

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

University of California, San Diego

November 20-22, 2019

Team Roster

Reed Dasenbrock, Chair; Professor of English, University of Hawaii at Manoa;
Chair, WSCUC Senior College and University Commission

Maria del Carmen Sigler, Assistant Chair;
Retired Provost and VPAA, Professor Emerita, San Jose State University

William Ladusaw, Dean and Professor, Emeritus, University of California, Santa Cruz

Meredith Michaels, Chief Financial Officer and Vice Chancellor, Emerita,
University of California, Irvine

Kristen McKinney, Director, Student Affairs Information and Research Office,
University of California, Los Angeles

Sharon Salinger, Dean and Professor, Emerita, University of California, Irvine

Richard Osborn, Vice President, WSCUC

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

IA. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History -----	3
IB. Description of Team's Review Process -----	5
IC. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update -----	6

SECTION II: EVALUATION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

IIA. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions -----	7
IIB. Component 2: Compliance with Standards and Federal Requirements	
Standard 1: Defining Educational Purposes -----	7
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives -----	9
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Structures-----	14
Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance -----	16
IIC. Component 3: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degree-----	18
IID. Component 4: Educational Quality-----	19
IIE. Component 5: Student Success-----	22
IIF. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement-----	24
IIG. Component 7: Sustainability-----	26
IIH. Component 8: Optional Essay on Advancements in Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion---	27
III. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvements-----	29

SECTION III: COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS-----31

APPENDICES: Federal Requirements

Appendix 1: Credit Hour and Program Length Review-----	35
Appendix 2: Marketing and Recruitment Review-----	37
Appendix 3: Student Complaints Review-----	38
Appendix 4: Transfer Credit Policy-----	39

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

I.A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

Description: The University of California San Diego (UCSD), established in 1960, traces its roots to The Scripps Institution of Oceanography. In the years following its founding, it has become a major research university and earned recognition for its contributions to social mobility and public service.

The institution currently consists of the General Campus (with seven academic divisions), Health Sciences (which includes the School of Medicine and School of Pharmacy) and The Scripps Institution of Oceanography. All undergraduate students and all General Campus faculty are affiliated with one of the following colleges: Marshall College, Muir College, Roosevelt College, Warren College, Revelle College, and Sixth College. The Seventh College is ready to open in Fall 2020, and a proposal for an eighth college is being prepared. The colleges are not discipline specific and “each college defines its own set of general education requirements, leading to a division of academic responsibilities: academic programs define major requirements, while general education is the domain of the colleges” (*Institutional Report*, p. 4).

While UCSD delivers courses online, it offers no on-line undergraduate degrees. The Department of Structural Engineering offers a Master of Science Degree in Structural Engineering for students at Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Similarly, the Jacobs School of Engineering offers a Master of Advanced Studies in Architecture-based Enterprise Systems Engineering with a distance component. (*Institutional Report*, Appendices 6 & 7).

In recent years, UCSD has experienced a significant growth in student enrollment. In the 2012-2018 period, undergraduate enrollment grew by 33% (from 22,676 to 30,285), graduate enrollment grew by 35% (from 5,618 to 7,602), and the institution’s total enrollment reached 37,887 students, exceeding its

long-range plan goals (*Institutional Report*, p. 5). During the same period, the international student population almost tripled (1,812 to 5,628). According to provisional data shared by the institution, in fall 2019 total headcount enrollment reached 38,736 indicating a continuation of the upward trend.

Other significant changes include the adoption of UCSD's first Strategic Plan, which asserts the institution's commitment to student success, and the increase in underrepresented students, particularly in the percentage of Chicanx/Latinx students.

Accreditation History. UCSD has been accredited by WSCUC since 1964. The last comprehensive review was conducted in 2008 (Capacity and Preparatory Review) and 2009 (Educational Effectiveness Review). The 2008 CPR letter recommended that the institution focus on assessment, information literacy, diversity, and strategic planning. Following the EER visit, the Commission found that while UCSD had made "substantial progress on building the capacity for assessment of student outcomes," the "quality and effectiveness of the assessment effort are variable" and recommended that the institution a) continue its efforts to engage faculty in the assessment of program learning outcomes, and b) focus on financial planning and management following a reduction in State support. The Commission, then, voted to reaffirm the institution's accreditation for ten years and to request an Interim Report on progress in assessment and program review.

After receiving the Interim Report in 2012, the Commission found it to be "exceptionally thorough in addressing the recommendations" and commended UCSD for having achieved "significant progress" in areas identified in the previous letter. However, it recommended continued focus on assessment of student learning outcomes and strategic planning.

The new accreditation process required that the previously scheduled CPR and EER visits be changed to an Offsite Review to take place in spring 2019 and an Accreditation Visit in fall 2019.

Since the last accreditation UCSD submitted two substantive change proposals. The first was to establish a Master of Advanced Studies- Architecture-based Enterprise System Engineering to be delivered partially on-line. The Substantive Change Committee recommended interim approval, and the Commission granted approval on February 6, 2014. The second substantive change proposal, for a distance education Master of Science in Structural Engineering with a Specialization in SHM&NDE, was granted final approval by the Commission on April 9, 2018.

1.B. Team's Review Process

The team was provided access to the Institutional Report and supporting documentation in February 2019. Team members reviewed all the available materials and recorded their observations into worksheets that they forwarded to the assistant chair to be incorporated into the *OSR Team Worksheet* that guided the team's discussion during the conference call held on March 11th. At that time, the team determined that it needed additional information. UCSD promptly provided it before the suggested deadline.

