

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL**

**SUBMITTED TO THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES (WASC)
OCTOBER 2005**

...with liberty and calculus for all.

Anonymous UCSD freshman

1. Institutional Context

In 1960, the inaugural class of one hundred graduate students enrolled in the University of California, San Diego, the sixth campus established in the ten-campus University of California system. Over the past forty-five years, founder Roger Revelle's vision of a powerhouse campus in the sciences and engineering has been fulfilled and greatly expanded to include impressive programs in the arts and humanities and the social sciences. (Nancy Scott Anderson chronicles UCSD's development and the driving force behind it in *An Improbable Venture*, published in 1993.) The campus offers an intellectually rich curriculum, opportunities to participate in research and creative activities, and a wide variety of co-curricular activities giving students the opportunity to explore, learn, and develop both intellectually and personally. In Fall 2004, more than 25,000 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students pursued educational and career goals in the arts, biological and health sciences, humanities, engineering, management, physical sciences, and social sciences.

The quality of UCSD's academic programs has been nationally and internationally recognized, and UCSD is ranked among the most highly rated institutions in many, widely cited polls, e.g., *US News & World Report*, *The Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance*, *Newsweek*, *the 2006 Kaplan/Newsweek College Guide*, *Washington Monthly*, and *Shanghai Jiao Tong University*. While not substituting for rigorous, empirically based investigations of education quality, these rankings reflect beliefs commonly held by the educational and research community about the excellence of UCSD's programs.

For undergraduate students, the campus' much-lauded college system enhances the student life experience by providing a sense of belonging to and identity with a smaller, more intimate, and more accessible institution within the context of a large research university. Each of the six colleges—Revelle, John Muir, Thurgood Marshall, Earl Warren, Eleanor Roosevelt, and the newest, Sixth—has its own unique identity, academic approach, general education requirements, and geographic campus neighborhood.

Much of the institutional context within which our reaffirmation self-study will be conducted, from the development of this proposal through our Educational Effectiveness Review, is presented in the accompanying text, data displays, and appendices. One feature of our institution, however, that is particularly important for understanding the following proposal is our culture of continual educational improvement using data-driven analyses. Empirical evidence, ongoing monitoring, self-study, and reflection are not confined to our laboratories, our study carrels, our studios, and our performance venues, but they are essential components of our approach to education at all levels—undergraduate, graduate, professional, and extended studies.

Like many large universities, UCSD is proficient at recognizing problems and shortcomings as they emerge. There are many sources of input for the expression of those concerns: student,

faculty, and alumni surveys, faculty committees, the faculty, staff, and administrators who work regularly with students and who oversee educational programs. In addition, Chancellor Marye Anne Fox is accessible to every member of the campus community and has set aside time each week for “walk-in appointments”. The Chancellor has also established a website at http://www-chancellor.ucsd.edu/new_rev.html for anyone to use who wishes to send anonymous comments or suggestions about UCSD to her directly.

UCSD is reasonably good at investigating and proposing solutions to problems, as is witnessed by the large number of committees, task forces, and work groups that study putative problems and recommend solutions with the hope and expectation that our educational product will be improved. The institution is also reasonably adept at implementing the recommendations of these groups, although at times budgetary and personnel constraints, local culture, and a host of other factors can make implementation slow and, occasionally, difficult. What is most demanding is the post-implementation assessment and evaluation of instituted changes in order to determine the extent to which

- these efforts at “continual self improvement” have actually accomplished their goals;
- the desired and expected changes have occurred; and
- the quality of education has been improved.

In our proposed reaffirmation activities, we plan to engage in this final and critical step of continual educational improvement as well as launch an inquiry into an issue that we believe will develop considerable significance over the course of the review process.

As indicated above, UCSD relies on many information sources to identify issues that merit attention. Not the least of these is the WASC accreditation reaffirmation process. [Appendix 1](#) details actions that we have taken since our last reaffirmation in response to the observations and recommendations that were made by the review team. There are a few, however, which should be noted at this point, for they directly bear on our proposed activities and the institutional context for the review. One of the major points made in the earlier reviews was the need to assure the availability of accurate and relevant information to the campus community for the purposes of planning, assessment, and self-understanding. To this end, data on all aspects of university functioning have become widely available through websites and the active distribution of reports to the academic units. (A list of many of these websites and a summary of their content is given in [Appendix 2](#).) In addition, then-Chancellor Dynes appointed the Institutional Research Coordinating Committee to oversee the production and dissemination of institutional data. This committee is one of the three central committees involved in our reaffirmation efforts. It is our hope that the degree to which this activity has been successful will be clearly demonstrated in this proposal and in the two reports and site visits to follow.

