

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW OF THE SELF-STUDY

PARTICIPANTS IN THE SELF-STUDY

In September 1998, then-Executive Vice Chancellor William J. Lillyman appointed a Steering Committee to prepare for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) reaccreditation visit, initially planned for spring 2000. Associate Executive Vice Chancellor Herbert Killackey was appointed as the campus Accreditation Liaison Officer and was asked to serve as chair of the Steering Committee. Other members appointed to the team included William Parker, then-Associate Executive Vice Chancellor; James Danziger, then-Dean of Undergraduate Education; and Robert Daly, Director of the Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management. Representatives to the Committee from the Academic Senate were appointed by Professor James Fallon, Divisional Chair. They included Professors David Bruce, Department of History; Barbara Doshier, Department of Cognitive Sciences and then-Vice Chair of the Academic Senate; Virginia Mann, Department of Cognitive Sciences and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies for Social Sciences; Martha Mecartney, Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering and Materials Science and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies; Michael Mulligan, Department of Developmental and Cell Biology; Robert Newsom, Department of English and Comparative Literature, and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education; Debra Richardson, Department of Information and Computer Science, and then-Chair of the Council on Educational Policy; Rajesh Gupta, Department of Information and Computer Science; and Peter Taborek, Department of Physics and Astronomy.

In May 1999, Dr. Erwin Seibel, then-Associate Director of WASC, visited UC Irvine to meet with the Steering Committee and review the proposed topics selected for self-study: Enrollment Management, Improving Communication Skills at UCI, and Undergraduate Research Opportunities at a Research I University. Dr. Seibel advised postponing the review until spring 2001, to allow additional time to develop the proposed self-study themes.

In early 2000, several changes were made to the Steering Committee team. New members included Dr. Judy Shoemaker, Director of Research, Evaluation and Grants; Michael Leon, Professor of Neurobiology and Behavior, and Associate Dean of Biological Sciences, who replaced Michael Mulligan; Yong Chen, Associate Professor of History, and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, who replaced Martha Mecartney; Meredith Lee, Professor of German, and Dean of Undergraduate Education, who replaced James Danziger; and Jenny Duke, University Editor.

In August 2000, Herbert Killackey stepped down as chair of the Steering Committee due to the establishment of a new position in UCI's central administration that became responsible for the project. Michael Clark, newly appointed Associate Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning, and also Professor of English and Comparative Literature and former Acting Dean of the School of Humanities assumed Dr. Killackey's role and is now the chair of the UCI WASC Reaccreditation Team. Also newly established within UCI's central administration was the position of Associate Executive Vice Chancellor, Space and Enrollment Management, and Barbara Hamkalo was named to that post. Dr. Hamkalo is Professor of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry and a former

Associate Vice Chancellor for Research in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies and a former Acting Dean of the School of Biological Sciences.

In early fall 2000, Dr. Greg Scott was appointed as Associate Director of WASC and assumed Dr. Seibel's responsibilities as the WASC representative for UCI's 2001 reaccreditation efforts. He visited the campus in October to present the key principles of WASC's newly adopted process model for accreditation reviews. The process should recognize institutional diversity, emphasize collaboration, affirm the centrality of educational effectiveness, focus on institutional purposes and results, and should build on existing evidence that the institution can use to improve itself. The new WASC model defines accreditation around institutional demonstration of two core commitments: institutional capacity and educational effectiveness. Dr. Scott proposed, therefore, revising the proposed self-study topics to reflect the new model, and thus Enrollment Management was replaced by Assessment of Undergraduate Education. The other two topics—Improving Communication Skills and Undergraduate Research Opportunities—were retained.

Other members of the UCI community who have assisted in providing information and expertise to the self-study reports are Said Shokair, Director, Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program; Dr. De Gallow, Director, Instructional Resources Center; Dr. Audrey DeVore, Associate Director, Campuswide Honors Program; Dr. Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions and Relations with Schools; Linda Georgianna, Professor of English and Comparative Literature; James Craig, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Life; Mark Warner, Director of Financial Aid and Scholarships; and Dr. Marie Richman, Assistant Director, Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management.

ONLINE COMPONENTS OF THE SELF-STUDY

Draft reports of each component of the self-study were forwarded to the Academic Senate committees, to deans and associate deans, and to the Associated Graduate Students and the Associated Undergraduate Students of UCI for review and comment. Their [comments](#) may be viewed on the UCI Accreditation Website.

The campus has developed an accreditation website to provide members of the WASC visiting team, other WASC and university officials, and UCI students, faculty, and staff with easy access to the pertinent information about UCI that is now available on the World Wide Web. This use of the Web to provide relevant information in the context of accreditation is intended to comply with WASC's goal of making the accrediting process more useful and efficient. The format identifies information required by the nine WASC Standards. The Website includes UCI data as well as information from the University of California system's [Website](#).

A BRIEF HISTORY OF UCI

UC Irvine is one of the 10 campuses of the University of California, and one of three that opened in the 1960s. The campus is located in Orange County, a center of high technology, biomedical technology, and a dynamic international business environment, with a 1999 population of some 2.5 million people. In conjunction with the 1,489 acres of campus land, there are 510 acres of "inclusion" area land which are being developed for purposes complementary to those of the University. That land includes 180-acres for the University Research Park, a joint venture with The Irvine Company that has attracted such private companies as

America Online, Canon Information Systems, and Cisco Systems. Corporate tenants in the research park agree to collaborate with UCI faculty and students on internships, research, and other programs. In addition, the 202-acre San Joaquin Freshwater Marsh, part of the University's Natural Reserve System, is adjacent to the campus. UCI Medical Center, the teaching hospital for the College of Medicine, is 13 miles from campus, on a 31-acre site in the City of Orange.

