



February 2, 2004

Robert M. Berdahl  
Chancellor  
Office of the Chancellor  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dear Chancellor Berdahl:

Enclosed is a copy of the final team report, based on the visit on October 15-17, 2003. The team reports will be acted on during the February 19-20, 2004 meeting of the Commission at The Fairmont San Jose, 170 South Market Street, phone (408) 998-1900.

The University of California, Berkeley is scheduled on the agenda of the Commission on February 19, 2004 at 4-5 p.m.. We encourage your attendance at this meeting so that you may interact with members of the Commission and review with them your response to the team report and evaluation of the visit. Please return the attached form indicating your intention to attend the meeting on February 19.

Your institution's report will be heard by a Commission panel, comprised of James Appleton, Carmen Decker, Larry Gould, Marvalene Hughes, Frank Lazarus, Tim Robinson, and Steadman Upham. The enclosed pamphlet, "*Commission Meeting Guide*" describes how the Commission conducts its institutional reviews:

The Commission will appreciate an written acknowledgment of receipt of this final report, together with your statement of any points on which you wish to comment or with which you disagree. Absent such a statement, I will assume that the institution finds no errors in the final report. If you plan to submit a written statement for the Commission's review, please fax it to the office as soon as possible.

985 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 100  
Alameda, CA 94501  
PHONE: 510.748.9001  
FAX: 510.748.9797  
E-MAIL: [wascstf@wascsenior.org](mailto:wascstf@wascsenior.org)  
INTERNET: [www.wascweb.org](http://www.wascweb.org)

**CHAIR**  
James R. Appleton  
*University of Redlands*

**VICE CHAIR**  
Louanne Kennedy  
*California State University,  
Northridge*

Mark Bookman  
*University of Judaism*

Barbara Cambridge  
*American Association for Higher  
Education*

Kenyon S. Chan  
*Loyola Marymount University*

Carmen Maldonado Decker  
*Fullerton College*

Lawrence Gould  
*Public Member*

Diane F. Halpern  
*Claremont McKenna College*

Marvalene Hughes  
*California State University,  
Stanislaus*

Frank Lazarus  
*University of San Diego*

Sherwood G. Lingenfelter  
*Fuller Theological Seminary*

Christina Maslach  
*University of California, Berkeley*

Hugo Morales  
*Public Member*

Thomas H. Robinson  
*Porter Unified School District*

Beverly P. Ryder  
*Public Member*

John B. Simpson  
*University of California,  
Santa Cruz*

Mary Kay Tetreault  
*Portland State University*

Rose Y. Tseng  
*University of Hawaii, Hilo*

Steadman Upham  
*Claremont Graduate University*

John D. Welty  
*California State University, Fresno*

W. Atom Yee  
*Santa Clara University*

**STAFF**  
Ralph A. Wolff  
*Executive Director*

Stephanie R. Bangert  
*Associate Director*

Elizabeth Griego  
*Associate Director*

Gregory M. Scott  
*Associate Director*

Robert R. Benedetti  
*Adjunct Associate Director*

Lily S. Owyang  
*Adjunct Associate Director*

Thomas J. Gallagher  
*Finance & Operations Manager*

Robert Berdahl  
February 2, 2004  
Page 2

An important aspect of the accreditation process is the use of the team report by the institution. The report should be disseminated within the institution and discussed by those who participated in the development of the institutional presentation. It also may be made public by the institution to the extent you wish. According to Commission policy, the institution should avoid quoting only those portions of the report favorable to itself.

As part of our commitment to make the accrediting process as effective as possible, we evaluate each accreditation visit. We are therefore sending the Accreditation Liaison Officer an evaluation form by email to complete and return.

We look forward to interacting with you at the February Commission meeting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ralph A. Wolff" with a small "ph" or similar mark at the end.

