

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM  
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW  
TO THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

OCTOBER 8-10, 2013

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

David J. Skorton  
President and Professor,  
Departments of Medicine,  
Medicine in Pediatrics  
and Biomedical Engineering  
Cornell University

Helen L. Chen  
Research Scientist  
Director of ePortfolio Initiatives  
Stanford University

Kenneth M. Doxsee  
Associate Vice Provost for Academic  
Affairs  
Professor of Chemistry  
University of Oregon

John Hildebrand  
Professor of Oceanography  
University of California, San Diego

Teresa M. Shaw, Assistant Chair  
Special Assistant to the President  
and Secretary to the Board of Trustees  
Pomona College

Richard Osborn  
Vice President/Staff Liaison, WASC

The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards for Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. 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 WASC website.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### SECTION 1: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of the Visit	1
Educational Effectiveness Review Report	2
Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review	5

### SECTION 2: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

<b>Essay One:</b> Analysis of Educational Effectiveness at the Institutional Level: Defining and Assessing General Education Learning Outcomes	8
<b>Essay Two:</b> Assessing Student Learning in the Major	15
<b>Essay Three:</b> Excellence in Graduate Education	21
<b>Special Topic Essays</b>	
Student Success	26
Academic Program Review	30
<b>Other Issues</b>	32
<b>Conclusion</b>	34
<b>SECTION 3: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	36

### APPENDIX

## OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

### Description of the Institution and Visit

The **University of California, Santa Barbara** is a public research university and one of the ten general campuses of the University of California system. It was founded in 1909 and is located near Santa Barbara, California in a suburban setting. Set up on a quarter-based academic calendar, the campus has a three-quarter average undergraduate student FTE of 17,828 and a graduate student FTE of 2,734, predominantly full time on the campus. The university is a comprehensive doctoral university and is organized into five colleges and schools. The campus has a faculty FTE of 963 (headcount of 1,054) and staff FTE of 5,046 (1,453 academic, 3,611 non-academic staff) with staff headcount at 8,812 (2,579 academic, 6,223 non-academic staff) in support of its missions. Bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees are offered.

UC Santa Barbara is a research-intensive university with growing national and international recognition for the quality of its programs across a variety of fields. UC Santa Barbara was ranked forty-first among "National Universities" and eleventh among public universities by *U.S. News & World Report's* 2014 rankings. The university was also ranked thirty-third worldwide by the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings* and thirty-fifth worldwide (sixth worldwide for engineering) by the *Academic Ranking of World Universities* in 2013. UC Santa Barbara is a member of the prestigious Association of American Universities.

UC Santa Barbara's accreditation was last reaffirmed in July 2001, with the Preparatory Review originally scheduled for spring 2011 and the Educational Effectiveness Review for spring 2012. The Commission granted an extension of the Preparatory Review to fall 2011, and the Commission letter of February 2012 extended the Educational Effectiveness Review to fall 2013. No off-campus or distance education programs were reviewed in connection with this visit, and no special follow-up visits were required.

The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) visit of October 8-10, 2013 was a follow up to a Capacity and Preparatory Review visit conducted October 11-13, 2011. For both visits, the chair

was David Skorton, President, Cornell University; for the 2013 EER visit, Skorton attended most but not all of the sessions via Skype videoconferencing. The rest of the team included Teresa Shaw, Pomona College, Ken Doxsee, University of Oregon, Helen Chen, Stanford University and John Hildebrand, University of California, San Diego. The team was accompanied by Richard Osborn, Vice President of WASC.

The visit included individual meetings with Chancellor Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas, and Vice Chancellor for Research Witherell. In addition, the visiting team met with the WASC steering committee, comprised of faculty and staff from UCSB, co-chaired by Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas and Academic Senate Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani.

Additional meetings focused on budget and planning context, general discussions of learning assessment, general education learning outcomes, general education writing assessment, undergraduate and graduate program learning outcome assessment, graduate excellence and career outcomes and student success and co-curricular programs. In each of these meetings, the visiting team met with faculty and staff, including selected department heads and deans. In addition, in selected meetings, students participated in the discussion.

Visiting team members met in separate, open sessions with staff, undergraduate students, faculty, and graduate students, as well as a smaller group of staff leaders.

At the end of the visit, the team chair spoke alone by telephone with Chancellor Yang to relate the general recommendations and then the entire visiting team met with the WASC steering committee to share commendations and recommendations.

### **Educational Effectiveness Review Report**

UC Santa Barbara submitted its Proposal for Review in 2009 and subsequently requested a revision of that proposal in light of the effects of the economic downturn on the resources of the University. WASC staff approved the proposal revision in May 2010, so that the original plan to

examine “enhancing undergraduate education through research” was modified to focus more broadly on defining and achieving excellence, and the proposal to examine “excellence in graduate education and planning for graduate growth” was modified to focus more broadly on excellence in graduate education. This modification of the Proposal was appropriate, given the fact that the budgetary crisis limited the prospects of both enhancing the capacity and resources for undergraduate research and increasing the number of graduate students. In addition, the shift in focus allowed the University to apply all of its energy and attention to making substantial progress in establishing and assessing learning outcomes across all programs, at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The Educational Effectiveness Review Report is well-written and well-organized, and clearly presents the current state of the University and key strategic issues. The report includes essays on three themes:

- Analysis of Educational Effectiveness at the Institutional Level: Defining and Assessing General Education Learning Outcomes
- Assessing Student Learning in the Major
- Excellence in Graduate Education

Two additional essays are devoted to “Student Success” and “Academic Program Review.” (This report of the visit team is organized to respond to each of these essays.) In addition, the University provided all data required for the EER report as well as additional materials to support each of the themes. The team found that it had information and data sufficient to evaluate the University’s progress since the CPR visit as well as the institutional commitments, culture, and resources directed toward educational effectiveness.

As elaborated further in this report, the team found that the UC Santa Barbara faculty and staff took this review process seriously and used the opportunity of the EER review to pursue inquiry into questions that matter deeply on their campus, at the same time moving the University forward in the assessment of student learning by establishing processes and resources to support these efforts into the future. The individual essays demonstrate not only the University's commitment to the success of its undergraduate and graduate students, but the capacity of its faculty and staff to engage in research concerning student learning and institutional effectiveness that is rigorous, sustained, and based on responsible use of evidence. The team found that the institutional research and planning office continues to be a strong partner in the University's overall planning efforts as well as the academic program review process, and that the research staff played a critical and appropriate role throughout this process. As the University moves forward with assessment of both program learning outcomes and General Education outcomes, and with the revised program review process, staff resources and expertise in research and data analysis will be critical.

