THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

REPORT ON THE
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

MARCH 12 – 14, 2008

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Chair
John W. Etchemendy
Provost & Chief Academic Officer
Stanford University

Assistant Chair
Jerome B. Walker
Associate Provost
University of Southern California

Joseph I. Castro
Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Affairs
University of California, San Francisco

Dara Regaignon
Assistant Professor of English
Director of College Writing
Pomona College

Keith R. Williams
Senior Lecturer, Section of Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior
University of California, Davis

Clara Yu
President
Monterey Institute of International Studies

SECTION I -- OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A.   Description of the Institution

The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) is a comprehensive, Ph.D. granting, research institution located in La Jolla, California. Founded in 1960 on a commitment to provide strong educational programs in the sciences, medicine and engineering, UCSD has become one of the finest public universities in the country, with many world-renowned graduate programs and an outstanding undergraduate program. It is particularly impressive that UCSD has achieved this level of excellence in only 50 years, and has gained increasing momentum in the last 20 years.

UCSD is part of the ten-campus University of California system, which educates more than 220,000 students, and includes more than 170,000 faculty and staff. The UC San Diego campus is located on 1,200 acres along the coast of the Pacific Ocean, and total campus enrollment for Fall 2007 was 27,500 students. In academic year 2006-2007, the regular rank faculty numbered 816, and the total faculty numbered 1348. The faculty is extremely productive. The National Science Foundation ranks UCSD 7th in the nation in federal R& D expenditures, and total research funding for 2005-2006 was $733 million. The University also ranks 7th in the nation in National Academy of Sciences membership. The National Research Council ranks UCSD 10th in the nation in the quality of its faculty and graduate programs, and the NRC ranks oceanography and neurosciences at UCSD as first in the nation.

UCSD's graduate and professional schools include the Scripps Institution of Oceanography; the School of Medicine; School of International Relations and Pacific Studies; Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies; Skaggs School of Pharmacy; Jacobs School of Engineering; and the Rady School of Management. The campus also is home to the UCSD Medical Center and the San Diego Supercomputer Center.

Undergraduate education at UCSD is organized around the six colleges, led by college provosts, who have responsibility for the general education curricula; and the majors and degree programs, overseen by divisional deans and department chairs. The Academic Senate oversees the entire curriculum through the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). Clearly there is a widespread commitment to excellence among both faculty and staff that will assure continued improvement in the quality of faculty and programs; but the Chancellor and the Senior Vice Chancellor decided that the decentralization, complexity and centrifugal pressures of six separate undergraduate entities required a counterbalance. The Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education was established in 2001, and it has contributed to many of the improvements made in recent years. The WASC team commends the University, the founding Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, Mark Appelbaum, and his successor, Barbara Sawrey, for making this new position a vital source of leadership.

The six-member WASC team visited UCSD from March 12-14, 2008 for the purpose of conducting a Capacity and Preparatory Review, which constitutes the second phase of the three-part WASC accreditation process. UCSD conducted an extensive self-study in preparation for the team's visit, including construction of a very informative website. The team extends special thanks for the gracious hospitality to Marye Anne Fox, Chancellor; Mark Appelbaum, former Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education and Accreditation Liaison Officer; and Barbara Sawrey, the new Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education and the in-coming Accreditation Liaison Officer.

B.   Response to Previous Commission Issues

UCSD made a good faith effort to respond to previous concerns raised in the visiting team's report and the Commission's letter reaffirming the University's accreditation in 1998. These issues were addressed in Appendix A of the 2007 Capacity Report.

(1)   Continued Development of the Data Portfolio

The increasing complexity of the required data exhibits provides good evidence that UCSD's data portfolio has developed effectively. A request from the visiting team for additional faculty data demonstrated that the portfolio could produce the desired information rapidly.

(2)   Planning and Budgeting Processes

A new process for budgeting, called "Charting the Course," began just before the previous WASC review to create support for more open and transparent planning. Initiated by then Senior Vice Chancellor Marsha Chandler, the University has completed four planning cycles. Four hundred and nineteen faculty positions ("lines") have been allocated, including 49 positions established for the development of new interdisciplinary fields. New funding for the College Writing Programs also has been provided.

(3)   Undergraduate Colleges

The 1998 visiting team recommended the systematic assessment of the undergraduate colleges, and a review of Revelle College was completed in academic year 2006-2007. The recommendations stemming from the review have not yet been acted upon by the Committee on Educational Policy in the Academic Senate, and they were not available to the current visiting team. Consequently, this will be a priority for the team's review during the Educational Effectiveness visit in 2009.