Ralph A. Wolff  
Executive Director

RW:brn

Enclosures

Cc: Charles R. Upshaw

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM  
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW  
To the University of California, Berkeley

October 14-16, 2003

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

**Team Roster**

**David Ward, Chair**

**Jon Wergin, Assistant Chair**

**Gene Awakuni**

**Denise Bielby**

**Susan Forman**

**Douglas Hesse**

**Charles Nelms**

**Lee Shulman**

**J. Fredericks Volkwein**

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution according to Commission Standards and Core Commitments and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

## I. Overview and Context

### A. Description of Institution and Visit

The Organic Act of March 23, 1868, chartered the University of California, Berkeley as a public, state-supported, land-grant institution of higher education. The university was written into the State Constitution as a public trust to be administered under the authority of an independent governing board, the Regents of the University of California. The University was “blanketed into” membership in 1949 in the Western College Association. The University received accreditation in 1952 and has enjoyed continuous accreditation since then with reaffirmations in 1955 and 1960 by WCA, and 1965, 1970, 1980, 1985, and 1990 by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, which was created by the WCA in 1962.

The WASC Preparatory Review took place in 2002. The visiting team for the Review (including current members Ward, Wergin, and Nelms) conducted a site visit during October 29-31, 2002, and its report was considered and acted upon at the February, 2003, meeting of the Commission. In July, 2003, the university filed its Educational Effectiveness report, and the visiting team for this review conducted its visit during October 14-16, 2003.

### B. Quality of the Educational Effectiveness Presentation

In its Institutional Proposal, the university identified three broad areas for investigation in the Educational Effectiveness Review: (1) enhancing academic engagement at a large public research university; (2) rethinking the delivery of education; and (3) improving undergraduate program review. Quoting from the *UC Berkeley Educational Effectiveness Report*:

The Academic Engagement Working Group and the Delivery of Education Working Group were established to address the first two topics. These groups were chaired by faculty members and composed of faculty, students (graduate and undergraduate), and staff. For the third topic, Program Review, the campus made use of the existing Academic Program Review Working Group, a joint Academic Senate/administration committee that had been charged separately by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, but whose work overlapped with the WASC self-study. The Steering Committee, consisting of the chairs of each of the Working Groups, members of the Academic Senate, and key administrators involved in the WASC process, oversaw the self-study process, and a Distinguished Advisory Group provided additional input. (p. 2)

Beginning in early 2002 the university began identifying potential topics for more intensive investigation, and by the time of the Preparatory Review in October had approved four of these for inclusion in the final report: Preparing Students for Successful Capstone Experiences; Reinventing Large-Enrollment Courses; Enhancing the Culture of Teaching; and Improving Academic Program Review.

The Educational Effectiveness Report includes a brief introduction; four essays developed by the Working Groups, together with a set of exhibits designed to provide more detailed evidence of educational effectiveness organized around the chosen topics; and a conclusion which discusses “some of the common crosscutting issues that emerged in this

investigation, ... areas for continued growth and development, and ... how the institution will move forward to sustain and extend the work undertaken to date.” (p. 3)

The team was impressed with the quality of the university’s presentation of its Educational Effectiveness review. Just as it was with Berkeley’s Preparatory Review, the team was encouraged by Berkeley’s willingness to address difficult problems. Further, the team was struck by the vitality of those assigned to work on both the Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review: clearly these are people engaged in what they perceive to be important work to the institution, and are not simply going through a purely accreditation exercise. The narrative is clear and straightforward; the text displays a consistent style and point of view; and with few exceptions, assertions are supported by appropriate documentation. On-line exhibits are extensive and cross-referenced to pertinent essays. The review also addresses most of the concerns expressed by the Preparatory Review team in 2002.

Most noteworthy is the tangible commitment of the academic leadership, in the form of hiring a faculty member of high stature in the Berkeley community as vice provost for undergraduate education, and giving her a broad mandate for change. Other important initiatives include the creation of mid-level structures, such as the Council of Academic Partners and educational technology services, to support the undergraduate mission; recognition for faculty via a Presidential chair in undergraduate education; and continuing support of the Mellon Faculty Fellowship designed to help Berkeley faculty explore creative and effective ways to partner with the University Library and other academic support units to bring research to the classroom. All of these efforts are aligned with a culture at Berkeley that respects the professional autonomy and entrepreneurial spirit of academic units and individual faculty members.

