

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

Thematic Pathway For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To University of California, Davis

October 30th to November 1st, 2024

Team Roster

Ángel Cabrera, Chair
President, Georgia Institute of Technology

Stephen Schellenberg, Assistant Chair
Director of the First Year Seminar and Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences
San Diego State University

Georgina Dodge
Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion
University of Maryland

Adriana Galván
Dean of Undergraduate Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Raka Ray
Dean of Social Sciences
University of California, Berkeley

Barbara Gross Davis, Staff Liaison
Vice President, WSCUC

The team evaluated the institution under the 2023 Handbook and Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC).

The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT.....	3
A. DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION AND ACCREDITATION HISTORY	3
B. DESCRIPTION OF TEAM’S REVIEW PROCESS	5
C. INSTITUTION’S REACCREDITATION REPORT AND UPDATE: QUALITY AND RIGOR OF THE REPORT AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	7
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS.....	8
A. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS COMMISSION ACTIONS	8
B. INSTITUTION SPECIFIC THEMES	12
Theme 1: 2020 Initiative	12
Theme 2: Student Success and Equitable Outcomes	14
C. REFLECTION AND PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT	18
D. COMPLIANCE: REVIEW UNDER WSCUC STANDARDS AND FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS	20
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity	20
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success.....	21
Standard 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures.....	28
Standard 4: Creating an Institution Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement. ...	30
SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS.....	32
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
APPENDICES	35
FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS	35
Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form.....	37
Marketing and Recruitment Review Form	39
Student Complaints Review Form	40
Transfer Credit Policy Review Form.....	42
DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW FORM.....	43
OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW	51

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

University of California, Davis (hereafter UCD) was established in 1908 as an extension site of the University of California, Berkeley, and became a stand-alone UC campus in 1959 with continued expansion since in scope and scale. With a total enrollment of now more than 40,000 students, the campus currently offers more than 120 undergraduate majors across four colleges (i.e., Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Letters and Science, Biological Sciences, and Engineering) and more than 100 graduate and professional degrees through these colleges and various professional schools (e.g., Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing, Graduate School of Management, School of Education, School of Medicine, School of Law, School of Veterinary Medicine). For their incoming Fall 2023 undergraduate population, 85% were California residents, 5% were U.S. domestic students from outside California, and 10% were international students, with 36% of the total undergraduate population being from historically underrepresented groups (i.e., African American, American Indian, Hispanic/Latino(a), Pacific Islander), 41% being first-generation, and 34.6% being Pell-eligible.

In the most recent US News and World Report rankings, UCD is tied at #9 for Top Public Schools and tied at #33 for National Universities, with the biological and agricultural engineering program tied for #1 and seven other programs ranked among the top 30 in their field. In 2023-24, the university's external funding exceeded \$1 billion, with the top three recipients being the School of Medicine (\$400 million), the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (\$169 million), and the College of Engineering (\$118 million).

The 5,300-acre campus is directly adjacent to the city of Davis, a college town of about 68,000, and roughly twenty minutes from the state capital of Sacramento. More than 23,000

academic and administrative staff are employed at UCD and, in 2020-21, the university was the largest employer within the City of Davis, accounting for nearly 65% of the total city labor force. The campus has two additional locations, the UC Davis - Sacramento Education Building in Sacramento and the UC Davis Graduate School of Management - Bay Area in San Ramon, and the latter was formally reviewed as part of the Accreditation Visit (AV). The campus offers a distance-education-based Masters of Business Administration, and the program was reviewed as part of this AV.

UCD's last reaffirmation of accreditation by the WSCUC was in July 2014 for ten years, with Commission recommendations to (1) expand the use of assessment data for improvement across all departments, (2) continue ongoing efforts to improve undergraduate education, (3) enhance the program review process through greater integration of assessment data and greater consideration of program review findings in resource allocation, and (4) continue the implementation of the 2020 Initiative. The Commission also requested a Special Visit in 2017 focused on assessment, program review, and the 2020 Initiative. This Special Visit occurred in April 2018, and the team report informed a Commission action letter in July 2018 that affirmed the planned 2024 accreditation visit during which UCD was required to address five recommendations around (1) strengthening general education, (2) developing sustainable assessment practices, (3) enhancing program review of interdisciplinary and interdepartmental programs, (4) clarifying the nature and role of Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment appointments, and (5) deriving the full benefits of the 2020 Initiative. This team report addresses UCD's progress on the first four items in Part II.A. and the fifth item in detail in Part II.B.

UCD was approved to participate in the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR). The TPR process is available only to institutions with a history of strong student outcomes, financial

equilibrium, and organizational stability that received a nine- or 10-year reaffirmation during their prior review. Institutions elect to be considered for this review pathway. Once affirmed by the Commission, institutions create the “theme(s)” for their self-studies, which are in turn reviewed by WSCUC staff. The institution thus has the freedom and responsibility to choose an activity that will contribute to its ongoing improvement – consistent with its vision and mission - and to document and demonstrate how it conducted and concluded that activity.

UCD selected two themes for its TPR: “The 2020 Initiative” and “Student Success and Equitable Outcomes.”

B. Description of Team’s Review Process

The review team for the Accreditation Visit (AV) was established on February 28, 2024, and the chair emailed a team letter on August 22, 2024, that outlined the general timeline and proposed member assignments for the AV. The team members then worked asynchronously to complete their assigned sections of the team worksheet based on the institutional report and associated review materials uploaded by UCD on August 20, 2024. After the compilation of team worksheet materials, the review team met via Zoom on October 14, 2024, to discuss their preliminary findings, confirm team member roles and responsibilities, review a UCD-proposed visit schedule, and develop a list of requested additional materials. The assistant chair then worked with the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) to finalize the visit schedule and obtain the requested additional materials prior to the visit. The visit began informally with an evening team session on Tuesday, October 29, 2024, where the team reviewed the visit schedule and finalized the leads, questions, and discussion items for each session.

The formal visit began on the morning of Wednesday, October 30, 2024, with separate sessions with the ALO and support team, chancellor and provost, and WSCUC steering

committee. These meetings set the stage for the remainder of the visit, which included separate meetings with various organizational groups and units (i.e., department chairs, chancellor's leadership council, TPR thematic groups, academic deans, senate leadership, institutional research, program assessment, academic review, research, budget and finance, student affairs, global affairs, graduate studies, undergraduate education, DEI, enrollment management), and three separate open forums with faculty, staff, and students. The various sessions were productive and collegial, and the review team was impressed by the level of commitment of faculty, staff, students, and administrators to their campus mission and community. The team was particularly appreciative of the responsiveness of the ALO and support staff to various team questions and requests during the AV. Prior to and throughout the AV, a confidential WSCUC-based email address was shared with the campus community, and received communications were reviewed and discussed by the review team. Between sessions and during lunch and evening work sessions, the review team discussed their findings to continue to develop their report.

The AV ended on Friday, November 1, 2024 with a private meeting between the team chair and chancellor followed by an exit meeting where the team chair presented team findings in the form of commendations and recommendations to the UCD leadership. Following the AV, the review team continued to develop the team report based on the institutional report and associated materials, the compiled team worksheet, and findings from the various sessions during the AV. The finalized team report was provided to UCD for corrections of errors of fact on December 11, 2024, and subsequently submitted to the WSCUC on January 9, 2024.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The institution's approach to and preparation for the Accreditation Visit was led by the WSCUC Accreditation Steering Committee, and appears to have been open and inclusive, with twenty overview presentations during fall 2023 and winter 2024 to more than 700 people from across the colleges, student affairs, academic senate, academic federation, and executive leadership. To promote broader awareness, a recorded version of the presentation and a one-page outline of the reaffirmation process were also distributed to all faculty and staff via email and posted on the accreditation website. In spring 2024, feedback solicited through various pathways was considered and used to help inform the development of the institutional report and associated materials. The steering committee and various institutional leaders reviewed the draft institutional report in summer 2024, and the finalized report was submitted to WASC in August 2024.

