well as promoting best management practices.

This long-range orientation to resource planning strives to ensure that current needs can be addressed while always preparing for our future.

#### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [UC Davis Office of Resource Management & Planning](#)
- [Office of Resource Management and Planning Organization Chart](#)
- [Academic Plan For UC Davis: 2000-2006](#)
- [10 year all-funds capital improvement plan \(available in August\)](#)
- [Current campus capital projects](#)
- [Sciences Laboratory Building](#)

- [Five-year capital improvement plan \(2001-2006\)](#)
- [Long Range Development Planning](#)

---

**3.6-The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. For on-campus students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kind to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered. These resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's purposes, and are appropriate, sufficient, and sustainable.**

## **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

The General Library at UC Davis is distinguished by its collections, staff, services and facilities as well as its membership in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The Library consistently ranks in the top third of the 122 members of ARL. As a major educational and scholarly resource, the Library is an integral part of the University. Its mission is to collect, preserve and provide access to books, journals, manuscripts, documents, and other records of knowledge held in an ever expanding range of print and digital media in support of University instruction, research, patient care and community outreach.

In addition to the acquisition of books and other media, the Library currently receives thousands of journal titles in support of undergraduate, graduate and faculty instruction and research. A significant number of these journals are being produced in digital form accessible via the Library's gateway. Providing rapid and efficient access to appropriate scholarship ensures that students and faculty have the resources needed to facilitate the process of intellectual discovery.

General Library facilities are designed to promote study and research. Increasingly, these facilities are being outfitted with network and wireless connections which enable students, faculty and other users to coordinate the use of print and electronic resources in the same location. At the same time, Library investments in technology have enabled a host of alternatives to traditional library use. Remote access to catalogs, finding aids, and full text materials as well as the Internet are increasingly commonplace and fit the use patterns of a new generation of learners. On the horizon are Library initiatives to develop personalized portals that users will be able to use to customize information specific to their needs and interests.

The General Library continues to invest in technologies that allow remote access to digitized material (databases, text files, images). Based on national trends, it is estimated that as many as 75% of users prefer to access such materials remotely (i.e. students in dorm rooms or residences, faculty in their offices). Thus, the ability to deliver instructional and research materials to the user desktop will continue to be a focus.

A strong user assistance program is in place in the General Library to enrich the learning experience for students as well as the discovery process for researchers. Classes in the use of basic print and electronic tools are readily available from trained library staff via mediated classroom sessions or on-line tutorials. Special instructional sessions are also available which focus on specific disciplines or areas of research and to specific audiences from incoming freshmen to transfer students to graduate students.

## Spotlight

---

For the past ten months the Health Sciences Libraries at UC Davis have moved the concept of real time digital reference to reality by offering live reference chat sessions with a librarian between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The software selected for this program, 24/7 Reference, has proven stable and patron reactions to the service have been positive. This software allows a patron and librarian to do a live chat as well as "co-surf" the web. The Librarian can collaboratively work on pages with a patron or simply push pages to and assist a patron with developing a search strategy for the Melvyl online catalog or PubMed or other web resources. The average number of "live interactions" per day since the program began in October, 2001 has been about one per day. While all reference librarians at the Health Sciences Libraries participate in this program, one librarian has coordinated the effort by providing training sessions with librarians trading off as patrons and librarians, developing guidelines, and leading regular discussions on how the service can be improved/made easier for librarians. This has been a very efficient way to introduce new and cutting edge public service applications. Using the service is simple and user friendly and may be accessed [here](#).

The UC Davis General Library has been participating in the [UC Collection Management Initiative](#) (CMI) supported by a grant from the Mellon Foundation to assess user acceptance of electronic journals. UC Davis is monitoring the use of a group of "experimental" titles in the sciences, which are available in electronic form. The print volumes and issues of these titles have been removed from the shelves for the years that are available online, but they are available "on demand". Both the online use of the titles and requests to see the print copies are being monitored. On the Davis campus, after 9 months, a pattern is emerging that suggests that access to print material is more likely to be requested when an issue, article or other information has not been made available online. For the "control" titles, UC Davis is monitoring the print use of the journals on the shelves as well as the use of the online versions. For these titles, there is use of both the print and online. [Partial data](#) on the titles being monitored in this study is available. Overall, throughout the nine campuses, demand for print titles has been extremely low now that they have been removed from the shelf.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [UC Davis Library Home Page](#)
- [UC Davis Library Services](#)

---

**3.7-The institution's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

Coordination of information technology resources is achieved through an advisory structure that was developed in 1998 as a result of a recommendation from the previous Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Information Technology that recognized the need for a more representative system. Most of the work is carried out by two councils, the Academic Computing Coordinating Council (AC4) and the Administrative Computing Coordinating Council (AdC3), who report to the Information Technology Policy Board, which is chaired by the Provost. The Councils are comprised of stakeholders and representatives of campus constituencies, rather than by Information Technology professionals or advocates, using similar principles to the Teaching and Learning Technology Advisory Boards being promoted through the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) at the time (now the Teaching, Learning and Technology Group).

One of the first recommendations of the AC4 was that the senior information technology administrator should be an academic appointment, the Vice Provost-Information and Educational Technology (VP-IET), instead the Associate Vice Chancellor position then vacant. The new position was filled after a national search. At about the same time, there was an Administrative Unit Review of the Office of Information Technology (AUR-OIT), the Learning Environment Architecture Development Project (LEAD), and the Provost's Commission on the Future of Information Technology (PC-FIT). The importance of the councils was immediately established by the Provost requesting (and accepting) advice about substantial budgetary and programmatic issues.

The results of this period of intense study and planning for the coordination of information technology resources to best serve the mission of the institution were widespread on the campus. A case study illustrates the effects. The AUR-OIT and the PC-FIT both recognized that the services for education provided centrally needed to be more accessible and responsive to campus needs. As a result, many of these services were consolidated under the VP-IET in a unit named Mediaworks. Mediaworks immediately replaced the old first-come, first-served approach to educational projects for faculty with a 3-tiered approval mechanism that aligns the services to institutional priorities and pedagogical goals. The first tier is partnerships between a dean, a department and Mediaworks that address the challenges of enrollment growth. Two such partnerships are now in place and the program is developing. The second tier involves collaboration between Mediaworks and the Teaching Resources Center (TRC), a unit under the Vice Provost-Undergraduate Studies, in which the TRC approves the pedagogical quality of faculty-initiated projects at Mediaworks in a grant application mechanism (Education Technology Grants). The third tier requires a 10% cost-sharing.

This Criterion emphasizes the coordination of information technology activities. In addition to links relevant to our discussion of that, we have also included a few that go to sites where projects can be found. The structures that we have in place to coordinate educational technology and the projects that we are capable of executing are a crucial element in the institutional capacity that is a prerequisite for our self-study element on educational technology.

## **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [UC Davis - Office of the Vice Provost - Information & Educational Technology](#)
- [UC Davis - Administrative Computing Coordinating Council \(AdC3\)](#)
- [UC Davis - Academic Computing Coordinating Council \(AC4\)](#)

- [SisWeb and RSVP](#)
- [Classroom Upgrade Project](#)
- [IT Project Updates](#)
- [Classroom Upgrade Project FAQs](#)
- [Faculty Technology Guide](#)
- [The Information Technologies Policy Board \(ITPB\)](#)
- [Information and Educational Technology](#)
- [Learning Environment Architecture Development \(LEAD\) Project](#)
- [Mediaworks](#)
- [Teaching Resources Center](#)
- [Chemistry 2C Laboratory Presentations Login Page](#)
- [Mediaworks/TRC Grants for Educational Technology \(ET Grants\)](#)
- [Mediaworks Gallery](#)

### ■ Organizational Structures and Decision Making Processes

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

#### **3.8-The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, and sufficient to support effective decision making.**

##### **WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has an organization chart that clearly depicts positions, associated responsibilities, and lines of authority.*

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

Although it is a huge institution with ten campuses, the University of California has, at least in broad outline, a conceptually straightforward organization. Ultimate responsibility for the University rests with the Board of Regents. The President of the University and the Office of the President are responsible to the Regents for systemwide policy and administration. Each campus has an administrative structure led by a chancellor. The administrative organization and division of responsibility for UC Davis are summarized in the Organizational Chart and Administrative Plan to which there are links below.

Analogously the university faculty are organized into the systemwide Academic Senate and then into the the corresponding Divisions of the Academic Senate on each campus.

Most of the other Criteria speak, in one way or another, to the sufficiency of this organization to support effective decision making.

### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [The Regents of the University of California](#)
- [Office of the President](#)
- [Systemwide Academic Senate](#)

- [UC Davis Office of the Chancellor](#)
- [UC Davis Administrative Organizational Chart 2001-2002 \(pdf\)](#)
- [UC Davis Administrative Plan \(pdf\)](#)
- [Davis Division of the Academic Senate](#)

---

**3.9-The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.**

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

The Regents of the University of California set overall policy for the University and to some extent insulate it from political pressures. They select the President of the University, to whom most administrative functions are delegated. They approve all high level appointments at the Office of the President and on the campuses.

### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [Regents of the University of California](#)

---

**3.10-The institution has a chief executive whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, together with a cadre of administrators qualified and able to provide effective educational leadership and management at all levels.**

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

Since the University of California has ten campuses, it has two main layers of administration. While the President of the University and the [Office of the President](#) handle many overall functions, each campus has a Chancellor with local administrative responsibility and a great deal of autonomy. Since the accreditation is by campus, it is the UC Davis [Chancellor](#) and the rest of the local administration that are most relevant in the reaccreditation process.

### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [Chancellor](#)
  - [Administrative Organizational Chart 2001-2002 \(pdf\)](#)
  - [UC Davis Administrative Plan \(pdf\)](#)
-

**3.11-The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution's educational purposes and character.**

## **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

The University of California and the Davis campus have a clear, explicit, and well documented organization structure. It is unremarkable, except for the very high level of commitment to the principle of shared governance, by which the faculty and administration have joint responsibility for the effective operation and overall excellence of the institution. The administrative leadership and organization is discussed in more detail in other Criteria and Standards. The faculty have primary responsibility for purely academic matters such as courses and curricula.

While academic departments and programs have considerable autonomy, the overall responsibility of the faculty for academic policy is evident in the extensive [committee structure](#) of the Senate. Every proposal for a new course or for a change in an existing course receives multiple levels of review. At the college level, there are the college courses committees and the college executive committees. At the campuswide level, there are several committees that are very important in academic matters. The Graduate Council oversees academic matters related to graduate education. The undergraduate education committee structure has just been reorganized. There is now an Undergraduate Council with overall responsibility for Senate policy on undergraduate education. It includes committees on general education, undergraduate instruction and program review, preparatory education, and special programs. In addition, there is the Committee on Courses of Instruction.

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review is one formal mechanism by which Senate and administrative policy can be coordinated. There are numerous other established and *ad hoc* points of communication. The development of the Academic Plan exemplifies the extensive cooperation and consultation between faculty and administration on important complex issues with major implications for academics and resources.

Many Senate committees including the Executive Council, have undergraduate and graduate student members.

## **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [UC Davis Academic Senate Committees](#)
- [UC Davis Academic Senate Organizational Chart](#)
- [Committee on Courses of Instruction Annual Report 1999-2000](#)
- [Establishment of Academic Units and Programs 9/23/91](#)
- [Program establishment](#)
- [Program review](#)
- [Undergraduate Council](#)
- [Comittee on Courses in Instruction](#)

## Standard 4

[Data](#) | [Prescribed Exhibits](#) | [Standard 1](#) | [Standard 2](#) | [Standard 3](#) | [Standard 4](#)

### Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

- [Strategic Thinking and Planning](#)
- [Commitment to Learning and Improvement](#)

The institution conducts sustained, evidence-based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities at different levels of the institution, and to revise institutional purposes, structures, and approaches to teaching, learning, and scholarly work.