The two-day Offsite Review was conducted on April 22-23, 2019. It included a video conference call with key UCSD administrators in which the team identified areas for further exploration during the Accreditation Visit (AV). After the meeting, the *Summary of Lines of Inquiry* was forwarded to the institution requesting that additional documents be provided before September 24, 2019. The institution provided most of the information before the deadline. A few additional documents, such as

enrollment and budget data for Fall 2019, were made accessible to the team as soon as they became available in November.

Shortly after the OSR team members drafted sections of the report, which were compiled by the assistant chair and distributed to the team prior to the AV.

The AV began with a team executive planning session on Tuesday, November 19, 2019 in which the team reviewed the final visit schedule and identified specific questions to pursue during each group or individual meeting. The campus visit started the next day with a meeting with Chancellor Pradeep Khosla, followed by a meeting with the WSCUC Self-Study Group. During the course of the visit the team met with all members of the senior leadership team and held individual meetings with Executive Vice Chancellor Elizabeth Simmons and CFO Pierre Ouillet. Team members also participated in meetings with the college provosts and the academic deans as well as representatives of the Student Success Collaborative, the Teaching and Learning Commons, the Academic Senate, Associated Students and the Graduate Student Association. Several open meetings were scheduled by the institution to provide different constituency groups (students, international students, staff members, faculty members) the opportunity to share their experience with the team. All the meetings were productive and informative with the exception of the meeting with faculty that was cancelled due to the fact that no faculty members were present.

The team reviewed documents relevant to federal requirements on-site. A confidential email account was established to allow greater participation from the campus community. It was monitored by the assistant chair during the visit and the information shared with team members.

I.C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

UCSD prepared a careful, well documented report that provided an excellent overview of the institution and a detailed description of initiatives and efforts under way. At the conclusion of the OSR the team commended the institution for “the quality and comprehensiveness of the report and, in particular, the self-assessment of the Review under the Standards.”

SECTION II: EVALUATION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

II.A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

As indicated above, in 2012 the WSCUC Commission recommended that UCSD continue to focus on student assessment, financial management and planning. In response, the institution invested considerable energy and resources in developing its assessment infrastructure and adopted its first strategic plan in 2014. The *Institutional Report* provides detailed information about UCSD’s efforts on both ongoing issues in the institutional self-review documentation and essays: assessment is addressed in essays 3, 4, and 6, while essay 7 describes strategic initiatives. The team reviewed all relevant information and relates its findings further below in the report.

II.B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.

Review under the Standards

Standard 1:

The institution’s stated mission is to “transform California and a diverse global society by educating, generating and disseminating knowledge and creative works, and engaging in public service. As a public research university, its vision acknowledges its responsibility “to give back to society by educating global citizens, discovering new knowledge, creating new technology, and contributing to our economy.” (CFR

1.1) As a state-supported public university operating under the general governance of the Regents of the University of California, the institution makes public a wide range of policies, procedures, and academic and administrative practices (CFR 1.7), including its commitment to academic freedom (CFR 1.3), catalog of degree programs, expectations of members of the academic community, and a wide range of data on student achievement. (CFR 1.6)

The institution publishes educational objectives associated with the descriptions and requirements of its degree programs. The institutional report referenced two sets of educational effectiveness indicators, one with program-specific learning objectives and another set focused on their relation to WSCUC's core competencies. The institution generates and makes public data on student degree completion rates and time to degree that can be disaggregated by various student characteristics. (CFR 1.2)

As the institutional report acknowledges (p. 17), program faculties vary greatly in the degree to which they engage in evaluating data on student achievement and evidence of student learning, identifying it in the self-review as an issue important to address in this review. (CFR 1.2)

The institution's commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion is the focus of the eighth essay of its report. Its strategic plan for inclusive excellence is discussed further below. (CFR 1.4).

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

Standard 2:

UCSD has a strong complement of undergraduate and graduate programs undergirded by clearly defined degree requirements and strong general education programs centered in each of the undergraduate colleges (CFR 2.2). The team noted that plans for additional colleges continued a strong focus on the cohesiveness and comprehensiveness of general education requirements. The team's understanding is that the creation of the Seventh and Eighth Colleges is intended to accommodate undergraduate growth that has already occurred, allowing the colleges to reduce their total enrollment and to operate at their designed capacity.

Strong processes exist for the review of new courses and degree programs and requirements. Rapid growth of the campus has put an identified strain on faculty capacity, but the institution is clearly committed to strategies to reduce the student faculty ratio to a level more in line with peer institutions (CFR 2.1).

UCSD has exceeded the WSCUC mandate for core competencies and articulated 12 competency goals for students as well as instituting a diversity requirement. Impressive work has been done to organize reporting of campus data around these competency areas to inform the campus of student performance in these areas (CFR 2.6). The team noted that significant effort has been made by the institution to ensure that all undergraduate majors have articulated SLOs and that evaluation of this work is embedded into the program review process (CFR 2.3).

The team also observed that the extent to which faculty are meaningfully engaged with, and assume responsibility for, assessment of SLOs seems quite variable across the institution (CFR 2.4). The commitment of resources through areas such as the Teaching + Learning Commons signals that the

institution takes seriously the need to focus on student learning, but it is unclear whether this imperative is a focus of the faculty.

UCSD's program review process is undergoing a needed revision with the objective of strengthening and streamlining the process (CFR 2.7). Historically, the undergraduate and graduate program reviews have been conducted as separate reviews on differing cycles and with different foci for consideration. During the visit the team learned that the campus is currently focused on an intermediate step toward the goal of a fully integrated departmental program review process—a combined review. This intermediate step aligns the timelines and requires a single self-study document but still engages two independent committees (undergraduate and graduate) to review the department during the same year. The team's understanding is that the institution is aware of the need to ensure that as the previously separate reviews of graduate and undergraduate programs are coordinated and to some degree integrated. Attention should be given to ensuring that each type of program receives appropriate levels of attention and expertise.