A second major point made in the last review emphasized that the budget and planning process should be more inclusive and actively seek input from faculty and campus academic units. We are pleased to report that Senior Vice Chancellor Marsha Chandler has instituted Charting the Course. This new budgeting process begins with individual academic departments, colleges, and other instructional units and focuses on the development and justification of planned growth and change for a three-year projection. It has now been successfully used during three budgetary cycles. The plans and requests of the individual units are consolidated by the divisional deans and

provosts into divisional and college requests. These planning documents become the basis for budgetary decisions to be made by the Senior Vice Chancellor.

A third major theme mentioned in the last review dealt with institutional commitments to undergraduate education and to educational outcomes—as opposed to inputs alone—as the basis for understanding educational effectiveness. As a result, the institution has taken additional steps to advance undergraduate education; some of which are central to our proposed self-study. In addition to these initiatives, a new position, Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, was established five years ago. Among the activities of that office has been the creation of a Council on Undergraduate Education, whose members are the Vice Chairs for Undergraduate Education within each department and academic unit. This council has become a major forum for the discussion of key issues in undergraduate education at UCSD.

For the current reaffirmation process, we have chosen four self-study themes. Three result from our emphasis on a model of continual educational improvement; they are freshman writing, foreign language instruction, and undergraduate program review. The fourth, information literacy, grew out of discussions through forums such as the Council on Undergraduate Education. These themes will serve as specific focal points for our assessment of UCSD's adherence to the four WASC Standards of Accreditation (1) Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives, (2) Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions, (3) Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability, and (4) Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement. In addition, we will examine and report on other aspects of institutional behavior that indicate the degree to which the four Standards are deeply embedded in the basic philosophy and psychology of the institution.

During the course of the accreditation review process, we anticipate that in-depth examination of the four themes will result in improvement of these particular aspects of the academic enterprise and further the pursuit of the University's mission of education, research, and public service. Although it is beyond the purview of this review, we further propose the broader goals of the development of an ongoing campus-wide data portfolio and expansion of review processes to insure that each academic program has specific student-learning outcomes in order to provide the campus with a framework for continual improvement.

2. Description of Outcomes

Over the course of the current accreditation self-study, the campus hopes to achieve four goals, specifically:

1. To use internal review processes in which independent study groups composed of faculty, students, and administrators will carefully review three ongoing initiatives designed to improve educational effectiveness in combination with the external, independent evaluation of these initiatives provided by the WASC review team to assess the adequacy of our continual educational improvement efforts;
2. To reinforce the use of student-learning assessment measures, particularly output measures related to specified learning goals, and ongoing monitoring of retention and successful degree completion in the undergraduate program review process;

3. To more fully understand how learning occurs at the institutional level by studying the processes of implementing three programs—writing review, language instruction reform, and undergraduate program review—each of which has a long history of conflicting points of view (methods of writing instruction, philosophy of foreign language instruction, undergraduate program review as secondary to graduate or department review) and by emphasizing the importance of post-implementation review;
4. To establish a committee charged with the task of identifying standards by which student information literacy and critical use of non-print based resources may be evaluated, to consider the committee's recommendations, and to begin implementation of those recommendations.

These four goals will be achieved by a variety of approaches, some of which have already been instituted. For example, the campus has initiated two pilot assessment tools that measure the educational effectiveness of essential skills and knowledge that each undergraduate degree recipient should have. These two tools assess the teaching methods and learning outcomes of student writing skills and foreign language acquisition. The current accreditation re-affirmation process comes at a time when we can couple our ongoing internal evaluation of these pilot assessment tools with the independent, external examination of the WASC review team.

Moreover, significant changes to the established campus undergraduate program review process have been initiated; the new undergraduate review model now more closely parallels the highly successful model used for campus graduate programs. We anticipate that during the course of the accreditation process, departments will incorporate into their own self-studies an intensive evaluation of issues related to student retention, students' advancement within their major, and the degree to which students receive quality, personal academic advising. In addition, the campus will examine how well academic programs meet WASC Standards and Criteria for Review. Further, as part of each review, departments and programs will study how best to establish appropriate measures of student learning.