#### [UC Davis Standard 4 Reflective Essay](#)

##### ■ Strategic Thinking and Planning

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

**4.1-The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate.**

##### **WASC Guidelines**

*A clear charge to planning bodies with a regular schedule and the existence of an understandable and coherent plan for assessing the attainment of educational objectives must be developed. Evidence of the ways the results of planning and evaluation are linked to decision-making is demonstrable.*

### UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

The most comprehensive recently completed planning process was the development of the [Academic Plan](#) already mentioned in the context of several other Criteria. Section II of that gives a description of the planning process. Work in progress includes the new [Long Range Development Plan](#) (LRDP). Both of these have been done in response to the challenges and opportunities associated with the ongoing enrollment growth. Motivating the LRDP is the fact that the campus must accommodate many new students, faculty and staff in the coming years, with growth needs ranging from new academic buildings and support services to recreation fields and housing. What are the challenges and opportunities for addressing this growth? How can the campus change and improve? What are the most environmentally, socially and economically beneficial ways to grow?

The completed Academic Plan is the product of several years of intensive discussions, proposals, and priority setting, which included extensive collaboration between the faculty and administration. It includes detailed plans for the growth and priorities in each of the

colleges.

The most pressing present planning is for the [campus response](#) to the budget cuts associated with recent economic problems in California.

In addition to these extraordinary efforts, there is routine planning that takes place in the regular meetings of administrative leaders. Our essay gives some examples. On the Senate side, the Committee on Academic Planning & Budget Review has, among its duties the following:

- To confer with and advise the Chief Campus Officer and Divisional administrative agencies regarding policy on academic planning, budget and resource allocations; to forward recommendations on staff allocations to the Committee on Academic Personnel for their review.
- To initiate and coordinate studies or reviews of existing and proposed academic programs as they relate to local matters of academic planning, budget and resource allocation, and to report thereon to the Chief Campus Officer and/or to the Representative Assembly as it may deem appropriate.

This is the most established process by which faculty participate in campus planning. However, in respecting the principle of shared governance, faculty Senate (and also Academic Federation, student, and staff) representatives are often included in key planning groups.

Among the most vital and inclusive planning events are the annual [Chancellor's Fall Conferences](#). These are off-campus, two-day events with about 150 participants drawn from many campus constituencies. Each conference has a theme. As we have already noted, the 2001 topic was undergraduate education.

## Spotlight

---

School of Education

On July 17, 2002, the Regents of the University of California approved [\(3.9\)](#) the formation of a new School of Education on the Davis campus. This act culminated several years of planning [\(4.1\)](#) on and off the UC Davis campus and can be used to spotlight several of the WASC criteria for review as well as demonstrate evidence for other issues raised in the essays prepared for this reaccreditation process. Throughout this essay we have included the relevant criteria for review in parentheses.

### Background

While it is easy to identify the exact day the new school was approved, it is much more difficult to determine when the actual planning process started. Until 1995, the division of Education was affiliated with the College of Letters and Sciences. In that year, the campus restructured the College, dividing it into three academic units: Math and Physical Sciences; Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies, and Social Sciences. All of the departments housed within the College were assigned to one of these divisions. At that time, there were campus discussions about the appropriate academic home for Education. It should be noted that the Master Plan for Higher Education in California assigns the responsibility for teacher training

to the California state colleges system. Thus while our [Division of Education](#) had a credential program, it was relatively small compared to the one offered at nearby Sacramento State University. In addition to the credential program, the Division of Education offered a Ph.D., as well as a joint doctorate ([Ed.D.](#)) with CSU Fresno program and housed the CRESS Center. There were approximately 11 FTE associated with the unit at that time.

This Division of the College of Letters and Science coincided with local, statewide and national discussions about the deterioration of K-12 education as well as with the initial indications that the first decade of the 21st century would witness a surge of K-16 enrollment in California. These factors influenced campus discussions not only about the placement of the Division of Education, but also about its overall size and the scope of its mission. [\(2.8\)](#)

Process Many of the conversations took place among the faculty within the school, as well as members of the [Graduate Group](#). [\(4.7\)](#) The Academic Leadership and Planning Group (ALAP) began its discussions in June 1998 [\(1.3, 3.10, 4.1\)](#) Early in the ALAP discussions it became clear that if any change was going to be made, it would need to be a major one. Given the need for support for K-12, the infusion of a limited number of resources into the division would not have made a substantial difference. Further, the Education faculty had made it clear that with a major allocation of campus resources, the division would be better positioned to apply for major external research grants.

Since the campus has such a strong profile in the sciences, the campus leadership recognized the importance of campus-wide discussions about the possibility of making a major investment in education research and teaching. Beginning in the spring of 2000 and continuing into the 2000-2001 academic year, the Chancellor hosted a series of very visible [forums](#) on the state of K-12 education in the state and in the region. These forums and the dinners that followed them were very well attended both by members of the immediate campus community, as well as educators and policy makers throughout the region. During the fall of 2000, the Chancellor devoted his [annual fall conference](#) to the subject of K-12. [\(4.8\)](#)

The action plan that followed that conference advocated the continuing work of a committee to define areas of research for a new School of Education. The committee was chaired by [Merna Villarejo](#), an emeriti professor of Biological Sciences. [\(3.11\)](#) Because she is so well respected by colleagues in the Division of Education, Professor Villarejo was an excellent choice as a leader of this effort. Moreover, because of her recent retirement, she was able to devote a great deal of time to this effort, probably much more than any faculty member who had other campus responsibilities. After developing a mission statement for the school, the committee identified broad priority areas for the school. The staff from Office of Resource Management and Planning (<http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/>) used the mission statement to identify appropriate financial and space resources for the plan. The Villarejo committee recommended the allocation of 24 new FTE so that by 2007-2008, the New School would be home to about 35 faculty. [\(3.4, 3.5, 3.6\)](#) ORMP identified space for this growth in offices that will become available when the Graduate School of Management moves into its new building. [\(3.5\)](#) Other components of the committee's recommendations include the development of a series of institutes focused in such areas as policy research and science/math education. The former was developed in response to current faculty interest, the needs of the state and UC Davis's close proximity to the state capital. The commitment to science and math education also builds on existing collaborations between the Education faculty and their colleagues in the campus's many science departments.

The committee then changed its focus and became a search committee charged with identifying the founding dean. [\(1.3\)](#) After a nation-wide search, Harold Levine

(<http://education.ucdavis.edu/welcome.html>), a very well respected Professor of Education joined the faculty in fall 2001. Together with his faculty he prepared the proposal for the establishment of the new school. (4.4) This process can be a very lengthy one because it requires departmental approval and must be thoroughly reviewed by several [academic senate committees](#) on the campus as well as undergo review at the system-wide [Academic Council](#) as well as the California Postsecondary Education Commission. It is quite remarkable that this proposal was approved in less than a year. (3.8) The faculty have already applied for major grants and the process of recruiting for new positions is underway, with three new faculty hired in time for the 2002-03 academic year.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [2001 Chancellor's Fall Conference](#)
- [Long Range Development Plan \(LRDP\) main webpage](#)
- [Academic Plan](#)
- [Budget planning](#)

---

### **4.2-Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

The University of California is faced with an unprecedented challenge: having to plan for and accommodate 60,000 new students and 7,000 new faculty by 2010. In other criteria, general planning structures and processes are covered. In this summary, we will focus on a particular, very ambitious example, the New Business Architecture, because it exemplifies the integrated planning that is the the topic of this criterion.

To help UC campuses address the multi-faceted implications of this growth, the Office of the President formed a planning group, with a goal of identifying the strategies needed to manage growth effectively while controlling costs and improving the overall work environment for UC employees. In July 2000, the group developed a report outlining a New Business Architecture (NBA) for the UC system.

The NBA envisions an operating environment strikingly different from the current one. In short, it calls for the development of campus business portals capable of integrating multiple campus systems and resources, the streamlining of cumbersome policies and processes, and the leveraging of new technology to contain costs and improve services to UC's constituents.

UC Davis quickly recognized the need for a creative and collaborative approach to meet the tight timeframe and the multi-faceted challenges at hand. The UC Davis New Business Architecture Initiative was officially launched in September 2001 when the MyUCDavis Web portal was identified as the foundation for the development of a campus enterprise portal from which students, faculty and staff will be able to access a range of administrative, business, and academic resources.

Transforming MyUCDavis into an enterprise portal is a complex undertaking. Involving more than just technology, a project of this nature also entails re-engineering campus processes, examining policies, and preparing for major cultural change. To ensure broad representation, early buy-in, and long-term success, the UC Davis NBA team structure (including a Steering Committee, Implementation Workgroup, Technology Development Team, Change Management Team, and Business Processes Team) was carefully designed with representatives from all major campus organizations, including senior campus administrators, staff, faculty, technologists, and other specialists. In all, 70+ team members are directly involved in making the NBA vision a reality on the UC Davis campus.

Beyond the NBA team membership, planning processes have included broad consultation and a series of interviews with key segments of the campus population. This ongoing feedback mechanism provides critical information for the development of an NBA approach that effectively combines UC Davis goals and priorities with constituent needs. A similar approach, relying heavily on user group and campus constituent feedback as well as close connections with the NBA teams, guides the identification and development of new functionality for the MyUCDavis portal.

The UC Davis NBA Initiative recently concluded its first year. Yet it has already profoundly changed the ways in which the UC Davis campus approaches, plans for, and implements strategic solutions to academic, personnel, fiscal, and technological needs. It is the latest example of the campus ability to successfully work together towards a common institutional goal.

## Spotlight

---

This [document](#) reviews the planning that went into the new Sciences Laboratory Building.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [New Business Architecture](#)
- [MyUCDavis enterprise portal](#)
- [Special Issue of IT Times: UC Davis and the New Business Architecture](#)
- [UC 2010: A New Business Architecture for the University of California](#)

---

**4.3-Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

This summary of evidence is an integrated discussion of Criteria 4.3-4.6. Many of the topics in these criteria, such as program review and planning, have already been covered in other

criteria. The criteria in 4.3-4.6 are distinguished from those by an emphasis on the importance of having the capability to collect data, collecting appropriate data, and using that data to drive reviews, planning, and decision-making, including improvements to pedagogy and the curriculum. A key element is the collection and use of data on educational effectiveness and student learning.

Several units on campus are occupied with extensive data collection and analysis: [Student Affairs Research and Information](#) (SARI), [Analytical Studies](#), [Program Planning and Budget Operations](#), and the [Data Warehouse](#).

Many aspects of campus planning are informed by data collection and analysis. The links contain a number of examples of studies tied to specific decision-making. The Thornton E-card, the use of "triples" in residence halls, the campus recreation survey, and the quick study on reasons for attending summer session are specific, unique examples.

There has been a concerted effort to make relevant data available to campus managers and staff for decision making via the web. Web-enabled decision support systems such as the Financial System and Payroll/Personnel System have been instrumental in providing managers and staff with up to date data which allows for better decision making at the local department level. Web-enabled access to campus data is also a major component in the campus' New Business Architecture initiative.

In the key area of educational effectiveness, a great deal of data is collected. Important processes are the SARI surveys, several of which have appeared in the links throughout our portfolio, and teaching program reviews, which have already been discussed. While these data are both broad and deep in their coverage, they are, for the most part, secondary. By that we mean that they are measures of student success after graduation or of student satisfaction. By these measures, we are very pleased with the quality of our data and programs. We are just beginning the discussion of how we might collect primary data on student learning that goes beyond the usual evidence from classwork and build an institution-wide commitment to the use of direct measures of cumulative student learning by the time of graduation. Significant progress in this area will follow if our faculty become convinced that this is an effective way to improve student learning.

There is a long-established and elaborate process of program review that is documented here and in the discussion of previous criteria. With regard to the central topic of educational effectiveness, the situation is mixed. In program review, data on the effectiveness of the program drives the recommendations in the report. Some of the recommendations can be directly implemented by the programs. In addition, these reports eventually find their way to the Deans who are in a position to implement other recommendations.

In some areas, such as courses offered by MediaWorks and the TRC, assessment is becoming established. However, as is the case with most of our peer institutions, the element that is largely missing in most of the campus planning is a broad institutional commitment to collect primary data on student learning and to use those in planning.

In moving toward the use of primary and cumulative data on student learning, the necessary step in improving our practices must be a description of the educational objectives that we would like to achieve and are therefore the elements of student learning that need to be assessed. We now have educational objectives in place. A first step in opening a [discussion on assessment](#) took place at the 2001 Chancellor's Fall Conference.