UCI opened to students in fall 1965 with 116 faculty and 1,589 students. Since then, its programs, faculty, and graduates have achieved distinction in virtually every discipline. The fall 1999 campus enrollments (excluding the College of Medicine) totaled 18,199, including 15,522 undergraduates and 2,677 graduate students. About 70 percent of these students live off campus.

As of the 2000-2001 academic year, UCI offers 53 bachelor's degree programs, 36 master's, and 38 Ph.D. degree programs. As a research university, UCI challenges students at every level, both academically and personally. While research is critical to graduate education, the research environment also opens up new educational experiences for undergraduates. Students have access to a faculty at the forefront of their fields and also have opportunities to participate directly in faculty research projects. In addition, to empower students for the future in an information-focused society, UCI has integrated computer technology throughout the curriculum and campus life.

Two Nobel Prizes in 1995 for founding faculty F. Sherwood Rowland in Chemistry and the late Frederick Reines in Physics, helped to secure UCI's position among the leading American research universities. More recently, UCI has been ranked prominently along with much older universities for excellence in

the arts and humanities, earth system science, management, social sciences, technology, and information systems.

The quality of students' educational experience and the caliber of UCI's faculty now consistently place the campus among the nation's 10 best public universities, and among the top 50 universities overall. Election to the American Association of Universities (AAU) a group of 62 of the most distinguished research institutions, is another indication of UCI's stature within the academic community.

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE 1991 ACCREDITATION REVIEW

At the conclusion of its 1991 accreditation review, the WASC team presented the following five major recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 1 — PLANNING, GOALS, AND RESOURCES

WE HAVE TWO PARTS TO THIS RECOMMENDATION. THE FIRST IS THE SILENT DRAG OF HABIT. WE FOUND IN MANY PLACES (E.G., PROGRAM REVIEWS, ALLOCATION STRATEGIES, STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLANNING) POLICIES AND PRACTICES DESIGNED FOR AN EARLIER INSTITUTION, THAT APPLY LESS TO THE PRESENT, AND THAT COULD BE ILL-SUITED FOR THE BUDGET REALITIES OF THE FUTURE. WE RECOMMEND, THEREFORE, THAT THOSE TOOLS OF THE UNIVERSITY BE REVIEWED TO SEE IF THEY WILL BE AS POWERFUL IN

CREATING THE FUTURE AS THEY WERE IN BUILDING UCI TO ITS PRESENT CONSIDERABLE STATURE.

THE SECOND PART IS ABOUT INTERNAL CONNECTIONS AMONG KEY ELEMENTS IN THE UNIVERSITY'S PLANS. WE HAVE COMMENTED SEVERAL TIMES ABOUT THE SEPARATION OF PLANS FROM THE BUDGETS AND ABOUT THE LACK OF PRIORITIES GUIDING PLANS. WE BELIEVE THE ECONOMIC, PUBLIC POLICY, AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE WILL BE BETTER MET BY INSTITUTIONS THAT CAN DEAL AS WELL WITH LIMITS AS WITH GROWTH. WE RECOMMEND, THEREFORE, THAT A PRACTICAL INTERRELATIONSHIP AMONG PLANS, GOALS, AND RESOURCES BE DEVELOPED SUCH THAT A GENUINELY STRATEGIC VISION GUIDES ACTIONS.

In both parts of Recommendation 1, the WASC reviewers were influenced by their sense that UCI has learned well to manage the opportunities and problems of growth in resources, but that in the years ahead the public and private sources of funds might not sustain that growth. Accordingly, the WASC team recommended that UCI determine ways in which campus priorities can be addressed given changing resource patterns.

UCI's Response

The first recommendation essentially advises UCI to develop planning processes and objectives that would be more oriented toward the future and that would be flexible and innovative enough to accommodate “budget realities” that might

differ significantly from those of the past—i.e., the campus should not count on remaining in the mode of rapid growth that marked the first 25 years of its history. The collapse of the State budget in the early 1990s proved the wisdom of that recommendation. Fortunately, UCI was in fact able to adjust to a drastic reduction in funding and resources during those years, and the campus emerged from that recession with its academic mission and research programs intact.

Since that recession, the amount of State funding has steadily increased (though proportionately it has fallen to less than 25 percent of UCI's total budget, a drop that reflects a nationwide reduction in state support for public research institutions). Even more importantly, the level of non-State funding at UCI has increased dramatically. In 1999-2000, UCI received \$115,870,000 in State and Federal contracts and grants, and more than \$51.7 million in private funds, both record amounts for the campus. Perhaps even more significantly, the entire UC system is projected to grow rapidly over the next 10 years, and UCI is scheduled to grow more than any campus in the system: by 2010-11, UCI is projected to have 27,600 students, an increase of 9,795 from 2000-01. In that same period, the number of faculty FTE is projected to increase by 566, from just over 900 to 1,466. Since State funds are directly linked to enrollment growth, these projections indicate an extraordinary period of funded growth over the next decade.

These dramatic changes in levels of funding and projected growth have necessitated increasingly flexible planning processes at UCI, and they have turned planning into an ongoing and ubiquitous activity on the campus. To coordinate these planning efforts centrally, UCI has created two new administrative positions dedicated to planning: Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Space and Enrollment (Barbara Hamkalo) and Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for

Academic Planning (Michael P. Clark, who is also the Accreditation Liaison Officer). These administrators are working closely with the Academic Planning Group (APG) and the on Planning and Budget (CPB) to make sure all aspects of planning on the campus are integrated, and that information regarding those plans is regularly communicated to all affected units.

