

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

ACCREDITATION REVIEW

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-DAVIS

April 9-11, 2014

Team Roster

Gerald L. Bepko – Chair
IUPUI Chancellor Emeritus, IU Trustee Professor and Professor of Law

Cecilia A. Conrad, Assistant Chair
Vice President, MacArthur Fellows Program, MacArthur Foundation
Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Pomona College

Chris M. Golde
Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Education
Stanford University

Michael L. Jackson
Vice President Emeritus and Professor of Higher Education

G. Steven Martin
Dean of Biological Sciences and Professor, Department of Molecular and Cell Biology
University of California, Berkeley

Jeannette E. South-Paul
Professor and Chair of Family Medicine
University of Pittsburgh - Pittsburgh Campus

Barbara Gross Davis – Vice President
WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 WASC Senior College and University 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.

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 I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
Description of the Institution and the Reaccreditation Process.....	3
Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor	5
Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission Actions and Reviews.....	6
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS.....	6
ESSAY 1-2: Meaning, Quality and Rigor of the Degree/Graduation Proficiencies.....	6
Meaning, Quality and Rigor of the Degree	7
Graduation Proficiencies: Student Learning and Program Review.....	9
ESSAY 3: Defining and promoting “student success”	12
Student Graduation and Retention.....	13
Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Collaboration	15
ESSAY 4: Ensuring institutional capacity and effectiveness in the future, and planning for the changing environment for higher education	15
SECTION III: Commendations and Recommendations.....	18
APPENDICES	22
Compliance Audit Checklist for Reaccreditation	22
Credit Hour and Program Length Review Checklist.....	29
Student Complaints Review Checklist.....	32
Marketing and Recruitment Review Checklist.....	34
Transfer Credit Review Checklist	35
Off-Campus Site Visit Report	36

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of the Institution and the Reaccreditation Process

University of California-Davis (UCD) has recently celebrated its centennial and is a strong member of the University of California's system of higher education. Founded in 1905 as a University Farm (an experimental site for the College of Agriculture at University of California, Berkeley) and designated as a stand-alone UC campus in 1959, UCD embraces and celebrates its history as a land grant institution charged with teaching agriculture, among other 'mechanical arts,' and broadening access for all segments of society to higher education that is both liberal and practical. (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.6, 3.9)

UCD's undergraduate programs have been ranked by *US News and World Report* as 8th among public universities and 38th overall. In the 2010 National Research Council Assessment of US Doctoral Programs one third of UCDs programs ranked in the top 25%. The amount of external support for research places UCD at the same general level as other UC campuses, such as UC Berkeley and UCLA. On the research side, grants and contracts in 2013 were nearly \$750 million -- a record for UC Davis. This trajectory leads to an aspiration for UCD to be a pre-eminent leader of higher education that is driven by its land grant heritage to provide broad access to a socially relevant world-class education. Chancellor Katehi, who is in her fifth year at UCD, has articulated a *Vision of Excellence* ten-year plan to be recognized as one of the nation's top-tier public research universities. (CFR 1.2, 1.3, 1.6, 3.10. 4.1, 4.2)

UCD has remained true to the land grant tradition by serving increasingly diverse student populations in top-ranked agricultural and engineering programs, biological sciences, mathematical and physical sciences, as well as the social sciences and humanities. It also has highly regarded professional schools. A new school, the Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing, opened in 2010. The common thread across schools and programs is the shared goal of solving society's problems, and UCD's success is evident in its growth both in size and in prominence. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

UC Davis received a record number of undergraduate applications for the 2013 academic year, a jump of 11.4 percent, and is attracting more diverse applicants. Those from historically under-represented groups increased 12.5 percent, first-generation applicants were up 30 percent and low-income applicants were up 15 percent. UCD's enrollments have increased steadily. The fall term 2012 enrollment was 33,300, of which roughly 77% were undergraduates, 13% were graduate students, and 6% were in health science programs, with the remainder in professional programs. (CFR 1.5)

Against this momentum for UCD is a troubled national economy that has reduced the flow of public funds to higher education in many states, especially in California. UCD will have a \$40 million dollar structural deficit because of fixed pension and health care costs, and the UC system experienced as much as a one billion dollar decrease in state support over the previous five years. To address this challenge and to continue its momentum, UCD has developed a "2020 plan" that proposes enrollment growth with emphasis on the addition of nonresident students. Serving a larger student body will not be constrained by limits on the footprint of the UCD

campus because of its enormous land holdings. UCD has developed long-range goals that advance their vision of excellence through strategic initiatives that generate new revenue from managed growth, research funding and philanthropy, while enhancing campus diversity, student success, and graduation rates. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

As the team noted in its Offsite Review (OSR) report, UCD prepared an excellent and thorough institutional report within a shortened timeframe and in a context of process transitions at WASC. The essays demonstrate that academic and administrative leaders are working together to define and achieve educational effectiveness and student success. The report was informed by existing planning activities on campus, including the Provost's Task Force for the 2020 Initiative, the Joint Administration/Academic Senate Special Task Force on Graduate Education, the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences report, and the Blue Ribbon Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (which finalized the report of its initial recommendations between the off-site and on-site reviews). These reports illustrate a planning process that is proactive, transparent, and consultative. The team found that faculty and staff alike seem familiar with these initiatives. (CFRs 1.7, 1.9, 3.8, 3.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6)

The team made requests for additional documents and identified several areas of inquiry for the on-site review. UCD provided the requested documents in a timely fashion and prepared additional materials beyond those requested to respond to specific questions posed in the team's OSR report. These materials were extremely helpful to the review process, permitting the team to narrow its attention to a few critical issues during the campus visit, primarily the plans to

accommodate enrollment growth without diminishment of educational effectiveness, and the efforts to strengthen the undergraduate experience, including improved graduation rates. (CFR 1.9)

Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission Actions and Reviews

UC Davis was first accredited by WASC in 1954. Its most recent on-site reaccreditation visit was in 2003. The Institutional Report outlines specific responses to the WASC recommendations that emerged from that review and describes campus progress on two areas identified as requiring further attention in UCD's 2008 and 2010 WASC Interim Reports: general education and the assessment of learning outcomes. In 2011, UCD implemented substantially revised undergraduate general education requirements, and has developed an ambitious general education assessment plan. The assessment of learning outcomes continues to be an area of focus for both the graduate programs and the undergraduate programs. (CFRs 1.9, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

ESSAY 1-2: Meaning, Quality and Rigor of the Degree/Graduation Proficiencies

In the combined essay, "Meaning, Quality and Rigor of the Degree/Graduation Proficiencies," UC Davis clearly articulates the meaning of both its graduate and undergraduate degrees and demonstrates its commitment to the quality and rigor of these degrees. Under shared

governance, the faculty has responsibility for degree programs. The Graduate Council has authority for the graduate programs, and the Undergraduate Council for the undergraduate programs. These bodies, in collaboration with the university's administration, have been actively engaged in the development of vigorous processes to improve program review and the assessment of learning outcomes. These efforts are highly developed for graduate programs and emerging for the undergraduate programs. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 4.4, 4.8)

Meaning, Quality and Rigor of the Degree

The report of The Joint Administration / Academic Senate Special Task Force on Graduate Education provides a macro-perspective on graduate education and defines clear goals for graduate education. Each graduate program at UCD has established learning objectives with specific expectations regarding level of achievement. The team's conversations during the site visit suggest that both faculty and students understand these objectives and expectations. (CFRs 1.2, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.11)

UCD has defined reasonable learning objectives for undergraduates at the institutional level and for general education. One hundred percent of the undergraduate programs have defined learning outcomes, but a smaller percentage of programs have specific indicators that these learning objectives have been achieved. The university's report highlights Biology, Chemistry and Physics as exemplars in the use of the assessment to improve student learning, but the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness reveals that most programs lack well-articulated plans of assessment. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)

The Undergraduate Council has developed an assessment plan for new general education requirements adopted in 2011 and has defined clear criteria for the certification of general education courses. With over 4000 courses at both the introductory and advanced levels certified as meeting the new requirement, the General Education Committee of the Undergraduate Council has wisely decided to assess the program at the institutional level through sampling student work from the largest general education courses in each program. This plan will unfurl over multiple years, but there should be a substantial body of evidence available at the time of the next reaccreditation review. (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.11)

The university's report, its responses to the OSR report and the team's interviews during the on-site visit provided strong evidence of a commitment to meaningful assessment both in academic and co-curricular programs. The administration has committed resources through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and has incentivized faculty to seek technical assistance from the Center. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)

Robust procedures for the establishment of new programs and for course review ensure the integrity of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. The university's commitment to these procedures will be increasingly important as it moves to incentive-based budgeting. This budget model has many advantages, including greater clarity with respect to costs, efficiencies, and opportunities, as well as some encouragement for entrepreneurial thinking. Similar budgeting models implemented on other campuses may have induced decisions or curriculum choices that are not optimal for student learning or knowledge development. At UCD this danger seems well

understood – an advantage of not being among the first to explore the use of this type of model. (CFRs 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)

Graduation Proficiencies: Student Learning and Program Review

In its institutional report, UCD provided to the team a detailed account of its well-established procedures for review of undergraduate and graduate programs. In an initial review, the team raised a number of issues, to which the institution provided written responses both prior to and at the accreditation visit. At the visit the institution provided examples of program review materials, and members of the relevant committees were interviewed. (CFRs 1.9, 2.7, 4.3)

Undergraduate program reviews are the responsibility of the Academic Senate's Undergraduate Council (UGC), and its subcommittee, the Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review Committee (UIPR). Each year clusters of undergraduate degree programs are reviewed, with the intention of providing information that can be used to effect change and inform college planning. With the exception of professional programs, which are reviewed by outside accrediting agencies, graduate programs are reviewed separately by the Academic Senate Graduate Council. The Graduate Council makes recommendations to program heads and monitors their implementation, and if necessary takes appropriate action. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)

The graduate program review process was judged to be excellent, with an institutionalized feedback loop through the Program Review Closure Committee. Until recently, the undergraduate program review process lacked such a strong institutionalized feedback loop. Reviews were taking too long (up to three years) and there was insufficient follow-through. The institution has strengthened the feedback loop by expediting the review process, by providing

reports to deans, department chairs and faculty executive committees within each college, and by closer monitoring of the implementation of recommendations. The team commends the institution for taking steps to ensure that the recommendations made in the course of program reviews result in concrete actions. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 3.6)

The team observed that the program review process could benefit by benchmarking its programs against comparable programs at other institutions. The inclusion of an external reviewer in the Program Review Committee for Masters of Fine Arts and PhD programs provides such a benchmark and is to be commended. The undergraduate program review process has recently been restructured to include an external reviewer (or reviewers). The team considers this to be another significant improvement in the process and commends the institution for taking this step. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)

One area of the program review process that requires significant further development is the inclusion of direct evidence of student learning outcomes. While student-learning outcomes have been established for all programs, in most programs the establishment of assessment methods is still at an early stage. Hence, assessments cannot be regularly provided to program reviewers, nor can the institution provide consistent and regular feedback to programs on their assessment efforts. The team was pleased to note efforts to strengthen the assessment process, and recommends that the institution continue to work towards inclusion of these assessments in the review process. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7)

UCD's new self-study template does not require the collection or analysis of direct evidence of student learning outcomes. During the on-site review, the UIPR indicated that there were no plans for direct evidence of student learning outcomes to be made available to external reviewers. Best practice in undergraduate program review gives external reviewers access to this body of evidence. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7)

Another aspect of the review process that needs strengthening is the use of the results of program reviews in the budgeting process. The campus is moving towards an incentive-based budgeting process, similar in many respects to the "responsibility-centered management" system used at other academic institutions. The institution intends that program reviews be tied more closely to the budgeting process, and the team recommends that these efforts continue. (CFRs 1.8, 2.5)

As stated above, the Undergraduate Council has also made improvements to the undergraduate program review process. These improvements were implemented in response to an internal assessment of the program review process and illustrate a culture of using evidence to inform improvements. Even as the team acknowledges this effort, the absence of a formal feedback loop between the program reviews overseen by the Undergraduate Council and the program reviews overseen by the Council on Graduate Study is a concern. The team recognizes the complexity of aligning these two processes given the lack of one-to-one correspondence between undergraduate and graduate programs or academic departments, especially in areas with Graduate Groups, but encourages efforts to link these two processes.

