June 2003 Accreditation Action Letter	
WASC Action Item Recommendations	Institutional Action
Requests 2008 Interim Report to address the following:	**Interim Report submitted February 2008 addressed the following:**
Connect the Pieces - progress on the "draft" *Strategic Vision Statement* as a core planning document to align and prioritize the many initiatives underway; set institutional priorities; create more cohesive internal action agenda; external public image.	*The Strategic Vision Statement* formally codified as the *UC Davis Vision: The Campus's Strategic Plan* (commonly referred to as the campus Strategic Plan) and organized around themes of "Learning, Engagement, Discovery, and Success." Plan is posted to the campus website with reports of progress on various initiatives. (See Essay 4, p.55.)
Strengthen the Culture of Evidence - incorporate assessment of student learning systematically in all program reviews (use campuswide student survey data; employ trend and benchmark data); consolidate and integrate institutional research and decision support capacity.	New disciplinary "cluster" model of program review adopted in 2006, and integrates into the "self-study" responses for assessment of student learning in relation to campus Educational Objectives; analysis of institutional data (i.e., alumni surveys, trend and comparative data from other UC Davis programs in the same cluster). (See Essay 1/2, pp. 14-22.) Institutional Research Work Group formed in 2003 to address shared mission objectives.
Define Research Activities More Clearly – to address what is included under the general rubric of research by disciplinary contexts.	Campus discussion on planning for the future Undergraduate Research Center, and in 2006, renaming of annual conference to *Annual Undergraduate Research, Scholarship & Creative Activities Conference* embodies how we define "research" activity. (See Essay 3, pp. 42-43.)
Map the Sequence of Research Activities – to guide and track student pathways through the research landscape incorporated into the undergraduate experience in a premier research university; articulate research skills and abilities.	Undergraduate Research articulated as a learning goal metric in the adoption of the 2003 campus Strategic Plan; Establishment of Undergraduate Research Center in 2008, informed by broad campus discussion, articulates learning outcomes; Orientation and Freshmen seminars lay the foundation and establish an understanding of the undergraduate research landscape. (See Essay 3, pp. 41-49.)

Fall 2007 The Chancellor's "Information Technology as a Vehicle for Innovation at UC Davis" conference, while not in direct response to an Action Item, enabled progress toward WASC recommendations as follows:	
Information Literacy - formalize technology use expectations for students; provide necessary training opportunities and assessment mechanisms.	Conference participants adopted as a recommendation the goal that a description of core competencies be articulated both for student and faculty.
Technology in the Major – review relevant technology and information management requirements and ensure curriculum includes experiences to provide expected outcomes.	In conjunction with revised Program Review and deliberation over WASC recommendation, Academic Senate opted to not specify "explicit" technology and information management requirement in the majors, nor in GE; instead has established the expectation for overall assessment of the major in terms of the quality of preparation for the workforce and for graduate school.
Technology Effectiveness - as resources permit, build systemic processes (instructional design, faculty development, assessment) to ensure educational effectiveness.	Discussed at the fall conference and found agreement that this recommendation is now implicit within the mission of the Office of the Vice Provost – Information and Educational Technology; engages the CIT, CCFIT and CETL in its processes.
Instructional Development – ensure temporary instructors and teaching assistants have access to the full range of services provided to faculty.	It has always been the case that the full range of instructional development services provided to ladder-rank faculty, also have been available to instructors, lecturers and teaching assistants.
Technology Strategy – expand engagement of individual faculty in the use of instructional technology to larger-scale strategic projects within the colleges; articulate technology vision and metrics for assessment; address policy issues in the use of instructional technology (e.g., intellectual property and workload).	Discussed at the fall conference and found agreement that this recommendation is now implicit within the mission of the Office of the Vice Provost – Information and Educational Technology; engages the CIT, CCFIT and CETL in its processes.
Technology Facilities and Infrastructure – ensure systems, services, funding, and policies support an infrastructure appropriate to institutional-wide requirements.	Discussed at the fall conference and found agreement that this recommendation is now implicit within the mission of the Office of the Vice Provost – Information and Educational Technology; engages the CIT, CCFIT and CETL in its processes.
General Education – strengthen educational requirements on the front end of student experience, or develop a system for accumulating and reflection upon outcomes evidence on the back end; proportionality of general education reflected in students' experiences.	A four-year process involving extensive faculty deliberation and broad campus attention resulted in a revised GE proposal to be put before the Academic Senate Representative Assembly (which includes a representative from every campus academic department and every Academic Senate standing committee chair) for approval in June 2008; the new GE calls for 52 units of topical breadth and 35 units of Core Literacies with a plan to implement the revised program in Fall 2010 (later deferred to Fall 2011). (See Essay 1-2, p. 12.)