Since the previous WASC review, UCSD has opened "Sixth College" and debated its mission and curriculum in the context of the five existing colleges. In addition, Roosevelt College has opened a new campus complex, which expands the capacity of the colleges to serve as spaces where students from different backgrounds can come together to share experiences.

(4)   The Integration of Transfer Students

The WASC team found that the concern for transfer students which was expressed in the last WASC review is being addressed aggressively and appropriately with the appointment of a Task Force on Transfer Students, whose charge was to suggest strategies to improve efforts to recruit transfer students and to accommodate them at UCSD, and the construction of a new 1,006 student housing project. The visiting team commends the University's commitment of resources for the new North Campus Housing complex, which is designed almost exclusively for transfer students, and efforts to make transfer students' transition from community colleges smoother, including integrating these students into the culture of the campus. Data provided on cohort graduation rates shows an 82% six-year graduation rate for transfer students, compared to an 86% graduation rate for students who entered in their freshman year, which the visiting team considers good evidence of progress.

(5)   Additional Key Issues Deserving Attention

Several other issues were raised in 1998, including diversity trends, strengthening procedures for program reviews, and the absence of a strategic plan to guide the University's future. The visiting team inquired how these issues have been addressed, and they are examined in greater detail below.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

Four themes were selected by UCSD as the focus for the Educational Effectiveness Review by WASC. These themes served as the focal points for the University's assessment of its adherence to the four WASC Standards of Accreditation. The visiting team's agenda was built around gathering evidence concerning these four areas. Alas, active and continuing discussions within the faculty of the colleges, academic leaders, and the Academic Senate on ways to determine student learning in these four areas have created sensitive change dynamics that seriously constrained the visiting team's access to key participants. Because of this, the team did not speak to some faculty in the writing and foreign language programs who were engaged in sensitive policy negotiations and was unable to read some recent program reviews because they were being reviewed by the Senate's Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The visiting team presumes that it will have full access to faculty and students during the Educational Effectiveness Review, regardless of the status or dynamics of the change process.

A.   Freshman and Entry-Level Writing

The diversity of structures for offering first-year and entry-level writing at UCSD is certainly a strength of the college system (CFR 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.10). Given the different general education curricula of the six colleges, customizing writing instruction to those curricula is both admirable and beneficial. However, within a culture of diversity the colleges need to agree on the goals of first-year writing instruction; otherwise, students will arrive in upper-level courses with radically different levels of preparedness for the discipline-based writing tasks they face there (CFRs 2.3, 2.4).

Currently, Muir and Warren Colleges require students to take two quarters of writing. The principles underlying the two programs are closely aligned; these programs both focus on "critical thinking and the writing of analytic prose" (UCSD catalog 530), teaching students "to teach and thereby enable students, through intensive practice, to read critically and write appropriately for a variety of academic contexts" (UCSD catalog 674). Both programs are workshop based, both emphasize revision, and individual conferences with the instructors are at the heart of both pedagogies. The writing courses at Muir College (MCWP 40 and 50) are topic-based, including (for the Spring quarter 2008) such topics as "How New Is It? Investigating Media and Technology," "Medicine, Culture, and AIDS," "The Graphic Novel," and "Eating Culture: Making Social Meaning of Food." In Warren College, 10A and 10B are also topic-based, using a curriculum that "provides a context within which a diversity of cultural experiences is foregrounded to address a range of issues inherent in the relationship of the 'individual and U.S. society'" (UCSD catalog 674).

Roger Revelle, Eleanor Roosevelt, Thurgood Marshall, and Sixth Colleges rely on a writing-intensive model, in which writing instruction forms part of the work of the introductory core curricula (a core Humanities sequence in Revelle College; a sequence on "The Making of the Modern World" in ERC; the "Dimensions of Culture" sequence in Thurgood Marshall College; and the "Culture, Art, and Technology" sequence in Sixth College). According to the 2002 external review, these programs are all "based on the lecture/section format, in which a faculty member or team lectures to large groups of students on a particular content area of importance, with graduate students later holding small section meetings so that students may discuss the lectures and their concomitant readings; student writing is assigned in these sections and the graduate student leaders respond to the writing and focus to some degree on writing instruction" (Briggs et al. 5).

It's unclear what the actual – rather than desired – cap on sections is across the Colleges. While we were assured that Muir College caps its freshman writing seminars at 15, we heard that the core curriculum discussion sections at Sixth College held as many as 25 students. This also raises questions of staffing – who, in each college, is responsible for teaching freshman writing, and how are those positions configured and supported? What kinds of faculty development are there for writing instructors? These issues resonate with concerns, raised in several fora during

the site visit and in confidential emails, that the core curricula in the colleges and academic support services university-wide are underfunded.

