

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)**Wednesday, May 6, 2015****9:00 – 10:30 am****KL 362**[UCMCROPS/CAPRA1415/Resources](#)**I. Faculty Survey on Provost's FTE Hiring Plan**

Discussion: results from CAPRA's survey of faculty.

II. Chair's Report – Anne Kelley

A. Meeting of the Division on April 23

B. Division Council/CAPRA meeting on April 30

C. UCPB meeting on May 5

III. Consent Calendar**Pg. 1-2**

Action requested: approval of minutes from April 22 meeting.

IV. Request from Provost/EVC Peterson

Discussion: formulation of explicit guidelines/formulas for space allocation and reallocation. (Per the Provost/EVC's request.)

V. Informational Item – PROC**Pg. 3-16**

Vice Chair Viers, CAPRA's representative to PROC, asked that the deans' analysis that accompanies submission of PLO Reports to PROC be shared with CAPRA as the deans' comments include evaluations of resource requests made by programs in response to assessment results. Appended to this meeting's packet are deans' analyses that have been received for 2014-15 thus far together with the abstracts and budget implications sections of the relevant PLO Reports. These analyses are informational only.

VI. Campus Review Item**Pg. 17-51****A. UC Merced's Review under the WSCUC Standards**

UC Merced initiated its efforts to re-affirm accreditation by WSCUC which will conclude with an Accreditation Visit in spring 2018 and, in June 2018, the WSCUC Commission decision to re-affirm accreditation for a period of 6, 8 or 10 years. The first step in the Institutional Review Process for re-affirmation is to complete, as an institution, the *Review under the WSCUC Standards*. All Senate standing committees are asked to review.

Action requested: CAPRA to review the report and send any comments to the Senate chair by May 15.

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
(CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
April 22, 2015**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 9:00 am on April 22, 2015 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

Attendees: Anne Kelley, Josh Viers, Cristián Ricci, Mukesh Singhal, and Daisy Figueroa.

Absent: Jan Wallander, Marilyn Fogel, and Danielle Bermudez.

I. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The April 8, 2015 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

II. Campus Review Items

--Revised Economics CCGA proposal. CAPRA members discussed the Economics group's response to CAPRA's comments on the original proposal. Members still had concerns over graduate student support and agreed that the Economics group should provide a reasonable estimate of how many courses the group believes would require TAs in order to justify the plan to support its graduate student population.

ACTION: CAPRA to send a memo to the Senate chair stating its endorsement of the revised proposal pending the aforementioned comments.

III. Provost/EVC's Faculty Recruitment Plan

After several iterations with CAPRA members, Provost/EVC Peterson emailed his FTE plan on Friday, April 17. Many faculty members have expressed concern over the tenets of the plan as well as the process by which FTE will be allocated. While CAPRA is the Senate committee charged with advising the Provost/EVC on these issues, it is also CAPRA's duty to inform the Provost/EVC of faculty members' opinions.

CAPRA members agreed that a brief survey should be sent to all Senate faculty to inquire about their agreement with the FTE plan and the percentage of allocation of faculty lines to the thematic/strategic areas. There should also be a comments function. The identity of the respondents will remain confidential.

The survey should be sent this week so that CAPRA members can discuss the results at the May 6 committee meeting.

ACTION: CAPRA members will discuss via email the language for the survey.

IV. Space Allocation Request from Provost/EVC

Provost/EVC Peterson requested that CAPRA draft explicit guidelines or formulas for space allocation and reallocation.

CAPRA members agreed that the committee should advise the Provost to allow the schools and units to decide on specific space requirements as these entities are in the best position to negotiate with faculty and determine what space is needed.

ACTION: Further discussion of this issue will occur at the May 6 meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 am.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, CAPRA Chair

Minutes taken by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-4629

April 30, 2015

To: Anne Kelley, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)

From: Thomas W. Peterson, Co-Chair, Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC)
Cristian Ricci, Co-Chair, Periodic Review Oversight Committee

Re: 2014-15 PLO Reports and related Dean's Analyses

At its March meeting, PROC initiated a review of the workflow associated with the annual submission of Program Learning Outcome Reports (by each undergraduate major, standalone minor, and graduate program). During that discussion, CAPRA's representative to PROC asked that the dean's analysis that accompanies submission of PLO Reports to PROC be shared with CAPRA because the dean's comments include evaluations of resource requests made by programs in response to assessment results.

We write to provide CAPRA with the dean's analyses that have been received for 2014-15 thus far (see table below), together with the abstracts and budget implications sections of the relevant PLO Reports (attached). Full reports are available as there is interest. We still await a few reports, and accompanying deans' analyses, for this spring. These will be forwarded upon receipt.

We are happy to provide these materials in order to facilitate informed resource planning. We do, however, want to emphasize the importance of responding to program assessment efforts, including findings, in ways that are consistent with the [UC Merced Principles of Assessment](#). In particular, principle 4 which states

4. We share our assessment activities in ways that preserve our focus on candid engagement in improvement-oriented inquiry, facilitate the exchange of practices and meaningful insights, and address external expectations for accountability.

Improvement-oriented assessment requires an environment that supports and reinforces candid investigation of how well we are achieving our goals, while simultaneously promoting a shared understanding of what we aim to achieve, what we are achieving, how we are achieving it, and what we need to continue to improve. In making decisions about what to share and how, we prioritize actions that will preserve engagement in questions of institutional significance, with due consideration of external calls for transparency and accountability. As a community united by a common mission, we support our colleagues' endeavors through actions that are consistent with these values.

In support of these shared values, **we ask that CAPRA use these materials for informational purposes only.**

Looking forward, we seek CAPRA's recommendations on how to productively integrate annual assessment reporting, including deans' analyses, into the annual planning process in ways that advance the campus's goals

for evidence informed planning and decision making. As revealed by the documents shared here, a clear first step will be promoting a consistent format for dean's analyses as well as timely submission of program reports.

Dean's analysis	Number of PLO Reports Summarized	Requests for resources beyond those that exist	PROC Comments
SoE Fall 2014	4	0	BioE was the only report due Oct 1, 2014. The analysis for MSE, ME, and EnvE are associated with reports due in March 2014 (i.e. AY 2013-14), but not formally forwarded to PROC until fall 2014.
SNS Spring 2015	3	0	The dean's analysis addresses 3 of 5 PLO Reports due March 1. Chemistry's PLO Report was submitted in Fall 2015, but without a Dean's analysis. (SNS did not have Assessment Manager until January 2015).
SSHA Fall 2014	5	2	The analysis includes 5 of 7 reports due October 1. Writing's request to shift its due date was approved by PROC.
SSHA Dec 2014	1	0	Actual due date for the report addressed here was October 1, 2014.
SSHA Spring 2015	4	2	This analysis includes 4 of 8 reports due March 1. Arts' report will be submitted July 15 as approved by PROC.
SSHA Grad Report Fall 2014	1	0	Includes 1 of 1 report due in fall 2014.
SNS Grad Report Fall 2014	2	2	Includes 1 of 1 report due in fall 2014, and 1 report that was due the prior spring (QSB).

Abstracts and Budget Implications for PLO Reports Submitted during AY 2014-15 (as of April 1, 2015)

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
Bioengineering Major (Fall 2014)	<p>The BIOE program chose to evaluate student ability on “An understanding of professional and ethical responsibility”. This outcome was evaluated through student term papers in the engineering professional seminar course, which is taken in the final year of the program.</p> <p>The program chose to use evidence from the professional seminar as it provides the best source of evidence for ethical knowledge, due to being taken at the end of the student’s academic career. Students are able to demonstrate the knowledge they have gained across the program curriculum.</p> <p>The program found that all papers scored Basic or above on each rubric category, and the average overall score was just below Proficient. Recommendations from the program faculty are to improve the quality of assessment evidence by working with the professional seminar instructor to require a longer paper, and provide students with precise paper specifications.</p>	No resources are needed to implement the plans for improvement.

SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
Applied Mathematics Major (March 1, 2015)	<p>The applied mathematics faculty performed an assessment of the Applied Mathematical Sciences program. In particular, we studied the first program learning outcome: Solve mathematical problems using analytical methods, and associated WASC’s Core Competencies: written communication, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking. The applied mathematics faculty used direct (course project) and indirect</p>	To conduct future assessments and carry out the plans above, the Applied Mathematical Sciences program will continue to require several resources. These current resource needs are contained largely within the Center for Research on

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
	<p>(student focus group discussion and senior survey results) evidence for this assessment. Through this assessment, the applied mathematics faculty discovered that their major students could communicate mathematics clearly in writing but needed improvement in their ability to reason abstractly and logically. Consequently, the applied mathematics faculty has made concrete plans to institute necessary curricular and pedagogical changes. These results will be communicated to all Applied Math faculty at the next Faculty meeting.</p>	<p>Teaching. The newly appointed Student and Program Assessment Manager of the School of Natural Sciences, Amy Moffet, has provided invaluable assistance in collecting and analyzing the Graduating Senior Survey results and other data. We would like to emphasize that the assessment process can only be successful with the help of such qualified staff members.</p> <p>The Center for Research on Teaching Excellence and especially, the Students Assessing Teaching and Learning service has provided a great deal of support to the Applied Mathematical Sciences program assessment in the past, and we plan to use this resource in future assessments. The applied mathematics faculty values greatly the work that this center does for this program. As the applied mathematics faculty prepares to conduct future assessments, they will look even more to this center for help and support.</p>
<p>Chemistry Major (October 1, 2014)</p>	<p>During alternate academic years between 2009---2010 and 2013---2014, the Chemical Sciences Faculty employed a nationally---normed, standardized exam from the American Chemical Society ACS) called the Diagnostic of Undergraduate Chemistry Knowledge (DUCK) as the summative assessment for a portion of our first Program Learning Outcome (Fundamental Knowledge and Skills). The exam was administered to upper-division students enrolled in one of our advanced laboratory courses offered during the spring term: CHEM 150 (Inorganic</p>	<p>The changes proposes in Section V require faculty to plan for the ordering, upkeep, and use of assessment instruments from the ACS Exams Institute, along with the modest yearly budget required for these exams (and consensus on the value of their use).</p>

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
	<p>and Materials Lab) or CHEM 153 (Physical Chemistry Lab). Results from this exam (as well as direct assessment of student work in the laboratory) show a moderate but steady increase in student performance over the period in question, as compared with national norms, where appropriate. Additionally, beginning with the Fall, 2012 term, ACS exams have been employed as pre- and post-course formative assessments of student performance in two or our lower division courses, CHEM 002 and CHEM 010.</p>	
<p>Earth Systems Science Major (March 1, 2015)</p>	<p>In 2013-2014, the Earth Systems Science (ESS) Program and the Environmental Science and Sustainability Minor (ESSU) evaluated Program Learning Outcome (PLO) #1: Foundational knowledge of physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics related to Earth systems that supports a working knowledge of basic research methodologies, data analysis, and interpretation for a variety of Earth-related data. In addition to PLO 1, two WASC Core Competencies were also assessed for the first time: Quantitative Reasoning (CC#3), and Critical Thinking (CC#5). The PLO and the two competencies were assessed through independent evaluation of final exams from two required upper division courses (ESS 100, Environmental Chemistry) and ESS 148 (Fundamentals of Ecology) and a general education course (ESS002, Sustainability Science). The upper division courses were selected because they each require employment of critical thinking and quantitative analysis using foundational knowledge from chemistry, biology, and mathematics and application to problems and questions from Earth Systems Science. Sustainability science, a course designed to be a gateway to the Environmental Science and Sustainability minor (ESSU), was selected because it employs foundational scientific principles and critical thinking in understanding environmental problems and assessing sustainability solutions. In addition, senior exit interview conducted by Students assessing teaching and learning (SATAL) was employed as a secondary measure for assessing PLO#1 and CC #3 and #5.</p>	<p>This section not included in report.</p>

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
<p>Natural Sciences Education Minor (March 1, 2015)</p>	<p>The Natural Sciences Education (NSED) minor is primarily intended for students interested in teaching careers at the K-12 level. The NSED minor program prepares students for direct admission into teaching credentialing programs in the State of California. The NSE minor includes pedagogy and teaching methods coursework at the lower and upper division levels. This year, based on suggestions from the previous year's assessment, the NSED staff has chosen to specifically focus for a second year on assessing student performance on portions of PLO 1 and 2 in the lower division field courses. We chose to reassess program on achievement of PLOs specifically in the lower division courses now that we have completed a full year of the new curriculum including two semesters incorporating Tier 1 and Tier 2 students in the program. Minor adjustments were made to curriculum across the lower division courses in response to student suggestions. In addition, rubric calibration was conducted and analyzed. Both direct and indirect evidence was collected and reviewed by NSED staff and faculty. We continued to use the new textbooks and curriculum for both the fieldwork and seminar portions of the lower division courses that was previously adopted and field-tested in the Fall 2013. This report will focus on a continued assessment of changes make to better align the courses together, and the additional scaffolding to PLO achievement through the creation of the Tier 2 assignments.</p>	<p>); Recommendation 1: new feedback form to be completed by mentor teachers. This does not require any additional resources as we already have a good draft.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: Undertake a series of faculty meetings in spring and summer 2015 to strengthen the alignment of lower and upper division coursework. This does not require any additional resources, but it does require time for instructors to meet together. There is already a CROPs page designated for collaboration, and can be utilized to store course information.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: Begin process of interviewing students who are just completing the NSED minor and graduating, as well as students who are in a credentialing program currently. We are in the process of designing a series of PLO targeted questions that will be utilized for interviews this spring 2015. This does require some resources to create and maintain a database of current and former students with up-to-date contact information. This will be the job of the new Administrative Assistant to the CalTeach program director. The interviews will be conducted by the Program Director.</p>

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES, AND ARTS

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
Anthropology Major (October 1, 2014)	Anthropology Program assessment of student learning for AY 2013-14 focused on direct evidence of student’s ability to communicate anthropological knowledge effectively in writing (PLO 6). In addition indirect evidence of student learning for PLO 6 and the five additional PLOs of the Anthropology program gathered through the graduating senior survey complemented these data. Direct evidence for PLO 6 suggests that we may be falling short of our goal of 80% Moderate Proficiency or better in all elements assessed, especially with respect to grammar and, to a lesser extent, presentation of supporting data in tables, figures, and/or bibliographies. Indirect evidence for PLO 6 and the remaining PLOs demonstrates great success in student learning, with 100% of both majors and minors reporting Moderate Proficiency or better in nearly all areas.	We do not have resource requests to address PLO 6 at this time, although all of the preliminary pedagogical or curricular solutions offered would require additional faculty resources either in ANTH or the Writing Program, or both.
Chicano/a Studies Minor (October 1, 2014)	We used student work (n=3) from AY 2013-14 sampled from a single upper division course where three of the five Chicano/a Studies (CCS) students were enrolled. We focused on PLO 2, Analyze the role that race, gender and ethnicity have played in defining Chicanos/as as a group. In addition to student essays, we relied on student responses from the annual Graduating Senior Survey. We used three years of student responses to increase our sample size (N=6). Ultimately, we see that our approach to exploring PLO 2 among our CCS students was useful, but our small sample size prevents us from developing meaningful assessment results.	None.
Economics Major (March 1, 2015)	We assessed PLO 6: Communicate clearly and cogently in written and oral form using modern technology. We evaluated student presentations of all the students enrolled in Economics 130. We also sampled 23 senior majors with a survey. Our results show that students perform at moderate and high proficiency on PLO 6 and report that PLO 6 skills are important to their studies in Economics.	The Economics faculty, while heartened by the strong performance of students’ on PLO 6, seek to do even better in the future. To achieve our goals for PLO 6 performance additional research track Economics faculty are required to expand class offerings that

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
		directly target communication skills. An additional tenure track faculty FTE will improve our performance in meeting our goals of excellence for all students on PLO 6 so that a capstone class can be introduced into the major.
English Major (Dec, 2014)	For this, our first report for the new English major, with many of our students still completing the old Literatures and Cultures major, I returned to the writing PLO, which is the same for the two majors. The question I asked was not about the performance of students on the PLO <i>per se</i> . I asked, instead, about students' perceptions of themselves as writers in order to assess what A. Bandura refers to as "self-efficacy," the perception students have of themselves as learners. High self-efficacy leads not only to the resilience necessary to complete a degree, but also is highly correlated with whether a student learns up to his or her abilities. I chose this question because I have seen persistent underperformance in the Senior Thesis class when considering student writing in the thesis compared to student writing in earlier courses. Self-efficacy theory offers one kind of explanation of the underperformance. To assess self-efficacy, I asked students in ENG/LITC 190, Spring 2014, to write a meta-cognitive self-reflective essay describing their development as writers over the course of their time at UCM. The idea was to code these against a rubric to evaluate students' reported efficacy and to see if they gained efficacy over the course of their studies. As the study evolved, however, other explanations of the performance gap appeared, casting doubt on the utility of using the senior thesis as our primary evidence for assessing learning outcomes.	This section not included in report.
History Major (October 1, 2014)	: The History program has, based on disciplinary norms, used the capstone essays written by our students as the primary source for assessing learning outcomes. Following our program review in 2012-13, we also agreed that we needed to assess those essays holistically, rather than taking one learning outcome at a time. A successful capstone essay	This section not included in report.