The WASC Steering Committee included faculty leaders as well as key administrative staff who had direct influence and responsibility for the areas of focus represented in the report, including institutional research, graduate programs, General Education, writing, program review, co-curricular programs, and academic affairs. Beyond the Steering Committee, a broader group of faculty and staff was significantly engaged in the various inquiries represented in the report. The Academic Senate reviewed, provided feedback for, and approved all program learning goals. The team concluded that the level of faculty engagement was strong and broadly representative.

## **Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review**

The team report following the October 2011 CPR visit ended with the following recommendations in preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review:

- “Each of the departments involved in the pilot project for student learning outcomes should be able to show a) a final, approved set of learning goals, b) an approved program of assessment, and c) data and conclusions from at least one application of the assessment methods.
- Other departments should be able to show a) approved sets of learning goals, and b) concrete plans for assessing student achievement against those goals.
- The graduate program should be able to demonstrate concrete actions and processes that have been put in place to address the questions first raised in 2001 about career options for graduate students.
- We suggest that the undergraduate assessment effort exploit synergies that might exist between the outcomes approaches practiced in Engineering and the efforts being developed in other programs and departments.
- Progress should be made toward infrastructure and systems to support increased out-of-state student recruitment.”

Subsequently, in its letter of March 8, 2012, the WASC Commission expressed a level of “dissatisfaction” with the rate of progress at UC Santa Barbara regarding the assessment of student learning and the broad WASC expectations for educational effectiveness. The letter specified that by the time of the EER review the Commission expected “at a minimum that the four pilot studies will be completed and that all remaining undergraduate programs will have approved learning outcomes and assessment plans in place” and that “assessment work also needs to be extended to graduate-level programs and co-curricular activities.” In addition, the letter stated the expectation that UC Santa Barbara would approve “institution-wide learning goals” and “continue campus-wide discussions about general education as it works toward establishing these institutional-level outcomes.”

As elaborated in the report below, the team found through its review of the report and supporting materials, as well as its interviews on campus, that the University has met these expectations, and has made substantial, broad, and meaningful progress in response to the CPR team report and the Commission Letter. Specifically, the four pilot assessments have been completed and results analyzed, and the faculty in each program has articulated learning goals for its undergraduate and graduate degrees, and has developed initial assessment plans. All of these have been approved by the Academic Senate through its Committee on Learning Outcomes and Assessment (CLOA), in a thoughtful process that involved careful review and feedback. Assessment of student learning has been integrated into an already-strong program review process, and the new process takes effect this fall. With strong faculty participation and ownership, and with a collaborative and supportive approach that allowed faculty and staff leaders with more direct experience in assessment to advise others newer to learning outcomes assessment, learning goals have been developed and disseminated for the General Education program, and have been affirmed as representing the broader institutional goals of UC Santa Barbara. As part of this process, the University conducted an assessment of the writing requirement and developed writing rubrics that reflect different disciplinary expectations, again with significant faculty involvement. The team reviewed the assessment plans, writing assessment, and rubrics, and spoke with many faculty members about the impact of this work on their teaching and program planning (see below).

As the review report essay on student success illustrated, and as discussed at length below, the team found that UC Santa Barbara staff and faculty have responded to the Commission Letter's

expectations regarding co-curricular assessment and are engaged in and committed to the support of student success through co-curricular programs and resources. The team also reviewed plans for assessing the entire student affairs area (see below).

In relation to graduate education, the team learned from the review report and during its visit that the faculties in all programs have developed learning outcomes for their graduate degrees, and almost all of these have been approved by the Academic Senate. In addition, all graduate programs are on track to have assessment plans completed by the end of the fall quarter. At the same time, the University has focused energy around graduate student professional development, support of interdisciplinary work at the graduate level, and resources and programs for helping doctoral students think about and position themselves for careers that recognize and utilize their doctoral training but present alternatives to the traditional tenure-track faculty path. See below for a fuller discussion of graduate education.

In sum, the team found that the University has responded carefully and thoughtfully to the recommendations of the team report and the Commission letter.

## **II: EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS**

### **Essay One: Analysis of Educational Effectiveness at the Institutional Level: Defining and Assessing General Education Learning Outcomes**

This essay provides an overview of the products and processes that represent both the purpose of the General Education (GE) program at UC Santa Barbara as well as an ongoing culture of assessment around General Education learning outcomes. To accomplish these objectives, the General Education Work Group, appointed and endorsed by the Academic Senate for this purpose, intentionally took an approach that included multiple iterations of review and refinement before a final set of outcomes was determined and ultimately approved by the Undergraduate Council. This time-intensive work process was characterized by multiple methods including, for example, convening numerous focus groups and analyzing the syllabi and assignments for the top twenty courses used to fulfill GE requirements in each of the twelve subject areas. The end result was a set of learning outcomes that not only reflected the goals and objectives of General Education but also communicated a broader vision of the skills and competencies that students at UC Santa Barbara experience during their undergraduate learning careers.

In fact, the team learned that as the GE learning outcomes evolved, many on campus came to regard them as representing broader, institutional-level learning outcomes, or goals that the University would want to articulate for all of its students. As UC Santa Barbara's student population is heavily undergraduate (approximately 17,828 undergraduate student FTE and 2,734 graduate student FTE), this is perhaps not an inappropriate conclusion and represents the

University's commitment to undergraduate education. (At the same time, as the University continues to strengthen its graduate programs, doctoral research, and graduate program outcomes, the articulation of broader institutional goals that include graduate education and doctoral research would be a valuable undertaking.) The team reviewed the GE learning goals and found them to be ambitious, meaningful, and thoughtful. [CFR 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4]

### Writing Requirement Assessment

Armed with this set of newly defined GE learning outcomes, the GE Work Group carried out a study comparing the performance levels of students who satisfied the Area A GE writing requirement through different pathways, including placing out of the required GE course via Advanced Placement scores or taking the required course at varying times in the first two years. Following an approach that was similar to the process for defining the GE learning outcomes, the GE Work Group consulted with faculty colleagues and also held a four-hour workshop on articulating and understanding disciplinary writing conventions, which eventually resulted in a set of rubrics that were discipline- or multidiscipline-specific. The eight rubrics that were created were then tested with 340 student papers collected from writing requirement courses and analyzed by a group of twenty-one raters that included Writing Program faculty and graduate teaching assistants. The preliminary findings from the Writing Requirement assessment have already inspired investigation into the writing performances of particular student populations such as transfer students, and are being considered in decisions about possible policy changes regarding the Writing Requirement and how it is implemented. The team also heard from several faculty members about the effect of the writing analysis and the development of disciplinary-sensitive rubrics for the teaching and curricula in their programs. For example, the team learned

that one department has redesigned its B.A. curriculum to more fully address the goals made more explicit through the Writing Requirement assessment. [CFR 1.2, 2.4, 2.5]