Finally, the team notes the importance of encouraging faculty participation in faculty development programs such as those offered by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. Although the university provided information about faculty participation in specific programs, the team was unable to determine the breadth of participation across all faculty ranks and ladder-statuses. The institution may wish to consider inclusion of data on such participation in program reviews. (CFRs 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)

ESSAY 3: Defining and promoting “student success”

UC Davis has developed a thoughtful and well-considered institutional definition of student success and how it strives to promote it for both graduate and undergraduate students. (CFRs 1.2, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2)

The university’s mission, vision, and educational objectives flow from the University of California’s Master Plan for Higher Education. They are articulated clearly and concisely in the document titled UC Davis: A Vision of Excellence. They are sufficient to encompass an educational vision for graduate, professional, and undergraduate students. (CFRs 1.5, 2.10, 2.11, 2.14)

The institution has given special attention to improving the educational experiences of students. This attention has been focused on advising, various ways to improve retention and graduation rates, the use of data in decision making, and increasing effective cross-departmental collaborations. It has done so through institutional research studies; college-based and joint Senate and Administration committees; administrative units like Undergraduate Education,

CETL and the iAMSTEM hub; and special groups like the Blue Ribbon Committee on the Undergraduate Experience. (CFRs 2.10, 2.12, 2.13)

This work has resulted in enhanced and strong collaborations between the Provost's office, the Faculty Senate and its Committees, Federation Faculty representatives, Student Affairs, and other key administrative offices. An esprit de corps of commitment to improving programs that lead to greater student success is palpable; this commitment has resulted in the elimination of barriers between academic and administrative units that might on other campuses work at cross purposes. The placement of advisors and mental health professionals in several schools is but one example.

One major area that has benefited from these re-invigorated collaborations is advising for undergraduate students. The team acknowledges the thoughtful and systematic work that has gone into understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the current advising system and the development of new approaches, systems and technological infrastructure that should have positive effects. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13)

Student Graduation and Retention

UCD has studied its retention and graduation rates for undergraduate students, including transfers, and compared and benchmarked them with comparable institutions. It is also examining them in light of the university's ambitious plan for the success of each student. The data have been disaggregated and the institution seems to have an increasingly clear understanding of why some students are more successful than others. And, despite the fact that

many students are first generation and Pell grant recipients, the institution wants each to succeed and graduate in a reasonable period of time. The work of the Blue Ribbon Committee is crucial in this area. It shows strong potential for promoting greater student success in and outside the classroom and shorter time to degrees. (CFR 4.5)

In 2011, the UCD first time freshman six year overall retention and graduation rate was 81%. The retention and graduation rate for white and for Asian and Pacific Islander students was 83%. The retention and graduation rate was 76% for African Americans and for American Indians and 70% for Hispanic/Latino and for Pell Grant Recipients.

The team found through the reading of institutional reports and conversations with university leaders, faculty, and staff that a consensus is emerging that UCD must increase its five and six year graduation rates to equal or exceed comparable universities in the UC system. The team recommends that UCD explicitly and publicly state an ambitious but achievable four-year graduation rate that will focus institutional efforts and attention. (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)

UCD research on graduation rates noted significant disparity in the graduation rates of under-represented students and other students. Concerted efforts should be made to reduce these differences so all students graduate at nearly the same rates regardless of ethnicity or social/economic status. (CFR 1.5)

Graduation rates for graduate students are high, and meet or exceed national standards. A strong infrastructure for the career and professional development of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars is in place, such as the now-institutionalized Mentoring at Critical Transitions program

that helps develop faculty as mentors. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13)

Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Collaboration

Given the university's ambitious agenda to improve the educational experience of all students, the team noted that enhanced collaborations between the Academic Senate, academic departments, central administrative units, and Student Affairs were underway. These efforts are focused on important projects like improving advising for undergraduates; ensuring that new international students have good educational and developmental experiences; increasing student mentoring and providing more research opportunities for undergraduates; and expanding internship and career exploration and placement services for undergraduate and graduate students. The team encourages the strengthening and nurturing of these relationships that could be a competitive advantage for UCD, since many universities struggle with such collaborations and don't create or foster productive synergies among academic support units. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

ESSAY 4: Ensuring institutional capacity and effectiveness in the future, and planning for the changing environment for higher education

Along with other public universities in California, UCD has experienced considerable economic challenges during the past five years. Despite this troubling economic environment, UCD has engaged in a robust, institution-wide strategic planning process for the last several years to ensure that UCD not only remains a leading research university, but also continues to excel. This planning is related to the economic challenges that have affected all California public

institutions, but it does not appear to be only a defensive strategy to counter resource challenges. It provides a vision conceived to help UCD achieve its full potential.

Reaching financial sustainability requires a number of changes, some of which have already been implemented. Significant changes in university budgeting are one cornerstone of this work.

UCD is moving to a hybrid model that includes responsibility centered budgeting, so that the flow of funds is more transparent and predictable. This has been done by implementing budget modules: first for indirect costs, then undergraduate tuition, next graduate tuition, and other modules will follow. Each step has been accompanied by wide consultation and adjustment to make sure that the plans make sense for, and are accepted by, the UCD community. (CFRs 1.8, 3.5) Faculty and administration appear to be aware of the need to ensure that the budget incentive system promotes collaboration between different academic units, rather than the competitive interactions that marred the early rollout of responsibility centered budgeting in some other institutions.

