



December 21, 2009

CHAIR
Sherwood Lingenfelter
Fuller Theological Seminary

VICE CHAIR
Horace Mitchell
California State University, Bakersfield

Mark Bookman
American Jewish University

W. Bernard Bowler
Public Member

Jerry Dean Campbell
Claremont School of Theology

Anna DiStefano
Fielding Graduate University

James Donahue
Graduate Theological Union

Jackie Donath
California State University, Sacramento

Aimée Dorr
University of California, Los Angeles

John Eshelman
Seattle University

John Fitzpatrick
Schools Commission Representative

Laurence Gould
Public Member

Michael L. Jackson
University of Southern California

Linda Johnsrud
University of Hawaii

Roberts Jones
Public Member

Louanne Kennedy
*California State University,
Dominguez Hills*

Thomas McFadden
*Community and Junior Colleges
Commission Representative*

Leroy Morishita
San Francisco State University

William Plater
Public Member

Sheldon Schuster
Keck Graduate Institute

Eleanor Dantzer Siebert
Mount St. Mary's College

Carmen Sigler
San Jose State University

Larry Vanderhoef
University of California, Davis

Michael Whyte
Azusa Pacific University

Paul Zingg
California State University, Chico

PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Ralph A. Wolff

Michael V. Drake
Chancellor
University of California, Irvine
510 Aldrich Hall
Irvine, CA 92697-1000

Dear Chancellor Drake:

During its conference call meeting on December 17, 2009, a panel of the Proposal Review Committee (PRC) considered the Institutional Proposal submitted by the University of California, Irvine (UCI) for its reaffirmation of accreditation review. The panel would like to thank you and your colleagues who participated in the call, including Michael Gottfredson, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor; Michael Clark, Vice Provost and Co-ALO; Sharon Salinger, Dean of Undergraduate Education and Co-ALO; Judith Stepan-Norris, Chair of the Faculty Senate; David Pan, Chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy; Derek Dunn-Rankin, Chair of the Academic Program Review Board; Judy Shoemaker, Director of Assessment and Research Studies; Chris Procello, Assessment Coordinator; and Rob Ameele, Assistant Vice Provost. Your comments proved most helpful.

As indicated to Co-ALO Michael Clark during a phone call on December 18th, the panel acted to accept the Proposal. The panel found much to commend in the proposal including its seriousness, thoughtfulness, detail, clear writing, and integration of past concerns. The panel found the involvement of the faculty governance in the preparation of the proposal to be impressive. The panel affirmed the candor of the report and the decision to address student learning in this accreditation review cycle. The panel also commented on the clear linkage of the CPR and EER in the proposal and on the Road Map and Documentation which the panel sees as not only useful for UCI's work but helpful to the evaluating teams of the upcoming reviews. The panel noted the commitment of institutional resources to the process as well.

As the institution moves forward, the panel offers the following reminders of some of the points discussed in the conference call in the hopes that they may be of value both to the institution's planning and to the review teams that will read its reports in the years ahead:

General Education Learning Outcomes: The panel appreciates the work that has already been done in this area and reminds UCI to remember to add to the learning outcomes that are being defined specific criteria or indicators for measuring if the outcomes have been met.

Co-curricular outcomes of university experience: Understanding that defining outcomes and assessing whether or not they are being met often begins with the academic programs and moves from there to the co-curricular programs and the institution at large, the panel encourages UCI to move toward co-curricular assessment.

Timeline: In discussing the timeline for the review process, it was noted that specific outcomes for the process would be useful including objectives for various steps or benchmarks for monitoring progress.

Student Learning Outcomes for Graduate Programs: Graduate programs are sometimes overlooked in creating student learning outcomes because they are often reviewed by professional associations. Since UCI is an institution with many graduate programs, the panel reminds UCI that when the CPR occurs UCI should be able to show how it is going to be able to assess student learning outcomes at the graduate level, and how UCI will know that they have been met.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Use: The discussion included the suggestion that UCI have in place by the CPR its process for the collection, analysis, and use of data at the course, program, and GE level. The panel notes as a reminder that a CPR focuses on capacity and preparation and an EER focuses on how that capacity was used and how its use has enhanced the educational effectiveness of the university, either by strengthening what could be improved or by planning future endeavors.

The Proposal now becomes the framework for the accreditation review and represents a plan of action and commitment by the institution. The Proposal will be shared with the visiting teams for both the Capacity and Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review and with the Commission following each visit. You may choose to make minor adjustments to the activities you undertake in the Proposal; however, major changes to the Proposal, such as a change in the outcomes or themes, need to be approved in advance by Commission staff.

Finally, as you are aware, changes were made to the Standards of Accreditation and Criteria for Review and to the Institutional Review Process in 2008. Please be sure that you are using the current Standards of Accreditation as you address the WASC Standards. Also, please be sure that you follow the requirements for CPR and EER reports carefully. The requirements are set forth in the relevant section of the Handbook of Accreditation under the heading "Institutional Review Process." Note that there are new required areas of coverage (student success for CPR and EER reports and program review and sustainability of effectiveness efforts for EER reports). As you work toward preparing your report, please remember that the report is due 12 weeks before your visit.

Chancellor Drake
December 21, 2009
Page 3 of 3

If you have any questions about the review process, please feel free to contact me. We wish you well and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Diane Harvey". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail on the letter "y".

Diane Harvey
Associate Director

cc: Michael Clark, Co-ALO
Sharon Salinger, Co-ALO
Members of the Proposal Review Committee