The institution provided a wealth of evidence in support of institutional compliance with the WASC 2023 Standards of Accreditation through their self-review of standards worksheet, the institutional report, and other provided materials. The institutional report was well-organized and clearly written and claims therein were supported by appropriate evidence within the narrative and through copious links and appendices. Some minor areas of confusion for the review team were readily resolved through discussions with constituents during the AV. The two TPR themes, a retrospective on the *2020 Initiative* and a retrospective and prospective on *Student Success and Equitable Outcomes*, were consistent with the WASC-approved proposal for UCD's Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation. Overall, based on the AV, the institutional report and associated materials accurately portrayed the conditions of the institution, and the institution

clearly used the reaffirmation process as an opportunity for reflection on the past and planning for the future.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Response to previous Commission actions

The Commission Action Letter from the 2018 Special Visit charged UCD to address five specific recommendations for this 2024 AV; each recommendation is provided below in italics and followed by the review team’s summary of how the institutions has addressed each. The Criteria for Review (CFR) refer to the 2013 Standards that were in effect at the time of the 2018 Special Visit.

***Recommendation 1:** Strengthen the assessment of General Education by: (CFRs 2.2a, 2.6, 4.1) a. establishing a rigorous process of GE course approval; b. ensuring that GE courses meet and maintain the standards for the GE literacies for which they were approved; c. making certain that all GE instructors understand these goals and that courses deliver promised outcomes.*

UCD has established what appears to be a rigorous process for GE course approval as overseen by the Academic Senate’s Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI). During the faculty open forum, the review team noted some frustration with the broader course development process, specifically a lack of clarity around expectations and a lengthy time to approval. In other meetings, some individuals challenged this sentiment, attributing these issues to faculty submission of incomplete or incorrect proposals and to long delays in faculty resubmission of revised proposals. The review team suggests these differing perspectives represent two sides of the same coin, and encourages COCI to engage in a review and refinement of the user experience from the perspective of lay faculty not steeped in the curriculum development process. For

example, course development information in the supporting websites and associated PDF links could be more integrated and strengthened in terms of clarity, flow, and organization, and the associated series of guiding videos (dating back to initial 2018 launch of the new curriculum system) would likely benefit from a refresh that address any post-launch “lessons learned” and emergent trip-points around course development. Finally, in reviewing the guiding videos for the course proposal system, no explicit section for stating representative course-specific learning outcomes was observed; if correct, COCI could consider requiring representative course-specific learning outcomes (with associated examples of how these could be assessed), which, in turn, may facilitate assessment of broader aligned outcomes at the GE Breadth or Literacy level. Relatedly, the various PDFs for each GE Breadth or Literacy are on the General Education Faculty and Staff Resources webpage also did not specifically mention course-level learning outcomes. The review team suggests that incorporating such course-level learning outcomes in these GE course proposals would reinforce a “start with the end in mind” approach to course development and contribute to broader GE assessment efforts and culture.

The team did not explicitly address the processes for ensuring that GE courses meet and maintain the standards for the GE literacies for which they were approved, nor did it evaluate how instructors are informed of these goals or ensure the delivery of promised outcomes. However, no evidence emerged to suggest that these areas are not functioning as intended. It may be inferred that the institution’s existing practices are adequately supporting these objectives, though further confirmation may be warranted in future evaluations.

Recommendation 2: Determine and provide the type and level of support needed to keep the assessment workload manageable and meaningful. More specifically, provide appropriate resources to colleges for assessment activities and personnel. (CFRs 2.6, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4).

UCD's Center for Educational Effectiveness has made strides in making assessment more meaningful and manageable for lay faculty who lack a formal background and may even be actively resistant to the process. The center offers individual confidential consultations, frequent workshops on various aspects of teaching and learning, and the annual Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Conference. In 2020, the center developed the PACE4Equity (Program-level Assessment Capacity Enrichment for Equity) program, which guides faculty-led teams through a six-stage, equity-focused, program- and course-centered assessment project over a twelve-month interval. Since its inception, fifteen academic programs have moved through the PACE4Equity program. During the AV, multiple faculty participants stated that the PACE4 Equity program was an effective means to engage lay faculty in meaningful and sustainable assessment practices. Institutional investment in the Center for Educational Effectiveness, and its mission to support assessment, is evident through the 2022 hiring of an additional assessment specialist and provost funding during the last fiscal year to support faculty participation in the PACE4Equity program.

Recommendation 3: Enhance the reviews of interdisciplinary and interdepartmental undergraduate programs by: (CFRs 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 4.2) a. establishing a responsible point of contact for each program among senior leadership; b. clarifying what the program should expect from the process; c. defining what resources are available to support assessment in this context.

For interdisciplinary and interdepartmental programs at the undergraduate and graduate level, UCD has addressed the first component of this recommendation by defining the dean of the college in which the department chair or program director is situated as the point of contact among senior leadership. The institutional report addressed the second and third component of this recommendation in general terms of how program reviews operate and the resources

available to support assessment. However, conversations during the AV suggested that, for interdisciplinary and interdepartmental programs, particular expectations should be developed on a case-by-case basis through consultation with the leadership point of contact and that additional resources for such programs in terms of data solicitation and assessment strategies could be obtained through consultation with the office of Institutional Analysis and the Center for Educational Effectiveness. The review team suggests that the Undergraduate Council make such flexibility and support more evident for interdisciplinary and interdepartmental programs within available materials and during the initial orientation for their review cycle.

Recommendation 4: Clarify Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (LPSOE) appointments by: (CFRs 3.1, 3.2) a. defining more clearly the role that LPSOEs should play in carrying out research into disciplinary pedagogy and introducing pedagogic and assessment innovations into the community at large; b. clarifying expectations for LPSOE merit reviews and promotions; c. explicitly considering the appropriate balance between lecturer and ladder- rank appointments.

In May 2024, the UC system changed the Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment series to a Professor of Teaching series, and this new series carries an assistant to associate to full progression that parallels the traditional “ladder-rank” faculty series. UCD currently has 60 faculty in the Professor of Teaching series, and this growth reflects instructional planning over time that start each year with departmental requests that funnel to the deans and are ultimately decided by the provost based on operational priorities and budget constraints within the broader context of the 2020 Initiative and now the To Boldly Go strategic plan. University policies have established clear expectations for research, teaching, and service for this Professor of Teaching series, with greater teaching expectations and higher expectations for

instructional excellence, and, for series advancement, progressively larger educational contributions within and beyond the campus.

Recommendation 5: *Derive the full benefits of the 2020 Initiative by: (CFRs 3.1, 3.4, 4.1) a. completing the faculty hiring component; b. securing faculty office and research space; c. enhancing teaching facilities.*

Recommendation 5 is addressed in detail through the first theme in the next section.

B. Institution specific themes

Theme 1: 2020 Initiative

Not unlike other public institutions across the nation, UCD faced a significant budgetary shock following the Great Recession. Between 2008 and 2012, the university had to compensate for declining state appropriations and higher costs by doubling tuition and laying off employees. In 2011, the then Chancellor launched the 2020 Initiative centered around enrollment growth (specifically non-resident) as a path towards financial sustainability. Forty-five faculty, staff, and student representatives were organized around three taskforces focusing on academic resources, enrollment management, and facilities. The work and consultation of the task forces over 16 months resulted in a plan to add 5,000 students by 2020, which was announced in March of 2013. The additional enrollment, especially the increase of out-of-state tuition-paying students, was estimated to generate an increase in revenues of \$38M to \$40M a year to help address high-priority campus needs.

The joint report from the task forces supported the growth plan and identified several issues that needed to be addressed: maintaining opportunities for California students while increasing out-of-state and international enrollment; focusing on increasing revenue rather than further cutting costs; recruiting high-quality national and international students; expanding

support services for international students (e.g., ESL courses and cultural integration programs); improving advising, orientation programs, and student services facilities; securing additional classroom and lab space while incentivizing efficient space utilization; aligning faculty hiring with growth needs; and increasing the use of lecturers.