Concerns emerging in the streamlining discussion include balancing depth of content area expertise with overall committee size and scheduling, as well as ensuring continued focus on the effectiveness of undergraduate education. The Academic Senate has encouraged the workgroup to keep the combined review for another year to gain more data and insight on the ideal review team size and composition to meet the needs of questions to be considered at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

The team endorses the current approach and urges the campus to continue to center the consideration of educational effectiveness in the planning process, and to ensure that the new process integrates

review of learning outcomes assessment and robust follow-up on action steps proposed during the review process.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

UCSD has a strong faculty research culture, which is recognized nationally. Perhaps more importantly for the students, the campus has made it a priority to find ways to engage students in that research in order to benefit their educational experiences (CFR 2.8). Research productivity is a strong consideration in faculty promotion, along with innovation in teaching and engagement in service (CFR 2.9).

Student Learning and Success

UCSD's overall retention and graduation rates meet or exceed those of their peer campuses. Institutional Research provides a wide variety of information to the campus about student needs and progress, including graduation and retention rates for several sub-populations of interest to the campus, such as URM students, Pell Grant recipients, and transfer students. The campus has responded to the differential graduation rates of these populations with a plethora of new initiatives. The team notes that critical evaluation of the success of these initiatives will be an important component for future planning (CFR 2.10).

UCSD offers a wide range of co-curricular engagement experiences, and academic and student support services. Significant effort has been made to align co-curricular experiences with the achievement of the 12 student competency areas. A highlight of the work in this area is the co-curricular transcript and the development of the Research and Applied Learning Portal, which provide a helpful aggregation of the opportunities for students (CFR 2.11). Student Affairs is actively engaged in efforts to assess the

outcomes of co-curricular and support experiences for students, and plans for a comprehensive student affairs program review are promising (CFRs 2.11, 2.13).

According to the institutional report, “objective evaluation of teaching effectiveness has proven challenging” (CFRs 2.8, 2.9) and a Senate-administration group was charged with reviewing best practices and issuing recommendations to improve the process. Prior to the visit, the team was able to review the workgroup report and observed that it presents a thoughtful analysis of the potential value and challenges of teaching evaluation overall as well as of issues context specific to UCSD. The report discussed important clarifications regarding the purposes of data collection (and the need to agree upon standard definitions regarding formative and summative approaches), as well as the need for faculty to have control over how such information collected about their teaching practices is utilized. The report ultimately recommended a “thorough overhaul” of existing questionnaires, along with the adoption of a more holistic teaching portfolio process. Specifically, it recommended: 1) maintaining a clear distinction between assessment (formative) and evaluation (summative) both to encourage pedagogical awareness and to facilitate the evaluation of teaching effectiveness in academic files; 2) a thorough overhaul of CAPE questionnaires, taking into account best practices with respect to student feedback on teaching; 3) the adoption of a holistic teaching portfolio and an accompanying instructor self-reflection as the primary means of evaluating teaching in academic files, and 4) additional training and oversight for the teaching review process. The team recommends that the campus prioritize the implementation of these recommendations, building on the training and support being offered through the Teaching + Learning Commons to scaffold the critical instructor self-reflection and feedback processes that are essential to the formative assessment process. The team also underscores the importance of continuing to incorporate teaching assistants in the teaching portfolio process.

During the visit the team heard consistent complaints from students about how enrollment growth had negatively affected student services. The most pervasive issues are with Counseling and Psychological Services (Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)), student health, and disability services. As one student explained, the campus did a wonderful job informing students about mental health services on campus, but it proved nearly impossible to get an appointment with a counselor. As he explained, he called in the throes of a crisis but couldn't be seen for 3 weeks. International students echoed how frustrating it was to try to make an appointment. They also articulated needs specific to them: homesickness and a sense of dislocation. In addition, even if their English language skills are strong, it would be preferable by far to receive mental and general health help from practitioners who speak the same language. The team is aware that CAPS is understaffed; we urge that achieving appropriate staffing levels become a keen priority. The same wait times and frustrations were expressed about general healthcare. One student admitted that during the triage conversation, when asked to rank the urgency on a scale of 1 to 10, he contemplated inflating the need so he could be seen within two weeks. The team also heard disturbing accounts from students working with disability services. One student said that she was aware that the office is very small with few staff, indeed noticeably smaller than the disability office of her community college. But her prolonged ordeal meant that the first time she met with a disability advisor took place 2 days after her first midterm. The team suggests that disability services be evaluated to determine if further resources or different processes might better serve students.

Students also expressed concern about “capped” majors. Although the team understands that capped majors emerge as part of the landscape of student demand and not solely as a result of the increase in growth of the undergraduate population, we share the students’ concern. The team is also aware of the effect that capped majors have on other programs, the enormous growth, for example, of mathematics

because computer science and engineering are capped. However, it appears to the team as if students receive mixed and therefore confusing messages. The Office of Admissions informs them about the major in which they are admitted. Advisors are urged to discourage any hope that students will ever be able to transfer into a capped major. And yet, some capped majors do admit matriculated students. The team supports the current efforts to find a consistent message and process for students seeking entry into a capped major and note that this seems to be a bigger issue for students on campus than the administration seems to realize.

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

Standard 3:

UCSD's financials are audited and reported annually to the Regents. The campus is in a strong financial position, with annual revenues exceeding \$5B in 2018, comprised of diverse revenues. Approximately 40% of the campus's revenues derive from the medical (hospital) enterprise, about 20% from contracts and grants, and close to 20% in state funds and student tuition (general funds). Changes to mandated accounting rules, which now require the inclusion of future pension and retirement liabilities, potentially mask financial performance. The campus maintains a healthy fund balance which, should it be needed, provides the campus with the ability to adjust to future financial challenges (CFR 3.4). The campus's underlying financial performance is strong with revenues continuing to increase at rates greater than expenditures. In 2018-19 – the latest year for which audited financials were available – revenues grew by 8% and expenditures by 6%.