The team also observes, however, that the intellectual energy that went into the reflective essays may not necessarily translate into energy for change. The Recommendations listed after each essay are not especially bold ones: in most cases the university proposes strategies intended to identify and support excellence and to create connections. While the team supports these strategies as consistent with the Berkeley culture, it is also concerned about the tentative language used in the text supporting the recommendations (“We want to...”. “We are investigating...”, “The campus could...”), as well as a lack of any specific action plan for carrying out these recommendations. In its conclusion to the Educational Effectiveness Report the campus cites various initiatives already underway (e.g., Strategic Academic Plan, Campus Community Initiative, New Ideas Initiative, Commission on Undergraduate Education), but does not indicate how the WASC recommendations will complement these.

### C. Preparatory Review Update

In 2002 the university underwent a WASC Preparatory Review and the visiting team stated the following in its “Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations”:

- “The University is fortunate to have people in key positions who are committed to working on campus issues of educational effectiveness. In particular, the Academic Senate, a crucial lever for change at Berkeley, has impressive and articulate faculty in positions of leadership. The team also met with numerous other faculty, staff, and students who are capable of influencing positive change. This is a propitious time for Berkeley to take the lead in defining ‘quality undergraduate learning’ for a prestigious research university, in a way that reflects more than just cardboard rhetoric.

- “The team found many ‘pockets of excellence’ in undergraduate teaching and learning at Berkeley. Now is the time to take these good ideas and ‘scale up’ to a more integrated University vision.
- “Current plans pay little attention to diversity as a means of increasing engagement in the undergraduate experience. Diversity is a strength at Berkeley and should be recognized as an important resource for student learning.
- “Obvious connections exist among program review, assessment of teaching, and assessment of learning outcomes; and between work on accreditation and the campus strategic plan. Coordination of these connections should be more explicit; in particular the University should be clearer about how priorities will be set, and how energy for accreditation and strategic planning might become more complementary and mutually-reinforcing.” (pp. 9-10)

The current team reviewing Educational Effectiveness would make these same observations one year later. In particular, our team underscores the need for the university to “scale out” from its many pockets of excellence to a vision that positions Berkeley as a leader in undergraduate teaching and learning among prestigious research institutions. The team found only spotty evidence of plans to do this, although to be fair the time between the Preparatory review and submission of the Educational Effectiveness report was short, less than seven months. Similarly, diversity receives only passing attention in the Educational Effectiveness report, and the connections among program review, assessment of teaching, and assessment of learning outcomes remain unclear. The team has more to say about these points under Part II, below.

## II. Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness

### A. Evaluation of the Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Inquiry

*General comments.* Berkeley’s Educational Effectiveness Report demonstrates that the campus takes seriously a concern for the undergraduate experience. The campus has initiated some important innovations and has begun to build an infrastructure which, while not yet fully implemented, should allow for a more systematic documentation of student learning outcomes. Still, virtually all of the work on documenting learning outcomes remains at the individual course level. “Scaling out” from individual exemplars (that is, diffusing good ideas more broadly throughout the institution) has yet to be demonstrated. Berkeley does not have an effective program review process as yet. Campus leadership recognizes that the process is dated, no longer as timely or effective as desired. The campus is just beginning to put a new process in place, and much work is to be done to make it more efficient, effective, and consequential.

The team has these more specific observations about the four points of focus contained in the institutional report:

#### 1. Capstone experiences

Berkeley has developed a good model for undergraduate research experience (the 3-stage “explore/experience/capstone” model), a model which should be communicated more broadly.