Together, the processes for articulating the GE learning outcomes and conducting the assessment of the Writing Requirement have identified two important areas necessary to support ongoing and future assessment of General Education outcomes:

*Leadership and Advocacy for General Education and Assessment* –Throughout the visit, and particularly in meetings with faculty, the point was reiterated that the process of defining the General Education outcomes was faculty-led and ultimately faculty-owned. The strong leadership of the GE Work Group and its investment in fostering broad faculty involvement through individual and departmental outreach, has established a strong foundation and collaboration among faculty who share an openness and willingness to explore assessment-related questions. This kind of buy-in is not easy to initiate and to sustain, and continuing advocacy for General Education and assessment by the Academic Senate and also the Council on Assessment and Assessment Research Group will be necessary in order to further cultivate a culture of assessment at UC Santa Barbara. Moreover, if General Education is recognized as the foundational for the University’s overall institutional goals, ongoing oversight and leadership through both administrative attention and the faculty governance and committee structure are essential. [CFR 2.4, 4.6, 4.7]

*Assessment Resources and Expertise* – The significant progress made by the GE Work Group in a relatively short period of time is due in no small part to the efforts of the local assessment and

writing experts on campus. Several faculty members mentioned the usefulness of the workshops, the writing assessment study, and other assessment-related activities. The participating faculty gained a deeper understanding of how writing is taught in context and in discipline-specific settings as compared to teaching writing in General Education from a disciplinary lens. As mentioned earlier, these kinds of insights are informing the current redesign of one department's entire Bachelor of Arts program, and the team heard from several programs that the exercise of developing the rubrics has resulted in a careful scrutiny of disciplinary expectations and how those are communicated to students through grading of writing assignments. In addition, the fact that the number of faculty applications for assessment grants exceeded the number of grants that were available to be awarded is another measure of the impact of these kinds of workshops and programs. [CFR 2.4]

From offering both individual and departmental consultations to inviting external speakers to meet with faculty and campus leaders, these initiatives not only contribute knowledge and expertise but also provide opportunities for members of the campus community to discuss and share their questions and experiences with each other. The team notes, however, that many of these steps have been made fairly recently, and the success of these efforts depends on a kind of serendipitous concurrence of the particular interests and assistance of individual faculty members, graduate assistants, and assessment coaches. In order to continue to ensure that these kinds of opportunities are implemented most effectively and most broadly, the right process, structures, resources, as well as responsible individuals and groups must be clarified and affirmed.

Further Institutionalization

UC Santa Barbara has made tremendous strides towards ensuring greater transparency of the educational mission, specifically in General Education. Looking ahead, advancing the implementation of the General Education outcomes in practice should be a priority. The following are some areas that warrant further consideration:

*Alignment of Learning Outcomes with Existing and Future General Education Courses* - Given that there are approximately 800-1,000 courses currently certified as GE courses, the task of aligning learning outcomes with existing and future courses has already begun. The plan includes disseminating the learning outcomes to the department chairs and faculty so that they might use these outcomes as a means by which to examine how their department or program's current GE courses map to these new outcomes. An additional criterion for the GE designation is that a course must be taught at least three times in five years. Although the review and approval process for new GE courses and any proposed modifications to existing courses will require clear articulation of outcomes on the redesigned GE course proposal form, questions remain as to how this process of designating General Education courses will work and in what kind of time frame, for example: Will all current GE courses need to be re-certified according to the new learning outcomes? How will any imbalances in GE course offerings across the twelve subject areas be addressed to ensure that students have access to enough classes to meet their GE requirements in each area? The team believes that the development of clear recommendations and expectations for programs, as well as target dates for specific goals and milestones, will be important. [CFR 2.2, 2.7]

*Benefits and Communication to Stakeholders* - The articulation of GE learning outcomes has resulted in a framework that establishes a set of criteria for departments and programs to use when explaining their role in and contributions to undergraduate education at UC Santa Barbara. In addition to their use by faculty and administrators, the outcomes are helpful to the Admissions Office when determining GE course equivalency for transfer courses between institutions. The team heard that eventually, the learning outcomes will be disseminated more broadly to students through new student orientations, academic advising interactions, course syllabi, bulletins, and other online resources and publications. Particularly for faculty and advisors, the learning outcomes can also serve as talking points to explain to students how these courses fit into their academic program (and that they are not just requirements to check off or “get out of the way”). [CFR 2.3, 2.4]

The process of defining the GE learning outcomes and the rubrics that emerged from the writing assessment study has also had unanticipated benefits for the professional development of faculty as well as graduate students. The GE outcomes and rubrics are used as pedagogical tools to help communicate the objectives of the curriculum to new faculty and teaching assistants. These statements about the General Education that UC Santa Barbara is aspiring to deliver to its students, what this learning looks like, and how to measure it have led to a more intentional learning framework that carries forward into curricula redesign and the alignment of upper and lower division courses. Moreover, because many departments have lost faculty and class sizes have increased, the rubrics have been particularly useful in helping graduate students understand the grading standards and to ensure greater consistency across sections and courses. The team observed real excitement from faculty representatives of several departments, because the

processes of developing GE outcomes and expectations for writing in their disciplines allowed the faculty to articulate the “value and logic” of their curricula. At the same time, however, it appears that in order for these positive developments to be replicated throughout the University a structured approach built around planned outreach, target dates, and milestones will be effective. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 4.7]

*Assessment of Additional General Education Outcomes* - The General Education writing assessment study was not only a useful platform for designing a strategy for assessing GE learning but also resulted in a process that allowed individual faculty and departments to think more critically about the meaning of the GE outcomes for their specific discipline. While the GE Work Group is confident that the processes and methods developed during the writing requirement study can be generalized and adapted to meet the assessment needs of the other areas in the General Education program, careful consideration will need to be given to the sustainability and commitment of both faculty leadership and involvement as well as the support and resources needed to complete similarly thorough and meaningful assessments. The team observed that there are no clear plans for moving forward with the assessment of the other GE learning goals, and in fact there seemed to be a hesitation to be too directive or dictatorial with the faculty and programs. While the team believes that the collaborative and “organic” approach has been effective thus far, the team would strongly encourage the GE Work Group to develop, in consultation with faculty and administrative leadership, a coherent and sustainable plan for General Education assessment and to collaborate on the implementation and dissemination of this assessment work on GE learning goals across the University. Armed with a deeper understanding of the structure and framework for accomplishing these tasks, a timeline for

prioritizing both the goals and resources for the design and implementation of future GE assessment activities is necessary. [CFR 2.4]

In summary, it is obvious that UC Santa Barbara possesses a strong commitment to General Education and to a culture of assessment that is significant and meaningful for both faculty and students.

