



# MEMORANDUM

Academic Senate Executive Office  
Los Angeles Division  
3125 Murphy Hall  
140801

May 1, 2007

Professor Douglas Hollan, Chair, Anthropology  
Professor Timothy Deming, Chair, Biomedical Engineering  
Professor Eric Avila, Chair, Dept of Chicana & Chicano Studies & the Chavez Center  
Professor Ali Behdad, Chair, Comparative Literature  
Professor Gary Hansen, Chair, Economics  
Professor Timothy Tangherlini, Chair, Scandinavian Section  
Professor Hans Wagener, Chair, Germanic Languages  
Professor Stephanie Jamison, Chair, Indo European Studies  
Professor Massimo Ciavolella, Chair, Italian  
Professor Adrienne Lavine, Chair, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering  
Professor Ferdinand Coroniti, Chair, Physics and Astronomy  
Professor Stuart Kirk, Chair, Social Welfare  
Professor Christine Littleton, Chair, Women's Studies  
Director Bruce Beiderwell, Writing Programs

Dear Colleagues,

Some time ago, you received a letter informing you that your department is scheduled to undergo its Academic Senate Review next academic year, with your self-review report due at the end of June. We write to you now to provide some additional direction with regard to the undergraduate aspect of the review.

For our upcoming accreditation, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) requires us to complete an "Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators" that must include information about the educational goals of each degree program offered by your department, where the goals are published, and what evidence exists that the goals are being met.

UCLA's WASC steering committee proposed to integrate this WASC requirement into the Academic Senate Review Process in such a way that it is consonant with our vision of peer review of academic programs and can enhance departments' opportunity to reflect upon and potentially improve their educational programs. We do not wish to make the review process more onerous for departments, but rather intend to focus their self-reviews of undergraduate programs in such a way that they will fulfill the WASC requirements simultaneously. Initially, we are addressing undergraduate degree programs only; for graduate degrees, you should follow the usual Academic Senate guidelines.

The following three steps blend the current undergraduate program review process with the WASC requirements. Departments are expected to take these steps over time (not necessarily all with equal thoroughness in the context of the current review, as explained in #2 below):

- a. Stating the educational goals of your undergraduate programs and publishing them so that students are aware of what they are expected to achieve. *Stating goals is already a requirement in the current review process; publishing them is not.*

- b. Articulating how your goals for undergraduate education are currently being implemented and any plans you are considering for changes. *This is paraphrased from the current Guidelines for the Review Process, Section C.*
- c. Examining evidence that the department thinks is relevant in order to evaluate whether goals are being met. Examples could include quality of student work in key courses, placement of students in graduate programs or jobs, students doing research with faculty, etc. *This step is consistent with the current review process and is alluded to in the phrase “providing evidence and support as appropriate” in the current Guidelines. However, step c sharpens the focus on the evaluation component.*

For the current review process, we ask you to do two things:

1. Fill out the enclosed brief survey, the goal of which is to establish where your department is in the sequence of steps a, b, c. This is due to Mitsue Yokota, 2300 Murphy Hall, by May 31<sup>st</sup>.
2. Relative to the baseline established in #1, your department should make progress on a, b, and c. Specifically:
  - Since steps a and b are already articulated in the current Guidelines (other than publishing), they should be fully addressed in the self-review.
  - If the educational goals are not already published, the self-review should state where they will be published, and publication should be accomplished by the time of the site visit (or in progress, depending on the timing of the publication).
  - Since step c presents a newly sharpened focus on evidence, you are asked to simply make progress on this step. For example, you could choose one or two educational goals to evaluate. Your self-review should state what you plan to accomplish, and then you should do so by the time of the site visit (or have made headway if it requires a longer time to implement).

At the time of the site visit, the review team will take note of how you have accomplished your stated plans in #2.

This modest modification of our current process is a pilot program which will undergo further revision in the future. Your comments are welcome, and your efforts to tailor the process to the benefit of your program will ultimately make our review process more meaningful.

Sincerely,



Robert Fink  
Chair, Undergraduate Council



Adrienne Lavine  
Immediate Past Senate Chair and  
Chair, WASC Workgroup on Academic Senate  
Program Reviews

cc: Professor Michael Jura  
Professor Raymond Knapp  
Professor Kathleen Komar  
Professor Reynaldo Macias  
Professor David Rigby  
Vice Provost Judith Smith

## SURVEY CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL GOALS

Please complete a separate survey for each undergraduate degree program in your department or IDP. Enter your responses into this form. The survey should be returned to Mitsue Yokota, 2300 Murphy Hall, MC: 143801 or [myokota@college.ucla.edu](mailto:myokota@college.ucla.edu), by May 31st.

DEPARTMENT / IDP NAME:

DEGREE NAME:

NAME/POSITION OF RESPONDENT:

1. Describe any consultation process that took place in preparing this survey response.

2. Have educational goals been articulated for this program? If so, what are they? (Please note that the self-review will require you to articulate educational goals, but we acknowledge that you may not have had time to prepare them by the deadline for this survey.)

3. Have the educational goals been published or presented? If so, where? (Check all that apply.)

- Catalog
  Department handbook or brochure  
 Department website
  Other website
  Other (Please specify)

4. In your opinion, does this approach adequately bring them to the attention of all constituents on a regular basis?

- Yes
  No

If you answered "No," please explain:

5. When were the educational goals last reviewed and discussed by the faculty?

6. The following is a list of mechanisms that could be used to assess the degree to which students are fulfilling the program's educational goals. Please indicate in the first column which mechanisms your department/program has consciously used in the past. In the second column, indicate those which you believe could be useful in the future.

|   | (a) Have used<br>in past. | (b) Would consider<br>in future. |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Graduation percent (of number entering)?.....       | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Time to degree.....                                 | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| GPA.....  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Quality of student work in one or more classes..... | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Supervised research projects.....                   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Culminating projects or classes.....                | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Student portfolios.....                             | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Faculty discussion of individual students.....      | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Department Honors.....                              | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Awards for academic distinction.....                | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Graduate school acceptance rates.....               | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Job placements.....                                 | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Student surveys or interviews.....                  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Alumni surveys or interviews.....                   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |
| Other (Please specify below.).....                  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>         |

7) Which of the mechanisms listed in 6(a) have you found to be most useful?

8) Have the approaches you selected in 6(a) provided an adequate assessment?

Yes  No

If you answered "No," please explain.

9) Please provide any additional comments. Thank you for your input.