On a broader level, the campus is working to improve students' critical evaluation skills when they use internet materials. We expect that by the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2007, a committee will have been established that will propose guidelines for evaluating information literacy skills. By the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review in 2009, a plan will have been implemented to ensure that students understand and comply with national standards for ethical use of internet materials and that they can critically evaluate data quality and validity.

3. Constituency Involvement

As UCSD approached the creation of its Institutional Proposal, we first developed a widely based institutional commitment to the reaffirmation process and a broad consensus on those issues whose investigation would most benefit the campus in general and, more specifically, undergraduate education. To this end, three standing committees, including one existing committee, were engaged in creating the Institutional Proposal and for guiding the reaffirmation process from start to finish. The first is the Executive Steering Committee, whose function is to guide the overall approach to our reaffirmation process, including our selection of a study approach. This committee, appointed by

Chancellor Fox, is composed of faculty and administrative leaders who will serve in this capacity throughout the reaffirmation process.

The second is the Senate-Administration Advisory Committee, whose membership was selected by the Academic Senate's Committee on Committees (for faculty membership on the committee) and University administration (for the members from administration). This Committee was charged with establishing the themes of reaffirmation proposal and the approaches that would be taken. The Associated Students of UCSD, the campus student governance association, appointed five undergraduate student associates to serve on the committee. The committee, including its student associates, operates with four subgroups. Each student serves on a work group to plan detailed approaches to the four themes of inquiry. Membership on this committee may change as the reaffirmation process develops, but members will be encouraged to stay involved as long as possible. Clearly, the student associates will rotate over time.

The third is the Institutional Research Coordinating Committee (IRCC) which was charged to coordinate the gathering, analysis, and presentation of the data elements used throughout the reaffirmation process in addition to its other functions. The IRCC is a relatively new committee appointed by the Chancellor and one whose creation was, in part, a result of recommendations made during UCSD's last reaffirmation. The membership of each of these committees is listed in [Appendix 3](#).

Finally, involvement of the entire campus has been solicited and encouraged through the creation of a publicly accessible website. The Chancellor has encouraged the campus community to participate in the process and make comments via the website at <http://accreditation.ucsd.edu>. (See [Appendices 4.A](#) and [4.B](#).)

During the development of the Institutional Proposal, extensive consultation was held with the many constituent groups. These included discussions with academic department heads, divisional deans, college provosts, key Senate committees and leadership—including the Senate Council—and student groups. Each of the campus accreditation committees reviewed drafts of the proposal, and members of the committees were encouraged to discuss both the general framework of the proposal as well as details of the self-study plan. Further, because our approach links the topics of inquiry with the campus' efforts to continuously improve, the campus is currently pilot testing two of the proposed topics, freshman and entry-level writing and undergraduate program review. The pilot testing brought many of the constituent groups, i.e., academic departments, the Academic Senate's Committee on Education Policy, the directors of writing programs, and the college provosts, into the process at the level of involvement that parallels that of the next stages of the accreditation inquiry.

4. Guiding Principles for Approaches to the Capacity and Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review

As UCSD moves forward from the proposal stage of the accreditation process into the Capacity and Preparatory Review (C&PR) and Educational Effectiveness (EE) stages, we will intensify the involvement of faculty, students, administration, and staff. The nature of the four themes makes this participation not only desirable, but necessary because three of the four themes focus on the assessment and improvement of ongoing activities in our educational system.

Therefore, all groups involved in these activities will likewise be involved in the accreditation process. Details are described below.

5. Approach for the Capacity and Preparatory Review

Preparation for the Capacity and Preparatory Review phase of the accreditation process builds on institutional research and data repositories that are currently available to various campus constituencies. Over the past decade, the campus made these data directly available to academic and administrative departments via a number of data portals, and increasingly, results of this research may be found on diverse campus web sites. Work is underway to design and publish a web-based Institutional Data Portfolio that provides links to existing campus resources as well as to comparable data at the system-wide level. The Institutional Research Coordinating Committee (IRCC) is instrumental in overseeing this process along with representatives from Administrative Computing and Telecommunications (ACT).