### **Essay Two: Assessing Student Learning in the Major**

The essay describes a commendable level of progress since receipt of the CPR report, its recommendations, and the Commission letter. Every academic program has established well-reasoned sets of program learning outcomes (PLOs) through a rigorous process of drafting, review, and revision (CFR 2.3). Significant support structures were established to provide guidance and assistance, particularly the Council on Assessment (primarily faculty) and the Assessment Research Group (primarily staff); both structures arose organically as natural supports for the evolving program (CFR 4.6). New permanent staff positions, including an Associate Dean and an institutional research analyst in the Graduate Division and two analyst positions associated with the Assessment Research Group, were created specifically to support the assessment efforts. Assessment approaches and efforts evolved appropriately and thoughtfully in response to observations and needs as they arose, including a significant change made to enhance the agility of the approval process (CFR 4.4). Faculty buy-in was fostered through the creative choice to frame assessment as a response to meaningful and researchable questions about students and their learning (CFR 2.4). A competitive assessment grant program that provided financial assistance to programs seeking to move their fledgling efforts forward also encouraged engagement. Grant recipients and the original four pilot departments have made

substantial progress, making important observations that have already led to reforms that will enhance the undergraduate experience (CFR 4.7). This effort too has been highlighted in part by its flexibility, with some grant recipients substantially revising their initial hypotheses and approaches following initial data collection. Specific examples of these findings and reforms are presented below. Leaders of the effort feel the program has already been incorporated into the institutional DNA and will be continued regardless of personnel changes.

Program-level learning outcomes (PLOs) were reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate, while the assessment plans incorporating these PLOs were reviewed by the newly-formed Council on Assessment, which then worked with departments to refine the plans. This modified approval structure adopted in order to allow the plans to be more dynamic. The team concluded that this approach, while thoughtful may run the risk of establishing the initial round of PLOs as static drivers of assessment efforts, when in fact initial assessments may lead to a desire to reconsider the PLOs themselves. The team was very impressed with the extent to which the undergraduate PLO effort appears to be poised to impact the graduate program as well. For example, in a remarkable display of engagement, graduate teaching assistants in one program have adopted the PLOs and begun incorporating them in their own teaching.

The PLOs are available to faculty and students through a web site and in various other print and electronic documents. In the interests of transparency to students, development of course-level outcomes and/or the keying of course outcomes to broader programmatic (or General Education) goals and specifying these outcomes on course syllabi, could be of value, particularly if they are thoughtfully crafted and presented in terms that might resonate with students (CFR 1.2).

Faculty from across the institution were effectively engaged in every stage of the process, and both the depth and breadth of engagement is clearly apparent. Leaders of the effort are vocal, enthusiastic, and energetic – their spark will help to ignite the efforts of others across the campus. The impacts of their efforts are reaching beyond the institution as well, with a new all-UC group of assessment personnel established to share information and best practices (CFR 4.8).

Grant recipients are carrying out studies that may serve as models for other departments approaching the assessment effort with greater trepidation. Importantly, significant enthusiasm – evident both in the overall response to the call for proposals and in the on-going commitment of those faculty groups that were not successful – suggests that the intrinsic merit of assessment effort is seen. The team found no evidence for the development of a “pay us to play” mentality.

- The pilot studies of Economics and Economics and Accounting students revealed a dismayingly low likelihood of successful transition of transfer students into these majors. While the assessment project did not necessarily directly relate to the PLOs identified for these majors, the observations have been translated into action plans that promise to enhance the learning and success for all students. In addition, concrete action was taken in the form of a formal request for revision to the transfer policy, in essence representing a “truth in advertising” approach that will encourage those students least likely to be successful to consider other options (CFR 2.14).
- The Biology pilot, interrogating the motives of students repeating courses, similarly addressed a question that, while both important and interesting, does not directly align with the specific PLOs. Observations are being translated into early intervention planning for at-risk students and to considerations of curricular reform in the introductory course

sequence. These valuable outcomes are particularly commendable for a department that apparently began the process with a skeptical, “We don’t have any problems.”

- History’s pilot exemplified versatility, in that the original focus was abandoned in the face of irresolvable complexity of analysis. By addressing curricular mapping to the PLOs, the History pilot directly addresses the PLO effort, though it has not yet led to actual assessments of student learning. To some extent, that future effort might be guided by a considered response to the hypothetical situation of a student saying, “I appreciate the clear identification of learning outcomes for this course. How am I doing in achieving each of them?” (CFR 2.5)

It is early in the process, with many of these developments having occurred only since the CPR visit, but an impressive mobilization of effort and creation of infrastructure is apparent. Carrying these initial efforts through – closing the loop when possible in these pilot studies, and looking for ways to disseminate effective approaches and meaningful discoveries more broadly – will help to drive continued expansion of the efforts. Importantly, the initial assessment efforts, framed in the form of interrogation of interesting questions, have panned out, leading to the development of a compendium of compelling anecdotes regarding the value of assessment. In the end, it is this recognition of value that will be most effective in ensuring continued engagement and progress. This said, it will be essential to ensure that the assessment activities are designed to explore the PLOs. Some departments are nicely aligning their efforts with their PLOs. For example, Chemical Engineering targeted technical writing skills, and History analyzed the types of assignments that can best help to develop the skills identified as their PLOs. Others, however, have addressed interesting questions, but the connection of these questions to the PLOs is not always clear. If it becomes apparent that vitally important studies are warranted but appear

disconnected from the PLOs, the program should consider the possibility that they might wish to reframe their PLOs so that they more directly connect to these issues of perceived great importance. In short, the framing of “assessment questions” represents an excellent “hook” for faculty engagement; a further step should be to garner comparable faculty enthusiasm for the PLOs (CFR 2.5, 2.6).

