

PREPARATORY REVIEW TEAM REPORT FOR UC Davis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preparatory Review Team Roster	2
Draft Report	
I. Institutional Context	3
II. Evaluation of the Institutional Presentation	5
III. Visit Strategy and Validating Evidence	7
IV. Response to Previous Commission Issues	8
A. Comments on Planning	8
B. Comments on General Education	8
V. Review of UC Davis Institutional Capacity under the Standards	12
Standard 1	12
Standard 2	14
Standard 3	18
Standard 4	20
VI. Summary of Findings and Recommendations	25

Preparatory Review Team Roster

Date of Visit: December 4-6, 2002

Type of Visit: Preparatory Review

Chief Executive Officer:

Larry N. Vanderhoef, Chancellor

Accreditation Liaison Officer:

Patricia Turner, Vice Provost,
Undergraduate Studies

WASC Staff:

Elizabeth Griego, Associate Director

WASC Chair:

Milton D. Glick
Executive Vice President and Provost of the University
Arizona State University
PO Box 872803
Tempe AZ 85287-2803
(480) 965-1224 FAX (480) 965-0785
Email: glick@asu.edu

WASC Assistant Chair/Team Writer

James Fredericks Volkwein
Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education and Professor
The Pennsylvania State University
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16801-3203
(814) 865-9739 FAX: (814) 865-3638
Email: volkwein@psu.edu

WASC Members:

Joel Hartman
Vice Provost, Information Technologies & Resources
University of Central Florida
MH 350
4000 Central Florida Boulevard
Orlando, FL 32816-2800
(407) 823-6778 FAX (407) 823-6710
Email: joel@mail.ucf.edu

Weldon E. Ihrig
Executive Vice President
University of Washington, Seattle
Office of the Executive Vice President
306 Gerberding Hall, Box 351235
Seattle, WA 98195-1235
(206) 546-6410 FAX: (206) 543-3951
Email: wihrig@u.washington.edu

PREPARATORY REVIEW TEAM REPORT FOR UC Davis

I. Institutional Context

Established as an experiment station site for the University of California in 1905, UC Davis became a general campus of the university in 1959 and has grown to a large public research institution that is an integral part of the ten-campus University of California system, California's land-grant institution. UC Davis serves over 27,000 students and reflects, more than most UC campuses, the land grant tradition.

Davis has a clearly stated commitment to undergraduate education and serving the community. Even in tight budgetary times, Davis enjoys the advantage of the prestige of the larger system of which it is a part and the extraordinarily generous support of the state of California. The landmass of the campus is the largest of any in the system and the town environment conducive to the mission.

The last on-site visit was conducted in October 1991. A subsequent fourth-year visit to focus on planning and general education in 1995 was later changed to a fourth year report. The recommendation for a fourth year visit was the result of the commission's strong concerns about the university's requirements and practices with respect to general education and planning. The team also had concerns about the university's draft planning statement.

In 1997, the commission completed its review of the fourth year report. It found that UC Davis had made considerable progress in the area of planning (although it found that planning remained reactive rather than proactive), and it concluded that a strong foundation for future planning had

been laid. With respect to general education, the commission found that considerable effort had been expended, but that the results were not encouraging. A major concern was the absence of a General Education philosophy and the lack of coherence. While recognizing that a general education curriculum is a difficult challenge for all large complex universities, the 1997 team believed that UC Davis could and should do better.

II. Evaluation of the Institutional Presentation

The Preparatory Review report appears both informative and self-reflective. A change in WASC's process called for a streamlined 35-page report, which the institution faithfully executed. Obviously, quite a bit of effort went into assembling information and evidence and organizing it into an online format. The supporting information included on the website is voluminous, but it is made digestible by a crosswalk map between the standards and key data that was constructed by the UC Davis self-study team.