The outcome of the 2020 initiative was successful overall, with enrollment exceeding growth goals, and despite the negative impact of factors beyond the university's control. Most notably, the University System capped out-of-state enrollment to 18% in 2017. Consequently, while the student population grew by 6,100 undergraduate students, amply exceeding the goals, only 4,300 of that increase was nonresident. Tuition increases were limited to 2% over nine years, thus severely limiting the projected revenue increase. These constraints notwithstanding, the increased resources allowed the university to add 138 new ladder-rank and equivalent faculty and 91 lecturers. While these numbers fell short of the 200 and 100 goals in each category, student-faculty ratios remained stable overall (19.8 to 19.4 among tenure-track faculty and 41.6 to 37.7 among lecturers).

This significant growth in students also required the university to undergo an extensive set of construction and renovation projects, including the twenty-classroom Teaching and Learning Complex, the 61,700 square-foot International Center with classrooms and administrative offices to support international students, the California Hall classroom for 600 students, and the Ann E. Pitzer Center with a recital hall and practice rooms. In addition, major renovations of Walker Hall, Cruess Hall, and Briggs Hall modernized existing classroom and instructional laboratories and improved sustainability standards. The university also added more than 5,000 beds to its student housing portfolio, exceeding commitments made to the City of Davis in 2018.

When considering a total enrollment growth of 7,000 (including graduate and professional students), the addition of new faculty and research, and the investments in infrastructure, it is fair to say that this has been a transformative decade for UCD. Notably, the growth has also made the university more diverse, with international students growing from 3% to 14% and underrepresented minority students from 20% to 27%. The university has expanded services in support of its growing international student populations and the results seem to be paying off, with international students outperforming California students. Also, the increased diversity in the student body earned the university Hispanic Serving Institution status in the fall of 2024.

The TPR process and report were seen by the administration as a way to provide closure for Project 2020, take stock of the progress made, and draw conclusions for the future. The overall judgment of the team is that the university's infrastructure now needs to catch up with the new size and complexity, which will include investments in deferred maintenance, major expansion of instructional laboratories, and the modernization of existing information systems. While these investments take place, it is clear that the overall UC System is under political pressure to continue to grow. The institution plans to accommodate this growth in part by increasing summer session and online enrollment and by continuing to reduce time to degree.

Theme 2: Student Success and Equitable Outcomes

The Student Success and Equitable Outcomes Task Force (SSEO)—comprised of more than 30 faculty, staff and students—convened in January 2023 and completed its work in June 2024, recommending initiatives to the provost that address student needs. The university connected its efforts to the strategic plan, *To Boldly Go*, to describe the central components of this theme. For student success, a primary goal of the strategic plan is that the institution should

“provide an educational experience that prepares its students to address the needs and challenges of a diverse and changing world,” which is conducted through the classroom, research, and experiential learning (institutional report, p. 48). The strategic plan also states that UCD will “take bold steps to close gaps in academic outcomes for students from underrepresented, first-generation, and socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds,” a goal that aligns with those established by the UC System to ensure timely and increased graduation rates for all undergraduates.

Overall improvements in graduation rates are impressive when comparing the 2008 and 2018 cohort of incoming first-year undergraduate students, particularly in light of the massive growth and the increased diversity of the student population due to the 2020 Initiative. While gaps still remain between ethnic groups, over the 10-year period the four-year graduation rates doubled for African American (26% to 53%) and Hispanic (36% to 62%) students while increasing for all demographics. UCD is making progress towards reaching the institutional goal of a 78% graduation rate for all incoming first-year students by 2030.

The two-year graduation rates for transfer students from the 2010 to 2020 entering cohorts have also increased and gaps have been reduced, with the exception of international students (59% to 55%). Considering the large number of transfer students the university is committed to serve, and the inherent complexities around transfer student success, the trends reported by UCD are commendable and the institution makes progress towards its 2030 goal of a 66% two-year graduation rate for all transfer students. Though stated as an ambitious goal, aiming to achieve a 66% graduation rate for transfer students was viewed by the review team as rather low, particularly since transfer students have already invested significantly in their educations and are motivated to complete. That said, the uneven level of preparation among

transfer students often increases the time to graduation, as does the specific circumstances among this population, which may include employment or other obligations that impede timely progress. This may require a metric of success other than the two-year graduation rate.

The institution analyzes the graduation equity gap between URM and non-URM students, which is currently at 15%, and plans to eliminate that gap by 2030. While the current gap is the same as the overall equity gap within the UC system, the review team encourages UCD to take the lead within the UC system in this space. While there is clearly an impressive jump in percentages of four-year graduation rates, students from underrepresented groups continue to lag behind, and additional strategies will need to be considered in order to close the remaining gaps. This is an issue that the institution continues to address by employing diagnostics and best practice interventions, targeting resources where required.

An important strategy employed to accommodate student population growth and the need for a student-centered approach was to increase the ranks of the Professor of Teaching category. This position focuses on impactful pedagogy and was instrumental in the successful pivot to online teaching during the pandemic. The diversity among the Professor of Teaching ranks also contributed to faculty diversity, although more work needs to be done in this area for faculty demographics to more closely reflect that of students. There is some concern that the move towards hiring teaching-focused professionals might negatively impact the research enterprise, and campus leaders are aware that teaching must be buttressed by research to maintain the balanced ecosystem of a leading R1 university.

Another explicit initiative the university instituted to address the remaining graduation gap is launching the Advising Executive Work Group, operating under the auspices of the Sustaining Teaching and Research Task Force (START), which succeeded the Student Success

and Equitable Outcomes Task Force (SSEO). The SSEO Task Force recommended increased funding and assessment of advising, which was a significant challenge for some units that was amplified by a lack of resources as well as the admitted populations of diverse students, many of whom are first-generation or otherwise unfamiliar with academic norms, and therefore require more guidance in addition to other support services. The advising working group is now determining how best to restructure campus-wide to unit-level advising and has been provided funds to hire 26 advisors. New software will also be purchased to replace a homegrown system that has degree audit limitations. Since students turn to advisors for more than just guidance on academic progress, ensuring that advisors are able to provide a case-manager approach to each student is seen as necessary and will require collaboration across a variety of units that address student needs. In order to facilitate communication, advising directors attend the monthly meetings of associate deans to monitor outcomes and ensure that information is provided to stakeholders.

A recent example of effective collaboration includes the Black and African Diaspora Summit, which brought together various stakeholders on a Saturday to discuss how to leverage effective efforts in a cohesive manner to support Black students. The holistic approach to student success is more necessary now more than ever due to the challenges facing today's college-aged students around mental health issues and the sense of disconnection and isolation exacerbated by the pandemic. Stakeholders are using results from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey surveys to assess students' sense of belonging, and dashboards generated by the Budget and Institutional Analysis unit provide needed data to move forward with assessment and implementation of wrap-around services.

Another consideration is the revising of “gateway” courses—particularly in math, chemistry, physics, and biological sciences—that are required but produce high DFW percentages (percent of students who receive D, F, or Withdraw), especially among students whose high school curriculums lacked rigor. Biological Sciences is overhauling its introductory courses and assessing the outcomes, and advisors are working with community colleges to have transfer students complete crucial courses prior to transfer.

The institution’s ability to capitalize on the increasing diversity of the state population, particularly its youth, is a strength that the university has embraced. UCD is to be congratulated on having recently achieved Hispanic Serving Institute (HSI) status, in part through the intentionally built transfer student pipeline. In addition to increasing enrollment from previously underrepresented populations, the institution seeks to understand and address the lagging academic achievement outcomes experienced by newer communities to ensure that all of its students succeed. There is also thoughtful consideration of how students define success in order to provide pathways for helping them achieve career and personal goals.

C. Reflection and plans for improvement

2020 Initiative – The objectives of the Initiative 2020 were largely achieved, in some areas beyond the originally stated goals and while facing some unexpected changes in policy and state regulation. The university intentionally used the TPR process as an opportunity for broad reflection on lessons learned. As a result of this initiative, the university increased its size, impact, and diversity, and developed new support services and infrastructure to accommodate the new reality. The administration and faculty recognize that additional work remains for physical infrastructure to catch up with the new size and complexity, and the university faces increasing

political pressure to accept additional growth. The success in implementing the 2020 Initiative prepares the university well to deal with what will likely be an ongoing period of growth.