In addition to the Institutional Data Portfolio, we plan to address issues raised by an analysis of WASC Standards and associated Criteria for Review related to how the campus meets specific criteria and where improvements can be made. We will develop a matrix that will show precisely where evidence relating to each criterion may be found or indicate what actions are being taken to improve UCSD's effectiveness. Further, some of the topics that will be covered in the Reflective Essays, e.g., student-learning outcomes measures, are also addressed in the self-study themes.

We view the preparation and use of institutional research data as integral to both the Capacity and Preparatory Review report and the Educational Effectiveness Review report; effectiveness cannot be separated from the resources and culture that support the University mission.

6. Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review

The campus reaffirmation process will center on four areas of self-study and evaluation. These four topics were selected from a large number of suggested topics based on their relevancy for the campus and the degree to which they would have a maximal impact on undergraduate education. The four are (1) entry-level and freshman writing, (2) the organization and structure of foreign language instruction, (3) undergraduate program evaluation, and (4) information literacy. The first three of these themes have been the focus of ongoing campus efforts to improve student learning. Moreover, two of the current themes—writing and undergraduate program review—were noted in the 1998 report of the WASC Visiting Committee and in the July 6, 1998 letter from Ralph Wolff to then-Chancellor Dynes reaffirming our accreditation. The fourth topic of self-study will concentrate on information literacy. This is a topic of growing concern locally and nationally because profound transformations in information availability and authentication have occurred as electronic sources rapidly supplement and, in some instances, replace printed materials.

A. Entry-level and Freshman Writing

Overview

Writing instruction during the first several quarters of a student's life at UCSD represents a major commitment by the institution in terms of time, effort—of both students and instructors—and resources. Producing UCSD graduates with skills to communicate

effectively in standard written English has been important to the institution from its earliest days. UCSD's approach to teaching writing is different from most Research 1 universities. Writing instruction is not the responsibility of a single academic department such as a Department of English; rather, the six undergraduate colleges and the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement (formerly known as Subject A) office are responsible for this aspect of undergraduate education. The result of this distributed approach to writing is that there are multiple units responsible for the development and delivery of writing instruction, and each has its own philosophy and approach. Some colleges utilize a series of stand-alone, rhetoric-based programs, while others have embedded writing instruction within the core curriculum. Despite the investment of substantial resources and attention to writing pedagogy, there have been complaints from the faculty that many students cannot write at a level commensurate with their college standing. The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee on Preparatory Education (COPE) of the Academic Senate have raised questions about the efficacy and adequacy of writing instruction. University administrators have taken these concerns seriously and have invited an outside panel of writing specialists to advise the university on how best to assess the nature and effectiveness of its writing programs. (The panel's report may be found in [Appendix 5](#).) Despite these concerns and efforts, the fundamental question, "Can UCSD freshmen communicate adequately in standard written English after completing the General Education required writing sequence?" has not been fully answered. Ralph Wolff, in his 1998 letter reaffirming campus accreditation noted that although UCSD provided substantial documentation supporting the high quality of its education enterprise, the material "...does not provide the University with much specific evidence on the capacities of graduates in vital areas, such as writing...." With these concerns in mind and with the "culture of evidence" as a guiding principle, one area of proposed self-study is the evaluation and assessment of entry-level and freshman writing.

Proposed Actions

To this end, the Academic Senate, through its Committee on Educational Policy and Committee on Preparatory Education, mandated an empirical review of the six college writing programs along with a review of the English as a Second Language (ESL) and Entry-Level Writing programs. These reviews and their consequences will be the focus of our first self-study. The process will involve the collection of a random sample of student writing from each of the writing programs, i.e., the actual student writing products in fulfillment of the requirements of the courses. For the freshman writing programs, evaluators will collect writing samples from forty to sixty students in each of the college's core curriculum writing programs; four samples will be collected from each student. The examples will represent a writing exercise from early in the first quarter of writing instruction, one from late in the first quarter, one from early in the second quarter, and one from late in the second quarter. A faculty appointed Writing Review Committee, consisting of members of the Academic Senate who are themselves not associated with any of the writing programs, but who come from disciplines in which writing is critical, will evaluate the samples according to the University-wide "Subject A" criteria and guidelines articulated by CEP. The committee will then assess the degree to which each individual has improved. (The detailed instructions given to the evaluators in the pilot study of this process are included in [Appendix 6](#).) A similar process will be conducted for students who are placed in ESL or Entry-Level Writing.

