

## Interim Report

**Name of Institution:** University of California, Merced

**Person Submitting the Report:** Laura Martin, ALO

**Report Submission Date:** February 26, 2014

---

### Table of Contents & Report Organization

I. STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION .....	1
II. LIST OF TOPICS ADDRESSED IN THIS REPORT .....	2
III. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT .....	3
IV. RESPONSE TO ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMISSION .....	5
A. ISSUE 1: FINANCIAL STABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY.....	5
B. ISSUE 2: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW.....	9
C. ISSUE 3: RETENTION AND GRADUATION.....	15
V. IDENTIFICATION OF OTHER CHANGES AND ISSUES CURRENTLY FACING THE INSTITUTION .....	24
VI. CONCLUDING STATEMENT .....	26
VII. LIST OF EVIDENTIARY APPENDICES.....	27

**Report organization:** UC Merced’s Interim Report consists of responses to the required topics (Sections I-VI in the Table of Contents above), together with a set of evidentiary Appendices. Appendices are referenced by number throughout the report narrative, and are available by number in one of two companion PDF files. Appendices that are available online can also be reached via the hyperlinked Appendix number in the report text. A list of Appendices is provided in Section VII of the report. We have tried to minimize appended material, for example, by providing illustrative examples or executive summaries of reports.

The report also includes hyperlinked text (in addition to the Appendices). These links, which provide supplemental information, context or easy access to a relevant resource (e.g. our Commission Action Letter), are offered as an optional resource to readers.

## I. Statement on Report Preparation

*Briefly describe in narrative form the process of report preparation, providing the names and titles of those involved. Because of the focused nature of an Interim Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of all institutional constituencies is not normally required. Faculty, administrative staff, and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the report. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the governing board, should review the report before it is submitted to WASC, and such reviews should be indicated in this statement.*

This Interim Report was prepared by the [Interim Report Steering Committee](#), which was charged by the Chancellor and Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor to

- Identify and oversee a timeline for report development and review, including the required data appendices,
- Identify appropriate writers and/or respondents for each element of the report,
- Review and approve the completed report on behalf of the campus.

In keeping with the topics to be addressed in the report, the Steering Committee is composed of the following institutional representatives.

- Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, Elizabeth Whitt
- Acting Dean of the Graduate Division, Christopher Kello
- Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Jane Lawrence
- Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB), Daniel Feitelberg, designees
  - Chief of Staff to the VCPB, Kathleen Jefferds
  - Director, Institutional Research and Decision Support<sup>1</sup>, Nancy Ochsner
- Interim University Librarian, Donald Barclay (representing the Academic Senate)
- Graduate Student Representative, Chelsea Carey
- Undergraduate Student Representative, Miguel Jimenez
- Chief of Staff to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, Susan Sims
- Accreditation Liaison Officer & Coordinator for Institutional Assessment, Laura Martin

The membership reflects recommendations to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and Chancellor from the [Senate-Administration Council on Assessment and Planning](#), the joint Administration-Senate committee with responsibility for advising campus Senate and administrative leadership on accreditation-related matters.

Following its initial meeting in February 2013, the Steering Committee identified lead writers for each focal area of the report and developed a timeline and steps for report development and review by relevant campus constituents. Through this process, drafts of select elements of the report were developed and reviewed in consultation with a broad range of campus constituents, including the General Education Subcommittee of the Academic Senate, the Undergraduate Student Success Subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Council, the Graduate Student Success Subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Council, the leadership of the Division of Student Affairs, and the Senate Administration Council on Assessment and Planning. Final drafts of the report were reviewed by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

---

<sup>1</sup> Formerly *Institutional Planning and Analysis* (IPA)

## II. List of Topics Addressed in this Report

*Please list the topics identified in the action letter(s) and that are addressed in this report.*

The [WASC Commission action letter](#) conferring initial accreditation (dated July 5, 2011) identifies three topics as the focus of this Interim Report: 1) financial stability and sustainability, 2) further progress in institutionalizing and sustaining assessment of student learning and program review, and 3) updated data and information about retention and graduation and initiatives to promote student success.

In an email dated December 8, 2013 (Appendix 1), UC Merced's WASC staff liaison, Vice President Barbara Gross Davis, clarified the Commission's expectations, asking UC Merced to address the following.

- 1) *Financial stability and sustainability*: Please provide an update on the following: status of the MOU with the Office of the President; current and projected enrollments; and impact of the passage of Proposition 30 on the university's finances. In addition, please provide the link to publicly available budgetary information about UC Merced. You may address financial sustainability anyway you wish, including a narrative description and/or projected budgets.
- 2) *Assessment of student learning and program review*: Please describe UC Merced's further progress in assessing: student learning; general education; student affairs programs; and graduate academic programs. Please also describe UC Merced's progress in sustaining program review.
- 3) *Retention and graduation*: Using data from 2012 (and earlier as appropriate for documenting trends), please provide retention and graduation figures for undergraduate students, aggregated and disaggregated by ethnicity and other variables of interest to UC Merced (such as transfer students, Pell recipients, and so on). Include descriptive information about the university's current and/or planned efforts to strengthen undergraduate student retention and graduation rates. Please also provide data on master's and doctoral student retention and graduation rates by program or relevant disciplinary grouping and by ethnicity. Include, as appropriate, UC Merced's current and/or planned efforts to strengthen retention and graduation rate for graduate students.