Because a common understanding of the meaning and purpose of “capstone” does not exist on campus, however, work is needed to flesh out a definition of “capstone experience” as a culmination of liberal learning. The undergraduate experience at Berkeley is highly variable and so the capstone notion is quite new. The team found a disconnect between what was written in the report and the understandings of faculty members connected with the profiled programs. Some informants even said they were unfamiliar with the term “capstone.” Hence the team believes that “capstone” may not be the most appropriate term to use, if it is understood to be roughly synonymous with “undergraduate research.” The two terms overlap, but they are not the same.

Relatively few real examples of how this model has been applied in practice are given in the report, leading the team to wonder about the variability of experience among those Berkeley students who report having engaged in “undergraduate research.”

The team concurs with the Challenges noted by the Working Group, especially the following, which apply not only to undergraduate research but to the improvement of undergraduate education generally:

- “The tendency for undergraduate research innovations to be isolated and the result of individual faculty entrepreneurs rather than coordinated efforts to promote innovative curricular and co-curricular change at the departmental, college, or campus level.
- “A lack of infrastructure for faculty to share pedagogical strategies and practices in working with undergraduates on research activities.
- “A lack of a well-developed incentive/reward system for faculty that communicates the value and importance of undergraduate research mentoring.
- “A lack of assessment mechanisms to help us track both participation in and learning effectiveness of undergraduate research on both a local and campus-wide level.”

The team would add another challenge to those already listed: The university needs to be mindful of the impact of higher student costs on student participation in undergraduate research. Such costs have an adverse impact on students who must work to be able to study at Cal. Financial barriers like these discourage some deserving students from participating in academic enhancement programs.

The team endorses the recommendations of this Working Group, particularly #10: **“Improve campus-wide mechanisms for tracking participation in undergraduate research, assessing how well we are meeting our objectives for students, and evaluating the impact of such experiences on student learning.”** At Berkeley, examples of academic excellence are everywhere. The key question however is, how many students benefit from these exemplary programs? How many, in contrast, spend their entire undergraduate career without the benefit of significant academic engagement of any sort, including undergraduate research? Many universities are promoting undergraduate research, but little is known about its effects on students, especially effects on learning. Given its tradition of using undergraduate research as one of its hallmarks of undergraduate education, Berkeley could be a national leader in research on its outcomes.

## 2. Reinventing large-enrollment courses

The Educational Effectiveness report notes that nearly all freshmen (98%) enroll in at least one class of more than 200 students during their first year at Berkeley, and the mean number of large classes is more than four per student. Given the well-documented limitations of the lecture format on engaging students in their learning, the university is to be commended for taking on such a huge part of most students' undergraduate experience. The team endorses as well the Core Values guiding the thinking of this Working Group.

The team found creative and innovative pedagogical approaches in all four pilots (anthropology, computer science, history and physics), and had the opportunity to obtain direct evidence of impact in the anthropology and physics courses. The team was impressed with how faculty in these courses used technology and collaborative learning strategies to shift from a primarily information-dissemination model of instruction to a more problem-based model. Support from the university's technological infrastructure was first-rate in all cases. The team was impressed also with how the Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) Teaching and Resource Center had helped GSIs reconfigure their roles from "lecturer" to "coach."

The team concurs with the Challenges noted by the Working Group, and observes that most of these challenges have less to do with the availability of resources and ideas than they do with the difficulty of initiating and sustaining change. Such innovations as those described in the report are seen by many faculty as risky endeavors which take a great deal of time to develop, and are not likely to be sufficiently acknowledged by the academic community anyway. Thus, in addition to the Working Group's recommendations which deal primarily with providing more incentives and resources for individual faculty members, the team recommends the following as well:

- The university should develop a plan for broad diffusion of good practices, focusing on scalability and sustainability. It should look across large enrollment courses to identify common issues and top-priority strategies, and identify benchmarks against which to measure progress.
- The university should assess the extent to which faculty and other members of the campus community are taking full advantage of the remarkable resources provided by Educational Technology Services (ETS).