Another important step is the establishment of the [Undergraduate Council](#). This council and

one of its committees are specifically charged with addressing these issues. We find in the charges the following statements: "To define the goals and establish criteria for use in reviewing the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate teaching programs and/or majors. To develop and review campuswide educational objectives and criteria for evaluating educational effectiveness. To evaluate undergraduate program reviews to ascertain that the established educational objectives for programs have been addressed in a meaningful way. To work with the Office of the Provost to insure that undergraduate instructional programs and program reviews are considered in the planning and support of campus activities."

In addition to these positive initial steps, there are the real accomplishments of the College of Engineering. The programs (undergraduate curricula) in this College have separate accreditations from the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). The most recent review was conducted in the fall of 2000, under recently revised [criteria](#) that are assessment-based, similar to those of WASC. The programs of the College of Engineering now have in place processes to measure educational objectives and outcomes and to use the results in a continuous improvement feedback loop. For example two instructive documents from the Chemical Engineering program can be found in the links below. It is likely that other colleges will be able to draw upon these impressive developments in Engineering.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Student Affairs Research and Information](#)
- [SARI study results](#)
- [Program Planning and Budget Operations](#)
- [Campus Recreation \(pdf\)](#)
- [David Thornton E-Card Evaluation \(pdf\)](#)
- [A Study of Triple-Room Residency at UC Davis \(pdf\)](#)
- [Reasons for attending summer session \(Quick poll\)](#)
- [UC Davis - Academic Plan 2000-2006](#)
- [Internal Audit Plan for fiscal year 2000-01 \(pdf\)](#)
- [2001-2002 Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs \(pdf\)](#)
- [Chemical Engineering program](#)
- [Chemical Engineering accreditation report](#)

### ■ Commitment to Learning and Improvement

Click each of the Criteria for Review to read the UC Davis response.

---

**4.4-The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

See discussion beginning at Criterion 4.3.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Program establishment](#)
- [Program review](#)
- [Committee on Courses of Instruction](#)
- [2000-01 Annual Report Committee on Educational Policy](#)
- [Academic Senate](#)

---

**4.5-Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included among the priorities of the institutional research function is the identification of indicators and the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution's purposes and educational objectives. Periodic reviews of institutional research and data collection are conducted to develop more effective indicators of performance and to assure the suitability and usefulness of data.**

### WASC Guidelines

*The institution exhibits existence of clear institutional research capacities with appropriate reporting lines and support appropriate to the institution's size and scope. Institutional research or equivalent databases are developed that are sufficient to meet all external reporting needs (e.g. IPEDS), and there are appropriate ways to access or disseminate this information through publications, reports, or widely-accessible databases.*

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

See discussion beginning at Criterion 4.3.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Analytical Studies](#)
- [The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System \(IPEDS\)](#)
- [Student Affairs Research & Information Goals](#)
- [Student Affairs Research and Information Office Summary \(pdf\)](#)

---

**4.6-Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility**

for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.

#### **WASC Guidelines**

*The institution has clear, well established policies and practices for gathering and analyzing information that leads to a culture of evidence and improvement.*

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

See discussion beginning at Criterion 4.3.

### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [On-line pre- and post- chemistry laboratory](#)
- [Evaluation of service as department chair - Guidelines for Deans.](#)
- [Appointment and Promotion - General \(pdf\)](#)
- [Appointment and Promotion - Review and Appraisal Committees \(pdf\)](#)
- [Appointment and Promotion - Professor Series \(pdf\)](#)
- [Academic Review Process--General Policy and Procedures 10/1/99](#)
- [Academic Review Process--Appointments 10/1/99](#)
- [Academic Review Process--Promotions 10/1/99](#)
- [Academic Review Process--Merit Increases 10/1/99](#)
- [Academic Review Process--Deferrals 10/1/99](#)
- [Academic Review Process--Appraisals 10/1/99](#)
- [Annual Call for Merits & Promotions](#)
- [Library Personnel](#)
- [College of Letters and Science - Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee](#)
- [Evaluation of service as department chair - Guidelines for departmental letter.](#)

---

**4.7-The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.**

### **UC Davis Summary of Evidence**

---

The most important campus unit devoted to the process of teaching and learning is the [Teaching Resources Center](#) (TRC), which has already been featured Criteria 2.8 and 3.4, which overlap with this one. The TRC is an administrative unit, but the director is a faculty

Academic Senate member. It runs a multitude of programs for all instructors. For example, it promotes and supports instructional innovation through [Undergraduate Instructional Improvement Program](#) (UIIP) grants and in hosting the [Summer Institute on Technology in Teaching](#) (SITT). It also offers in-class evaluation and individual consultation. The technology part of TRC operations will be elaborated upon more fully in our educational effectiveness review.

We have already described the teaching program review process. It is very concerned with the conditions and practices of teaching and learning within the context of each program as it is individually reviewed. If weaknesses are identified, recommendations for improvement are made to the department or the dean as appropriate.

## Links to Evidence and Related Documents

---

- [Teaching Resources Center](#)
- [Improvement of teaching](#)
- [Summer Institute on Technology in Teaching](#)
- [TA programs & resources](#)
- [Program review](#)
- [Mediaworks: The Arbor](#)

---

### **4.8-Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs.**

## UC Davis Summary of Evidence

---

Every three years there is a survey of recent alumni. There are links for the surveys of the 1996 and 1999 graduates below.

The new engineering educational effectiveness processes call for a more active participation of stakeholders in "a process based on the needs of the program's various constituencies in which the objectives are determined and periodically evaluated."

The ultimate stakeholders in the University of California are the people of the State of California. Through their willingness to take from their own needs to support the University, they provide the most meaningful assessments of the value of our contributions to the education of their children and to the well-being of society. We are honored and humbled by their confidence in our enterprise.

## Spotlight

---

In the summer of 2002, the Director of the ICC noticed that business employers who once recruited heavily from UC Davis undergraduate seniors were not scheduling visits for the

coming year. Given the chaos in the business world that summer, he might have merely attributed this to corporate belt-tightening. But he and his staff probed and learned that our limited accounting courses had insufficiently prepared our students for a recently revised CPA exam. He shared this information with the Provost's office and the Provost will share with the relevant deans. This is such a current situation that we cannot report closure, but it exemplifies attention to external assessment and to the communications norms on our campus.

### **Links to Evidence and Related Documents**

---

- [Educational and Occupational Outcomes \(pdf\)](#)
  - [Outcomes and Opinions of June 1996 Graduates One Year After Graduation \(pdf\)](#)
  - [Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs \(pdf\)](#)
  - [Cal Aggie Alumni Association - Membership](#)
  - [Graduate School of Management Alumni Survey](#)
-

## Reflective Essays

- [Introduction](#)
- [Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives](#)
- [Achieving Educational Objective Through Core Functions](#)
- [Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures and Ensure Sustainability](#)
- [Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement](#)

### Introduction

Describing the history of UC Davis (UCD) in *Assembling California* (his 1993 ode to California geology), the celebrated Pulitzer Prize winning author John McPhee uses a sparse eloquence to succinctly summarize 88 years of campus history:

*In 1905, the College of Agriculture in the University of California, in Berkeley, set up an experimental farm in Davis, in Yolo County, in the valley's center. In 1925, the farm itself became an agricultural college. In 1959 it became a general campus in the state's university system. The livestock-judging pavilion is now a Shakespearian theatre. Under sky-scraping water towers, the ground hugging university is of such breadth and grandeur that it has its own beltway. It may have more bicycles than Shanghai. But Davis is still the main agricultural research center in California, and just outside the glassy postmodern geology building are sties containing massive monolithic pigs.*<sup>1</sup>

McPhee is describing Davis in order to set a scene within the story of his exploration of California's natural history with Eldridge Moores, a member of our Geology faculty. This brief passage evokes all of the familiar images we associate with the history of the campus and its transition from a preeminent Agricultural College to a more academically and culturally broad university campus. It also sets the scene for the story of how UC Davis has endeavored to enhance its profile so that it can best serve the region, the state and the nation.

Since UC Davis submitted its Institutional Proposal for the reaffirmation of its accreditation in June 2000, our campus, our state and our nation have undergone many significant changes. Elizabeth Faber, our undergraduate representative on the WASC Steering Committee, a sophomore in 1999, has graduated. Robert D. Grey, the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor who was the co-chair of the WASC Steering Committee at the beginning of this process has retired, and the campus has welcomed Virginia S. Hinshaw as our new senior academic officer and co-chair of the WASC steering committee. We have also appointed new deans in Engineering, Biological Sciences, Graduate Studies, Education, a new Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, and a new Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Campus Community Relations. More significantly, we have larger student, staff, and faculty populations. Although this growth was predicted, California's unexpected financial downturn has undermined some of our

efforts to prepare for it. The once staggering state surpluses of the late 90s have been replaced by a spiraling state deficit. California's financial woes are not isolated and are not the only source of economic challenge for us. Many of our students' families and our alumni have experienced financial setbacks in the past two years. Non-profit foundations have seen their returns on endowments diminish. Multiple revenue streams have diminished substantially.

But financial problems are not the only challenge to our capacity we need to acknowledge as we set the context for our preparatory review. As part of our commitment to maintaining undergraduate excellence, we planned a Chancellor's Fall Conference on Undergraduate Education for the third weekend of September 2001. We planned to hone our educational objectives, revisit our GE curriculum, digest several recently produced documents on our composition requirement, and consider ways of shoring up our students' first-year experiences. Those of us most heavily involved in the preparation of our Institutional Proposal for WASC knew that many members of our campus community were unaware of recent assessment trends in higher education. And we knew that even those familiar with these developments included many quite skeptical that learning outcomes could be measured in any truly meaningful manner. Within the confines of a two-day retreat, the 150 plus administrators, alumni, faculty, staff and students had to cover a great deal of terrain.

Since our peer institutions measure themselves and each other by their implementation of The Boyer Commission Report, *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*, we invited the Boyer Commission's chair, Shirley Strum Kenny, to be our keynote speaker. Then came September 11. The ensuing travel problems prevented many of our planned participants from attending, and within two days of the conference Kenny herself, President of State University of New York, Stony Brook, near the devastated World Trade Center, was compelled to cancel. Our attention was divided. The President was on television making plans for armed conflict, and we were in the Sierra Nevada scheduled to discuss how we could inspire more faculty to teach freshmen seminars. We pondered whether or not we could assess GE effectiveness at shaping good citizens at a moment when national conversations on citizenship, patriotism and national security dominated the media. To be sure, most of us recognized that our curriculum, and our own research agendas would be influenced by the international crisis. Of course, these disparate events and developments remind us that the strongest universities are those able to grapple with even profound changes in their internal and external circumstances. While the current fiscal uncertainties and the nation's involvement in international conflicts have prompted us to scale back some of our plans, we still believe that the visiting team will find that UC Davis is fundamentally a very robust university poised to tackle the challenges ahead.

Following the Fall Conference we embarked on a new academic year. In our Institutional Proposal we state, "We are particularly interested in developing educational objectives for the integration of teaching, learning and research". Conference attendees worked on a draft set of Educational Objectives. This process is detailed in our discussion of Standard 1. We are particularly pleased by the continued partnership between the Academic Senate

and the administration on at least two important areas. Conference attendees were uniform in their praise for the Freshmen Seminar program and eager to expand the number of these classes we can offer. During the 2001-2002 academic year, the Senate approved the use of variable units so that now we can offer one- as well as two-unit courses. The administration approved a hefty fiscal infusion to support the expanded program. Even more significantly, the Senate pursued a reorganization of its committee structure, substituting an Undergraduate Council for the Committee on Educational Policy.

As fall 2002 approaches, UC Davis is readying itself for a new academic year. There are somewhat troubling national and international tensions, but on campus, we look forward to welcoming the Class of 2006 cohort of Tidal Wave II students. In spite of the fact that the State Budget was not signed until after Labor Day, students on financial aid will receive their checks on time. The deans' offices report that the registration process has progressed smoothly, and students will be successfully enrolled in classes. We are putting the finishing touches on the Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts and anticipate a spectacular inaugural season. We trust that the WASC teams who visit us this year will find an exciting and engaged campus community.