### III. Institutional Context

*Very briefly describe the institution's background; mission; history, including the founding date and year first accredited; geographic locations; and other pertinent information so that the Interim Report Committee can understand the issues discussed in the report in context.*

UC Merced officially opened on September 5, 2005 as the 10<sup>th</sup> campus of the University of California system. Sharing in the system's mission of excellence in teaching, research and service, UC Merced was located in the historically underserved San Joaquin Valley to increase access to a research university education and to improve the educational outcomes of underserved student populations. It was also expected to contribute to the Central Valley's economic vitality and diversification, drawing intellectual and financial resources to a region with high levels of poverty and unemployment, a comparatively young populace, and low levels of educational attainment. Consistent with our purpose to serve the underserved, 62% of UC Merced undergraduates are [first generation](#)<sup>2</sup>, 60% are [Pell Grant recipients](#), and ~ 50% are from historically [underrepresented groups](#). More than one third of our students are from the San Joaquin Valley. Additional information can be found on our [Fast Facts](#) site. Designated as an Hispanic Serving Institution, UC Merced is by demographic metrics the most diverse campus in the UC system. Since opening UC Merced has been realizing its [educational](#) and [economic](#) promise. In June 2011, UC Merced was granted initial accreditation for seven years, the maximum period possible, following comprehensive review under the 2008 WASC Handbook.

Now its ninth academic year, UC Merced [enrolls](#) 5,837 undergraduates and 358 graduate students in undergraduate and graduate degree programs spanning three schools: the [School of Engineering](#), the [School of Natural Sciences](#), and the [School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts](#). Across these three Schools, 327 tenured/tenure track and lecturing [faculty](#)<sup>3</sup> support 20 undergraduate majors, 10 standalone minors, and six graduate programs offering research masters and PhDs. A seventh graduate degree, the Individual Graduate Program (IGP), supports study in an additional seven emphasis areas (Appendix 2: Existing & Anticipated Graduate Programs). The IGP plus emphasis model was established as an interim mechanism to incubate the development of standalone degree granting programs during the campus' early growth phase. It is being phased out as existing emphases, or tracks within emphases, undergo review for standalone degree granting status following policy of the Academic Senate's system-level [Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs](#). UC Merced does not offer any online degrees or fully online courses, nor do we offer any graduate professional degrees. Instruction takes place on the UC Merced campus, with additional research laboratories and administrative support services located at the campus' Castle facility, less than 25 miles from main campus. Additional administrative units are housed in leased facilities in two locations within the City of Merced.

In February 2012, UC Merced was granted general degree approval for bachelor's degrees. UC Merced has individual degree approval for graduate degrees, masters and PhDs, with each new graduate degree subject to Substantive Change review. In 2011, UC Merced was granted expedited review for new master's degrees stemming from existing emphases under the Individual Graduate Program (IGP). In November 2013, UC Merced was granted expedited review for new PhD degrees stemming from existing emphases under the IGP. This unique arrangement reflects the unique circumstances of UC Merced, the IGP, and the UC system's robust review process for new graduate degrees. Finally, three of five undergraduate degrees in UC Merced's School of Engineering are currently in review for program accreditation by ABET. A decision on accreditation is expected in July 2014.

---

<sup>2</sup> Neither parent has graduated from a four year university or college.

<sup>3</sup> Fall 2013 headcounts; ~50% are tenured/tenure track.

Nearing the close of its first decade of operation, UC Merced has all the essential elements of a comprehensive research university including [research institutes, centers and programs](#), a world class [library](#), and a rich array of co-curricular support services and enrichment opportunities through [the Division of Student Affairs](#), the Office of Undergraduate Education, and the schools. In 2011, UC Merced joined the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), and now fields eight competitive [sports teams](#). Thus, our students have an ever increasing, rich array of opportunities to pursue interests in research, student clubs, sports, study abroad, and other activities that typify a residential research university experience. Student interest in UC Merced is [robust](#) and continues to grow annually ([Appendix 48: Fall Applicants by UC Campus](#)), and the campus is actively engaged in the integrated [planning](#) activities necessary for a campus of 10,000 students that is 10% graduate by 2020. These planning activities are described more fully in Sections IV A and V of this report.

## IV. Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

*This main section of the report should address the issues identified by the Commission in its action letter(s) as topics for the Interim Report. Each topic identified in the Commission's action letter should be addressed. The team report may provide additional context and background for the institution's understanding of issues.*

*Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes.*

### A. ISSUE 1: FINANCIAL STABILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY

In its July 5, 2011 [letter](#) granting Initial Accreditation (p.2), the Commission concluded that campus leadership had worked very effectively with the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) to develop a multi-year financial plan (MOU) to support continued development of the campus (Appendix 3: MOU & Codicil). Looking forward, the Commission recognized the campus would need to balance enrollment targets, new construction, new academic programs, and hire against fiscal constraints for the foreseeable future. The Commission also noted that creativity, flexibility, and careful planning at all levels, as well as formal linkages among various planning efforts, would be needed to ensure orderly, sustainable growth.

In light of these needs, the Commission asked that our Interim Report include an update on the status of the MOU with the Office of the President, current and projected enrollments, and a description of the impact of the passage of Proposition 30 on the university's finances. We were also asked to provide a link to publicly available budgetary information about UC Merced, and to address the campus' financial sustainability in either narrative format and/or projected budgets. These requests are addressed in the paragraphs and supporting evidence that follow. The campus' public financial documents are available at <http://bfs.ucmerced.edu/Pages/Financial-Reports.aspx>.

#### **The MOU and Financial Sustainability**

The memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Office of the President was enacted during a time of significant fiscal stress within the State of California. At the time the MOU was signed, appropriations from the State of California general fund to the University of California had fallen from \$3.26 billion in FY 2007-08 to \$2.59 billion in FY 2009-10, a \$666 million reduction in only two years<sup>4</sup>. The civilian unemployment rate had climbed from 5.7% in July 2007 to a staggering 12.7% in July 2010<sup>5</sup>.

In the face of a sobering fiscal backdrop, the Office of the President committed to ensuring appropriations to UC Merced sufficient for it to continue to grow enrollment at an average rate of 600 students per year and achieve financial sustainability (Appendix 3: MOU & Codicil).

