

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM  
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To the University of California, Irvine

February 14 – 17, 2023

*Team Roster*

Ana Mari Cauce, Chair  
President  
University of Washington

Laura E. Martin, Assistant Chair  
Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost  
Academic Planning and Institutional Assessment  
University of California, Merced

Valeria Bertacco  
Vice Provost for Engaged Learning  
Arthur F. Thurnau Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science  
University of Michigan

Christopher Manning  
Vice President and Chief Inclusion and Diversity Officer  
University of Southern California

Oliver O'Reilly  
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education  
Professor, Mechanical Engineering  
University of California Berkeley

Barbara Gross Davis, Staff Liaison  
Vice President  
WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT ..... 4**

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History ..... 4

B. Description of Team’s Review Process ..... 5

C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence..... 6

**SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS ..... 8**

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions ..... 8

B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements..... 10

    Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives..... 10

    Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions..... 13

    Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability..... 17

    Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement..... 20

C. Component 8: Institution-specific Themes..... 23

    Theme 1: Inclusive Learning for a Diverse Student Body (CFRs 2.2, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.3) ..... 23

    Theme 2: Student Engagement and Participation in Research (CFRs 2.2, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.3) ..... 26

    Theme 3: Learning Communities (CFRs 2.2, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.3) ..... 28

D. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement ..... 30

**SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 33**

**APPENDICES..... 35**

    Appendix A - Federal Compliance Forms ..... 37

        1 - Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form..... 37

        2 - Marketing and Recruitment Review Form ..... 39

        3 - Student Complaints Review Form ..... 41

        4 – Transfer Credit Policy Review Form ..... 43

    Appendix B - Off-Campus Location Review of Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility..... 44

    Appendix C - Distance Education Review..... 48

## **SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

### ***A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History***

The University of California, Irvine (UCI) was founded in 1965 with a mission to catalyze the community and enhance lives through rigorous academics, cutting-edge research, and dedicated public service. As one of the ten campuses of the University of California system, UCI is a comprehensive research university serving over 37,000 students in 89 undergraduate and 200 graduate degree programs, including 56 PhD and five professional doctoral degrees offered by 14 academic and professional schools spanning the arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, engineering, business, law, nursing, pharmacy, and medical fields. A fifteenth school, the School of Population and Public Health, is planned. Five degrees, four master's degrees and one professional doctorate, are offered via distance education. The campus has one additional location, the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility in San Diego County, which was approved by WSCUC in summer 2022 to offer a bachelor's degree for the incarcerated population. Since 1996, UCI has been a member of the Association of American Universities, placing it in the company of the leading public and private research universities in the United States and Canada.

Since its reaffirmation accreditation in 2013, UCI has changed considerably. Most significantly, UCI's undergraduate and graduate student populations have increased 33% and 34%, respectively, over its fall 2012 enrollment to 29,449 and 7,056 students, respectively, as of fall 2021<sup>1</sup>. With this growth, approximately 175 new Senate faculty have been hired since 2016. The campus also achieved new levels of research funding, with nearly \$600 million in grants and contracts awarded during fiscal year 2020-21<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://datahub.oapir.uci.edu/Enrollment-Dashboard.php>

<sup>2</sup> <https://news.uci.edu/2021/08/02/uci-receives-record-592-million-in-research-funding-for-fiscal-2020-21/>

Over the last decade, UCI's student body has also diversified significantly. Since 2012, students identifying as female increased by 32% to 54%, historically underrepresented minority (URM) students by 71% to 34%, first-generation students by 38% to 46%, and low-income students by 33% to 32% of the undergraduate population. At the graduate level, students identifying as female increased by 62% to 50% and URM students by 127% to 19% of the student population. UCI is now designated a minority-serving institution (MSI), a Hispanic-serving Institution (HSI), and an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving Institution (AANAPISI) by the US Department of Education. It is also a founding member of the Alliance of Hispanic Serving Research Universities.

In 2013, UCI's accreditation was reaffirmed for a period of 10 years. In 2017, UCI submitted a progress report addressing the two Commission recommendations stemming from its reaffirmation. As noted above, in summer 2022, the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility in San Diego County was approved as an additional location. A site visit was conducted as part of this review. The report is attached as appendix B. The team's review of UCI's distance education programs is provided as appendix C. For this reaffirmation review, with the WSCUC Commission's approval, UCI undertook the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation of Accreditation (TPR).

### ***B. Description of Team's Review Process***

Following the TPR model, the team's contribution to UCI's review consisted of preparatory work for the Accreditation Visit, the Accreditation Visit itself, and the development of the team report. The Accreditation Visit, which took place at UCI's main campus, began on Tuesday February 14, with a team meeting, and concluded Friday, February 17, with the exit meeting with institutional stakeholders.

Over the three and one-half days of the visit, the team conducted structured in-person meetings with campus constituents, including faculty, staff, students, and administrative leadership. Meetings were organized to gather information and insights bearing directly on UCI's compliance with the WSCUC

Standards and to better understand the work undertaken for the themes. Team members also had access to stakeholder comments submitted via the confidential email account. Preparation for the visit involved the development of a preliminary draft of the team's report based solely on written materials provided by UCI, without final conclusions or judgments. The Accreditation Visit concluded with the exit meeting in which the team communicated its commendations and recommendations.

The team prepared systematically and collaboratively for the Accreditation Visit. In anticipation of a two-hour pre-visit meeting, team members reviewed UCI's institutional report and associated materials, with each member summarizing their observations in the WSCUC- provided worksheet. The team then discussed the completed worksheets as a group, identifying institutional strengths and areas for further inquiry as a basis for conversation with UCI stakeholders during the accreditation visit. To further focus conversations with UCI stakeholders, the team developed questions to guide each Accreditation Visit meeting.

To ensure all aspects of the institutional report—and related review requirements—were considered, pairs of team members assumed responsibility for specific components of the review, leading the team's analysis and summarizing the group's conclusions in draft sections of the team's report. To put their own responsibilities in context, all team members read UCI's institutional report in its entirety, including the appendices. Team members also read and edited the final team report. As such, this report represents the team's collective understanding and evaluation of UCI.

### ***C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence***

UCI's Thematic Pathway to Reaffirmation of Accreditation Institutional Report consisted of the four components required of a TPR review: Introduction, Compliance with the Standards, Institutional Specific Themes, and Conclusion. In keeping with the thematic focus of the review, the majority of the

report's written narrative examined UCI's goal for the self-study, which was to understand empirically, for undergraduate and graduate students alike, how learning experiences inside and outside of the classroom, participation in research, and participation in learning communities promote academic success, student well-being, and educational utility across UCI's increasingly diverse student body. To demonstrate its compliance with the WSCUC Standards, UCI completed the *Compliance with WSCUC Standards and Federal Requirements Worksheet*.

The team found UCI's institutional report well-written and very well documented. For each section of the report, the appendices and hyperlinked resources provided the team with appropriate information to better understand the basis of UCI's analysis and findings. As presented in the report, and confirmed by the visit, the self-study process provided UCI with a greater understanding of the impact of learning experiences, research participation and engagement, and learning communities on measures of academic success, student well-being, and the utility of education, including for different populations of undergraduate and graduate students, and with implications for improving student support. Other notable outcomes of the self-study process include the novel idea of cluster recruiting graduate students, an initiative that is accelerating the diversification of UCI's graduate student body, and the use of self-study data to inform UCI's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Finally, the results of UCI's thematic study also suggested possible avenues for further inquiry and assessment, particularly as UCI's data infrastructure and data sets become more robust through the campus's ongoing work to develop a student data warehouse and related analytic capabilities. The team commends UCI for these important impacts of its self-study process.

The institutional report was developed under the guidance of the Steering Committee for Reaffirmation, a committee of more than forty representatives from across the institution, including the central administration, Academic Senate, faculty representatives from across UCI's schools, undergraduate and

graduate students, staff, and the executive director of the UCI's alumni association. The steering committee, together with its executive committee, developed the thematic focus of the TPR and participated in the development of the final report, including interpretation of associated analyses. Report components were developed and drafted under the guidance of an administrative lead with input from relevant campus units, including the Academic Senate. Following approval of the self-study themes by WSCUC in April of 2021, UCI gathered data, conducted analyses, and drafted the report, with a final draft reviewed by the senior administration and Academic Senate in the fall of 2022.

In sum, the team found the institutional report to accurately portray UCI's condition as understood by its stakeholders and confirmed through discussions during the Accreditation Visit. It is clear that UCI took the accreditation review process seriously, using it as an opportunity to further the institution's progress on topics of importance to the campus. When combined, the report and the Accreditation Visit also make clear that UCI is committed to honest and open communication with the Commission. (CFR 1.8)

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS**

### ***A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions***

In its 2013 letter confirming UCI's accreditation for a period of ten years, the WSCUC Commission identified two areas for attention: (1) continue to integrate General Education (GE) outcomes into syllabi, review grandfathered courses for alignment to the new GE outcomes, and fully implement the new GE curriculum with assessment of student learning to follow; and (2) continue existing, and monitor ongoing, staffing needs in support of the campus's assessment and institutional research work given the campus's "substantial and data collection and analysis activities."

Since 2013, and as reflected in UCI's 2017 progress report to WSCUC and its institutional report for reaffirmation, UCI has made significant progress with these recommendations. The GE curriculum is fully



implemented with Academic Senate policies in place to ensure its ongoing stewardship. This includes the expectations that all GE-designated courses are reviewed every five years for consistency with established GE criteria and that, to be approved, syllabi for new GE courses must include GE learning outcomes. All grandfathered GE courses have also been reviewed for alignment to the GE learning outcomes, and GE learning outcomes are now populated onto course sites in the learning management system, making them available to students and instructors alike.

Assessment of the GE program was initiated in 2014 by the Academic Senate's Policy and Assessment Subcommittee (SCPA). Attention to the effectiveness of these assessment practices has led the campus to evolve its approach to GE assessment, most notably by implementing a GE Learning Community/GE Institute to engage faculty teaching GE courses in the assessment of the learning outcomes with a focus on identifying and disseminating actions to improve student learning. UCI plans to continue to use the learning community approach, initiated in 2022, to assess intended GE outcomes.

Since 2012, UCI has also increased staffing in support of assessment and institutional research. In 2022, a staff member was added to the Center for Applied Assessment and Research (CAAR) to support assessment in graduate programs, bringing the office to a full-time staff count of four. Assessment support also has been supplemented by the creation in 2015 of the Office of the Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning (OVPTL) and its Division of Teaching Excellence and Innovation (DTEI), which support faculty efforts to translate assessment projects into faculty development initiatives. Finally, in 2022 CAAR was organizationally relocated to the Division of Institutional Research (DIR) in the Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research (OAPIR) to strengthen institutional data sharing and support.

UCI has also strengthened its institutional research capacity in several ways. It has added three full-time staff to the DIR, bringing the total to six. At least eight institutional research staff have also been added

to administrative units across the campus, including in schools, thereby establishing a “federated model of institutional research.” In 2020, institutional research was moved to the Office of Academic Planning from the Division of Finance to form OAPIR and better connect its expertise to academic priorities. Lastly, UCI is also investing in the development of a student data warehouse, a tool that undergirds initiatives like Comprehensive Analytics for Student Success (known on campus as COMPASS), a collaboration of OAPIR, Enrollment Management, Information Technology, and the OVPTL to provide actionable information to student advising staff, faculty, and administrators to improve student success.

