

## ***Introduction to the Report and Appended Materials***

UCLA initiated its reaccreditation with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) by submitting an ambitious [Institutional Proposal](#)<sup>1</sup> in May 2006 that was approved by the WASC [Proposal Review Committee](#)<sup>2</sup> in July. Using the *Proposal* as the basis for its work, UCLA entered the second phase of reaccreditation and now submits its report for the *Capacity and Preparatory Review* and the site visit, which is scheduled for March 2008. The report, vetted and endorsed by relevant groups of faculty, students, and administrators demonstrate that:

1. UCLA “functions with clear purposes, high levels of institutional integrity, fiscal stability, and organizational structures to fulfill its purposes” (WASC’s Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity), and that
2. UCLA is prepared to fulfill its obligations for the WASC *Educational Effectiveness Review*. For this third phase of the reaccreditation process, UCLA will demonstrate a strong commitment to WASC’s Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness by showing that we have “clear and appropriate educational objectives at the institutional and program level” and employ processes of review, including the use of data, which assure our students are learning and performing at a level appropriate for the degree awarded.

To prepare for the capacity report and site visit, UCLA’s Acting Chancellor Norman Abrams appointed a [WASC Steering Committee](#)<sup>3</sup> charged with overseeing the process, which included: 1) development of a comprehensive [UCLA WASC Reaccreditation Website](#)<sup>4</sup>; 2) appointment of seven [Essay Workgroups](#)<sup>5</sup> responsible for drafting the essays; 3) review and finalization of essays submitted by the workgroups; 4) distribution of draft reports for review by Academic Senate agencies, administrative councils, student governing groups, and other UCLA constituents (defined below); and 5) preparation of the final essays and appendices for submission to WASC.

Our report includes [seven reflective essays](#)<sup>6</sup> first introduced in our *Proposal*. The opening essays on *Academic Strategic Planning (Essay 1)* and *Academic Senate Program Reviews (Essay 2)* illuminate UCLA’s commitment to strategic planning and shared governance. They also demonstrate our capacity for self review, how we sustain our operations through effective organizations and decision-making bodies, and the ways in which key resources are aligned to achieve UCLA’s goal of sustaining a quality environment for education, research, and service. Furthermore, both essays review our progress in making effective use of “indicators of institutional performance” to support planning, decision making, and improvement. [Performance Indicators](#)<sup>7</sup> was a special theme selected by UCLA for its 1998 WASC reaccreditation, and the campus continues to benefit from the work undertaken during that review.

The next two essays, *UCLA’s Commitment to Diversity (Essay 3)* and *Ten Years of General Education Reform at UCLA (Essay 4)* consider our progress related to the other two themes featured in our WASC report of ten years ago, [Diversity](#)<sup>8</sup> and [General Education](#)<sup>9</sup>. We opted to include an essay on these topics to reflect on our progress—defined by successes and challenges—and to demonstrate how UCLA works collectively to shape institutional direction and advance the role of higher education in relationship to society at large. These essays, as well as the first two, address UCLA’s response to a few recommendations included in the [Commission’s action letter](#)<sup>10</sup> for the 1998 WASC review.

The last three essays—*Shaping Undergraduate Education via the Capstone Experience (Essay 5)*, *Using Educational Technology to Enhance Learning and Teaching (Essay 6)*, and *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Education and Research (Essay 7)*—represent the three “special themes” that UCLA

selected for its *Educational Effectiveness Review*. We realize the effectiveness report is intended by WASC to be substantially different from the capacity report, and our inclusion of these three essays is not meant to blur this difference. But because one goal of the capacity report is to demonstrate our preparedness to fulfill our obligations for the upcoming effectiveness review, the theme workgroups began by developing essays to explore UCLA's capacity for institutional engagement with programs that would promote the development of undergraduate capstone experiences, the advancement of learning and teaching through the appropriate use of educational technology, and the improvement of education and research by facilitating innovative interdisciplinary efforts.

This capacity report ends with a *Concluding Essay* that summarizes UCLA's commitment to capacity and educational effectiveness. Here, we also consider our successes and challenges in meeting the Commission's four Standards, and we end with comments about our ability to complete UCLA's report for the *Educational Effectiveness Review* within the next 12 months (by December 2008).

Each of the seven essays includes endnotes that are hyperlinked to a variety of documents, datasets, websites, or comments. Many of these were included as evidence to demonstrate our Commitment to Institutional Capacity or to document UCLA's general culture of evidence. Others were included to assist and instruct readers wanting more information about specific issues raised. A complete list of the endnotes for each essay is posted in **Appendix A**.

WASC has outlined four Accreditation Standards and several accompanying Criteria for Review (CFR). In all, there are 42 CFR (9 for Standard 1; 14 for Standard 2; 11 for Standard 3; 8 for Standard 4). These standards and CFR have guided us in our self review, and they will also serve as guideposts for the site visit team in their assessment of our efforts. Rather than writing an essay designed specifically for each of the four standards, we elected to craft essays around the seven topics described above. In **Appendix B** (Part 1), we have included a comprehensive CFR chart to demonstrate how documents of evidence cited in the essays, as well as the stipulated documents and required datasets (see below), relate to each of the 42 CFR. In Part 2 of this appendix, we have added a worksheet based on one of the essays to illustrate, by example, how UCLA's WASC Steering Committee matched each content statement to an appropriate CFR.

To demonstrate that UCLA included many segments of the campus in the self review and reflection processes required for reaccreditation, we have posted a timeline of events that led to the writing and review of our report for the *Capacity and Preparatory Review* (see **Appendix C**). As detailed in this timeline, these events included a leadership retreat in Fall 2007 (see *Essay I*) and dozens of meetings for many groups, including: the UCLA WASC Steering Committee, seven Essay Workgroups, numerous Academic Senate agencies (Standing Committees and Faculty Executive Committees), two administrative groups (Chancellor's Executive Committee and the EVC/Provost's Deans' Council), councils for the [Graduate Students Association](#)<sup>11</sup> and the [Undergraduate Students Association](#)<sup>12</sup>, as well as the Boards of Directors for the [UCLA Foundation](#)<sup>13</sup> and the [UCLA Alumni Association](#)<sup>14</sup>.

In addition to the seven essays and sets of exhibits outlined above, UCLA's report includes the following required elements:

- **Appendix D** contains a listing of the institutional data posted in the [electronic portfolio](#)<sup>15</sup>. These include an updated set of data charts contained in UCLA's *Institutional Proposal*, as well as other datasets specified by WASC.
- **Appendix E** contains UCLA's *Stipulated Statement* and a list with web-links for all the university policies and regulations identified in Appendix 1 of the *WASC Handbook*.