---

<sup>4</sup> State of California. Edmund G. Brown Jr. Governor, State of California. Governor's Budget Summary 2014-15. Page 35. <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2014-15/pdf/BudgetSummary/FullBudgetSummary.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> State of California. Employment Development Department. Labor Market Information Division. Industry Employment and Labor Force. March 2012 Benchmark. [http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/cal\\$hws.xls](http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/indhist/cal$hws.xls).

The MOU also expressly acknowledged the importance of UC Merced to the system, to the State of California, and to the San Joaquin Valley, noting that the campus “*has been a beacon of hope and a catalyst for enhanced college preparedness by students from throughout the region, while the research of the faculty is already having an impact on many of the area’s most pressing problems*” (p. 10, Appendix 3: MOU & Codicil).

The MOU helped ensure consistent growth of core funds to UC Merced during the period of significant financial distress. Core funds provide permanent funding for core mission and support activities, including faculty salaries and benefits, academic and administrative support, student services, operation and maintenance of plant, and student financial aid. The State of California provides appropriations to the University of California, which are allocated to each campus through the Office of the President. Tuition and fees generated by each campus also support each campus’ budget.

Due to the strength of the commitment the University of California made to the continued growth of the Merced campus, state general fund and special fund appropriations to the campus increased from \$49.7 million in FY 2009-10 to \$80.5 million in FY 2012-13 (Appendices [4](#) and [5](#): UC Merced 2009-10 and 2013-14 Annual Financial Reports).

Strong increases in general fund revenue helped the campus surpass its goals for enrollment growth during this time. In FY 2009-10, UC Merced enrolled 3,488 FTE undergraduate and graduate students. During the first three years of the MOU, the campus achieved annual average growth of 823 FTE students per year to 5,958 FTE in 2012-13 ([Appendix 6](#): FTE Annualized Enrollment). Increases in enrollment, together with increased tuition rates, caused gross tuition revenue to grow from \$24.7 million in FY 2009-10 to \$62.2 million in FY 2012-13 (Appendices [4](#) and [5](#): UC Merced 2009-10 and 2013-14 Annual Financial Reports).

The MOU helped provide certainty for the campus to continue its aggressive growth. Indeed, the campus has a balanced budget and can sustain operations at current levels for the foreseeable future.

As described within the campus’ most recent financial statements, total assets have grown to \$728.2 million in 2013, compared to \$662.8 million in 2012 ([Appendix 5](#): UC Merced 2013-14 Annual Financial Report). Generally, over the past two years, capital assets and cash and cash equivalents have increased. Cash and cash equivalents increased by \$20.5 million from the prior year due primarily to an increase in state educational appropriations to meet operating needs.

In addition, capital spending continues to increase in order to provide the facilities necessary to support UC Merced’s teaching, research and public service mission. The facilities include core academic buildings, a library, student services, housing and auxiliary enterprises, utility plant and infrastructure. Total additions to capital assets were \$116.3 million in 2013 compared to \$48.0 million in the prior year. [Capitalized buildings and improvements](#) include a new science and engineering building which is scheduled to open in fall 2014, a newly opened student services building, and a new 364 bed student housing building.

Primarily as a result of its continued investment in its physical facilities, the campus’ net position increased from \$137.2 million to \$200.7 in FY 2012-13.

UC Merced’s most recent financial statements are provided as [Appendix 5](#) (UC Merced 2013-14 Annual Financial Report). These financial statements are not individually audited, but rather are audited as part of the Consolidated Annual Financial Report of the University of California by the firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers, whose report is transmitted to The Regents. The report is published by the UC

Office of the President and is publicly available at <http://www.ucop.edu/financial-accounting/financial-reports/index.html> .

### **Status of the Current MOU and Current and Projected Enrollment Growth**

While the campus believes it could sustain its current operations at current enrollment levels for the foreseeable future, continued support from the Office of the President will be necessary to facilitate growth to its near-term enrollment goal of 10,000 students (anticipated in 2020; [Appendix 7](#): UCM 2013 Long Range Enrollment Plan). Toward this end, the campus is in the process of negotiating a successor MOU to be in place by June 2014, the expiration date for the existing MOU.

Since the fall of 2013, four members of the campus leadership (the Chancellor, the EVC/Provost, the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget and the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services) have been meeting regularly, in person and by phone, with key members of the leadership in the Office of the President. The purpose of those engagements is to develop and discuss the specifics of a successor MOU.

While negotiation of the details continue, the three elements that are clearly understood by both parties to be critical to a successful MOU are (a) continued support for enrollment growth, (b) support for the up-front (startup) costs associated with recruiting approximately 25 new faculty each year through 2020, and (c) a partnership in the support for campus expansion of the campus physical plant (*2020 Project*). The stated purpose of the MOU is straightforward: identify and support a funding model for UC Merced as it grows from our current enrollment of 6,195 to 10,000 students, and affect the smooth transition in (2020 or 2021) from the MOU-based funding model to the funding formulation used by the other comprehensive UC campuses.

The following sections outline the goals and objectives of the successor MOU and their relationship to the campus' history, new planning initiatives, and related long range enrollment plan. In doing so, they illustrate our progress in developing a formally integrated planning process that addresses enrollment, new construction, new academic programs, and hiring.

### **Focus of the New MOU**

The new MOU recognizes that UC Merced must meet three challenges: (1) to mature as a research university in the same intellectual class as the other UC campuses, which will require focused attention and investment in graduate programs and the research enterprise; (2) to continue to play an important role in fulfilling the UC's Master Plan commitment to find a place for every eligible student; and (3) to preserve the unique academic and cultural character of a campus intentionally placed in California's San Joaquin Valley.

*Background- Building a Research University:* From its inception, UC Merced has hired faculty with the expectation that they contribute with distinction to research, teaching and service. However, as Merced faced higher than anticipated undergraduate enrollment growth, two things happened. First, greater reliance on lecturing, as opposed to tenure/tenure-track, faculty was necessary to quickly provide an acceptable array of curricular offerings. Second, greater emphasis was placed on recruiting faculty in social sciences, humanities and arts, not for strategic pedagogical reasons, but because it was less expensive to do so.