The presentation documents changes in leadership and senate governance, as well as undergraduate initiatives. The specificity of the draft Vision statement and the Academic Plan complements the diffuseness and length of the "Philosophy of Purpose." The University Community appears engaged in an array of relevant issues of concern. The essays for each standard provide a helpful overview though the introductory narrative for each criterion is necessarily brief, and the online documentation describes both process and product. The website data includes:

- Admissions and Student Preparation
- Student Enrollments
- Degrees Awarded
- Faculty and Staff Composition
- Information, Physical, and Fiscal Resources
- Institutional and Operating Efficiency
- Assessment Activities

This information remains as relevant background information for the Educational Effectiveness Review. In the Educational Effectiveness Review, we hope that the university will discuss how it plans to synthesize and draw connections among institutional mission, evidence of goal attainment,

and specific improvement strategies as required by Standard 4 (specifically Criteria for Review 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4). It is unclear in the Preparatory Review Report whether performance assessment and quality assurance and goal attainment information is woven into the fabric of the institution as well as it might be. Performance indicators exist, but it is not always clear in the report how these are utilized for continuous improvement. The website portfolio contains references to an array of ongoing assessment studies of various student and alumni populations. There appear to be both faculty governance structures and administrative teams that regularly review the products of these evaluations. The Fall Conference appears to be an annual opportunity for organizing institutional improvement efforts.

III. Visit Strategy and Validating Evidence

The four-person team in some ways defined how the team organized—four team members, four standards. In addition to each team member taking the lead on one of each of the four standards, each team member assumed additional responsibility for looking at the institutional portfolio through the lens of their respective areas of expertise: planning, budget, information technology, and general education. The two-day visit itself gave the team the opportunity to test how well the self-study reflects reality, as well as to learn from the members of the UC Davis community their perspective of the issues in play at UC Davis. Although the visit was short, the schedule allowed flexibility for the team to address issues not derived from the report and allowed campus members many opportunities for input. Our interactions included both scheduled and open meetings with individuals, as well as groups. We concluded, however, that the 30-minute time slots were too short, and we recommend for the next visit that 45 minutes be allotted for scheduled meetings with 15 minutes in between to prepare and travel between locations.

IV. Response to Previous Commission Issues

A. Comments on Planning

From the materials reviewed, the University appears to have made great progress toward addressing the planning challenges described in the 1997 Interim Report. The Academic Plan is setting the direction for guiding the annual budget decisions, and the existence of the Academic Plan has moved beyond “philosophize about planning,” as expressed in the Interim Report. The coordination and synchronization now appear to be established. The key next steps are to ensure adequate extension of the Academic Plan as 2006 approaches. The draft Strategic Vision Document is an excellent start toward agreeing upon performance measures. UC Davis has created a viable and effective planning foundation to guide the University into the future.

B. Comments on General Education (GE):

Since the previous WASC 1997 letter, UC Davis responded to the expressed concerns by taking several positive steps. After a series of campus conversations the University developed a General Education philosophy that appears in the Catalog, implemented a modest restructuring of the Academic Senate governance structure, and acquired Hewlett Foundation grant support for enhancing the General Education Program. By creating an Undergraduate Council with a standing committee responsible for the General Education program and courses, and by using foundation support creatively, the campus has increased the number of General Education offerings, and strengthened the program by organizing attractive General Education course clusters in areas that seem to “fit” Davis well (e.g., Changing Agriculture, Global Population and Environmental Issues, Biodiversity and Cultural Diversity, Food and Fiber). In addition, UC Davis is actively developing a General Education Scholars program

where students complete courses in a General Education theme option and then choose a capstone experience, seminar, or curriculum-related internship to integrate key concepts. These positive actions mark significant progress since 1997.

In our meetings with faculty, students, chairs, and deans, we received several clear impressions. First, UC Davis has a cadre of faculty who enjoy teaching General Education courses and who are good at it, and who mostly are doing it for the right reasons (namely enhancing the intellectual depth and breadth of undergraduates). Second, the number of General Education offerings and theme clusters has increased in recent years and taken the pressure off the supply versus demand problem that was evident in the 1990s. Third, certain aspects of the General Education program have been strengthened, such as bringing greater clarity and organization to the diversity and writing requirements, and using the new data system and warehouse to identify students with common interests and clustering them into General Education themes. Fourth, the current program still consists mainly of a cafeteria of courses that students and faculty alike seem to prefer because it maximizes flexibility and choice, and it generates needed FTE enrollments for many departments. While this cafeteria approach has been strengthened by the organization of many General Education courses into theme clusters, it still falls short of the WASC-recommended minimum of 45 semester credit hours. Fifth, faculty generally support and recognize the value of a General Education program that provides a coherent educational experience for students, and they believe that Davis is headed in the right direction. However, the faculty and chairs that we met fear that anticipated resources will not support a more elaborate General Education program.