## 3. Culture of teaching

The team is impressed by, and strongly endorses, the Core Values guiding good teaching at Berkeley. The team agrees that these values, once widely disseminated, should be used to shape future efforts to provide a more supportive environment for teaching.

The team also concurs with the Challenges facing enhancement of the teaching culture, and with the Recommendations therefrom, and would like to amplify several of the Recommendations, as follows:

**“#1. Improve overall communication among programs and strengthen the infrastructure.”**

The team found evidence both of useful innovation in individual courses and of fledgling structures that support good teaching. The cases presented by the Working Group are worth emulating and growing elsewhere on campus. The team was especially impressed with the

efforts of the Council of Academic Partners, a highly energetic group that is committed to following through on this recommendation. An especially important part of the teaching infrastructure at Berkeley is the Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) Teaching and Resource Center, which in the team's opinion is a model for GSI development programs everywhere. The team notes that the Center is expanding its mission through its summer institute for academic and professional development, which helps prepare future faculty for the multiple roles they will be called upon to play in the academy, including but not limited to the teaching role. This effort fits with national trends and programs such as Preparing Future Faculty. The team encourages the Center to continue activities like the summer institute.

**“#4. Make the assessment of student learning more central to the culture of teaching.”** The university has made progress with respect to evaluating the quality of instruction, but much remains to be done. What is missing is commitment to the *quality of the evidence* used for evaluation. Although the University has begun to move beyond self-reported evidence about student learning, more work needs to be done to gather other forms of evidence.

The Service Learning Research and Development Center, as the nation's first university-based research center to focus its research exclusively on Service-Learning, could take the lead in investigating more closely the links between student engagement through S-L (and other recent innovations in college pedagogy), and the quality of student learning.

Initiatives in the assessment of student learning are hampered by the lack of consistent rewards and incentives for excellence in teaching. The culture of evidence for teaching effectiveness should parallel that for faculty scholarship. The case studies presented in the campus report suggest that the campus needs to move to deeper culture of evidence about teaching practice, just as it already has with the assessment of scholarly practice. Significant researchable questions exist about teaching and learning relationships in a large research university, and an opportunity exists at Berkeley to do important work.

**“#6. Seek and make more prominent extramural grant funding for teaching and learning.”** The Mellon Fellowship Program shows promise as a vehicle for increasing active learning approaches across the Berkeley campus. However, without a significant infusion of funds and without a means of sustaining fellows' involvement beyond the term of their workshop/stipend, the team is concerned that this vehicle and others may simply be too small to carry the whole campus very far.

*In sum*, Berkeley has taken some early and necessary steps to demonstrate a serious commitment to developing a “culture of teaching” on campus. If the university aspires to become a leader among national research universities in undergraduate education (as the team believes it is poised to do), then it must not only sustain and extend these initiatives but also foster a deeper culture of evidence about teaching and learning.

#### 4. Program review

Unlike the other three topics investigated for the Educational Effectiveness Report, program review has been the focus of both the institution's Educational Effectiveness and Preparatory Reviews. Because of its key links to academic quality, and the general dissatisfaction with its effectiveness at Berkeley, program review has received more attention in

both reviews than any other campus issue. The visiting team said this in its report on Berkeley's Preparatory Review (2002):

The team concurred that successful program review lies at the heart of any campus reform of undergraduate teaching and learning. The team has several reasons for this emphasis. First, program review at Berkeley is faculty-driven, and this is an important and critical advantage... Second, given the culture of decentralization on campus, program review can serve as a lever for change in departments and other academic program units. Third, the shift in attention on campus to program review at the undergraduate level provides a means by which Berkeley can encourage academic units to think more carefully about student learning, in ways that make sense for individual academic disciplines. Accordingly, the team applauds campus efforts to broaden the scope of program review beyond the graduate level, and beyond an emphasis on "reputational" criteria and similar measures. The team endorses the regularization of the program review process so that it can be accomplished in a shorter time frame and underscores the importance of face-to-face meetings of the review team, departmental representatives, and the Provost's Office as a way of making reviews more consequential. (p. 7)

Reform of program review at Berkeley has had two major purposes: 1) to develop clearer guidelines for the review of undergraduate programs and to create more integration between undergraduate and graduate program review; and 2) to remedy the protracted and burdensome timeline and administrative structure for academic program review and to provide improved support for departments undergoing review, especially around the delivery and analysis of data.