UCI’s growth in assessment and institutional research capacity, including the underlying data infrastructure, is essential to navigating the most significant changes to the campus since 2012 - the diversification and growth of its student body. The team applauds UCI’s evolution in this regard and encourages the campus to continue its important work to ensure all students have equitable access to educational opportunities and achieve commensurate levels of learning and success.

***B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements***

**Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives**

*Institutional Purposes (CFRs 1.1, 1.2)*

UCI is part of the ten-campus University of California system. Founded in 1965 on the Irvine Ranch, the campus currently enrolls over 37,000 students. A significant part of this growth has occurred in the past decade. UC Irvine’s mission to “discover and disseminate knowledge through research, teaching, and creative expression in acclaimed academic programs” captures its fundamental character as a research university and its contribution to the public good.

UCI's educational objectives are publicly available on websites and syllabi. Likewise, data describing student achievement, including retention and graduation rates and student perceptions of their learning, are easily accessible via web-based dashboards.

*Integrity and Transparency (CFRs 1.3-1.8)*

As a campus of the UC system, the academic freedom of UCI's staff, students, and faculty is guaranteed by systemwide university policy. Under the California Constitution, the UC and its campuses have the authority to operate with appropriate autonomy.

UCI makes public information on the student experience and the educational resources available to its students. This includes information about academic goals, programs, services, and costs as well as data illustrating that students complete their degree programs in a timely fashion. Mechanisms exist for students to voice their concerns and provide input to the administration, including clear communication lines through student government and end-of-term teaching evaluations. Policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and matters related to financial aid are appropriately communicated on campus websites.

The team's meetings with students, administration, and faculty underscored UCI's commitment to collecting and leveraging findings from varied campus data streams to support important goals such as diversifying the faculty and eliminating achievement gaps among students from diverse ethnic, racial, or economic backgrounds. The commitment to further diversifying the faculty, staff, and students, both undergraduate and graduate, to inclusive teaching, and to developing strong programs in support of diversity and inclusion was clear and broadly shared among those with whom the team spoke.

Consistent with these commitments, the Office of Inclusive Excellence has a publicly available Action Plan and provides related data, programming, and resources. Nonetheless, the team was unable to

discern elements of accountability in support of its equity, diversity, and inclusion priorities, such as benchmarking or timelines on strategic outcomes like diversifying the faculty or eliminating achievement gaps among students of different demographic or economic backgrounds. In addition, meetings with university stakeholders and data on university dashboards revealed a mismatch between student and faculty diversity. In several meetings with stakeholders, the team also heard that the Office of Inclusive Excellence, and related programs like the Diverse Educational Community and Doctoral Experience (DECADE), were understaffed and underfunded, relying heavily on “volunteer” work from faculty and/or students from underrepresented backgrounds and/or unable to meet the campus’ demand for action.

In sum, the campus has the elements of a comprehensive approach to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion, and increased investment in efforts to robustly define, support, and evaluate progress towards its goals will be an important next step. Thus, the team recommends UCI enhance its efforts to diversify the faculty and senior administration to better align with the diversity of the student body and, relatedly, develop a sustainable, coordinated infrastructure for equity, diversity, and inclusion that is supported by resources, timelines, and milestones.

UCI exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, guided by appropriate policies, procedures, and sound business practices. On the UCI campus, the Irvine Division of the Academic Senate partners with the administration to help ensure integrity in its operations. Consistent with the Senate’s Regentally-delegated authorities, this partnership is central to the periodic review of programs, recommendations on faculty promotions and budgetary matters, and approval of courses and curricula.

As verified through the Accreditation Visit and by related documents, UCI abides by WSCUC substantive change policies and is committed to honest and open communication with the WSCUC Commission.

## *Conclusion*

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCI has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

## **Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions**

### *Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7)*

UCI offers 89 undergraduate and 200 graduate degrees. Among the graduate degrees, offerings include 56 PhD, five professional doctorates, and five distance education programs. Undergraduate degrees require the completion of a minimum of 180 quarter units. All undergraduate students must fulfill four groups of requirements: general University of California requirements, UCI requirements, GE requirements, and degree program requirements. In contrast, graduate degree requirements vary by program. Undergraduate students value the richness of degree programs offered while noting a scarcity of interdisciplinary degree programs.

The UCI campus includes several classroom facilities, including the recent addition of the Anteater Learning Pavilion (ALP), a state-of-the-art classroom building equipped to support active teaching and learning. Instructors who complete an active-teaching certification with the DTEI receive priority in reserving classroom spaces in the ALP. Overall, the team finds the institution offers a strong portfolio of degree programs for which degree requirements are clearly defined and appropriate to the type and level of degree.

UCI's online course offerings are robust and growing, thanks to dedicated teams supporting the development of online courses within the Graduate Division and the DTEI. For each course offered at UCI, the course catalog specifies the offering modality: in-person, hybrid, or online. Currently, the suite of online courses is expanding rapidly across the institution, which has sufficient resources to support

the development of new courses but has not developed plans nor dedicated resources to maintain and regularly refresh these courses. Thus, the team recommends that UCI ensure that sufficient financial and faculty resources are available to regularly refresh online course content.

The campus employs 1,371 full-time faculty and 347 part-time faculty as of spring 2021, leading to a student to faculty ratio of approximately 21:1. At least 73% of the full-time faculty hold doctorate degrees, with an additional 8% holding master's degrees. The institution does not have available education-level data for approximately 15% of its faculty. Overall, UCI has a faculty of sufficient size and appropriate qualifications to deliver the curriculum.

Reviews of UCI's degree programs are conducted on a ten year-cycle to confirm and support the alignment of learning outcomes with the degree's goals and the institutional mission. These reviews are complemented by ongoing faculty-led assessments of student learning achievement and general education requirements at program and institutional levels. Student achievement of the core competencies is assessed principally through institutional student surveys, with ongoing efforts to strengthen the direct assessment of these skills. Survey results, which are provided to each major for consideration, show strong majorities of respondents reporting good, very good, or excellent proficiency with the core competencies. Overall, the institution employs a solid mix of reviews and assessments to evaluate and continuously improve the quality of its teaching and learning programs over time, including with respect to student success.

#### *Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)*

UCI seeks excellence in research and creative activities as an integral part of its mission. To this end it offers a rich set of research experiences for undergraduate students, including through its Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP), which serves approximately 1,500 students each year. In light of the positive correlation between undergraduate research and student success and

subsequent enrollment in graduate education, the institution has set the goal of 30% of the undergraduate student population (about 8800 students) undertaking a research experience. To support and complement the student experience, the UROP program issues an annual journal presenting a selection of research reports completed by UROP students during the prior year. Recently, the program has established student support teams, comprising a graduate student and two to four undergraduate students, a structure that has proven highly successful in yielding student completion of the research experience.

The institution values faculty's scholarship and creative activity through awards and seed-grant support by the Office of Research, resulting in many successful grants by external funding agencies and a significant overall growth of the institution's research expenditures. To strengthen the research experiences available to students, UCI is working to increase the fraction of principal investigators who pursue supplement funding opportunities provided by grant agencies.

#### *Student Learning and Success (CFRs 2.10–2.14)*

UCI regularly tracks student success and completion. Information on student retention and degree completion rates is publicly available on the campus website, and, during each program review, student learning and success are evaluated. For this TPR, UCI also analyzed alumni survey data to learn about the long-term success of their graduates with respect to their employment history and career trajectories, a commendable and very valuable endeavor. As described elsewhere in this report, UCI is developing a student data warehouse and undertaking associated projects to provide faculty and staff with a rich variety of undergraduate student data to guide planning and decision making at all levels of the university in support of student success.

For UCI's graduate programs, the Graduate Division publicly reports the average time-to-degree, selectivity, diversity, and student sources of support. At the undergraduate level, the DIR reports

retention and graduation rates. These data show strong first-year retention and six-year graduation rates, ranging from 91% to 94% and 83% to 87%, respectively<sup>3</sup>, for the 2012 to 2021 time period. Rates for Pell-grant recipients are similar, ranging from 91% to 95% and 82% to 86%, respectively, for the same time period. While first-year retention rates for Black undergraduates were similar to those of the campus more generally, ranging from 85% to 95% over this time period, Black student graduation rates were generally slightly lower ranging from 67% to 82%. Hispanic students' first-year retention and graduation rates were also lower, ranging from 87% to 92% and 76% to 81%, respectively. The team is impressed with UCI's success in maintaining overall student success rates as student enrollment has increased significantly over the last decade and encourages UCI to continue to focus on closing the completion gaps among its student populations. The work undertaken for this TPR is central to those efforts.

Many resources are available to enhance the student experience and support student success. These include academic advising by a professional advising staff, study abroad, honors studies, a broad portfolio of research opportunities, and civic engagement through the Global Service Scholars and the UC in Washington D.C (UCDC) programs. Moreover, within the Division of Student Affairs, several offices support a diversity of student affinity groups. Students report valuing the richness of UCI's experiential opportunities, especially the access to faculty mentors. At the same time, students note they must be proactive in finding and pursuing these opportunities. Students also observed the absence of some key affinity groups among those represented within the Division of Student Affairs (e.g., Asian American Pacific Islander). To address these concerns, the team recommends that UCI broaden students' awareness and access to the array of co-curricular opportunities and advising support, with special attention to the needs of first-generation students and students with intersectional identities.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://datahub.oapir.uci.edu/Student-Success-Dashboard.php>



### *Conclusion*

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCI has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

### **Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability**

UCI supports the achievement of its educational purposes through its investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. Combined, these elements support a high-quality educational environment, a diverse student population, and the broader university mission.

#### *Faculty and Staff (CRFs 3.1-3.3)*

UCI has a world-class faculty that justifies its reputation as one of the finest institutions in the country. The campus was recently ranked as one of the top 10 public universities in the United States by *US News and World Report* and is classified as an HSI, AANAPISI, and MSI. It has well documented policies and practices to evaluate faculty and staff and to support their professional development. UCI's focus on the excellence of its faculty has remained strong, even during the recent period of rapid growth. There has been a focus on diversifying the campus's faculty, with some noteworthy progress, although more is necessary especially considering the growing diversity of the campus's student population. Data available on UCI's Office of Inclusive Excellence website indicate that, as of 2022-2023, 29% of UCI's undergraduate population is URM versus 12% of its faculty<sup>4</sup>. As mentioned in the discussion of Standard

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://inclusion.uci.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/UCI-Demographic-Charts-2022-23.pdf>

1, one of the team's recommendations is for the campus to enhance its efforts to diversify the faculty and senior administration to better align with the diversity of the student body.

*Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources (CFRs 3.4, 3.5)*

UCI has been in a stable financial condition, with additional state allocations allowing it to make important investments to support its rapid growth. The institution has made critical investments in human, physical, IT, and fiscal infrastructure, with a special emphasis on collecting and collating data on institutional performance at all levels to enable analytics to support sound decision making. The latter will prove especially important as the newly negotiated salary costs for teaching and research, resulting from the recent contract negotiations with the United Autoworkers (UAW) union, are expected to create considerable strain in the absence of substantial tuition increases or additional funding from the state. During the site visit, questions were also raised, including by students, about additional investments necessary for student housing given the growing student population, most of whom are from low-income backgrounds, and about the high cost of living in the surrounding area.