There are three components to the General Education requirement at Davis:

- a) Topical breadth (satisfied by taking 6 courses outside of the student’s major)
- b) Social-cultural diversity (1 course from approved list)
- c) Writing experience (3 courses from approved list)

In our view, the new course clusters and the General Education Scholars program add coherence to the topical breadth requirement that did not exist before. In addition, the writing requirement responds to faculty, employer, and alumni concerns. The trouble is that courses approved for one area may also count for the other components; thus, a student can conceivably get by on six courses outside the major (or 24 units) chosen carefully to “double count” the writing and diversity requirements. Apparently many students, including some that we met, undertake double majors and minors that add greatly to their “topical breadth.” Nevertheless, we are concerned about the number of other students who may be allowed to avoid such breadth and coherence. No member of our team believes that UC Davis graduates should enter their careers with as few as 24 General Education units. Just the simple step of eliminating the “double counting” of courses would make General Education a 40-unit program for all UC Davis graduates.

We understand that the WASC Standards were written to avoid a “one size fits all” approach to General Education. However, the commission’s expectation is that institutions not reaching the 45 semester credit hours General Education guideline should ensure that the expected outcomes for General Education and the baccalaureate are being met through other approaches (Criteria for Review 2.2). There needs to be assessment evidence that students are achieving the stated educational objectives, levels of attainment, breadth, and skills (C.F.R. 2.4 and 2.6). We recommend that UC Davis develop a system for accumulating and

reflecting upon such evidence, and the Educational Effectiveness Review will provide an opportunity for the team to discuss further with the campus its plan for General Education.

V. Review of UC Davis Institutional Capacity under the Standards

STANDARD 1 – DEFINING INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES AND ENSURING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Standard 1 calls for clarity of mission and purpose, and additionally requires the institution to function with integrity and autonomy. It appears that the UC Davis community has accepted the institutional mission statement, or “Philosophy of Purpose.” It is easily accessible to all from the university’s home page. Although somewhat generic, it is completely appropriate for a public institution of higher education. The statements could fit any large land grant multiversity and do not provide a template to determine what the campus should not do. The choices of undergraduate research and the effective use of technology as key foci of the accreditation are reasonable, but do not appear to be driven explicitly by the mission statement or key objectives. The document varies between being highly general and highly specific. Its length brings into question the degree to which the document is widely understood by the institutional community or serves as a beacon for institutional direction. However, this could be true at most large institutions.

The level of collegiality, concern for undergraduate education, and interest in individual students reflect for many the “Davis advantage,” and that certainly rang true throughout the team’s visit. In our experience, few public universities, or even private ones for that matter, can exhibit such a warm, enthusiastic, and supportive campus culture.

The leadership of the institution appears highly qualified and has engaged the community in the planning processes. The structure of the UC system requires a carefully orchestrated blend of campus autonomy within a strong university-wide governance structure. The relationship of the

campus senate to the university senate is one manifestation of this structure. The overall strength of UC makes the burden of university governance worth the effort. All of the systems necessary to assure academic freedom are in place, although the documentation did not allow an evaluation of the effectiveness of these systems. The faculty merit step system of UC appears to be a great strength in spite of the workload involved.

The Academic Senate adopted a formal statement of “Educational Objectives” for undergraduate students. Though possibly implied by the stated objectives, information fluency and research are noticeably absent as explicitly stated educational objectives (even though the importance of both is explicitly stated elsewhere.) There is also no link to this document from the Students section of the UC Davis website.

The actions of the Regents, especially in the area of affirmative action, have been headline news in the national media, thus making adequate safeguards even more important. The widely distributed and well-regarded UC Davis statement on diversity (contrasted with affirmative action) is a sign of health in this important and complex area. The development and nurturing of ethnic studies programs and special efforts concerning minorities demonstrate a commitment of the campus to diversity. As the self-study points out, the impact of SP-1 and Prop 209 combined with the institutional expectation of high selectivity, have left the campus faculty and student body less diverse than the leadership aspires to. Low numbers of historically disadvantaged students should be of particular concern.