Revenue enhancement is planned through enrollment growth at a more rapid pace than in the past, with plans to add five thousand new undergraduates (mostly international) and an increase in graduate student enrollment of up to 50 percent. This increase of approximately 7,500 new students on campus resulting in a total enrollment of over 40,000 will not only generate revenue, but will require new campus resources. At the same time, an increased emphasis on philanthropy is well underway. (CFRs 1.8, 3.1, 3.5)

Growth brings associated new costs: increased faculty hiring, increased student support services, and construction of new classroom and research buildings as well as intangible costs associated with any process of change. During the on-site review, the team heard concerns about staff workload and the ability of staff engaged in direct student service to meet the needs of an expanding and increasing diverse student body, concerns probably intensified by the recent history of retrenchment and layoffs. The team recommends that UCD take steps to address the morale of staff members whose workloads in many areas have increased significantly. (CFRs 3.1, 3.4, 3.6, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

Planned faculty hiring, for faculty growth and retirement replacement, provides a window of opportunity to diversify the faculty to better represent the population the university already serves. The team recommends that UCD take full advantage of this opportunity. (CFR 3.2)

UCD has available land to accommodate growth - a considerable asset. New and renovated facilities are planned, with commendable attention to issues of environmental sustainability for which the campus has a strong reputation. The planning and implementation timeline required to renovate and create space to accommodate campus growth will require short-term adjustments until the final plan is achieved. All of this infrastructure will take time to develop, so the university must be mindful of the short-term pinch points. One example noted in the self-study focused on growth and a correlated lack of access to gateway courses, which in turn has been identified as a factor in longer time to degree. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

There was considerable evidence of thoughtful planning processes and reports, notably the three 2020 Task Forces and the Graduate Task Force. This campus is meeting its challenges head on and with a good deal of transparency and appropriately consultative processes. That said, the team recommends, as did the self-study, that consideration of graduate education must be fully integrated into university strategic planning, so that graduate education, research and undergraduate education are seamlessly intertwined. (CFRs 2.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

Although educational technology is considered in some quarters to be a “silver bullet,” this is not the view at UCD. As noted in the self-study, technology-enhanced teaching and online or hybrid courses are only employed to a limited extent; they are being instituted with a great deal of support from pedagogical experts, and include a research and assessment component. Similarly, technology is being leveraged to cross-link data to understand where students are accessing university resources (or not), with the goal of reaching out to students who may be in academic difficulty before the situation is dire. This is an example of cross-unit collaboration (IT, Registrar, Undergraduate education, IAMSTEM hub, and Student Affairs) in service of a larger vision of student success. (CFRs 2.1, 3.7, 4.4)

SECTION III: Commendations and Recommendations

UCD has developed campus long-range goals that advance its vision of excellence through strategic initiatives that generate new revenue from managed growth and research funding and philanthropy while enhancing campus diversity, student success and graduation rates.

Specifically, the team commends the university for the following:

- Preparation of an excellent and thorough institutional report within a shortened timeline with essays that demonstrate the collaborative work of academic and administrative leaders to define student success, an impression reinforced by the team's campus visit.
- The embrace of transfer students from 2-year colleges, students who are from nearly every community college in the state.
- A high proportion of transfer students as new students, in keeping with the California Master Plan.
- A large number of Pell Grant and first generation students.
- A plan to achieve enrollment increases by adding nonresident students without displacing California residents, thereby maintaining mission to serve residents of the state.
- Focused attention on improving advising by faculty, student affairs professionals and the administration.
- Strong visionary leadership at a time of seriously constrained resources with executive leadership that enjoys the respect of faculty, that is aggressively garnering resources for the campus and reacting quickly to changing conditions.
- Executive and faculty leadership who have jointly fostered a productive collaboration between administration and the Academic Senate.
- A planning process that is proactive, transparent and consultative as illustrated by the Joint Administration / Academic Senate Special Task Force on Graduate Education, the

College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences report, the 2020 Task Force, and the Blue Ribbon Report on the Undergraduate Experience.

- An excellent graduate program review process that includes an institutionalized feedback loop through the Program Review Closure Committee and external reviewers, providing a benchmark in parallel to standards at other institutions.
- A sustained focus on general education and ambitious plans for the direct assessment of general education learning outcomes.
- A commitment to being on the cutting edge of environmental sustainability issues and practices.
- The development of a thoughtful set of initial programs and support services, including staff and faculty development opportunities, to deal with the anticipated rapid increase in international students.
- Improvements in the Undergraduate Program Review process, which include the addition of external reviewers and an expedited timeline that facilitates "closing the loop" and the resulting improvement of the programs and departments under review.

The team offers the following recommendations:

- Set a target 4-year graduation rate that is ambitious but attainable and that is the same for all student groups. (CFR 2.10)
- Continue to fully integrate graduate education into the planning process so that graduate education, research and undergraduate education are seamlessly intertwined. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

- Incorporate direct evidence of student learning into the undergraduate review process.
(CFR 2.7)
- Ensure that the results of undergraduate and graduate program reviews inform decisions about the allocation of resources. (CFRs 2.7, 3.8, 4.3)
- Continue efforts to improve undergraduate education by strengthening advising, assessing General Education, engaging the faculty in instructional improvement activities, and providing needed academic support and student services for the expanding and changing undergraduate population. (CFRs 2.11, 2.12, 2.14, 3.4)
- Increase the diversity of the faculty as retiring faculty are replaced and as new positions are created to accommodate enrollment growth. (CFRs 1.5, 3.2)
- Take steps to address the morale of staff members whose workloads in many areas have increased significantly. (CFRs 3.1, 3.4)

APPENDICES

Compliance Audit Checklist for Reaccreditation

Name of Institution: University of California at Davis

Review Date: 2/25/2013

Instructions to institution:

Please provide a link to each document designated below. Be sure that the reviewer will be able to see where this document is published. If you do not have the exact document that is specified but have some comparable document, please provide a link to that document.