A substantial and critical review of assessment planning is now included as a component of the periodic program review process, a process that is clearly viewed by the faculty and administration as a very important and potentially revenue-impacting event (CFR 2.7). Anecdotes abound of critical program reviews leading to painful decisions regarding departmental staffing, including the potential loss of faculty lines. Given the current uneven development of departmental assessment plans, however, the team wonders whether primary reliance on program review, which occurs on an eight-year cycle, will be sufficient to ensure steady progress. The team reviewed program learning outcomes and assessment plans. While each plan appears to present a thoughtful set of learning outcomes, consistent with the rigor of the Academic Senate approval process, the full assessment plans are in a number of cases deficient in, or even wholly lacking, the identification of concrete assessment activities that would allow evaluation of success in achieving the identified learning outcomes. One program, for example, notes that they have no methodologies in place beyond the assignment of grades for exams and courses. Another program representative reported, on the other hand, that the faculty was currently aligning program requirements and the curriculum as a whole as a result of engagement with their PLOs. If the assessment element of the program review process is to carry the same weight and authority as the other evaluative elements of that important process, it is

critical that each department develop real approaches – both direct and indirect – and begin to apply them, so that by the time of program review there is a realistic possibility for data to have been collected, analyzed, and used. The team notes that a significant body of indirect assessment data is available through the annual UCUES student survey; enhanced awareness of the survey and the range of data available may be useful (CFR 2.10).

In this context, the team notes that while important support structures have been developed – in particular, the Council on Assessment and the Assessment Research Group, it seems apparent that these groups will need to reach out proactively to departments rather than simply wait for their assistance to be recruited. Continued “motivation” will be required to keep the early momentum going, and it seems clear that substantial assistance will be required in the development of appropriate assessments for the PLOs. As one faculty member remarked, the process of writing of PLOs itself does not change anything; change come through the use of PLOs in order to gauge success, to understand, and to revise.

The remarkably knowledgeable and dedicated staff, placed in new and permanent positions, and the popularity and effectiveness of the grant program bode well for future progress. When superimposed on the apparent enormity of the General Education assessment effort, however, the sustainability of the effort becomes a question. With a significant proportion of faculty most willing to engage in the assessment program perhaps having already done so, the ability to move programmatic assessment efforts forward may be at some risk, especially given the fledgling level of development of many of the assessment plans. A critical issue for sustainability will be ensuring a continued focus on the intrinsic value of the work and the impacts not only on student

learning but on faculty time and energy. It is encouraging that junior faculty members appear confident that their assessment efforts will be received favorably by their colleagues and by promotion and tenure committees. They feel that the assessment effort is directly connected to teaching effectiveness, a matter that is critically appraised in the promotion and tenure process (CFR 4.6).

### **Essay Three: Excellence in Graduate Education**

In the CPR Report of 2011, the visiting team noted that UC Santa Barbara was well positioned to review and adapt its graduate education based on student achievement. What was lacking, however, were formal learning outcomes and assessment metrics for each graduate degree (CFRs 1.2, 2.3 and 4.4). The expectation for the EER visit was that for every department and degree program, learning outcomes and assessment tools would be developed.

Subsequent to the CPR Report, UC Santa Barbara undertook a series of steps to develop learning outcomes for its graduate degrees. A new associate graduate dean position was created to assist with learning outcome development (CFR 3.1). At the time of the EER review, all sixty-eight graduate degrees had proposed learning outcomes to the Grad Council for review, and sixty-five of these had been approved (CFR 3.11). In addition, twelve programs had also completed final assessment plans, with the rest expected by end of fall term 2013. The priority for development of assessment plans was especially applied to programs approaching their program review, as completed assessment plans will now be required as a component of the review, and visiting teams will be asked to evaluate the program's success in the assessment of learning outcomes, for both undergraduate and graduate programs. The Associate Dean of the Graduate School will

serve as an assessment resource for programs as they approach and prepare for review (CFR 2.7).

It was apparent from discussions with faculty that they were able to see the value of the effort (CFR 4.6). In one program, for example, the faculty first used a survey of students and alumni to identify issues with the current program (CFR 2.10, 4.8). Students indicated that they wanted more guidance on completion of their degrees, so a mentorship program was established (CFR 4.7). The students also wanted more career opportunities, so the department developed a network of alumni to engage with current students. Another change they implemented was more rigorous Teaching Assistant training. The survey results addressed and suggested revisions to the learning outcomes, a good demonstration of using the results of assessment (CFR 4.4).

Other program representatives described the ways in which the process of identifying graduate learning outcomes had made certain gaps obvious. For example, one doctoral program implemented teacher training after they found that pedagogy was a desired outcome but no training was offered. Another graduate advisor reported that as she and her faculty colleagues identified learning outcomes and expectations for graduate degree programs, they realized that they should track student progress more carefully and communicate more frequently with graduate students about their progress to degree. As such they implemented an annual review of every student's progress. Other programs with specialty accreditation (e.g., Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology) already had assessment plans at an advanced state, as part of their professional degree accreditation; they expressed satisfaction that the campus-wide process now in place created a "common language" for program assessment. In summary, UC Santa Barbara

has made a substantial effort to create learning outcomes for all of its graduate degrees, and is undertaking development of assessment tools. The key issues going forward will be continuation and sustainability of these efforts.

In the CPR Report of 2011, the visiting team also noted that UC Santa Barbara “must learn more about student career outcomes; ... must deliver the information and provide professional training to prepare students for the workplace.” In addition the report asked that attention be paid to “analysis of departmental structures and procedures to assist the student with support, timely progress and completion to degree. ... Specifically, the difficulties of working collaboratively between departments should be resolved.”

Since 2011, the UC Santa Barbara Graduate Division has made a concerted effort to find individuals that received their graduate degrees at UC Santa Barbara since 1963 (CFR 2.10). Current addresses were obtained for over 50% of these graduates, and their career status was determined. These data were compiled into a series of statistical graphs that give the career outcomes in terms of employment in the following categories: Academic, Private Section, Government, Postdoc, and Not Employed. The data were further subdivided within the Academic Employment category as: Tenure-Track Faculty, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, Researcher, and Administration/Staff. The categories were separated temporally into groups according to the number of years since degree completion. The data are available on the Graduate Division website for doctoral recipients, by department (CFR 2.12). The latter links can be found under: <http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/departments/>. Included in the departmental listings is a comprehensive list of names of the alumni employers. These data suggest that about half of

UC Santa Barbara doctoral alumni are employed in academia, and about one-third are employed in the private sector.