The university will need to be attentive to perceived issues that are likely to be leading indicators: a statement on the website that summer school helps students who cannot register in necessary courses during the academic year; the number and roles of lecturers; perceptions of under-staffed support units and limited classroom availability. In the faculty forum, the status and workload of lecturers was raised as an important issue facing UC Davis.

However, these issues notwithstanding, UC Davis is a well-funded high quality university that any state would be proud to claim. The campus community seems to be confident it can work through the coming budget issues without doing serious damage to the integrity and quality of the enterprise.

In the past five years, considerable delegation of decision-making authority to deans and a coherent campus plan seem to be very positive steps toward achieving institutional goals. The several research initiatives underway reflect energy and forward thinking, but they were not discussed and it should be a goal to integrate them into undergraduate education where feasible.

The bottom line is that the institution appears to have in place the basic resources, structures and processes to meet its core commitment to Institutional Capacity. The level of collegiality, positive view of campus, and low barriers to collaboration, are positive hallmarks of the campus.

STANDARD 2 – ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES THROUGH CORE FUNCTIONS

Standard 2 requires the institution to align its core academic and administrative functions with its educational goals and objectives. UC Davis has assembled in its portfolio substantial evidence about its capacity and attainment of undergraduate educational objectives and successful outcomes. Our

team concentrated its attention on the infrastructure that supports the core teaching and learning activities. While a decentralized approach to undergraduate education dominates the UC Davis landscape, the evidence suggests that the WASC self-study has provoked a healthy and deliberate institutional re-examination that is the hallmark of thoughtful and effective institutions of higher education.

There are many admirable strengths of the undergraduate educational experience at UC Davis. Perhaps the strongest feature of the campus landscape is the supportive and positive campus culture that generates a feeling of teamwork, and that makes more permeable the academic and administrative silos that are so common at large universities. This positive Davis hallmark is perhaps best illustrated by the remarkable and elaborate partnership between student affairs and academic affairs. The collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs even extends to offering undergraduates the opportunity to enroll in an academic minor in Leadership.

Two examples struck our team as especially noteworthy. First, campus-wide “Aggie Advising” efforts are coordinated by an interconnected web of centralized and de-centralized student advisement services. Collaborators include undergraduate studies, housing, Senate governance, the Learning Skills Center, Advising Services, the associate deans, the Internship and Career Center, peer tutoring and advising, as well as professional staff in the professional schools and large departments. According to the students attending our open meetings, this multiple array provides undergraduates with steady exposure to effective advisement resources at the university. The UC Davis student satisfaction survey results for advisement are comparable to our own institutions, and

the academic program review data indicates that 80-90% of students are moderately to highly satisfied with advisement in their majors.

Second, the Student Affairs Research and Information group (SARI) has for many years conducted institutional research at the university. This program of conceptually driven, periodic data collection and research has been widely shared and packaged for the diverse academic and administrative programs and offices across the campus, ranging from enrollment management and housing to academic program reviews and undergraduate educational outcomes. SARI regularly assesses student and alumni opinions and outcomes using items constructed not only from George Kuh's *Involving Campuses*, but also from qualitative, open-ended feedback received from UC Davis students, parents, and employers. Recently, SARI began reconstructing some of its survey instruments to align them with the seven new UC Davis educational objectives for students. These objectives were approved by the campus community in 2001. Another new and flexible SARI tool – a web based quick poll – can provide salient information within days to appropriate academic and administrative units.

There are many other features of the student experience at UC Davis that reflect upon Standard 2. There is now campus consensus about the educational objectives for students, and this holds the promise of greater coherence over time. The university maintains an elaborate system for collecting and reporting student ratings of instruction. Housing offers a remarkable array of alternative residential clusters based on student academic, as well as social interests. Several thousand students each year participate in a program of impressively diverse internships. The academic program review cycle focuses on the undergraduate major and the student instructional experience. The

faculty generally see these periodic reviews as a hated, if not feared, process that is nevertheless a serious exercise having a cumulative beneficial effect over time by forcing gradual program alignment with educational objectives and academic standards. We referred above to the greater attention now devoted to general education. While much of General Education remains decentralized, faculty-driven, and enrollment driven, we were pleased to meet a number of faculty who approach their General Education instruction with a spirit of service and citizenship, if not missionary zeal.