We expect to conduct this initial compliance audit for all accredited institutions once. In subsequent reaccreditation reviews, you will be asked to update the documents if they have been revised.

Instructions to team:

Please attach this form to the team report. Missing documents should be noted in the recommendations section of the team report as appropriate.

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	WASC Check
1.1	Mission statement	UC Mission Statement UC Davis Philosophy of Purpose UC Davis Vision of Excellence	X
1.2	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels	Educational Objectives for Students Undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes General Education Objectives Objectives for Graduate Education	X
1.2.1	Public statement on student achievement (retention/graduation, student learning)	UC Davis Profile UC Davis Facts Freshman Retention and Graduation Rates Transfer Retention and Graduation Rates	X
1.3	Organization chart (Also see 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)	Office of the Chancellor Administrative and Resource Management	X
1.4	Academic freedom policy	Academic Freedom (APM-010) Faculty Code of Conduct (APM-015)	X
1.5	Diversity policies and procedures; procedures for accommodations re disabilities	Regents' Policy on Diversity UC Diversity Statement Office of Campus Community Relations Diversity Resources General Education Diversity (see 2a) Campus Climate: Race and Ethnicity Student Disability Center Guidelines Applying to Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability (PACAOS-140) Policy on Nondiscrimination (PACAOS-20)	X

1.6	Documents setting forth the authority of a corporate, governmental, religious organization or system that is affiliated with the accredited institution	California Constitution Article 9 Education (see Section 9)	X
1.7	Catalog (online <u> x </u> , hard copy <u> ___ </u>) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (X 2.10.1)	UC Davis General Catalog 2012-14	X
1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies	Policy on Student Grievance Procedures Student Rights and Responsibilities (PPM 280-01) Student Complaints (PPM 280-05) Student Rights and Grievances Privacy and Disclosure of Information from Student Records (PPM 320-21) Sexual Harassment (PPM 380-12) Student Disability Center Appeals Procedure Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Disqualification and Appeal Procedures for Graduate Students	X (see separate Student Complaint Checklist)
1.7.2.1	Grade appeals policy	Grade Changes Information and Grievances Grade Grievances Grade Change Committee Guidelines	X
1.7.2.2	Records of student grievances	Privacy and Disclosure of Information from Student Records (PPM 320-21) Records of Sexual Harassment Grievances (PPM 380-12, see item VI.B.5)	X
1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies	Senate Bylaw 335 -- Grievances Faculty Code of Conduct (APM-015) Procedures for Faculty Misconduct Allegations (UCD-015) Non-Senate Appointees Grievances Grievance Procedures, Non-Senate Faculty Davis Senate Bylaw 87, Privilege and Tenure Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure	X
1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievances	Academic Affairs maintains faculty grievance records indefinitely. The Academic Senate maintains Privilege and Tenure Committee grievance records for five years following closure of each case.	X
1.7.4	Staff grievance policy	Complaint Process Complaint Resolution Resolution of Concerns -- Managers Resolution of Concerns -- Senior Managers Collective Bargaining Contracts	X
1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances	Staff Grievance Files Disposition	X
1.7.5	Employee handbook, if available	Employee Resources Employee Toolkit Graduate Student Employment Handbook	X
1.7.6.1	Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc.	Transcript Information Transcript Legend Undergraduate Transcript Graduate Transcript	X

1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files	Freshman Holistic Review Manual Freshman Holistic Review Profile (example) Freshman High School Transcript (example) Freshman Finalization Procedures Freshman Finalization Profile (example) Freshman Credit Summary (example) Evaluating Using the Transfer Profile Transfer Evaluation Profile (example) Transfer Verification Process Transfer Finalization Process Transfer Finalization Profile (example) Transfer Credit Summary (example)	X
1.7.6.3	Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades	Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline (PACAOS-100) Code of Academic Conduct Administration of Student Discipline	X
1.7.6.4	Tuition and fee schedule	UC Davis Student Fees	X
1.7.6.5	Tuition refund policy	Fee Refunds	X
1.7.6.6	Policy on credit hour/award of credit; processes for review of assignment of credit; review of syllabi/equivalent for all kinds of courses	Committee on Courses of Instruction: Credit for Courses	X
1.7.6.7	Policy on human subjects in research, if applicable	Research Involving Human Subjects: Policies Institutional Review Board Administration Human Research Protection Program Plan	X
1.8	Independent annual audits of finances (also see CFR 3.5)	UC A-133 Audit Report 2010-11 UC A-133 Audit Report 2009-10 Audit Reports List	X (OP audit)
1.9	Policies to ensure that WASC substantive change policies are followed	Ethics, Compliance and Audit Services Approval Process for Academic Programs UC Davis ALO Responsibilities	X
1.9.1	Documents relating to investigations of the institution by any governmental entity and an update on the status of such investigation;	Available on request	X
1.9.2	List of pending legal actions by or against the institution, including a full explanation of the nature of the actions, parties involved, and status of the litigation	Available on request	X
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each (also see CFR 1.7)	Degree Requirements Index to Major Degree Programs Graduate Programs of Study	X