Student Success and Equitable Outcomes – The progress that UCD has made in closing the equity gaps that exist between graduation rates of underrepresented versus mainstream students is commendable, with an especially notable advancement among international students. The current overall equity gap of 15% for all underrepresented demographics equals that of the UC system average, and the steady increase in improvement over the past few years demonstrates the concerted and evidence-based approach taken by the institution. Regular assessment provides an ongoing feedback loop that guides efforts to support diverse students. While acknowledging and celebrating its achievements in closing the equity gap, the institution also recognizes that the final stages of reaching full equity are the most challenging, and has focused on additional strategies, including advising and gateway courses, in order to ensure continued progress.

Having recently achieved recognition as an HSI, UCD is also cognizant of its geographical setting and, as the northernmost UC campus, has considered how best to engage with representative populations to its north, particularly miner and Native American descendants. Improving outcomes for transfer students and eliminating the equity gap are both goals that the institution continues to pursue. Diversifying faculty to better align with the increased diversity of the student population is also an explicit objective. UCD has established a flexible strategy for reaching their goals that includes reviewing and refining advising in order to provide students with greater wrap-around services as well as updating software so that students can better assess their own degree progress. Hiring teaching professors provides an important avenue for diversifying the faculty ranks as well as seeking to make diverse hires when tenure-track

positions become available. Student success is a topic that evokes notable passion on the part of UCD faculty and staff, many of whom are UCD alumni and thus take ownership of and pride in its achievements. They are determined to advance the institution through the success of their students, and to make the university a model for its peers in the system. In order to continue this successful trajectory, the institution will need the support of the system and the state through resource allocation as well as recognition and appreciation for its achievements.

D. Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and federal requirements

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity

Institutional Purposes (CFRs 1.1, 1.2) – The university transparently communicates its mission, values, and data. Institutional and unit-level mission statements align with the university’s overall mission as well as unit-specific goals. The strategic plan, *To Boldly Go*, serves as both guidance and aspiration, and *The Principles of Community* provide a way to define university culture and establish community norms. Educational objectives are clearly presented through Aggie Data and infographics, and tuition information is transparent. Budget and Institutional Analysis dashboards provide regular and thorough assessments of student achievement and evidence of student learning. Communication is practiced effectively to stakeholders on and off campus, and the Chancellor’s regular video communications are a best practice.

Integrity and Transparency (CFRs 1.3-1.8) – UCD adheres to academic freedom and provides clear information to constituents. In addition to the Academic Senate, which helps to safeguard academic freedom, is the Academic Federation, representing 17 different types of academic titles. All employees were sent a one-page summary of the institution’s reaffirmation process, and that document was also posted on the accreditation website. Regular surveys help

assess campus climate and in addition to the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, numerous resources exist to support a diverse workforce. Both UCD and UC Davis Health Care have been favorably ranked as employers by Forbes and Newsweek in 2024. The growing diversity of the student body also receives attention through the assessment of student outcomes and the adoption of measures for student success. UCD is federally recognized as an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution and recently became a Hispanic Serving Institution.

While many policies are clearly provided, some are less so. There is clear information about how UCD classifies plagiarism, including work done by AI, and student conduct expectations and sanctions. There are clear policies on instructional and faculty accommodations. The remote/hybrid work agreements document was last revised in July 2022 and may need revision. The Academic Personal Manual policy on academic freedom was last revised in 2003. The university meets federal requirements for handling complaints and grievances. However, greater transparency in sharing statistical data with the community, while maintaining appropriate personnel confidentiality, could enhance understanding of how these matters are addressed and resolved.

Conclusion – The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCD has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with WSCUC Standard 1. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success

Degree Programs (CFRs 2.1-2.4) – The degree programs at UCD are appropriate in content and educational objectives (CFR 2.1) and are appropriately and rigorously evaluated through a streamlined and clear program review process. This process benefits from strong

collaborative ties across the relevant offices, including the Academic Senate, Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis, and the Center for Educational Effectiveness (CEE). CEE provides resources and staffing to support the institution's colleges in assessing the efficacy of teaching and learning. The program review process ensures the development of core and professional competencies relevant to the level of the degree. Faculty and students alike corroborated this assertion, and program requirements and GE requirements are clearly noted on websites. Student learning outcomes are clearly articulated for each academic program and centrally at <https://assessment.ucdavis.edu/PLOs>.

In response to the previous accreditation visit, UCD clearly articulated the GE process of governance, course approval, and standards in the self-study. The GE assessment program consists of two parts: 1) In-depth assessment of a selection of specific courses by the General Education Committee; and 2) Program self-assessment of all GE courses. The GE Committee reviews all submitted materials and communicates to each program, noting observations, suggesting improvements, and assessing each course. These letters are reviewed by the Undergraduate Council and sent to the programs and the provost. One component of program self-assessment is confirmation that instructors are familiar with the GE goals and that courses deliver stated outcome goals.

Faculty (CFRs 2.5-2.8) – The faculty at UCD are world-renowned and respected scholars in their respective fields. They have the capacity and scale to deliver a high-quality curriculum and to evaluate, improve, and promote student learning and success (CFR 2.5). UCD faculty are celebrated scholars who are recipients of prestigious awards (e.g. Guggenheim, MacArthur, Sloan, PECASE), UC Davis Faculty Honors and recognition by academic disciplines.

The total number of instructional faculty is 2,175 (1,527 full-time and 648 part-time), with 840 from historically minority groups, 985 women, and 70 from international countries. The Common Data Set provided by the institution lists an overall student-faculty ratio in fall 2023 of 21:1 based on 36,142 students and 1,683 faculty. A separate spreadsheet (see institution's Appendix I, 2.5) provides more granular information than the Common Data Set and disaggregates by instructor type, college, and department lists the student-faculty ratio as 23.4:1 overall in 2020-21 (the most recent year provided). From 2011-12 to 2020-21, the student-faculty ratio remained fairly steady, ranging from 23.1:1 in 2016-17 to 24.5:1 in 2013-14.

The faculty are active senate members who participate in faculty governance committees. They exercise effective academic leadership and act consistently to ensure that the quality of academic programs and the institution's educational purposes are sustained through Academic Senate committees (CFR 2.6). There are currently 27 senate committees, some of which have subcommittees (e.g., Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council). The faculty executive committees include representation from each college or school. The review team observed strong collaboration between academic senate leadership and senior administrative leadership. Bylaws and regulations are clearly articulated on the academic senate website.

Faculty are deeply involved in creating student learning outcomes and establishing standards of student performance (CFR 2.7). As noted in their assessment website, faculty are encouraged to lead with curiosity when establishing learning outcomes. Campus goals for student learners include the development of effective communication skills, higher cognitive skills, cultivate virtues, focus and depth in one or more disciplines, leadership skills, a global perspective, and lifelong learning. The website provides a clear path towards achieving these learning outcomes in students, by providing tools to aid faculty in analysis of the curriculum,

how to collect evidence of student learning, and interrogating the results. There are also assessment FAQs and tools for designing assessments available to faculty. The PACE4Equity program is a unique tool available at UCD and is intended to ‘build faculty capacity for participating in and leading equity-minded program-level assessment efforts.’ A hallmark of the program is that faculty work towards articulating expectations for student learning, designing projects to gather evidence of student learning, and writing action plans for improving continuous improvement of their program in a cohort-based model. They receive ongoing support through consultations and working sessions, and customized dashboards for analyzing and disaggregating student learning outcome achievement by populations of interest.

Faculty engagement in assessment infrastructure is clear (CFR 2.7). Academic program review is under the purview of the Undergraduate Instruction and Program Committee (UIPR), a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council (UgC). The UIPR evaluates whether established educational program objectives have been achieved. Certification of courses for the general education (GE) requirements are governed by the General Education subcommittee of the UgC. This subcommittee also periodically reviews courses approved for GE credit, promotes the development of new GE courses, and reviews the effectiveness of the GE program. The subcommittee also assesses whether GE-certified courses meet the Minimum Elements (ME) for each Literacy. The Committee on Courses of Instruction within UgC oversees approvals for credit-bearing courses in all academic programs as well as provides approval of new courses, modifications to existing courses, and general education designations. The Center for Educational Effectiveness within the Division of Undergraduate Education offers program learning outcomes assessment tools to engage faculty and provide resources for their role in assessment.