The collective and cumulative evidence will be used by the Writing Review Committee to evaluate, in an evidence-driven process, the degree to which the campus writing programs achieve the goal of training UCSD students to write clearly and concisely.

B. Delivery of Foreign Language Instruction

Overview

While our proposed self-study on writing focuses on student-learning outcomes, the proposed self-study on the delivery of foreign language instruction focuses more on institutional and organizational learning outcomes. For many years, the campus has taken a somewhat unusual approach with regard to the instruction of foreign language. At UCSD, there are no academic units with the sole responsibility for the instruction of foreign languages, i.e., there are no departments such as a Department of French or a Department of Asian Languages. Rather, at UCSD language instruction is a shared responsibility of at least four academic units, Linguistics, Literature, History, and the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies (IR/PS), who report to three different deans. These units are responsible for teaching multiple languages. For example, the Department of Linguistics instructs the entry-level courses (Language 1 sequences) in languages such as American Sign Language, Arabic, French, German, Hindi, Portuguese, Spanish, as well as the Heritage Language courses. The Department of Literature teaches more advanced language courses (the Language 2 sequences, among others) in these and other languages including Italian, Korean, and Russian. Similarly, the Department of History has the responsibility for the instruction of Chinese, Hebrew, and Japanese through programs in Chinese Studies, Judaic Studies, and Japanese Studies. IR/PS offers undergraduate students the opportunity to learn languages of the Pacific Rim regions on a space-available basis.

This Balkanization of language instruction has proven to be somewhat problematic at a number of levels, not the least of which is the span of language coverage. This issue is of particular importance to Chancellor Fox and Senior Vice Chancellor Chandler, who have determined that international proficiencies will be a significant emphasis in undergraduate education. The degree to which language instruction conforms to contemporary, competency-based standards of language instruction and the degree to which the model will be able to sustain changes in student needs and interests are of paramount concern.

Proposed Actions

In order to assure that foreign language instruction at UCSD is “on the right track” or to make modifications to the current system, a Faculty/Administrative Advisory Committee on Foreign Language Instruction was empanelled and has studied language instruction at UCSD for several quarters. This committee is expected to issue its report within the next few months and make a series of recommendations for the improvement of foreign language instruction. The proposed self-study is designed to focus on the processes of disseminating, evaluating, and implementing the recommendations of that advisory committee. Most importantly, as the advisory committee documents the progress of implementation, it will

examine the impact that implementation has upon language instruction from multiple perspectives. These perspectives are:

The view of the student regarding

- the changing availability of courses,
- perceived quality of instruction, and
- changes in elective language-taking behavior;

The view of the instructor regarding

- the utilization of support services,
- changes in instructional approaches and methods, and
- instructor satisfaction;

The view of administration regarding

- costs,
- course enrollments, and
- instructor longevity.

C. Undergraduate Program Review

Overview

A major theme and set of concerns and recommendations that arose from the last reaffirmation cycle centered on UCSD's system of undergraduate program review. The issues identified included the manner in which the reviews were conducted, the use of data systems as part of the review process, concerns with student learning as part of the "output" side of the equation, and the feedback mechanisms that would lead to improvement of undergraduate programs as a consequence of program reviews. UCSD took these issues seriously. A task force convened jointly by the Senior Vice Chancellor and the Academic Senate in 2002-03 was charged with reviewing undergraduate and graduate program review processes, and in May 2004, the task force issued its comprehensive report. (A copy of this report is provided in [Appendix 7](#), and the self-study guidelines for each undergraduate program may be seen in [Appendix 8](#).) Immediately after release of the report, UCSD began a consultative process with the Academic Senate, particularly with the Committee on Educational Policy, the body responsible for conducting undergraduate program reviews, to consider and implement recommendations made by the task force. Substantial progress has been made in implementing the revised program review guidelines. Currently, one major program (Human Development) and three minor programs (Contemporary Black Arts, Law and Society, and Space Sciences and Engineering) are being reviewed using the new model, and a full-time staff position has been created to coordinate future review efforts. Many of the recommendations found in the WASC review have been implemented. For example, the mandatory review process to be conducted by academic units will focus on the grid of educational outcome expectations and methods of fulfillment of those expectations. The focus of this self-study will be a full and neutral assessment of the effectiveness of the new undergraduate review process in achieving the goals for which it was created.