The campus has a strategic plan for continued growth and expansion formed on four pillars: 1) Growth that Makes a Difference: Expanding Our Capacity to Improve Lives, 2) First in Class: Elevating the Student Experience to Prepare Future Leaders, 3) Great Partners: Making Regional and Global Connections that Enhance Our Mission and Serve the People, and 4) New Paths for Our Brilliant Future: Forging Best Practices to Power the Coming Century. In response to the long-term trend of decreasing state support for the UC system, a fundraising campaign is a key component of the fourth pillar. As part of a \$2 billion fundraising campaign, the campus has raised \$1.44 billion from 89,000 donors. Although the campus has over 50,000 engaged alums, as a relatively young campus, without the kind of generational alumni base of some other older UC campuses, fund raising in support of the research and academic mission will remain an area requiring ongoing focus.

UCI's budget allocation letter for fiscal year 2021-2022 noted, with concern, a structural deficit of \$45 million that would be filled by reserves. With inflation and the newly negotiated UAW contracts for teaching assistants, graduate student researchers, and postdocs, the team raised questions about the campus's efforts to reduce the structural deficit and maintain the excellence of its programs, especially as UCI expects the deficit to grow and budget cuts are being made. As such, the team recommends that UCI continue to monitor how the changing financial landscape impacts faculty and staff recruitment and retention and student success.

*Organizational Structure and Decision-Making Process (CFRs 3.6-3.10)*

UCI has well-developed governance structures with a balance of leadership at its schools and university-wide programs and centers. As with all the campuses of the UC system, there is also a partnership between its administrative leaders and the Irvine Division of the Academic Senate. This partnership includes good engagement with faculty on regular reviews of academic programs and faculty and a rigorous approval process for new and existing degree programs. UCI's commendable efforts to implement and continuously review and improve its GE curriculum over the last decade provide an excellent example of the campus's commitment to quality improvement.

During the Accreditation Visit, the team learned of concerns about faculty and staff morale.

Consequently, the team recommends that UCI identify and implement strategies to improve faculty and staff well-being following stressors resulting from a long period of rapid growth, the pandemic, the impact of the UAW-UC Strike, and associated increased workload expectations.

## *Conclusion*

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UC Irvine has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3. Final determination of compliance rests with the WSCUC Commission.

## **Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement**

### *Quality Assurance Processes (CFRs 4.1, 4.2)*

UCI has strong, faculty-led quality assurance processes that, at the undergraduate level, are developed and institutionalized. SCPA policy expects each undergraduate program to report at five-year intervals on learning outcomes assessment efforts, with the expectation that approximately one learning outcome is assessed per year. The assessment report submitted at year 10 is intended to inform periodic program review, thus integrating learning assessment into the program review process. The SCPA-developed rubric for assessing the quality of program assessment efforts, and related reporting guidelines, commendably place priority on whether efforts to improve student learning have had the intended effect. Rubric criteria also inform a "revise and resubmit" process implemented by the SCPA to further strengthen program assessment efforts. Per the SCPA, there is a desire to integrate equity, diversity, and inclusion considerations into the rubric, a next step the team strongly endorses. Likewise, the team encourages UCI to consider how it might feasibly disaggregate direct assessment data on student learning outcomes by student demographics. Such data could significantly enhance and complement the indirect data on student learning experiences and outcomes that UCI plans to provide to departments and instructors.

At the graduate level, UCI is redesigning its approach to student learning outcomes assessment with the goal of institutionalizing a regular reporting and feedback process like that at the undergraduate level.

As part of this restructuring, the Graduate Council has revised its bylaws to acknowledge formally its responsibility to “periodically review and evaluate all programs of study.” The campus has also hired in CAAR a full-time staff member to support graduate program assessment. The team applauds UCI’s efforts, and encourages UCI to continue in this direction, noting that direct assessment of student learning has the potential to support UCI’s goals to further improve its already strong PhD completion rates.

UCI maintains a schedule for undergraduate and graduate program reviews that are undertaken under the oversight of the Academic Program Review Board (APRB), a subcommittee of the Academic Senate’s Council on Education Policy and Graduate Council. In response to changes to the campus academic budget model, the APRB has been carefully evaluating and revising the program review process to ensure its continued effectiveness. This is just one of several examples of how UCI regularly examines the efficacy of its quality assurance processes, amending them as needed.

The Division of Student Affairs is in the process of strengthening and regularizing its quality assurance efforts. This includes adopting expectations that every unit in the division, except for those accredited by outside agencies, undergo external program review every eight years. As in academic affairs, units’ ongoing outcomes assessment expectations are being timed to inform program review. During the visit, commendable examples were shared of how assessment has led to improved student learning and success. The team strongly encourages the division to continue with vigor its efforts to institutionalize assessment. Assessment is central to ensuring and demonstrating the division’s contributions to student learning and success at UCI. Beyond Student Affairs, administrative assessment has been identified as a final area for development of regular quality assurances and improvement processes.

UCI’s DIR is an important campus partner in the campus’s efforts to increase data-informed decision making, by increasing data availability and analytics capacity across academic affairs. As described in

section II.A. of this report, UCI subscribes to a “federated model” of institutional research support with DIR staff working to bring institutional research staff in schools and other academic units into conversation about campus priorities.

DIR works closely with OVPTL and other units across campus on projects such as COMPASS, which will bring a trove of disaggregated student data to student advisors, faculty, and administrators with the goal of providing actionable information to improve student outcomes. Since its move to the Office of Academic Planning, DIR has been working to define and deliver its new role in academic affairs. When the time is right, the team encourages DIR to undertake a periodic review of its effectiveness, including the suitability and usefulness of the data generated and the support it provides to make the most of its use.

#### *Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.3-4.7)*

Discussions during the Accreditation Visit confirmed that faculty, staff, and the administration are committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. As described in multiple places in this report, assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment – in support of academic and co-curricular objectives – is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. Another significant example of UCI’s work in this regard is the Measuring Undergraduate Success Trajectories (MUST) project, which brings together institutional administrative data, student survey data, data from the learning management system, and data from pulse surveys to provide insights into the student experience in support of improving student success. Initiated with a grant from the Mellon Foundation, the project is being institutionalized and integrated with the COMPASS project. Data from MUST have been used by the Academic Senate to guide decision making.

The thematic choice for this reaffirmation and many initiatives represented in the report and further discussed during the Accreditation Visit directly support UCI's strategic plan, particularly those in Pillar 2: First in Class: Elevating the Student Experience to Prepare Future Leaders. A refresh of the existing plan, which was originally released to the campus in February 2016, is currently under campus review. The revised plan, which will guide the strategic investment of resources over the next five years, responds in part to the campus's experience of the pandemic and associated learning. It also continues to reflect the focus of UCI's TPR. Areas of ongoing investment include ensuring that UCI's educational opportunities are an engine for social mobility, impact, and innovation; diversifying pedagogical options for students who seek a balance between traditional in-person instruction and online educational opportunities; developing innovative technologies that will enhance student engagement and student support services; and expanding career pathways to provide students the opportunity to supplement their education with real-world practicums, internships, and research, and provide ongoing professional development opportunities for UCI alumni. The refreshed strategic plan will be released to the campus in spring 2023.

### *Conclusion*

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that UCI has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

### ***C. Component 8: Institution-specific Themes***

#### **Theme 1: Inclusive Learning for a Diverse Student Body (CFRs 2.2, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.3)**

Over the last decade, UCI has experienced impressive advances in URM and female student representation among undergraduate and graduate students. UCI pointed to this growth as its rationale for selecting the theme: Inclusive Learning for a Diverse Student Body. From fall 2012 to fall 2021, UCI's

undergraduate population grew by 33% to 29,449 students. Of that population, 30% are URM<sup>5</sup>, with significant numbers of Hispanic and Asian American/Pacific Islander students. Likewise, in the same period, UCI's graduate/professional student population grew by over 34% to 7,056, with 19% reporting as URM and 50% female. Considering these demographic characteristics, UCI seeks to be the destination campus for California students, especially those of historically marginalized backgrounds.

UCI used a broad range of data to address this theme. It began by using the MUST project to bring together multiple strands of existing student success data, including that of the UCI registrar, University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), and alumni surveys. UCI also brought in measures of college preparation, student demographics, student course characteristics, and student experiences. UCI prepared a Graduate Student Success Survey that borrowed items from existing studies such as the Graduate Exit Survey, the University of California Graduate Student Experience Survey, and the 2021-2022 Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium, which allowed it to cross reference new survey outcomes with historical data points. In both cases, the University applied regression analysis to the data sets to determine the relationship between students' demographics, background information, and course characteristics and its pre-determined measures of student success: academic success, well-being, and educational utility.

UCI's results showed variable associations between student experiences and student success indicators by demographic populations at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. For instance, well-being analyses showed no meaningful differences across undergraduate student populations with respect to stress about housing, finances, and transportation. Likewise, for graduate students of all demographic backgrounds, perceived support significantly predicted academic success, well-being, and educational

---

<sup>5</sup> As of 2022-23 that number is 29%; <https://inclusion.uci.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/UCI-Demographic-Charts-2022-23.pdf>



utility. Female undergraduate students, however, reported experiencing higher levels of stress generally, and transfer, first-year URM, and first-year female students all had better outcomes when in classes with a greater number of students of similar backgrounds.

UCI reflected on the findings from its analyses and identified strategies to improve student support. UCI found lower academic performance across first-generation and URM students in the entry phase and has articulated a series of early intervention steps, particularly regarding advising, enrollment, and early research opportunities. UCI noted that enhanced support could likewise improve graduate students' academic and career outcomes. The university has already made progress in this area by expanding graduate student housing, via the Verano 8 housing project, and its graduate funding guarantee, which locks in funding support for six years.

UCI is cognizant that there is more work to be done. Findings that URM and women students experienced improved outcomes in classes with students of similar identities point to a need to go beyond external supports and delve into classroom practices that render those supports necessary. In the quantitative realm, there are likely more relevant findings to be made as UCI continues to analyze its ever-growing data sets, and the university plans to expand its use of the COMPASS initiative to transition from observing patterns more rapidly to tangible impacts for student success.

In conclusion, the team was impressed with the research undertaken for this theme as well as UCI's plans for ongoing inquiry and for broadening access to and use of data by faculty and staff. The team encourages UCI to continue its commendable work to understand and continuously improve the success of its students, with a particular focus on closing any disparities in success outcomes.

## **Theme 2: Student Engagement and Participation in Research (CFRs 2.2, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.3)**

At UCI, research is a central facet of the undergraduate and graduate educational experience, consistent with the campus's mission and status as a top-tier research university. Given the importance of research activities in the education of its students, through this theme UCI sought to examine for its undergraduate and graduate students alike the relationship between engagement with research and academic success, well-being, and the utility of education.

At UCI, research opportunities, broadly defined, span all disciplinary areas of the institution, from the arts to the humanities, social, health, and physical sciences. At the undergraduate level, the Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP) is the pre-eminent program facilitating student participation in research. Commendably, its efforts include the Research Discovery Program, which is dedicated to preparing first-generation, low-income, and underrepresented students to conduct research as undergraduates. At the graduate level, the Graduate Division supports graduate students through research opportunities and funding support. While not a complete inventory, UCI reports over 40 distinct research opportunity programs for undergraduate students and, for graduate students, a rich pool of labs, centers, and research groups, amounting to over 100 distinct pathways to engagement.