Finally, the university supports a student and faculty undergraduate research program that will receive greater scrutiny during the Educational Effectiveness Review. It appears that undergraduate involvement in research receives encouragement and support from UC Davis deans and department heads. Undergraduate Research is spreading from the sciences and engineering to social sciences and humanities; and often involves transfer students and native freshmen alike. More students are participating more frequently over time, and some faculty work with students almost every term. Many of these faculty-student collaborations are highly informal and decentralized, others take on the flavor of a student honors experience, while still others rise to the level of a formal, capstone presentation at the Undergraduate Research Conference attended by several hundred students and parents each year.

Defined broadly, undergraduate research experiences can involve independent research and creative projects within regular courses, as well as summer internships and supervised off-campus experiences. It appears that thousands of UC Davis students per year are involved at this level, and seven out of ten recent graduates report having at least one such experience. At a more intensive

level, working directly with a full-time faculty member outside of regularly scheduled classes on research or creative projects that result in a formal presentation, the initial evidence suggests that hundreds, rather than thousands, of undergraduates participate each year. What is the program's realistic capacity given that the number of track faculty is about 1150 and many of them, we assume, may be almost totally committed to graduate training and research? The extent and nature of undergraduate research participation will receive greater attention during the team's effectiveness visit in March.

STANDARD 3 – DEVELOPING AND APPLYING RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND ENSURE SUSTAINABILITY

The review demonstrates that Standard 3 is being met at Davis through investment in human, physical, fiscal and information resources. UC Davis is being forced to deal with budget cuts due to the State of California's economic situation, while simultaneously planning and funding added positions for enrollment growth, along with growth in research support. Those are two competing and difficult challenges to balance, requiring University-wide involvement and understanding. The Academic Plan provides the vision and foundation for UC Davis through 2006. The open budget process involves people University-wide in decision-making and promotes campus understanding of the impacts on human, physical, fiscal and information resources. There also appears to be clear interactions between the annual budget processes and the Academic Plan to ensure continuity, as the resources become known. Developing a ten-year all-funds capital plan is an excellent addition to the UC Davis planning function. Clear efforts have been made to ensure that the capital plan is guided by the goals in the Academic Plan.

The challenge for UC Davis during this period of planned enrollment growth, while State support is being cut, will be to maintain academic quality as well as adequate support services. Reasonable student/faculty and staff/faculty ratios may need to be defended. The impact and role of Lecturers as a teaching resource will need to be thoughtfully addressed. During our visit, we heard several concerns about the lack of, and loss of, instructional space. Classroom availability, quality and utilization should be evaluated and addressed as a part of construction and renovation planning.

The examples of information resources appear focused and supportive of the needs for library services, as well as information technologies. The computing coordinating councils and IT Policy Board are effective approaches to setting priorities and reviewing performance in accordance with the Academic Plan. The Policy Board provides a link with the Academic Plan. In addition, systems for life-cycle costing/funding of the IT infrastructure appear to adequately support the demands for services.

The UC Davis organization appears to support the necessary decision making processes. The academic planning principles provide a strong foundation for addressing for the State's difficult fiscal situation, and people commented that they felt more involved and informed than they were when State fiscal stresses occurred during the early 1990s. The annual resource allocations support the Academic Plan, as do the annual reviews of the colleges and units' performance. While the rate of accomplishment may be slowed due to limited State resources, the Academic Plan remains the strategic focus for UC Davis. The draft Strategic Vision Document with its Key Strategies and Measures reflects an excellent framework for assuring that the strategic directions are achieved. It

will be interesting how the Strategic Vision Document develops and is used to support UC Davis' planning and evaluation of performance outcomes.