Proposed Actions

A self-study team led by and including the Senate-Administration Advisory Committee will be appointed to design and conduct an outcome evaluation of the newly implemented program review system. The self-study team will seek input from all of the

groups that participate in the new review process, including the members of the Academic Senate committee responsible for the conduct of the program review, the members of the review teams, the departments that will have participated in the revised review system, and administrators responsible for helping departments implement recommendations. Each year we anticipate that the committee will review four majors, several minors, and at least one “cross-cutting,” non-degree program. (The Academic Internship Program is an example of a non-degree program that is subject to review.) In addition, the committee will have at its disposal the self-studies generated by the departments, the reports produced by the review teams in response to the self-studies and campus visits, the actions recommended by the Academic Senate in response to the reviews, and the department reports of actions taken in response to the review, which follow one year after the Academic Senate action recommendations are received. These reports detail the actions that departments have taken in response to Academic Senate recommendations. The self-study team will have access to program review documents that preceded the implementation of the new process in order to be able to make comparative judgments. The self-study team will focus its attention on three issues:

- the degree to which the departments and programs have specified realistic, credible learning objectives and the ways in which those objectives are reflected in students’ demonstrated competencies,
- the unit’s sensitivity and responsiveness to issues of diversity as reflected in their self-studies, and
- the degree to which the units address issues of student retention and graduation rates with specific emphasis on their efforts to collaborate with the colleges and student support programs, such as Office of Academic Support and Instructional Services (OASIS) and the Academic Enrichment Program.

D. Information Literacy

Overview

Unlike the first three areas of self-study that focus on understanding and assessing the efficacy of innovations that have been or will be implemented by the university, the fourth area of self-study, information literacy, is a developmental inquiry. The nature of information delivery and its use has changed in dramatic ways in the last twenty years. Indeed, a major theme that permeated our last reaffirmation activities centered on the delivery and use of electronically generated information and our use of electronic data in planning, budgeting, and assessment. Similarly, the sources and types of information used by students have changed dramatically. They no longer only get information through textbooks, journals, class handouts, library collections, and other materials carefully vetted by faculty and professional staff. Instead, students today far more often obtain information as “free agents.” They have easy access to electronic information from home, residence halls, and libraries. Some of this information is reliably vetted, and some is of questionable origin and value. Instructional materials are now provided to students in a variety of ways, e.g., map rooms, slide presentations in art history, group listening of auditory samples in music theory courses, and headset listening in language laboratories. This theme focuses on the

development of a principled study that will lead to an institutional understanding of the degree to which it can responsibly address these changes in information technology and its pedagogical applications and consequences. The proposed inquiry, formulated under the direction of the University Librarian as a member of the WASC Executive Steering Committee, will emphasize three primary issues:

- “e-stores,”
- class management and information systems, and
- the vetting of information sources.

The first of these, “e-stores,” is concerned with the degree and manner by which the university has provided high quality, reviewed materials accessed through electronic means, e.g., maps, journals, art, and primary source data sets. The second, class management and information systems, investigates the degree to which the university has provided tools, though the electronic media, for the management and improvement of class-based instruction. The third, and perhaps most important and most difficult, addresses the vetting of information by focusing on critically important student-learning outcomes. The following questions will be the focus of this component of inquiry:

- Are students instructed in how to critically review information from electronic sources?
- Are students able to detect bias in information?
- Should there be a unit with responsibility for teaching students how to use information from electronic sources in a critical and ethical manner, or should this be a shared responsibility of all academic programs?
- Should such instruction be embedded in general education requirements?
- Are vetting processes homogeneous, or are they discipline specific?

Proposed Actions

We anticipate that this study will result in a series of conversations, inquiries, and a written report with recommendations that will serve as the basis for the development of an action plan. An outline of preliminary findings will be available at the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review. By the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, a fully articulated report and action plan will be available to the University community and reviewers. At least one reflective essay will be written in response.