For this theme, UCI sought to assess specifically the effect of research engagement on students' academic success and the utility of education with a high level of rigor. At the undergraduate level, student involvement in research was defined as the percentage of research units completed by students graduating between 2016-2021 and, for 2019 graduates, participation in research via UROP. The principal outcome examined was enrollment in graduate school within two years of graduating. At the graduate level, research engagement was measured with four items on the Graduate Student Survey assessing how often students engaged with research theory, methods, and activities using a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very often). Among the metrics used, the team especially valued the alumni survey,

which enabled the analysis and inclusion of long-term impacts of participation in research, beyond student's completion.

The self-study led to several key findings. First and foremost, UCI found that research participation for undergraduate students was strongly associated with subsequent enrollment in graduate studies. For graduate students, engagement in research was associated with well-being, with students who were more engaged with research feeling more valued by their peers, faculty, and staff. Engagement with research was also associated with academic success measured as GPA, and enhanced career opportunities, with graduate students who were more engaged in research reporting more satisfaction with their professional development and greater optimism about their post-graduation prospects. In terms of overall involvement in research, at the undergraduate level, a substantial percentage of the 2019 graduating seniors, 15% of native first-year students, and 13% of transfer students reported participation in research via UROP. At the graduate level, across all types of programs, academic to professional, students reported high levels of engagement with research, with 89% of responses being "often" or higher.

In selecting this self-study topic, the institution focused on its strength as a research university, highlighting the significant intersection of the educational and research components of its mission and, correspondingly, the richness of the opportunities it has to offer. The team commends UCI for its ongoing analysis, and the reflection resulting from this study. As reported by UCI, the study opens the door to subsequent analyses that could investigate the impact of the experience in relation to its quality, a step the team encourages. The team also suggests that, for a deeper understanding of the findings, it may be valuable to investigate the impact of required versus optional research experiences on student outcomes. At the graduate level, the finding that graduate research experiences are positively

correlated with student well-being was unexpected by the institution. The team encourages UCI to investigate related conjectures further.

Overall, the team found commendable the depth of the data analysis conducted and the effort to use these data to guide institutional directions. The strategic choice of research participation for the investigation is a very good one as the institution has pervasive research endeavors encompassing all campus units, augmented by dedicated research centers in many disciplinary areas, and a significant fraction of junior faculty who seek to expand their research program. In light of the campus's brimming research portfolio, the pursuit of research experiences as a vehicle to student success enables UCI to provide a rich pool of engagements to satisfy its large student population. The team commends UCI for its commitment and activities in this regard.

**Theme 3: Learning Communities (CFRs 2.2, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.3)**

For its third theme, UCI undertook its first ever institutional effort to empirically examine the relationship between participation in learning communities and student success. At the undergraduate level, these communities include classroom-based, residential, and curricular experiences as well as group-based experiences designed for URM students or students with similar academic interests. All told, there are well over 50 communities of varying size and structure throughout the campus: for instance, the EASE program for 90-120 first-year students in the biological sciences, the Research Discovery Program, which is being piloted for 100 students, a housing-based learning community of 45 students (2,500 program alumni over 45+ years) in Sierra Hall, and the Honors Collegium for over 200 students. At the graduate level, focus groups conducted as part of the self-study helped identify the experiences graduate students, both professional and academic, consider to be learning communities. These included informal peer-created reading and writing groups, fieldwork groups, professional groups,

peer cohorts, research labs, the Competitive Edge program run by the Graduate Division, and the DECADE program run jointly by Graduate Division and the Office of Inclusive Excellence.

Survey data showed that substantial numbers of undergraduate and graduate students are participating in learning communities. At the undergraduate level, 37% of first-year students and 34% of transfer students reported participating in learning communities averaged over the 2016, 2018, and 2020 UCUES administrations. Undergraduate participation in learning communities has also increased over time to 43% from 31% per data from the 2011 and 2020 alumni surveys. At the graduate level, 44% of graduate students taking the spring 2022 Graduate Student Success Survey reported participating in a learning community.

UCI's analysis also provided initial insights into associations between participation in learning communities and student success. At the undergraduate level, first-year students who participated in learning communities had higher retention rates. Significant associations were also observed between learning community participation and peer learning and a sense of belonging. Unanticipated challenges with data collection and integration, however, hindered deeper analysis and prevented disaggregation of some data. This included the need to develop a broadly shared definition of what constitutes a learning community as a necessary precursor to robust data collection.

At the graduate level, results showed that frequency of participation was a significant predictor of student well-being, with students who participated in learning communities reporting feeling more valued by their peers, faculty, and staff. Likewise, frequency of participation was a significant predictor of the utility of education, with students who participated in learning communities reporting greater satisfaction with their professional development and greater optimism about their post-graduation prospects. Female and URM academic doctoral students who participated in formal learning communities, like DECADE or Competitive Edge, also reported greater satisfaction with their

professional development and fourth-year students feeling more valued. Finally, focus group results reinforced the power of learning communities to foster student well-being, with students across program types reporting that learning communities benefited their well-being more than their academic success or the utility of their education.

Taken together these studies point to the value of learning communities as a means of fostering student success. They also point to the work to be done to identify and invest strategically in the most impactful learning community experiences for its students. The team encourages UCI to continue its work to better understand the value of the investments already made and to identify the most beneficial investments to be made going forward.

#### ***D. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement***

UCI is, without doubt, a jewel in the crown of the UC system and one of the country's premier public research universities. Throughout the accreditation visit, the team witnessed UCI's strong commitment to serving as an educational institution of choice for California's college students, with a strong focus on first-generation, low-income students from historically underrepresented groups, especially those from Asian American, Black/African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Pacific Islander backgrounds. The team was especially impressed with UCI's robust and rapid growth, which provides important access to higher education to in-state students. The team was equally impressed that this growth has taken place while maintaining high academic standards for its students, strong retention and graduation rates, and high expectations for faculty teaching and research. One of UCI's key themes, to better support and encourage student involvement in research, underscores UCI's commitment to the educational and research components of its mission and how these commitments can be mutually reinforcing.

In both the written report and throughout the Accreditation Visit, the pride that UCI faculty and staff take in serving as an engine for social mobility for their diverse undergraduate and graduate student

bodies was evident and a joy to witness. As one dean put it, UCI's mission is not just about excellence and diversity (including economic diversity), but about excellence because of its diversity. The team left feeling inspired and uplifted, viewing UCI as a model for where higher education needs to be headed to restore public confidence and make good on the promise of the transformative power of a college degree.

UCI has developed a robust strategic plan, and this reaffirmation's themes align closely with its strategic priorities. The team lauds UCI's focus on inclusive education, which is particularly important given the campus's student demographics. Looking forward, it will be important for UCI to ensure this commitment, and the resources needed to support it, are sustained during what is likely to be a time of resource limitation relative to the most recent period of rapid growth. In addition, while students who had accessed UCI's educational opportunities and services felt well served and connected to UCI, they often expressed feeling "lucky" to have done so. As noted elsewhere in this report, a more concerted effort to elevate awareness of the rich opportunities available, especially outside the classroom, is recommended, especially for first-generation students.

The team was also impressed with UCI's focus on continuous improvement and its solid, evolving data collection and assessment infrastructure to support that process. Through the well-written report and appendices, UCI comprehensively addressed the CFRs with clear illustrations of compliance. The team found faculty and staff referring to assessment findings throughout the visit. What was lacking and worthy of more attention was the link between assessment and specific goals, with metrics, timelines, and accountability processes to assess goal attainment. Attention to these practices will be especially important both to maintain the strong momentum that was evident in the report, and during the Accreditation Visit, and to clarify priorities during a period when difficult decisions will be required. For example, while the team understands the expressed desire for continued growth in research,

development of a more diverse professional healthcare workforce, and expansion of the healthcare enterprise, it is also aware that these are expensive propositions.

As UCI advances its plan to move toward the next level of excellence and the “bright future” envisioned in its strategic plan, it will be important to balance the speed of that drive with attention to the well-being of its faculty and staff, including administrators. UCI, and higher education, more broadly, are going through a difficult and disruptive period. This includes the COVID-19 pandemic and the institutionalized racial violence that has led to a growing awareness of the deep racial inequities baked into so many of society’s structures, including its institutions of higher education. In addition, the UC system has and continues to experience the impact of the recent UAW strike. While these experiences have resulted in innovations in how faculty and staff teach and work, galvanized commitments to examine and dismantle structures that reinforce racial and economic inequities, and demonstrated resilience and ability to turn research into impact in service of students and communities at large, they have also left many faculty, staff, and students stressed out and feeling overwhelmed. If ignored, these conditions could lead to burnout and disengagement. It is also important to acknowledge that these burdens have not been experienced uniformly, with some faculty and staff bearing a higher burden of emotional labor.

Another factor for UCI to attend to, as it approaches the next level of success, is the importance of continual communication among different levels of administration, among administration and faculty and staff, and across lateral units. The team was impressed by the collaborative spirit among stakeholders, including among the cadre of deans, many of whom were relatively new to UCI. Nonetheless, questions emerged throughout the visit, especially about how funding decisions would be made and how a new budget model would work. While some of these changes may be very much still in development, it is critical to begin to communicate transparently, and as early as possible about the



process(es) that will be used for decision-making when it comes to priority setting and budgetary decisions. Doing otherwise will risk damage to the strong sense of community pride and commitment to shared goals that were so inspiring throughout the team's visit.

### **SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

As reflected in this report, UCI has fulfilled the intended outcomes of the comprehensive review process. The themes for its self-study - inclusive learning for a diverse student body, student engagement and participation in research, and learning communities – align directly with the campus' most critical priorities as outlined in its strategic plan. The findings of its empirical examination of student success point to concrete next steps and continued areas for institutional investigation with the promise of much actionable information to be generated. The campus's ongoing commitment to this work is evident in its vision for bringing together rich and diverse sources of data to inform decision making in support of the success of its increasingly diverse student body and its thoughtful investment in its organizational capacity, technological and human, to realize this vision. This includes most importantly its plans for increasing access to and use of student success data by departments and instructors.

UCI's accomplishments with respect to its self-study are especially notable given that much of the work took place during the pandemic. As described in this report, UCI's self-study efforts helped to guide its response to the pandemic, actions that further emphasize UCI's commitment to the work described in this self-study and its centrality to UCI's day-to-day operations.

Overall, the team was appreciative of, and impressed with, the thorough and comprehensive self-study. Throughout the visit, the team found clear evidence of the seriousness with which UCI undertook this endeavor and of collaboration and engagement in the TPR across various units and constituencies.

Although a plethora of campus strengths was evident in the self-study and site visit, the team would like to particularly commend UCI for the following seven accomplishments:

1. The tremendous growth and diversification of UCI's student body, both undergraduate and graduate, that has occurred over the last decade, with a clear focus on expanding its public service mission while maintaining and increasing its academic and research excellence.
2. The strong commitment of faculty, administrators, and staff to the institution, and most notably, to its diverse student population.
3. The development and implementation of a range of strategies to support and improve instruction. Notable efforts include the creation of the Division of Teaching Excellence and Innovation, the Anteater Learning Pavilion, and a wide range of instructor training and support.
4. The breadth of UCI's data, the growing sophistication of its data infrastructure, and the clear commitment to using data to inform planning and decision-making. Throughout the visit, faculty and staff pointed to evidence from these efforts as they discussed future plans and initiatives.
5. The use of self-study data to help guide UCI's response to the pandemic. Because the self-study began just before the pandemic, UCI has been able to use its findings to gauge how student learning, well-being, and engagement have been affected during this period, a process that is ongoing and will leave the university well-positioned to provide valuable insights across higher education in this time of disruption and opportunity.
6. The development of innovative strategies to increase the diversity of its graduate student population, most noteworthy cluster recruitment of graduate students, which has accelerated graduate student diversification.
7. The impressive array of online graduate degree programs carefully designed to be engaging and inclusive.