STANDARD 4 – CREATING ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT TO LEARNING AND IMPROVEMENT

Standard Four requires that an institution conduct participatory, evidence-based discussions about the effectiveness with which it achieves its educational objectives and accomplishes its purposes. A primary mechanism for reflection and planning is the Chancellor's Fall Conference, which serves as a forum to engage the campus in a structured dialog on key issues. The 2001 conference examined undergraduate education (including General Education), assessment, and basic skills that should be reinforced in the curriculum. The 2002 conference focused attendees on planning for a future capital campaign. Beyond the 150 or so individuals who participate directly in the Chancellor's Fall Conferences, the Faculty Senate is a forum for general faculty involvement in institutional governance and planning. These appear to be effective mechanisms that involve diverse representatives from throughout the institution. Campus preparation for the WASC accreditation reaffirmation process has also had a positive impact on planning and campus dialog and, as intended, has stimulated stakeholder attention and conversation on major issues, opportunities, and needs. The online materials provided by UC Davis, and more importantly the information conveyed by campus constituents through meetings and conversations with the visiting team, reveal UC Davis to be a self-reflective institution. Institutional leadership demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement of the institution, with the involvement of broad campus constituencies including faculty and students.

The Academic Plan, 2000-2006, delineates future directions for interdisciplinary programs, new schools, institutional priorities, and the associated resource allocation process. Similarly, the Long Range Development Plan describes the institution's plans for future development of its physical infrastructure. Detailed processes are in place at the UC System and UC Davis campus levels for the creation of new programs and review of existing programs. Processes are also in place to coordinate academic planning, long-range facilities development, and the associated fiscal needs. However, UC Davis is currently confronting the unfolding implications of significant state budget reductions while also facing enrollment increases and planning the development of major new academic and research programs; collectively, these issues will represent one of the key planning challenges for the next few years. It is worthy of note that members of the campus community with whom the team met appear to be facing the future with confidence in the strength of the institution and its leadership, and a feeling that future resource allocation decisions will be made in a fair, open, and consultative manner. The visiting team observed an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust among the various groups with whom we met.

UC Davis has developed extensive data collection and analysis resources, including Student Affairs Research and Information (SARI), a data warehouse, and the Office of Resource Management & Planning's Analytical Studies and Program Planning & Budget Operations sections. The institution is increasingly making strategic and planning information available to the campus through standard reporting tools and easily accessed Web interfaces. Information to meet planning and decision-making needs appears to be readily available to those who require it. The capabilities of SARI and ORMP to rapidly provide campus planners and decision makers with timely information and data are exemplary. When fully developed, the data warehouse and associated data marts can be expected to substantially enhance this capability. The data warehouse will become an increasingly important

resource to support UC Davis planning, decision making, and reporting, as well as an important tool for integrating the institution's disparate data sources. Mechanisms for ongoing funding of data warehouse development and support should be put in place to ensure the success of this project.

Central information technology management and coordination at UC Davis falls under the Vice Provost for Information and Educational Technology, whose office has comprehensive responsibility for academic, administrative, and research computing, communication, and instructional technology. The institution has engaged in a series of projects and programs to develop campus IT infrastructure and services, including initiatives in networking, technology-enabled business processes, an enterprise portal, and student computer ownership. Faculty and students who spoke with the WASC Team reported that campus information technology infrastructures are robust and reliable, and playing an increasingly important role at the institution. Well-equipped student computer labs and e-mail stations meet student needs for on-campus access to network resources and instructional software. Lab infrastructure is life cycle funded to ensure continued modernization.

High-level committees exist to advise on priorities for academic and administrative computing, with an overall IT policy committee chaired by the Provost. These mechanisms should serve to ensure that technology priorities and resource allocations are aligned with institutional priorities. Recent strategic developments in technology include UC Davis's participation in the UC System's New Business Architecture initiative and the associated development of the MyUCDavis enterprise Web portal. In addition, a series of "Advanced Technology Projects" have been undertaken, including campus video services, workflow, the MyUCDavis portal, enterprise directory services, wireless networking, electronic payment, and network security. These serve as feasibility studies and pilot projects to guide future technology deployments.

The Division of Information & Educational Technology appears to have adequate staff and budget to achieve its mission. However, the connection between institutional mission and goals and information technology developments reportedly occurs as a tactical response by I&ET to institutional needs, rather than as a result of top-level institutional strategic planning. The coming period of fiscal constraints will emphasize the need to make information technology investments in a more strategic manner, with an added emphasis on reducing the costs of delivering instructional and administrative services.