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
	<p>demonstrates not only that each learning outcome has been achieved, but that they have been integrated. We recognize that this sets a very high standard for our students, but we are committed to helping them reach it.</p> <p>Over the course of this year, we have implemented a number of changes to the history major, designed to address the consistent challenges our students have faced, as well as the results of our program review. These include a rewriting of our program learning outcomes, based on the work done by the American Historical Association in their “Tuning Project”; the introduction of a new required research course taken prior to the capstone course; and the elimination of our geographical tracks, and their replacement by requirements that ask students to explore a range of historical contexts, both temporal and geographical. We have also – as a result of student comments – encouraged majors to take History 100 earlier rather than later. As these changes have not yet had an impact on students, our assessment reports for the next two years will be exploratory while we wait to see the impact of these changes. Thus our faculty assessment meetings for the next two years will focus on developing shared understandings of our goals, and sharing pedagogical strategies.</p> <p>In addition to the essays themselves, in recent years many sections of HIST 191 have required a reflective essay that addresses learning within the history major. Recognizing that such reflection aids metacognition, as well as providing useful information for the faculty, we will make this a standard part of the course, and we are developing guidelines for it. This reflective essay will be used as indirect evidence of learning in future assessment reports.</p>	
Management Major (March 1, 2015)	We assessed PLO 3: Communicate clearly and cogently in written and oral form using modern technology. We evaluated student presentations of all the students enrolled in Economics 130. We also sampled 23 senior majors with a survey. Our results show that students perform at moderate	The Economics faculty, while heartened by the strong performance of students’ on PLO 3, seek to do even better in the future. To achieve our goals for PLO 3 performance

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
	and high proficiency on PLO 3 and report that PLO 3 skills are important to their studies in Economics.	additional research track Economics faculty are required to expand class offerings that directly target communication skills. An additional tenure track faculty FTE will improve our performance in meeting our goals of excellence for all students on PLO 3 so that a capstone class can be introduced into the major.
Philosophy Minor (March 1, 2015)	From Fall 2014 to Spring 2015, the philosophy faculty created a new PLO assessment instrument: a survey that was distributed in philosophy classes for extra credit by SATAL. We used this survey to assess the third PLO: "Ideas: Describe the contribution of major thinkers in the philosophical canon." While in 2013-2014 our expectations for the minors were met and exceeded for this PLO, our expectations were not met in the current assessment. Especially illustrative is the fact that minors reported having taken more than twice as many philosophy classes on average than non-minors, yet the former group had a lower mean score for the basic level and an only marginally higher mean score for the proficient level. Minors did report higher levels of subjective proficiency than non-minors. These discrepancies—between last year's assessment and this year's assessment and between the direct and indirect measures—point to some drawbacks of the current assessment instrument. These and other problems are discussed, with specific recommendations provided for future assessments.	In order to achieve the recommendations provided above, the philosophy faculty will need to consult with SATAL to determine whether SATAL is equipped to provide them with the extra material. If not, the philosophy faculty will likely need to hire an RA to assist with this project in future years.
Political Science Major (March 1, 2015)	Political Science majors choose courses from four subfields or areas of the discipline: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Pre-Law (a newly added area of emphasis). The study of institutions and behavior is central to all four of these subfields, although the substantive emphasis differs. Courses in American Politics focus on domestic politics in the U.S., while courses in Comparative Politics examine government and politics in other nations. International Relations classes address issues in foreign policy, international conflict, and the	At this time, we have no changes to suggest to the major. We have recently undergone a series of major and pre-requisite revisions, and though they are unrelated to this particular assessment, we are very pleased with the current state of the major. And, while we have made changes in direct response to several of the previous rounds of

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
	institutions intended to govern the interactions between nations. Pre-Law classes involve legal institutions and the behavior of legal actors. Students choose two subfields on which to focus.	assessment, and particularly in response to the first time that PLO 1 was assessed, we see this round as a strong affirmation of the effectiveness of the major.
Sociology Major (October 1, 2014)	In the 2013-2014 school-year, Sociology assessed program learning outcome #5: Upon completion of a BA in Sociology, students will use their sociological education outside the undergraduate classroom, particularly in their careers or future study. In the Summer of 2014 we conducted a survey designed to provide evidence regarding this outcome among sociology alumni and current sociology major juniors and seniors. We also present indirect evidence regarding student mastery of this objective from the UC Merced Graduating Senior Survey. The results of all three assessments provide strong support for our program's success on this outcome. The vast majority of our alumni are employed in careers related to sociology or are enrolled in graduate school. A strong majority of alumni indicated that their sociological training and skills are useful in their jobs or school. And, 100% of graduating seniors state that they can use their sociological education in their careers or further study. Our primary recommendation for the program is that we hire additional faculty so that we can offer additional courses, and provide more research and internship opportunities to better train students for their future careers or education. We also recommend increasing career training workshops through the undergraduate Sociology Club. We provide further information on the process and outcomes of these assessment activities in this report.	The results of our assessment suggest that it would be desirable for us to offer more career training, classes, and research and internship opportunities. We can offer additional career training without additional funding. However, offering more classes and research and internship opportunities will require additional faculty. We propose that we be authorized to conduct a faculty search this year (2014-15), and request that the SSHA administration consider allocating additional lecturer funding to our program. Additional sociology faculty could be hired at the Assistant Professor level, which will carry a cost of approximately \$120,000 per year including salary and benefits. ¹ Start up costs for a sociology faculty member are typically no more than \$100,000. An additional full time lecturer in sociology would cost approximately \$80,000 per year, including salary and benefits.
Spanish Major and Minor (October 1, 2014)	The PLO assessed for the major and minor in Spanish during the academic year of 2013-2014 was the one related to student writing ability (PLO1). For the students finishing their major in Spanish, the program pursued the question of whether by the completion of their major in Spanish, students	At this moment our major concern with respect to the writing component of the minor and major in Spanish is the need of reducing the number of maximum enrollment

¹ Assuming that approximately 38% of the cost of a faculty member is in benefits.

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
	<p>possessed Spanish writing and reading skills equivalent to the advanced–high level of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. For students finishing their minor in Spanish, the program pursued a similar question, whether by the completion of their minor in Spanish student they possessed Spanish writing skills equivalent to the advanced level of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. While this report will address the assessment of the one (1) student that finished her major in Spanish in the Academic Year of 2013-2014, it will focus on the assessment of PLO1 in the minor in Spanish, which was finished by 30 students during the academic year of 2013-2014. The process of assessing PLO1 in the major in Spanish was similar to the one of the minor. The Same direct evidence and indirect evidence were used. In order to assess PLO1 for the minor in Spanish, a faculty committee read and evaluated direct evidence as well as indirect evidence. The results of our assessment showed that most students that finished the minor are proficient communicating in writing at the advanced level. Also the student majoring in Spanish demonstrated proficiency at the advanced-high level. However, our assessment also pointed to areas where our program can improve the way we teach skills related to writing in Spanish. In addition, the student work assessed shows that the teaching and learning of the skills associated with the process of writing in a foreign language would benefit from classes with a smaller number of students. We consider this an urgent issue in Spanish Composition and Conversation (SPAN 103), a course that is a requirement for both the Spanish major and minor.</p>	<p>in SPAN 103. At this moment we offer two sections of that course each semester, which represent a total of 60 students. If we reduce the maximum enrollment to 20, we will need to offer three sections each semester. Unfortunately, we do not have the number of instructors, we would need to cover that need, so we would need to hire one instructor. We recommend that hire, since our results show that in order to improve their writing skills in Spanish students benefit from instructor individual feedback. The quality of this feedback is affected by the number of students and is not as effective as it could be due to the large classes.</p>