There are strengths to both structures for first-year writing at UCSD, but there currently seems to be only the most basic consensus about the goals of writing instruction university-wide (CFR 2.3, 2.4). The empirical review of the six college writing programs, the English as a Second Language program, and the Entry-Level Writing program reflects a desire to assess the writing of first-year students at UCSD in order to learn "the degree to which the campus writing programs achieve the goal of training UCSD students to write clearly and concisely" (Institutional Proposal 8) (CFR 2.6).

The study of freshman writing was initiated by the CEP in 2003 and completed in 2006. In this study, portfolios were collected from 240 freshmen; each portfolio included "four writing samples that students submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the writing courses in which they were enrolled" (C&PR 29). These samples came from the beginning and end of each of the two quarters in which students took the writing or writing-intensive courses mandated by their colleges. Each portfolio was read and scored by two faculty members without affiliation to the writing programs using the evaluative criteria from the UC Analytical Writing Placement Exam, and was also given a letter grade (CFR 4.8). A similar scoring process was undertaken with portfolios of writing from students who failed the Subject A exam. There, the portfolios included the students' initial exams; the Analytical Writing Placement Exams they took at the end of the quarter; and papers from their freshman writing courses (CFR 4.1).

During the team's visit, we learned that the findings from the study of writing of students who had initially failed the Placement Exam were encouraging. Most of those students improved over the quarter they took SDCC 1 or 4; the students whose initial writing issues were at the level of organization and argument improved the most markedly; students with more sentence-level patterns of error did not improve as dramatically.

By contrast, the findings from the study of freshman writing showed no statistically significant improvement, on average, across all six writing programs. In addition, several individuals (to us and, apparently, over the course of the process), raised concerns about the focus and methodology of the study, pointing out that it was insufficiently holistic in its approach to writing assessment. These rather disappointing findings have, however, had useful and productive results (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.7). For the first time in UCSD's history, the writing program directors and provosts of all six colleges came together in the spring of 2007 to develop a set of common goals, namely, that once they've fulfilled their freshman writing requirement, students will be able to:

- "read, understand, and critique texts in diverse genres";
- communicate clearly with the appropriate vocabulary and techniques;

- revise their written work both globally (for a specific and appropriate audience) and at the sentence level;
- arrange arguments logically and effectively;
- cite sources properly and in accordance with the university's guidelines for academic integrity; and
- have "skills that will be useful in their work for other classes or future careers."

Having this common goals statement – essentially, a statement of the learning outcomes for student writing that apply university-wide – is an important and essential step. It isn't yet clear how widely this statement has been disseminated or what steps the writing programs are taking to communicate with the academic departments about, first, the mission and goals of freshman writing at UCSD and, second, what the departments hope and need to see in student writing after the first year (CFR 2.4). Furthermore, at this juncture, it seems crucial that the college writing programs not lose the momentum they've gained in the last two years. Given the diversity of the college writing programs, it seems that the logical next step is for each program to develop its own statement of goals for student writing, essentially adapting and customizing this statement for its particular core curriculum and pedagogical setting (CFR 2.3).

That return to particularity should not lose the benefit of the collaborative energy that produced this common goals statement. The college writing directors should continue to talk to one another productively, taking advantage of the diverse community of individuals on this campus concerned with writing instruction and writing program administration to advocate for the resources they all need and the centrality of writing to a UCSD education (CFR 2.4). For example, if the writing programs are all under-staffed (and therefore either delivering writing instruction in sections too big for instructors to provide substantive feedback to all students or unable to offer enough seats in a given quarter for students to fulfill the requirement in their first year), then communication between writing programs and collectively between the programs and the university might reveal the urgency of the problem.

Finally, we hope that by the EE Review the writing programs will have capitalized on their frustrations with the study of freshman writing and will have taken advantage of the structure for Undergraduate Program Review that has been put into place. Like academic departments and the colleges themselves, the writing programs need a structure and schedule in place that will make regular, comprehensive self-reflection and review possible. Ideally, one of the other college writing programs might be involved in the review of each program (CFR 2.4, 2.7, 2.10).

- The progress made thus far in the study of writing instruction is to be commended, even if the results of the assessment exercise produced unexpected results.
- The study resulted in a statement of shared goals university-wide, which is a significant accomplishment.

- By the EE review, it would be helpful to see a statement of goals for each writing program that coincide with the shared university-wide goals, and a structure for regular collaboration among the writing programs.
- It would be helpful to know when and how the writing programs will be reviewed by the undergraduate program review process.