Faculty expressed satisfaction with the evaluation, promotion and tenure process (CFR 2.8). The academic personnel manual is accessible and revised frequently as policies are modified by the UC-wide system.

Student Learning and Performance (CFRs 2.9-2.14) – Assessment reports from four representative samples of degrees (Biotechnology Program; Neurobiology, Physiology, and Behavior Program; Spanish; and Wildlife, Fish and Conservation Biology Program) were provided by UCD (CFR 2.9). These reports indicate that graduates achieve stated learning outcomes and standards of performance. Each program provides clear program learning objectives on a program website and provides students with a curriculum map outlining sequencing of required courses and performance indicators for faculty guidance.

UCD students make reasonable progress toward and complete their degrees in relative timely manner (CFR 2.10). Overall retention rates are high: first year retention rates have ranged between 91-93% since 2013. These percentages are roughly similar across race, economic, and first-generation populations of students. However, the percentage of students who graduate within four years, currently at ranges between 63% and 70% between 2013 and 2019, could be improved. Relative to the overall population of students, the percent of students who graduate within four years is lower for African American (48-53% between 2013-2019), American Indian (45-89%), Hispanic (48-60%) students and for students who are first-generation (54-64%) or low-income (48-62%). Overall graduation rates for first year students within five- or six-years range between 83% and 86%, but follow the same general trend of lower percentage rates for those who identify as African American, Hispanic, American Indian, first-generation and/or low-income.

For transfer students, overall retention rates have ranged between 91.1% and 93.8% since 2013. First year retention of transfer students is similar across race, economic, and first-generation populations of students. Two-year graduation rates for transfer students could be improved. Between 2013 and 2021, the rates were between 52.9% and 61.4% overall. The graduation rates are lower for African American (39.1-53.6% between 2013-2019), American Indian (34.9-61.3%), and Hispanic (44.6-64.6%) students and for students who are low-income (48.2%-62.2%). Graduation rates within three and four years for transfer students are quite high at roughly 82.9%-89.7%.

UCD monitors and analyzes the success of its students soon after graduation (CFR 2.11). Graduating students are surveyed approximately two months after graduation, and again between one and five years from their graduation date. There was no mention in the materials provided about whether alumni are monitored beyond five years. In terms of student outcomes, based on data provided by WSCUC, UCD is performing strongly as an institution. It consistently ranks above the national median in post-graduate economic outcomes. The institution maintains stable, strong performance in retention and graduation rates. The data suggest UCD is a well-established, successful institution that provides good value to students, particularly in terms of career outcomes.

Student Support – UCD does an exemplary job providing information for students on websites and portals. For example, there is a user-friendly academic tutoring website, important and current information for advising and for student-athlete advising is clear, and information about first-year, transfer and international admissions is accessible. Students have ample access to curricular and co-curricular offerings. These offerings include opportunities to engage in faculty-mentored research, which draws close to 1,000 students, present research findings at an

undergraduate research symposium, participate in the UCDC program, and in the Honors program. The Division of Undergraduate Education is actively conducting assessments and programming to increase diversity of the students who participate in the Honors program. For example, a pilot program is currently underway to change the criteria by which students are admitted to the Honors program. There is also a proposal under review to add an opt-in piece so those who enroll in Honors demonstrate interest in pursuing the program, which will help reduce the number of students who leave the program.

The team observed that academic advising is rather decentralized (CFR 2.12). Although program requirements, GE requirements and student learning outcomes are clearly articulated throughout the UCD website, academic advising occurs in multiple places, which may be confusing to students. UCD staff noted that advising is currently “siloed” across the colleges, the Division of Undergraduate Education, and individual academic departments, and there is uneven coordination among the offices who provide it. For example, advising is offered within the colleges through departmental advisors but there is also advising through the dean’s office in each college, and the College of Biological Sciences has its own centralized advising. An upcoming workshop with the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) is expected to yield guidance in resolving these academic advising challenges. The team recommends that UCD enhance academic advising services by leveraging National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) assessment findings, student data, and ongoing program evaluation to better support student success and ensure sustained academic progress. (CFR 2.12)

Despite the lack of uniformity in where students receiving advising support, graduation rates and time-to-degree metrics suggest that UCD ensures that students understand the requirements of their academic programs.

The writing center and its oversight is in flux. Several stakeholders shared concerns and confusion about a recent move of the writing center, but these logistical issues appear to be achieving resolution.

Conclusion – The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCD has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with WSCUC Standard 2. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Standard 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures

Faculty, Staff, and Administrators (CFRs 3.1- 3.6) – The institution clearly invests in the human, physical, fiscal, technological resources necessary to maintain the quality of its education. The faculty and staff are highly qualified and generally of a reasonable size (Appendix I, 3.1). As enrollments are expected to increase beyond the 2020 Initiative, however, there is a need for increasing the size of the faculty. Administration is aware of this need, and there have been thoughtful discussions about the trade-offs involved in hiring teaching professors versus senate faculty. Clear guidelines exist for recruitment and evaluation that can be found on appropriate websites (such as the Academic Policies Manual and Annual Employee Appraisals), and there are institutionalized surveys (COACHE) to gather information on faculty and staff satisfaction. Some of those the team interviewed reported feeling overwhelmed with heavy workloads and too much work to handle effectively. Based on the session interviews, the institution could develop support systems, such as staffing plans, resources, or workload management tools, to alleviate faculty and staff strain resulting from increased enrollment demands as a result of the success of the 2020 Initiative. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2). The institution deploys surveys to great effect. Thus, evidence for the alleviation of faculty and staff strain may be found in improved morale as indicated in subsequent surveys.

Fiscal, Physical, Technology and Information Resources (CFRs 3.4-3.6) – The institution is financially stable, and while subjected to the vagaries of California state budgets, has engaged in effective and long-term planning to ensure long-term viability. This includes enrollment management, budget cuts when necessary, and diversification of revenue sources. There is clear communication about core fund deficits and about the state of the budget (CFR 3.10). The institution has concluded a successful fund-raising campaign in which the goal of \$2 billion was exceeded.

There is a plan in place to address issues of deferred maintenance as well as issues of physical and technological infrastructure to match the growth in their student body. In the AV session, the review team learned that UCD currently houses 40% of its student population, but is still grappling with the need for more classroom space. The lack of classroom space has led to planning for more online classes which may mitigate the need for physical classroom space. UCD manages its own law-enforcement, fire, and safety departments, and oversees the planning and maintenance of its facilities.

The office of research is well organized so as to effectively help faculty secure grants in order to undertake their research, and to help undergraduates secure research opportunities. The one concern reported here was with regard to processes. Some academic faculty and staff reported that the processes they must use in Contracts and Grants results in reduced efficiency.

The team observed challenges with technology infrastructure that could threaten organizational effectiveness, and physical facilities facing space constraints. Through sessions the review team learned that while a substantial backlog of deferred maintenance exists, there are systems in place to identify and address critical needs in a timely manner. At the same time, given the growth in enrollments, the review team recommends that UCD modernize and

strengthen its information technology and facilities to meet current needs, boost operational efficiency, reduce risk, and ensure scalability for future organizational demands. (CFR 3.6).

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes (CFRs 3.7-3.11) – In terms of organizational structures and decision-making processes, the institution is highly functional, with a responsive and effective leadership structure (see institutional report’s Appendix I, 3.9 for organizational charts). Like other UCs, UCD is guided by the Board of Regents and by the policies of the Board of Regents. Within UCD, there is a clear system of reviews of leadership (CFR 3.9).

The Chancellor's Office has established strong communication channels across campus through in-person meetings, written updates, video messages and social media engagement. New organizational structures have been implemented to improve cross-campus communication and reduce departmental silos. Regular engagement with student leadership has helped maintain productive relationships with the student body. The weekly leadership council meetings foster a collaborative environment, which has helped the campus community work together constructively on necessary changes despite budget-related challenges.