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

PROGRAM	ABSTRACT	Implications of Proposed Changes (Planning/Budget) as reported by program
Chemistry and Chemical Biology (Nov 2014)	<p>During the summer of 2014 the faculty in the Chemistry and Chemical Biology graduate group initiated assessment of our second Program Learning Objective (communication). This assessment was based on evaluation of the oral presentation and writing skills of students during their qualifying exam and their required annual committee meetings, and the writing skills demonstrated on Master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations. This initial assessment suggests that our students' oral and written communication skills are fairly good but could use improvement. Our rubrics for assessing communication also need to be improved, particularly to distinguish between oral presentation and writing skills.</p>	<p>Initial implementation of recommendation #4 will require additional time from Natural Sciences graduate student support staff. If enrollment in CHEM/MATH/BIO/PHYS 270 increases substantially as a result of recommendation #5, it may be necessary to divide the course into multiple sections (perhaps a CHEM/QSB section and a MATH/PHYS section), which would require additional teaching resources.</p>
Quantitative Systems Biology (Fall 2014)	<p>In accordance with the Graduate Program Assessment Plan of the WASC-approved Quantitative and Systems Biology (QSB) accreditation proposal, for AY2013-2014, the QSB Educational Policy Committee (EPC) has assessed the fourth QSB PLO: <i>Demonstrate ability to perform original scholarship in specialized areas of biology</i>. The QSB assessment plan originally called for assessment of PLO#1 for AY2013-2014, but upon consultation with School of Natural Sciences graduate program staff and the Substantive Change and Graduate Assessment Coordinator, Angela Krueger, the EPC has decided to postpone assessment of PLO#1 until AY2014-2015, in order to design and implement more effective means of assessing PLO#1.</p> <p>PLO#4 addresses scholarship in the context of reading, critiquing and incorporating scientific literature into the student's own work, particularly in publications, qualifying exam proposals, dissertations, and conference presentations (talks, posters). The original assessment plan proposed to assess PLO#4 using QSB dissertation exam rubric scores as direct evidence and student self-statements as indirect evidence.</p> <p>The EPC sought to slightly modify these methods in order to broaden the available evidence by reviewing QSB Qualifying Exam Rubrics in addition to QSB Dissertation Exam Rubrics as direct evidence. The aim was to assess</p>	<p>To provide better access to faculty ratings of students' scholarly abilities, we recommend that SNS graduate program support staff work with the Graduate Assessment Coordinator and the EPC to develop a more reliable and robust system for collecting and cataloging Qualifying Exam Rubrics and Dissertation Rubrics. Establishing such a system will require more consistent submission of these forms by QSB faculty serving on committees. SNS graduate program staff have recently developed an online web-form that will enable students and faculty to upload the required documents from the annual committee meeting. Something similar may be possible for exam and dissertation rubric forms.</p>

	<p>student performance at a critical period of their training, the qualifying exam, and at the completion of their training, the dissertation defense. Additionally, we designed an email survey for current QSB students and QSB alumni to collect indirect evidence, including counts of publications and presentations, as well as student self-assessment of skills in relation to original scholarship.</p>	
<p>Political Science (October 1, 2014)</p>	<p>For our first PLO assessment report we focused on PLO 4, “Effective scientific communication skills, especially the ability to convey complex concepts and information in a clear and concise manner.” For direct evidence we used student performance on the First Year Exam and faculty evaluation during the Annual Student Progress Review. For indirect evidence we collected student feedback from the Annual Student Progress Review, group interviews, and scores from the Teaching Assistant (TA) evaluations for all students. Findings suggest that our graduate students are performing at a level consistent with program expectations. To address some inconsistencies in faculty evaluations and anticipated difficulties in comparing student progress over time, we plan to reevaluate the scoring methods used on our program rubrics and Annual Student Progress reports.</p>	<p>In order to implement the changes noted above, the Graduate Group chair will task the Graduate Curriculum Committee with evaluating the First Year Exam rubric, the Qualifying Exam Rubric, the Dissertation Proposal and Defense Rubric, and the Annual Progress Report scoring scales. The Committee will be charged with determining whether or not changes should be made to ensure comparability across faculty and progress among students. The Graduate Curriculum Committee will also be asked to evaluate the Assessment Plan in order to determine whether the Qualifying Exam should be added as a line of direct evidence on the Communication learning outcome.</p>



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

April 20, 2015

Jian-Qiao Sun
Chair, UC Merced Division of the Academic Senate
UC Merced

RE: UC Merced's Review under the WSCUC Standards

Dear Chair Sun:

As you know, this semester UC Merced initiated its efforts to re-affirm accreditation by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC, formerly "WASC"). This process, which involves several stages¹, will conclude with an Accreditation Visit in spring 2018 and, in June 2018, the WSCUC Commission decision to re-affirm accreditation for a period of 6, 8 or 10 years. The Chancellor and Provost expect UC Merced to earn a 10-year re-affirmation period, continuing our record of strong accreditation reviews.

The first step in the Institutional Review Process for re-affirmation is to complete, as an institution, the *Review under the WSCUC Standards*. Through this first step, UC Merced will

1. Undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the [WSCUC Standards](#), the commitments, standards, and criteria UC Merced must be in substantial compliance with for accreditation to re-affirmed.
2. Identify strengths and areas of good practice.
3. Identify areas that may need attention.
4. Generate a required document for our accreditation review; the *Review under the WSCUC Standards* is the basis for the second essay of the [institutional self-study report](#), and the conclusions and supporting evidence are carefully validated by the external review team.

The WSCUC Steering Committee has completed a draft of the *Review under the WSCUC Standards* on behalf of the campus, and is now seeking feedback on this draft.

Toward that end, I write to invite the Academic Senate to review the document, with a particular focus on Standards 2, 3, and 4, and return comments to me (with a cc to Laura Martin) by Thursday

¹ The stages of the Institutional Review Process (IRP) for re-affirmation, and the campus' timeline for this work, are available on the [Re-affirmation page](#) of UC Merced's accreditation website, accreditation.ucmerced.edu.

May 21st. If this is not possible, please respond with an alternative submission date as soon as possible.

When reviewing the document, the faculty of the Senate should consider the extent to which they agree with

1. The Steering Committee's *Self-Review Rating* (column 3) and rating of *Importance to Address* (column 4) for each Criteria for Review (CFR). WSCUC's scoring rubric is provided in the box in the upper left hand portion of p. 2 of the document.
2. The responses to the Synthesis/Reflections questions for each of the four standards.

If there is disagreement with a self-rating score, **these differences can be noted in the document using the PDF sticky note or highlight function. Alternative scores, together with a brief explanation for the conclusion, including hyperlinks and/or references to evidence in support of the conclusions, are welcome.**

Similarly, the PDF sticky note and/or highlight function can be used to comment on and/or modify responses to the Synthesis/Reflection questions.²

To increase the efficiency of the work, we recommend dividing the work of reviewing each Standard among individuals or teams of individuals.

Laura Martin, the campus' Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), and I are happy to meet with the Senate to review this process and/or answer questions. Please note that the first page of the worksheet includes a helpful overview, including

- the purpose of the worksheet , *Purpose of Worksheet*
- the relationship of the WSCUC Standards, Criteria for Review (CFR), and Guidelines, *The WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines*
- guidance for completing the worksheet, *Using this Worksheet*

Finally, please know that, in addition to the Senate, a broad array of institutional stakeholders have been invited to review and comment on this draft, including but not limited to the School Executive Committees, campus administrative leadership, and student leadership.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, thank you very much for your assistance in completing this significant first stage in our re-affirmation of accreditation effort. We look forward to your feedback.

Sincerely,
Nate Monroe
Associate Professor, and Chair, WSCUC Steering Committee

² We chose not to offer Word documents as we have found the tables quite difficult to work with and somewhat unstable in their formatting.

Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements

Purpose of the Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to assist planning groups preparing for a WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) review to undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards by identifying strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention. Institutions will also use this worksheet to identify, and insert references to, key supporting documentation to support its judgments. Teams will follow these references to verify the completeness of the information. After being used to stimulate discussion and to help focus the review, the completed worksheet will then be submitted with the self-study for evaluation as evidence for Component 2 of the Institutional Report at the time of the Offsite Review, with follow up as needed at the time of the Accreditation Visit. The submission of this worksheet with the institution's self study helps to validate that the institution has been reviewed under all Standards and relevant Criteria for Review.

The WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines

The WSCUC Standards guide institutions in self-review, provide a framework for institutional submissions, and serve as the basis for judgments by evaluation teams and the Commission. Each Standard is set forth in broad holistic terms that are applicable to all institutions. Under each of the four Standards are two or more major categories that make the application of the Standard more specific. Under each of these categories are Criteria for Review (CFRs), which identify and define specific applications of the Standard. Guidelines, provided for some but not all CFRs, identify typical or common forms or methods for demonstrating performance related to the CFR; institutions, however, may provide alternative demonstrations of compliance. This worksheet contains all the CFRs and Guidelines from the 2013 *Handbook of Accreditation*. An "X" in the cell indicates a cross-reference to other CFRs that touch on related issues.

Using this Worksheet

The worksheet is used during the early stages of planning for the Institutional Report and may be revisited later when preparing for further reviews. For each CFR, institutions are asked to give themselves a rating indicating how well they are doing, to identify the importance of addressing the CFR as an aspect of the review, and to provide comments as appropriate, about their self-assessment. Key areas may thereby be identified where more evidence is needed or more development required. Institutions may have members of the planning group complete the worksheet individually with responses reviewed by the group as a whole. Or an institution may divide the worksheet by Standards with different groups completing each standard. Use these or other approaches to complete the worksheet.

Once the institution has completed this self-review process, priorities that are identified using this form should be integrated with the institution's context, goals, and planning in the development of its report. Summary questions are provided in the worksheet as a means of assisting institutions in determining areas of greatest concern or areas of good practice to be addressed or highlighted in institutional reports. Please include the summary sheets with the submission of this worksheet.