The campus has engaged in an aggressive building program to both address student enrollment growth (driving the need for additional student housing, student services as well as faculty office and research space) and a goal to provide a 4-year housing guarantee for undergraduate and doctoral students.

Further construction in the \$6-8 billion range to address seismic deficiencies as well as growth is envisioned. The result has been an increase in debt that affects the campus's balance sheet with regard to days of cash and debt capacity. Debt service for the new hospital (Jacobs Medical Center) and projections for new debt, assuming capital construction proceeds as proposed, could reach the limit set by Regents' policy by 2024. The campus is aware of this and will scale its expenditures accordingly while it continues to pursue cost containment and alternative revenues strategies.

UCSD's restructured multi-year and multi-source budget is robust, transparent and inclusive. The framework/context for the budget and high--level priorities is communicated early in the process. The CFO actively engages with units to review 5-year projections prior to budget submittals, and staff meet regularly with units to ensure the appropriate management of resources. The process was described by academic, administrative and Senate leaders as being well rationalized – strategic with a clearly articulated focus. In the face of last year's unprecedented enrollment growth, the process used to address the immediate was described as being "methodical and deliberate." Assumptions about expenditures and resource projections are realistic. The administrative organization of the campus ensures that the financial oversight of the hospital/medical centers is linked with the general campus (CFRs 3.7, 3.8). There are clear roles and lines with respect to financial management, including oversight of the hospitals. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8).

Over the last decade, UCSD has experienced growth of nearly 10,000 student FTE. A decade ago, California residents comprised nearly 91% of the student population; today that share is closer to 77%.

The growth in nonresidents was a deliberate strategy aimed at growing resources and diversifying the student body. During this period of growth, faculty hiring has kept pace to the extent that the student-faculty ratio is about the same today as it was 10 years ago (CFR 3.1). Highly qualified graduate students and Teaching Professors (formerly Lecturers with Security of Employment) help address teaching needs. Teaching Professors are fully integrated into departments. The institution has an aggressive capital program to ensure the availability of adequate and appropriate space to accommodate faculty and students.

For the not-too-distant horizon, the campus has a clear sense of financial challenges: enrollment of international students, implementation of UC Path and other new enterprise systems, and the health care enterprise. Strategies are either in place or being developed to mitigate the risks associated with these challenges.

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

Standard 4:

UCSD appears intensely focused on student success and demonstrates its commitment in a number of ways. The Strategic Plan, launched in 2014, was the result of a broad university conversation. Its mission is to be a “student-centered, research-focused, service-oriented public university.” Part of the plan deals with the university’s sense of higher education in the future and their planning for changing demographics and student academic needs. It also includes multiple ways for community members and alumni to engage with the university. (CFRs 4.5-4.7)

UCSD has a rigorous process for review and approval of programs. The results lead to improvement and refinement. Institutional Research has been recently reorganized, its staff has been increased, and it now reports to Academic Affairs to bring it directly in line with student data: admissions, retention, and graduation (CFR 4.2). A faculty-led Education Initiative resulted in the establishment of the Teaching + Learning Commons, which partners with academic departments through several hubs (the Academic Achievement Hub, the Engaged Teaching Hub, and the Educational Research and Assessment Hub, among others). (CFRs 4.1-4.3). For example, the Engaged Teaching Hub provides a variety of pedagogical developmental opportunities, including support and training for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Finally, the campus seems fully engaged in trying to anticipate the many changes it will confront over the next decades—increased enrollment, growing diversity in the face of declining state support. As new programs are designed, the aim is to address the changing demographic and demands by students. (CFRs 4.4-4.7)

While many of the innovations reflect careful thought and creativity and the number of new programs speak to the campus commitment, less effort has been made to assess the effectiveness of these initiatives. The institutional report provided Inventories of Educational Effectiveness Indicators resulting from previous work in articulating learning outcomes for all programs. In one inventory the objectives are more discipline specific; in the other, the objectives focus on the WSCUC-specified core competencies. The campus has done extensive work to create a teaching/learning support infrastructure. The team heard many examples and appreciations from faculty of the value of the center's support in advancing assessment activities.

As the institutional report acknowledges (page 17), engagement with and progress in assessment has been variable. The team understands that several programs have developed curriculum maps and that these have stimulated revisions to curriculum and improvements in courses. The team also understands that a few programs have fully completed assessment projects. These will presumably be incorporated into the next cycle of program review. All of the team's conversations with faculty revealed strong commitments to reflecting on teaching effectiveness and adapting to a changing environment for student learning.

Leadership should be able to monitor the spread of engagement with assessment through the Teaching + Learning Commons. As a coordinated program review process is finalized, attention should be given to ensuring that the results of completed assessment projects are mentioned in departmental reports. This would ensure that the campus has readily available evidence to demonstrate its commitment to improving educational effectiveness. (CFRs 2.4, 2.7) In addition, the current discussion of the development of a more holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness provides opportunities for synergy. (CFRs 3.2, 4.1)

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

II.C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees

UCSD has approximately 150 degree programs/majors, each with clearly defined course requirements and pathways. All of UCSD's undergraduate degrees include major, university, and college requirements (including a diversity component) (CFR 2.1). The institution maintains a helpful dashboard tool for

students to help them understand degree requirements and how to progress through the degree pathway (<http://plans.ucsd.edu/>) (CFR 2.12).