Progress on these reforms has been slow. The Working Group has promulgated a set of Core Values, which the team strongly supports. Especially noteworthy among these values is the determination to keep the process faculty-driven and flexible with respect to departmental needs. The university has yet to adopt new program review guidelines, however, and the report contains an example of only one program – Women's Studies – which was reviewed under "Interim Guidelines."

As campus leaders will readily acknowledge, much work remains to be done to make program review at Berkeley an integral part of academic quality assurance. The team endorses all nine of the Working Group's recommendations, implementation of which will be a significant step forward. The team also believes that implementation should not wait until "the economic climate improves" (p. 46)! To the contrary, program review can be an effective means of helping the university identify where best to invest scarce resources.

The team wishes to amplify on the following campus recommendations:

- #1: Create a permanent joint Academic Senate/administration committee, with appropriate staff support, to oversee the academic program review process;**
- #4: Convene a single external review committee with an internal Academic Senate liaison; and**
- #7: Streamline the process that occurs after an academic program review has taken place, clarifying who needs to read and comment on the report and in what timeframe.**

At present, program review at Berkeley is a hopelessly ponderous process. The amount of “cycle time” requiring rigorous – but rigid and time consuming – reviews by the Academic Senate present huge demands on faculty time, making it all but impossible to undertake more than four to five reviews per year. Implementation of the above recommendations would speed the process considerably, as would giving more emphasis to yearly reviews at the college or school level, thus making the seven-year reviews less onerous for the academic unit.

**#2: Identify an institutional home for the academic program review process to be centrally coordinated within a single administrative unit;**

**#8: Assure that the relevant Deans are involved in follow-up actions as a result of the academic program review report; and**

**#9: Create a mechanism for regular follow-up that will enable the campus to evaluate progress and outcomes resulting from recommended actions.**

One of the difficulties with retrofitting program review policies which have previously had a largely graduate focus – and thus which have had an emphasis on national research rankings and how to improve them – is a diffuse administrative responsibility for implementing and monitoring these policies. The Deans have traditionally had only a weak role in the process. There is neither accountability for follow-through of recommended actions, nor a clear relationship between program review and resource allocation/ institutional long range planning. Further, no formal connection exists with the exacting faculty review process and thus no clear tie between the work of individuals and work of their academic units. Finally, the yearly turnover of faculty leadership in the Academic Senate means that implementation of program review will depend upon the extent to which the Divisional Council, especially the Chair, takes it seriously. Implementing the above recommendations by placing administrative coordination and accountability within the Provost’s Office, giving the academic deans a greater stake in the process by enlisting their help in setting the agenda, and holding both administrators and academic units responsible for following through on negotiated action plans stemming from the review, should go a long way toward making program review more consequential.

**#6: Provide sufficient resources to ensure timely periodic reviews of academic units every seven years as recommended by the Academic Senate.**

Based on interviews with representatives from departments which have either recently completed or are in the process of completing their program review cycle, the team believes that the issue is less about providing “sufficient resources” than it is about coordination of these resources. As many as five separate offices of “institutional research” exist at Berkeley. Together these sources are able to provide a rich array of data to departments for their self-studies, but faculty report that not only do issues of “data ownership” frequently arise when dealing with these offices, but also the statistics they provide sometimes conflict. The interim guidelines state explicitly which information is to be provided by which office, but apparently some confusion exists about who is responsible for insuring the delivery of these data. Centralizing the administrative function for program review in the Provost’s Office should also lead to centralization of data management services, in ways initially recommended by the Preparatory Review team:

