Office of the President

TO MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:

<u>DISCUSSION ITEM</u>

For Meeting of November 14, 2018

ASSESSING AND ENSURING ACADEMIC QUALITY ON CAMPUS AND SYSTEMWIDE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Academic quality is a cornerstone of the University of California. Maintaining that quality is foundational to ensuring that UC attracts and retains top-notch faculty, produces essential scholarly works, and conducts cutting-edge research. At UC, world-class quality and access are equally important and the University strives to educate and graduate a diverse set of students that will become future researchers, leaders, and contributors to our society.

Many discussions of academic quality focus on metrics such as student-faculty ratio, student satisfaction, and graduation rates. These metrics are mostly proxies for academic quality, given the difficulty of directly measuring teaching and learning effects. Such measurement is made even more difficult given the inherently complex nature of a research university that pursues outcomes associated with diverse forms of research and scholarship. Reliance solely on these metrics will not capture the complexity of UC's educational mission and operations.[1]

Instead, the focus here is on evaluative processes that ensure academic quality by guiding the identification of areas of strength and improvement in UC's academic enterprise. Many of these processes are based on peer review, reflecting an institutional commitment to validating the University's work through the involvement of internal and external experts. These processes cover a wide array of activity, from the approval of individual courses, regular quality reviews of academic departments, reviews and approvals of new schools, colleges and graduate programs to the institution's overall accreditation. Academic quality considerations also drive the University's hiring, evaluation, and promotion processes for faculty and other academic and institutional leaders. Individual schools and departments, campuses, the UC Office of the President, the Academic Senate (systemwide and campus), and the Regents all play a role in assessing and ensuring academic quality.

This item describes the ways UC assesses and ensures academic quality to inform a discussion on ways the Board may further advance academic quality at the University.

---

[1] This item focuses on quality in UC's educational mission rather than the many measures UC uses to assess its research impact. The two are inextricably linked since the quality of the faculty is essential to both missions.

BACKGROUND

Evaluative reviews that assess and ensure academic quality exist at practically all levels of UC's organization, at all campuses, throughout divisional and systemwide Academic Senates, and at the UC Office of the President. These reviews often share common areas of focus to ensure UC maintains academic quality across the organization. These reviews can be divided into ones that operate at the institutional, school/departmental, and individual level. At each level, there are both a campus and systemwide role, with the Academic Senate and the academic administration each having complementary roles within each category:

	Institutional-Level Reviews	**School/Departmental-Level Reviews**	**Individual-Level Reviews**
Campus role	WSCUC accreditation Institutional planning Performance reviews of senior administrators Course approvals	Academic program review Student learning assessment Program establishments, modifications, and curricular review Disciplinary accreditation	Faculty appointment and promotion Student evaluation of teaching
System role	WSCUC accreditation Campus reporting to UC President Annual meetings with campus leadership	*Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes* Review of new graduate academic programs	*Academic Personnel Manual (APM)*

Institutional-Level Reviews for Assessing and Ensuring Academic Quality

WSCUC accreditation. All UC campuses, along with the Office of the President, are continually engaged with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges' Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). Recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and by the Council for Higher Education as an authority on the quality of education provided by degree-granting institutions, WSCUC's accreditation process serves to assure the educational community, parents, students, employers, policymakers, and the public that accredited institutions have met high standards of quality and effectiveness.

WSCUC expects accredited institutions to, first, ground their activities in three "core commitments":

- Student learning and success;
- Quality and improvement; and
- Institutional integrity, sustainability, and accountability.

These commitments are specified through WSCUC's Standards of Accreditation:

- Standard 1: Defining institutional purposes and ensuring educational objectives;
- Standard 2: Achieving education objectives through core functions;
- Standard 3: Developing and applying resources and organizational structures to ensure quality and sustainability; and
- Standard 4: Creating an organization committed to quality assurances, institutional learning, and improvement.

Thirty-nine criteria for review are distributed across the four Standards, and these criteria are cited by institutions in their reports, by peer reviewers in evaluating institutions, and by WSCUC's Commission in making decisions about institutions. Some examples of criteria reviewed include:

- The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered.

- Undergraduate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, undergraduate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others.

- The institution's graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students' active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice.

- The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.

- Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is

consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning.

- The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives.