The Graduate Division has done an admirable job in both collecting these data and in presenting them in an accessible and comprehensible manner. They are a significant resource for potential graduate school applicants to examine when making decisions about enrolling in a graduate degree program. The EER visit revealed that UC Santa Barbara intends to maintain this database and keep it current. Along these lines, the University initiated an annual Job Outcomes Survey, which requires that academic departments report the placement of their doctoral graduates from the preceding academic year (CFR 2.10). The Graduate Division has also asked academic department chairs to provide career and contact information for doctoral graduates and make the career data available on the departmental websites. The campus also plans to develop means for keeping graduate alumni connected with their departments, for instance, using electronic networking. The survey of departmental doctoral alumni will become part of each department's periodic Academic Program Review (CFR 2.7). UC Santa Barbara has shown leadership in graduate education with its serious attention to collecting information on graduate student career outcomes and making the information available (CFR 2.10, 2.12).

The CPR team report also asked that graduate students be exposed to a broad range of professional development that would prepare them to enter a variety of labor markets, beyond academia. In response, the Graduate Division has been sponsoring professional development workshops and other resources for students to help them better prepare for multidisciplinary careers. The Graduate Division website has been redesigned to give a more prominent role to

career development. In particular, there is now a career and professional development page (<http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/profdev/index.aspx>), as well as a page that provides information on all the requirements for obtaining a graduate degree (<http://www.graddiv.ucsb.edu/academic/index.aspx>). In addition, a graduate student blog has been created (<http://gradpost.ucsb.edu/>) that gives information on career-related events and opportunities for career networking (CFR 2.13). Perusal of the gradpost blog revealed a nearly steady stream of opportunities for professional development including: academic job market webinar, micro-teaching workshop, dissertation writing workshop, and intellectual property and start-up workshops on successive days. Graduate student leaders (e.g. Graduate Student Association) reported that they have a rich educational experience (CFR 2.5).

The Graduate Student Showcase is an annual event that presents graduate student research to the wider UC Santa Barbara community. The central event of the showcase is the “Grad Slam,” a campus-wide competition for the best three-minute presentation on graduate student research. There are research fund prizes awards to the top three presenters. The Grad Slam winner for 2012-2013, a graduate student in the Materials Science Department, presented a description of his research on novel devices for treatment of disease and connection to entrepreneurial opportunities. These programs are all evidence for development of graduate student communication and other networking skills (CFR 2.8).

The CPR team report also mentioned the particular challenges for graduate students who wish to pursue their degree collaboratively between departments, and that the difficulties of working collaboratively between departments should be resolved. Along these lines, UC Santa Barbara

has instituted a pilot program, called Crossroads, that provides doctoral students with a year-long interdisciplinary research experience, including development of new undergraduate course materials (CFR 2.9). Crossroads projects involve three faculty members from at least two different departments. Each project provides one year of fellowship support for three to five graduate students. The students receive full fellowship support for two quarters and serve as TAs in the third quarter of the project. The goal of Crossroads is to facilitate collaboration and development of interdisciplinary research projects. During the EER visit a faculty member from the Bren School involved in Crossroads described a project that had resulted in increased collaboration and graduate student interdisciplinary research. The project involved five PhD fellows and five faculty members, working together for both research and teaching in the areas of psychology, environmental science and management (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

### **Special Essay: Student Success**

UC Santa Barbara has strengthened its commitment to understand and support the success of all students but especially in relation to the low-income, first-generation students with Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) eligibility. In the 2011 CPR report, foundational work was conducted to identify the characteristics of the undergraduate students that enroll at UC Santa Barbara and recognizing critical milestones in the academic trajectory where program interventions or additional resources could be introduced. Many of the ideas that were initially proposed, such as targeted advising and expanded uses of technological tools have been implemented with positive results.

UC Santa Barbara has continued to gather data on retention, graduation, and academic probation rates with special attention given to evaluating the success of EOP students. Since the 2011 CPR

report, these indicators of student success have shown positive gains in graduation and retention rates, particularly for EOP students. Both the four-year and six-year graduation rates for UC Santa Barbara's freshmen-entry undergraduates have steadily increased over the last decade for both EOP and non-EOP students. Compared to the graduation rates of the American Association of Universities (AAU) public institution average, 66% of UC Santa Barbara's 2005 first-time freshmen cohort completed their degree in four years or less vs. AAU's 54%. The six year graduation rate was also slightly higher (80% vs. AAU's 78%). [CFR 1.2, 2.10]

Most striking are the graduation rates for transfer students, which have improved from 41% for the transfer cohort that entered in fall 1999 to 70% of the 2010 entering transfer class completing their degrees within two years of first matriculation. Again, both EOP and non-EOP transfer students have also showed comparable gains from 36% (EOP) and 42% (non-EOP) in fall 1999 to 66% (EOP) and 71% (non-EOP) for the fall 2010 cohort. While there remains a gap between EOP and non-EOP students for four-year graduation rates, trend data suggests that this gap is closing in the most recent entering freshmen classes. As evidence of this possible trend, the percentage of the fall 2009 EOP transfer students who graduated within three years was identical to the rate of non-EOP transfer students in that year. There were similar reductions in the gap between freshmen-entry EOP and non-EOP students with respect to academic probation rates, from 24% for students who entered in 2007, 2008, and 2009 to 19% for students who entered in 2010 and 2011. [CFR 1.2, 2.10]

In response to the findings reported in UC Santa Barbara's 2011 CPR report, the University took steps to facilitate easier access to advising resources in the College of Letters and Sciences.