To achieve the international stature as a research university demonstrated by all the UC campuses, Merced must increase the fraction of tenure/tenure-track faculty and rebalance the ratio of faculty in



the sciences and engineering to faculty in humanities, social sciences and arts. Further, our research portfolio, and the graduate programs supporting that portfolio, must grow if we are to achieve the campus's rightful place as a Carnegie High or Very High research university.

There will be four key elements to our growth over the next 6-8 years that, if accomplished, will allow us to smoothly transition from a 6,000 to a 10,000 student university:

1. *Define our strategic academic focus* – Refine the current and future directions of campus academic programs, both at the undergraduate and graduate level. This initiative, which builds on the campus's 2009 [Strategic Academic Vision](#), commenced in fall 2013 (Appendix 8: SAF Announcements & Materials). The first stage concluded in fall 2013, yielding information to guide the campus' expansion of its physical plant (see next bullet). The second stage, to be completed in spring 2014, will conclude with the development of an academic "road map" to be updated annually.
2. *Expand the campus capacity* - Provide adequate facilities to support 10,000 students, including academic, administrative, research, and recreational buildings, student residences and student services and residential buildings, utilities and infrastructure, outdoor recreation areas, and associated roadways, parking, and landscaping. This initiative, known as the *2020 Project*, is also in progress. The project's website provides a brief summary of project [goals](#), [background](#), [status](#), and [timeline](#). Appendix 9 (2020 Project Summary) provides a two page summary of the project as of fall 2013. Exhibit E of Appendix 62 (UCM Draft Successor MOU 2.25.2014), provides additional information.
3. *Meet immediate infrastructure needs* - The campus must upgrade its central plant and telecommunications facilities in the near-term to avoid significant operating risk.
4. *Meet our historic commitments* - Environmental mitigation requirements remain from the original agreement by The Regents prior to construction of the current campus.

*MOU Funding Requests:* The MOU will emphasize three key areas necessary for the campus to address these challenges effectively.

1. *Continued support for undergraduate and graduate enrollment growth* - Our Long-Range Enrollment Plan to UCOP ([Appendix 7](#)) establishes projections for enrollment growth over the next several years. Consistent with this plan, UC Merced has requested that the UCOP commitment of an addition to the UC Merced base budget of \$10,000 per new student (a key element of the current MOU) be continued.
2. *Support for hiring outstanding research-active faculty.* UCOP is asked to provide a one-time permanent addition of \$5M to the budget base, to be used to partially fund start-up packages for up to 25 new faculty to be hired each year over the next seven years.
3. *Assist in financing the physical facilities necessary for the campus to enroll up to 10,000 students (the [2020 Project](#)) as well as the near-term capital development needs.* The MOU proposes to provide funding to support the campus' central plant and telecommunications reliability upgrade, and the acquisition and construction of off-site compensatory wetlands mitigation required by the University's Section 404 permit.

To summarize, the MOU will support enrollment growth, addition of research-active faculty and building the physical plant to accommodate 10,000 students.

## **Status of the New MOU**

As stated previously, a working group comprising representatives from the campus and UCOP have met periodically since fall 2013 to consider a number of issues related to the finalization of the successor MOU. The campus and UCOP anticipate adoption of the MOU within the next two months in keeping with University of California President Janet Napolitano's [public commitment](#) to extend the MOU to ensure the success of the campus' *2020 Project*. A nearly final draft of the successor MOU is provided as Appendix 62 (UCM Draft Successor MOU 2.25.2014).

## **Impact of the Passage of Proposition 30 on the University's Finances**

With the passage of Proposition 30 in November 2012, an improving state economy, and the State's success in addressing a vast and seemingly intractable structural budget deficit, the University of California faces the prospect of a stable State funding environment for the first time in five years. Following passage of Proposition 30, the Governor proposed a multi-year funding plan for the University of California in his January budget proposal for 2013-14. His proposal calls for 5% base budget increases in 2013-14 and 2014-15 and 4% increases in 2015-16 and 2016-17. The Governor's multi-year funding plan provides a stable context for the University to assist UC Merced plan for its next phase of growth.

### **B. ISSUE 2: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW**

In its July 5, 2011 [letter](#) granting initial accreditation (p.2), the Commission concluded that "UC Merced has made remarkable progress in developing assessment processes and diffusing them throughout academic programs and student affairs". The Commission also recognized the degree of faculty ownership of assessment as "particularly impressive", and cited the Senate-Administration Council on Assessment (now "SACAP", the [Senate-Administration Council on Assessment and Planning](#)) as a "best practice" for coordinating and integrating assessment efforts across the campus.

While these findings were strongly positive, the Commission recommended that UC Merced extend its assessment efforts to general education and graduate programs; integrate assessment efforts in different programs and at different levels to effect improvement efficiently and effectively; continue to implement external program review, incorporating results of learning outcomes assessment; and optimize access to and use of data to inform campus-wide planning and improvement. WASC's subsequent clarification of the focus of our Interim Report speaks to these recommendations; *it asks that we describe UC Merced's further progress in assessing student learning, general education, student affairs programs, graduate academic programs, and in sustaining program review*. In the paragraphs and supporting evidence that follow, we describe the progress we have made in these areas. We also provide an analysis of the effectiveness of our actions to date, and a milestone-based timeline for additional planned steps, as warranted.

### **Advancements in Institutional Capacity for Assessment**

Since our initial accreditation review, UC Merced has taken a number of actions to advance institutional capacity to support and sustain annual academic assessment and program review, both undergraduate and graduate. As briefly outlined below, these include improvements to organizational support for assessment and steps to formally recognize the assessment-related responsibilities of faculty.