<sup>1</sup> John McPhee, *Assembling California*. Farrar, Straus & Giroux, New York, 1993 p.178-179

## **Standard 1**

Since institutional autonomy and integrity are components of Standard 1, it is worthwhile reviewing the structure of the University of California (UC) before moving on to the key subject of institutional purposes. Now a ten-campus system, UC guarantees the top 12.5% of California's high school seniors access to an affordable education at a preeminent research university. The hierarchy of the University includes a President of the entire system (Richard Atkinson) and individual chancellors on each campus (Larry N. Vanderhoef at UC Davis). Shared governance characterizes UC, so there is one systemwide Academic Senate with individual divisions on each campus. Although the University has a largely advantageous constitutional autonomy within the infrastructure of the State, an appointed Board of Regents is responsible to the citizens of California for governing UC. The University and its employees and policies are subject to laws of the state. Thus UC Davis must comply with policies established by the Regents, the systemwide Academic Senate and, of course, any legislative actions approved by California voters. Decisions about academic plans must be evaluated through a systemwide approval process, and issues such as the size of enrollment growth are dictated by the Office of the President. While this governance mechanism can prove to be cumbersome and even Byzantine at times, the University of California system is often recognized as the finest state-supported university in the world, so it seems clear that citizens are well-served by all of the checks and balances that have been

put in place.

Even a selective extrapolation from the 2001-2002 UC Davis Fact Card suggests the breadth of the institution:

- 5,200 acres
- \$298.3 million dollars in extramural research support
- 25, 242 total employees
- 27,292 total student enrollment
- \$1,723,009,993 annual budget

Although the campus relishes the breadth that characterizes us, the scale assigned to UC Davis comes with the obvious responsibility to avoid the mediocrity that can develop when an institution tries to be all things to all constituencies. Strategic decision-making often involves discussions of at least two important factors. On the one hand, we talk about preserving the "Davis Advantage." In other words, we believe it important to invest in those programs where Davis has traditionally excelled. But we are also eager to expand into new arenas of discovery. Our initiative on Technocultural Studies exemplifies this goal to be on the cutting edge of new knowledge. We also periodically assess our offerings in terms of developments at peer institutions both within the UC system and with other outstanding research universities. As an example, we are investing heavily in Genomics because we have a core faculty research interest in this field and benchmark institutions are making similar investments. In our Educational Effectiveness review, we will focus on educational technology and student research because enhancing these areas is a goal common throughout the campus.

### **Purposes, Missions, Objectives, Goals**

The most important element in Standard 1 is an articulation of institutional purposes through a mission statement and a statement of educational objectives. At UC Davis, the Philosophy of Purpose plays the role of a mission statement. It was created in 1989, updated in 1999, and reformulated in 2000. Although extensive attempts at campus consultation were made, we still believe it likely that, if asked to articulate UC Davis's mission statement, most of our faculty and staff would respond with the ubiquitous mantra, "research, teaching and service." As we tried to develop the kind of cogent, memorable mission statement promoted by most strategic planning gurus, faculty resisted any statements that could apply to other campuses similar in profile to UC Davis. We reviewed samples from other campuses, came up with our own versions and found that campus members did not want to attach themselves to a nonspecific text. On the other hand, our rather longer Philosophy of Purpose met with more approval as individuals repeatedly indicated support, saying that it suits our campus. No one has memorized it. It won't fit on a snazzy little card. But we doubt that any shorter statement would satisfy the way that this one does. In our concluding essay we will refer to nascent plans to embark on a strategic planning

process that might result in a briefer campus mission statement.

The second key document for institutional purposes is the statement of educational objectives. Our Institutional Proposal includes the development of educational objectives as one of the products that we hoped to obtain from our reaccreditation process. An important goal for the 2001 Chancellor's Fall Conference was the development of educational objectives for the campus. This process proved to be much simpler than some of us expected. Given the size and intellectual range of our population, getting agreement on a set of educational objectives might have been difficult. Several breakout groups were asked to develop the objectives independently. Then a faculty member took the lists from those groups and collapsed them into one list. Each of those individual lists had a great deal of overlap. For example, all groups urged that the development of students' oral and written skills should be a campus objective. Some objectives did not emerge on every list, e.g., life-long learning, but once the item was raised in discussion, other participants quickly concurred that this was an important goal for our students. Following the conference, we circulated the draft through the campus administration, faculty senate committees, the student government, and to the population at large through *Dateline*, the faculty and staff newsletter. Each department received a copy. Ultimately the changes suggested were minimal, and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) approved the final version during the spring 2002. During the next several years, we will seek ways of making the educational objectives operational. To ensure that the educational objectives do not become stagnant, the new Academic Senate Undergraduate Council will review them regularly.

Within the Integrity component of Standard 1, there are six criteria. For a major institution such as UC Davis, five of these are simply built into the way business is done. Evidence for this can be found in the online portfolio, and we will highlight an example related to one of those at the end of this essay. Considerably less straightforward is Criterion 1.5, which reads, "Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs and its administrative and organizational practices". In its 1991 report on UC Davis, the visiting WASC team was enthusiastic about our recently enacted Principles of Community, as well as evidence of our goal to create an inclusive and harmonious campus. When campus incidents have threatened our sense of community, the Principles have provided a framework from which we could seek resolutions to the potential divisions that faced us.

There have been several positive academic developments germane to Criterion 1.5. In 1993, the Native American Studies program (NAS) was awarded departmental status and, in 1998, the department accepted its first class of graduate students. In 1999 the Asian American Studies program (AAS) undergraduate major proposal was approved by the Academic Senate. In 1994, the NAS Department, the AAS program, the American Studies program (AMS), the Chicana/o Studies program

(CHI), the African American and African Studies program, and the Women and Gender Studies program (WMS) were co-located in the same building. Although an expensive undertaking at the time, this move has resulted in the newfound ability of these offices to share some central staff and functions. Further, physical proximity afforded by this change allowed faculty in this group, also known administratively as the Hart Interdisciplinary Programs (HIP), to foster intellectual collaborations among themselves and with colleagues across the campus. One very concrete result of this effort is the relatively new Cultural Studies Ph.D. program.

Elsewhere on campus, other efforts have been made to diversify the faculty and the curriculum. This process can be challenging to accomplish, particularly as rapidly as we would like. As our educational effectiveness review on undergraduate research will more thoroughly indicate, we have invested quite heavily in "pipeline" activities---namely those kinds of sponsored programs that offer support to K-12 students and our own undergraduates.

In pursuit of the state's highest-achieving underrepresented minority students, we have extensive recruitment programs that take our staff, students, and faculty to all corners of California to inform high school seniors about the educational advantages of UC Davis. Our faculty have been aggressive in their pursuit of federal and foundation dollars that permit targeting underrepresented minority students. From Howard Hughes funds in the biological sciences to California Alliance for Minority Participants (CAMP) in engineering to the McNair Scholars Program in the social sciences, we have successfully sought every kind of external resource available to benefit these students. Indeed, we have leveraged these programs so that they undergird our overall undergraduate research program. For example, our Undergraduate Research Conference (URC) began in 1990 as a showcase for sponsored programs for underrepresented students. The conference was a success, and we were eager to extend it as an option for all students participating in undergraduate research. We will further elaborate on undergraduate research in the Educational Effectiveness review.

In recent years, the percentage of underrepresented minorities have increased in both the senior management team and within the staff. However, we have not made equivalent strides at the faculty or student level. A separate document, perhaps the length of a full-size book, could be devoted to the impact of SP1 and SP2, the Regental actions that ended affirmative action policies for student admissions criteria at UC, and Proposition 209, the referendum that eliminated such policies in the State of California. UC Davis must comply with these measures. However, many members of the campus community would agree that continued excellence in research universities and multi-ethnic and gender-balanced populations go hand in hand. Thus we have explored numerous strategies to meet this goal. Our faculty searches are exhaustive and deans close down searches when pools are too homogenous. We aggressively compete with other universities for faculty. Although the quaint, bucolic character of the city of Davis makes it an attractive destination for many prospective faculty, its own lack of ethnic diversity and its rural ambiance

can be negative factors for others. The portfolio includes information that documents some of the institutional procedures that help us to make progress in this area.

### **Case Study: Summer**

One aspect of Criterion 1.7 is how the campus represents its goals, programs and services to students and the public. An interesting case study can be seen in the process we have been undergoing to increase the number of curricular opportunities available in the summer. This relates to our responsibility as a public institution to accommodate qualified students and to assure that the expectation of graduation within four years is actually feasible. As noted above, because we are part of a state system, we must pursue legislative and systemwide goals. The "Tidal Wave II" student growth stimulated the Legislature to encourage the UC system to deliver more of its curriculum in the summer months. For several years, each of the UC campuses has been planning to shift to a fully State-supported model for summer instruction. Summer 2002 marked UC Davis' first official summer session supported in the same fashion as the other three quarters. To prepare for this, we began with extensive collaboration. We closely examined the data on student/faculty participation on our own campus and others in the summers of 2000 and 2001. This research revealed several misconceptions about summer school. For example, many campus members had assumed that summer students were typically marked by academic jeopardy, but, in fact, we found by looking at their GPA's that this was not the case.

A subcommittee of the Academic Senate articulated a set of principles to follow in the process. By examining the outcomes of the three UC campuses that were ahead of us in the queue, we learned that student financial aid was an extremely important factor in making summer school attractive to students. We studied the curriculum and provided incentives for departments to teach the courses with the highest student demand. Our research demonstrated that, of all the student services needed, those at the Learning Skills Center were foremost in the students' minds, so we provided more resources to that office. Two major committees comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators oversee these efforts. We will assess this program both at the end of this summer session and continually thereafter as we pursue the growth of a summer quarter.

To conclude this essay, we emphasize the development of educational objectives. We established the formation of this goal in our institutional proposal, and we have met it. The objectives are the most important element in Standard 1 as it relates to the new WASC philosophy. They are crucial to demonstrating the institutional capacity to continue to the Educational Effectiveness review.

### **Reflections**

A piece of sculpture carved by the celebrated UC Davis artist Robert Arneson is resting on Mrak Mall, the green space that connects the main administration building with the rest of the campus. Titled *Eye on Mrak*, and one of five *Egghead* sculptures that populate the campus public space, this one is an upside down laughing face. The back of the head, which faces the front of the administration building, is a very wide-open eye. *Eye on Mrak* stands as a constant reminder to all of us that we have been entrusted with the responsibility for UC Davis's continued integrity and persistent commitment to higher learning, the search for truth and the dissemination of knowledge.



*Robert Arneson, Eye on Mrak (Fatal Laff), from The Egghead Series, 1991-92, Richard L. Nelson Gallery & The Fine Arts Collection, © UC Regents.*

## **Standard 2**

Standard 2, Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions, is divided into three sections: Teaching and Learning, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Support for Student Learning. While the portfolio is a systematic presentation of our evidence in these areas, this essay will highlight three main points. After noting some successful outcomes that indicate effective teaching and learning, we will examine in detail two of the contributors to that success: student advising and student engagement. These are included in Criteria 2.11 and 2.12 within Support for Student Learning. One of the most difficult aspects of the Teaching and Learning Criteria is the general education element in 2.2. Later in this essay, we discuss the developments at UC Davis regarding general education.

We begin with some statistics that demonstrate successful teaching and learning at UC Davis. Our surveys indicate that approximately 63% of our students who choose to pursue graduate education obtain their first choice and 19% obtain their second choice of graduate schools. A report tracking June 1999 graduates indicated 79% of our students were employed full time and were working in their first-choice careers. This evidence contributes to our belief that we are fulfilling our educational objectives through our core functions. This belief is further reinforced for most faculty members by their own contact with successful UC Davis alums. Indeed, at the 2000 WASC Annual Meeting, members of the UC Davis team recognized a familiar face across the room. It was the institutional research director for another California university. A mid-1990's alum of the undergraduate curriculum at UC Davis, he earned a Ph.D. from UCLA and was now as engaged in the WASC review

process as we were. Thus our students go on to pursue useful careers, and they distinguish themselves as remarkable citizens. From producing television programs such as ER, editing *Newsweek*, running the California State Department of Education, and preparing institutions of higher learning for accreditation reviews, UC Davis alumni succeed in many arenas.