B.   Delivery of Foreign Language Instruction:

UCSD's self-study on the delivery of foreign language instruction focuses on institutional and organizational learning outcomes.

The University, challenged by its self-described "Balkanization of language instruction," launched a massive undertaking to gather data, engage representatives from different disciplines (e.g., linguistics, literature) and administrative units (e.g., Humanities, Social Sciences), and examine language instruction from different perspectives (student, instructor, administration).

The faculty and administrators have been able to make significant progress at the institutional level, gaining a deeper appreciation of pedagogical and assessment issues, articulating the importance of expanded and strengthened foreign language instruction, and providing a road map to achieving integrated delivery of language instruction without sacrificing the advantages of multi-pronged approaches. (CFR 3.3, 3.4, 4.1)

Major recommendations presented by the Senate-Administration Advisory Committee on Language Instruction (October 2006) include its endorsement of proficiency-based language instruction as a campus-wide principle, the creation of a standing Language Instruction Advisory Committee to provide intellectual and administrative cohesion, and the establishment of a Center for Language Instruction that delivers instructional support, professional development, and proficiency assessment, and collaborates with other UC campuses and the UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching.

We expect that, if these recommendations are successfully implemented, measurable improvement in student learning outcomes will follow.

(1)   Organizational Learning

One of the most noticeable characteristics of the University is its college system, which provides its undergraduates with a more intimate physical environment, fostering a sense of belonging and identity with a smaller college community, yet affords them the benefits of being part of a large research university. This in itself is not unique; many universities have such "commons" or "colleges." What is particularly noteworthy is that at UCSD each of the six colleges also has developed its own academic offerings, including different general education requirements, and a variety of ways for students to fulfill the requirements. The college's curricular offerings are

delivered by faculty members in academic departments, through which most of the teaching resources flow.

The University's proposed self-study of foreign language instruction speaks of a "Balkanization of language instruction." Four academic units—Linguistics, Literature, History, and the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies—are responsible for teaching multiple languages, and are accountable to three different deans. Different departments, which offer different languages at different levels, manifest different philosophies of language instruction. In addition, two of the six colleges require language study as an undergraduate degree requirement, while the others do not. Such complexity has "proven to be somewhat problematic at a number of levels, not the least of which is the span of language coverage." Other challenges identified include uncoordinated language offerings, difficulties in advising, and a lack of a commonly embraced, disciplinarily grounded, language pedagogy.

In a sense, the challenge the University faces in the delivery of foreign language instruction reflects the natural tension between a distributed decision-making system of curriculum design and delivery on the one hand, and the desire, or need, for coherent and efficient oversight of student learning and outcome assessment, on the other.

The University should be commended for its recognition of these challenges, and for its thorough investigation of the issues. Three of the themes of the self study-- -- writing, foreign language instruction, and information literacy—have to do with basic knowledge and skills that an informed citizen in today's world should possess. (CFR 2.3, 2.4) These areas of "literacy" may very well share a common solution space. There are ongoing discussions in the University community -- among the departments, colleges, and administration -- on educational effectiveness in all these areas. These decentralized discussions hold out the promise of a complex network of excellence that is more powerful than might be produced by centralized control.

An excellent example of such a process at work is the progress made in the area of "Undergraduate Program Review." The University has made persistent efforts to improve the manner in which the such reviews are conducted, in the use of data systems, in measuring student learning outcomes and the feedback mechanisms, all of which are designed to lead to improvement in undergraduate student learning. The "Faculty Perspective" essay in the Capacity and Preparatory Review Report specifically notes the change from an "audit" form to a broadened focus:

> "Now we want departments to reflect on: their role at our institution; how they serve the students in the major as well as those taking courses as part of their general education; how they advise and prepare students for post-college careers or education; and how they monitor and measure the success of their work. There has been a shift from the old judgmental view to one of collaboration, an emphasis on the department showing that

they can educate students both in depth and breadth…. [the department] must look beyond piecemeal, day-to-day operations, to revisit their motivations and projections in the face of current information."

The change from the judgmental to the reflective, collaborative, and eventually innovative seems to be a good roadmap for the three other thematic areas to follow. The discussion on the delivery of language instruction shows great promise. (CFR 3.11)

(2)   Language Instruction: Process and Outcome

The University's contemplation of its language delivery has been long, thorough, and persistent. A proposal for comprehensive review of campus language policy was put forth in December of 2001. A joint Senate-Administration Advisory Committee on Language Instruction was formed in 2003-2004 "to assess language course offerings, the coordination of instruction among teaching units and client areas, pedagogical issues, resource requirements, the administration of the language programs, and instructional facilities available for language instruction." This investigation continued during the academic year 2004-2005, and the Committee's recommendations, summarized below, were made public in October 2006.