The team observes that while accomplishments to date are impressive, institutional research staff could be used more effectively than they are now. One way to assure most effective contributions is to have analysts as active participants on committees developing policies to which data can contribute. This is happening already, and should be continued. Another way is to invite institutional research staff to volunteer analyses of data to policy makers in the form of short, *ad hoc* analytical papers that are pertinent to current campus issues, and demonstrate the utility of data as a means of stimulating important conversations and supporting a culture of inquiry on campus. A barrier to doing this, especially with student data, is the fragmentation of institutional research among several offices, with three institutional-level offices dealing with student data alone. Each office may not feel “authorized” to step forward and volunteer analyses until asked. Somewhat more centralization, or at least a more systematic way for the offices to communicate and coordinate their efforts, could be helpful in addressing this problem. (pp. 6-7)

At present, program review at Berkeley does not completely satisfy the new WASC criteria. This deficiency will be resolved, however, if the recommendations of the campus’ own Working Group are fully implemented.

#### B. Evaluation of the Institution’s Systems for Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness and Learning Results

The team has already commented on the challenges of creating “systems for enhancing teaching effectiveness and learning results” in an institution as large, complex, and decentralized as Berkeley. It is clear that the Working Groups and others who put the Educational Effectiveness Report together recognized this as well. In its Conclusion to the Report the campus notes that it “has not fully articulated and embraced a shared vision of what we expect our undergraduates to take away from a Berkeley education” (p. 47). The team believes that “articulating and embracing a shared vision” of student learning outcomes is critical to enhancing the quality of student learning at Berkeley. The team therefore strongly endorses the current efforts by the Vice Provost and the Council of Undergraduate Deans to draft a statement of desired learning outcomes. Once vetted and established, this document will “provide the conceptual structure to integrate the many pieces of the undergraduate experience, identify gaps and shortcomings, guide new initiatives, and provide the basis for evaluation of student outcomes” (p. 48).

Both the Preparatory Review team and the current Educational Effectiveness Review team have commented on the need to improve campus coordination of data collection, analysis, and dissemination. The team wishes to emphasize the word *coordination*. A wide array of data sources exist already; these include the Quality of Undergraduate Education Assessment Project (QUEAP), the Career Destination Survey, the Performance Metrics project (an exemplary model, well worth emulating at other universities), the Institutional Data Gateway project, and the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). The team was impressed by the departmental profiles presented during its campus visit, and with the promise such presentations hold for generating fresh questions about departmental assumptions and purposes. These resources should be consolidated, with appropriate oversight by the Provost’s Office, into a single resource for information about student learning. The proposed campus “catalog” of undergraduate education data, and a Web-based undergraduate education annual report, is a step in the right

direction. The team would urge the campus to compile these resources in a way that would help academic units undertake their *own* inquiries about student learning.

### III. Summary of Team Conclusions and Major Recommendations From the Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review

The team recognizes the strength and genius of the “Berkeley Way” – a commitment to academic quality through individual excellence, strong faculty governance, and a decentralized administration. These qualities should not be diluted as the institution moves forward with the recommendations contained in its own Educational Effectiveness Review. The challenge will be to continue balancing administrative and faculty leadership so that the University of California, Berkeley might accomplish the goals to which it aspired in its Institutional Proposal:

- “Continue to strengthen our capabilities for capturing critical data and using it as part of our institutional decision-making processes...
- “Move the campus’s undergraduate education agenda forward in relation to four key objectives: 1) enhancing students’ academic engagement and interaction with faculty; 2) increasing opportunities for capstone experiences; 3) optimizing teaching resources to enhance educational quality and student learning; and 4) helping instructors teach with excellence...
- “Regularize and institutionalize the departmental review process to ensure that both graduate and undergraduate programs receive distinct focus and attention...
- “Focus campus attention on how best to assess student learning outcomes...
- “Develop feedback mechanisms to involve Berkeley faculty more fully with the assessment and improvement of teaching and learning.” (p. 2)