Compliance with Federal Requirements

In addition to the Review, there are four checklists that team members will complete during the Accreditation Visit and attach to their team report in order to ensure that the institution is in compliance with the federal requirements cited in the checklists. The institution is expected to provide the links to the needed information in anticipation of the team's review at the time of the visit.

Review under WSCUC Standards

<p>Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.</p> <p><u>Self-Review Rating</u> 1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p> <p><u>Importance to address at this time</u> A:U= High priority – Urgent A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth. B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Institutional Information</p> <p>Institution: University of California, Merced</p> <p>Type of Review: ® Comprehensive for Reaffirmation</p> <p>Date of Submission: ____/____/____ Mo Day Year</p> <p>Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO</p>
---	---

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives <i>The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy.</i>						
Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Institutional Purposes						
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines.	2	C	Though functional, the mission could benefit from revision. A recurrent theme is that the mission statement is overly long and slightly outdated. Recently, CAPRRA noted that the mission is not a relevant reference document. Rated as a lower priority in light of more urgent and important priorities. Steering Committee noted that UCM might consider updating its mission after the self-study is complete, permitting revisions to be informed by the outcomes of the self-study process.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: <i>Introduction.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission • Principles of Community 	

<p>1.2 Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning outcomes. X 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.2</p>		2	B/A:OA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are educational objectives widely recognized? How do we know? How are educational objectives shared/communicated within the institution (students, faculty, staff) as the institution grows? As an institution, need to consider how we will make public "evidence of student learning outcomes", beyond those reported in the UC Merced Profile and in keeping with our campus principles of assessment. IRDS makes data on student achievement including retention and grad available, but it is difficult to get there from any of main landing pages. Propose adding assessment/student success link on campus homepage under "About." 	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 5: <i>Student Success</i>.</p> <p>Public disclosure links verified by Annual Report.</p>	
---	--	---	--------	--	---	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Integrity and Transparency						
<p>1.3 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and writing. X 3.2, 3.10</p>	<p>The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure that these conditions are consistent with generally recognized principles of academic freedom. Due-process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.</p>	1	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commitment is publicly stated in system-wide APM (APM – 010). Hard to know how easy it is to locate from campus. What about for staff who work with academics? Do they need/receive orientation on academic freedom? Is there existing policy for non-academic staff regard academic freedom? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Freedom Statement in system-wide Academic Personnel Manual (APM -010) Academic freedom for Unit 18 lecturers is provided in Article 2 of MOU with UC. Principles of Community 	

<p>1.4 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices. X 2.2a, 3.1</p>	<p>The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WSCUC Diversity Policy.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>A:OA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus has a clear commitment to diversity as stated in our mission, but needs to continue to focus on diversity as a campus, including in all its definitions, across all areas. • Would campus benefit from a strategic plan for diversity? 	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
<p>1.5 Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. X 3.6 – 3.10</p>	<p>The institution does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by governmental, religious, corporate, or other external bodies that have a relationship to the institution.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The University is governed by The Regents, which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution has "full powers of organization and governance" subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The article states that "the university shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs." Consistent with this, the UC Merced operates with appropriate autonomy.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
<p>1.6 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public. The institution demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. The institution treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid. X 2.12</p>	<p>The institution has published or has readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Truthful information about academic goals, programs, services and costs to students is available to students and the larger public on campus websites including those of the Registrar, Student Affairs, Disability Services, Office of Student Life, Student Conduct (Student Judicial Affairs), and Financial Aid.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p> <p>Truthful representation and complaint policies evaluated during comprehensive review</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>1.7 The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors.</p> <p>X 3.4, 3.6. 3.7</p>		1	C	<p>UC Merced has a high level of integrity and transparency in its operations as evidenced by commitment to an appropriately resourced Office of Campus Culture & Compliance (OC3) placed within the Chancellor's Office for the highest degree of independence when evaluating campus operations. OC3 is organized to ensure coordinated independent evaluation of business processes through the Internal Audit function as well as through compliance monitoring within the Ethics & Compliance Program. Coordination of campus-wide policies and procedures has been consolidated under OC3 to enhance access to and development of local procedures. Timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances have received robust attention at UC Merced. Coordination of complaints across all functional areas at UC Merced is being carried out by OC3, with emphasis on promoting efficiencies, improving accountability, and tracking complaints and outcomes through disposition so we are better able to understand and improve culture in real time.</p>	Audits submitted with Annual Report.	

<p>1.8 The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>UC Merced carefully attends to accreditation requirements, including those related to substantive change, with the support of the ALO and Substantive Change Coordinator. UC Merced continues to develop practices (e.g. ALO ex-officio on Graduate Council) to ensure that we abide by these expectations. When questions arise we work with WSCUC staff to gather answers and understand the implications for the campus.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: <i>Introduction</i>.</p> <p>Commitments to integrity with respect to WSCUC policies are demonstrated in prior interactions with WSCUC.</p>	
--	--	----------	----------	--	--	--

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard One

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

- Our mission is outdated and could benefit from revision. The Steering Committee suggested that revisions might be an outcome of the self-study process associated with re-affirmation of accreditation.
- We meet these expectations but our documentation needs to be more accessible to stakeholders. For instance, the academic freedom policy and student success data.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

- The campus does a good job of collecting data that illustrates we meet to this Standard (and CFR), in fact and in spirit.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

- We need to better job of making crucial information—such as, the eight guiding principles, academic freedom, commitment to diversity, and student outcomes—easily accessible to internal and external stakeholders.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Teaching and Learning						
2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. X 3.1	The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.	1.5 - UG 1.5 - Grad	A:OA	Content, length, and standards of academic programs, graduate and undergraduate conform to recognized disciplinary and professional standards. Programs are also subject to rigorous peer review, both at the time they are proposed and once every seven years via program review. Faculty: student ratios at the institutional level are in keeping with our UC peers, although ratios vary across programs. Faculty are appropriately qualified for the curriculum as vetted through faculty hiring and peer review processes and, in some cases as appropriate, administrative review. Additional faculty are needed as programs continue to grow. We are engaged in integrative planning as an institution in support of the goal of 10,000 students by 2020.	Evaluated during comprehensive review, documented in "Credit Hour and Program Length Checklist"	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. The institution has both a coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees and processes that ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees.</p> <p>X 3.1 – 3.3, 4.3, 4.4</p>		<p>2 - UG 1- Grad</p>	<p>A:U - UG C - Grad</p>	<p>At the undergraduate level, entry level requirements are clearly defined and set at the system-level. Within the major and standalone minors, PLOs and associated rubrics define levels of student achievement that represent more than an accumulation of courses or credits. As an institution, we are in the process of clarifying and fully defining the meaning of the baccalaureate degree as part of our re-examination of General Education. At the graduate level, degrees are clearly defined in terms of entry level requirements as articulated in program-level policies and procedures, and the Graduate Advisor Handbook. Capstone experiences are required for masters (thesis or comprehensive exam) and PhD (dissertation); expectations associated with degree completion (PLOs, rubrics) define levels of student achievement necessary for graduation and represent more than an accumulation of courses or credits. There is a coherent philosophy that guides the meaning of graduate degrees, including learning outcomes for the Masters and PhD, and processes to ensure the quality and integrity.</p>	<p>Program descriptions in Catalog.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UCM Catalog <p>See also program websites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts • School of Natural Sciences • School of Engineering <p>Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major). X 3.1 – 3.3</p>	<p>The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).</p>	<p>3 – UG</p>	<p>A:U</p>	<p>The score of three reflects the status of GE; we are in the process of revising General Education to address the description outlined in the guideline. A process is in place to attend to student development and assessment of the core competencies for all majors through the program learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Description of General Education program with reference to Core Competencies.</p> <p>Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>.</p>	
<p>2.2b The institution's graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students' active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program. X 3.1 – 3.3</p>	<p>Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ, at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered and have a preponderance of the faculty holding the relevant terminal degree in the discipline. Institutions demonstrate that there is a sufficient number of faculty members to exert collective responsibility for the development and evaluation of the curricula, academic policies, and teaching and mentoring of students.</p>	<p>1 -Grad</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>See CFR 2.2. We clearly meet all aspects of this CFR, including as described in the guideline. We demonstrate this to WSCUC with every substantive review for new graduate programs. Initially, there were a number of conjoined undergraduate/graduate courses; with growth of faculty this has decreased to an appropriate number.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>2.3 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and Standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment.</p> <p>X 3.5</p>	<p>The institution is responsible for ensuring that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well developed, and subject to appropriate oversight.</p>	<p>1 – UG 1 -Grad (with respect to the CFR, 3 with regard to the guideline, if we choose to accept the guideline)</p>	<p>A:OA (with respect to the CFR); B with respect to the guideline.</p>	<p>As described in the CFR, this is an area strength for us. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow. Regarding the guideline: there are questions about resourcing for co-curricular experiences like internships or service learning that address the needs of our students specifically, e.g. financial needs, or the factors related to local context.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>.</p>	
<p>2.4 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards.</p> <p>X 4.3 – 4.4</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi.</p>	<p>1 – UG 2 – Grad</p>	<p>A:OA</p>	<p>By Regental authority, policy and practice, faculty are responsible for curriculum, including student learning outcomes, standards of performance, and for demonstrating through assessment student achievement of these standards. Student learning outcomes are required for approval of new courses, and appear in the syllabi of nearly all courses. At the graduate level, shared expectations for learning as reflected in systematic assessment of program outcomes that advances a shared set of standards among faculty is still evolving. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. X 4.4</p>		<p>2 - UG 1 - Grad</p>	<p>A:U – UG A:OA - Grad</p>	<p>Rated as a 2 for the undergraduate level, because we need to address these expectations for General Education. There is also some thought that expectations for student performance, and support to help students meet those expectations, may not be uniformly high across all undergraduate programs. Some programs and courses may benefit from development in this area.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
<p>2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work. X 4.3 – 4.4</p>	<p>The institution has an assessment infrastructure adequate to assess student learning at program and institution levels.</p>	<p>1.5 – UG 1.5 -Grad</p>	<p>A:OA</p>	<p>UCM has a strong academic assessment infrastructure, growing understanding of practice and use of results to inform teaching and curriculum. Student achievement of academic standards is also considered during program review. Assessment of student learning in GE is in development. At the graduate level, we need continue to attend to assessment as programs grow and new programs are added.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations. X 4.1, 4.6</p>		<p>1 – UG 1 -Grad</p>	<p>A:OA</p>	<p>All academic and co-curricular programs are subject to program review on a seven year cycle. By policy, reviews consider student learning outcomes, retention and graduation rates. The process is overseen and coordinated by the Periodic Oversight Review Committee, which is working to strengthen periodic review as a means for advancing program and institutional goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic program review policies: Undergraduate, Graduate • Academic program review schedules: Undergraduate, Graduate • Student Affairs Program Review policy and schedule <p>[Description of Program Review process and calendar for academic and co-curricular units.]</p> <p>Also addressed during review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, Component 5: <i>Student Success</i>, and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>.</p>	

