

October 26, 2003

VPDUE Lynda Goff  
McHenry Library

**RE: WASC Accreditation Essays**

Dear Lynda,

I have received comments from four of the Senate committees (CEP, CFW, GC, and CPB) on the WASC essays. In general, although the language of the essays may seem “foreign” to many faculty, it seems quite suitable for the purpose of presenting the campus to the WASC visiting committee. There are, however, some minor corrections and some more significant and substantive issues that should be addressed before the essays are sent to WASC. The latter deal with issues that have been discussed to some extent for varying amounts of time but which at the writing of these essays had not yet reached the point of consensus. As I have not yet received the final versions of the committee letters, and I know that you need to get this information as expeditiously as possible, I have taken the specific recommendations from the drafts and added them to the end of this letter.

The issue of measurement is one that is still under discussion. In addition to the measures as suggested by the Faculty Instructional Activity assessments, the departmental profiles suggested by the EBC are also subject to consultation with the Senate. Some of the proposed changes do overlap directly with the evaluations under the purview of Senate committees so their inclusion is critical. As I have stated on other occasions, many faculty are less concerned with the measures themselves and much more concerned with how these will be used in the governance of the campus. However it will take considerable consultation before we can present a list of measures that the faculty feel reflect the investment made in teaching and research as well as the quality and quantity of the accomplishments. The discussion of measurement should reflect the stage of development rather than making it appear as if this is on the verge of implementation.

Similarly, while the Graduate College does have substantial faculty and graduate student support, implementation will depend on extensive Senate consultation and some portions may lie within the purview of the Graduate Council. The essays should again reflect the tentative nature of this proposal.

In the same vein, changes in external review of departments are currently under consideration. Solid proposals have been prepared but they are not yet ready for implementation as suggested by the essays. Concern was raised about the foregrounding of the UARC when very little is yet known about this program by the faculty and it is not yet incorporated in the graduate much less the undergraduate mission of our campus.

Another point of concern is the general use of the Lipmann Hearne report as validation of claims of campus excellence. Since they are hired to find ways to promote our success to the external communities, it is hardly an independent assessment of our worth. However, we have much of which to be proud and the consultant phraseology may be useful in that context. For example, the administration along with the Senate committees have worked to reverse the trends in declining graduate enrollment and are now increasing this toward a Senate agreed target of 15% – a point not emphasized in the essays. Some of the features that are seen as being unique to this campus, and indeed have been recently copied by other institutions, appear to be downplayed. These would include the role of the colleges, the dual grading system, the writing program, and the very impressive quantity of undergraduate research

Finally we would like to request that the final stage of the WASC review include the Senate to a much greater extent at a much early stage. The initial proposals did not reach the Senate committees although some Senate members were included on the steering committee. These essays reached the Senate with a very short turn-around time during a period when the committees were just beginning to gear up for the year. I would like to meet with you to discuss how we can approach the next phase differently and how to integrate this work with the review of many of these issues under other venues.

Sincerely,

Alison Galloway, Chair  
Academic Senate  
Santa Cruz Division

Enclosure

## Introductory Essay

Page 1 second paragraph, states "...WASC is not just a process in itself, but it has been integrated into existing processes." This statement is puzzling, as little evidence of this integration is visible to us. Recommend that this statement be eliminated or provide substantive evidence.

## Essay 1

Page 1, first paragraph, details eight "UCSC educational objectives." Where are these from?

Page 1 column 2, second paragraph, **change** year of opening of SOE to **1997** (was approved in 1996, began operating on July 1, 1997).

Page 1, Column 2, second paragraph, sentence states "Several engineering and computer science programs were developed at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, including M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Electrical Engineering (2002-03)." Gives misleading impression that graduate programs were developed ONLY after the SOE was established. For example, first Ph.D. in Computer Science was awarded in 1977-78, long before .

Page 3, bottom of first column, major is **Business Management Economics**, not Business Economics.

## Essay 2

Page 3, 4: paragraph of section about "Teaching and Learning," statement that "currently highly decentralized and "siloe" system [of advising] that has evolved has many inherent problems. Much of the effort is duplicative, not differentiated and synergistic...." This is not supported by the Final Report of the Special Committee of the Colleges about the effectiveness of college advising and the explicit advantage of decentralization for this.