Strategic deployment of technology resources has also resulted in greater access and more widespread support for all students, from online orientations for students who are unable to come to campus to virtual advising via Skype and Adobe Connect. The team heard about other impressive efforts to support student retention and success of all students, including analysis of retention by in-state vs. out-of-state students and tracking of nearly every student who “stops out,” so that the staff can identify students who eventually complete their degrees elsewhere. The impact of these initiatives is seen in the reported satisfaction with the overall UC Santa Barbara experience of graduating seniors as compared to other students in the UC system. According to the UC accountability report, UC Santa Barbara has the highest proportion of students in the UC system who state they are satisfied or very satisfied and the lowest proportion of students who say they are dissatisfied. [CFR 2.12, 2.13, 2.14]

The diversity of co-curricular program offerings is notable, especially those initiatives to support undergraduate and graduate involvement in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math through research and fellowship opportunities as well as outreach and professional development programs in the community, particularly around science. Additional offerings include a freshman summer start program open to EOP students and financial literacy workshops. The dedicated efforts of staff members in the office of admissions and the Student Academic Support Services to support and engage transfer students, undocumented students, first generation students, non-residents, international students, and foster youth in the Guardian Scholars from application to graduation are most impressive. Many of these co-curricular initiatives fall within Student Affairs and reinforce the critical need to advance the plans for a division-wide assessment effort

(discussed in the EER report, page 35), in order to better understand and evaluate the impact of these time-intensive programs on student success. [CFR 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14]

While assessment planning in the Division of Student Affairs is in its early stages, the preliminary findings emerging from the collaboration between the Campus Learning Assistance Services (CLAS) and the Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) group are extremely promising as a model for how data can be shared across divisions to inform the design of interventions and services to better support students. One example of the potential of these kinds of collaborations was evident in one proposal to the Howard Hughes Medical Institute to investigate the factors influencing persistence and retention of EOP students in the biological sciences. This data-driven proposal was strengthened by evidence documenting the retention rates of EOP vs. non-EOP students, which was provided by IRPA in partnership with EOP colleagues. The IRPA group has compiled student success data over time from various sources including surveys of enrolled students, graduating seniors, students who have chosen to stop-out, and alumni. More important than knowing that these data exist and are available, is the fact that through groups such as the Council on Assessment and Assessment Research Group, faculty members know who to contact in order to access these data. [CFR 1.5, 2.10, 4.5, 4.7]

Triangulation of data to inform organizational planning and decision making in academic and co-curricular areas is made possible because of the collaborative culture that pervades the UC Santa Barbara campus. This is most obvious in the partnerships that have developed among the organizations in both the academic and student affairs divisions including faculty, IRPA,

enrollment services, the business intelligence committee, and student academic support services.

[CFR 4.5]

UC Santa Barbara has continued to make significant progress in advancing a broad diversity of advising resources, programs, and other tailored interventions aimed at supporting the success of all students but especially EOP-eligible students as well as international students, transfer students, students formerly in foster care, and undocumented students. The impact of these collaborations that have emerged across divisions as a result of this shared commitment to student success are evidenced in both impressive graduation and retention rates as well as reported student satisfaction with the UC Santa Barbara experience.

### **Special Essay: Academic Program Review**

In the 2011 CPR visit, the visiting team concluded that UC Santa Barbara's institutional program review process is "mature, well-developed, and well-executed." The introductory portion of this essay and the sample program review notebooks provided for examination, which present a truly encyclopedic analysis of virtually every aspect of each department, further establish the strength of this process (CFR 2.10, 4.5).

The essay moves beyond the content of the CPR visit, highlighting the ways in which the results of program review are used to formulate and follow through with meaningful and significant program modifications and improvements. The weight and impact of the program review process are clear and unambiguous. Comprehensive curricular reform, elimination of majors, and gain or loss of faculty lines and other resources all represent real outcomes of the process. In this light, the incorporation of programmatic assessment as a critical element of program review represents

a seemingly powerful and effective means of ensuring that appropriate attention is paid to assessment (CFR 2.7). The revised program review process injects assessment of student learning at four key stages of the review: 1) The data notebook prepared to support each academic unit's preparation of its self-study report will include a listing of current Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and assessment activities targeting them, as well as a summary of findings from these activities. 2) Academic units will be directed to include critical discussions of PLOs and their assessment in the self-study. 3) The external review committee will be specifically charged to carry out a critical analysis of the PLOs, the assessment activities, and the unit's response to any findings from these activities. 4) Internal committees, including the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils, will make recommendations to the unit and/or to the Executive Vice Chancellor regarding follow-up reviews, monitoring, or, in rare occasions, action to address significant deficiencies. (As a side note, the team was impressed to learn that a department expressed disappointment in the timing of their program review given their inability to include their newly formulated program learning outcomes in their review notebooks.)

As of our October, 2013 EER visit, the revised process is only beginning to be implemented in new program reviews, and thus there are no completed reviews to examine in which assessment planning and outcomes were included. The "next steps" identified in the essay represent soundly-reasoned and important directions in which to move. To this list, we must append an additional critical item, namely proactive outreach by the Council on Assessment and/or the Assessment Research Group to programs still in the early stages of assessment planning. As we discussed in detail in our response to the essay on student learning in the major, while each program has thoughtfully developed lists of PLOs, there is considerable variability in the quality of planning

of actual assessment activities by which to ascertain success at imparting these PLOs to students. Moreover, the individual program assessment plans as we reviewed them include a statement that they are *not* road maps for the assessment portion of the program review process, so the alignment and the role of assessment in preparation for the program review are not clear.

The program review process is long-standing, robust, and multi-year as it is, but without active outreach to programs, specific targets, and structural benchmarks, the team sees a risk—for some areas—of inadequate progress during the eight-year program review cycle. Last-minute attempts to deal with assessment will be destined to lead to disappointing coverage of assessment in the review process, and this will be glaringly obvious given the high level of rigor and thoughtfulness each other component of the program review engenders. In short, for program review to serve as the key driver for progress in program-level assessment, the expectations for this component of the review must be every bit as rigorous as those for the other elements of the review. This will require consistent focus throughout the 8-year cycle, just as do matters of teaching and research excellence.

### **Other Issues**

As a result of conversations with members of the UC Santa Barbara community during the campus visit, the team highlights the following additional issues for consideration.

#### Strategic Planning

During its visit the team discussed the Long-Range Development Plan currently under review by the California Coastal Commission and its relationship to the Academic Strategic Plan, which was approved in 2007 for the period to 2025. In light of both the economic and budgetary

challenges of recent years as well as the potential benefits to UCSB from state Proposition 30 and the University of California re-benching process, the team encourages the University to consider updating the Strategic Academic Plan, with a focus on continued alignment of any planning for growth with academic goals and vision (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

### Succession Planning

The team discussed the issue of the sustainability and long-term success of the culture of inquiry and assessment of student learning with several groups and individuals during the campus visit. Many faculty and staff members expressed confidence that the carefully-structured processes, additional dedicated staff resources, faculty involvement, and accountability that have been put in place over the past three years will ensure vitality and effectiveness in the assessment of learning outcomes specifically and the institutional culture more broadly. At the same time, the team is aware that the long-term success of these initiatives will depend on committed leadership and shared vision. It will be important over the next several years for UCSB to plan carefully for succession in leadership positions that have responsibility for planning, resource allocation, institutional research, accreditation, assessment, and program review, in order to maintain momentum toward the priorities established in the Educational Effectiveness report (CFR 1.3, 3.8, 4.2, 4.6).