It is important to note that WSCUC has an Equity and Inclusion Policy guided by the following principles:

- Commitment to student learning and success requires that institutions actively seek to support the success of all of their students.

- Engagement with historical and contemporary issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion are educational objectives that can be productively incorporated into programs at any level.

- Seeking and valuing multiple dimensions of diversity within its various constituencies strengthens an institution's effectiveness.

WSCUC's institutional review process, which typically last two to three years, begins with an institutional self-study in which the institution gathers data to reflect on its current functioning and effectiveness under the Standards. This self-study culminates in the completion of an institutional report that is the basis of the review. During the latter stages of developing the institutional report, the process for selecting Review Team members begins, and this process reflects a partnership between the campus and WSCUC staff. The campus can propose potential members to the staff and WSCUC staff considers these proposals. Both campus and WSCUC suggestions for Review Team membership are tested against the availability of potential members. While membership differs for each review, WSCUC Review Teams are alike in that they are composed primarily of experienced educators from peer institutions. The Review Team conducts an offsite review that is then followed by a three-day campus visit. Following the visit, the Review Team finalizes its report to the Commission. The Commission serves as the decision-making and policy-setting body of WSCUC and its final "action letter" to institutions represents the official accreditation status granted.

All UC campus are fully accredited. Campuses' most-recent WSCUC's action letters reaffirming their accreditation differ in the areas emphasized, ranging from student success to financial sustainability. See the Attachment for a list of campus reaffirmation letters and areas of emphasis.

Institutional planning. A cursory review of the areas emphasized in WSCUC's action letters reveals the centrality of campus-level institutional planning to the assurance of quality and

effectiveness. The processes involved in campus strategic, financial, and academic planning, for example, are designed to ensure that academic quality is considered in the development of strategic directions, in resource allocation, and in the development and evolution of academic programs. Moreover, these planning functions are institutionalized at UC, with full-time positions dedicated to these functions and with constant checks on the alignment of these functions with the University's core mission.

Performance reviews of senior administrators. At both the campus and system levels, evaluations of the performance of senior administrators provides an opportunity to assess their effectiveness in matters related to academic quality. Administrative reviews of chancellors and provosts are guided by Regents Policy 7702: Senior Management Group Performance Management Review Process. Every five years, an assessment is administered in which faculty and staff, the Academic Senate, and other administrators have the opportunity to assess the effectiveness of a given administrator. This assessment is combined with annual performance evaluation information, which may include self-appraisals, client feedback, and input from key stakeholders. The resulting goals and objectives, although varied, usually include aspects of academic quality given that this set of aims is aligned with UC's educational mission.

The performance of campus deans is also reviewed, as guided by the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 240-80: Review Procedures for Decanal Duties. Here too, a five-year review is conducted and combined with information from annual assessments.

Course approvals. Each campus Academic Senate division has a Committee on Courses, which has authority for final approval of all courses at the campus. These committees usually have at least one member from each broad disciplinary area (e.g., a humanities, social sciences, biological sciences, and physical sciences member) along with a representative from each of the campus' colleges/schools. The committee typically approves new courses of instruction, the modification of existing courses, special prerequisites for major subjects, the withdrawal or retention of courses, the conduct of courses, the credit valuation of courses, the classification of courses, and the review of Independent Study programs. The approval of new courses is more often than not at the center of the committee's work with campus faculty submitting course proposals each academic year for review. Using established procedures, the committee then reviews each proposal in a timely manner. The criteria used for the review clearly relate to issues of educational effectiveness and curricular alignment. For example, following are the course approval criteria from UC Berkeley:

- Are the standards for the proposed course consistent with the standards for other courses taught on the Berkeley campus?
- Is the level (lower division, upper division, graduate, professional) appropriate? Are the prerequisites justified?

- Is the instructional format (lecture, discussion, laboratory, etc.) of the course appropriate?

- Is the unit value for the course justified? That is, is there an appropriate workload for the number of units offered?

- Does the syllabus present in a clear manner the requirements for the course and the standards for assessment of student work? The relative weight of each requirement toward the final grade should be specified.

- Is the course description sufficient to let students know the general content of the course?

- Does the course appear to fit the department's curriculum and disciplinary jurisdiction? While Committee on Courses of Instruction is not charged with approving curricula, courses and curricula should have some relation to one another.