### **Aggie Advising**

There are many factors that contribute to this success. Among them is advising, which is an area in which we have made important improvements in recent years. The high value we place on multiple levels of advising is a good example of the attention we give to support for student learning. In 1996, the Vice Chancellor-Student Affairs (VCSA) and the Vice Provost-Undergraduate Studies (VPUS) realized that the campus student growth necessitated that we think more holistically about the advising services we provide. Multiple offices have ownership for advising but, at that time, communication among them was limited and somewhat ad hoc. The VCSA and VPUS formed the Undergraduate Advising Council (UAC) that meets once a month. The membership includes all of the associate deans with responsibilities for undergraduates; the associate director of Student Housing, the directors of the Learning Skills Center, Advising Services, and Student Affairs and Research Information; the Internship and Career Center; the chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy (CEP); and a student representative assigned by the Associated Students of the University of California, Davis (ASUCD). This group coordinates campuswide advising efforts. UC Davis still has a decentralized, but now very effective, system of advising for our undergraduate students that really begins before students arrive at UC Davis.

To complement personal contacts with prospective students, the print and cyber materials that represent UC Davis are continually updated. We also host numerous information sessions designed to help students and their families make an informed choice. We encourage prospective students to read our websites, come to campus for visits, attend information days, and speak to relevant members of our community. In this way, we hope to attract those students who will be most likely to flourish at UC Davis.

At the UAC's recommendation, the letter that invites newly admitted students and their parents to Summer Advising stresses that this process is an expectation we have for our incoming students. They learn about their majors, the opportunities for double majors and minors, and our internship programs. Summer Advising functions as a crash course in the University's organization. With professional staff in the workroom, they go on-line and register for their fall courses.

Again, following a recommendation of the UAC, we have successfully utilized the residence halls for regular advising during the evening hours. This schedule complements the availability of professional staff advisors housed in the dean's offices during regular hours. Larger, more complicated, majors such as those in

engineering and most of the social sciences have professional staff advisors. Smaller, leaner majors rely upon a combination of staff advisors and faculty advising. Most of our special undergraduate programs, e.g., the Davis Honors Challenge and the Education Abroad Center, are staffed by professional student affairs officers (SAOs).

### **Aggie Engagement**

Many recent higher education treatises have identified student engagement as an important indicator of student learning. And in his inaugural address of 1994, Chancellor Larry N. Vanderhoef eloquently challenged the campus community to "be a fully engaged campus". Through numerous co-curricular programs (Criterion 2.11), we foster student engagement. Ample evidence of this can be found. Students participate in over 370 clubs. We have a vibrant, large, and talented multicultural Gospel Choir whose performance venues have included the Sacramento Jazz Festival and Carnegie Hall. We have one of the higher rates of Peace Corps participation in the United States.

UC Davis athletics reflect this high degree of student engagement. We have a very high rate of participation in intramural sports, and our intercollegiate teams are comprised of true student athletes. From water polo to basketball, we have distinguished records in Division II sports. At present, we are carefully considering an invitation to join Division I sports in a Western Conference. If we believe this move suits our educational objectives, then we will make the change. Even our opponents comment on the UC Davis sense of school spirit. The 300-plus members of our spirit club, better known as the Aggie Pack, make our sporting events fun for all.

This engagement is seen in other areas as well. We arrange about 6,000 internships per year, far and away the most significant percentage in the UC system. Although we cannot guarantee every student the exact internship s/he wants, we are rarely unable to find an appropriate match. Similarly, some students who want to study abroad may not get their first choice of countries, but, if they are flexible and meet the criteria for acceptance, they will be able to study abroad. The same is true for our Washington Center and the Bodega Marine Laboratory programs.

Most UC Davis students recognize the importance of pursuing a broad range of curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular activities. Many of our students enroll in double majors with ostensibly unorthodox pairings such as Chemical Engineering and Comparative Literature. Many others graduate with one or more minors. While it is the case that we do not have an upper division GE requirement, many upper division courses carry GE credit so students are likely to enroll in ambitious courses outside of their majors.

### **The Evolution of GE at UC Davis**

Our emphasis on stressing opportunities and minimizing requirements is key to understanding our approach to general education. Between the multitude of academic offerings and the numerous extracurricular activities, UC Davis is replete with opportunities for students to achieve many of the goals of traditional general education programs. In its 1997 Interim Report on UC Davis, the Commission urged the campus to "insure that by the time of the next WASC visit, there is a comprehensive, functional, viable, and operational general education policy and program in place." Like many colleges and universities, UC Davis has struggled with the design and implementation of a solid GE program. We are quite proud of the uses we have developed for running a surplus nuclear reactor; we are proud of the way we responded to student demand for instruction in Farsi; we are proud of the high placement rates of our students; but we know that our work on developing and delivering a good GE program is incomplete. However, since the Commission's letter in 1997, we have pursued a better alignment of our GE curriculum and our Educational Objectives.

Few faculty members would deny that in the early 1990's UC Davis suffered from major difficulties in the implementation of an effective GE program. Apparently we were not alone, according to the recently published *Students in the Balance: General Education in the Research University*, a report on the 2001 Symposium on General Education at Pennsylvania State University.

"The presentation and discussions at the first meeting of the symposium all pointed to the conclusion that in balancing their mission of research and specialization with a commitment to General Education, research universities put a heavy emphasis on the former. General Education is not a high or natural priority for many, and perhaps most, members of the academic community. Yet at the same time, institutions advance a philosophy and rhetoric that call for a robust emphasis on General Education, and they do so for the weightiest of reasons: freedom, democracy, and opportunity." <sup>1</sup>

For years faculty from across the UC Davis campus struggled to develop a challenging, coherent GE program. While there was consensus on the broader goals of the curriculum, the devilish details confounded our communities. The diversity and writing requirements were particular sources of angst and aggravation. Undergirding the many discussions of philosophy were core financial and human resource realities. How could we offer a strong curriculum in a timely manner? Students and their parents were understandably upset when our inability to offer sufficient seats in GE courses prevented them from graduating on schedule. So we streamlined our curriculum and increased the number of GE courses. This enabled students to graduate in a more timely fashion. However, many faculty believed we did not try hard enough to make the old curriculum work. Other members of the faculty questioned the premises upon which a GE requirement is based. It should be noted that UC Davis offers a very broad array of undergraduate majors. We have Colleges of Engineering, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, a freestanding Division of Biological Sciences, and within the College of Letters and Sciences,

there are three divisions. As this breadth suggests, UC Davis does not embrace a "one-size-fits-all" academic philosophy.

Our institutional research shows that many of our students do not need coercive requirements. They elect to add considerable breadth to their courses. For example, over a third of our students major in the Social Sciences, and they take half of their courses in humanities, science, and engineering. In the context of GE, each major falls into one of the three topical breadth groupings: science and engineering, social sciences, and arts and humanities. Overall, 38% of units taken by UC Davis students are outside of the grouping that contains the student's major. More detailed information is in our on-line portfolio.

In 1999, the Academic Senate leadership began to scrutinize its committee structure to determine if the then-current model was optimal for serving undergraduate education in general and GE in particular. At the graduate level, UC Davis has one council that undertakes the curricular business of the campus's many graduate programs. In contrast, the work of the undergraduate curriculum was under the stewardship of multiple committees with minimal central oversight. Given the success of our Graduate Council, several Senate leaders and senior administrators made the case that we could streamline our efforts by developing a single Academic Senate Undergraduate Council that would connect and help advance the efforts of several committees. Since it represented a departure from business as usual, this process required extensive consultation. However, the change was ratified by the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate in June of 2002, and the new council will begin its work in fall 2002. One of the key elements of the new structure is a committee of this council that will focus on General Education.

One of the more auspicious moments in UCD's General Education saga came in spring 2001 when the campus received a \$150,000 William & Flora Hewlett Foundation Grant for General Education in Research Universities to improve GE. *Improve* is a key term here, because there was no campus interest in pursuing a major overhaul of the general education requirement. The full proposal is in the WASC Related Links page, but there are three key components of the grant: 1) renewal; 2) assessment; and 3) new clusters. Renewal is a key feature of that grant, because we wanted to use these external resources to expand programs already supported by our faculty. In particular, the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES) faculty had organized several GE clusters with an audience of students in Letters & Science humanities and social sciences curricula. While the course clusters were quite attractive, CAES lacked the resources to market them aggressively.

The grant was written after more than a year of focused campus conversations on whether to change the Division of Education into a School of Education and dramatically increase the size of its faculty. Consequently, the grant was written to strengthen the clusters that faculty had already designed and to develop a strong new

one in the area of education. We think our most ambitious students will see multiple advantages in the GE Scholars cluster opportunities. We had evidence, albeit anecdotal, from some employers who hire our students that some of them had weak abilities to write and to work in teams. Thus, one component of the grant is dedicated to strengthening the GE writing course requirement.

After we've had more time to implement the grant, we suspect that GE will reflect our approach towards "opportunities" rather than "requirements." Unless a particular college or division chooses to do so, we doubt there will be any major changes in the core GE requirements for graduation. The exception here could prove to be that the courses with the Writing designation will be uniformly stronger as we work with faculty to develop more sophisticated assignments. However, we will strongly advise students to consider taking one of the GE clusters leading to GE Scholars status. This would not be required, but it would be available and we would certainly encourage our most motivated students to choose this route.

While we do not expect that the new Educational Objectives will directly affect specific General Education requirements in the short run, it is likely that, with their emphasis on general education subjects, the objectives will begin to affect the way that all requirements are viewed. Over time this will have an impact.

In this discussion, we have highlighted just three of the many important topics in Standard 2. The portfolio has much more evidence of our commitment to the core functions. Criteria 2.8 and 2.9 deserve comment. The former includes the promotion of instructional innovation. The application of educational technology is one of our Educational Effectiveness self-study topics. Institutional capacity to support that is included in the evidence for Criterion 2.8.

Evidence presented in conjunction with the discussion of Criterion 2.9 demonstrates our capacity to engage students in the research and scholarship of the University, and this is our other educational effectiveness topic.

## Reflections

It is Standard 2 that is most concerned with the mission of student learning. We have discussed student engagement and advising as important parts of the process. *Bookhead* is an Arneson *Egghead* sculpture poised in front of Shields Library. An upside down head, firmly ensconced in the pages of an open book, it is noteworthy that this was the



*Robert Arneson, Bookhead, from The Egghead Series, 1991-92, Richard L. Nelson Gallery & The Fine Arts Collection,*

*first of the sculptures the artist* © UC Regents.  
prepared for campus. At the  
same time that the egghead  
idealizes a total dedication to  
learning, it also cautions  
against a learning process that  
neglects wider engagement.

<sup>1</sup> *Students in the Balance: General Education in the Research University*. The Penn State Symposium on General Education. The Pennsylvania State University 2002 20

### **Standard 3**

As was noted earlier, California, more so than any other state, has invested heavily in its public research universities. Discussing UC Davis, former President of the University of California, Clark Kerr said:

"Davis was an all-around joy. It had its own special place in the university as the primary center for agricultural research—one of the best in the nation and even in the world, I discovered as I traveled abroad. Managers of sheep ranches in Australia and vineyards in France spoke of Davis as the center of research in their specialties. It had professional and academic respect...It was, above all other campuses, an integrated and intellectual community." <sup>1</sup>

President Kerr praises then Chancellor Emil Mrak for his leadership during what has become known as the first tidal wave of campus growth. Standard 3 is concerned with the human, fiscal, organizational, and physical resources that are devoted to creating an institution that can achieve its objectives. Clark Kerr's comments indicate that our campus began its modern development with the effective leadership, accomplished faculty, support staff, and facilities that are necessary for excellence. In this section of the essay, we will highlight our present status in those areas and the process we use to build upon past successes.