The scope of the plans has ranged from individual academic department or administrative office plans to campus-wide plans. Campuswide planning takes place formally through two standing committees: the Council on Planning and Budget, which is an elected, representative committee of members of the Academic Senate, and the Academic Planning Group, an administrative committee appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor (who may elect to chair the group or to appoint a representative to chair it). The Academic Planning Group is composed of administrators and faculty. These two committees serve in an advisory role to the Executive Vice Chancellor, and their activities are coordinated by the ex-officio appointment of the chair and vice-chair of the Council on Planning and Budget to the Academic Planning Group. The two groups consider a wide range of planning issues. The Planning and Budget committee formally comments on and recommends approval (or not) of proposals regarding all academic programs (new majors, interdisciplinary initiatives, etc.) It also is the deliberative body of the Senate for any large-scale proposals requiring significant expenditures or any other substantial change in the allocation of resources on the campus. In the past, the primary job of the Academic Planning Group was the review of requests from the academic units regarding authorization for recruitment of faculty and, in some years, budgetary requests. The assignments of this group vary considerably, depending upon the circumstances, however. During the 1999-2000 academic year, for example, following the allocation of FTE for a two-year period in 1998-99, UCI has begun to explore

ways of increasing the cooperation and interaction between the administration and the Academic Senate regarding campuswide planning, and to systematize that planning process to a greater degree. A major step in that direction occurred in 1999 when the Executive Vice Chancellor approved a proposal from the Council on Planning and Budget that the Council join together with the Academic Planning Group to make recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor regarding the allocation of FTE (a task formerly assigned to the Academic Planning Group alone). Further cooperative efforts are being explored by the chair of the Council on Planning and Budget and the Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning, and the campus will continue to explore ways to increase cooperation between the administration and the Senate in the planning process and to coordinate the various parts of that process to a greater degree.

Enrollment Planning

Enrollment planning is structured around three time frames: short-term, intermediate, and long-term. UCI's short-term enrollment plans are updated at least twice yearly, in conjunction with the undergraduate and graduate admissions offices, the UCI Enrollment Council (a group of faculty, staff, and administrators), and the UC President's Budget Office. Intermediate-term plans (10 or fewer years) and long-range plans (more than 10 years) are updated less frequently. The short-term enrollment plans are regularly communicated to the campus by the Executive Vice Chancellor and affect many operational decisions. The intermediate enrollment plans serve as building blocks for each academic unit's plan and are integrated with, and dependent upon, the campus's overall intermediate enrollment plan. Long-term plans are modified occasionally as needed, to reflect changes in the levels of State funding, changes in State demographics, other external factors, and/or major changes to UCI's academic programs. The primary long-term enrollment plan is the Long-Range

Development Plan (LRDP), which was originally produced in 1965 and established maximum enrollments and land use. The LRDP has been modified only twice since its inception.

Capital/Facilities Planning

With regard to capital/facilities planning, the LRDP established land-use parameters and the location of physical facilities; however, shorter-term physical facility plans are closely tied to changes in enrollments, academic and research programs, and funding sources. In fact, for the first decade of the 21st century, the lag in construction of physical facilities will be UCI's major enrollment and research growth constraint. Campus physical planners work closely with all other campus planning functions to ensure that capital plans reflect and support the campus's overall academic goals.

Academic Program Planning

UCI's academic programs are continually being evaluated and revised by the academic units, Senate faculty committees charged with that responsibility, and by the central administration. This systematic evaluation is due not only to faculty input but also to the results of the external reviews that each undergraduate and graduate program undergoes every five to eight years. The external reviews ensure that the programs are providing the best possible education for their students and research opportunities for the faculty. Faculty, department chairs, and deans use the reviews to modify the programs to ensure that they meet all goals. These reviews are essential to each dean's planning process, as the Executive Vice Chancellor has charged the deans with the continual improvement and development of programs under their purview. Also, the Academic Planning Group meets regularly and advises the Executive Vice Chancellor concerning enhancements to UCI's existing academic programs and in

the development of new programs. During the 1999-2000 academic year, the group focused entirely upon the development of new academic programs, especially at the graduate level, that would not arise out of existing programs.

Planning for Housing and Parking

UCI's housing and parking planning processes are driven by enrollment planning, as well as by growth in the number of faculty and staff. Student housing has established a goal of housing at least 40 percent of all UCI students on campus; approximately 30 percent currently live on campus. It also is expected that another 10 percent of UCI's students will be living within walking distance of the campus. Obviously, since perhaps half of the student body will be driving to the campus, UCI has an obligation to provide adequate parking. Planning for campus parking is thus dependent upon not only the availability of on-campus housing, but also on the number of students and employees. Plans developed by the Parking and Transportation Services Office are incorporated into the campus LRDP.

University Advancement Planning

As the distribution of the University's resources moves away from State funding toward private funding, the importance of **University Advancement's** planning process and plans has greatly increased. The Chancellor and the Executive Vice Chancellor have instructed University Advancement to set its goals based upon the objectives of the campus and the priorities set by each of the deans. One of Advancement's primary objectives, for example, is to raise funds to establish multidisciplinary research centers. The faculty has identified such centers as being of extreme importance for UCI's continual development and improvement of its academic programs and reputation.

Since the 1991 WASC accreditation review, UCI has moved from being a young major research university that aspired to achieve national status, to a research university that is now recognized as one of the top research universities in the United States. Ten years from now, UCI will have increased the size of its faculty by more than 50 percent and will have reached its maximum projected enrollment. In that decade, UCI will become a large, mature university complete with an even wider range of ever more distinguished programs and professional schools. That ambitious goal will be attained in the same way that UCI has grown so successfully over the past three decades: by devoting substantial resources to the on-going planning that is a fundamental part of campus life.

RECOMMENDATION 2: UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

THE TEAM COMMENTED, “[T]HE ASPIRATION TO CREATE A DISTINCTIVE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM IN A DISTINGUISHED RESEARCHED UNIVERSITY HAS NOT RECEIVED THE QUALITY OF ATTENTION IT DESERVES AT UCI.” IN PARTICULAR, THE TEAM URGED THE UNIVERSITY TO COME TO A CLEARER DEFINITION OF WHAT IT MEANS BY “GREATNESS” IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AND THEN TO COUPLE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THOSE GOALS WITH THE ALLOCATION OF MORE FACULTY ATTENTION AND MONEY. SOME SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS ARE IN EVIDENCE, SUCH AS NOTABLE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM. YET SERIOUS PROBLEMS PERSIST IN MATTERS AS FUNDAMENTAL AS THE AVAILABILITY OF CLASSES TO ENABLE STUDENTS TO GRADUATE WITHIN EXPECTED TIMEFRAMES.