7. Work Plan and Milestones

Following acceptance of the Institutional Proposal, the campus plans to:

ACTION	INITIATOR	DATE
Continue ongoing consultation with campus accreditation committees supplemented by regular notices to the campus community so that all interested persons may have the opportunity to offer their views about the process; the campus accreditation website at http://accreditation.ucsd.edu offers a forum for this exchange of ideas	Mark Appelbaum, Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO)	Fall 2004
Engage academic departments during their respective program reviews to research, identify, and implement student-learning assessment measures and means to improve student retention and graduation rates	Mark Appelbaum, ALO	May 2005
Review recommendations made by the Task Force on Foreign Language Instruction	Academic Senate and the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (SVCAA)	Winter 2006
Analyze undergraduate program reviews completed under the new guidelines to determine where improvements can be made in the review process	Program review work group of the Senate-Administration Advisory Committee	Spring 2006
Evaluate preliminary data from the pilot program in freshman and entry level writing	Writing Review Committee	Summer 2006
Construct survey and/or other data collection instruments to determine level of competence in student information literacy and sophistication in vetting internet data	Information literacy work group of the Senate-Administration Advisory Committee	Summer 2006
Design a set of questions, establish data collection model, identify existing data sources, and implement a pilot program to examine foreign language instruction	Advisory Committee on Language Instruction	Fall 2006
Review and evaluate the WASC Standards and Criteria for Review and identify where UCSD is successful in attaining these principles, where improvement should be made, and how best the campus can continue improving student-learning outcomes	Mark Appelbaum, ALO	Fall 2006
Complete the Institutional Data Portfolio and publish these data on the campus accreditation website	The Offices of Analytical Studies and Space Planning; Student Research and Information; and Graduate Studies and Research	June 2007
Submit Capacity and Preparatory Review to WASC	The Chancellor	December 2007
WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review team site visit	WASC	March 2008
Compile and analyze information gathered from the freshman writing and foreign language teaching pilot programs	IRCC	Summer 2008
Propose improvements to current pattern of assessing freshman writing skills and foreign language teaching and initiate changes in how these skills are taught	COPE, CEP, and the Associate Vice Chancellor-Undergraduate Education	Summer 2008
Examine student-learning outcomes measures and retention efforts proposed by departmental/program faculty as part of undergraduate program review; implement as appropriate	CEP	Summer 2008
Compile and analyze survey data collected to measure students' ability to use and judge internet data critically and ethically	IRCC	Summer 2008
Submit Educational Effectiveness Review to WASC	The Chancellor	July 2009
WASC Educational Effectiveness Review team site visit	WASC	October 2009
Continue updating and expanding the Institutional Data Portfolio for use by the campus community and the general public	The Offices of Analytical Studies and Space Planning; Student Research and Information; and Graduate Studies and Research	November 2009

8. Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

Since the last review, the amount and variety of institutional research data have increased substantially and have become much more accessible to academic departments and administrative units. Three departments, Analytical Studies and Space Planning (<http://assp.ucsd.edu>), Student Research and Information (<http://ugr8.ucsd.edu/sriweb/sri.htm>), and the Office of Graduate Studies and Research (<http://www-ogsr.ucsd.edu/>) carry out the majority of campus institutional research endeavors. Each of these offices is responsible for extracting, analyzing, and disseminating institutional research data to the campus community and the general public. On a centralized level, student, financial, and payroll/personnel data are stored in campus-wide databases maintained by Administrative Computing and Telecommunications (ACT). This wealth of information is now accessible to the offices mentioned above, to academic departments, other administrative units, and often to the general public via easy-to-use, web-based query tools designed by ACT. In addition, each of the campus institutional research offices has expanded the breadth and depth of analytical studies available on the internet. The result has been that academic departments and other administrative units on campus can use these studies to make informed decisions concerning current business practices and that students and the general public can determine how well UCSD is doing in fulfilling the University mission of education, research, and public service. One anticipated outcome of the current accreditation self-study is that a web-based Institutional Data Portfolio, to be housed at <http://accreditation.ucsd.edu>, will be established beginning with the Institutional Proposal in October 2005. This site will be substantially completed by the time the Capacity and Preparatory Review is submitted in 2007 and will then be regularly updated until October 2009 when the Educational Effectiveness site visit is completed. After October 2009, the Portfolio will continue to be revised and expanded for use as a permanent, up-to-date resource for the campus community and the general public.