Our present Chancellor, Larry N. Vanderhoef, is only the fifth individual to serve at the helm of our campus. Having come to campus in 1984 to serve as Executive Vice Chancellor, he became Chancellor in 1994. Many members of the senior management team have long histories with the campus. But we conduct national searches for almost all of our senior positions, so we also recruit and hire talented leaders from other institutions. The result is a nice blend of institutional memory and new blood. Evidence of the caliber of our senior management team can be seen in the number of individuals who have moved on to lateral or higher positions at other prominent universities. This list would include the present Presidents of the University of Wyoming and Kent State, the Chancellors of UC Santa Cruz and UC Merced, the Executive Vice Chancellor of University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill,

and the Provost of Virginia Tech.

In addition to administrative leadership, another crucial institutional resource is our faculty. Enhancing faculty excellence in a time of rapid growth requires some care. To deal with the financial shortfalls of the early 1990s, amounting to \$400M or about 25% of the total state allocation, the UC system offered a very attractive "golden handshake" that successfully enticed many faculty and staff into partial or full retirement. As a result, the late 1990s did not see a large number of retirements because so many employees who were eligible for early retirement took advantage of this opportunity in the early part of the decade. Now we are seeing that large numbers of staff and faculty are eligible or close to being eligible for retirement. As we indicated in our Institutional Proposal, this retirement blip coincides with a student growth blip. In our plans for expansion, we have factored in both genuinely new positions allocated by the State for growth, as well as positions vacated by retirees. Since we have been in this growth period, we have had to hire large numbers of faculty, at a time when many peer institutions have been hiring in similar disciplines. Competition for the promising junior faculty and distinguished senior scholars can be fierce but the deans have held firm to the principle that a faculty investment is the most crucial one made by the University. Most of them operate under the rule that if they can't get their first or close second choice faculty member, then the search is rolled over to the following year.

Given the level of campus growth, we are fortunate that we have had stability in our human resources. We also have a first-rate staff on campus. We are considered more than a model employer - we are a family friendly employer in the context of our outstanding childcare services centers, funds to support students, and the lactation program. Nevertheless, for the past two years, the UC budget has had a particularly negative effect on staff salary increases, limiting them to 2% or less. It should be noted that UC staff have fared slightly better than most other State employees.

As disappointed as we are at being unable to adequately reward our staff for the enthusiasm they have demonstrated in grappling with our growth, we have instituted a number of measures to show our appreciation for their hard work. These include more generous funding of Thank Goodness For Staff events, flextime accommodations, and gift certificates for employment anniversary milestones.

### **TAs, Unit 18s, Assistant IIIs, Full Off-Scales, Full VIs, SOEs, Associate-Ins, Clinical Xs**

To most of our students, any individual standing in front of a room with chalk or a laptop is a member of the faculty. Because of the scope of the University of California and its sweeping research and teaching mission, the system evolved a complicated faculty personnel system. The titles in the heading above are just a sample of the multitude of titles under which members of the University of California instructional body are classified. Our faculty personnel processes contain many checks and balances to ensure that faculty are reviewed and rewarded

appropriately. However, during this period of growth, the campus has struggled with issues that come with this multi-tiered system. How much instruction should be entrusted to graduate student TAs? Should lecturers enjoy the same job security as ladder faculty? Should assistant professors teach advanced graduate students? Should full professors routinely teach freshmen? Although we have either established policy or understood expectations that address many of these issues, different constituent groups have challenged those norms. We will be re-examining and modifying our views on these issues as members of the UC system and, in many cases, within the context of labor contract negotiation processes. UC Davis teaching staff, regardless of classification, take their teaching mission seriously and our student outcomes are a testimony to this dedication.

Some of the more specific aspects of the institutional processes by which we assure the very high quality of faculty, administration, and staff, are covered in the institutional portfolio web site in Criteria 3.1 - 3.4.

### **Planning Councils, Steering Committees, Task Forces, Working Groups, Ad Hoc Groups, Coordinating Councils**

UC Davis relies on many strategies to sustain its operations and support achievement of educational objectives. Most of these strategies are developed and debated at a meeting or series of meetings. The information in the web site portfolio with Criteria 3.8 - 3.10 lays out the formal organizational structures, which support planning and decision-making. We have long-standing groups such as the Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC), which meets weekly, and more task-oriented groups convened in response to a particular issue, such as the Tactical Advisory Committee on Year Round Instruction, which meets on an as-needed basis. For all of the groups, we seek appropriate representation, and we solicit student participation whenever possible.

While all of this consultation is admirable, we are even more proud of the way in which we take the deliberations of the various groups and put them into action. Most groups need to report on their activities and accomplishments, forcing the leadership to always ensure action plans are developed and implemented. Clearly, we are not perfect in this regard. In 2000-2001, a group was charged with examining our commencement processes. It worked hard for several months and reported its findings to the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors (CODVC). One clear recommendation was that the campus pursue a December graduation ceremony. Although CODVC accepted this recommendation, seven months later we realized that no one had been put in charge of creating the new ceremony. That situation has been rectified, and there will be a fall commencement in December 2002. We are usually more goal-oriented than that example suggests. In recent years, we have made very effective use of joint Academic Senate administrative groups organized around specific campus goals. For example, several years ago Chancellor Vanderhoef and Academic Senate Chair Jeffrey Gibeling charged a committee of administrators and faculty to explore the possibility of establishing a School of

Education on campus. This group worked diligently on its charge and, as a result of its efforts, we now have a Dean of Education, and we were just authorized by the UC Regents to proceed with developing a School of Education. Faculty searches have been conducted with many more positions targeted in the years ahead, and we have identified space on campus for this enterprise.

When faculty are asked to take on a particularly time-consuming leadership role, we often find a way of compensating them either through a course load reduction, summer salary, laboratory support, or similar incentive. These workload modifications are developed on a case-by-case basis. In some instances, we are able to secure the services of emeriti faculty still committed to our mission. A recently retired faculty member coordinated campus efforts to justify the new School of Education and she went on to chair the search for a Dean.

Through the principle of shared governance, the primary responsibility for courses and curricula is delegated to the faculty. The organizational structures and processes by which they exercise that responsibility are covered in the portfolio in Criterion 3.11.

### **Space: The Final Frontier**

Fiscal, physical, and informational resources are also essential to our success. Many aspects of these are covered in the portfolio with Criteria 3.5 - 3.7. Perhaps the most difficult one within these categories is space. We don't think that UC Davis faculty are distinct from their colleagues at other universities in their persistent exhortations for more space. As we noted in our commentary on Standard 1, we do not operate autonomously. Particularly when it comes to matters of construction, we must adhere to an intricate web of rules imposed by the State, the Regents, the campus itself, and, in many instances, the City of Davis. Thus, we acknowledge that synchronizing increasing numbers of people with their space needs continues to be a challenge. However, we take space planning very seriously and have a very intricate growth plan, which is included in the Institutional Portfolio under 3.5.

Chancellor Vanderhoef often notes that UCD has come to stand for "Under Construction Daily." It is clear that the UC Regents earmarked our campus for a sizeable portion of the Tidal Wave II growth, because with our 5,200 acres of land, we are the largest in land area of the ten UC campuses. From the Science Laboratory Building, the Activities and Recreation Center (ARC), the football stadium, to the Graduate School of Management, we are endeavoring to meet many critically needed space requirements for the campus.

Shortage of classroom space is a particularly vexing challenge. Ask most students and faculty if we have sufficient classroom space and they will respond, "No!" Ask the California Post secondary Education Commission (CPEC) if we have sufficient instructional space, and they will respond, "Yes." The Commission uses the same formula for this recommendation for all the strata of higher education institutions.

Thus, the California State and community college standards are the same as those applied to UC campuses. Yet UC students don't share the commuter profile of their counterparts in the other systems. The community and four-year state colleges serve a much larger part-time student population, a cohort of students more likely to work during the day and expect to take classes in the evening and on weekends. Although many of our students do work, it is usually a much less intense schedule and the expectation is that evening and weekend time are to be devoted to study. We are, however, offering more and more evening and weekend classes and laboratories.

Information technology is one of the Criteria (3.7) in Standard 3 and is also central to one of our Educational Effectiveness self-study topics. Our discussion in 3.7 describes how we have made major changes in our information technology institutional organization. One of the main goals was to produce a structure that is better able to align the efforts in improving technology with the needs and priorities of our campus. We are now much better organized to apply information technology in student learning. Our Educational Effectiveness self-study will explore this topic much more extensively.

### Reflections

A pair of *Eggheads* rest on the hill between Mrak Hall, the administration building, and King Hall, the Law School. Arneson called the pair "See No Evil and Hear No Evil." Both heads have their mouths open as though talking, but neither has ears. Each head has one blank eye. Through these whimsical pieces of sculpture, Arneson was no doubt imploring those of us charged with campus leadership and the dispersal of the campus's resources to privilege the listening and looking aspects of consultation and collaboration.



*Robert Arneson, See No Evil, from The Egghead Series, 1991-92, Richard L. Nelson Gallery & The Fine Arts Collection, © UC Regents.*



*Robert Arneson, Hear No Evil, from The Egghead Series, 1991-92, Richard L. Nelson Gallery & The Fine Arts Collection, © UC Regents.*

<sup>1</sup> Clark Kerr, *The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the University of California 1949-1967*. University of California Press: Berkeley 2001 306.

#### **Standard 4**

The elaborate consultation network described in our Standard 3 essay is particularly important in our efforts to create an organization committed to learning and improvement. The main element is a planning process that is informed by appropriate institutional research. We have two main units devoted to institutional research: the Office of Resource Management and Planning (ORMP) and the Student Affairs Research and Information Office (SARI). They are key resources which are available to virtually all campus groups and can provide the current and sophisticated institutional data that are the basis for informed decisions and sound recommendations. From decisions such as those that the Council of Vice Chancellors grapples with concerning the long-range development plan to alternatives about what countries in which we should develop Short Term Programs Abroad (STPAs), we enjoy the benefit of superb institutional researchers.

#### **Strategic Thinking and Planning**

Although new members of the UC Davis administration, faculty and staff may bemoan the list of acronyms that matches our multitude of committees, they come to realize that these groups are essential for planning the progress of the institution. The efforts of all of these committees and the institutional researchers who support their efforts continue to be challenged by the Tidal Wave II students. The late 1990s was not the first time UC campuses began planning for increased enrollments. Less than a decade earlier, a surge of enrollment was predicted, and campus planning had commenced. However, that phantom tidal wave of students never materialized. Some faculty and staff were understandably reticent about the planning for the next predicted surge, but these students have indeed arrived. For an example of institutional planning at UC Davis, we will now describe the process that led to the Academic Plan.

UC Davis began planning for the growth with the formation of the Provost's Academic Advising Council (PAAC) in 1998. This group was comprised of faculty and administrators from across the campus. They began by articulating principles upon which to solicit proposals from throughout the campus. It was important that all academic units have the opportunity to participate. Although re-investing in established programs is often an appropriate and necessary thing to do, we know that it is also important for an institution of our caliber to develop new initiatives. Thus, the process began with a broad solicitation of new initiatives to be followed

by the solicitation of plans for growth for extant programs. With its long tradition of interdisciplinary collaboration, the campus was successful in attracting proposals that pool much of our faculty talent. Another principle that was promoted by the PAAC was the notion that enrollment growth would not be the driver of FTE allotments. Instead, we opted to invest the new FTE more strategically and use alternative revenue streams to fund some of the campus' curricular needs.

Following the PAAC process, the Academic Planning Council was formed. The new group was comprised of both the original PAAC members as well as a number of additional senior campus leaders who further vetted recommendations. At relevant meetings, members of our institutional research office were in attendance. They provided the members of the group with several important kinds of information. This material included instructional workload data, faculty/student ratios, profiles on the research rankings of our departments, budget materials for colleges and divisions. Additionally, the ORMP staff offered multiple models on the workload impact we could anticipate as we chose which colleges and divisions into which to enroll the new students. We have noted before that we are sometimes constrained by mandates external to our processes. In this case, the evidence clearly indicated it was time to accept many more graduate students so that we could improve the graduate student/undergraduate student ratio. However, the California Legislature puts a much higher priority on undergraduate enrollment than on graduate student enrollment.