Scholarship and Creative Activity

<p>2.8 The institution clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and all categories of faculty. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, and their dissemination appropriate to the institution's purposes and character. X 3.2</p>	<p>Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure the recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.</p>	<p>2 - UG 1 - Grad 1 - Faculty</p>	<p>A:OA</p>	<p>The extent to which expectations for research, scholarship and creative activity is defined for undergraduates varies with major as described in program learning outcomes and degree overview. The institution is working to clarify this aspect of the meaning of the baccalaureate degree. These requirements are available to all faculty, Senate and non-Senate as codified in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 210) and MOU, respectively. Instructional and curricular innovation is encouraged. Faculty are encouraged to apply for graduate training grants from funding agencies, and this activity is recognized in personnel reviews. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow. [Note: Recommendation by Review Team for Initial Accreditation (p.30): "In the tenure and promotion process, consider research on teaching as a standard, acknowledging the firm foundation of assessment. View this as a form of scholarship."]</p>	<p>Policies related to faculty and student research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Faculty: APM 210 • Non-Senate, lecturing faculty: MOU
---	---	--	-------------	---	--

<p>2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service. X 3.2</p>		<p>2 – UG 2 - Grad</p>	<p>A:OA</p>	<p>Appropriate linkages are recognized in system-wide policy governing appointment and promotion for Senate faculty: “Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.” (APM-210). Some non-Senate faculty also engage in scholarship on teaching, pedagogy, and assessment. However, interpretation and recognition of these expectations varies across by-law units. The campus also continues to work on recognizing assessment as part of teaching (at course and program levels). Toward this end, the Graduate Division, the Office of Institutional Assessment and the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence offer a learning community “Assessment as Pedagogy and Planning” for faculty and graduate students. Interest in the learning community increases with each offering suggesting a growing recognition of the importance of assessment/culture of assessment. The campus is also working on mechanisms for assessing mentoring in interdisciplinary context, especially across schools.</p>	<p>Policies related to faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Faculty: APM 210 • Non-Senate, lecturing faculty: MOU 	
---	--	----------------------------	-------------	--	---	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Student Learning and Success						
<p>2.10 The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.</p>	<p>The institution disaggregates data according to racial, ethnic, gender, age, economic status, disability, and other categories, as appropriate. The institution benchmarks its retention and graduation rates against its own aspirations as well as the rates of peer institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 - UG (TTD, and degree completion) • 1.5 – Grad • 1 -both (for data collection and disaggregation, etc.) 	<p>A:U - UG A:OA – Grad and both</p>	<p>UCM's data collection efforts are sound in relation to the expectations described in this CFR. At the undergraduate level, we are actively seeking to understand barriers to completing a degree in four years in order to improve the fraction of students completing in a timely fashion. These efforts could benefit from greater coordination campus-wide. On finer scales than described in this CFR, we need to improve data gathering and use in support of student success. At the graduate level, TTD and degree completion rates are commensurate with national norms, but we strive to continue to improve. We are in the process of further systematizing data collection at the graduate level.</p>	<p>Included in Annual Report.</p> <p>Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>.</p>	
<p>2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. X 4.3 – 4.5</p>		<p>UG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 (for alignment and support for all students' personal and professional development), • 3 (for integration), • 2 (for assessment and use of results) <p>Grad:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 (for alignment and support for all students' personal and professional development), • 2 (for integration), • 2 (for assessment and use of results) 	<p>A:U – UG A:OA - Grad</p>	<p>At undergraduate level, co-curricular programs are designed to support all students' personal and professional development, and are aligned with academic goals. They are not, however, integrated with academic programs. At the graduate level, Student Affairs and Graduate Division are offering programs that are aligned with academic goals, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. At both levels, co-curricular assessment is happening but not consistently.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	

<p>2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements. X 1.6</p>	<p>Recruiting materials and advertising truthfully portray the institution. Students have ready access to accurate, current, and complete information about admissions, degree requirements, course offerings, and educational costs.</p>	<p>2 - UG 2 - Grad</p>	<p>A:U</p>	<p>UG advising is an area to strengthen, particularly with respect to ensuring <i>all</i> students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely and useful information. For instance, data suggest that a significant fraction of students struggle with degree planning. At the graduate level, annual student reviews are critical to ensuring students understand and receive timely advice about degree requirements; we are working to strengthen this aspect of graduate education.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review; documented in "Marketing and Recruitment Review" Checklist.</p>	
<p>2.13 The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring, services for students with disabilities, financial aid counseling, career counseling and placement, residential life, athletics, and other services and programs as appropriate, which meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers. X 3.1</p>		<p>2 - UG 2 - Grad</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>UCM provides all listed services for undergraduates. We are unclear about the extent to which services are systematically assessed to ensure they meet the needs of UC Merced's students. Relevant services also exist at the graduate level, but we have additional needs, including residential life for international students in particular, and mental health services oriented for graduate students. Assessment is happening but not consistently at both levels.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
<p>2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students provide clear, accurate, and timely information, ensure equitable treatment under academic policies, provide such students access to student services, and ensure that they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process. X 1.6</p>	<p>Formal policies or articulation agreements are developed with feeder institutions that minimize the loss of credits through transfer credits.</p>	<p>3 (UG) 0 (Grad)</p>	<p>A:U</p>	<p>At undergraduate level, it is not clear what is working and what is not working. Transfer success is a system-wide priority.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 5: <i>Student Success</i>. Also documented in "Transfer Credit Policy Checklist".</p>	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

Undergraduate Level:

- Clarifying the meaning of the baccalaureate degree, including as a means for contextualizing the contributions of the major, GE, and the co-curriculum. (CFR 2.2)
- Addressing all aspects of GE including its contribution to the undergraduate degree, the learning outcomes of General education, its contributions to student development of the Core Competencies, its design to cultivate intended learning outcomes, and our mechanisms for sustainably assessing student achievement of intended outcomes. (CFR 2.2a, 2.5, 2.6)
- Undergraduate advising (CFR 2.12)

Graduate

- Assessment of graduate academic programs is evolving and needs continued development to ensure meaningful, valid and reliable results on which to take action. (CFR 2.4, 2.6)
- More consistent implementation of annual reviews of student progress. (CFR 2.12)

Undergraduate and Graduate

- More systematic collection of data to assess the extent to which our services meet the needs of our students, including intended learning outcomes, and using the results for improvement. (CFR 2.11, 2.13)

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

With respect to Standard 2 CRF's, the evaluations above were made on the basis of available and informative evidence. This includes data/information on academic program outcomes assessment and student success metrics (at least at undergraduate level), demographics etc.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

- Graduate assessment: At the graduate level, we are still building systematic review processes and data sets as programs move to standalone status. We are working toward program-level dashboards.
- Undergraduate: strengthening our ability to further disaggregate data to explain and examine patterns in IRDS data.
- Undergraduate and Graduate, Academic and Co-Curricular: We are working to improve our ability to easily track assessment activity and aggregate results at levels above the program/unit to inform planning and decision making. Data exist but need to be readily available to a broader array of constituents and would benefit with being coupled to other metrics (e.g. student success) to provide a holistic picture of student learning, student success, and support for these core institutional functions.