- Proficiency-based language instruction is endorsed as a campus-wide principle.
- Foreign language instruction should be strengthened and expanded.
- A UCSD Center for Language Instruction should be created.
- A standing Language Instruction Advisory Committee should be established.
- Impediments to obtaining language instruction should be removed to encourage UCSD students to acquire foreign languages.
- Heritage Language is a widely accepted term in the field of linguistics and language instruction, and the continued use of this term is appropriate.
- The Linguistic Language Program should be transferred from the Division of Arts and Humanities to the Division of Social Sciences

According to University officials, as of March, 2008, the University's Committee on Committees is in the process of appointing members to the standing Language Instruction Advisory Committee; the Center for Language Instruction has not yet received support because of budgetary uncertainty. Proficiency-based language instruction is endorsed as a campus-wide principle, and the oversight of the Linguistics Language Program has been transferred from the Division of Arts and Humanities to the Division of Social Sciences. These steps taken, or expected to be taken, are consistent with WASC Standard Three, "Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability."

During the team's visit on campus, we found a genuinely collaborative spirit among faculty members from different disciplines, and a general readiness to experiment and to learn from one another. There is also obvious pride in the high quality of teaching and undergraduate research.

We sense that the University's commitment to demonstrable educational effectiveness is greatly facilitated by the institution's culture of collegiality and striving for excellence. (CFR 3.3., 3.5, 3.8).

We are further encouraged by the fact that capabilities are probably easier to assess in foreign languages than in other disciplines. We can understand speech and comprehend written work, or we cannot. We know whether we can communicate in a foreign language expertly, and artfully, or awkwardly and ineptly. Even without elaborate assessment instruments, students are generally capable of telling whether they are a successful language learner learners or not. This kind of assessment, compared with that of demonstrated competence for, say, a Philosophy or Physics Major, is relatively intuitive and transparent. There are, in addition, well established, standardized assessment instruments and certified test administrators for assessing competence in just about any language offered in U. S. higher education. As the Advisory Committee Report notes, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) is a ready resource for proficiency standards. Since UCSD is already an active member of the UC Consortium on Language Learning and Teaching, the University can make extensive use of the programs offered by the Consortium, and through the Consortium can access expertise resident in the other UC universities for teacher training, curricular development, and assessment administration.

It is perhaps important to note that a language learner's ability to understand and to communicate effectively in a foreign language often has little to do with seat time or grades earned in a formal language course. It will be important for the University, in demonstrating educational effectiveness, to show the link between formal language instruction and proficiency through assessment results. (CFR 4.3, 4.4) A natural series of next steps, following the Advisory Committee's recommendations, may be the establishment of baseline data for current learner language proficiency, training of language instructors and TAs in proficiency testing, delivery of proficiency-based language offerings across language programs, and data collection through post-session proficiency tests to measure learner progress.

Another area that is worthy of exploration is the incorporation of language learning into study-abroad programs. The team understands that 25% of the University's students already have a study abroad experience, and the goal is to double that percentage. The team applauds the University for this decision. Carefully planned sequences of language learning, with a well-designed study-abroad component, can be a very effective and efficient way for language learners to achieve language and cultural proficiency.

The Modern Language Association's 2007 report on "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World" deals with some of the major issues that the University community is discussing (e.g., the literary approach to the study of languages vs. the applied linguistics approach, translingual and transcultural competence, integrative approaches, multiple pathways to language proficiency, and governance issues). While this report has not gained the

status of a formal recommendation from the Modern Language Association, it may be worthy of study and debate on the UCSD campus.

(3) Conclusion on Foreign Language Instruction

The University has built a solid foundation on the institutional basis for moving forward on student outcome assessment in foreign language instruction. The visiting team is optimistic that the step to measurable learning outcome assessment is a short and relatively easy one. Our encounters with UCSD undergraduate language students gave us the impression that they truly enjoy language learning, and see the value of multilingual competence. The affirmation coming from proficiency-based assessment can only help spur their enthusiasm for success.

- The study of foreign-language instruction focuses on institutional and organizational learning outcomes. The study brought different perspectives, expertise and disciplines together for serious pedagogical discussions and led to important decisions that should create cohesion and coordination in the institution's offerings.
- We expect that if these recommendations, such as implementing proficiency-based language instruction, are successfully implemented, it will result in measurable improvements in student outcomes. Such processes should be well underway and results available by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review.