The team wishes to commend Berkeley in the following ways:

1. For the commitment shown to undergraduate education in its Educational Effectiveness Report; for hiring a visible senior administrator for undergraduate education with clout with both the administration and the faculty; and for a resolve not to let recent budget cuts undermine the power of what has been done to date.
2. For using the WASC process as an occasion for serious reflection on educational practice. The team recognizes that the Educational Effectiveness report does not fully capture all of the work that has been done.
3. For innovations in educational practice which have proceeded remarkably well: these include freshman seminars, undergraduate research, Service-Learning, large-class teaching, the E-Berkeley Symposium, and GSI training.
4. For the beginnings of some “cross-wiring” of campus resources, such as the Council of Academic Partners and Educational Technology Services.

The team has these observations and recommendations (in **bold**):

1. *Priorities and budget challenges.* Undergraduate education is embedded in the core values of the institution, and so **attention to undergraduate education should remain a priority at Berkeley**. Many of the initiatives noted throughout the report are potential objects of private fund raising.

2. *Continuity of governance agendas.* **Attention to undergraduate education should not be compromised by the vicissitudes of changes in personnel**, especially in the Academic Senate. The campus should ensure that transitions in leadership allow for follow through of long-term projects.
3. *Administrative infrastructure.* **A decentralized culture like Berkeley's requires a nimble central administration**, one that not only negotiates key initiatives and creates resources for furthering them, but also **with the authority to fix problems and see that commitments are followed through.** The more the "Berkeley Way" is followed the more centralized the support services need to be. This is especially true for data gathering functions, where "one stop shopping" for accurate information will benefit faculty and staff alike.
4. *Diversity.* Pluralism is a source of identity and quality in the Berkeley experience, and adds to the vitality of undergraduate education. **Work towards diversity goals should not be curtailed as result of cuts in outreach budgets.**
5. *Culture of excellence.* Berkeley should not turn away from its culture of individual excellence, but neither should it become a prisoner to it. Instead it should **harness that culture of excellence so that faculty have a stronger sense of the whole.** Initiatives already underway through such groups as the Council of Academic Partners give the term "scaling up" real meaning. Recent experiences with such events as the E-Berkeley Symposium demonstrate the power of learning from one's colleagues as a force for change.
6. *Student learning.* Berkeley has made significant progress in elevating the culture of teaching. The campus is ready now to **focus seriously, and with equivalent creativity, on campus-wide student learning outcomes.** Clarity about outcomes is essential to effective practice, and the team hopes that the assessment initiatives described in the Conclusion to the Educational Effectiveness Report will be followed through. The team also suggests that the campus engage in more "benchmark" discussions about what "success" and "learning effectiveness" mean at Berkeley. Berkeley is well-positioned to engage in scholarship on student learning, addressing such issues as the connection between undergraduate research and liberal learning outcomes, and the role of non-cognitive learning, such as commitment to public service, as a desirable outcome. The team understands that the university is under pressure from the legislature to be more "productive" in undergraduate education, and a way to respond to such pressure is to **engage in more creative discussions about deployment of faculty resources.**
7. *Program review.* **It is time that reform of program review at Berkeley be brought to closure.** The Core Values undergirding the proposed revisions are sound, as are the proposed policies and procedures themselves. The team recommends that **the nine recommendations proposed by the Program Review Working Group be implemented forthwith.**
8. *Transparency.* For too long research universities have not made public their commitment to quality student learning. **Many good things in undergraduate education are happening at Berkeley, and it should let the rest of higher education know about it.** Institutions like Berkeley have a special kind of duty to the larger academic community to serve as examples for others to emulate, and the University of California, Berkeley should take this responsibility seriously in the enhancement and promotion of good educational practice.

Success with future WASC reviews will turn on how well Berkeley is able to reform program review, articulate and embrace a shared vision of student learning outcomes, and otherwise pursue the recommendations contained in its own Educational Effectiveness report. The team wishes the campus well as it undertakes this good work.