The institution has clear and comprehensive processes and committee structures in place for both the review of new courses and periodic review of existing programs. General Education requirements are determined at the college level, but all seem comprehensive and aligned with the philosophy/theme of each college, and all include a significant writing requirement. Standards of faculty qualification and processes for review are also in place (CFR 2.2).

The institution has clearly stated undergraduate and graduate degree requirements in terms of total units required, number of units in residence, and the depth and the breadth of curriculum, as well as a stated commitment to provide opportunities for engagement with research at the undergraduate as well as graduate levels. Plans for additional colleges to be introduced show a strong commitment to integrated and meaningful general education experiences for undergraduate students (CFR 2.2). The potential lack of integration across courses taught in sequence noted in the report (page 17) is of concern and needs attention; the development of curricular maps in the SLO process can provide a point of discussion for how such sequencing might be more effectively accomplished. In addition, as the institution focuses on reducing the units needed for graduation, attention should be paid to ongoing cohesiveness of the major to ensure continuing integrity of degree programs (CFR 2.2).

The institution's focus on core competency achievement goes beyond the five areas outlined by WSCUC to identify 12 competencies that are being integrated into curricular and co-curricular programming across the campus and can be documented by students in a co-curricular transcript (CFR 2.8).

The institution has made significant progress in the integration of Student Learning Outcomes for undergraduate majors, though the team noted that the quality and depth of the outcomes varies considerably across departments (CFR 2.3).

II.D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation

All undergraduate programs have clearly defined learning outcomes, which include the five WSCUC WSCUC core competencies. In addition to the WSCUWSCUC five, the campus has added competencies embedded in a number of experiential learning programs including civic engagement, innovation, appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, and the ability to work with one another. The institutional report admits that they are an emerging culture that aims to embrace the competencies as the core goals and objectives for student learning. They have only just begun to assess the effectiveness of the core competencies.

Several transformative initiatives, launched since 2012, are devoted to developing this area. Teaching Professors (LPSE), faculty whose scholarly interest is teaching and learning in specific disciplines, have been added to the campus and take the lead in curricular and pedagogical reform. Also new is the development of the Teaching + Learning Commons and the Holistic Teaching workgroup formed to offer peer evaluation and to recommend measures to improve teaching effectiveness. Other foci emphasize the development of online accredited programs, masters and certificate programs. The Office of Undergraduate Education is partnering with academic divisions to revise learning outcomes and develop assessment protocols.

During the visit, the Team heard from many faculty constituents that consultation with the Commons was essential for their effectiveness in helping establish PLOs and curriculum maps for their programs even at the granular level of aligning syllabi and assignments with outcomes. In the design of new online initiatives, they have embedded assessment within the course and program proposals. We also heard how important the Commons was to faculty who approached them for feedback on teaching effectiveness; they provide strategies, techniques, and help faculty align SLO's with course material and assignments.

On the student side of their mission, the energy inside the Commons was palpable. They provide four distinctive types of student support: 1) content tutoring, 2) learning strategies workshops and consultations, 3) supplemental instruction, and 4) writing support. In supplemental instruction, faculty approach the Commons to support their course, promote the program in the class, and offer peer mentors. Paid peer mentors meet with students who choose to participate for the same number of hours weekly as the class meets. They do not do homework with the students nor attempt to repeat the lectures, but rather guide the students to understand the key concepts presented in lecture.

Supplemental instruction has proven to be very effective; if a student attends five or more times, grades improve. The Commons has also worked closely with the math department to refine the math placement exam, which focuses on conceptual learning. It has proven to be a powerful tool in placing students in appropriate courses. Peer tutoring is another robust Commons program. The sessions are one on one in a variety of subject areas. Again their data indicate that if students are involved in tutoring at the beginning of the quarter, course grades are significantly better. Peer tutors also meet with students who need help with writing.

It is clear to the team that having these services integrated into a single unit enhances its effectiveness.

Faculty and students repeatedly praised the Commons as a support service essential to their success.

However, in addition to student learning and core competencies, Component 4 asks about standards of performance at graduation, an element they have yet to address directly. Moreover, beyond surveys, they are just beginning to assess student learning (except for programs with discipline specific accreditation like engineering). Also, the only current measure of faculty effectiveness in teaching in teaching is based on student surveys. They acknowledge the need for more consistent coordination among faculty who teach in sequence courses. And while they have a number of initiatives directed at more effective teaching it is unclear how engaged how faculty are in these efforts.

II.E: Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, retention, and graduation

The team is impressed by many aspects of UCSD's attention to student success. The campus as a whole has clearly undergone a shift in terms of seeing undergraduate student success as a key issue, something central to the mission and indeed success of the campus. As one indicator of the commitment to student success, senior leadership brought to our attention UCUES data that reveal low rankings on student satisfaction compared with other UC campuses. Committed to Peter Drucker's apothegm that you can manage only what you measure, the conversation about student success on campus is clearly data informed, and in keeping with this, the report is full of relevant data. It is certainly helpful that the UC system gives UCSD both a set of comparable institutions against which to measure itself and an incentive for improvement in those metrics, not just for "UC bragging rights" but also for recruitment and reputational indices. These data points tend to place UCSD between third and fifth among UC campuses in most of the student success metrics. Although this is somewhat lower than

one would place UCSD in research reputation (where it is clearly one of the top three in the aggregate), it can be explained by the remarkable diversity of its student body.

This renewed attention on student achievement is having results. UCSD already had impressive retention and 6 year graduation rates, but what has improved perceptibly since the last accreditation visit is the 4 year graduation rate, which has climbed from 57% to 65.7%, so it is increasing about 1% a year. They are also tracking the percentage of students who need just one more quarter, and that is holding steady at an additional 7%. Given the demographic diversity of the UCSD student body, these are impressive numbers, and the numbers exceed the HERI predicted graduation rates, which take into account various diversity factors in the student body.