Page 4, column 2, first paragraph states "We have begun to examine our writing programs at the lower division and upper division levels to determine if they are meeting the needs of our students." Add "and continue to seek improvements on a basic model that is strong."

Page 4, column 1, point 4. No one was familiar with "CAPs (Coordinating Academic Preceptors)"

## Essay 3

Page 1: the PAS (post-doctoral scholars association) should be added to the last paragraph.

Page 1 "One result of this process was that the Senate requested the creation of four new senior administrative positions...: (1) a full-time Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education; (2) a full-time Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Studies; (3) a full-time Vice Chancellor for

Research; and (4) a full-time Vice Provost of Academic Affairs.” Some faculty remember that the Senate questioned seriously the idea of a VPAA.

Page 3, second column, second paragraph, last sentence about development of professional programs. There is no clear campus consensus on development of professional programs.

Page 4, bottom of first column. Statement about “The proposed Science, Medicine, and Technology Studies program and the Anthropology of Technology emphasis...” Who is proposing these?

Page 5, second paragraph, statement about major in Human Health, this collaborative proposal is definitely seen as underdeveloped. **Restate** to indicate the relative immaturity of these effort.

Page 5, column 2, service learning and leadership programs. States “In many of our departments (e.g., ), service learning is required...” Change “many” to “some.”

Page 7: the draft states that the review period is two years for assistant professors, and three for associate and full professors. In fact, the period is two years for both assistant and associate professors; For full professors up to Step V, professional reviews occur every three years. Once at Step V, they are mandated to occur no less often than every five years. **Reword** sentence more accurately.

Page 8 “Currently nearly 200 faculty and staff live in homes” of school-owned rentals or houses on campus.” How many in which?

Page 9, second column, we no longer have a “full-time Vice Chancellor for Research” or a full-time Graduate Dean. **Restate** here and elsewhere to be accurate about this position.

#### **Essay 4**

Page 1 bottom of the left column and top of the right column speaks of various groups like the Provost’s Advisory Council. It would be very helpful to indicate the date at which each was started

Page 2 references Fact Sheets about admissions stats, student retention, and so on. One set of reports concerns “faculty workload” Where are these? Are they relevant to the issue of increased workload?

Page 3, third paragraph beginning “Questions that used to go unanswered...” This uses the example of removing workload units for Subject A tutorial, indicating that these had only been assigned to keep students from falling below eligibility for financial aid. This decision did NOT consider the pedagogical and motivational value of providing units for these tutorials, nor did it consider more broadly our responsibility to underprepared students. The impact for them has gone from providing them course credit to charging them tutorial fees. Change wording to indicate that this was an administratively expedient decision, but that it has academic

complexities which were not fully considered in making this decision.

Page 3 under left column, there is a typo. The text says “date” when it should say “data”

Page 4: the date `February, 2003' seems wrong;

Page 6 How do they propose to access “reputation” in the “historical data spreadsheets”?

Page 7, second paragraph. Statement that “Future plans include broader use of existing student course evaluations to provide feedback to faculty curriculum oversight committees with respect to instructor teaching effectiveness.” What? This seems to step into both CEP and CAP territory. **Eliminate.**

Page 7, second column, second paragraph, mandating exit survey of undergraduates. Is this imposing a graduation requirement without Senate consultation?

Page 7 typo. Says “Not content to simply report” when it should say “Not content simply to report

Page 7 left column near the bottom there is a typo. A word is missing. The sentence reads “The results of this survey, which can be found at “ at where?”

Page 8, second paragraph, discussion uses of new course evaluation forms (to be designed) in measuring success of different Writing 1 class sections. The Writing Program has been working on a multi-faceted assessment project; these statements in the WASC essays appear to preempt these faculty efforts. Eliminate this reference to the assessment of Writing 1 or reword to more accurately reflect the role of Writing faculty in carrying out this undertaking.

p. 8 at the end “We will also work with departments including mathematics, biology, psychology, and others to determine whether some of the tests available in these subject areas might be useful to programs in assessing their educational effectiveness.” Do the departments named know of these plans?

Page 8, third paragraph, why is the section about math assessment here?

Essay 4 closing photo: You close with a picture of Neil Balmforth, who is currently on leave from the University, and who we understand may not be returning. Perhaps you should showcase a different faculty member?