Widespread campus consultation took place throughout the academic planning process. Given our size and complexity, it would be unrealistic and perhaps even unhealthy to expect that all campus citizens buy in to all of the points in the current Academic Plan. However, we believe all relevant parties were given the opportunity to comment. The conclusion of this process can be found in the Academic Plan available in the on-line portfolio.

The UC Davis Graduate Group structure has provided us with extensive experience in cross-college cooperation. Even so, new cross-campus academic initiatives pose significant implementation challenges. For each of these, we identify a "lead dean." This dean is charged with working with the other relevant colleges and divisions to move an initiative forward.

We are now finding that we might have been more concrete in our statements and planning for curricular needs. More often than we would like, we are adding courses very close to the beginning of the quarter. A recent systemwide audit reveals disproportionately large classes and disproportionately small classes. During the next academic year we will convene a group to redress this problem.

Additional important examples of planning processes can be found in the portfolio. They include the Chancellor's Fall Conferences and the Long Range Development Plan. A noteworthy example connected with Criterion 4.2 is the very ambitious New

Business Architecture (NBA).

Although we have excellent data on student outcomes and satisfaction and have established procedures for program review for quality assurance, we do not have institution wide or highly developed tools for gathering or using direct measures of student learning beyond those used in each individual class. Key to progress in this area is an articulation of educational objectives and a body charged with developing our methods for measuring educational effectiveness and using the results. We have recently put both of these elements in place. In the coming academic year, the next steps will be taken.

### **Commitment to Learning and Improvement**

Criteria 4.6 and 4.7 are concerned with the institutional commitment to improvements in teaching methods and student learning. For several reasons, we have opted to talk about the Physics 7 and Chemistry 2 series offered in the Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences (MPS). Both of these series are very important foundational ones vital to the academic success of students in many science-oriented majors. They are service courses, and at UC Davis, the students in them often come from colleges and divisions other than MPS, the division that is expected to support them. They have counterparts at most major universities and colleges. Because of their laboratory sections, they are among the most expensive lower division courses on our or any other campus. As the number of students we accept increases, we must constantly think about ways to accommodate them in these courses. Since the preparatory review is intended to demonstrate our capacity to foster increased undergraduate research experiences (an element of our educational effectiveness self-study), it is worthwhile to undertake a discussion of courses that are likely to have a direct impact on whether or not our students in the sciences are actually ready to pursue strong undergraduate research.

Physics 7 was designed by three faculty members from the Physics Department in the early 1990s. A gateway course in high demand by pre-med students, Physics 7 often proved to be a stumbling block that prevented students from further pursuit of a science major. Professors Potter, De Leone, and Coleman believed that if the course were restructured, it could maintain its rigor without deterring so many bright students. As they note in "Radically Restructured Introductory Physics Course at a Large Research University":

Physics education research consistently demonstrates the need for students to actively construct new models of physical phenomena if learning with understanding is to take place. Some of the activities that are most conducive to this type of learning include engaging the student in dialogues which expose their previously held views and allowing students to construct new models to replace their old views. However, a large lecture format is not conducive to an active learning approach. While change from the traditional lecture/lab style of

teaching may be desirable, there are typically many structural barriers to creating an active learning environment in physics courses. Many large research universities teach upwards of 1000 students a year in these introductory courses, making reform difficult. In this project, our goal is to address both of these problems by developing and fully implementing a new large introductory physics course that facilitates, rather than hinders, students' construction of physics knowledge, yet works within the constraints of a research university.

In 4.6 we are asked to demonstrate that leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry and assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives. We want to discuss how various offices of the University have been called upon to support Physics 7. The initial funding for Physics 7 came from the National Science Foundation, the Office of the Vice Provost--Undergraduate Studies, and the Dean of the Division of Math and Physical Sciences (MPS). The latter two offices routinely make investments to continue support for the course. The Physics Department itself has made an enormous investment in the course, and as noted above, it is a course for non-majors. Physics 7 requires more TAs and a very different kind of lab configuration. In spite of the space constraints described in Standard 3, we have always managed to find more space for Physics 7 as the enrollment has grown. Physics 7 was one of the first courses on campus to move to weekend lab times. Even before the Legislature requested that the University make more of its courses available in the summer, the Physics Department worked with the Summer Sessions Office to offer Physics 7 in the summer. This required extensive negotiation because the Physics 7 labs are quite expensive and Summer Session courses needed to be self-supporting at that time. Both the Physics Department and the Summer Sessions office had to invest to make Physics 7 affordable in the summer. As the need for lab space grew, the Office of Resource Management and Planning worked with the department to identify and rehabilitate space for labs. Funds for modifying this space came from the Office of the Provost and the Dean of MPS.

Even though the course is about 10 years old, the Physics 7 faculty continue to refine the course and its labs. Evidence demonstrates that the students have met or exceeded the pass rate on the MCATS. Thus Physics 7 and other courses that so thoroughly embody our educational objectives will continue to receive full campus support and encouragement.

The faculty in Chemistry have taken a different approach. As they anticipated the impact of the enrollment growth on the Chemistry 2 series, they realized that they were likely to run out of space in the teaching laboratories. New teaching laboratories are quite expensive; we know this from the costs associated with the new Biological Sciences laboratories being constructed at this time. The discussions about how to prepare for this eventuality in Chemistry coincided with an increased understanding of the benefits of adopting certain components of educational technology. In 1999, the Dean of Mathematical and Physical Sciences proposed that

our Chemistry faculty work with the staffs of the Teaching Resources Center and Mediaworks to develop on-line modules for the pre and post sections of the laboratory courses. Such modules would have several benefits. First, they allow us to shorten the duration of time a student must spend "at the bench". Part of the lab time would be at their own computer terminals or ones available throughout the campus. As the document attached to the on-line portfolio indicates, the faculty and the staff of Mediaworks were interested in pursuing this change only if it had pedagogical merit. The following 5 principles guided their efforts:

1. The quality of student learning will be improved or maintained.
2. Documentation of student learning will be improved.
3. Outcomes assessment, rather than "seat time", will be used to evaluate student learning.
4. Enough class work will be replaced to allow at least one extra laboratory section per day.
5. The program will be cost-effective, but not necessarily cheaper.

While the Chemistry Department, MPS, and Mediaworks were the core working group on this effort, it did require the kind of cross-campus cooperation and support intrinsic in 4.6. Both the former and present Executive Vice Chancellor/Provosts were involved in the allocation of resources. The Office of Resource Management and Planning was key in identifying revenue streams and the Vice Provosts of Undergraduate Studies and Information and Educational Technology and their staffs were involved in the effort to keep the project moving. Since it also speaks to our Educational Effectiveness review, we will offer a more nuanced commentary on it in the next phase of our WASC review.

Our Institutional Proposal states that we are particularly interested in developing educational objectives for the integration of teaching, learning, and research and that given the enrollment growth and faculty turnover we anticipate, we are eager to develop strategies to consistently communicate our campus priorities. We have made some considerable progress toward these goals. We discovered that we had no formal, documented educational objectives and that our Academic Senate committee organization and program review criteria were not optimally organized to address and promote overall policy in undergraduate education. We now have a new Academic Senate Undergraduate Council, and educational objectives have been adopted. These are important steps forward, but it is interesting to note that the educational objectives are framed at a level on which a statement of student involvement in research does not easily fit. Nevertheless, the task of making the objectives operational still lies before us, and student involvement in the research life of the university can very effectively foster all of the stated educational objectives. Thus it is possible to speculate that in the implementation of the objectives, research will have a central role.

## **Reflections**

North and South Halls are among the oldest buildings on campus and are now fully dedicated to student support services. Arneson's *Stargazer* is positioned between them and Dutton Hall, a very new student services building. With an expression of wonder and enchantment, the *Egghead* looks towards the skies. Here the campus is inspired to continually strive onwards and upwards as we pursue our goals.



*Robert Arneson, Stargazer, from The Egghead Series, 1991-92, Richard L. Nelson Gallery & The Fine Arts Collection, © UC Regents.*

## Conclusion

In the reflective essays and on-line portfolio, we believe that UC Davis has demonstrated the core capacities that are prerequisite to our educational effectiveness review. From ramping up our advising activities to accommodate the Tidal Wave II students to refining our program review processes, we have been committed to improving the learning-centered environment at our institution.

In our Institutional Proposal dated June 14, 2000, we stated:

Three general goals can be mentioned first. UC Davis is looking forward to the opportunity to engage the campus more broadly in the review process through the capacity review. We are particularly interested in developing educational objectives for the integration of teaching, learning, and research. Given the enrollment growth and faculty turnover we anticipate, we are eager to develop strategies to consistently communicate our campus priorities as articulated in our mission statement and academic planning documents.

As we have noted in the introductory essay, the Chancellor's Fall Conference on Undergraduate Education, held in the fall of 2001, set the stage for a yearlong set of activities that engaged the campus in the review process. We have offered more specific information on how we used it as an opportunity to develop educational objectives, but we also used this conference to stimulate discussions on first year experiences, campus honors programs, General Education, assessment, educational technology, and campus composition requirements. Although many members of the campus community were already convinced that the formation of an Academic Senate Undergraduate Council would mark an important step towards improved undergraduate education decision making, the myriad of issues and recommendations that surfaced at the conference further reinforced the need for a body charged with pursuing proactive courses of action on behalf of the undergraduate curriculum. With the formation of the new Undergraduate Council, as well as continued attention by the administration, we are confident that these will be on-going discussions that will outlast the WASC review process.

We have succeeded in our goal of establishing Educational Objectives for the campus. In the

coming academic year, we will continue our extensive efforts to publicize and distribute them. We recognize that much more needs to be done to make them operational. Both the Senate's Undergraduate Council and the administration are committed to developing functional metrics for them, and they will be key in any upcoming strategic planning process.

We make effective use of the campus communication tools available to us. Even more so than was the case in 2000, when we submitted our proposal, campus stakeholders rely on the Internet to receive information. We also reinforce our messages with hard copies of directives, both student and staff/faculty publications, and plain old-fashioned word of mouth. In our Educational Effectiveness review we will more thoroughly discuss the ever-increasing role our *MyUCDavis* portal plays in campus communication.

For our Educational Effectiveness review, the UC Davis institutional proposal states that:

Regarding our inquiry into research, we would like to be able to provide our faculty with best practices for integrating research into the student learning experience. We are also interested in developing more specific student research goals for the ten academic initiatives recently developed for the campus. We intend, thereby, to gain a clearer picture of ourselves that will, in turn, help us to articulate to various audiences what it means to be a research university and the way in which the research component of our mission benefits our students, their parents, and other constituencies.

Our preliminary data collecting would suggest that many members of our faculty are already quite aware of, and in some instances the architects of, best practices for integrating research into undergraduate learning experiences. We have learned just how discipline-specific discussions of undergraduate research must be. We have benefited from participation in discussions sponsored by The Reinvention Center at State University of New York, Stony Brook, on undergraduate research. At UC Davis and elsewhere, students in the humanities and fine arts often characterize research as something done by their colleagues in the sciences. A key component of the advising process we describe in the Standard 2 essay now involves familiarizing students with the range of opportunities for creative work, scholarship, and research at UC Davis. Our ten academic initiatives are at various stages of maturity, and the fiscal constraints we have discussed have forced some of them to slow down a bit. Thus we believe it best to identify student research goals for those that are the most fully developed. As part of our 2000-2001 student survey, we asked students for narrative comments on their views of the benefits of attending a research university. The results have prompted interesting campus discussions, and we will elaborate on them in the next stage of this process.

Given the State's increasingly precarious fiscal situation, it is more important than ever that we use our resources for educational technology judiciously. In our Institutional Proposal we state:

...we want to ensure that sound pedagogical and intellectual practices drive the deployment of technology, rather than letting the availability and seductiveness of new technologies drive our endeavors. At the end of this WASC accreditation process we would like to have criteria that will help the campus departments and programs reach informed decisions about the use technology in instruction. Additionally, we would like to have an improved sense of how best to enable us and our students to develop the new literacies required by the digital age.

In our discussion of Standard 3, we have documented our ability to pull together key groups to grapple with specific tasks on campus. In our Educational Effectiveness review, we will more fully demonstrate how we have used this to our benefit with the formations of the computing coordinating committees, Administrative Computing Coordinating Council (AC3) and Academic Computing Coordinating Council (AC4).