Challenges remain: African-American retention and graduation rates remain well below UCSD-wide averages, and they do not seem to be improving. Latinx rates—a much larger percentage of the UCSD student body—are improving, especially the four-year graduation rate, but they are still lagging. And the (probably closely related) figures for Pell grant students show the same pattern as Latinx students. The team senses no complacency on campus about any of this. Indeed, UCSD has just set ambitious new goals for progress on these issues. The goal by 2030 is to improve the 4--year graduation rate to 75% and to eliminate the disparities in graduation rates among different ethnicities. These two goals do not represent an either/or: given the ethnic diversity of the UCSD campus, which is only likely to grow in the near future, the only way to move the needle on graduation rates in general is to move the needle even more significantly on the graduation rates of those populations whose rates lag behind others. The team commends UCSD for the clarity and the ambitious nature of these goals and consider them reachable, assuming that the campus continues to keep its eye on the ball.

Recent curricular changes should boost completion rates across the board in the coming years, and there are a remarkable number of initiatives now underway addressing every conceivable aspect of the retention and graduation challenge. The sheer number of on-going initiatives deserves praise as a sign of a campus committed to addressing this issue and committed to innovative programming. Yet that sheer number also prompts a cautionary note. It is in the nature of things that everyone associated with a specific initiative will consider it the best approach; it is also in the nature of things that some of these initiatives will be more successful than others. Beyond the current period of letting one hundred flowers bloom will come a more complicated period in which the success of these initiatives will need to be assessed and the scalability of them considered: those that look the most successful and the most scalable should receive renewed support, while some promising initiatives with the best of intentions may need to be phased out. Our role here is certainly not to suggest winners and losers, an act of judgment that in any case would be premature, but we do urge the campus to understand that optimizing student outcomes over the long term will require some difficult choices about which programs deserve moving beyond the pilot stage to full-scale, campus-wide implementation.

To be quite concrete, the Student Success Collaborative has already concluded that the plethora of student success initiatives on campus—though a sign of innovation and focus on the issue that deserves to be commended—is also potentially a source of confusion that may lead to a suboptimal use of resources. They have taken the essential first step, which is to inventory the array of programs along these lines. What is now needed is for the success of these programs to be assessed, and this assessment will require dedicated resources and an intentional, campus-wide effort.

The reason why this is both urgent and important is that only when such an assessment is complete, will it be possible to know which of these programs are more successful than the others, which will indicate

which programs deserve additional investment. This will be a difficult process, because each of these programs are well intentioned and doing good things. But our sense gathered from administrators, faculty, staff and students is that the sheer number of these initiatives itself is inhibiting their success, as students don't quite know where to go to get the help they need.

This process will not be completed overnight, as it will take time to gather data, assess these programs, make decisions about where additional investment is needed, and then track the results of this additional investment. So if as we believe a more intentional and systematic approach to these programs is needed, and the campus is to meet its 2030 goals, *tempus fugit*.

II.F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

UCSD is a data rich environment and the strong centralized institutional research function is providing an impressive variety of data to support campus decision makers, including analytics to identify success factors and monitoring graduation trends for various groups. The IR group seems to be thoughtful about providing data responsive to campus needs and reporting in ways that help connections to be made (e.g., mapping of UCUES and other survey data to competency areas) (CFRs 2.10, 4.1-4.2). Less clear is how the data provided have guided change in practice on the campus.

While all majors have articulated SLOs, the extent to which rigorous assessment of these outcomes is being conducted varies considerably across departments. There has been targeted focus on entry--level skills targets through comprehensive reviews of math placement and writing courses, but assessment of “capstone” competencies appears to be quite variable (CFRs 2.3-2.4, 2.6).

Current program review structure separates undergraduate and graduate program reviews. The current guidelines for undergraduate reviews have a strong focus on curriculum and the integration of student learning outcomes (CFRs 2.3, 2.7, 4.4-4.5). However, the review guidelines are limited in their consideration of aspects beyond the curriculum, such as diversity, budget/resources, etc. In fact, there are no clear guidelines provided for reviews of graduate programs. The administrative review for new courses seems a promising step in integrating broader structural and budget considerations, but such review is not currently integrated into review of existing curricula through program review (CFRs 4.3, 4.7).

As discussed under Standard 2, the team observed that the plans to integrate the two into a more comprehensive and cohesive process constitute a positive step. The new structure should be sure to integrate a broad consideration of factors influencing departmental performance and their potential influence on student success (CFR 4.3).

The team noted the acknowledged limitation discussed in the institutional report concerning timely and in-depth follow-up on program review recommendations and action steps (CFRs 4.5-4.6). It will be important for the institution to address staffing and other structural needs for program review going forward.

II.G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

As discussed in Standard 3, the campus is currently in a strong financial position. The campus's multi-year, multi-source budget augmented by its cash management practices positions the campus well for long term sustainability. The focus on cash management is key. A healthy fund balance provides the

campus with the ability to adjust to future – known and unknown – financial challenges. The ambitious campus goals, translated into bold and aggressive management, comes with some future risk. Of particular note for the general campus is the enrollment of international students. There are multiple dimensions to the concern.

The Regents have imposed a 23% cap on the percentage of nonresident undergraduate students that can be enrolled in any given year. The campus is close to, but not at, that cap. At issue is that over 80% of these students are from one country. National events and policy are beginning to affect the decision and ability of these students to attend American educational institutions. UCSD is vulnerable.