*Organizational Support for Assessment:* Following recommendations from the [Senate-Administration Council on Assessment and Planning](#) (SACAP), the campus established and filled 5.0 FTE in assessment-related support staff to build assessment expertise in support of faculty assessment activities. These include the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment within the Provost's Office, a full-time assessment

specialist within each of UC Merced's three schools, a 50% time Substantive Change and Graduate Assessment Coordinator, who reports to the Institutional Coordinator, and 0.5 FTE for a Senate Analyst for Program Review in the Academic Senate.

SACAP also established two permanent assessment-related committees, the [Committee for the Review of PLO Reports](#) and the [Campus Working Group on Assessment](#). The *Committee for the Review of PLO Reports* reviews and provides feedback to academic programs on their annual program learning outcome reports to support continuous improvement of assessment practices. The Committee also identifies emerging trends in both assessment practices and student learning outcomes, recommending institutional action as appropriate. The Committee's 2012-13 Report, for example, highlighted undergraduate writing as an area of emerging concern (Appendix 10: 2012-13 Report - Committee Review PLO Reports). In response, SACAP recommended to the Provost and Academic Senate that a campus-wide discussion on undergraduate writing be organized. A joint Senate-Administration Task Force on Undergraduate Writing began meeting in spring 2014 (Appendix 11: Undergraduate Writing Task Force).

The *Campus Working Group on Assessment* provides a forum for staff to identify and address assessment-related institutional needs. Among its activities, the group drafted, and the campus approved, the [UC Merced Principles of Assessment](#). The *Principles* provide the campus community with a set of assessment-related aspirations and values that is grounded in the inquiry-oriented mindset of a research university.

To provide a centralized clearing house for assessment-related information, the campus developed the [assessment.ucmerced.edu](http://assessment.ucmerced.edu) website. The site includes [links](#) to other campus sites where assessment-related information is available.

Finally, the campus has increased its capacity for routine data collection at both the undergraduate and graduate levels by leveraging existing campus surveys for program-specific data collection. Graduate-level exit and alumni surveys also have been established.

*Formal Recognition of Assessment-Related Responsibilities:* Several significant steps have also been taken to formally recognize faculty involvement with and responsibility for annual and periodic assessment activities. SACAP has recommended to the faculty that evidence of engagement with the assessment of student learning be documented in faculty case files as part of faculty contributions to teaching for evaluation in the personnel process (Appendix 12: SACAP to Unit Leads 8.8.2013). At the graduate level, [Faculty Assessment Organizer](#) (FAO) responsibilities have been explicitly integrated into the compensated duties of Graduate Group Chairs (Appendix 13: Ex Grad Chair Appt Letter) and, at the undergraduate level, the Provost has allocated funds to compensate FAOs for undergraduate programs.

*Analysis and Next Steps:* All of these are significant institutional steps to advance a sustainable culture of evidence-informed planning. Under SACAP's charge to develop a sustainable system of assessment practices, we will continue to evaluate and build our practices. Ongoing areas to be addressed include (1) continuing our efforts to [identify a digital assessment management solution](#) in order to advance our capacity to share, integrate, and archive practices and findings across the campus, and (2) strengthening the connection between administrative and academic unit assessment activities in support of institutional educational and research goals.

### **Progress in Annual Academic Program-level Assessment – Undergraduate and Graduate**

*Undergraduate:* Since initial accreditation, UC Merced’s undergraduate academic programs have continued to demonstrate a strong commitment to annual assessment. For example, over the last two years 88% and 95% of the programs expected to engage in annual assessment did (Appendix 14: PLO Report Abstracts 2012-2013). Program assessment practices also continue to advance toward a “Developed” [standard of practice](#) (Appendix 15: Development of Academic Assessment). Most importantly, programs are identifying actions to take in response to findings. In 2012-13, 86% of program assessment reports included follow-up curricular or pedagogical actions, or concluded that no changes were warranted (Appendix 16: PLO Report Review Executive Summary 2012-13).

As the data in Appendix 15 reveal, there are areas of practice that can be strengthened. Toward that end, trends in assessment practices are summarized annually in the reports generated by *The Committee for the Review of PLO Reports* (for example, see p.3, Appendix 16: PLO Report Review Executive Summary 2012-13). These findings are discussed by the school-based assessment specialists, and we continue to focus on providing the resources and support to address these areas.

*Graduate:* At the time of initial accreditation all of UC Merced’s graduate programs and emphases under the Individual Graduate Program (IGP) had developed Program Learning Outcomes; the single standalone degree granting program apart from the IGP, Environmental Systems, had developed and implemented an assessment plan. UC Merced had also committed to extending program assessment to IGP emphases through the review process each would undergo for standalone degree granting status.

Since spring 2011 five emphases have successfully undergone review, including WASC Substantive Change review, for full degree granting status.<sup>6</sup> The result is eight new degrees (five academic doctorates and three academic masters), each with a multi-year assessment plan (Appendix 17: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators). Of these five degree programs, four have submitted annual assessment reports in keeping with expectations (Appendix 18: Example Grad PLO Assessment Report). The first annual assessment for the fifth is due in spring 2014.

In spring 2012, SACAP proposed a schedule for initiating assessment in the remaining IGP emphases (Appendix 19: SACAP Grad Annual Assessment 5.24.12). In keeping with this schedule, all emphases have developed assessment plans, with first annual reports due at the conclusion of this academic year (2013-14). With the support of the Substantive Change and Graduate Assessment Coordinator, next steps include building routine evidence collection processes within programs to ensure samples sizes support valid, reliable conclusions. This is a particular challenge given the relatively small sizes of our programs and the individualized nature of student progress to the degree.