As UCI continues to pursue its mission with energy and commitment, the team recommends that UCI

1. Enhance its efforts to diversify the faculty and senior administration to better align with the diversity of the student body. (CFR 1.4, Equity and Inclusion Policy, Equity and Inclusion Guide)
2. Develop a sustainable, coordinated infrastructure for equity, diversity, and inclusion that is supported by resources, timelines, and milestones. (CFR 1.4, Equity and Inclusion Policy, Equity and Inclusion Guide)
3. Broaden students' awareness and access to the array of co-curricular opportunities and advising support with special attention to the needs of first-generation students and students with intersectional identities. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13)
4. Identify and implement strategies to improve faculty and staff well-being following the stressors resulting from a long period of rapid growth, the pandemic, the impact of the UAW-UC Strike, and associated increased workload expectations. (CFR 3.7)
5. Continue to monitor how the changing financial landscape impacts faculty and staff recruitment and retention and student success. (CFR 3.4)
6. Ensure that sufficient financial and faculty resources are available to regularly refresh online course content. (CFR 2.1)

## **APPENDICES**

The report includes the following appendices:

- A. Federal Compliance Forms
  1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
  2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
  3. Student Complaints Review
  4. Transfer Credit Review

- B. Off-Campus Location Review of Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility
- C. Distance Education Review

**Appendix A - Federal Compliance Forms**

**1 - Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form**

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? University of California Academic Senate Guidelines, Council on Educational Policy Guidelines, Senate Subcommittee on Courses Syllabi Guidelines
	Comments: <a href="#">University of California Academic Senate Guidelines 760</a> <a href="#">Council on Educational Policy Guidelines, Section D. Units Syllabi Guidelines</a>
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Senate Subcommittee on Courses (SCOC) reviews and approves requests for new courses.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: <a href="#">UCI Schedule of Classes</a>
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS X BA/BS X MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Information & Computer Science, Communications, Education, and Engineering
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The materials showed that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours	How many syllabi were reviewed? 8
	What kinds of courses? Internships, field work, clinical work
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS X BA/BS X MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral

(e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	What discipline(s)? Biology, School of Business, Education, History, School of Social Ecology, Art, History, Nursing
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The materials showed that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 4
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? On ground
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Engineering, Dance, History, Biology
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The materials showed that the programs offered are of a generally acceptable length.

Review Completed By: Laura Martin  
 Date: February 14, 2023

## 2 - Marketing and Recruitment Review Form

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:            UCI follows all federal regulations.</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO            Time to degree is available on this dashboard:  <a href="https://datahub.oapir.uci.edu/Time-to-Degree-Dashboard.php">https://datahub.oapir.uci.edu/Time-to-Degree-Dashboard.php</a></p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO  <a href="#">Fees</a>  <a href="#">Net Price Calculator</a></p> <p>Comments: UCI makes public information about the overall cost of the degree.</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO  <a href="#">Graduating Senior Survey</a></p>
	<p>Comments:            UCI's Division of Career Pathways for students (<a href="https://career.uci.edu/">https://career.uci.edu/</a>) provides various services (<a href="https://career.uci.edu/undergraduate/explore-a-career/">https://career.uci.edu/undergraduate/explore-a-career/</a>) and resources (<a href="https://career.uci.edu/graduate/non-academic-careers/">https://career.uci.edu/graduate/non-academic-careers/</a>), including a resource list from various units across the campus: <a href="https://career.uci.edu/campus-resources/">https://career.uci.edu/campus-resources/</a>.</p> <p>Example career resources from this list include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://merage.uci.edu/programs/masters/master-science-biotech-management/career-services.html">https://merage.uci.edu/programs/masters/master-science-biotech-management/career-services.html</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://gps-stem.grad.uci.edu/">https://gps-stem.grad.uci.edu/</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://myidp.sciencecareers.org">https://myidp.sciencecareers.org</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://calteach.uci.edu/">https://calteach.uci.edu/</a></li> </ul>

	<p>Individual departments also provide career-related guidance on their websites, for example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MBA: <a href="https://merage.uci.edu/programs/mba/full-time-mba/career-services.html">https://merage.uci.edu/programs/mba/full-time-mba/career-services.html</a></li> <li>• MCLS - <a href="https://clsmas.soceco.uci.edu/pages/career-paths">https://clsmas.soceco.uci.edu/pages/career-paths</a></li> <li>• MPAC: <a href="https://merage.uci.edu/programs/masters/master-professional-accountancy/career-services.html">https://merage.uci.edu/programs/masters/master-professional-accountancy/career-services.html</a></li> <li>• MS Pharmacology: <a href="https://sites.uci.edu/mspharmacology/prospective-students/career-paths/">https://sites.uci.edu/mspharmacology/prospective-students/career-paths/</a></li> <li>• BA Anthropology: <a href="https://www.anthropology.uci.edu/undergrad/careers.php">https://www.anthropology.uci.edu/undergrad/careers.php</a></li> <li>• BA Mathematics: <a href="https://www.math.uci.edu/math-majors/math-career-resources#sec%201.1">https://www.math.uci.edu/math-majors/math-career-resources#sec%201.1</a></li> <li>• BA Physical Science: <a href="https://ps.uci.edu/stuaff/content/sample-careers">https://ps.uci.edu/stuaff/content/sample-careers</a></li> </ul>
--	---

\*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

\*\*Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Laura Martin

Date: February 14, 2023



### 3 - Student Complaints Review Form

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where?  <a href="#">UCI Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct (AISC)</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Reporting an Issue (AISC)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Appeals and Grievances Policy 110</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">FERPA Complaint Form</a></li> </ul> <a href="#">UCI Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity Complaints (OEOD)</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Reporting an Incident (OEOD)</a></li> </ul> <a href="#">Office of the Ombuds FAQ</a>  <a href="#">UCI Disability Services Center Complaints Policy</a>  <a href="#">UCI Care</a>  <a href="#">UCI Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity Policies and Laws</a> </p> <p>Comments: UCI has publicly available policies and procedures for student complaints.</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:  As linked above, UCI provides multiple processes and resources to assist students and other UCI members through various issues, including academic, privacy, discriminatory, and work-related (e.g., student worker) complaints. While the Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct (AISC) oversees student complaints, other units may take the lead on facilitating and working through the complaint process depending on the type of complaint. For example, complaints about faculty or staff typically will be sent to the Office of Ombuds to address. Online resources exist to provide information about the complaints process and how to submit complaints (links above). AISC and other offices identified above have</p>

	<p>appropriate resources and trained staff to handle their respective issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">AISC Staff</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">OEOD Staff</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ombuds Staff</a></li> </ul> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?    X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>Records</p>	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?    X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? General complaints are tracked at a system-level by AISC. In addition, depending on the type of complaint, oversight, monitoring, and ensuring the disposition of complaints are managed by the respective offices involved in the complaint process. For example, Title IX related complaints are addressed and managed by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (OEOD). All records and data related to complaints are properly safeguarded per UCI’s privacy and compliance policies.</p> <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?    X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: All formal complaint are entered into the campus database (<a href="#">Simplicity Advocate</a>) that is supported by the <a href="#">Office of Information Technology</a> and allows units to properly access, monitor, process, record, and archive complaints.</p> <p>Comments: UCI has a campus database that enables to track, monitor, and archive student complaints over time.</p>

\*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)  
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Laura Martin  
Date: February 14, 2023

#### 4 – Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Under federal regulations\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? <a href="#">Transfer Credit Statement</a>
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Policies and practices for awarding transfer unit credit are determined at the systemwide level (see link above). Policies and practices for awarding <i>subject</i> matter credit for transferable courses are determined at the campus level. That information is available here- <a href="#">Transfer Student Admission Information</a>
	Comments: UCI has clear public information on transfer criteria and policy and procedures for receiving transfer credit as established in both campus and system policy.

\*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

- 1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- 2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Laura Martin

Date: 2/13/2023

## Appendix B - Off-Campus Location Review of Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility

Institution: University of California, Irvine

Type of Visit: Thematic Pathway Review for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Name of reviewer/s: John K. Hausaman; WSCUC Assistant Vice President, Substantive Change

Date/s of review: January 17, 2023

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed<sup>6</sup>. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address:  
Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility  
480 Alta Road  
San Diego, CA 92179
2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

This is an Additional location operated at the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility (RJD) in San Diego, CA, which is a Level 2 medium security facility operated by the California Department of Corrections. UCI operates its LIFTED program at RJD, which is its prison education initiative that allows for an incarcerated individual to earn a bachelor's degree. Through LIFTED, it offers one degree program, the BA in Sociology, which is taught by UCI faculty who commute to the campus for cohort-based classes.

The location was approved through the WSCUC Substantive Change process in July 2022 and classes began in the fall 2022 term. At the time of the visit, the program enrolled 25 students in the program. The location is supported by a UCI staff member residing in the San Diego area who serves as the primary liaison between the correctional center staff, students, faculty, and student services, and a program director from the UCI faculty whose discipline and scholarly work on the correctional system compliment the nature of the location.

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

This is the first off-site instructional location for UCI. The approval process for an Additional location requires the review and approval of a proposal which outlines how the institution's current support for students and faculty will be provided at the new location. The first 3 Additional locations of an institution are required to have a follow-up visit within 6 months of the location being implemented to confirm the implementation of the location and validate the contents of the proposal. This visit fell within the same timeline as UCI's reaffirmation review and a separate report of this visit is provided to the institution through the Substantive Change process for that purpose.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

During the visit, the reviewer was able to meet with the Program Director, Program Coordinator, founding faculty of the program and program instructors including the Sociology Department Chair, the Student Success Initiatives for Current and Formerly Incarcerated Students, RJD Education staff, and approximately 25 students who began the BA in Sociology program in fall 2022.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	There were no recommendations to be addressed resulting from the substantive change approval.	None
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	In the proposal for the location, UCI articulates that as a public university, "UC Irvine prioritizes learning opportunities for all students, actively partnering with community and business leaders to enhance lives and make a difference, changing humanity for the better. Our institution seeks to bring different perspectives together to advance our understanding of the world around us." The decision to bring the LIFTED Program to RJD is in the spirit of this mission, and the faculty, staff and students are fully participating members of the UCI Community. The planning and operation of the location is conducted in concert with institutional and academic leadership, and representatives of the California Department of Corrections. There is no separate administrative structure in place for this location.	None.
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Students reported feeling that they felt they are valued members of the institution's learning community and were pleased with the depth and rigor of their coursework in the major compared to their previous experiences with higher education. Despite barriers to communication (internet access), the Program Coordinator assures equitable access to UCI services and resources. The UCI presence is known through the presence of faculty, staff, and institutional logos in the primary	

	instructional space. Students also serve as ambassadors of their respective program.	
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The Program Coordinator plays a key role in assuring student needs are met, in both academic support and support services. Support Services are also have dedicated staff working with and at the location. There is a dedicated classroom utilized for the program within a cell block where students reside. A dedicated Program Director has oversight responsibility for the program and location, which is managed in concert with RJD Education staff. Faculty are provided training in advance of teaching at the location to support prison pedagogy, and trauma-informed instruction to support students of varying needs and abilities.	The institution should monitor the need for additional program staff support as enrollments increase.
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Students in the program are provided with their own laptop for completing assignments and accessing course materials. At the time of the visit, access was being expanded to allow for local versions of online databases (access to external internet sites is limited) to for scholarly articles to be provided to students as well to remove having to involve staff to provide those materials. LIFTED staff assume a responsibility for providing access to counseling, library resources, and other support services UCI provides to students at the main campus.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Faculty from the UCI main campus commute to RJD for courses that are cohort based. These faculty are typically FT and occasionally Graduate Students when appropriate. Faculty participate in the institution's curriculum development and assessment processes. The cohort model and weekly class times differ slightly from what may be offered at the main campus due to the unique setting of the location, but course	

	content and faculty are the same as the main campus.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	The program delivered at RJD is an existing program at UCI, the BA in Sociology. Content has not changed. The institution’s sociology faculty have backed the program, and the administration has provided support for funding and necessary agreements for the location.	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	Data on retention and graduation will be collected according to the institution’s normal data collection to be available for disaggregation. At this time, there is no data available given that the location has just begun operations.	
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	The location and faculty follow the institution’s processes for assessment of student learning as they would at the main campus. There was no student learning data available at the time of the visit given that the location has just begun operations and instruction.	
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	The effectiveness of Sociology program at this location will be evaluated by the institutions former Dean of the School of Education, and as with any new programs, incorporate minor tailoring as needed.	