2.2	Syllabi for all courses offered	Selected examples: Anthropology Electrical and Computer Engineering Food Science and Technology Community and Regional Development Computer Science English Human Development Mathematics Philosophy Physics University Writing Program	X
2.2.1	For bachelor's degrees: General education requirements (Also see CFR 1.7)	General Education Requirements (General Catalog) General Education Requirements (Website)	X
2.3	Student learning outcomes for every program	Program Learning Outcomes	X
2.4	Grading standards	Grades Senate Grading Regulation (A540)	X
2.5	Class participation policies if available	Only on a course by course basis	X
2.6	Placement data if available	Educational and Occupational Outcomes, 2007-08 Graduates	X
2.7	Program review process/guidelines	Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review Undergraduate Program Review Template Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines Graduate Program Review Administrative Unit Reviews	X
2.7.1	Schedule of program review (including reviews of non-academic units)	Undergraduate Program Review Schedule Graduate Program Review Schedule (click on "Schedule of Program Reviews") Non-academic units are reviewed frequently on an as-needed basis, with no fixed schedule	X
2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity	Appointment and Promotion (APM-210) Professor Series (APM 220)	X
2.9	-	-	-
2.10	-	-	-
2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, overall and disaggregated (link to the standard templates for retention/graduation reports)	Freshmen Graduation and Retention Rates Transfer Graduation and Retention Rates UG Retention-Graduation Rate Report Grad Retention-Graduation Rate Report	X
2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the course or program level, as appropriate	Grade distribution data is provided to programs for analysis during program review Undergraduate Program Review Template	X
2.10.3	Policy on student evaluation of faculty	Appointment and Promotion (APM-210) Course Evaluations Report of Special Committee on Student Evaluation of Teaching, 2010	X
2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students	Examples of Evaluation Forms	X

2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities	Student Life at UC Davis Graduate Student Life and Resources Graduate Student Guide	X
2.11.1	Financial aid policy and procedures	UC Financial Aid Policy Financial Aid (Catalog Description) Financial Aid Office	X
2.12	Academic calendar (also see CFR 1.7 catalog)	Academic Calendar	X
2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year, including scripts for recruitment	Undergraduate Admissions Freshman Admission Presentation Transfer Admission Presentation Campus Tour Script Graduate Admissions	X
2.13.1	Procedures for students to register	Registration : Catalog information Registration Information : Registrar's Office	X
2.14	Policy on transfer of credit	Undergraduate Transfer Credit Graduate Residence and Transfer Credit	X
3.1	Staff development policies	Staff Development	X
3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program (link to relevant data exhibit)	Catalog Index to Degree Programs : select program for list of faculty Academic Personnel Attributes Chart Table 4.2 Faculty Headcount	X
3.3	Faculty hiring policies if available	Academic Appointments, Merits and Promotions Instructions to Appointment and Promotion Committees (APM 210) Appointment and Promotion, Professor Series (APM 220) Appointment and Promotion (APM UCD-220)	X
3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policy and procedures (Also see CFR 2.10)	See 3.3 above	X
3.3.2	Faculty handbook or equivalent	UC Faculty Handbook Faculty Guide	X
3.4	Faculty development policies	Sabbatical Leaves Faculty Training and Development Department Chair Training and Development Handbook for Chairs and Directors Graduate Faculty Adviser's Handbook Graduate Program Workshops	X
3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures	https://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/resources/new-faculty/index.html	X
3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty	Appointment and Promotion, Professor Series (APM 220) Appointment and Promotion (APM UCD-220) Lecturer and Senior Lecturer (APM-283) Agreement for the Lecturers Unit (IX) Adjunct Professor Series (APM-280)	X
3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning	UC Way to Educational Effectiveness Faculty role implicit in: Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate Office of Academic Assessment	X

3.5	Last two years audited financial statements (Also see CFR 1.8)	UC Independent Audit Report 2010-11 UC Independent Audit Report 2009-10	X
3.5.1	List of financial records maintained	List of financial records contained in: UC Davis Financial Report 2011	X
3.5.2	Last two years' financial aid audits	UC A-133 Audit Report 2010-11 UC A-133 Audit Report 2009-10	X
3.5.3	Last federal composite score if applicable	Not required for a public institution as described in: Federal Regulation Title 34, Part 668.171	X
3.5.4	Last report of two- and three-year cohort default rates	Default Rates Two-Year (search for OPE-ID 001313) Default Rates Three-Year (search for OPE-ID 001313)	X
3.5.5	Campus maps	Campus Map	X
3.6	Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty	Computing Resources Faculty Technology Guide Student Computing The Wheel	X
3.6.1	If online or hybrid courses, information on delivery method	Currently in pilot processes, delivery methods discussed in the following: Designing Courses for Hybrid Delivery Committee on Courses of Instruction: Online or Hybrid Courses	X
3.6.2	Library data/holdings, size	Facts About the Library	X
3.7	Inventory of technology resources and services for staff	IET Staff Support	X
3.8	Organization chart (Also see CFRs 1.3 and 3.1)	Office of the Chancellor Administrative and Resource Management	X
3.9	List of governing board members	UC Regents	X
3.9.1	Governing board member biographical information	Biographies of the UC Regents	X
3.9.2	List of governing board committees with members	Standing Committees of the UC Regents	X
3.9.2.1	Minutes of board meetings for last two years	Minutes of the UC Regents	X
3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operations manual	Bylaws of the UC Regents	X
3.10	CEO biographical information	Chancellor Biography	X
3.10.1	CFO biographical information	Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Biography	X
3.10.2	Other senior administrators' biographical information (e.g., cabinet, VPs, Provost)	Vice Chancellors Deans Vice Provosts	X
3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO	Regents Policy 7306: Performance of Officers Senior Management Group Review Process Senate Review of Chancellors Senate No Confidence Vote Options	X
3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority if applicable	Shared Governance Code of the Academic Senate	X
3.11.1	Faculty governance organization chart if applicable	Senate Davis Division Organization Chart Senate Davis Division Leadership	X
3.11.2	Minutes of the last year's faculty meetings	Senate Representative Assembly Senate Committee Information Search (search tool for all committee reports)	X
4.1	Strategic plan	Vision of Excellence Plan	X