### **Progress in Academic Program Review – Undergraduate and Graduate**

*Undergraduate:* At the time of initial accreditation (AY 2010-11), UC Merced had completed its first undergraduate academic program review, with an additional three in process. Since that time, UC Merced has proceeded to conduct program reviews as outlined in the Program Review Schedule ([Appendix 20: Undergraduate Program Review Schedule](#)). A review of completed program self-studies shows that 100% of program review self-studies explicitly consider the program’s learning outcome assessment activities, including findings. Similarly, 100% of Review Team Reports address the program’s assessment and evaluation activities, often including recommendations for making the work more

---

<sup>6</sup> Three reviews took place in spring 2011, concurrent with our Educational Effectiveness Review for initial accreditation. An additional two followed initial accreditation.

productive for the program (Appendix 21: Example Self-Study & Team Report).

*Graduate:* At the time of initial accreditation, UC Merced had established and implemented a seven year program review schedule for standalone graduate programs and emphasis areas under the IGP. Under this schedule, IGP emphases can elect to undergo review for standalone status as an alternative to traditional program review. This choice recognizes the robust nature of the review process for degree granting status, which involves development of a comprehensive proposal followed by campus and system-wide peer review; it also includes reviews by disciplinary experts external to the UC. Appendices 2 (Existing & Anticipated Graduate Programs) and [22](#) (Graduate Program Review Schedule) show that graduate programs are progressing through program review as planned.

*Analysis and Next Steps:* We continue to make clear progress in implementing coupled annual assessment and periodic program review, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. We will continue to focus on ensuring that these activities advance program and institutional goals for student learning and success in a sustainable manner. Toward this end, the Academic Senate, with input from the administration, is currently revising the program review policy with the intention of piloting the new process in AY2014-15. The revised policy will address the new WASC expectation for periodic evaluation of the efficacy of the program review process.

We will also attend to new expectations outlined in the *2013 Handbook of Accreditation*. By the conclusion of spring 2014, we will have begun to implement our plan to sustainably integrate the assessment of the five core competencies into annual program assessment ([Appendix 61](#): Draft Core Competency Plan). By the time of our off-site review (spring 2017), we will have assessed four of the five competencies, with the fifth completed by our accreditation visit in spring 2018. Finally, as an institution we will be clarifying (1) the meaning, quality and integrity of the degree at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and (2) our institutional definitions of student success, and evaluating the relationship of these overarching institutional outcomes to core institutional assessment processes.

### **Progress in General Education Assessment**

*Overview:* At the time of initial accreditation, we had identified ways in which existing Program Learning Outcomes aligned with the [Eight Guiding Principles of General Education](#). Undergraduate Council had also modified the new course approval process to ensure that GE courses addressed at least three of UC Merced's *Eight Guiding Principles of General Education*. These actions were intended as a foundation for additional efforts to define and assess general education at UC Merced.

Since initial accreditation, we have built on that foundation by re-establishing the [General Education Subcommittee](#) of the Undergraduate Council (UGC), launching an institution-wide review of general education, as part of the academic program review cycle initiated by the Academic Senate ([Appendix 20](#): Undergraduate Program Review Schedule), and engaging in some preliminary assessment activities to inform the review. Brief descriptions of each of these initiatives follow. To provide consistent leadership and encouragement for all of these efforts, a permanent and full-time position, Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education, was created and a successful search was conducted to fill that role.

*General Education Subcommittee & Assessment:* The General Education Subcommittee of the UGC resumed meeting in January 2013. From the outset, the group decided to focus on assessing the state of general education (GE) at UC Merced. Steps taken so far include identifying the alignment of courses described as meeting GE requirements with the *Eight Guiding Principles of General Education*; developing a curriculum map that demonstrates what *Principles* are incorporated into what courses; investigating what courses are used most frequently to satisfy GE requirements in the Schools (i.e.

Engineering; Natural Sciences; Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts); identifying what if any *Principles* are not included in students' GE-specific curricular experiences; and conducting an initial assessment of student learning and educational experiences in relation to GE at UC Merced. A report of the General Education Subcommittee's activities and progress as of August 2013 is provided as Appendix 23 (GE Subcommittee Report August 23).

Our curriculum mapping efforts have already generated helpful insights into the GE curriculum. For example, we learned that *Communication*, *Self and Society*, and *Aesthetics* are the three most frequently cited *Guiding Principles*, appearing in 88%, 76%, and 64% of GE course syllabi respectively. Of the remaining five *Principles*, each was cited in less than 35% of GE syllabi, with *Leadership* referenced in only 13%. In contrast, an analysis of course enrollment patterns revealed that students take a relatively limited set of GE courses, and that these courses address a different subset of *Principles* (Appendix 24: GE Curriculum Analysis). Thus, it seems that student engagement with the *Principles* may be restricted to a select subset, even though the number of GE-approved courses and related GE policies suggest a breadth model for General Education.

The General Education Subcommittee also oversaw an initial assessment of the *Eight Guiding Principles* at institutional and school levels. Through surveys and focus groups, the Committee gathered student perceptions of their learning gains in relation to each *Guiding Principle*, the extent to which students value these outcomes, as well information on the educational environments – curricular and co-curricular -- that support student achievement of the outcomes (Appendix 25: GE Focus Group Summary). The Division of Student Affairs contributed to this effort by conducting student focus groups to look at the role of co-curricular experiences in developing the Division's [Learning Outcomes](#), which intentionally align directly to the *Eight Guiding Principles of General Education*.

Preliminary results indicate that students value the skills identified in the *Eight Guiding Principles of General Education*, and conclude that their abilities have improved during their time at UC Merced. Students also identified academic and co-curricular research opportunities as a source of general education, particularly with regard to the *Guiding Principles of Decision-Making*, *Teamwork*, and *Ethics*. Student descriptions of GE programming seemed vague, however, and many expressed confusion about GE requirements. This result suggests that GE at UC Merced – intended outcomes, means to achieve the outcomes, and the role of GE in students' academic programs -- is not clear to students, a potentially important impediment to student learning. The academic and Student Affairs results also suggest that the *Leadership Principle* may be more frequently met through learning opportunities outside of the classroom. The data obtained from our students about their experiences with general education will inform upcoming campus-wide discussions about the meaning, quality, and integrity of UC Merced's undergraduate degrees.