In terms of faculty governance, there is an effective, engaged and co-operative faculty senate. However there seem to be some tensions around representation and voice for non-senate academic staff who are part of an academic federation but not the academic senate. There were also some complaints about the length of time taken by the senate to approve course proposals.

Conclusion – The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCD has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with WSCUC Standard 3. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Standard 4: Creating an Institution Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement.

Quality Assurance Processes (CFRs 4.1 – 4.4) – In addition to the academic-focused quality assurance processes described above in Standard 2 and Theme 2, the Office of Business Transformation, situated within the Finance, Operations, and Administration division, partners with units and individuals across the institution to “*identify areas for improvement, develop process documentation, perform data analysis, recommend and implement changes to a process, and build a framework to move people through change.*” The office’s resources include (1) curated online toolkits of templates, guides, and resources designed to support process improvement and change management, (2) a variety of system- and campus-hosted process improvement training courses (e.g., six sigma, root cause analysis, value stream mapping), and (3) formal partnering opportunities to support process design, development, and improvement in units across the institution (CFR 4.1).

Institutional Improvement (CFRs 4.5- 4.8) – Since 2018, the institution has solicited annual employee feedback through a comprehensive *Academic and Staff Satisfaction Survey*, and regularly published the Likert-based results for ten standard questions applied to sixty-four different services lines, with data disaggregation available by three response groups (i.e., administrative units, health campus, schools and colleges) and by academic or staff classifications within each response group. For the 2023, the survey response rate was 23% with seven service lines receiving an excellent rating and forty-four receiving a good rating. The associated website states that local units use survey findings for reflection and improvement (but does not specify a common structure or timeline for this process) and highlights some examples of past survey results informing actions associated with subsequent survey response improvements (CFR 4.5, 4.8). Given the potential for survey fatigue, the institution will want to

ensure that constituents can clearly see the return on investment for their completion of such surveys, and identify and reduce any barrier to survey participation.

From a student success perspective, UCD regularly collects, analyzes, and acts upon disaggregated student outcomes data (including retention and graduation rates) as demonstrated in the above *Student Success and Equitable Outcomes* theme (CFR 4.2, 4.4), and these efforts are supported through the complementary efforts of the office of Institutional Analysis and the Center for Educational Effectiveness (CFR 4.6). Complementing these traditional institutional student success metrics, UCD deploys the *UC Undergraduate Experience Survey* biennially to gain insight into seventeen areas (i.e., general satisfaction, AI usage, academic experience and globalization, academic engagement, advising, evaluation of major and educational experience, academic and personal development, major evaluation, campus climate for diversity and inclusiveness, student life and development, co-curricular experience, community and civic engagement, time allocation, basic needs and affordability, plans and aspirations, background). General and disaggregated findings from this broad survey and other campus-specific surveys have been incorporated into the ongoing work of the *Student Success and Equitable Outcomes Task Force* and have informed the development of the current *To Boldly Go* strategic plan (CFR 4.3).

Conclusion – The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCD has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with WSCUC Standard 4. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS

Not Applicable.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

UCD effectively leveraged the WSCUC reaffirmation of accreditation process as a comprehensive opportunity for institutional self-examination. Through detailed analysis of the institutional report and extensive onsite interviews, it was evident to the team that the university community engaged deeply in reflecting on its mission, demonstrating compliance with accreditation standards, and advancing two strategic priorities: the *Initiative 2020* and *Student Success and Equitable Outcomes*. Based on its evaluation of submitted materials and interactions with the campus community, the review team identified the following commendations and recommendations:

Commendations:

The review team commends the University of California at Davis for:

1. Creating a sense of mission, pride, and belonging that encourages engagement and shared governance.
2. Cultivating a culture of transparency by making budgetary processes and data accessible through websites, dashboards, and informational videos.
3. Exceeding growth targets under 2020 Initiative while making significant improvements in graduation rates and narrowing gaps in graduation rates for underrepresented minorities.
4. Developing and embedding effective DEI practices across the institution through collaborative education and partnerships.
5. Leveraging comprehensive data and evidence to drive institutional excellence and measurable student success.
6. Demonstrating clear institutional commitment to global education and engagement, and to international students.

7. Achieving recognition as a Hispanic-Serving Institution.

Recommendations:

The review team recommends the University of California at Davis:

1. Modernize and strengthen information technology and facilities to meet current needs, boost operational efficiency, reduce risk, and ensure scalability for future organizational demands. (CFR 3.6)
2. Develop support systems, such as staffing plans, resources, or workload management tools, to alleviate faculty and staff strain resulting from increased enrollment demands as a result of the success of the 2020 Initiative. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)
3. Enhance academic advising services by leveraging National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) assessment findings, student data, and ongoing program evaluation to better support student success and ensure sustained academic progress. (CFR 2.12)

APPENDICES

Federal Compliance Forms

Overview: There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
3. Student Complaints Form
4. Transfer Credit Policy Form

As part of the institutional report preparation, the institution completes these forms and submits them with the institutional report. During the visit, teams validate the information on the four forms and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form: Under federal regulations, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

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

Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? UC Academic Senate, Davis Division Regulations, Section 526. Academic Credit (https://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/bylaws-regulations/regulations#526-)
	Comments: N/A
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: N/A
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: See https://registrar.ucdavis.edu/registration/schedule/class-search
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	How many syllabi were reviewed? Six
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Doctoral: Nursing (NRS 278V Advanced Pathophysiology and NRS 322AV Psychopharmacology Across the Lifespan: Foundations) MS: Nutrition (MCN 265Y Applied Principles of Lactation Management), MBA (MGV 201AV Individual and Group Dynamics); BS/BA: Communication (CMN 120V Interpersonal Communication), Science and Society (SAS 070A Genetic Engineering in Medicine, Agriculture, and Law)
Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: N/A
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed	How many syllabi were reviewed? Four
	What kinds of courses? Research, Research for Thesis, Directed Group Study
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Doctoral and MS: Material Science and Engineering (EMS 299 Research for Thesis); Earth and Planetary Sciences (GEL 299 Graduate Student Research); BS/BA: Animal Biology (ABI 198 Animal Ecology in the Field), Animal Science (ANS 198 Professional Development in Marine Sciences), Nutrition (NUT 198 Metabolic Regulation and Precision Nutrition)
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

hours (e.g., internship s, labs, clinical, ind. study, accelerate d) Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.	Comments: Also reviewed standard UCD syllabus templates for 299 and 198 offerings
Sample program informatio n (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Five
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Doctoral, MS, and BS/BA level
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Earth and Planetary Sciences (PhD, MS); Economics (BA, MA, PhD) Geology (BA, BS); German (BA, MA); Philosophy (BA, MA, PhD); Public Health (MS)
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Catalog content, centralized university websites, and departmental websites together provided a wealth of information beyond degree requirements and course descriptions, including faculty/staff information, advising points-of-contact, etc.

Review Completed By: Stephen A. Schellenberg

Date: November 15, 2024

Marketing and Recruitment Review Form

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Guidelines for undergraduate recruitment practices based upon federal guidelines may be found at https://policy.ucop.edu/doc/2700628/UndergraduateRecruitmentPractices
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Along with various other institutional metrics, information about time to degree in terms of four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates for first-time first-year students and two-, three-, and four-year graduation rates for transfer students may be found at https://aggiedata.ucdavis.edu/aggiemetrics-description
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: General information about workforce hiring at the major level is provided at https://careercenter.ucdavis.edu/career-discovery/undergraduate-students/what-can-i-do/majors-data in the form of regional companies who have hired UC Davis students in recent years.