- Does the course inappropriately duplicate the content of another course in the department or of a course in another department or school? It is recognized that minor overlap is unavoidable and that two or more departments may offer courses with similar subject matter, but with quite different disciplinary perspectives.

By following both systemwide and campus regulations on courses, this process is designed to ensure a consistency in quality and expectations for courses and course credit across departments and across campuses.

UC Office of the President-campus communication and reporting. Campuses also submit evaluative reports to the Office of the President which, again, include aspects of academic quality, and are a part of annual meetings among campus leaders, the Academic Senate, and the Office of the President. These annual discussions between the UC President, Provost, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Operations Officer, campus Chancellors and Provosts, and Academic Senate leaders focus on campus strategic plans and goals. In the recent past, key foci related to academic quality have included enrollment and degree production, student outcomes (e.g., attaining a 70 percent four-year graduate rate or the elimination of graduation gaps), campus diversity, and research and innovation.

School/Departmental-Level Reviews for Assessing and Ensuring Academic Quality

Academic program review. The academic program review process is at the center of school/departmental-level reviews for assessing and ensuring academic quality. Practically universal among higher education institutions in the U.S., academic program review is based on both evaluation and strategic planning. A comprehensive, evidence-based evaluation of the academic unit is undertaken and the resulting findings are used to define challenges and opportunities that shape strategic directions. Similar to the WSCUC process, the centerpiece of the academic program review process is a unit's self-study.

Academic program review is administered at the campus level in a way consistent with shared governance. Typically, it is overseen by a joint Academic Senate-administrative committee that includes a wide range of those with a stake in the process. Committees such as these maintain policies and procedures for the process, produce guidelines for conducting the process, manage the review schedule, and organize the extramural reviewers.

The quality of undergraduate education in units that serve undergraduates is typically the subject of deep study during the academic program review process. For example, at UC Davis, the program review process is separated by undergraduate and graduate programs. Undergraduate program reviews are integrated with assessment of UC Davis' general education program, with undergraduate programs under review being asked to assess all general education courses they offer to ensure they satisfy the learning outcomes that have been established. Another example is UCLA which has established a focus on "Excellence in Undergraduate Education" in its review process guided by a set of principles focused around the quality of undergraduate education. A third example is UC Irvine's process. UC Irvine's self-study guidelines ask for an analysis of past reviews, an analysis of current programs, which ought to include evidence of faculty distinction, an evaluation of undergraduate programs, an evaluation of graduate programs, and strategic plans for the future. The evaluation of undergraduate programs is comprehensive, as evidenced by the guiding questions for UC Irvine's process:

<p align="center">Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs [UC Irvine]</p>

1. Admissions:
   a. Describe efforts the Department makes to recruit and enroll high quality students in its undergraduate programs.
   b. Characterize the demographics of the Department's undergraduate students. Describe efforts the Department makes to recruit and serve members of underrepresented groups. Describe and comment on steps that the Department has taken to promote diversity. Is the Department's plan being effectively implemented?
   c. Comment on the number of Departmental majors and minors. Is it adequate, too few, or too many? Comment on the role of the department's minors.
   d. Describe the criteria for admission into the Department major(s). Are there additional criteria for freshman adopting the Department major beyond the campus-wide criteria? What are the criteria for transfer students who wish to adopt the department major? What criteria or restrictions exist for UCI students in other majors who wish to transfer to the department major?
2. Training:
   a. Provide an overview of the Department's undergraduate program, curriculum, and degree requirements. Include a sample 4-year course plan.
   b. Comment on the undergraduate class-size statistics and percentage of undergraduate courses taught by regular rank faculty. What is the ratio of teaching assistants to student enrollment? Is teaching assistant support adequate?
   c. Comment on the time to degree for undergraduate majors. Are required courses accessible and offered with sufficient frequency to ensure timely progress toward degree? What does the Department do to provide academic guidance and support for undergraduate majors?
   d. Referring to the results of the undergraduate student survey (forthcoming from APRS and the Division of Undergraduate Education), how would you characterize student satisfaction with the Department's undergraduate programs? What do undergraduate students perceive to be the key strengths and weaknesses of the Department?
   e. Comment on the Department's efforts at professional socialization for undergraduate students. For example, what percentage of students are involved in honors programs, independent study, undergraduate research, small seminars, internships, study abroad, or student chapters of professional societies? List prestigious awards and/or achievements by your undergraduate students.

        f.   Describe how the Department contributes to the education of UCI students not majoring in the Department. What courses are offered as breadth courses for non-majors? What restrictions are placed on non-majors with respect to taking courses offered by the Department?