## Appendix C - Distance Education Review

### Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institutions must have WSCUC approval to utilize distance education in the delivery of any of its programs in any amount, and are required to seek WSCUC approval for programs where 50% or more of the program can be completed through distance education. The institution's use of distance education in the delivery of its programs is reviewed as part of a comprehensive evaluation of the institution including an Accreditation Visit or Seeking Accreditation Visit.

**Distance Education** is defined as:

Education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor or instructors and to support **regular and substantive interaction** between the students and the instructor or instructors, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies that may be used to offer distance education include:

- The internet;
- One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband, fiber optic, satellite, or wireless communication devices;
- Audioconference;
- Other media used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in this definition

In keeping with federal expectations, WSCUC requires institutions that utilize distance education in the delivery of programs to demonstrate "Faculty-Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction" and "Academic Engagement" as defined by the federal regulations (see Code of Federal Regulations §600.2).

**Regular and Substantive Interaction** is engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment, consistent with the content under discussion, and also includes at least two of the following:

- (i) Providing direct instruction;
- (ii) Assessing or providing feedback on a student's coursework;
- (iii) Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency;
- (iv) Facilitating a group discussion regarding the content of a course or competency; or
- (v) Other instructional activities approved by the institution's or program's accrediting agency.

An institution ensures regular interaction between a student and an instructor or instructors by, prior to the student's completion of a course or competency -

- (i) Providing the opportunity for substantive interactions with the student on a predictable and scheduled basis commensurate with the length of time and the amount of content in the course or competency; and



(ii) Monitoring the student's academic engagement and success and ensuring that an instructor is responsible for promptly and proactively engaging in substantive interaction with the student when needed on the basis of such monitoring, or upon request by the student.

**Academic Engagement** requires active participation by a student in an instructional activity related to the student's course of study that –

(1) Is defined by the institution in accordance with any applicable requirements of its State or accrediting agency;

(2) Includes, but is not limited to -

(i) Attending a synchronous class, lecture, recitation, or field or laboratory activity, physically or online, where there is an opportunity for interaction between the instructor and students;

(ii) Submitting an academic assignment;

(iii) Taking an assessment or an exam;

(iv) Participating in an interactive tutorial, webinar, or other interactive computer-assisted instruction;

(v) Participating in a study group, group project, or an online discussion that is assigned by the institution; or

(vi) Interacting with an instructor about academic matters

Please complete either Section A for institutions that offer distance education programs approved by WSCUC or are 100% distance education institutions OR Section B for institutions that utilize distance education in the delivery of programs that do not rise to the level of a WSCUC approved distance education program.

**Institution:** University of California, Irvine

**Type of Visit:** Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Review

**Name of reviewer/s:** Oliver O'Reilly

**Date/s of review:** February 15-17, 2023

**Section Completed:**  A OR  B

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

**SECTION A: Institutions with Approved Distance Education Programs**

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Two distance education programs were reviewed, Masters Legal and Forensic Psychology (MLFP) and Masters Human-Computer Interaction and Design (MHCID).

Two courses, one from each program were reviewed, Masters Human-Computer Interaction and Design (MHCID) program: IN4MATX 280 Lec A: *Overview of HCID*, taught by Professor Anne Marie Piper and Teaching Assistant Julie Oh, and Masters Legal and Forensic Psychology (MLFP) program: P215 *Psychology and Law*, taught by Professor Jodi Quas and Teaching Assistant Kirsten Domagalski

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

UCI offers five distance education programs:

- Masters in Criminology Law and Society (active since 2003)
- Masters in Human-Computer Interaction and Design (active since 2016)
- Masters in Legal and Forensic Psychology (active since 2016)
- Masters in Pharmacology (active since 2017)
- Doctor of Nursing Practice (active since 2019)

For enrollment and related student data, see [UCI's data hub](#).

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

The two online courses listed above (IN4MATX 280 and P215) were examined and a remote meeting was held with the following individuals on Friday, February 10, 2023:

Masters in Human-Computer Interaction and Design (MHCID) program

- Anne Marie Piper
- Stephen Hosaflook
- Katie Salen Tekinbas, Faculty member

Masters in Legal and Forensic Psychology (MLFP) program

- Elizabeth Cauffman
- Sarah Miltimore
- Nicholas Scurich, Faculty member
- Heidi Beezley, Instructional Designer

Topics including financial sustainability, resources required for faculty to refresh their courses every 2-3 years, accommodations for students with documented disabilities, and accessible technologies were discussed.

*Observations and Findings*

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>The University of California, Irvine (UCI), as part of the University of California land grant institution system, upholds the <a href="#">mission</a> of serving through teaching, research, and service. Two of <a href="#">UCI's strategic pillars</a> also underscore the importance of serving both local and national communities. Finally, all of UCI's schools support the goal of providing access to first-class educational experiences to all students. As such, UCI's distance education degree programs were developed in response to the growing need in California and across the nation for graduate-level professional training for those who may not be able to enroll in an onsite degree program. As will be evidenced below, students of UCI's distance education degree programs experience flexibility and the same high-quality learning experiences and support services as the onsite degree programs. Below are additional details on two of UCI's distance education degree programs:</p> <p><b><i>Master of Human-Computer Interaction and Design</i></b> The <a href="#">Master of Human-Computer Interaction and Design (MHCID) program</a> is part of the Informatics Department, located within the</p>	

[Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences \(ICS\)](#) at UCI. This program was conceived in response to the growing need in California and across the nation for professionals highly trained in user experience research, development, and design. The program was the first professionally oriented graduate program in the Informatics Department and is structured as a self-supporting program (i.e., tuition-based), and enrolled its first students in fall 2016. It is fully self-sustained financially. The program is governed by the rules of the [Graduate Council](#) (Academic Senate) and [Graduate Division](#) (administration) centrally with local administrative control split between the department and school. Curricular decisions are made by the governing board of faculty as conceived and approved during the program's initial approval. Substantial curricular changes are also approved by the school faculty and the graduate council, as per [Academic Senate guidelines](#) for all graduate programs.

Since the program's inception, it has operated with one staff program director, who is fully funded and solely dedicated to the MHCID program; one administrative coordinator who splits their workload 50% to the MHCID program and 50% to the Informatics Department; and one faculty director, who is a member of the Informatics Department. The faculty director traditionally teaches at least one course in the program and is additionally compensated with an administrative stipend and summer salary support.

***Master of Legal and Forensic Psychology***

One of the pillars of [UCI's School of Social Ecology](#) is "science driving solutions" and two of the pillars in the university roadmap are "Growth that Makes a Difference" and "First in Class." The online [Master of Legal and Forensic Psychology \(MLFP\)](#) program fulfills these aspects of the mission by equipping current and future practitioners in fields at the intersection of psychology and law to become future leaders. To that end, [courses](#) focus on equipping students with knowledge and skills that allow them to analyze and interpret scientific evidence to develop, implement, and evaluate evidence-based solutions. By offering the program online, working practitioners can continue to work full-time as they enhance their ability to lead and improve lives by addressing the many challenges at the intersection of psychology and law.

The MLFP program is a self-supported program or SSGPDP (i.e., tuition-based), meaning that its operations are fully supported by the fees of the enrolled students. The [program's instructional designer](#) works with faculty to develop courses that foster a community of inquiry and practice as students engage in authentic assessments that challenge students to apply what they have learned to real-world contexts of use. New courses are centered

	<p>around key topics in the field and are developed in order to align with best practices, program competencies, and course goals. <a href="#">Program learning outcomes</a> are incorporated into six key program competencies: Engage in Social Science Inquiry, Interpret &amp; Use Data Evidence, Synthesize Research, Communicate &amp; Collaborate with Stakeholder Partners, Create &amp; Apply Solutions, and Engage as Empowered Actors.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>UCI strives to ensure that all students have sufficient opportunities to participate in all that the campus has to offer, and UCI’s distance education degree programs provide several different ways for students to be integrated into campus life and culture. Relatedly, one of the campus’ concerted efforts operating under the COVID-19 pandemic was to ensure remote learning experiences included a sense of integration into the life and culture of the institution. The institutional report on the pandemic summarizes student success and satisfaction during the pandemic (i.e., Component 8).</p> <p>For instance, <a href="#">UCI’s Graduate Division</a> has expanded its <a href="#">virtual services</a>, which has allowed Graduate Division to better serve students who are not physically on campus. Students in distance education degree programs have access to online campus services (Counseling Center, Division of Career Pathway, Disability Services Center, etc.) and some in-person services or activities (e.g., in-person workshops or events, counseling services, etc.). <a href="#">Graduate Student Health Insurance Plan</a> (GSHIP) is not required for graduate students in distance education degree programs, but they can voluntarily enroll in GSHIP. As far as Graduate Division’s services, students in distance education degree programs can get help with forms and ask questions about academic policies via email, Zoom, or over the telephone. Students enrolled in distance education degree programs can meet virtually with one of the program’s academic counselors, attend virtual workshops held by the Graduate Division, including <a href="#">Diverse Educational Community and Doctoral Experience</a> (DECADE) and <a href="#">Graduate Interconnect Program</a> (GIC), and <a href="#">Graduate and Postdoctoral Scholar Resource Center</a> (GPSRC) programming. The Graduate Division Dean communicates via email important updates to students. Finally, since the start of the pandemic, Graduate Division can process degree forms and final degree paperwork or other requests virtually using DocuSign or ServiceNow. The division also moved the <a href="#">new graduate student welcome and orientation information</a> online using Canvas. Much of the information focuses on how to access services and information virtually (either online, via email, or by telephone). Orientation materials are accessible to students throughout the academic year. Below are additional details on two of UCI’s distance education degree programs:</p>	

**MHCID**

MHCID students begin their one-year program with an on-site visit to the UCI campus. They receive face-to-face interaction with their entire cohort, the MHCID and Informatics faculty, staff, and support services. They take a UCI campus tour that ends at the bookstore for branded apparel shopping and pictures. The MHCID students return to campus midway through their year-long program. During that time, the same type of campus integration activities occurs as well as interaction with alumni, current students in other graduate programs, and members of the MHCID governing and advisory boards. Finally, at the end of their one-year program, the MHCID students return to campus for their [final capstone presentations](#) and commencement. Since MHCID’s inception, commencement has been held at the Beckman Center, National Academies of Sciences and Engineering on the UCI campus. Recordings of past commencement ceremonies can be found online. Below are links to a sampling of them:

- <https://vimeo.com/602134944>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=67oLyzQJrSA&t=35s>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ArwEY2Fq23Y&t=2210s>

While the MHCID students are active, they receive all the emails, all of the invites, and all of the campus information that all graduate students in ICS receive. Students also receive additional [career support and mentoring](#) via the MHCID program. For the first three years, each student was paired with an industry mentor. During the first two years, each student was paired with two mentors. In the third year, due to the increase in student population and a desire to only utilize the best mentors, each student received one professional mentor (three examples below):

- Richard Tilghman- Former Senior Director of UX, PayPal
- Kenny Chen- Interaction Designer, Google
- Chris Mueller- Former, Senior UX Designer-NASA, Current Senior UX Designer, Blink

After the third year, mentoring occurs during their capstone projects. This allows industry professionals to apply hands-on learning during the most hands-on portion of the curriculum. There is one “Capstone Advisor” per team and each team has four to six members. This additional support is in addition to the professor, two teaching assistants (TAs), and the guidance provided by the industry expert(s) serving as the capstone partner.