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Stephen A. Schellenberg
Date: Nov 15, 2024

Student Complaints Review Form

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? The Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline is the document of record that informs UCD procedures related to the handling of allegations of misconduct. Allegations related to sexual harassment, sexual violence, and other forms of discrimination are handled pursuant to the University's Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy (SVSH) and the University's Anti-Discrimination Policy.</p> <p>Comments: N/A</p>
Process(es) / procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly: See above Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline. Within the policy, referrals may be resolved in one of three ways: Informal Resolution (103.10.7), Unilateral Action (103.10.8), and Formal Hearing (103.10.9). The SVSH and Anti-Discrimination Policies contain procedures for addressing complaints that fall under those policies.</p> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: N/A</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where? Yes, records are maintained in accordance with FERPA via the 3rd party software, Advocate Symplicity. The Harassment & Discrimination Assistance and Prevention Program (HDAPP) maintains records related to SVSH and discrimination matters in the 3rd party case management system, Case IQ.</p> <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly: For complaints submitted through the Office of Student Support and Judicial Affairs online portal to Advocate Symplicity Database, UCD is able to track and provide a variety of datapoints and run reports based on the information submitted. HDAPP maintains records on SVSH and discrimination complaints, and is able to track those complaints over time by running reports and searching for student complaints by name.</p> <p>Comments:</p>

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Stephen A. Schellenberg

Date: November 15, 2024

Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? See UC Davis information at https://registrar.ucdavis.edu/records/transfer-credit , which includes a link to the system-wide policy at https://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/counselors/preparing-transfer-students/transfer-credit-practice.html .
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

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

Review Completed By: Stephen A. Schellenberg

Date: November 15, 2024

Distance Education Review Form

Institutions must have WSCUC approval to utilize distance education in the delivery of any of its programs in any amount, and are required to seek WSCUC approval for programs where 50% or more of the program can be completed through distance education. The institution's use of distance education in the delivery of its programs is reviewed as part of a comprehensive evaluation of the institution including an Accreditation Visit or Seeking Accreditation Visit.

Distance Education is defined as:

Education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor or instructors and to support **regular and substantive interaction** between the students and the instructor or instructors, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies that may be used to offer distance education include:

- The internet;
- One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband, fiber optic, satellite, or wireless communication devices;
- Audioconference;
- Other media used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in this definition

In keeping with federal expectations, WSCUC requires institutions that utilize distance education in the delivery of programs to demonstrate "Faculty-Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction" and "Academic Engagement" as defined by the federal regulations (see Code of Federal Regulations §600.2).

Regular and Substantive Interaction is engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment, consistent with the content under discussion, and also includes at least two of the following:

- (i) Providing direct instruction;
- (ii) Assessing or providing feedback on a student's coursework;
- (iii) Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency;
- (iv) Facilitating a group discussion regarding the content of a course or competency; or
- (v) Other instructional activities approved by the institution's or program's accrediting agency.

An institution ensures regular interaction between a student and an instructor or instructors by, prior to the student's completion of a course or competency -

- (i) Providing the opportunity for substantive interactions with the student on a predictable and scheduled basis commensurate with the length of time and the amount of content in the course or competency; and

- (ii) Monitoring the student's academic engagement and success and ensuring that an instructor is responsible for promptly and proactively engaging in substantive interaction with the student when needed on the basis of such monitoring, or upon request by the student.

Academic Engagement requires active participation by a student in an instructional activity related to the student's course of study that –

- (1) Is defined by the institution in accordance with any applicable requirements of its State or accrediting agency;
- (2) Includes, but is not limited to -
 - (i) Attending a synchronous class, lecture, recitation, or field or laboratory activity, physically or online, where there is an opportunity for interaction between the instructor and students;
 - (ii) Submitting an academic assignment;
 - (iii) Taking an assessment or an exam;
 - (iv) Participating in an interactive tutorial, webinar, or other interactive computer-assisted instruction;
 - (v) Participating in a study group, group project, or an online discussion that is assigned by the institution; or
 - (vi) Interacting with an instructor about academic matters

Please complete either Section A for institutions that offer distance education programs approved by WSCUC or are 100% distance education institutions OR Section B for institutions that utilize distance education in the delivery of programs that do not rise to the level of a WSCUC approved distance education program.

Institution: UC Davis

Type of Visit: Re-Affirmation of Accreditation via Thematic Pathway Review Process

Name of reviewer/s: Stephen A. Schellenberg

Date/s of review: October 28, 2024

Section Completed: X A OR __B

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

SECTION A: Institutions with Approved Distance Education Programs

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list):

Program: Master of Business Administration; Courses: MGV-201AV Individual and Group Dynamics, MGV-261 Investment Analysis, MGV-268 Articulation and Critical Thinking, MGV-400AV Financial Accounting, MGV-403AV Data Analysis for Managers.

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method):

UC Davis offers one distance education degree in the form of the Masters of Business Administration that has been offered since 2019. The program currently has a student FTE of 304. The MBA consists largely of hybrid courses that use the Canvas Learning Management System with live sessions conducted via Zoom.

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

Lines of inquiry were investigated and addressed through a combination of information gleaned from the dedicated online MBA website (<https://onlinemba.ucd.edu>), discussions with UC Davis personnel, and review of representative syllabi.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>The online MBA program is an alternative version of the face-to-face MBA program and provides the opportunity to earn an MBA for individuals who are unable to travel to the physical campus on a regular basis. The program has both asynchronous (~47%) and synchronous (~53%) content, and students have an option to take up to half of their curriculum in-person if their schedules permit. The program works with an online partner (2U) who provides infrastructure support and marketing assistance. UC Davis faculty manage the curriculum, classes, and assessments. UC Davis staff support the student experience and provide career assistance. An overview of the program, along with detailed information, is available at https://onlinemba.ucdavis.edu/.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>The majority of the MBA students are working professionals, and the program provides various forms of support. For example, students attend multiple on-site multi-day “residentials” over the course of the program, which provides the opportunity to connect with fellow classmates and faculty outside of the online environment. Residentials are planned in Davis, the San Francisco Bay Area, and Los Angeles, and include guest speakers and presentations, team-based collaborative projects, and case studies and leadership scenarios</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the institution conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>The infrastructure is hosted and managed by our online partner 2U. Their infrastructure and security have been reviewed by the UC Davis teams and approved. From a student and faculty experience perspective, we haven’t had any difficulties with the technology since we began working with the company.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p><i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p>	<p>The program take a coordinated care approach to supporting students. In addition to course faculty and coordinators, student success and support staff include an admissions counselor and student success advisers, who provide both academic advising and technical support, and access to a career services team.</p> <p>More information is available at https://onlinemba.ucdavis.edu/experience/student-support/</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p>	<p>Instructional faculty are a mixture of full-time and part-time, and each course has a course coordinator who ensures that multiple sections have the same standards. For a given course, the instructor(s) and coordinator meets each week to discuss learning objectives and curricular materials, and to identify needed support from the coordinator. The curriculum is equivalent in breadth and depth to the on-site MBA program, and the asynchronous lectures are provided by tenure-track faculty. Instructional designers assist faculty during the course development phase, and Zoom and other trainings are provided as need to ensure a quality experience.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>The MBA program is overseen by the MBA Graduate Program Committee at UC Davis. All curricular changes are proposed by the committee and are evaluated by the Educational Policy and Curriculum committee of the Academic Senate. The curriculum in the online MBA program is the same as what is used in the face-to-face MBA program, and are often led by the same instructors</p> <p>Detailed information about the curriculum is available at https://onlinemba.ucdavis.edu/academics/curriculum/.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p><i>Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction”? How is compliance monitored? What activities count as student/instructor substantive interaction”?</p>	<p>Every course in the online MBA program has a live online component of 1 hour and 40 minutes every week. This interaction between faculty and the students provides an opportunity for students to learn in a small class setting (each class is limited to 24 students and the average class size is less than 20 students). Faculty also provide interactions via office hours to the students. All online students are required to come to “residentials” (three-day special topic sessions) that promote interactions between faculty, online MBA students, and face-to-face MBA students.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>Academic Engagement.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “Academic Engagement”? How is compliance monitored? What activities contribute to academic engagement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are required to attend weekly synchronous session for each course. • Students are assessed continuously through quizzes, exams, term papers, and presentations. • Students form teams in each course and those teams work collaboratively on assignments. • Students are encouraged to meet with their instructor during office hours to clarify any questions. • Program employs the Carnegie Unit with respect to instruction hours and credit assigned to each class. 	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>State Licensure Requirements.</i> Describe, as appropriate, the institution’s process for disclosing to students how state licensure requirements are met by distance education programs, whether licensure requirements are not met by programs, or whether the institution has not determined where licensure requirements are met by the programs.</p>	<p>The online MBA program operates through the UC Davis School of Business, which is professionally accredited by Association for Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), and this accreditation is noted prominently on the online MBA website.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p><i>Student Identification Verification and Privacy.</i> What is the institution's process for student verification, e.g., a secure login and pass code; proctored examinations; other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification? What precautions are taken by the institution to protect technology from cyber security intrusions on its or outsourced systems? Are additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity disclosed at the time of registration or enrollment?</p>	<p>UC Davis uses a centralized computing account for all students and affiliates (including online MBA students) to manage their online computing needs, including email, the course registration system, the billing system, and library access. Students create their account when they first enroll in a UC Davis program, and must provide proof of identity to our central IT Help Desk during the account creation process. To provide an additional layer of security, Duo multifactor authentication is used for all services that impact instructional or personal data. Student enrollment data is maintained in our campus student information system (Banner by Ellucian) and feeds into the Canvas learning management system powered by the corporate partner 2U. Banner, 2U, and Canvas are subject to the campus Vendor Risk Management program, which includes regular security assessments and SOC2 Type 2 evaluations. No additional charge is associated with the verification of student identity.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>Students are closely monitored and help is provided when a student is having difficulty with courses. The retention rate, graduation rate, and the proportion of students who are put into academic probation are all collected and appropriate actions taken. No differences are observed between the online MBA program and other on-premise MBA programs with respect to these measures. The program also compares very well with other online MBA programs in the country with respect to these measures.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>The AACSB accreditation process requires Assurance of Learning (AoL), which refers to developing learning objectives, measuring whether those objectives are being met, and making the necessary changes when the objectives are not being met. A complete report on this process for the online MBA is available. No major differences are observed between online or on-premise programs on these measures.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Agreements with Unaccredited Entities</i>?</p>	<p>Yes, the program partner is 2U, which provides infrastructure support, delivery of online live classes, and assistance in high-quality asynchronous. The partnership agreement has been reviewed by the broader university system and is consistent with all regulations.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>Every quarter, for every course, the program seeks student feedback that informs changes as appropriate. The program also collects data on professional progress of the students. Various ranking providers also measure the UC Davis program relative to other online programs; in the last ranking by Poets and Quants, a premier business education website, the UC Davis online MBA was ranked #16 in the country in terms of career progression for our students.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Revised April 2023