Over the past few years, UCSD has broadened its use of institutional research data from other universities. While we continue to compare important campus institutional indicators with those of other UC campuses and a standard group of comparison universities—UCSD’s “Comparison 8” institutions are Harvard, MIT, Stanford, SUNY-Buffalo, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Michigan, University of Virginia, and Yale—we now include information from sister institutions in the Association of American Universities (AAU). Further, the campus is actively participating and assuming a leadership role in the AAU Data Exchange (AAUDE). This group is dedicated to expanding the variety and improving the quality of institutional indicators and other data. For example, UCSD is now able to compare key quantitative indicators such as faculty salaries by discipline, overall financial capacity, faculty and staff population analyses, and student retention rates with other AAU schools. In addition to standard datasets, there is a provision for any member to make *ad hoc* queries of the group, directed to a whole or particular subset of the AAU. As a benefit of this association, UCSD will be able to utilize information from a recent *ad hoc* query related to descriptions of student-learning outcome assessments and corresponding identification of responsible administrative units, as we work to incorporate best practices into evaluation of programs.

9. Proposal Data Tables

The prescribed set of data elements required for the submittal of the Institutional Proposal may be found in [Appendices 9](#) and [10](#) and on the campus accreditation website at <http://accreditation.ucsd.edu>.

10. Off-Campus and Distance Education Degree Programs

None

11. Institutional Stipulations

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

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
MARYE ANNE FOX

Marye Anne Fox
Chancellor

APPENDICES *

Appendices referenced in the Institutional Proposal

1. [UCSD Actions Associated with Recommendations from WASC](#)
2. [Campus Planning and Student Data and Information](#)
3. [Campus accreditation re-affirmation committees](#)
4. Chancellor's campus-wide email announcements of the accreditation review
 - A. [Initial announcement, 6 May 2005](#)
 - B. [Follow up notice, 14 October 2005](#)
5. [A Review of UCSD Writing Programs: Visions of Assessment](#)
6. [Guidelines for readers of "University Writing" samples](#)
7. [Report of the report of the Senate-Administration Task Force to Examine Program Reviews](#)
8. [Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines: the Self-Study and Self-Study Report](#)
9. [Summary data form](#)
10. Required data elements
 - A. [Headcount enrollment by level](#)
 - B. [Headcount enrollment by status and location](#)
 - C. [Degrees granted by level](#)
 - D. [Faculty by employment status](#)
 - E. [Key financial ratios](#)
 - F. [Inventory of educational effectiveness indicators](#)

Information required for submittal with the Institutional Proposal

11. [Mission statement](#)
12. [Organizational chart](#)
13. [General Catalog](#)
14. Financial statements
(*Note: Financial data are audited at the systemwide level; the campuses are not individually audited.*)
 - A. [UCSD Annual Financial Report 2003 \(for 2002-2003\)](#)
 - B. [UCSD Annual Financial Report 2003-2004](#)
 - C. [UCSD Detailed Financial Schedules for the year ended June 30, 2003](#)
 - D. [UCSD Detailed Financial Schedules for the year ended June 30, 2004](#)
 - E. [University of California Annual Financial Report 2002-03 \(audited\)](#)
 - F. [University of California Annual Financial Report 2003-04 \(audited\)](#)
15. [List of academic programs currently offered from the Annual Report, 2005](#)

Additional information

16. About students
 - A. [Fall 2004 Student Profile](#)
 - B. [Fall 2004 Student Digest](#)
 - C. [2004-2005 Retention and Graduate Rates](#)
 - D. [2003-2004 Degrees Conferred](#)

If you need a break...

17. *New York Times* crossword puzzle, published in *The San Diego Union-Tribune* on 7 August 2005. (Please note the clue for 1-down.)

* Although we have provided these materials to the committee in paper format, all but the *New York Times* crossword are also available in electronic form via the campus accreditation website at <http://accreditation.ucsd.edu> or by clicking the active link on this page.

REFERENCES

2006 Kaplan/Newsweek College Guide, *Newsweek*, August 22, 2005.

"Academic Ranking of World Universities - 2005," Institute of Higher Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, August 12, 2005.

"America's Best Colleges, 2006," *U.S. News and World Report*, August 15, 2005.

"America's Hottest Colleges," *Newsweek*, August 16, 2005.

Anonymous freshman quoted by Judith Morgan, "In the Beginning," *@UCSD*, September 2004, Vol. 1, No. 3.

Lombardi, John V., Capaldi, Elizabeth D., Reeves, Kristy R., Gater, Denise S.
2004 "The Top American Research Universities," *TheCenter*, Annual Report from The Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance. University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Scott Anderson, Nancy
1993 *An Improbable Venture: A History of the University of California, San Diego*. The UCSD Press. La Jolla, CA.

"The Washington Monthly College Guide," *Washington Monthly*, September 2005.