C. Undergraduate Program Review

"The Commission supports as well the recommendation that the (Academic Senate) Committee on Educational Policy consider strengthening its procedures for program reviews to include explicit statements of the knowledge and skills expected of students who graduate, and inquiry into whether such objectives have been met."

[July 6,1998 letter from WASC to former Chancellor Dynes]

UCSD has implemented a new Undergraduate Program Review system since the last comprehensive WASC review. The system's framework was developed by a Joint Senate-Administration Task Force that was convened by the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs in 2002-03. The Task Force, which completed its report in 2004, called for a comprehensive review process led and coordinated by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education (a new leadership position created since the last WASC visit) and the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy (CEP). The process engages students, faculty and staff; scholars from other universities; and senior administrators (including the Deans and Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs) in analyzing undergraduate programs and recommending ways that they can be strengthened. The changes brought about by implementing the recommendations of the Task Force are impressive, and everyone with whom the WASC

Visit Team met seemed very supportive of the revised process. The current graduate and the emerging undergraduate program review systems are consistent with CFR's 2.7, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8.

The Human Development Program was the initial program reviewed under the new framework. Documents provided to the WASC visiting team confirm that it has been reviewed in a manner consistent with the newly developed framework. The second (or follow-up) program review by the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy indicates that the Human Development Program (with support from the Dean and Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs) has responded positively to many of the changes recommended by the program review committee.

The visiting team observed that the role of the deans in the current process does not begin until he/she comments on the initial program review by the CEP. While this part of the process should be continued, we believe that it would be beneficial if the initial review incorporated the deans' perspectives on the programs.   Deans and department chairs could identify issues that deserve special attention beyond the standard criteria for review.

The campus has initiated reviews of 13 other departments, programs and colleges and 6 minor programs. (Undergraduate Program Reviews Progress Timeline, January 8, 2008). It is anticipated that many of these reviews will be completed prior to the Educational Effectiveness site visit.   The team recommends that the writing programs be included on the calendar of reviews in the near future.

The new undergraduate program review system could not have been implemented successfully without the creation of the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education. This office demonstrates a commendable commitment to undergraduate education by the campus. In addition, the appointment of a full-time manager of the undergraduate program review process is appropriate for assuring that the revised process will operate smoothly.

The WASC visiting team looks forward to seeing how this new process aids in articulating learning objectives, identifying creative means of assessment, and tracking the results of the assessment enterprise. (CFR's 2.6, 2.7) It has the potential to be a model that can be replicated at other research universities.

D.   **Information Literacy**

The fourth area of self-study was focused on information literacy. This is a new initiative for the campus, and, at the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review, was not as far along as the other areas of self-study.

UCSD has developed extensive electronic information and student information capabilities over the last decade, and the wide variety of online resources referenced in their Capacity Report, coupled with meetings held by the committee with information systems representatives, confirmed that they have successfully incorporated the use of such information into their planning, administrative, and educational activities. (CFR's 4.2, 4.3) Students have an increasing variety of resources available to them (CFR's 3.6, 3.7), and it is the process of making quality electronic information available to students, and the students' ability to appropriately use information, that is the primary subject of the information literacy inquiry.

One definition of information literacy is provided in a faculty essay in the Capacity Report as "…the ability not only to recognize that a set (or sets) of information is (are) needed but also to possess the means to access and evaluate it for validity" (p.19). Three primary areas of study were identified in the original proposal and confirmed during the Capacity and Preparatory Review as being the primary thrusts of the inquiry: "e-stores;" assessing how well the university provides high quality, reviewed electronic materials; class management and information systems, investigating how the university provides electronic tools for the management and improvement of class-based instruction; and the vetting of electronic information, focusing on critically important student learning outcomes and investigating how students use and are trained to critically evaluate electronic resources.

Information literacy seems a very timely and appropriate avenue to pursue, given the growth in electronic information over the last decade and its critical role in student learning and student lives, and the wide variety of expertise available at UCSD should make the institution well positioned to address important issues related to the effectiveness of the use of electronic information in the instructional setting. (CFR 3.7) Of notable interest in this plan is the intention to develop ways to help students understand how to evaluate electronic and other information for validity and relevance. Linked to this idea are issues related to "…understanding the ethical, legal, and social dimension of this information." (p.19).