UCI's Response

UCI's response to the three points WASC raised in Recommendation 2 — course availability, notable improvements in general education, and defining "greatness" in undergraduate education — are addressed below.

Course Availability

One of the recurring problems cited in the review was access to upper-division writing courses. The Writing Board directly took up the challenge of increasing the number of these writing courses. The School of Biological Sciences, in particular, started fulfilling the needs of its majors with its own upper-division writing course, whereas it had previously relied upon School of Humanities courses. The new course received praise by an external committee that had been brought in to review UCI's upper-division writing requirement by the Council on Educational Policy. In addition, UCI established a policy of fully funding the lower-division writing program that essentially has eliminated any backlog in those courses. The results of these two actions are encouraging. Between 1989 and 2000, the average number of undergraduates increased 10 percent (1989-90=12,844; 1998-99=14,190) while the number of seats in upper-division writing courses increased by 40 percent (1989-90=3,501; 1998-99=4,907). Additionally, over the same period the number of seats in lower-division writing courses increased 15 percent.

More broadly, since 1991 UCI has taken other significant steps to assure the general availability of classes. First, we introduced **TELE**, UCI's voice-response registration system, which became operational in spring 1991. It enables students—22 hours per day, seven days per week—to enroll in classes. Students are assigned appointment “windows” according to their class level and may enroll

throughout the enrollment period once their "window" opens. When a student requests a class section that has already been filled to capacity, TELE automatically lists the remaining open sections of that course in its response to the student, thus enabling the student to more conveniently select another section. Academic units monitor demand and enrollment in courses both via TELE and the Web. When additional class sections are added, the new sections are linked to existing ones and are available for immediate enrollment. Also, some faculty members send email to students on a waitlist to notify them of the availability of the new section. A waitlist program automatically lists students who TELE does not admit to a course, for example, because the student has not satisfied the course's prerequisite(s), or the course is full, etc. In spring 2001, that program will enable a student to request to be automatically admitted to a course he has been waitlisted for, when a seat becomes vacant. TELE also provides a convenient way to add and/or drop classes once the quarter begins, and in addition, students needing to register for tutorial assistance courses can do so via TELE.

TELE also performs other functions, such as course prerequisite checks (including transfer credit verification) to ensure that only fully eligible students are enrolled on the first class day. In spring 2001, TELE will be able to accommodate faculty assigning final course grades online. Students who receive full financial aid can use TELE to authorize payment of their Registration fees.

Second, we developed EEE UCI's Web-based Electronic Education Environment. Both faculty and students use the services of the EEE to enhance enrollment. EEE was implemented in the early 1990s and is very popular with students and academic counselors, receiving over 206,000 "hits" during the 1998-99 academic year. Students use the online, searchable *Schedule of Classes* to identify current course offerings that meet breadth requirements and to find class sections that fit

into their schedules. EEE also provides services that reach well beyond issues of course availability. Now a joint project of the Division of Undergraduate Education, the UCI Libraries, the Registrar, and Network and Academic Computing Services (NACS), EEE also supports communication between instructors and students, course tools, educational materials and access to official University communications.

Third, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, with support from the Division's Office of Research, Evaluation and Grants, projects demand in key courses and advises the central administration about areas in which over-enrollment funds might be needed. In spite of significant growth in the number of new students and, in fall 1999, the largest enrollment in the history of UCI, things went exceptionally smoothly: 94.1 percent of the new freshmen and 87.6 percent of all undergraduates were able to obtain a full (12+ units) academic schedule as of the first day of classes.

Relatively few curricular bottlenecks exist at UCI at present. Problems with course access are encountered primarily by those seeking entrance to just a few of UCI's minors (Digital Arts and Management, to be specific) and to certain electives, such as computing for the non-computing majors. Also, students complain that they are not always able to enroll in classes at times they view as convenient. While these limitations do not prevent students from graduating, the campus is addressing them within the constraints of space, funding, and the availability of instructors. Data from UCI's six-year assessments of graduation rates indicate that about 75 percent of UCI's students are persisting to graduation; this is about the average rate for all UC students. To get beyond the intuitive and anecdotal assessment of what factors affect a student's ability to graduate within four years (where UCI's percentage of success has declined since 1995, from 40

to 32 percent), the Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management is planning a study of recent graduates. Certain academic enrichment activities, such as the UC Education Abroad Program, students' decisions to double-major, and internships, may be playing a role, as well as the more predictable negative variables of economic hardship and underpreparation. The current average time-to-graduation for students entering as new freshmen is about 13 quarters, which equates to a shade more than four years and one quarter.

Notable Improvements in Undergraduate Education

UCI appreciates the recognition in the 1991 WASC review of the serious efforts that were made in the late 1980s to improve undergraduate education. The 1991 review noted in particular UCI's review and augmentation of new campus [breadth \(general education\) requirements](#). The Academic Senate Council on Educational Policy assesses all breadth categories on a regular review cycle. (The impact of that assessment of the Upper- and Lower-Division Writing requirements is presented in the self-study chapter on Communication Skills.) Assessment of the newest breadth categories, which were approved in 1990, began in 1997-98. The requirement in Multicultural Studies and International/Global Issues was reviewed in 1998, and the requirement in Mathematics and Symbolic Systems was completed in 1999. The requirement in Language Other Than English will occur in either 2001 or 2002.