The primary campus units whose missions are focused on improving teaching and learning are Mediaworks and the Teaching Resource Center (TRC). Mediaworks provides faculty with workshops and an extensive array of planning and production support services for the creation of instructional materials for classroom and online use. The TRC provides several faculty programs and training sessions throughout the year, including the Undergraduate Instructional Improvement Program (UIIP) and the Summer Institute on Technology in Teaching (SITT). In addition, the Arbor provides a pleasant environment for faculty to improve their technology skills.

The UC Davis institutional proposal states that the university wishes to ensure that its deployment of technology be guided by sound pedagogical practices evidence and to develop criteria that will aid campus departments in making effective instructional use of technology. The staff, resources, and programs of Mediaworks and the TRC are highly regarded by faculty; however, both units have insufficient instructional design capacity to ensure that these objectives can be achieved. In addition, UC Davis is not conducting systematic, ongoing assessment of the educational effectiveness of its uses of technology. The review of assessment of the impact of technology on student learning will be a topic for the Educational Effectiveness Review. Systematic instructional design, faculty

development, and assessment, should be made integral elements of the university's initiative to employ information technology in classroom and online instructional settings. Examples provided to the visiting team of current online courses, as well as critical student comments, suggested the need for improved online course designs and pedagogies.

Alumni are involved in program evaluation in part through the triennial surveys conducted by SARI, and through surveys of graduates conducted by some colleges. Formal involvement of other constituencies, such as employers and practitioners, in the assessment of educational effectiveness appears to be limited to specific programs, such as engineering and law. WASC standard four suggests that involvement of stakeholders other than alumni in assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs should be institution-wide.

VI. Summary of Findings and Recommendations

We conclude that the UC Davis campus culture supports an atmosphere of openness and teamwork that is rare in large public, or even private universities. In the self-study and our visit, we found a self-reflective university with high academic standards. UC Davis has responded energetically and effectively to the concerns regarding general education and campus planning that were expressed in the 1997 review. We encourage the campus to prepare for the effectiveness review in March 2003, and we believe that the self-study team is well poised for the task. As UC Davis prepares for the Educational Effectiveness Review, we offer these recommendations:

1. In the Educational Effectiveness Review, we hope that the university will discuss how it plans to synthesize and draw connections among institutional mission, evidence of goal attainment, and specific improvement strategies. In the years ahead we recommend a continuing bond between the UC Davis draft Strategic Vision Document, the university's planning activities, and performance outcomes. How does the university plan to monitor and improve its programmatic, departmental, and university-wide student outcomes?
2. We congratulate UC Davis for creating a more viable and effective planning foundation to guide the university into the future. The university will need to be attentive to resource issues that are sensitive to enrollment growth, such as students who cannot register in necessary courses during the academic year; the number and roles of lecturers; staffing for support units; and the adequacy of high quality classrooms to meet instructional needs.

3. UC Davis has made admirable and significant progress in the organization and delivery of the general education program since 1997. However, no member of our team believes that UC Davis graduates should enter their careers with as few as 24 General Education units. Whatever numbers of courses and units are required, UC Davis needs evidence that students are achieving the stated educational objectives, levels of attainment, breadth, and skills. In the Educational Effectiveness Review, we will talk with the university about its plans to develop a system for accumulating and reflecting upon such evidence, and strengthening the General Education requirements if the evidence warrants it.
4. Regarding the undergraduate research program, we look forward to understanding the many facets and avenues for student participation in the Educational Effectiveness Review materials. Given the workload profiles of full and part-time faculty, what is the program's realistic capacity, and how will its impact on student outcomes eventually be evaluated?
5. The coming period of fiscal constraints will emphasize the need to make information technology investments in a more strategic manner, with an added emphasis on reducing the costs of delivering instructional and administrative services. During the Educational Effectiveness Review, the team will review how the university is assessing the impact of technology on student learning to guide its future planning and IT investments. We recommend that systematic instructional design, faculty development, and assessment, be made integral elements of the university's initiative

to develop hybrid online courses and technology-enriched classroom learning experiences.

6. Formal involvement of other stakeholders, such as employers and practitioners, in the assessment of educational effectiveness appears to be limited to specific programs, such as engineering and law. During the Educational Effectiveness Review, the team will inquire as to how UC Davis intends to involve stakeholders (other than alumni) in the assessment of educational effectiveness (C.F.R. 4.7 and 4.8).