A related challenge that persists is to provide, in a coordinated manner, the level of resources to ensure that international students receive the services (educational, social, et al) they need to ensure the delivery of a quality education and ensure success. Many units across the campus have a role in ensuring that international students are fully integrated in to the campus, but those efforts themselves lack integration. The team recommends that someone be appointed as the point person on this issue.

The campus recognizes the need to diversify the pool of nonresident students, and the team suggests that Enrollment Management ensure that this diversification is an ongoing priority in its nonresident recruitment efforts. This diversification should be aided by the large number of non-resident applications received by UCSD; UCSD is second only to UCLA nationally in the number of applications it receives. But a challenge is that the yield rates among out-of-state, non-international students is comparatively low. So attracted by UC's stellar reputation, students are applying, but once admitted to UCSD, they aren't coming at a very high rate, so one has to wonder if the extremely impressive application numbers aren't inflated somewhat by the ease of applying to multiple UC campuses

simultaneously. In any case, we view the diversification of the ‘non-California enrollment’ which has been so important for the campus’s success to be an urgent issue, and this involves a dual focus on diversifying the sources of international students and increasing the domestic, out of state enrollment in addition to making sure that all these students receive the services they need to be successful.

II.H. Component 8: Optional Essay on Advancements in Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

Advancement in equity and diversity is an institutional priority, articulated as Goal 2 of the university’s Strategic Plan. The plan to achieve that goal included structural change within the campus; the Office for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion opened six years ago led by a cabinet-level vice chancellor. Contained as well within the Strategic Plan are guidelines to help achieve equity, diversity, and inclusion. These include access and success; the means to attract, retain, and support a diverse student population, faculty and staff who reflect the demographics of California; creating a welcoming and positive climate on campus; and accountability, the creation of processes and structures to hold people and offices responsible for their actions.

The campus has launched several programs to achieve equity, diversity and inclusion for the student population. These provide support for particular at-risk students as well as the convening of a taskforce to help the campus become a Hispanic-Serving Institution. Similarly, it launched a series of programs aimed to help faculty including professional development and review of policies affecting faculty to ensure procedural clarity and transparency for achieving tenure and promotion as well as best practices in the search process. The work in support of campus staff includes a new position, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, who serves as the link with HR to better integrate the principles of diversity.

UCSD is also engaged in efforts of increased diversity beyond the physical borders of the campus. It seeks to become a porous member of the local region. The dedicated UCSD light rail line which is coming directly to campus from southern San Diego can be considered an innovative part of the diversity effort, as the plans for several buildings along its path will allow the university to engage with diverse communities that would otherwise have no contact with the campus. The train will also enable people from outside the campus's sphere to come to the campus and take part in the vital intellectual and artistic offerings on campus.

The energy demonstrated here is impressive. What remains unclear once again is whether any of these many initiatives have moved beyond the input stage toward an understanding of their effectiveness. Perhaps this many different programs are necessary to touch the maximum numbers of students, faculty and staff. However, it could also be the case that some yield more powerful results than others and it would be prudent to focus on them. The campus also admits that it has less progress to report on improvements in faculty diversity than on other areas, and this needs to remain an urgent focus.

II.I. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

The re-affirmation of accreditation for UCSD comes at a crucial point in the university's evolution. As earlier parts of this report document, UCSD has experienced a remarkable period of growth in the past decade, building upon its stellar reputation for research to become an increasingly attractive destination for the UC-eligible students in the state of California and for students from all over the world. This has meant that the campus is literally bursting at its seams, with every aspect of its infrastructure—human and physical—stressed to the limit by this unparalleled period of growth. The growth is a reflection of

the quality of the education offered by UCSD and a reflection of its reputation for quality, yet that growth also can be seen as challenging that quality.

The university has reacted to this growth by doing the right things to create the infrastructure needed for this level of enrollment. The amount of building on campus is unprecedented: the \$1 billion of capital expenditure this year means that over \$2.5 million is being spent every day, over \$110,000 every hour, nearly \$2000 every minute, 24 hours a day 7 days a week. Investments in people are comparable in extent: the university is committed to adding 30-50 new faculty each year, and the departments and colleges can't even hire as many faculty as they are authorized to hire, given the investment in faculty time needed to make those additions to the faculty. And this means that the effort to create the infrastructure to address the growth can be a new source of stress that is a potential challenge to quality: if there is no parking left on campus because every parking lot has become a construction site, people can't get to work and class.

This is not to criticize the university for these tremendous investments; just the reverse. Not too far around the corner will be a campus with the largest residential capacity for students of any university in the country, a campus with its own dedicated light rail line ending on campus, new facilities in the humanities and social sciences, its own fire station, good new restaurants with affordable prices for students —the list could go on. But that turn around the corner may be a vanishing horizon. The LRPD for the campus set a 2035 enrollment goal for UCSD of 32,000 undergraduates and 8,000 graduates. It has already—11 years early—essentially reached those goals.

UCSD badly needs a period of consolidation in which it can complete the physical infrastructure improvements it is already embarked on and which it needs to educate the students it already has. It

needs that period to establish the Seventh College which is starting in 2020 and the Eighth College on the drawing boards for 2023 in order to resize the colleges back to the 4000 students per college that the campus feels is optimal. It needs that period to add the faculty needed to bring its student-teacher ratio back down at least to the UC average, to shrink some of its large classes, and to address the shifts in enrollment which have led to some majors having thousands of students. Just as emphatically, there are crucial human infrastructure needs in such areas as student health, disability services, mental health, and teaching assistants in oversubscribed courses. The space needed for all these employees is just being built, so the human infrastructure in some cases has to lag the physical infrastructure, which is already lagging the enrollment increases stressing the entire system.