4.1.1	Operations plan	2020 Initiative Organizational Excellence Initiative	X
4.1.2	Academic plan	Academic Plans	X
4.1.3	Technology plan	Information Technology Excellence	X
4.1.4	Facilities plan	Campus Progress: Planning Major Capital Improvement Program	X
4.2	Description of planning process	UCOP Academic Planning Administrative Decision-Making Process Example: 2020 Initiative Work Plan	X
4.2.1	Process for review and monitoring of strategic plan/metrics	Vision Plan Goals and Metrics ARM 2011 Supporting Vision of Excellence Provost 2011 Supporting Vision of Excellence	X
4.3	-	-	-
4.4	New program approval process	Regent's Standing Order 105.2(b) UC Compendium Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs (PPM 200-25) Approval Process for Academic Programs Undergraduate Council Charge 121.B.3 Establishment of Graduate Programs	X
4.4.1	Program review process (Also see CFR 2.7)	Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review Undergraduate Program Review Template Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines Graduate Program Review	X
4.5	Description of institutional research function and staffing	Budget and Institutional Analysis	X
4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (Also see CFR1.2)	UG Retention-Graduation Rate Report Grad Retention-Graduation Rate Report Graduate Program Evaluation Metrics Graduate Studies Data Reports Provost's Dashboard	X
4.7	-	-	-
4.8	List of major industry or other advisory committees	College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences College of Letters and Science College of Biological Sciences College of Engineering (scroll to bottom) Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department of Biomedical Engineering Department of Computer Science Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering School of Education Graduate School of Management School of Nursing School of Veterinary Medicine	X

Credit Hour and Program Length Review Checklist

Under federal regulations, WASC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

- (1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-
 - (i) It reviews the institution's-
 - (A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
 - (B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework;and
 - (ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.
- (2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

- (1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
- (2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

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

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW CHECKLIST

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? Academic Senate: Credit for Courses																			
	Comments: The General Catalog also has information about the credit hour policy: http://catalog.ucdavis.edu/academicinfo/credit.html																			
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: Periodic review through program review and course approval process for new courses or changes in courses.																			
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: The detail view of the course search tool shows when elements of a course (lecture, discussion, lab) meet: Course Search Tool . For example, by choosing Spring Quarter 2014 with a Subject Area of Chemistry (CHE), the first course is listed as follows:																			
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>CRN</u> <i>Time/Days</i></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Course</u> <i>Location</i></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Sec.</u> <i>Seats Avail.</i></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Title</u> <i>Former GE Credit • New GE Credit</i></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Instructor</u> <i>Course Units</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15937 <i>8:00 - 8:50 AM, MWF</i></td> <td>CHE 002B <i>ROCK</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">A01 <i>0</i></td> <td>General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i></td> <td>Toupadakis, A <i>5.0</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15937 <i>8:00 - 8:50 AM, T</i></td> <td>CHE 002B <i>ROBBNS 146</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">A01 <i>0</i></td> <td>General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i></td> <td>Toupadakis, A <i>5.0</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">15937 <i>1:10 - 4:00 PM, M</i></td> <td>CHE 002B <i>SCILAB 2051</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">A01 <i>0</i></td> <td>General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i></td> <td>Toupadakis, A <i>5.0</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The first row shows the lecture times, the second row the discussion time and the third row the laboratory time.</p>	<u>CRN</u> <i>Time/Days</i>	<u>Course</u> <i>Location</i>	<u>Sec.</u> <i>Seats Avail.</i>	<u>Title</u> <i>Former GE Credit • New GE Credit</i>	<u>Instructor</u> <i>Course Units</i>	15937 <i>8:00 - 8:50 AM, MWF</i>	CHE 002B <i>ROCK</i>	A01 <i>0</i>	General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i>	Toupadakis, A <i>5.0</i>	15937 <i>8:00 - 8:50 AM, T</i>	CHE 002B <i>ROBBNS 146</i>	A01 <i>0</i>	General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i>	Toupadakis, A <i>5.0</i>	15937 <i>1:10 - 4:00 PM, M</i>	CHE 002B <i>SCILAB 2051</i>	A01 <i>0</i>	General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i>
<u>CRN</u> <i>Time/Days</i>	<u>Course</u> <i>Location</i>	<u>Sec.</u> <i>Seats Avail.</i>	<u>Title</u> <i>Former GE Credit • New GE Credit</i>	<u>Instructor</u> <i>Course Units</i>																
15937 <i>8:00 - 8:50 AM, MWF</i>	CHE 002B <i>ROCK</i>	A01 <i>0</i>	General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i>	Toupadakis, A <i>5.0</i>																
15937 <i>8:00 - 8:50 AM, T</i>	CHE 002B <i>ROBBNS 146</i>	A01 <i>0</i>	General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i>	Toupadakis, A <i>5.0</i>																
15937 <i>1:10 - 4:00 PM, M</i>	CHE 002B <i>SCILAB 2051</i>	A01 <i>0</i>	General Chem <i>SE • QL SE</i>	Toupadakis, A <i>5.0</i>																
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? Two																			
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? One fully online; one hybrid																			
	What degree level(s)? BA																			
	What discipline(s)? Expository Writing; Cognitive Psychology																			
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO																			
	Comments: Expository Writing is a 4 unit fully online course with required reading, three writing projects, an electronic portfolio, multiple quizzes, threaded discussions; bi weekly synchronous video chats. Cognitive Psychology is a 4 unit hybrid course with 2 hours of lecture and 1 hour of discussion per week, required readings, five midterm exams, one final, multiple quizzes and discussion worksheets, and threaded discussions.																			
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other	How many syllabi were reviewed? One																			
	What kinds of courses? Biological Sciences 2C: Introduction to Biology																			

kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	What degree level(s)? BA
	What discipline(s)? Molecular and Cell Biology
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: This 5 unit course involves three hours of lecture, one hour of discussion, and three hours of lab per week.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Three
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? On ground
	What degree level(s)? BA, MBA
	What discipline(s)? English, Psychology, Business
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The requirements for the three programs were reviewed using information from the General Catalog: http://catalog.ucdavis.edu/programs/PSC/PSCprog.html