   3. Placement
        a.   What can be said about the prospective job and educational opportunities for your Department's undergraduate majors? Provide any data available regarding placement of undergraduate majors in appropriate jobs or graduate programs. What does the Department do to provide career guidance for undergraduate students?

Most campuses' questions and guidelines for the self-study phase include ones that address diversity. At UC Berkeley, self-studies are expected to include an Equity and Inclusion Plan and to address questions on diversity and faculty strategic hiring; at UC Davis, the number and percent of underrepresented faculty and students are discussed; at UC Irvine, departments describe and evaluate their efforts and initiatives with respect to the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students; and at UC Merced an examination of efforts towards diversity is expected in discussion of program mission, goals, learning outcomes, and planning future directions.

At all UC campuses, responses to this wide range of questions are compiled into a report that is reviewed by an External Review Committee, usually three to five extramural reviewers who are experienced and respected faculty in the respective discipline. This Review Committee then visits the campus to meet with the academic unit for one to three days and, finally, prepares a report that is reviewed and discussed. These discussions can be pivotal as they potentially have resource implications for the academic unit. Finally, the program review process operates on a periodic cycle, ensuring that all instructional units are engaged in the evaluation process regularly. Mid-cycle reviews, however, are a possibility; final reports that identify pressing problems might require a mid-cycle review to verify that identified improvements are underway.

Student learning assessment and program establishments, modifications and curricular review. Ideally, evidence for the assessment of student learning is integrated into the academic program review process. Student learning assessment refers to the systematic and ongoing process of identifying student learning outcomes, assessing student performance in relation to these outcomes, and using the results to improve student learning and academic programs. Four basic steps are involved:

     1. Articulating outcomes for student learning;
     2. Gathering evidence about how well students are achieving the outcomes;
     3. Evaluating the evidence and interpreting the findings; and
     4. Using the findings for curricular and programmatic improvement.

All UC campuses have, to some extent, engaged in defining learning outcomes for their undergraduate degree programs, and many have attempted to collect and analyze student learning evidence. Some campuses have taken a step further to examine student learning in their general education programs. UC Davis' Undergraduate Council, for example, has developed a plan for assessing its general education course offerings.

The assessment process, if employed fully, plays a role in the establishment and modification of existing programs or in a curricular review of programs, a third process related to quality. Campuses can initiate and approve actions such as establishing new undergraduate programs or consolidating, transferring, or discontinuing undergraduate programs, any of which would entail reviews of matters related to student learning and academic quality. A campus review of a program's curriculum, such as a general education curriculum, would also be based in assessment and quality assurance.

Disciplinary accreditation. Several discipline-based associations manage disciplinary accreditation at the campus level. The accreditation process mirrors that of regional accrediting bodies, such as WSCUC, but is discipline specific. For example, organizations such as the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, American Psychological Association, American Bar Association, and the American Chemical Society conduct disciplinary accreditations. Considerations of academic quality are at the core of these disciplinary-based accreditations as departments align their programs with disciplinary/national standards and expectations.

The *Compendium*. At the system level, the procedure-based *Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units* guides processes for and decisions on academic quality.[2] First drafted in 1993-94, the *Compendium* brought together and formalized a variety of systemwide review processes leading to a single manual for administrators, faculty, and staff who decide on proposals to establish, transfer, consolidate, change the name of, discontinue, or disestablish graduate programs, schools, colleges, and research units. The *Compendium* also guides the *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* process, in which campuses biennially submit a list of anticipated academic program actions to the Office of the President. The *Compendium* is especially important to the establishment of new academic units as it guides the review and approval of new graduate programs, with attention to academic quality throughout, while specifying the roles of the Academic Senate's Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and the UC Office of the President's Academic Affairs in the review process.

Individual-Level Reviews for Assessing and Ensuring Academic Quality

Faculty appointment and promotion. Faculty appointment and advancement are both based on an evaluative system. The criteria that make up this system, for ladder-rank faculty, are:

1. Teaching
2. Research and creative work
3. Professional competence and activity
4. University and public service

---

[2] https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/compendium_sept2014.pdf

At the University of California, superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced in both teaching and research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.

First, clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. At UC, under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the following is considered: the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups.