Response to Previous WASC Reviews

June 2006 Sub Change Action Letter: GSM – San Ramon	
WASC Action Item Recommendations	Institutional Action
Requests update to be attached to the 2008 Institutional Interim Report	**Graduate School of Management update included as an appendix in the February 2008 Institutional Interim Report and addressed the following:**
Revise and Expand Learning Outcomes or Program Objectives	Report includes primary set of learning objectives, each with a set of secondary learning objectives.
Plan for assessing Program Learning Outcomes	Assessment plan described, and preliminary assessment results of student learning are included in the report.

May 2008 Interim Report Action Letter	
WASC Action Item Recommendations	Institutional Action
Requests 2010 Interim Report to report on the following:	**Interim Report Submitted March 2010 addressed the following:**
Assessment of Student Learning/Program Review – progress on new program review process should include results of assessment of student learning outcomes in terms of program objectives; progress on establishing learning outcomes and development of assessment plans for all programs utilizing multiple measures (summative, formative, direct, indirect).	Establishing program learning outcomes had progressed to about 25% of the programs, some of these articulating assessment approaches; program review process had modified self-study elements to include analysis of "major" student learning objectives and their relationship to the campus Educational Objectives. (See Integrative Essay, pp. 76-78.)
General Education – progress in adopting and implementing new GE and establishing an assessment plan.	Senate approved the revised GE requirement in June 2008; followed by an implementation process that resulted in the requirement taking effect in Fall 2011. Assessment pilots had been initiated but establishing an Assessment Plan was deferred pending additional Academic Senate deliberation. (See Essay 1-2, p. 13.)
Strategic Planning and Improved Coordination – no further action requested.	
Undergraduate Research – no further action requested.	
Educational Technology-panel found ET had advanced through ongoing discussions and activities; no further action requested.	

June 2008; effective June 2006 GSM-San Ramon Fully Approved
MBA Student Learning and Assessment – panel found requests to have been met; no further action requested.

Response to Previous WASC Reviews

May 2010 Interim Report Action Letter	
WASC Action Item Recommendations	Institutional Action
Requests progress to be reported in the 2011 Institutional Proposal	**WASC Redesign process placed UC Davis in the 2013 Pilot Group which eliminated the "proposal" and reporting defaulted to this February 2013 report. See details below.**
Assessment of Student Learning and Program Review – expectation of established Program Learning Outcomes and assessment plans for all programs by Spring 2013; expectation to see findings from assessment at next site visit.	100% of Program Learning Outcomes have been established in the Undergraduate Majors. Academic Senate has adopted a resolution for conducting Learning Outcomes Assessment at the program level; and, declared an approach to assessment consistent with the AAHE guidelines on outcomes assessment. (See Integrative Essay, pp. 76-78.)
Implementation and Assessment of General Education – update on GE implementation, and on the assessment plan.	Revised GE implemented Fall 2011; Undergraduate Council adopted an approach to conduct GE Assessment (February 2013). UGC will now present to the Academic Senate Executive Council a proposal to streamline program assessment. One component of the plan will be GE assessment. (See Essay1-2, p. 13.)

October 2012 / February 2013 Retention & Graduation Review Panel Report
Panel rated Undergraduate and Graduate response as "highly developed" with no concerns identified that need attention at Affirmation of Accreditation visit. Next response in 3 years, normative for the WASC Redesign process.
Retention and Graduation is elaborated upon in Essay 3, pp. 32-34.

November 2012 Financial Review Panel Report
Panel requested us to address our financial status in the Essay 4 as they were unable to audit our financial status reported as part of the UC system.
See Essay 4, pp. 54-56 for details of UC Davis financial stability and sustainability.