Review Completed By: Steve Martin

Date: April 13, 2014

Student Complaints Review Checklist

Under federal regulation*, WASC 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.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	YES
	<p>Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?</p> <p>Student Judicial Affairs (SJA) website: http://sja.ucdavis.edu Campus Policy and Procedures Manual; http://manuals.ucdavis.edu/PPM/contents.htm</p> <p>In addition, the following links provide information on student complaints and grievances:</p> <p>Policy on Student Grievance Procedures Student Rights and Responsibilities (PPM 280-01) Student Complaints (PPM 280-05) Student Rights and Grievances Privacy and Disclosure of Information from Student Records (PPM 320-21) Sexual Harassment (PPM 380-12) Student Disability Center Appeals Procedure Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Disqualification and Appeal Procedures for Graduate Students</p>	YES
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The SJA website provides information and links related to grievances involving discrimination, harassment, sexual harassment, student privacy, disability accommodations, and grades. SJA also provides a public reporting tool so that reports can be easily submitted. Links to SJA website for student grievances are provided through other campus websites such as Student Affairs, Graduate Student Association, and Harassment and Discrimination Program (HDAPP). Information about policy and procedures for addressing complaints of sexual harassment are provided on the HDAPP website: http://hdapp.ucdavis.edu/ Information about filing complaints involving campus police is available on the UC Davis police website: (http://police.ucdavis.edu).</p>	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly:	YES
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	YES
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Student Judicial Affairs resolves most student problems through early resolution by explaining procedures and facilitating solutions. If unresolved, the university determines if a formal investigation is required. For sexual harassment/sexual assault cases, the campus uses a case management team approach to ensure that policies and procedures are followed. There is a similar case management team to track to address graduate student complaints and to ensure correct policies and procedures are followed. A case management team for addressing complaints of discrimination and harassment is being developed.</p>	

Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? Student Judicial Affairs and Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Program. Privacy and Disclosure of Information from Student Records (PPM 320-21) Records of Sexual Harassment Grievances (PPM 380-12, see item VI.B.5)	YES
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: SJA uses an electronic database that allows tracking an monitoring of student grievances. In addition, Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Program maintains records for sexual harassment.	YES
	Comments:	

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Michael Jackson

Date: April 10, 2014

Marketing and Recruitment Review Checklist

Under federal regulation*, WASC 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.	Verified Yes/No
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? Comments: The institution follows Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) as described below. At the present time, there is no publicly accessible statement to this effect posted, but this has been the topic of robust discussion amongst the UC Admissions Directors and Associate Vice Chancellors of Enrollment over the past several months.	YES
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree? Undergraduate graduation rates are provided on the website: http://www.ucdavis.edu/about/facts/uc_davis_profile.pdf	YES
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree? Information on cost is on the website: http://admissions.ucdavis.edu/cost/ Information on student fees is on the website: http://budget.ucdavis.edu/studentfees/	YES
	Comments:	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide 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: Provides results of surveys of baccalaureate degree recipients—their educational and occupational outcomes: http://www.sariweb.ucdavis.edu/downloads/437.RG2012_Outcomes%20in%20template_final.pdf Profiles alums with advanced degrees: http://iccweb.ucdavis.edu/graduates/where/index.htm	

*§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: Jerry Bepko
Date: April 10, 2014

Transfer Credit Review Checklist

Under federal regulations*, WASC 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.)	Verified Yes/No
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?	YES
	Is the policy publically available? If so, where? Available in the Catalog, online: Undergraduate Transfer Credit	YES
	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?	YES
	Comments: Describes what units can be accepted and cites assist.org	

*§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: Jerry Bepko
Date: April 10, 2014

Off-Campus Site Visit Report

Team Report Appendix

OFF-CAMPUS SITE

Institution: UC Davis

Kind of Visit: Accreditation Visit

Date: 04-04-2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. One form should be used for each site visited. 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.

1. Site Name and Address

UCD Graduate School of Management, Bishop Ranch Campus
Building 12647
12647 Alcosta Boulevard, Suite 190
San Ramon, CA 94583

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus or standalone campus by WASC)

One
MBA
Faculty FTE – all faculty (31) have appointments in the Graduate School of Management at UCD main campus
Student enrollment – approximately 220

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Materials examined

Program information provided by Graduate School of Management (GSM)
Marketing material provided by Graduate School of Management

Interviews:

1. Staff
Christina Lozano, Carol Sandifor, Amanda Steidlmayer
Facility tour, review of the weekly schedule, operations at the remote site
2. Faculty
David Bunch, Kim Elsbach, Jim Olson
3. Students
Meeting with students
4. Administrators
Jim Stevens (Assistant Dean of Student Affairs) and staff members

¹ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>The mission of this off-campus site is identical to that of the on-campus site. The only difference is that this is a part-time program.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The institution makes great efforts to publicize events at the main campus and off-site campuses at both sites. Because of logistical and scheduling complications, complete participation by students at events at the other campuses is not feasible.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>The physical facilities are excellent. The UCD GSM Bay Area part-time MBA program is located at the Bishop Ranch Premier Business Park in San Ramon. The facility has four classrooms and three meeting rooms. The classrooms seat 68, 47, 45 and 40 students. The building includes an upstairs and downstairs Student Commons area where students are provided meals. The San Ramon site has one faculty and facility support staff member and one student support staff member. All classrooms at each site are equipped with PCs, projectors and screens and electrical outlets for each desk. One classroom at both Gallagher Hall (main campus) and Bishop Ranch also has video conferencing and integrated video recording capabilities. Oversight is provided by the UCD GSM Dean's office.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>Support staff at the Bishop Ranch site include admissions, student services and operations team members. Faculty provide advising on-site. In addition to on-site assistance, students in all MBA programs are offered a variety of career and academic resources. Library resources are provided online.</p>	

<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>All faculty are members of the UCD main campus faculty. Program oversight, curriculum development and learning assessment are identical to those on the main campus.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]</p>	<p>See above. All faculty are members of the UCD main campus faculty. Program and courses are identical to those on the main campus.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>Retention and graduation rates are > 90% and comparable to those at the main campus.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Assessment of student learning is carried out as at the main campus. At this point, assessment procedures are still being put in place.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes.</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Program review is incorporated into that of the main campus, since the two programs are identical except with respect to schedule.</p>	