**MLFP**

Increasingly, campus events are being offered in a dual format such that participants can attend via Zoom, campus web conferencing software, or in person. Online students have access to campus

	<p>services such as <a href="#">disability services</a>, the <a href="#">career center</a>, and the <a href="#">campus library</a>, and are also notified about events across campus. During their first course in the program, students are oriented to how they can access and utilize services such as the career center and library. In addition, students are invited to engage with campus events including <a href="#">workshops hosted by the Career Center</a>, <a href="#">speakers hosted by the School of Social Ecology</a>, and <a href="#">events put on by the Center for Psychology and Law</a>. Students also may serve as student ambassadors or a member of the <a href="#">Social Ecology Graduate Student Association</a> through the School of Social Ecology. MLFP also works to support networking and announcements of jobs via Facebook and LinkedIn groups, a monthly newsletter, and the student and alumni networking map. Additionally, the program has a virtual mixer each quarter where the current cohort interacts with alumni, faculty, and guest speakers (e.g., <a href="#">MLFP Monthly Newsletter</a>).</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the institution conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>UCI's <a href="#">Office of Information Technology</a> (OIT) oversees and supports all technology-related <a href="#">infrastructure</a> and provides several technology-related <a href="#">services</a>. The OIT webpage has a <a href="#">status dashboard</a> that both monitors and informs of any outages and upcoming upgrades. To <a href="#">request support</a> on any technology-related issues, students, faculty, and staff may open a ticket, email, call, or access the knowledge base. Support services also are filtered by campus audience (e.g., <a href="#">graduate students</a>). And within OIT, there is a <a href="#">Canvas unit</a>, UCI's learning management system, that supports all degree programs, students, and faculty. Regular Canvas backups are executed and held locally and at the campus. They also provide support for other <a href="#">learning-related software</a>. Each of these tools also undergoes an <a href="#">extensive review process</a> involving staff from OIT's learning management, security, and business services teams; UCI Procurement; and the campus privacy office. Below are additional details on two of UCI's distance education degree programs:</p> <p><b>MHCID</b> The MHCID program makes use of a variety of digital technologies to deliver instruction including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Canvas for overall course delivery.</li> <li>● Slack, Discord, Zoom, and various video chat platforms are used for coordination, communication, and additional in-person discussions amongst students, faculty, and TAs.</li> </ul> <p>Students also learn a wide variety of technical tools that are relevant to their field, including but not limited to UserTesting, Tableau, Mimeo, Figma, Adobe Creative Cloud, and Qualtrics. MHCID students make use of the full range of campus technological tools, many of which were updated and refined during the pandemic and improved the distance learning of the campus overall, such as <a href="#">Teach</a></p>	

	<p><a href="#">Anywhere</a>. Students also make use of a variety of tools available through the <a href="#">library</a> (available via <a href="#">VPN</a> for those off campus:;) and OIT. MHCID Students also receive a subscription to <a href="#">LinkedIn Learning</a> as part of their program to supplement any pragmatic or tactical skills they may be missing.</p> <p><b>MLFP</b>  Before beginning the program, students are asked to go through a technological orientation that provides support and information about various technologies and services that are available and how to get support from <a href="#">program staff</a> and OIT. Once they begin the program, students have many opportunities to engage with course faculty and fellow students. Faculty offer weekly office hours by Zoom as well as by appointment so that students can engage with faculty in real-time at a time that works with their schedule. All courses utilize a Q&amp;A discussion platform called <a href="#">Ed Discussions</a> where students can ask questions or make posts about current events or opportunities. Students can also email course faculty if they are uncomfortable posting to Ed Discussions or prefer the contact to be private.</p> <p>All courses are designed for student interaction in the program’s learning management system, Canvas. Students engage in discussion boards, collaborate in Google docs, problem-solve in group assignments, offer critique using Canvas peer review, and respond to polling and checks for understanding using Google Forms, PollEverywhere, and Qualtrics. These interactions are supported by the guidance provided in context within the learning management system, the instructional designer, and the campus OIT staff.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p>	<p>UCI’s distance education degree program students have access to the same student support services available to UCI students who attend in person, such as <a href="#">disability services</a>, <a href="#">financial aid</a>, <a href="#">housing</a>, <a href="#">wellness</a>, and <a href="#">academic</a> and <a href="#">career</a> counseling. <a href="#">Library services</a> provide access to the UCI Libraries' premier collections as well as the collections of all 10 UC libraries with access to over 1.9 million electronic books and 253,922 journals and serials, the majority of which are available electronically. Students have access to <a href="#">online guides and tutorials</a> that emphasize online research skills and can schedule consultations with librarians via video chat/Zoom. Also, as indicated above, UCI’s Graduate Division and OIT provide support for academic and technology services. Below are additional details on two of UCI’s distance education degree programs:</p> <p><b>MHCID</b>  All MHCID students have access to the same student support services available to UCI students who attend in person. The services identified above are shared during student orientation.</p>	



	<p><b>MLFP</b></p> <p>Students are introduced to <a href="#">UCI’s Career Pathways</a> and <a href="#">library services</a> during their in-residence course (Introduction to Legal and Forensic Psychology) when representatives from each resource give a presentation to incoming students letting them know about their available services. The assistant director and director of the program are also available as a resource to students to assist with career advisement, and students are made aware of career workshops through the monthly newsletter or from direct outreach by Career Pathways. Via VPN, they have full access to the library collection (electronic databases, electronic journals, and books, library catalogs, library website, training material, web-based bibliographic programs, etc.). This service is utilized continuously throughout the program, and the program has an <a href="#">MLFP Library Guide</a> as a menu item in every MLFP course to enable students to quickly access key needed resources from the course menu. In addition, students complete an orientation (both through the UCI Graduate Division and the School of Social Ecology) prior to beginning the program which introduces incoming graduate students to student services on campus and highlights how students can make the most out of their graduate experience. Regarding technical support from the program, the students engage with the course faculty and/or instructional designer as a first line of support. They are also able to contact OIT directly. Also included is a ‘Need Help?’ page in each course that outlines where and how to get support from course faculty, librarians, and technical support. Data gathered from various sources (e.g., <a href="#">weekly feedback</a>) reveal students are satisfied with the campus resources available to them.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty</i></p>	<p>The same faculty who teach courses for the onsite degree programs also teach the courses for the distance education degree programs. And they receive appropriate support from their respective programs, schools, and <a href="#">campus</a>. Per <a href="#">UCI’s Academic Senate policy</a> (as part of UC Senate policy), faculty also lead the efforts in <a href="#">curriculum development</a> and <a href="#">assessment</a>. They are supported by respective administrative units, such as the <a href="#">Division of Teaching Excellence and Innovation</a> (DTEI) and the <a href="#">Center for Assessment and Applied Research</a> (CAAR). Below are additional details on two of UCI’s distance education degree programs:</p> <p><b>MHCID</b></p> <p>The MHCID courses are taught by a mixture of tenured UCI Academic Senate faculty, UCI full-time lecturers, one tenured professor from Westmont College who received tenure at UCI, helped start the MHCID program, then moved to Westmont College, and two User Experience and Design industry <a href="#">professionals</a>. Outside of COVID, all UCI professors predominantly teach in-person classes.</p>	

<p>involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p>	<p>One lecturer hired for MHCID due to her particular design expertise teaches in-person courses in Oregon, but the only course she teaches for UCI is online.</p> <p>Almost all the MHCID professors are full-time UCI professors and part of the Informatics Department in ICS. Only three are not, one of whom is a former full-time UCI professor, one is an MHCID alumnus, and one who began as a long-term colleague of UCI professors has now taught in the MHCID program for seven consecutive years. All program instructors also attend in-person student events that are held three times per year. DTEI provides hands-on training and course development support for all UCI faculty. During program design, DTEI was heavily involved in the development of the Canvas templates and overall plans for instruction. Additionally, the Informatics Department hosts the <a href="#">Center for Connected Learning (CLL)</a> and the <a href="#">Jacobs Center for Educational Technology Research Ecosystem (CERES)</a>, both globally recognized research networks focused on educational technology and distance learning. The researchers in these centers teach in the MHCID program, and CLL conducted a comprehensive assessment of MHCID each year during the program's first three years to help iterate on the curriculum and delivery. Faculty receive compensation for the redevelopment of the courses as needed at a minimum of every three years. This compensation supports them in taking time to review the latest best practices as well as develop new content.</p> <p><b>MLFP</b></p> <p>Ladder rank faculty from the <a href="#">Departments of Psychological Science</a> and <a href="#">Criminology, Law and Society</a> teach a course in the program, with 79% (n=11) of the faculty teaching in the program being ladder rank faculty, 14% (n=2) of the faculty being lecturers with security of employment, and 7% (n=1) being taught by an adjunct faculty who is a practitioner out in the field (e.g., Assistant District Attorney). Ladder rank faculty and lecturers teach both online and face-to-face courses for the university, including the online courses, taught for the program. Faculty work with an instructional designer over the course of several months to design, develop, quality assure, and implement the courses they teach. Faculty receive support and training from the instructional designer and also are able to attend workshops and training on both pedagogy and educational technologies. Student learning is assessed through faculty and staff reviewing the student feedback in course modules and faculty evaluations, as well as the faculty's collaboration with assigned TAs.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance</i></p>	<p>As stated above, the program faculty design the educational experiences and courses and align with <a href="#">UC academic regulations</a>. All course and program actions require UCI Academic Senate review and approval. Some actions also require UC System Senate review</p>	