### Staff Concerns

During the 2011 visit for the University's Capacity and Preparatory Review the team learned of significant (10%) reductions in staffing levels brought on by the university's responses to the economic downturn and budgetary reductions in the University of California, and heard about

resulting stress from the staff members who met with the visit team. The budgetary outlook has since improved following the passage of Proposition 30 and the current “re-benching” underway at the University of California (which will bring a higher level of per-student state support to UC Santa Barbara). In its 2013 open meeting with staff and discussions with staff leaders, however, the team learned of a general perception that while the budgetary outlook may have improved, things have not and are not going to get better for staff. The team heard that the layoffs and retirements resulted in the loss of staff expertise and capacity, stressful workloads, and financial uncertainty, with no apparent plans to regain some of what was lost. In a related issue, staff members reported that while the UC system is implementing economies of scale through centralized systems for payroll, procurements, and other business processes, there has been insufficient communication with or the engagement of the front-line staff members who are responsible for these processes. In short, the team heard that the staff perceives that it has taken the brunt of the budgetary crisis and remains a low priority as the University recovers. As UCSB plans for growth in FTE and faculty size, it will therefore be important to consider carefully the appropriate levels of staff and staff capacity to support and facilitate its aspirations (CFR 1.8, 3.1, 3.10, 4.2).

### **Conclusion**

As a result of its research, its review of materials, and its conversations during the campus visit, the visiting team was impressed by the overall health and strength of the University of California, Santa Barbara, its capacity to deliver and support high-quality undergraduate and graduate education, and its ongoing commitment to the effectiveness of its programs and the success of its students. In addition, reflecting a core commitment to educational effectiveness, the UC Santa Barbara faculty and staff have, in recent years, created a sound structure and

healthy process for assessment of learning outcomes. By articulating clear processes and committee responsibilities, increasing personnel and institutional research capacity, and grounding assessment of student learning in a program review process that is widely-respected and linked to planning and financial resource allocations, the University has established a sustainable and meaningful assessment framework. Moreover, the faculty and staff have demonstrated their capacity for ongoing assessment by the pilot projects and writing requirement analysis conducted in relation to the WASC review process.

Many of these processes, including the new program review process, the assessment of General Education learning outcomes, and in particular the assessment of student learning in individual programs and majors, have only very recently been enacted. The next several years will be critical for the vitality and sustainability of all that the University has worked so hard to put into place—and results should be seen, disseminated, and acted upon—in the areas of program reviews under the new structure, completed assessment cycles for the General Education learning outcomes, and program-level assessment projects. Consistent attention through both collaborative and informal networks as well as formal committee structures, processes, and staffing resources, will be essential. We encourage the University to prioritize leadership in research, planning, and the assessment of student learning as senior-level staff positions are filled and resources are allocated moving forward.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Commendations and Recommendations

#### Commendations:

1. The University's work over the past three years to develop learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate programs and for general education has involved an iterative process that is faculty led, and has put in place well-articulated structures, processes, and personnel. In the same way, the writing assessment tool developed in relation to general education is nuanced and flexible, and has been driven by faculty and program needs.
2. We have seen not only strong support from senior leadership but, more important, widespread faculty buy-in and even enthusiasm for the process of establishing PLOs and pursuing program-specific assessment. The projects we learned about in the report and during our visit begin with "researchable questions" and are aimed at the improvement of student learning and program effectiveness.
3. The University's historical commitment to undergraduate education is reflected in and strengthened by the efforts to understand student learning and continually improve programs and curricula.
4. We observed a strong culture of collaboration in multiple areas.

5. We commend the University's successes in graduate education and doctoral-level research, and the efforts to further improve graduate programs through innovative interdisciplinary opportunities and attention to outcomes and career paths.
6. The UCSB faculty and staff demonstrate a commitment to success for *all* students and an understanding of the needs of different student populations, including: international students, transfer students, EOP students, students formerly in foster care, and undocumented students. The results of this support for student success and individualized attention are demonstrated in the University's retention and graduation rates.

Recommendations:

1. While the structures and personnel that have been put in place to support ongoing assessment of learning outcomes at the graduate and undergraduate level are coherent and substantial, the processes themselves are only recently being implemented, and there are few completed assessment cycles at this time, at least outside of departments and programs that have separate accreditation by bodies that require learning outcomes assessment. In order to ensure continued progress and the long-term sustainability of what has been built, we recommend that the UCSB faculty and staff develop a process and a timeline with target dates and specific goals for assessing each of the learning outcomes of the General Education program, building on the success of the writing requirement assessment, and establish direct and indirect assessment activities that appropriately address the *program-level* learning outcomes.

2. The program review process (PRP) at UCSB is strong and distinctive, and links to other planning processes and resource allocations. Integrating evaluation of the program's assessment of learning outcomes into the program review should ensure sustainability and increase the effectiveness and credibility of assessment. As of this October 2013 campus visit, the revised process is only beginning to be implemented with new program reviews, and there are no completed reviews to examine. The team also recognizes that programs are at different stages of development in their assessment plans. This piece of the PRP should be as robust as other elements. We recommend therefore that the institution ensure that programs will be able successfully to integrate assessment of learning into the review process.
3. The team heard in 2011 about the severe cuts to staff at UCSB, and concerns arising from this were again expressed in this visit. With the apparently improving budgetary projections, we recommend a critical evaluation of faculty and staff hiring, and appropriate alignment of workload with staff capacity.
4. We recommend that the University engage in succession-planning, particularly at the level of leaders with responsibility for and oversight of planning, resource-allocation, program review, accreditation, and assessment of student learning.



## STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW: TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: University of California, Santa Barbara  
Date: October 2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments</b> (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	<b>Verified Yes/No</b>
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a formal policy on student complaints?	YES
	Comments:	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?	YES
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	
	Comments:	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?	YES
	Comments:	

**MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW: TEAM REPORT APPENDIX**

Institution: University of California, Santa Barbara  
 Date: October 2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

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

\*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.