We are impressed by everything the administration and the campus as a whole is doing to address all these issues. But efforts to ‘catch up’ will go for naught if the 2030 enrollment goals are revised upwards prematurely, causing a new cycle of growth before the physical and human infrastructure that is needed for the current cycle is built. Currently, if ironically, the greatest threat to the quality of UCSD is the growth that this quality has engendered. The campus knows what it needs to do in order to address the challenge of growth, but it needs time to do all of those things.

This is not an argument for an absolute flatlining of enrollment: there are a suite of interesting new graduate programs in various stages of gestation, and some growth in graduate programs can provide the human resources in the form of teaching assistants that a high quality undergraduate program needs. And the commitment to meet the 2:1 California freshmen:transfer ratio goal and the desire to diversify the non-California undergraduate student population may both require a slight ramp up of the student population. But we view the recent massive growth in students as the single largest threat to

the quality of a UCSD education, so our strong recommendation is that the campus be authorized to pause that rapid growth while the exciting new plans for the campus move forward.

Our commendations for the campus include praise for its ability to think long-term and plan creatively and proactively for the long term, a strong commitment to student success shared by all on campus, a strong administrative team that works cohesively and collaboratively, and a stronger sense of shared governance than is often found on university campuses today. These are also resources, and these resources need to be focused over the near and medium term on implementing the plans already in place to respond to the surge in enrollment. Those plans are ambitious, and UCSD has major ambitions. We hope it is given the space in order to properly pursue those ambitions.

SECTION III. OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE

SECTION IV. FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

COMMENDATIONS:

1. The exceptional quality of the institutional self-study, which was not just extremely thorough but also showed signs of serious and deep self-reflection.
2. The creation and development of the Teaching + Learning Commons, which is off to a promising start and has the potential of dramatically improving both teaching and learning on campus.
3. The strength of the senior leadership team on campus, who have a common vision, are focused on key issues concerning student success, and are working collaboratively and creatively on the challenges and opportunities faced by UCSD.

4. The financial management of the campus, both in terms of a budget and resource allocation model which seems fair and transparent and has improved communication across campus, and in terms of a bold and successful approach to the utilization of financial resources.
5. An intentional focus on strengthening the ties between UCSD and the community, with UCSD's approach to the light rail connection to campus serving as a particular example.
6. A long-term and proactive focus on the future, with a more visionary mode of planning than is typical of many higher education institutions today.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue to focus on the improvement recently seen in graduation rates and in eliminating achievement gaps, with the aim of eliminating achievement gaps and achieving a 75% 4 year graduation rate by UCSD's stated deadline of 2030. (CFR 2.10)
2. Continue to extend engagement in assessment of educational effectiveness; integrate results of assessment into regular program review processes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.9)
3. Assess the many different diversity and student success programs with an eye to identifying which are the most successful and are therefore good candidates for scaling up. (CFRs 2.11, 3.1)
4. Since the University is already close to its Long Range Development Plan enrollment targets for 2035, resist any pressure or temptation to increase those targets to allow the campus to support current levels of enrollment, though perhaps allowing some room for a very modest increase in undergraduates and a somewhat larger increase in graduate student enrollment.
(CFR 3.4)

5. Within the current ceiling of 23% out-of-state undergraduate enrollment, diversify the sources of that enrollment, both in terms of the countries from which international students come and increasing the proportion of students from other states. (CFRs 3.4, 4.7)
6. Identify and deploy the resources necessary to respond to the recent enrollment surge by increasing the capacity of essential student life and academic programs, such as health services, disability services, mental health services, advising, and teaching assistants for heavily enrolled classes.
7. Act on the recommendations of the recent Senate-Administration Workgroup on Holistic Teaching Evaluation to develop a new system evaluating teaching effectiveness. (CFR 3.2)
8. Address the issues created by the existence of capped majors, making sure at the very least that the information about access to heavily subscribed majors is consistent and that processes for students wishing to major in these fields are consistent, uniform, and reasonable. (CFRs 1.6, 2.10, 2.12)

APPENDICES

The report includes the following appendices:

A. Federal Compliance Forms

- 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review**
- 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review**
- 3. Student Complaints Review**
- 4. Transfer Credit Review**

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? https://senate.ucsd.edu/media/276096/epc-credit-hour-policy.pdf
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Review for approval by academic senate committees and periodic program review.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? None
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?
	What degree level(s)?
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g.,	How many syllabi were reviewed? None
	What kinds of courses?
	What degree level(s)?
	What discipline(s)?

internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 6
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Social science, science
	What degree level(s)? BA and PhD
	What discipline(s)? Anthropology, Economics, Biology
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: William Ladusaw

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By: Kirsten McKinney
Date: 11/22/19

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? http://policy.ucop.edu/doc/2710531/PACAOS-110. https://students.ucsd.edu/_files/student-conduct/scs-studentcomplaintpolicy-cleanrevisions-april2015.pdf</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>UCSD has a comprehensive set of policies and procedures for students to file complaints about discrimination (because of gender, disability, race, origin, age, religion, veteran status), violation of privacy rights, academic complaints (grade-related and not grade related), housing contracts, and police misconduct.</p> <p>Information is posted in the campus website and, system-wide policies are also posted on the UCOP's website. It is also referenced during student orientation programs.</p>
	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>Every policy document describes the process and identifies the responsible office.</p>
	<p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The policy documents clearly describe the process</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where?</p>
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>Appropriate campus offices track and monitor the implementation of the policy.</p>
	Comments:

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Carmen Sigler 11/22/19

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? http://registrar.ucsd.edu/catalog/01-02?pdfls/undpoli.pdf</p> <p>Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: The institution participates in the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Program (IGETC) and information is made available to potential transfer students on the Transfer Pathways website.</p>

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

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

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

Review Completed By: Carmen Sigler

Date: 11/26/19