Among the achievements noted in the 1991 WASC review was the establishment of the Campuswide Honors Program. We are pleased to report its considerable impact on the campus and its noteworthy successes. Studies in the mid-1980s had revealed that the undergraduates leaving the campus mid-career (dropping out and transferring before completing their degrees) had higher academic qualifications than did those who persisted. Alarmed, the UCI faculty took a hard look at what

curricular challenges we were offering our best students. The Campuswide Honors Program (**CHP**), among the first responses to that concern, no longer stands in isolation as an academic enrichment to the general curriculum. Instead, numerous discipline-based honors programs and honors sequences have joined it in such key courses such as Organic Chemistry and in widespread interest in undergraduate research and active learning opportunities. In addition, the Campuswide Honors Program has given birth to two complementary programs: the Scholarship Opportunities Program (**SOP**) and the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (**UROP**). SOP identifies and assists students in the competition for prestigious national awards. In 1999-2000, campus undergraduates were awarded two Fulbrights, four Coros, one Truman, one Javits, two Goldwaters, one Rotary Scholarship, three National Science Foundation awards, and one National Defense Science and Engineering Fellowship. That year UCI also had finalists in the Rhodes, Marshall, and Mellon competitions. UROP involves 250 students annually and it facilitates individualized and group research in all disciplines. The self-study chapter on Undergraduate Research Opportunities in a Research I University provides a fuller elaboration of UROP's role in campus efforts to enhance the quality of the undergraduate educational experience.

Defining “Greatness” in Undergraduate Education

In response to the 1991 WASC review, the Academic Senate took up the challenge to define “greatness” in undergraduate education at UCI. As part of that process, in 1994 the Academic Planning Council, endorsed by then-Chancellor Laurel L. Wilkening's Vision Statement of 1994, made the following four-part recommendation to the Senate, saying:

If UCI is to have a distinctive undergraduate program of high quality and is to attract students of high quality, then some careful thought should be given to the adoption by UCI of several programmatic characteristics that distinguish the UCI undergraduate experience from that of other universities. These characteristics should transcend department specific programs. While the Academic Planning Council recognizes that the curriculum content is a responsibility of the Academic Senate, we suggest for discussion the following ideas:

UCI is one of the most culturally diverse research universities in the country. This feature should be converted to an educational asset. An argument can be developed along the following lines. Individuals who are to be successful in the 21st century will be those who understand and appreciate the cultural differences of the world. UCI offers the best environment of any university to experience the diversity of world cultures and to learn how to function effectively in such an environment. Issues of cultural diversity should be integrated into as many courses and majors as possible. Study abroad should receive a special emphasis.

Every student graduating from UCI should experience the rewards and challenges of independent research and scholarship. Every student should be required to complete a “senior project” either in an undergraduate experience or as a senior thesis.

Communication skills, both oral and written, should be integrated into every course and major on the campus.

Another skill that may be a prerequisite for success in the 21st century is the ability to extract useful information from an overwhelming richness of information available anywhere at any time in electronic form. A UCI graduate should be prepared to survive and prosper in the electronic information era.

These four recommendations, while more prescriptive in some details than the campus has been willing to accept, reflect a widespread consensus about how excellence in undergraduate education ought to be defined at the University of California, Irvine.

Building on the breadth requirement in Multicultural Studies and International/Global Issues introduced in 1990, one of the Academic Council's recommendations called for more than the establishment of selected courses to

satisfy the requirement, which specifies one course each in multicultural studies and in international/global issues. Echoing the original spirit of UCI's 1987 Task Force on General Education, which recommended the creation of this breadth requirement, the Academic Council's recommendation calls for an enrichment of the entire curriculum through integration of materials addressing cultural diversity and global experience. A recent Academic Senate review of the requirement in Multicultural Studies and International/Global Issues indicates that it has had the intended dual effect of diversifying campus curricular offerings, as well as altering existing courses by inclusion of more culturally diverse materials. The requirement also assures that all undergraduates have at least minimal exposure to these topics. A telling example of a course modified by the introduction of the requirement is the Humanities Core Course, which introduced a multicultural component in the early 1990s in response to the new breadth requirement.

In other cases, existing majors in various units were modified to meet the more general spirit of the new breadth requirement, such as the increased emphasis on global issues in the History major. UCI also created some new majors, such as the International Studies major in the School of Social Sciences, which immediately attracted some 400 students, and the European Studies major in the School of Humanities, newly created to provide interdisciplinary alternatives to existing majors in national languages and literature, history, art history and philosophy. Other majors have been modified: the reconfiguration of the History major to create a global emphasis is a case-in-point.

This global perspective is further reflected in courses and extra-curricular programs beyond our majors and minors. Student participation in the UC Education Abroad Program (EAP) has gone from 113 in 1994-95 to 190 in 1999-2000, an increase of 68 percent. We are eager to accomplish more here. In

absolute numbers we still lag behind all other UC campuses except UC Riverside. The greatest increase in student participation in the EAP has been in semester- and quarter-long programs, which are alternatives to many students for whom the full-year commitment appears culturally or fiscally daunting. Through UCI's International Opportunities Program (IOP), administered by the Division of Undergraduate Education, UCI also encourages alternative experiences to EAP, when appropriate. The Language Other Than English breadth requirement, designed among other things to encourage students to take additional years of language preparation while they are still in high school, is scheduled for Senate review by 2002. Although this requirement is arguably modest, given that all incoming new freshmen must complete two years of a high school language other than English to be UC-eligible, it is the strongest campuswide foreign language requirement within UC system. Intensifying the campus requirement, all undergraduate majors in the School of the Humanities complete two years of university-level instruction in a language other than English.