Review under WSCUC Standards

<p>Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.</p> <p><u>Self-Review Rating</u> 1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p> <p><u>Importance to address at this time</u> A:U= High priority – Urgent A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth. B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Institutional Information</p> <p>Institution: University of California, Merced</p> <p>Type of Review: Ⓢ Comprehensive for Reaffirmation</p> <p>Date of Submission: ____/____/____ Mo Day Year</p> <p>Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO</p>
---	---

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability *The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Faculty and Staff						
3.1 The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity and to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered. X 2.1, 2.2b	The institution has a faculty staffing plan that ensures that all faculty roles and responsibilities are fulfilled and includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty members with appropriate backgrounds by discipline and degree level.	1	A:OA	The institution engages in fair hiring practices to ensure diversity in staff and faculty recruitment efforts. Diversity efforts are based on Affirmative Action Goals per the institutions Affirmative Action Plan. While we are confident in the fulfillment of this core deliverable, it remains a continuous high priority to maintain adherence to and delivery of a consistently high standard.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importanc e to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>3.2 Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning. X 1.7, 4.3, 4.4</p>		2	A:OA	<p>The institution has established policies to ensure recruitment and hiring of faculty and staff are aligned with the mission.</p> <p>HR's Strategic Plan recognizes the long-range smart growth plans as detailed in the UCM's Workforce Planning exercise so that all hiring, training and development is integrated around a smart growth model to leverage people, skills and technology in the most efficient, effective and self-fulfilling way possible with continued focused dialogue anchored in the University's mission.</p> <p>Once on-boarded, the staff are evaluated annually with emphasize on essential functions, goals, achievements, core competencies, and professional development needs. Performance management training for supervisors is offered annually. Enhancement to our staff performance appraisal system, coupled with mandatory training and a reemphasis on overall employee training and development is a key component of the new HR Strategic Plan. Significant changes to streamline the appraisal process are underway. Institution offers cash and non-cash awards to recognize exceptional performance and innovation.</p>	<p>Faculty Handbooks</p> <p>Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures (MAPP)</p> <p>UC Policy PPSM 20 Recruitment</p> <p>PPSM 23 - Performance Management Policy, Performance Management Guidelines, Performance Appraisals, Employee & Supervisor Resources, Halogen.</p> <p>STAR & Innovation Awards</p>	

<p>3.3 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes. X 2.1, 2.2b, 4.4</p>	<p>The institution engages full-time, non-tenure-track, adjunct, and part-time faculty members in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>A:OA</p>	<p>Faculty development in support of teaching, learning and assessment of student learning outcomes is provided in several ways: through programming and resources provided by the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE,) in the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Academic Personnel Office, and in small part by the Office of Institutional Assessment. Faculty work on program assessment is supported by assessment specialists, one per school and one at the graduate level. CRTE resources are available to all faculty, lecturing and Senate. They are also available to staff and complement professional development opportunities in assessment offered by the Division of Student Affairs.</p> <p>At an institutional level, the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) is charged with advisory and oversight responsibilities for academic and administrative assessment, annual and periodic. This includes recommending appropriate resourcing in support of assessment, and facilitating processes by which assessment practices act to align resources with academic mission, campus strategic plans, and resources.</p> <p>A score of "2" is given for several reasons: (1) in part because the CRTE is undergoing periodic review in spring 2015, including an examination of "sufficient support". (2) It also reflects the need to better integrate engagement in assessment (as teaching at course and program levels) into the tenure and promotion process. (3) Also, while lecturing faculty are involved in program review, their involvement in annual program assessment varies across programs. (4) Under PROC's guidance, we are still developing assessment processes that facilitate alignment of educational and administrative activities and resourcing with campus goals. The "A" score reflects the need to continue to attend to these needs this as the campus faculty numbers grow rapidly over the next five years in keeping with 2020 planning.</p>	<p>Policies, budgets, or other indicators of faculty development programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Center for Research on Teaching Excellence Faculty Development Services - Non-Senate Faculty access to Instructional Support in MOU - Assessment specialist services for faculty and staff - PPSM 50 Professional Development Policy for Staff Members - Professional Development Programs for Staff Members - Lynda.com Access for staff and faculty 	
--	--	----------	-------------	--	---	--

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

<p>3.4 The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. X 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 4.6, 4.7</p>	<p>The institution has functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years. If the institution has an accumulated deficit, it should provide a detailed explanation and a realistic plan for eliminating it.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>A:OA</p>	<p>UC Merced's budget is based on estimated revenue expected to be received which is reviewed and adjusted to actuals throughout the year. Enrollment management is done in coordination with the University of California system as a whole and is reconciled against the long range plan for UC Merced. A tone at the top has been established and communicated campus-wide regarding current and future budget alignment with our Academic Strategic Plans, workforce planning initiatives, and our long range 2020 Project, which is a long-term strategic plan to grow the campus over the next 5 years. A long range financial plan has been developed to forecast the financial impact of the aforementioned plans. The financial plan outlines the targets that must be met for the campus to achieve financial sustainability.</p> <p>The diversification of revenue sources has been the most difficult in that the campus is in growth mode and many of the sources are not eligible to be used for capital use. Revenues received totaled \$224.8 million from a variety of sources from student tuition and fees, which accounted for 23% of total revenues, State Educational Appropriations from the State of California (47% of total revenue), auxiliary enterprises (10%), Grants and contracts (8% of total revenue), and other sources. State Educational Appropriations requires advance approval from the State of California before it can be used for capital purposes but the amount eligible is capped. As a result, a majority of the amounts are not eligible for capital use. Likewise, grants and contracts are typically not eligible for capital use. Additionally, over the last three years, the Campus has shown positive increases in the net position of the campus (i.e. no operational deficits).</p> <p>While individual campuses within the University of California do not issue stand-alone financial statements, the University of California System-wide maintains a net position (i.e. equity) of \$11.3 billion with a cash and investment portfolio totaling \$21.6 billion. Based on the</p>	<p>Audits submitted with Annual Report.</p> <p>Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
---	---	----------	-------------	---	--	--

				official records of the UC, UC Merced share of total cash and investments totaled \$171 million with a positive net position balance of \$56 million as of June 2014. The UC, on a consolidated basis, received an unqualified opinion for the fiscal year then ended June 30, 2014 from its independent accounting firm KPMG.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>3.5 The institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes. X 1.2, 2.1, 2.2</p>	<p>The institution provides training and support for faculty members who use technology in instruction. Institutions offering graduate programs have sufficient fiscal, physical, information, and technology resources and structures to sustain these programs and to create and maintain a graduate-level academic culture.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>A:U</p>	<p>UCM lacks sufficient or dedicated staffing and staff skill availability to support faculty in online course development, classroom use of technology and the use of a research cyberinfrastructure. As well, the content production and data delivery infrastructure is dated and lacks robustness, performance reliability, and standards-based installation and lifecycle. However, a new cloud-based LMS was launched in Jan 2015 that provides a solid foundation for the delivery of online course content. For spring semester 2015, approximately 376 faculty have activated an LMS course account as all grade submissions occur via this tool. At present five faculty are designing online courses per the UCOP ITLI funding and are using resources from other UC campus' for course and content development.</p> <p>Funding is in place to launch a multiyear upgrade of the campus network beginning April 2015. The IT Strategic Workforce Plan includes a request for a Director of Academic and Emerging Technology (Phase 1, launched in February 2015), along with a request for 10 staff lines to support content and course development and classroom technology support (Phase 2). The following 2 Goals are specified in the IT Strategic plan and scheduled to launch with the conclusion of Phase 1 of the IT workforce plan and the hiring of a Director of Academic and Emerging Technology: (2.1.5) Build and execute a classroom technology roadmap and (3.1.) Define vision for technology for teaching and learning. A Cyberinfrastructure external review occurred in March 2015 and we are waiting for final recommendations. Two proposals were submitted on 22 March, 2015 to NSF Solicitation 14-521 CC*DNI (Campus Infrastructure - Data, Networking, and Innovation) for funding to support faculty research computing needs.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
--	--	----------	------------	---	---	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importanc e to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Organization Structures and Decision-Making Processes						
3.6 The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.		1	C	The institution has assembled a leadership team that is committed to high performance goals and aspirations as evidenced by the launch of the Academic Focusing Initiative, workforce planning and the 2020 Project.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.7 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.	The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority.	2	A:OA	<p>The institution has well defined organizational structures to facilitate shared governance as evidenced by the establishment of the Periodic Annual Review Committee (PROC). PROC is a committee, co-chaired by the Provost and the Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, includes faculty and administrative representation. It was established to consolidate Academic and Administrative Reviews to reaffirm the shared governance concept. Under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the university's administration has undertaken a comprehensive workforce planning process to ensure the organizational structure facilitates efficient service and effective decision support structures.</p> <p>One area of potential improvement concerns the duties and responsibilities of Bylaw Unit chairs. Currently, unit chairs have responsibility for many duties outlined in APM 245, but the final authority for decision-making in those areas rests with the school deans. Over the next several years, the university could evolve to better align responsibility with authority for functions that reside respectively with the deans and unit chairs.</p>	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	
3.8 The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.		1	C	The institution has assembled a solid leadership team who display the ability to provide effective educational leadership and management. The Chancellor serves as the full-time chief executive officer and Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget serves as the chief financial officer. Both are accountable to the campus and serve as part of the Senior Management Group of the University of California.	Position Descriptions for CEO, CFO.	

