

PRELIMINARY SELF-REVIEW UNDER WASC STANDARDS

This summary reports the results of the University Planning Council's preliminary self-review under the four WASC standards of accreditation and the Criteria for Review (CFRs) under each standard. The self-review consisted of two parts: (1) to evaluate Santa Clara in relation to each CFR (see attached worksheet) and (2) to identify the two or three most important issues for review under each standard (see below).

By grouping related items, it appears that three general issues identified as needing most attention are (1) assessment of student learning outcomes, (2) diversity, and (3) various aspects of the teaching scholar model. These results are consistent with the results of the companion exercise, "What Really Matters on Your Campus?"

Twelve of 16 members of the University Planning Council provided responses included in this summary. CFRs identified by more than one respondent include:

- Eight mentions: 1.2 (educational objectives)
- Seven mentions: 1.5 (diversity), 3.2 (sufficient number and qualifications of faculty)
- Six mentions: 2.2 (undergraduate and graduate programs), 2.4/2.6 (assessment), 4.4 (quality assurance processes and use of assessment)
- Five mentions: 2.9 (linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, service)
- Four mentions: 1.3 (leadership system), 2.1 (appropriate programs and sufficient staffing), 3.3 (faculty workload and evaluation), 3.6/3.7 (information and technology resources), 4.1/4.2 (institutional planning and resource alignment), 4.3 (data in planning process and evidence of educational effectiveness)
- Two mentions: 2.8 (support for scholarship), 3.8 (organizational structures and decision-making), 3.11 (faculty leadership to ensure quality), 4.5 (institutional research capacities), 4.6 (commitment to improvement at all levels), 4.7 (inquiry into teaching and learning processes), 4.8 (involvement of stakeholders)

The full results are provided below. For each CFR identified, the number of respondents listing the CFR is provided, followed by their comments.

STANDARD ONE: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

CFR 1.2: Educational objectives (8)

- Educational objectives for graduate and professional programs

- Educational objectives particularly in light of the Core Curriculum review and Future Directions conversations
- Evidence for educational objectives
- How do we gather and evaluate *evidence* to ascertain level of achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives
- Articulating and measuring educational outputs, so that the focus is on evidence of impact, not the inputs
- Educational objectives – clarifying and publishing; indicators and evidence of achievement
- There is a need for more clearly articulated and widely shared goals concerning...educational purposes, the role of scholarship in the...academy as it relates to faculty engagement, faculty pedagogy and...institutional commitment to community and professional service

CFR 1.3: Leadership system (4)

- Department chair leadership and accountability
- Institutional leadership at all levels
- I think we have important “responsibility/accountability” issues to address

CFR 1.5: Diversity (7)

- How to achieve genuine diversity in both its narrow and wide connotations. How to have diversity reflected on all levels: Board of Trustees included
- Diversity is a key issue: spotty record of commitment
- Increasing attention to diversity
- We have important diversity issues to address, especially related to faculty and students – the latter includes the issue of admission and financial aid strategies
- Response to increasing diversity in society/globally
- Student and faculty diversity

STANDARD TWO: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

CFR 2.1: Appropriate programs and sufficient staffing (4)

- Use of term faculty in grad programs
- Number and composition of faculty
- % contribution by faculty who are not full time tenure track

CFR 2.2: Undergraduate and graduate degree programs (6)

- Core curriculum
- Efficacy of the Core Curriculum. Are students getting what we say they are getting?
- Competence, conscience, and compassion (1)
- Educational objectives in grad programs, admissions and quality of grad programs, relation of grad programs to purpose and character of the institution
- Graduating students of competence
- Clarification and communication of educational objectives/competencies

CFRs 2.4/2.6: Assessment (6)

- Assessment of student learning – course *and* program levels
- Evaluation of student learning: How do we know the above on an ongoing basis?
- Development and assessment of learning outcomes at program level
- Attainment of expectations for student learning
- Postgraduate data on employment, grad school placement, student satisfaction
- Establishing a more systematic assessment of student learning

CFR 2.8: Support for scholarship (2)

- Support for scholarship in the teaching/scholar model
- Supporting scholarship

CFR 2.9: Linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, and service (5)

- Teaching scholar model
- Faculty time: How can we link scholarship and student learning/teaching more realistically/effectively?
- Faculty must link expected levels of learning and the curriculum and preparation of students for professional practice

CFR 2.13: Student support services (1)

Unclear or Multiple CFRs under Standard 2:

- Diversity
- Helpful and effective program reviews
- Conducting a rigorous program review
- Grade inflation

STANDARD THREE: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

CFR 3.2: Faculty sufficient in number and qualifications (7)

- Unhealthy reliance on lecturers (AYL and QPT faculty) in College
- Full-time vs. part-time faculty question, and performance management of academic administrators
- Size and composition of faculty
- Number of full-time faculty
- Review question of need for more FT faculty vs. adjuncts
- Build faculty – through new and lateral hires – in key areas

CFR 3.3: Faculty workload, incentive, and evaluation practices (4)

- Inconsistent evaluation processes for non-continuing faculty in College
- Develop plan for faculty workload analysis and implement a faculty workload plan designed to support institutional goals in pedagogy, scholarship and professional service

CFR 3.5: Fiscal and physical resources (1)

- Financial resources (endowment)

CFRs 3.6/ 3.7: Information and technology resources (4)

- Technology on campus
- IT put together with string and chewing gum?

CFR 3.8: Organizational structures and decision-making (2)

- Governance model involves excess stress on scarce faculty resources?

CFR 3.11: Faculty leadership to ensure quality (2)

- Faculty leadership and policy committees are passive about quality

Unclear or Multiple CFRs under Standard 3:

- Teaching scholar model

STANDARD FOUR: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

CFRs 4.1/4.2: Institutional planning and resource alignment (4)

- Strategic plan – update and review of implementation
- Planning and budget processes need to be connected
- Engage faculty and key administrative staff in a thoughtfully ambitious strategic plan [for the school]
- Advance institutional planning processes in preparation for accreditation review and long range strategic plan

CFR 4.3: Data in planning processes and evidence of educational effectiveness (4)

- I think we could be more systematic in our collection and use of data
- Use of data in planning processes
- Use of data to inform planning processes; dissemination of data for use in program improvement

CFR 4.4: Quality assurance processes and use of assessment (6)

- Assessment for institutional effectiveness
- Assessing educational objectives
- Are assessment results used to “revise” and “improve”? Do we *close the loop*?
- Develop appropriate system for assessment of key performance indicators of student learning and faculty productivity

CFR 4.5: Institutional research capacities (2)

CFR 4.6: Commitment to improvement by leadership at all levels (2)

CFR 4.7: Inquiry into processes of teaching and learning (2)

- Continual reflection on teaching and learning

CFR 4.8: Involvement of stakeholders (2)

- [I think we could be more systematic in] our consultation with external stakeholders
- Alums and employers evaluate, but only through trustees and advisory boards (which is not a problem)

Unclear or multiple CFRs under Standard 4:

- How do we improve consistently?
- Culture of evidence and improvement