*Academic Program Review:* The assessment activities described above will feed into the program review of General Education scheduled for AY 2014-15. With the support of the Chairs of the Undergraduate Council, the GE Subcommittee, the Program Review Committee of the Academic Senate, and the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, this broad and deep review will use internal and external resources to consider the state of GE at UC Merced. The results of the review will have a significant influence on the nature of GE at UC Merced in the coming years, including intended goals, outcomes, and delivery methods, as well as means to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of, and to improve, UC Merced's GE program and student learning outcomes.

## **Progress in Student Affairs**

*Periodic Program Review:* At the time of the EER, the Division of Student Affairs had identified a multi-stage process and [guidelines](#) for conducting periodic Program Review and selected three departments to serve as pilot studies. These pilots allowed us to test the process and informed revisions to the Guidelines approved in 2011. In keeping with the [Program Review Schedule](#), the Division has completed four departmental Program Reviews and currently has six departments in various stages of the process (Appendix 26: SA Program Review Status). The Division continues to follow the approved guidelines and submit all completed Program Review documents to the Senate-Administration Council on Assessment and Planning.

Several themes emerged from the completed 2010 and the 2011 Program Reviews, including the challenge of scaling our services as UC Merced's student population increases, on-going physical space constraints, and a need for robust and responsive information technology support. We were also commended for our commitment to and our ability to serve "at risk" students (Appendix 27: SA PR Summary Report to SACAP). The external reviewers also highlighted and supported our efforts to create a culture of assessment and to attempt to link annual assessments, year-end reports and program review.

Staff participating in program reviews to date have reflected positively upon the lessons and outcomes of the experience for their departments. Directors noted that the process allowed their departments to prioritize short and long-term goals; validate mission, programs and services with multiple constituents and partners; and confirm the value of ongoing assessment activities in gathering evidence for continuous improvement. One director commented that, "The program review process has proven to be a meaningful and inclusive journey that has required each staff member to make informed, candid, and honest appraisals of functional areas with the Center. The value of the program review rests in the objectivity by which it was structured as we paired staff members who had a great deal of investment in an area with external members who could stand back, ask hard and incisive questions, and provide new ideas and fresh perspectives (Appendix 28: CSC Dept Response)."

*Progress in Annual Academic Department-level Assessment:* In 2009, the Division of Student Affairs began implementing department-level annual assessment with the two-prong goal of improving our services and identifying the student learning outcomes of our programs. By conducting rigorous annual assessments, each department contributes to the creation of a culture of assessment and continuous improvement. During this period, the assessment plans and reports were routinized with a [standard template](#) and scored using two [rubrics](#). Over the past four years, the template has been reorganized to include a self-scoring component, with the latter complementing the feedback provided by the [Assessment Team](#) (A Team) a cross-divisional group, led by the Coordinator for Assessment, Research and Evaluation. In AY 2013-14, the divisional template was again revised to more closely resemble the assessment process for academic programs. This [version](#) of the report requires staff to report their findings from one academic year and determine their goals for the next academic year in one document, to unabashedly promote assessment as a cycle.

The four years of annual assessment reports suggest that staff have struggled with creating meaningful assessments, with initial increases and some subsequent decreases in scores, as staff at all levels learn how to do assessment well (Appendix 29: SA Dept Scores). Student Affairs includes over twenty programmatic areas representing a broad range of student development and student services work. The Division has devoted time and resources to support the staff's assessment capacities, by providing [professional development and training](#), and by launching the A Team to monitor annual reports, provide

feedback and facilitate staff training. In addition, to ensure that staff at all levels of the Division are familiar with the importance of assessment and their role in the process, the Coordinator for Assessment, Research and Evaluation presents assessment findings or other relevant data at our annual All Student Affairs Staff Meetings (Appendix 30: Annual Meeting Agendas).

Once the expectation that departments conduct meaningful annual assessment was instilled in the staff, our focus shifted to understanding and subsequently assessing our overarching divisional Student Affairs' [Student Learning Outcomes](#) (SLOs). As a first step, the A Team coordinated a division-wide educational campaign to increase staff awareness of the Division's SLOs, which were created in 2006-7 and revised and reapproved in 2008-9. Evidence suggests the campaign was a success; between August 2011 and May 2012, the percentage of the Division's staff able to identify at least six of the seven SLOs increased from 40 to 80% (Appendix 31: SLO test results).

The Assessment Team then turned to clarifying the SLOs. During AY2012-13, the team developed literature-based definitions for each SLO and identified the values, knowledge and skills students will gain as they master each SLO (Appendix 32: SLO definitions). Most recently, the Assessment Team conducted a qualitative study to gather student impressions of their learning gains in relation to the SLOs, and to identify where engaged students say they practice and learn the seven SLOs. The results of this small-scale project are encouraging, in that they suggest myriad opportunities for students to learn and grow through our Division's co-curricular offerings (Appendix 33: Focus Group Findings). Next steps include determining how best to create linkages between our Student Affairs Student Learning Outcomes, our annual assessment activities, and the aspirational goals that will emerge from the strategic planning process the Division is undertaking this academic year.

After five years of annual assessment, one of the Division's "lessons learned" is that one size does not fit all. We are now poised to differentiate our departmental annual assessment approaches. Toward this end, this spring we will be moving departments to either coordinated work on one of the seven Student Learning Outcomes or to a new dashboard strategy where departments will identify, report and regularly monitor Key Performance Indicators. The Center for Educational Partnerships piloted this dashboard strategy in 2011-12 and their insights will be instrumental in designing dashboards for the enrollment management and auxiliary departments in 2014.