In regard to another of the Academic Council's recommendations, although there has been a reluctance to mandate that every student complete a senior project, a widespread interest at UCI in extending the possibility of undergraduate research to increasing numbers of students has characterized curricular change in the 1990s. The topic is addressed in full in the self-study chapter on Undergraduate Research Opportunities in a Research I University. Highlights include the steady expansion and widely acknowledged success of the Campuswide Honors Program (CHP) (established in 1989), the creation of a number of disciplinary-based honors programs, (most notably in the School of Social Sciences), and the creation of the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP). The Humanities Core Course, which enrolls 1000+ students from across the campus in their first year at UCI, just instituted a year-long program in research methods that

culminates in a research paper in spring quarter. In addition, students in specific disciplines regularly undertake independent and group research and performance projects, including events in the School of the Arts, design projects in The Henry Samueli School of Engineering, and a capstone requirement for field study in the School of Social Ecology. A 1996 study has demonstrated that about one-half of the graduating classes at UCI have been engaged in some form of undergraduate research.

The Academic Council's recommendation concerning communication skills has become a basis for the self-study chapter on Communication Skills. Arguably, no topic has concerned the campus so broadly as the question of the communication skills of UCI undergraduates and the enhancement of writing and oral communication in the curriculum. As Chapter Four explains, we have devoted substantial resources to this issue and made significant improvements in this area of our curriculum. We anticipate even greater changes in the next two years as we recruit and appoint a senior Professor specializing in this field to help focus our efforts more effectively and lend greater visibility to teaching and research in rhetoric and composition.

The final recommendation by the Academic Council addresses students' capacity to survive and prosper in the electronic information era. UCI has addressed this concern through several avenues. First and foremost, all students are now introduced to the Web and its resources through the curriculum of the two sequences used to satisfy the Lower-Division Writing requirement. Emphasis in these courses is on the extraction and evaluation of information from the Web in undergraduate research. Thus, a minimal technological capacity and guidance on the appropriate use of Web resources is assured for every undergraduate. In the Humanities Core Course, most of the lectures are now Web-based, linking the

lecture outlines to additional resources and information and guiding students beyond the material directly presented by the lecturer. In addition, the writing component of the core course also takes advantage of the same on-line resources as the composition program, and the Humanities Core Course requires in addition a year-long on-line curriculum in research methods (including print-based library research as well as on-line sources) that eventuates in a genuine research paper in the spring quarter of the students' freshman year as noted above. Together, these two courses enroll almost all of the first-year students every year, so we are reasonably assured that all of our students have had some systematic training in sophisticated research methods on-line and in the library by the time they are sophomores.

Many students enroll in additional courses designed to provide basic familiarity with electronic resources. For example, all students in the School of Social Sciences must complete a basic introductory course in computing, either in the Department of Information and Computer Sciences or by taking a course entitled "Computer-Based Research in the Social Sciences," offered in the School of Social Sciences. In other units, new programs, minors, and emphases have been created to integrate electronic resources with more traditional academic training. For example, the School of the Arts now offers a minor in Digital Arts for students interested in combining their interests in graphic arts and computers.

There has been a steady expansion of instructional technology within faculty teaching activities at UCI. The growth of interest in the electronic environment has been supported by faculty workshops, EEE services, technology mini-grants for course development, and a reconfiguring of support services, integrating Media Services into the Instructional Resource Center. Recently, the campus has cautiously begun to explore the feasibility—and credibility—of offering some

instruction entirely on-line in carefully controlled and limited situations, including a section of a popular economics course and a recently approved master's program in Criminology, Law and Society. Student and faculty interest in these areas, and their level of preparation in instructional technology have been assessed at regular intervals, and activities in these areas are overseen directly by the Dean of Undergraduate Education through UCI's Instructional Resource Center (IRC).

In sum, considerable activity characterizes the campus response to the question of "greatness" in undergraduate education. Because excellence cannot be defined here by some of the most familiar measures used to create national ranking of university programs (such as extramural grants, research expenditures, Ph.D. production, and the like), we are pleased to report the foregoing indicators of faculty engagement, curricular enhancement, and successful new programming. Since the 1991 WASC review, several more programs have been developed but have not been discussed here: the Freshman Seminars Program, the General Studies Advising Program, the NSF SMET project, the Hewlett grant in Problem-based Learning, the Teaching Colloquy, and the Celebration of Teaching awards and recognition events. Together, these activities represent what we believe to be a highly successful and comprehensive effort to imagine and address new measures of greatness in undergraduate education.

RECOMMENDATION 3 — DIVERSITY

UCI HAS BEEN FORTHRIGHT AND AGGRESSIVE IN DEFINING AND PURSUING DIVERSITY AS AN INTEGRAL ELEMENT OF THE INSTITUTION. THE WORK OF YOUR "THINK TANK ON DIVERSITY," THE NEW MULTICULTURAL AND

INTERNATIONAL GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS AND A NUMBER OF PROGRAMMATIC EFFORTS SUCH AS THOSE INITIATED BY UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, DEMONSTRATE SERIOUSNESS OF INTENT AND A MEASURE OF PROGRESS. YET, IT IS ALSO TRUE THAT PEOPLE OF COLOR AND WOMEN CONTINUE TO BE SERIOUSLY UNDERREPRESENTED IN IMPORTANT ADMINISTRATIVE POSTS AND WITHIN THE FACULTY DESPITE A PERIOD OF GROWTH WHEN MANY NEW HIRING DECISIONS WERE MADE.

UCI's Response

Efforts to Recruit and Retain Diverse Faculty and Staff

UCI is pleased that the previous WASC reviewers recognized our serious efforts to increase the diversity of our faculty and the campus community in general, and we share their disappointment that those efforts have not resulted in more success.

In an era of significant growth, UCI has redoubled its efforts to ensure that qualified women and minority candidates for faculty and staff positions are attracted to the campus and to the Medical Center. The campus continues to engage in an aggressive effort to recruit and retain such qualified candidates, and employs the following mechanisms to reinvigorate the process of diversifying the UCI workforce.

The Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (OEOD), in conjunction with the Office of Academic Personnel, has created a Website that lists Senate and non-Senate academic openings. All academic units are expected to advertise their open

positions on that Website, as well as in other media, particularly those likely to reach qualified women and minority candidates.

Chancellor Ralph J. Cicerone has communicated to the deans and department chairs his desire for UCI to embrace the goal of diversifying its academic and staff workforces. Executive Vice Chancellor Michael R. Gottfredson has encouraged the department chairs to include women and minority faculty on search committees to the greatest extent possible and to assign one member of each search committee specific responsibility for monitoring affirmative action efforts.

The Executive Vice Chancellor has reminded the deans/director of the hiring goals for each academic unit based on UCI's 1998-99 Affirmative Action Plan. The Executive Vice Chancellor also has provided resources for academic search committees, including a list of academic search procedures; a brochure entitled "Guidelines for Faculty Search Committees"; a link to a UC San Diego Website that contains a list of "best practices" in achieving a diversified applicant pool; and the availability statistics for each department, based on the number of Ph.D.s granted in the degree fields represented in each department's faculty.

OEOD and the Office of Academic Personnel continue to work jointly to provide educational programs to department chairs and other hiring authorities, concerning non-discrimination, affirmative action, and diversity in hiring and retention. OEOD has also compiled a list of relevant campus resources for department chairs (see enclosed handbook).

Since 1991, the Executive Vice Chancellor has conducted annual pay equity studies to identify any patterns that might indicate possible disparities in pay for

women and minority faculty in comparison to their male colleagues. Overall, no systematic pay equity problem has been found to exist at UCI, but monitoring activities continue.

In 1998-99, the Executive Vice Chancellor, in conjunction with the Senate Council on Academic Personnel, developed a special type of career review, called a [Merit Equity Review](#), for the purpose of examining individual personnel cases with regard to pay equity in relation to our standard peer-review merit system.

In conjunction with staff personnel's [Human Resources](#) Office, OEOD provides frequent educational programming to managers, supervisors, and staff concerning non-discrimination, affirmative action, and diversity in staff hiring and retention.

OEOD is also surveying the campus to identify which policies and programs are instrumental in helping to retain UCI employees, and in assisting them in attaining their promotional goals. In addition, OEOD has engaged in an aggressive campaign to inform the campus community of the rights and responsibilities that relate to non-discrimination, leaves of absence, and available resources

These efforts have and will continue to assist the University in further diversifying its staff and faculty. UCI has made some gains in the past few years in recruiting and retaining qualified women and minority candidates, as noted in the UCI 1998-99 Affirmative Action Plan.

From 1990 to 1997, UCI made progress in the representation of women in the academic work force. (The 1999-2000 Affirmative Action Plan, based on the workforce statistics from October 1998, is in progress.) Representation of women

increased in all academic job groups, except for the Professional Researcher category. There was an 11 percent increase in representation of women in Nontenured Faculty, and a 10 percent increase in Other Teaching Faculty. Minority representation grew 7 percent in the Tenured and Nontenured Faculty job groups, increasing 5 percent and 8 percent, respectively. And, the number of women in the Management (career staff) job group increased by almost 12 percent. Nevertheless, these gains are too small and too slow. We must do better than we have in the past, and we are optimistic that our increased efforts in this area will begin to improve the situation in the near future.

From 1990 to 1997, the percentages of Asian and Chicano/Latino representation in UCI's career staff work force increased by 5 percent and nearly 5 percent, respectively. Overall, there was an 8 percent increase in the representation of minorities in UCI's career staff workforce, from 32 percent to 40 percent. In most career staff job groups, the proportional representation of minorities also increased during this time period. Nevertheless, these gains are too small and too slow. We must do better than we have in the past, and we are optimistic that our increased efforts in this area will begin to improve the situation in the near future.

RECOMMENDATION 4 — INFORMATION, ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW

THE TEAM STATED, "... INFORMATION, EVEN SPLENDID RESULTS FROM PROGRAM REVIEWS, DOESN'T FIND ITS WAY INTO PLANNING AS IT SHOULD. WE RECOMMEND, THEREFORE, THAT UCI REVIEW ITS CONSIDERABLE BUT SCATTERED INSTITUTIONAL DATA AND PROCEDURES FOR APPRAISING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND INTEGRATE THESE MORE USEFULLY INTO PLANNING AND OPERATIONS."

UCI's Response

This recommendation suggests the need for more systematic centralized planning that was raised directly by the first recommendation. As explained above, UCI agrees that such a need exists, and it has begun to explore ways to meet it. In particular, the new joint working relationship between the combined Academic Planning Group and the Council on Planning and Budget should create an ideal forum for the distribution of information regarding units around campus in the context of the planning process, and the Executive Vice Chancellor plans to restore a regular meeting of the deans to create a forum for the sharing of information and the discussion of campuswide issues. Nevertheless, we want to make it clear that planning at UCI is deliberately decentralized. We believe this strategy is the most effective way to keep planning closely connected to the actual research and teaching of the campus, as opposed to the top-down perspective that is so often associated with more centralized planning. The problem identified by the WASC reviewers is to some degree inevitable given this strategic choice, since units will always focus on the information most pertinent to their needs and discount the rest. Nevertheless, UCI is seeking better ways of mitigating this negative consequence of our planning strategy, and one of the most important components of that solution is the centralization of our data-gathering efforts through the Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management.

As was indicated in our 1995 report to WASC, UCI's Office of Analytical Studies and Information Management (**OASIM**) for generating and maintaining official institutional data, including student characteristics, graduation rates, and financial data. OASIM also responds to internal and external requests for special analyses,

ad hoc studies, and related information, and is responsible for sending official UCI data to the Office of the President for use in systemwide reports.