While the Capacity and Preparatory Review Report describes the issues being addressed well, it was less clear in identifying the desired outcomes or products that would result from the proposed self-study. The team hopes that the charge to the task force being formed will be as specific as possible to guide them toward the desired outcomes. Though the Report includes more general aspects of information literacy, their approach focuses on electronic information, and it should be made clear to the task force how broad the inquiry should be. We suggest that the University explore how other educational institutions and organizations have defined and approached the broader concept of information literacy as they work toward developing a charge for the task force, and as the task force studies the issues. A college-level planning effort completed in December 2005, "Digital Literacy at Sixth College: A Plan for Development", should serve as a good starting reference as the University expands the scope of the effort to the

university level. Similarly, efforts to help redefine CSE 3: Fluency in Information Technology to help meet the practical learning goals of the Sixth College report may develop a course appropriate for the general student body.

The team notes with concern that progress in developing this project has not kept pace with the original plans cited in the 2005 Institutional Proposal, nor with the goals set in the January, 2008 Capacity and Preparatory Review Report. This makes it more difficult to judge how well positioned UCSD is to demonstrate educational effectiveness by the time of Educational Effectiveness Review. The Capacity Report had anticipated that by the time of the Capacity Review a task force charged with investigating this area would be available to the team for discussions. They are still in the process of forming that task force and writing a charge to the committee. The institution expects to have a report and recommendations from that group by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, but it is not clear that there will have been time for implementation of any proposed recommendations. As a result, the EE Review team may only be able to assess the proposed recommendations and may not have any further outcomes from this inquiry to evaluate.   The team recommends that the university set a tight timeline and accomplish as much as possible to demonstrate the influence this project might have on student learning.

To summarize, the team finds:

- The status of the information literacy self-study is of some concern. The team urges more rapid progress on the study.
- The team is concerned that the precise goals of the committee seem are unclear at this point, at least to us. A charge to the committee won't be available until just before summer. Digital asset aggregation and management (e-stores) is one topic, and pedagogy and curriculum is another topic being considered. It is not clear that one committee can or should be addressing both.
- The January report predicted that the Task Force would be constituted and available to meet with the visiting team, so it is already behind schedule.
- The team suggests that the Task Force look at what other institutions are doing in this area.

SECTION III: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

In addition to the four thematic areas addressed above, the Visiting Team inquired about two significant issues raised by the Commission and the 1998 Visiting Team which are key to evaluating the continued development of UCSD's institutional capacity.

A. Diversity:
   (Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives)

In 1998, the WASC Team Report noted that "demographic changes will increase the proportion of minority, particularly Latino and Asian, populations in the San Diego community and in the college-bound population. . . . UCSD is [therefore] presented with a challenge on how to diversify its student body while remaining selective in nature" (18). The 1998 Report complimented the University's efforts in K-12 outreach, and suggested that it step up its outreach to and communication with the community colleges, in part because they "provide a rich source of diverse students that could help UCSD meet its shorter term goals of attracting more underrepresented students." (CFR 1.5)

UCSD's enrollments of underrepresented minorities have held steady over the last ten years. Chicano/Latino students have consistently represented roughly 11% of the student body; African-American students 3%; Native American students less than 1%. It seems that the core problem is not entirely persuading students from these groups to apply to the University but persuading admitted students to enroll. UCSD's academic reputation is in place, but without a critical mass of students from these groups, significant outreach, well-publicized support services, and a diverse faculty and staff, this is going to continue to be a challenge.

There are initiatives in place – or just getting started – that speak to these concerns. The creation of the position of Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) in January 2005 was an important step, and that office appears to be well funded. The creation of a position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Equity also was an important step. Through the San Diego Foundation, African-American and Chicano/Latino alumni are providing scholarship funds (a program modeled on one at UCLA). In addition, students are building their own infrastructure(s) to recruit admitted students (again, modeled on UCLA programs), by bringing them to campus. There will be some space in the new Price Center for these groups, and it is important that they have regular funding and a formal institutional commitment from the University – since students, of course, graduate and move on.

Student support services are essential not just to the recruitment of under-represented minorities and first-generation college students. The team was concerned that despite the increase in enrollments in the last ten years the Oasis Center has lost two FTEs, and also that there is a general impression that the college advisors and other academic support staff are unable to serve students adequately. The reduced size of the Summer Bridge Program also is an area of concern.

The new Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs has initiated a number of projects that also go to these issues. The Sexual Assault Policy, which currently is under development, is an important step, as are the on-going efforts of the Work Force on Disabilities.

The Chief Diversity Officer and the Director of the Office of Academic Diversity and Equal Opportunity (OADEO) are working well to foster attention to diversity issues in faculty recruitment processes. The strategy of making formal presentations of best practices to department meetings is essential to raising the awareness of all faculty members (rather than simply those on search committees). In addition, the OADEO is providing an impressive service for departments by (for example) creating lists of places and ways to advertise their positions, specifically in order to increase the diversity of the pool. OADEO also tracks searches through their progress, and the Director of the OADEO reported that the deans have shut down searches before finalists were brought to campus on the basis of insufficient recruitment efforts.