Off-Campus Locations Review

Institution: UC Davis
Type of Visit: Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Raka Ray
Date/s of review: September 28, 2024

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address

UC Davis
Graduate School of Management (GSM)
San Ramon Campus
12647 Alcosta Blvd, Suite 190
San Ramon, CA 94583

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

The San Ramon campus is the home of the Bay Area Part Time MBA program, a professional master's degree program in business administration, since 2009. Fall quarter enrollment in the program was 90 for academic year 2023-24 and is expected to be approximately the same this year. Faculty teach across sites and programs and may be allocated as partial FTE to the Bay Area program. In 2023-24, slightly more than 3.1 FTE tenure track faculty, 1 FTE faculty in the adjunct professor series, and nearly 2 FTE Lecturer FTE were allocated to the program.

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

During the site visit, the team member conducted a comprehensive tour of the facilities and held interviews with key stakeholders, including the site administrator, faculty groups, students, and staff members.

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

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	NA	
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.1, 3.1, 3.6, 4.1)	The San Ramon location caters to working professionals who desire to get an MBA but live in the Bay area -- commuting to Davis is therefore difficult on a regular basis. The program provides access to a UC Davis education to those who otherwise wouldn't be able to easily access it. Instead of students traveling to Davis, faculty travel to the East Bay location and deliver the same curriculum as they do in Davis. There are GSM employees who manage the facility and ensure that the educational experience is positive for students in the program. There is a clear effort made to integrate the part-time programs with the fulltime programs: same syllabi, same faculty, and same students access to Davis and to networking opportunities.	
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.5, 2.10, 4.3)	The San Ramon MBA program is advertised, found through Internet search, and is prominently featured on the UC Davis website (https://gsm.ucdavis.edu/bay-area-part-time-mba). Students of this program can take courses offered by the GSM in other locations, and also online. They also participate in in-person Residentials that bring online program students together. Finally, students organize several events at each location and attract students from the other programs. There are regular opportunities for students across campuses to socialize and network (for example, there were 40-50 students from San Ramon, Sacramento and Davis campuses at a recent Giants game)	

<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 2.5, 3.1, 3.6)</p>	<p>The building has multiple classrooms, advanced AV systems, a dining area for informal interaction during lunch break, custodial help from the landlord, and a program manager who is on site during classes. The students have access to high-speed internet and a printer as well as to high-quality food and coffee through the day. They also have small meeting rooms in case they would like to meet in small groups.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 3.6, 3.10, 4.34.1)</p>	<p>The program manager and the manager of instructional support are on site during class sessions. A career placement staff member visits the location every week and provides career counseling support to the students. All students have access to UC Davis library system. The DSAC (Dean's Student Advisory Committee) meets with the Associate Dean of Programs and Curriculum once every quarter and bring up issues the students would like to be addressed. This regular feedback mechanism has helped them provide the students with the amenities they desire. Students with whom we spoke express appreciation for the supportive and helpful nature of the staff.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 4.8)</p>	<p>The mix of faculty deployed to teach at the San Ramon location closely mirrors the mix in Davis's other programs. About 60% of the credit hours are delivered by senate faculty, and the remaining hours are delivered by full-time lecturers who have been recruited given their expertise in certain areas. The MBA Graduate Programs Committee oversees the curriculum, and all changes are discussed and voted on by the faculty. Assessment of learning is done routinely as part of their accreditation requirement, and the five learning goals for the MBA program are assessed at least once every two years. Curricular changes based on the results of the assessment are discussed during the annual faculty retreat in September every year. Thus, the curriculum is closely managed by the faculty of the GSM. Faculty during the</p>	

	interview stated that they feel integrated into the shared governance system of UC Davis.	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 4.2)</p>	<p>The MBA program offered in San Ramon is the same as the MBA program offered in Davis and Sacramento. Therefore, the same curriculum is offered, which is under the purview of the senate faculty. When a new course is proposed to be offered, the faculty Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee evaluates the course, the instructor's credentials, and the fit of the course with the current needs before giving approval. The courses are in most cases identical to those offered at the Davis campus, with the exception of a few courses that are targeted to the needs of the San Ramon student population (e.g., IT electives).</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5)</p>	<p>Retention and graduation rates for all the programs are monitored and the San Ramon program is comparable to all other programs Davis offer. The retention rate of students at the end of the first year is 97%. Graduation rates are above 90%, again comparable to the other programs. We do not have any specific concerns about retention and graduation rates of this program.</p>	<p>While the retention and graduation rates are excellent, a key problem San Ramon must grapple with is the relatively low enrollment. At present the program is self-sustaining but there is clear capacity for them to take in more students. This would transform the program into a revenue generating one.</p>

<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5)</p>	<p>The Assurance of Learning process advocated by the accreditation agency (AACSB) is followed for the program. It consists of developing learning goals, measuring learning in various courses, evaluating gaps in learning, making modifications in the curriculum as needed, and closing the loop by re-measuring. There do not appear to be any differences in the ability to meet learning objectives between San Ramon students and students in the other MBA programs.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)</p>	<p>The San Ramon location uses the same instructors, same instructional support, same career support, and curriculum as in other programs Davis offers. The instructors are evaluated by the students using the same instruments as in other programs. Since most of the instruction is in person, it is the same faculty who teach in the Davis program who also teach in the San Ramon program. In addition to the assessment of learning, they also track career progress of their students (see https://gsm.ucdavis.edu/bay-area-part-time-mba for information on career impact of the program).</p>	

Revised, August 2023