Internally, OASIM supports the information needs of campus management in several ways. For example, it regularly produces reports on student characteristics, course enrollments, faculty FTE and financial data, both for the campus as a whole and for each academic unit. Such data may be used to assess progress toward diversity goals, for example, or in Academic Senate reviews of schools and departments. The Dean of Undergraduate Education utilizes OASIM class enrollment data to monitor adequacy of course offerings (especially in impacted areas such as upper- and lower-division writing courses). The dean also uses OASIM data to monitor retention and graduation rates of Undecided/Undeclared freshmen and low-income and first-generation college students and to create or modify programs accordingly.

Data from OASIM also play a key role in enrollment planning and in financial decision-making. The Director of OASIM is a member of the Enrollment Council and reports to the Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor, Budget, thus ensuring an on-going role in both areas.

OASIM also produces a standardized set of data for each academic unit undergoing Academic Senate review. Such data include the number of majors, number of degrees awarded, student credit hours, faculty FTE, and other indicators of workload and performance. Data from OASIM greatly reduce the data collection and reporting burden for the academic units, and also those data are consistent from unit to unit and from year to year.

In addition, each year OASIM responds to numerous ad hoc requests for information ranging from “What is the academic performance of transfer students?” to “Has there been any grade inflation at UCI?” Requested data can be produced in a matter of hours, or at most, a couple of days. Results from ad hoc requests are often distributed in the form of technical reports which contain analysis (text) as well as data (tables).

Most of the data produced by OASIM is now available electronically to the campus community, on both the Web and through Gopher. OASIM has also assisted other units such as the Division of Undergraduate Education in the interpretation and analysis of such data for their own ad hoc studies and analyses. OASIM has also taken the lead among the various UC campuses in adopting the use of the Common Data Set (CDS) as a method for responding to various external surveys (such as those from *U.S. News & World Report*). Use of the CDS greatly reduces the need to generate new data for each request.

OASIM has recently added a new responsibility—that of responding to requests for information that fall under the Freedom of Information Act. Each request is carefully reviewed by OASIM and dealt with in consultation with the affected unit within the time constraints proscribed by law. As a result of this new responsibility, OASIM staff members are becoming experts in related Federal and State laws and regulations concerning Freedom of Information.

As noted in the self-study chapter on Assessment of Undergraduate Education, collecting and analyzing information is a decentralized activity, consistent with the overall structure of the University itself (see the Assessment chapter for numerous examples). Individual units, such as the [Division of Undergraduate Education](#) or [Division of Student Affairs](#), conduct their own program evaluations

and student surveys on topics and issues related to their programs. Students enrolled in courses evaluate the quality of teaching. External reviewers participate in Academic Senate reviews of schools and departments. Such information is used to make decisions at the local level, thus ensuring that the data collected will be useful and timely.

Also as noted in the Assessment chapter, due to the distributed nature of collecting and analyzing information, few results are disseminated campuswide. The Assessment self-study concluded with a recommendation that more units share their results on a regular basis. One step in this direction is the newly formed, informal, Institutional Research Group whose members represent a number of administrative offices involved in data gathering, interpretation and assessment. Another important step is the distribution of campus-wide data to the Academic Planning Group, where it is used to inform and support their deliberations regarding the allocation of FTE to the Schools.

Finally, at the heart of planning is UCI's Academic Senate review process, described in more detail in the Assessment chapter. As noted there, all academic units are reviewed on a five- to eight-year review cycle. The review begins with a self-study report containing basic information on goals and objectives, student data, etc. External reviewers review the self-study and visit the campus before summarizing their observations and recommendations in reports to the Academic Senate's Graduate Council and Council on Educational Policy. The final reports with comments and observations from the academic units and recommendations from the Councils are forwarded to the Executive Vice Chancellor for appropriate action. The Assessment chapter also includes two examples where recent Academic Senate reviews have led to specific program changes (in History and writing).

Information plays a significant role in the Senate review process. The self-study reports a unit creates provide the background and context of the review for the external reviewers (much of the data come from OASIM). When combined with observations and judgments from the external reviewer, these data form an integral part of the academic planning process at UCI.

Recommendation 5 — SELF-STUDY

WHILE THE TEAM EXPECTED THE SELF-STUDY TO BE DIFFERENT FROM MOST BECAUSE OF THE SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS APPROVED FOR THIS VISIT, ANY SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT SHOULD BE MORE ANALYTICAL THAN DESCRIPTIVE. UCI'S SELF-STUDY DOCUMENTS FOR THE LAST TWO VISITS HAVE BEEN LARGELY DESCRIPTIVE, A SITUATION WHICH SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN PREPARING THE FOURTH-YEAR REPORT AND THE SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT FOR THE NEXT COMPREHENSIVE VISIT.

UCI's Response

We have tried to address this recommendation in all aspects of the documents prepared for this review. Most generally, the identification of three themes for review provided the occasion for a broad, self-reflective analysis of those activities that are most directly related to our sense of ourselves as a research-oriented campus dedicated to graduate and undergraduate teaching within an extraordinarily diverse community. We therefore have emphasized the extent to which we join research to teaching directly through Undergraduate Research in a

Research I University. In *Improving Communication Skills at UCI*, we have devoted a theme to the challenge of maintaining a high standard of literacy on an ethnically diverse campus where only 40 percent of the incoming fall 1999 freshmen report English as the primary language spoken in their homes, 37 percent learn English and another language at home, and 22 percent come from homes in which English is not spoken. This theme exemplifies the extent to which our campus has been willing and able to identify areas in need of greater effort, and it demonstrates our resolve to commit the time, energy, and considerable resources necessary to make that effort effective. Another theme, *Assessment of Undergraduate Education*, focuses on the ways we attempt to measure the results of those efforts (and the many others underway across the campus). In addition to considering the efficacy and relevance of the various forms of assessment, this section also uses the comprehensive overview of assessment on our campus to identify several ways in which the dissemination of the assessment results can be used to support both planning both campuswide and in the different academic units.