<p>3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer. X 1.5 – 1.7</p>	<p>The governing body comprises members with the diverse qualifications required to govern an institution of higher learning. It regularly engages in Self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>The University is governed by The Regents, which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution has "full powers of organization and governance" subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The article states that "the university shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs." There is an annual review of the CEO by conducted by the President.</p>	<p>University of California Board of Regents, membership and biographies.</p> <p>Board of Regents Standing Committees and Membership</p> <p>Bylaws of the Board of Regents</p> <p>Academic Senate Policy on Review of Chancellors</p>	
<p>3.10 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure that both academic quality and the institution's educational purposes and character are sustained. X 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4</p>	<p>The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of all categories of full- and part-time faculty.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>The institution has established governance structures through the Standing Orders of the Regents that outline the responsibilities clearly. In addition, the structures are also outlined in the Bylaws of the UCM Academic Senate.</p>	<p>Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority:</p> <p>Standing Orders of the Regents of the UC</p> <p>Bylaws of the UC Academic Senate</p> <p>UC Merced Academic Senate</p>	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

- While UC Merced has outlined clear roles and responsibilities for its administration and administrative structures, there is a need to further define the academic administrative structure. UCM has strategically decided to establish a multi-disciplinary structure; however, there is need to have some clear lines of responsibility in the context of the traditional departmental structure while still preserving the unique nature and synergistic benefits of a multi-disciplinary organization.
- The institution has deployed several strategic initiatives for mapping out the future of UCM through its Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative, the Workforce Planning initiative and the 2020 Project (Physical Planning initiative). The development of the Campus Financial plan consolidates the work of the aforementioned plans into a financial viability and sustainability plan.
- Given that UC Merced prides itself on being the first university of the 21st century, the need for additional support of IT infrastructure and workforce plan was highlighted as critical area for improvement. UCM lacks sufficient/dedicated staff with the skills to support faculty in online course development, classroom use of technology and the use of a research cyberinfrastructure. As well, the content production and data delivery infrastructure is dated and lacks robustness, performance reliability, and standards-based installation and lifecycle. While funding is in place to launch a multiyear upgrade of the campus network beginning April 2015, there is still a need to address the workforce needs for IT.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

An area of strength, showcased in this process, is that the institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. Through its hiring practices, and commitment to excellence in teaching, the institution employs a diverse faculty and staff and it provides for continued professional development. Also the institution has launched a several long range planning initiatives to ensure that the campus is able to deliver its mission of teaching and research through excellence in academia, workforce and physical resources. While these plans are still in development, the institution plans to integrate the plans for a comprehensive deployment in the near future.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

One area that is both a high priority for the institution, and needs significant development, is the provision and access to information and technology resources. This important focus area is linked to our institutional needs to enhance the institution's ability to utilize data gathered to improve programmatic success. As mentioned in the review Standards 2, and 4, the UC Merced generally has effective data gathering processes; however, data resides in a significant number of data systems, which makes the process of enabling cross-referenced data analytics challenging. Therefore, the consolidation of data systems to enable effective development of the institution's data warehousing capabilities are also important.

Review under WSCUC Standards

<p>Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p><u>Self-Review Rating</u> 1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p><u>Importance to address at this time</u> A:U= High priority – Urgent A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth. B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><u>Self-Review Rating</u> 1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p>	<p><u>Importance to address at this time</u> A:U= High priority – Urgent A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth. B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Institutional Information</p> <p>Institution: University of California, Merced</p> <p>Type of Review: ® Comprehensive for Reaffirmation</p> <p>Date of Submission: ____/____/____ Mo Day Year</p> <p>Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO</p>
<p><u>Self-Review Rating</u> 1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p>	<p><u>Importance to address at this time</u> A:U= High priority – Urgent A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth. B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p>		

Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement
The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Quality Assurance Processes						
4.1 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results. X 2.7, 2.10		2	A:OA	UC Merced employs a set of quality assurance process. Examples include new curriculum approval process, new program approval process, periodic program review, teaching evaluation by students, etc. However, the dissemination of information is limited. Additionally, how to meet the academic services and curriculum development needs to reflect our students or our growth, is an area for improvement.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.2 The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated. X 1.2, 2.10		2	B	In 2014, Institutional Research and Decision Support underwent periodic review with a focus on the development of a collaborative service. There is a sense that data are generated, but data need to be made available to all faculty and staff in a timely manner, and clear pathways to acquire data need to be developed.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance.</i>	
Institutional Learning and Improvement						
4.3 Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. X 2.2 – 2.6	The institution has clear, well-established policies and practices—for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information—that create a culture of evidence and improvement.	2	A:U	Improvements as a result of inquiry, evidence and evaluation are not readily implemented, as more focus is placed on research, it takes precedent over assessment of teaching. Better evidence of co-curricular effectiveness needs to be developed beyond satisfaction and participation data.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs,</i> Component 4: <i>Educational Quality,</i> Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance,</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability.</i>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>4.4 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology. X 2.2 – 2.6</p>	<p>Periodic analysis of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices.</p>	1	A:OA	<p>UCM has a strong, faculty-owned, academic assessment infrastructure, growing understanding of practice and use of results to inform teaching and curriculum. The teaching evaluation performed by students is a good process for faculty to sustain or improve their teaching quality. Curriculum committees, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council together play good roles in keeping our courses in high quality. Evaluation of programs is achieved through two processes: (1) student evaluations, in which student feedback provides a basis for change in the classroom regarding improvements in curriculum and pedagogy; (2) coupled annual program learning outcomes assessment and program review processes that focus on student learning results in support of program improvement.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
<p>4.5 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs. X 2.6, 2.7</p>		2	A:OA	<p>The School of Engineering has appointed Board of Advisors comprised of professionals that provide guidance to the educational programs. UCM's alumni population is now sufficiently large and advanced to contribute to advisory boards and they should be added as a means of connecting UCM's growing campus community to external stakeholders. Plans to develop other advisory boards are underway. Both graduate and undergraduate students have voiced concern that their request for courses and program topics go unheard.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.6 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including the governing board, faculty, staff, and others, in institutional reflection and planning processes that are based on the examination of data and evidence. These processes assess the institution's strategic position, articulate priorities, examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and define the future direction of the institution. X 1.1, 1.3		2	B	Continued growth of the university requires the institution to continually reconsider its direction, which requires input from faculty, staff, and administrators. While the rapid growth and pace of decision making often limits the frequency of engaging all these constituencies, improvement in campus-wide engagement in planning is needed.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	
4.7. Within the context of its mission and structural and financial realities, the institution considers changes that are currently taking place and are anticipated to take place within the institution and higher education environment as part of its planning, new program development, and resource allocation.		2	A:OA	This process needs to occur throughout the continued rapid growth of the university. For example, the recent curtailment of undergraduate admissions was a smart response given the space and financial restrictions given the current growth rate.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

- Effectively using the data collected to inform decisions, from course improvements, to program updates, to campus planning.
- Engaging the multiple constituency groups to both provide valuable data points on the institution and to help inform strategic planning.
- Rapid growth and development of the campus requires thoughtful, data informed planning to best direct new programs and growth of current efforts.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

- The structures are in place to engage various constituency groups.
- The tools exist and data are collected on all levels of the campus experience.
- The processes to perform annual assessment review and periodic program review are in place and help ensure on-going quality review of academic programs, student services, and administrative operations.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

- The paths to access institutional data points are not apparent.
- The lack of transparency on data informed decision-making generates skepticism that such activity occurs.
- The engagement of campus constituents in planning needs to be broadened and deepened.