<p>education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>and approval. All UCI degree programs follow the UC senate’s policy on the definition of the credit hour (<a href="#">SR 760</a>). The UC credit hour policy aligns with Carnegie unit guidelines for credit hours. <a href="#">UCI Academic Senate’s guidance</a> on academic units provides detailed information (see item D). Course offerings and unit requirements can be found in UCI’s Academic Catalogue. Below are requirement examples of two distance education degree programs and additional information about their respective instructional hours requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">MHCID Program Course Requirements</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">MLFP Program Course Requirements</a></li> </ul> <p><b>MHCID</b> Each course instructor ensures student attendance for instructional hours using a variety of metrics, which include monitoring student Canvas activity (logging on and making discussion posts), attendance during live lectures and panel discussions, watching recorded lectures and taking a quiz to check comprehension, completing the assigned readings and responding via a discussion post, engaging in regular weekly project group meetings, and attending office hours.</p> <p><b>MLFP</b> Course attendance is ensured through the completion of recorded lectures and videos which must be viewed to obtain course credit (via Canvas), as well as weekly engagements and learning activities, including discussion board posts on required readings/course content and other assigned projects.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction”? How is compliance monitored? What activities count as student/instructor substantive interaction”?</p>	<p>All UCI distance education programs comply with the federal expectation for “faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction.” UCI’s <a href="#">Teach Anywhere</a> provides faculty strategies and resources for effective online instruction.</p> <p>Programs employ various modalities, both synchronous and asynchronous for instructional content delivery. When synchronous, direct instruction and discussions are typical strategies. When asynchronous, coursework assessment, providing weekly information, online office hours (available for questions and discussions), email correspondence for questions, and group and sub-group online forums are typical strategies. Many programs also have an online help feature that contacts the faculty via Canvas LMS.</p> <p>Programs also provide their students with opportunities to provide feedback on their learning experiences. These range from weekly surveys, end-of-course surveys, end-of-program surveys, and alumni surveys to monitor both student satisfaction and workload. Students also are invited to focus groups with faculty to discuss how to improve programs. See the responses for “Faculty” and “Quality</p>	

	Assurance Process” items for additional information on ensuring faculty instructional quality.	
<i>Academic Engagement.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “Academic Engagement”? How is compliance monitored? What activities contribute to academic engagement?	<p>All students are required to actively participate in their respective programs. For courses that offer synchronous instructional content delivery, students are expected to attend, participate in discussions, make presentations, ask questions, and work in groups. For courses that offer asynchronous instructional content delivery, students are expected to: (a) view recorded lectures; (b) submit questions, assignments, projects, and presentations; (c) contribute to ongoing discussion forums; (d) take quizzes, surveys, and exams, (e) participate in study groups, group projects; and (f) interact with the instructor about their learning experiences. UCI’s <a href="#">Teach Anywhere</a> provides faculty strategies and resources for effective online instruction.</p> <p>Canvas analytics provide records of student attendance, student login, time spent online to view lectures, complete assignments, and exams. See the responses for “Curriculum and Delivery” and “Student Learning” for additional information on ensuring academic engagement.</p>	
<i>State Licensure Requirements.</i> Describe, as appropriate, the institution’s process for disclosing to students how state licensure requirements are met by distance education programs, whether licensure requirements are not met by programs, or whether the institution has not determined where licensure requirements are met by the programs.	<p>All degree programs are expected to timely and clearly disclose to students how state licensure requirements, as they are required by their respective accreditation organizations (e.g., California Commission on Teacher Credentialing). There is one UCI online degree programs that requires state licensure.</p> <p>The Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) program requires students to have an active, unrestricted California registered nurse license. This is a required element to get admitted into the program (i.e., documentation required) and is stated in the <a href="#">application process</a>.</p>	
<i>Student Identification</i>	All students are required to login to campus technology via personal <a href="#">NetID</a> and password. The sign-on is a two-step process through an	

<p><i>Verification.</i> What is the institution’s process for student verification, e.g., a secure login and pass code; proctored examinations; other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification?</p>	<p>application called <a href="#">Duo</a>, a multi-factor authentication application. It adds a second layer of protection by requiring the student to verify that it is the student after they login with their UCInetID and password. Typically, students use something they know (e.g., password) plus a second device (a smartphone or tablet). This extra layer of protection prevents anyone but the student from logging into their account.</p> <p>For written work, <a href="#">Turnitin</a> is used to authenticate original student work. For online exams, an application called <a href="#">Respondus</a> is used for security.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions’ online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>Retention and graduation data for UCI’s distance education degree programs may be reviewed through the <a href="#">campus data hub</a> (click Student Success Tab). For 2016-2021, the data shows comparable retention and graduation rates between distance education and similar in-person programs. For the 2016-2021 period, the MHCID and MLFD programs’ average first-year graduation rates were 95.9% and 92.2%, respectively. Below are additional details on two of UCI’s distance education degree programs:</p> <p><b>MHCID</b></p> <p>Below is a summary of the program’s graduation rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Year 1- 100% graduation rate (22 students)</li> <li>● Year 2- 92.8% graduation rate (26 of 28 students). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One student dropped out immediately upon entering the program. The other student was in good academic standing until the final quarter but received a failing grade for the final two courses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Year 3- 100% graduation rate (34 students)</li> <li>● Year 4- 100% graduation rate (37 students)</li> <li>● Year 5- 100% graduation rate (45 students)</li> <li>● Year 6- 100% graduation rate (32 students)</li> </ul> <p>The MHCID graduation percentage is at or above on-ground programs at UCI. The peer institutions that the UCI MHCID program directly competes with are, Georgia Tech, the University of Washington, the University of Michigan, the University of Maryland, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Carnegie Mellon University. Official graduation rates for these institutions are outside of the MHCID program’s knowledge.</p> <p><b>MLFP</b></p>	

	<p>The MLFP program collects demographic admission statistics as well as graduation rates. The program <a href="#">data</a> demonstrate a steady increase of applicants each year who are ethnically diverse and from various backgrounds. There are no evident disparities or concerns, and rates are comparable to onsite and online offerings within comparable programs at UCI.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p><a href="#">UCI's assessment process</a> for distance education and onsite degree programs is the same (i.e., CFR 2.6). In the fall of 2021, the faculty for graduate programs discussed the need to differentiate the assessment process for graduate programs, given different learning expectations and different types of graduate programs. As such, CAAR has been working with faculty and is piloting a new assessment review and report structure for graduate programs (for additional information, see Component 9, section IX.B.3., of UCI's institutional report). Below are additional details on two of UCI's distance education degree programs. In addition, see the programs' responses to "Quality Assurance Processes" item for additional information about how assessment results are used for program improvement.</p> <p><b>MHCID</b> The program's learning outcomes and assessment details are below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">MHCID Program Learning Outcomes Assessment</a></li> </ul> <p>Recent course and program improvements were completed through the assessment team led by Dr. Mimi Ito. In the first three years, the following changes were made to better meet the academic goals of the program and the needs of the profession: (1) A day of intensive training was added for students at the halfway point of the program. During this day, students choose one of three tracks (Design, Research, Development) to dive into deeply to provide additional education in specific areas to complement the cohort-based program that all students go through together. (2) In the second year of the program IN4MATX 282: Design and Prototyping was revamped to provide a more active learning style of engagement in the course with the same overall content and course learning objectives. (3) In the third year, IN4MATX 281: User Needs Analysis was similarly revamped to provide more active learning and professionally relevant examples with the same underlying goals and outcomes for design thinking and design education.</p> <p>The following improvements to the program took more time to implement and happened between the fourth and sixth cohort: How the program's capstone offerings and career development offerings were delivered, and IN4MATX 282 class was presented.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the capstones: as mentioned earlier, the program shifted mentoring resources to further aid the capstone process, adding “capstone advisers,” and changed professors for one of the two quarters, and how the teams were formed.</li> <li>● For the career development offerings, the program added a class solely focused on career development, IN4MATX 289.</li> <li>● For IN4MATX 282, the program replaced the professor and reworked the curriculum to be more industry focused.</li> </ul> <p><b>MLFP</b>  Course assessments are conducted in the Canvas learning management system. Courses that have online exams, utilize the proctoring service Respondus LockDown Browser and Monitor. Written submissions are evaluated for similarity with other services using Turnitin.com. In addition, faculty utilize online rubrics, narrative feedback, in-text markup, and peer review to provide feedback on student work. Student progress toward their degree is monitored quarterly, and success in each course is also evaluated annually (e.g., <a href="#">MLFP Capstone</a>).</p>	
<p>Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on Agreements with Unaccredited Entities?</p>	<p>As noted above, all applications used by the distance education degree programs undergo an extensive review process involving staff from OIT’s learning management, security, and business services teams; UCI Procurement; and the campus privacy office. Distance education programs do not outsource any of the courses’ delivery, development, or instruction. The faculty member teaching the course in collaboration with the instructional designer completes all aspects of course design and teaching. The program courses utilize university-approved educational technologies that go through a rigorous vetting process to make sure the vendor services fulfill the obligations and align with the campus mission. These include Canvas, Ed Discussion, Poll Everywhere, Qualtrics, Google Docs, Zoom, and more. The educational technology infrastructure is managed by the campus OIT/EEE team.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes.</i> How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What</p>	<p>All UCI degree programs undergo regular reviews by the Academic Senate (see <a href="#">CFR 2.7</a>, program review process). Tuition-based degree programs also undergo an additional Academic Senate review in year three of the program (i.e., <a href="#">Third Year Review</a>) to ensure quality and sustainability. A sample of reviews for the two distance education programs is below as well as additional information about their quality assurance processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">MHCID Review</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">MLFP Review</a></li> </ul>	

<p>evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p><b>MHCID</b></p> <p>In addition to the rigorous reviews by the academic senate, the program tracks exit surveys and alumni outcomes annually. Additionally, an extensive research study was done during the first three years of the program to ensure program quality, best practice alignment with distance education research, and program improvement.</p> <p><b>MLFP</b></p> <p>The program’s courses utilize several methods for evaluating the quality of courses. Students complete an <a href="#">end-of-year survey</a> and provide weekly feedback on the quality of the course. The weekly feedback generates a dashboard with both quantitative and qualitative data. This data is utilized to inform course refresh and updates. In addition, student performance informs course refresh and updates. For instance, when students struggle with an assessment, the assessment is modified in future iterations to either provide additional scaffolding or to improve the guidance. An example of this is from the course "Mental Health and the Law." Some students were struggling with creating a video-based presentation. As such, the instructional designer created a guide for the students to assist them with this assessment, which can be found here: <a href="#">Recording and Sharing a Presentation (for students) - Overview   Rise 360 (articulate.com)</a></p> <p>Initial course development is guided by the program’s <a href="#">draft guidelines</a> the program competencies, and best practices. In the future, the program plans to track course competencies across the program and also plan to utilize <a href="#">UCI’s Comprehensive Analytics for Student Success</a> (COMPASS) to inform course development and refresh and monitor program success.</p>	
---	---	--



**SECTION B: For Institutions Without Approved Distance Education Programs**

1. Courses reviewed (as appropriate; please list)
2. Nature of review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

<p><i>Nature of Online Learning Courses.</i> How do faculty use distance learning options in face-to-face courses e.g., blended learning, hybrid learning, hybrid flexible (hyflex), flipped classroom, or other instructional strategies that allow student/instructor separation? How extensive is distance learning in the curriculum?</p>		
<p><i>Faculty and Student Preparation for Distance Education.</i> What training is offered to faculty who incorporate distance learning in their courses? Can students request a distance learning option for onsite courses? How is their placement in the option determined? What orientation to distance education do students receive?</p>		
<p><i>Quality of the Distance Education Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the institution conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>		
<p><i>Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction”? How is compliance monitored? What activities count as student/instructor substantive interaction”?</p>		

<p><i>Academic Engagement.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “Academic Engagement”? How is compliance monitored? What activities contribute to academic engagement?</p>		
<p><i>Student Identification Verification.</i> What is the institution’s process for student verification, e.g., a secure login and pass code; proctored examinations; other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification?</p>		
<p><i>Quality Assurance.</i> What processes are in place to collect data from courses that use some type of remote learning? How are the findings used to improve instruction?</p>		

---

*Revised September 2022*