Since members of our campus team attended the first workshop relevant to the reaffirmation of accreditation in July of 1999, we have learned a great deal about our University. For a campus such as ours, where persistent enrollment growth and a deteriorating fiscal outlook can govern day-to-day decision making, the WASC process forces us into a more analytical mode. As we have inventoried campus practices, we have had moments where we were pleasantly surprised by a particular major's commitment to our educational objectives. While at other times, we've been disappointed and dismayed by some practices. We think that the decision on the International Relations major to require students to have an "international experience" reinforces our educational objective to "Develop a Global Perspective." On the other hand, our objective to "Develop Effective Communication Skills" would seem to be negated by those upper division courses that have diluted paper requirements because the departments can't hire enough teaching assistants. We are impressed by the fact that, overall, our faculty and staff are genuinely committed to providing an academic experience at the very highest intellectual standard possible.

In the immediate day-to-day life of the campus, one easily identifies enrollment growth, budget cuts, and space limitations as the biggest problems. However, from the perspective of the new WASC standards, one might conclude that our biggest challenge lies in fully developing a culture of evidence around student learning. Perhaps because so many of our faculty members are eminent researchers in the "hard" sciences, the campus conversations on "assessment" and "culture of evidence" have been quite lively. In their own laboratories our faculty maintain exacting standards for evidence. As our discussion of Physics 7 indicates, and our Educational Effectiveness review of educational technology will demonstrate, many of our faculty have adopted very sophisticated assessment tools for their courses. If strong evidence emerges that assessment really does result in enhanced learning outcomes, then it is likely that more of our faculty and departments will invest human and financial resources into the deployment of the more sophisticated tools of evidence gathering. At present, many members of the faculty are attentive to the research being conducted.

These changes are likely to coincide with the changes to our course format and structure that are unfolding as faculty embrace and increasingly rely upon educational technology in the delivery of instruction. Most UC Davis faculty who adopt their courses to new technologies rely upon the services of the Teaching Resources Center and Mediaworks. We are fortunate that the faculty directors of these programs are very current on assessment practices and can help faculty include assessment modules in their courses. Indeed, the Educational Effectiveness review will highlight the implementation of a Mellon Grant on assessment of on-line and hybrid on-line General Education courses awarded to Professor Harry Mathews, director of Mediaworks.

## Reflections

Each of the five egghead sculptures comments on human interaction. The King Hall and Main Theater pairs offer cautionary notes on human-to-human communication while the solitary Mrak Mall, Shields Library, and North Hall heads emphasize contemplation of human institutions, human knowledge, and the human spirit, respectively. As we strive to improve our institution, it is essential that we remain mindful of all these messages.

*Robert Arneson, Yin & Yang, from The Egghead Series, 1991-92, Richard L. Nelson Gallery & The Fine Arts Collection, © UC Regents.*

## Appendix

Just as UC Davis has evolved since the last reaffirmation of accreditation in 1992, so has WASC shifted its approach to the process of accreditation. The former model emphasized a set of 200 plus standards for which each institution in the region was expected to demonstrate compliance. The model codified in 2001 recognizes the range of institutional missions and resources and offers more potential for colleges and universities to use the accreditation process to answer questions that are at once important in terms of determining their worthiness for accreditation but also in terms of their own campus-specific goals and objectives.

Although WASC has dramatically reformulated its processes, it does expect institutions to note the efforts they made in response to the recommendations that emerged under the old model. The report from the 1992 reaffirmation of accreditation visit for UC Davis was very productive for the campus. The visiting team was impressed by many aspects of our campus and its approach to the delivery of the curriculum. At that time the team recommended an interim visit and the Commission's report from that visit is dated June 1997. Planning and General Education are the key issues addressed in that document.

### Planning

The team commented favorably upon the then recent formation of "an Academic Leadership and Planning body." Now known as ALAP that group is in its sixth year of existence. It is a relatively small group of nine members of the senior management team chaired by the Chancellor or in his absence, the Executive Vice-Chancellor/Provost. ALAP is charged with thinking proactively about the campus's academic future and with keeping priorities for the campus moving forward. A key new member of the ALAP committee is the Vice Chancellor for Resource Management and Planning (ORMP). This major campus office has been formed since the 1997 visit. As its title suggests, this office plays an extremely important role in our efforts to coordinate our often lofty academic goals and plans with our often limited financial resources. In preparation for a possible comprehensive campaign, ALAP has begun to discuss the pros and cons of embarking on a strategic planning process.

The 1997 team concludes its section on planning by noting,

"Coordination and synchronization are needed for long-term planning, short-term planning, budgeting and financial forecasts, data collection and maintenance, and periodic updates of the Strategic Plan. The Committee is convinced that the bases have been laid for the planning activities ahead."

In the essays and on-line portfolio constructed for this review, we identify the many planning processes the campus undertakes. As we note in our initial comments on Standard 1, our own campus planning is linked to and sometimes limited by our obligations to the University of California system. In recent years, our efforts have focused on planning for growth, and in recent months, we have been particularly dedicated to developing workable strategies for managing campus growth in an increasingly dire state budget situation. Fortunately for the campus, enough of the individuals who were experienced the budget shortfalls of the early 1990s are still here and we are benefiting from their insights.

### General Education

The 1997 committee summed up its comments on general education by saying,

"Crafting a solid general education curriculum is a challenge for all universities, and especially one as large and complex as the University of California, Davis." Nevertheless, the Committee urges that the University give increased attention to general education to find ways to cut across political boundaries and claims of ownership. Relying upon data from the assessment of academic achievement can provide a sharp instrument for that evaluation.

In our Standard 2 essay, we acknowledge that we remain somewhat dissatisfied by some aspects of our General Education curriculum. However, we make the case that our campus offers students such a broad range of courses and co-curricular activities that most of our students satisfy the most generally agreed upon goals of a liberal education as traditionally defined. As noted in the Standard 2 essay and given in more detail at Criterion 2.2 in the portfolio, the actual practice of students in selecting a broad range of courses is quite good. We see more grounds for optimism than for pessimism. The resources infused into the campus by the Hewlett grant have stimulated extensive faculty interest and some very innovative pilots. The General Education committee that was established by the Senate in June 2002 will be able to pursue its work with the benefit of progress reports already submitted by the external consultant. Indeed, because of the sophistication of our data management systems, we will be able to provide very rich detailed information about our student's academic profiles. In implementing the Hewlett grant, we have made good use of the campus's Data Warehouse, and this tool will facilitate data driven discussions for the GE committee.

## Appendix

Just as UC Davis has evolved since the last reaffirmation of accreditation in 1992, so has WASC shifted its approach to the process of accreditation. The former model emphasized a set of 200 plus standards for which each institution in the region was expected to demonstrate compliance. The model codified in 2001 recognizes the range of institutional missions and resources and offers more potential for colleges and universities to use the accreditation process to answer questions that are at once important in terms of determining their worthiness for accreditation but also in terms of their own campus-specific goals and objectives.

Although WASC has dramatically reformulated its processes, it does expect institutions to note the efforts they made in response to the recommendations that emerged under the old model. The report from the 1992 reaffirmation of accreditation visit for UC Davis was very productive for the campus. The visiting team was impressed by many aspects of our campus and its approach to the delivery of the curriculum. At that time the team recommended an interim visit and the Commission's report from that visit is dated June 1997. Planning and General Education are the key issues addressed in that document.

### Planning

The team commented favorably upon the then recent formation of "an Academic Leadership and Planning body." Now known as ALAP that group is in its sixth year of existence. It is a relatively small group of nine members of the senior management team chaired by the Chancellor or in his absence, the Executive Vice-Chancellor/Provost. ALAP is charged with thinking proactively about the campus's academic future and with keeping priorities for the campus moving forward. A key new member of the ALAP committee is the Vice Chancellor for Resource Management and Planning (ORMP). This major campus office has been formed since the 1997 visit. As its title suggests, this office plays an extremely important role in our efforts to coordinate our often lofty academic goals and plans with our often limited financial resources. In preparation for a possible comprehensive campaign, ALAP has begun to discuss the pros and cons of embarking on a strategic planning process.

The 1997 team concludes its section on planning by noting,

"Coordination and synchronization are needed for long-term planning, short-term planning, budgeting and financial forecasts, data collection and maintenance, and periodic updates of the Strategic Plan. The Committee is convinced that the bases have been laid for the planning activities ahead."

In the essays and on-line portfolio constructed for this review, we identify the many planning processes the campus undertakes. As we note in our initial comments on Standard 1, our own campus planning is linked to and sometimes limited by our obligations to the University of California system. In recent years, our efforts have focused on planning for growth, and in recent months, we have been particularly dedicated to developing workable strategies for managing campus growth in an increasingly dire state budget situation. Fortunately for the campus, enough of the individuals who were experienced the budget shortfalls of the early 1990s are still here and we are benefiting from their insights.

### General Education

The 1997 committee summed up its comments on general education by saying,

"Crafting a solid general education curriculum is a challenge for all universities, and especially one as large and complex as the University of California, Davis." Nevertheless, the Committee urges that the University give increased attention to general education to find ways to cut across political boundaries and claims of ownership. Relying upon data from the assessment of academic achievement can provide a sharp instrument for that evaluation.

In our Standard 2 essay, we acknowledge that we remain somewhat dissatisfied by some aspects of our General Education curriculum. However, we make the case that our campus offers students such a broad range of courses and co-curricular activities that most of our students satisfy the most generally agreed upon goals of a liberal education as traditionally defined. As noted in the Standard 2 essay and given in more detail at Criterion 2.2 in the portfolio, the actual practice of students in selecting a broad range of courses is quite good. We see more grounds for optimism than for pessimism. The resources infused into the campus by the Hewlett grant have stimulated extensive faculty interest and some very innovative pilots. The General Education committee that was established by the Senate in June 2002 will be able to pursue its work with the benefit of progress reports already submitted by the external consultant. Indeed, because of the sophistication of our data management systems, we will be able to provide very rich detailed information about our student's academic profiles. In implementing the Hewlett grant, we have made good use of the campus's Data Warehouse, and this tool will facilitate data driven discussions for the GE committee.

## WASC Related Links

### UC Davis's Proposal

[WASC EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW REPORT](#)

- [WASC Institutional Proposal \(PDF\)](#)
- [WASC Educational Effectiveness Self-Study Topics](#)
- [WASC Response to Institutional Proposal \(PDF\)](#)
- 

### Documents

[WASC Action Letter to the Chancellor](#)

- [Preparatory Review Team Report for UC Davis](#)
- [WASC Educational Effectiveness Addendum and Response to Team Capacity Visit Report \(PDF\)](#)
- 

### WASC Steering Committee

[WASC Steering Committee Membership](#)

- [WASC Steering Committee Meeting Minutes](#)
- 

### Accreditation Resources

[WASC handbook of Accreditation \(PDF\)](#)

- [Official WASC Site](#)
- [Evidence Guide \(PDF\)](#)
- 

### Other University Accreditation Portfolio

[Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis](#)

- [University of California, San Diego](#)
- [California State University, Sacramento](#)
- [Georgia State University](#)
- [Portland State University](#)
- [University of Illinois at Chicago](#)
- [University of Massachusetts Boston](#)
- 

### Accreditation Archive (1990-1999)

[Fourth Year Interim Report - 11/1996](#)

- [Fourth Year Interim Report Commission Review - 6/24/1997 \(PDF\)](#)
-

- [Reaccreditation Commission Report - 10/15/1991 \(PDF\)](#)
- [Commission Reaffirmation - 3/3/1992 \(PDF\)](#)

### **UCOP WASC**

- [Planning \(2001\) \(PDF\)](#)
- [Governance \(2001\) \(PDF\)](#)
- [Academic Issues \(2001\) \(PDF\)](#)
- [Mission and Overview \(2001\) \(PDF\)](#)

### **The Boyer Commission Report**

- [\*Reinventing Undergraduate Education:  
A Blueprint for America's Research Universities\*](#)

### **The Hewlett Grant**

- [Proposal](#)
- [GE Scholars](#)

### **Other Links**

- [Key Links By Standard](#)
- [Key Links By Category](#)