There are significant faculty mentoring systems in place, and they seem to be publicized well. Junior faculty reported themselves well-content with both formal and informal mentoring structures. The team sees no evidence that these systems are not working equally well for faculty from under-represented groups, or that promotion and retention rates are different for these groups.

It is less clear, however, what kinds of efforts are being made to recruit, retain, and promote individuals from the underrepresented minorities into staff leadership positions.

The team finds that:

- Diversity continues to be a concern, as it is at universities nationwide.
- Significant attention is being given to diversifying applicant pools for faculty recruitment, and considerable success is being accomplished.
- Students have voted to tax themselves to support recruitment of under-represented students, and the team encourages the University to support those efforts more systematically.
- The percentage of African-American and Chicano/Latino undergraduates is quite low and has not increased as much as UCSD had hoped. Indeed, UCSD's under-represented minority freshman enrollments lag the system-wide numbers: Chicano/Latino are 11% (vs. 16.3% system-wide) and African-Americans are 1% (vs. 3.2% system-wide). It is possible that this is related to UCSD's historical emphasis on science and engineering, fields in which these groups have a disproportionately low enrollment nationwide. This is all the more reason to continue efforts to increase enrollment from these groups.
- The team encourages the University to further develop its current efforts in recruiting admitted students. An expanded and visible commitment to student support services can often be an important part of such efforts.

B. **Strategic Thinking and Planning**
   (Standard 4: Commitment to Learning and Improvement)

There is evidence that UCSD is engaged in campus-wide strategic planning. The team identified and reviewed two major planning documents that are generally consistent with CFR's 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3: "Charting the Course" (CTC) and the "2004 Long Range Development Plan" (LRDP).

Since the last WASC review, UCSD has implemented "Charting the Course" (CTC), a campus planning and resource allocation process. Established in 1998, CTC enables academic units to formulate three-year plans. These plans are reviewed by the appropriate Dean and the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs in collaboration with the campus Program Review Committee (which includes Academic Senate representation). The Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs makes a final determination about the allocation of resources for academic programs.

Approximately 419 faculty FTE have been allocated through this process over the past decade. The CTC involves all academic units except for the School of Medicine and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, which do not report to the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

The philosophy of CTC is that most academic planning does and should continue to take place at the level of the academic unit. The Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Office role is "to design the general framework for the process, to stimulate divisional planning, to facilitate cross-divisional initiatives, to help recognize and organize patterns and priorities that emerge from the plans, and to translate those plans into an aggregate set of priorities to guide the General Campus." (source: October 24, 2006 memo by Senior Vice Chancellor Martha Chandler.)

The current three-year planning cycle for CTC, which was put in place by the former Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, is scheduled to be complete in 2009-10. This provides an opportunity for UCSD to evaluate the CTC and determine whether it should be continued in its current form or if changes are needed. That said, the evidence reviewed by the team seems to indicate that the strategic planning process at UCSD is functioning extremely well.

C. **Long Range Development Plan**

In 2004, the UC Board of Regents approved UCSD's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The LRDP "provides a general land use plan to guide the physical development of the campus."

(source: LRDP, Page 1) The LRDP guides planning through 2020-21, when UCSD anticipates enrolling 29,900 full-time equivalent (FTE) students.

An LRDP is required by the UC Board of Regents for each UC campus and medical center. The plan is based on academic goals for the campus. Its purpose is to "provide a broad, coherent, and adaptable policy framework to achieve UCSD's academic and support program goals and to inform decisions concerning land use." (source: LRDP, Page 4)   Campus leaders indicate that UCSD continues to embrace the vision and goals of the 2004 LRDP. (CFR 1.2, 1.3, 3.5)

The WASC Visiting Team observed that the CTC and LRDP were developed and implemented when the campus had a different senior leadership team in place. Nevertheless, those with whom the site visit team met indicated that there continues to be support for the overall vision and priorities articulated in the CTC and LRDP. (CFR's 4.1, 4.2)

SECTION IV – PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

The visiting team is pleased to have had the opportunity to learn more about UCSD, and the team looks forward to conducting the Educational Effectiveness Review. Although we have mentioned some concerns, we do not consider them indicative of any deficiencies in the institution's capacity to fulfill its core mission or its preparation to carry through the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Suggestions for refining the data being gathered and the design of the review have been incorporated in the recommendations above. The team expects to have access to all participants in the Educational Effectiveness reviews that are currently being conducted at the time of the EE visit in 18 months.