Second, with regard to research and creative work, evidence of a productive and creative mind should be present in the candidate's published research or recognized artistic productions. Publications of research and other creative accomplishments are evaluated for evidence that the candidate is continually and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Third, professional competence and activity are especially important for certain positions in UC's professional schools and colleges, such as schools of architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, law, and medicine, where a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities is recognized as a criterion for appointment or promotion. For all candidates though, professional activities are scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems, including those that specifically address the professional advancement of individuals in underrepresented groups in the candidate's field. Fourth, the university and public service criterion recognizes that faculty play an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition is therefore given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, college, and University policies. Service by members of the faculty to the community, state, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and quality, is also recognized as evidence for promotion.

Finally, the appointment and promotion process, as guided by the *Academic Personnel Manual*, make clear the role of promoting diversity in the criteria for appointment, promotion, and appraisal:

> "The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process."

Student evaluation of teaching. The opinions of students on individual faculty's effectiveness as instructors is a component of the faculty appointment and promotion process. Student evaluation of teaching is captured through campuses' course evaluation systems. All UC campuses have invested in such systems, most of which are now based on students completing their evaluations online. Online course evaluation systems (1) enable rapid access to useful information to help faculty improve their courses and their teaching effectiveness; (2) encourage and support meaningful student feedback to improve teaching and learning; and (3) improve the quality and integrity of data that the campus uses to understand and recognize teaching contributions. These evaluations, either online or paper-based, are not only used for decisions on faculty promotion but also for feedback on improving teaching and learning on the campus. In this way, students' voices are a part of the conversation on academic quality.

The *Academic Personnel Manual*. The *Academic Personnel Manual* is central to the guidance of individual-level faculty review. The *Manual* contains the policies and procedures, issued by the Provost and Executive Vice President, that pertain to the employment relationship between an academic appointee and the University of California. Policies and procedures for academic appointees such as professorial rank faculty, lecturers, and clinical faculty, academic research professionals (e.g., professional researchers and specialists), academic service professionals (e.g., librarians and cooperative extension specialists and advisors), and graduate student employees (e.g., research and teaching assistants) are covered in the *Manual*.

Unique Features of the University that Have Contributed to UC's Academic Quality

The University of California is often held up, both nationally and internationally, as a system that has been able to ensure a high standard of academic excellence at not just one or two flagship campuses but throughout its ten-campus system. This stature stems in part from structural elements such as UC's unique role in California higher education resulting from its constitutional status and the Master Plan's differentiation of function among the higher education segments. Another structural element is that the UC Academic Senate is a single, systemwide entity, rather than distinct campus senates. The Regents have been able to delegate most of the responsibility for the academic programs and their quality to the Academic Senate, which has allowed for effective shared governance between the Senate and the administration.

These structural elements have allowed UC to operate with a common standard of quality across the system. The *Compendium* process, whereby new academic units and new graduate degree programs are reviewed not only at the campus level but also at the system level (by both the Senate and the administration), ensures the highest level of quality among UC's academic units and graduate programs. Every new graduate academic program is reviewed by Senate faculty at both the campus and systemwide levels, with the systemwide review using extramural peer reviewers. In addition, new campuses, schools, and colleges are required to be approved by the Regents. Similarly, UC has common standards for faculty hiring and advancement across the system; these common standards ensure that every UC faculty member, no matter the campus and no matter their tenure status, meets a high level of excellence in teaching, research, and service.

Finally, in addition to these structural elements, UC is uniquely positioned to provide deeply-complementary data to its process for assessing and ensuring academic quality. Starting in 2009, UC began to compile data on institutional performance related to academic quality and performance, leading to a comprehensive systemwide document called the UC Accountability Report. This Report is now produced annually. The 2018 UC Accountability Report was presented to the Board in July 2018. Each year, as specific metrics are developed that further the discussion about academic quality, these metrics are included in the Accountability Report. Additional data on key metrics such as graduation rates is available in the UC Information Center. More detailed data on all of the metrics found in the Accountability Report and at the Information Center are produced at each campus and much of these data are used to inform the review processes described above.

Key to Acronyms

APM	Academic Personnel Manual
WSCUC	Western Association of Schools and Colleges' Senior College and University Commission

Attachment: UC Campus WSCUC Reaffirmation of Accreditation Letter Areas of Emphasis