The Division of Student Affairs is committed to continuing our annual assessment and Program Review efforts as these initiatives have illuminated opportunities to improve our programs and services to students. The Division is prepared to continue to demonstrate our commitment to assessment. Our progress-to-date signals an upward trajectory of improvement and is filled with promising indicators of an evolving "culture of assessment" within our Division.

### C. ISSUE 3: RETENTION AND GRADUATION

In its July 5, 2011 [letter](#) granting initial accreditation (p.3), the Commission concluded that UC Merced's undergraduates were succeeding at rates above what the demographic data predict and, thus, that our strategies to support our largely at-risk undergraduate population were clearly working. The Commission also noted that our retention and graduation rates lag those of our sister UC campuses, and encouraged us to attend to the challenges enrollment growth would place on our ability to continue to support our students' success. The Commission also encouraged us to attend to graduate student success, as graduate education is essential to development of a strong research culture.



Toward this end, WASC requested that our Interim Report address the following: *Using data from 2012 (and earlier as appropriate for documenting trends), please provide retention and graduation figures for undergraduate students, aggregated and disaggregated by ethnicity and other variables of interest to UC Merced (such as transfer students, Pell recipients, and so on). Include descriptive information about the university's current and/or planned efforts to strengthen undergraduate student retention and graduation rates. Please also provide data on master's and doctoral student retention and graduation rates by program or relevant disciplinary grouping and by ethnicity. Include, as appropriate, UC Merced's current and/or planned efforts to strengthen retention and graduation rate for graduate students.*

The sections that follow address these expectations separately for our undergraduate and graduate population.

### **Undergraduate**

*Data Tables:* Rates of retention and graduation for incoming undergraduates – both first-time, full-time freshmen and transfer students -- comprise one definition of student success. Updated numbers for both first-time, full-time freshmen and transfer students are available via the following hyperlinks (and as appendices). These tables include rates disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, Pell Grant recipient, and first-generation status.

- UCM First-Time Full-Time Freshman Retention & Graduation Rates, Fall 2005 – Fall 2012 ([Appendix 34](#))
- UCM Full-Time Transfer Student Retention & Graduation Rates, Fall 2005 – Fall 2012 ([Appendix 35](#))

Because a variety of factors, including incoming student characteristics, can significantly influence retention and graduation – both for individuals and in the aggregate –, information about incoming student characteristics is reported as well:

- UCM Undergraduate Enrollment By First-Generation Status, Fall 2005 – Fall 2013 ([Appendix 36](#))
- UCM Undergraduate Enrollment By Pell Recipient, Fall 2005 – Fall 2012 ([Appendix 37](#))
- UCM Undergraduate Enrollment by Ethnicity, Fall 2009 – Fall 2013 ([Appendix 38](#))

Additional student data are available on Institutional Research and Decision Support's [website](#).<sup>7</sup>

The data provided in the tables above identify and illustrate historical trends and ongoing challenges; a summary of those trends and challenges follows, as does a description of new initiatives to support student success.

*Undergraduate Demographics:* Decades of research on undergraduate student retention from the first year to the second, and persistence to graduation, highlight a number of factors that can inhibit and/or facilitate student success. These factors include characteristics of the institution and characteristics of students; we focus here on the latter. Risk factors for leaving postsecondary education before achieving intended outcomes include (1) student demographic attributes, such as gender, race/ethnicity, family income/financial need, and levels of parental education; (2) precollege preparation and performance, such as high school grades, performance on standardized exams (e.g., SAT, ACT), high school curricula, high school quality, and access to enrichment opportunities (e.g., AP courses, IB courses); and (3)

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://ipa.ucmerced.edu/student.htm>; Institutional Research and Decisions Support was formerly named *Institutional Planning and Analysis* (IPA)

personal characteristics, such as academic motivation and commitment, work and/or family obligations, disability/ability, and English as a second language. These factors can be related; precollege preparation and performance can, for example, be related to family income, race/ethnicity, and levels of parental education.

Data from UC Merced highlight the extent to which these risk factors are present in the UC Merced undergraduate population. For example, the proportion of freshmen who are of the first generation in their families to attend college has risen dramatically, from 45% in Fall 2005 to 69% in Fall 2013 ([Appendix 36](#)). The trend in students from low income families is similar. In Fall 2005, 36% of UC Merced freshmen were Pell Grant recipients (a common proxy for low income); that percentage had increased to 62% in Fall 2012 ([Appendix 37](#)).

In Fall 2013, 44% of UC Merced undergraduates identified themselves as Hispanic; 25% as Asian; 17% as White; and 6% as Black ([Appendix 38](#)). That semester, 82% of Hispanic students, 47% of Asian students, 35% of White students, and 57% of Black students identified themselves as first-generation college students ([Appendix 36](#)). Also, 51% identified themselves as female and 48% as male (1% declined to specify; [Appendix 39](#): Enrollment by Gender).

In Fall 2013, 32% of UC Merced undergraduates reported “English and Another Language” as the primary language spoken at home. Another 31% said “Another Language” (a language other than English) was the primary language spoken at home ([Appendix 40](#): Primary Home Language).

*Undergraduate Retention and Graduation Rates:* The short history of UC Merced and the variability in size and composition of incoming student cohorts create challenges for interpreting retention and graduation data and for identifying trends. For example, as the number of first-time, full-time students has increased substantially (from about 800 undergraduates in Fall 2005 to about 1900 in Fall 2013) and the proportions of first-generation and low-income undergraduates at UC Merced have increased significantly over the same time period ( [Appendices 36](#) and [37](#)), retention (continuing enrollment) and graduation rates have been fairly stable ([Appendix 34](#)).

The one-year retention rate for first-time, full-time freshmen in the Fall 2012 cohort was 84%, up about 1.5 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort and down about .05 percentage points from the Fall 2010 cohort. The highest retention rate was 87% for the Fall 2009 cohort (the last data point available at the time of initial accreditation); the lowest was 79% for the cohort that began in 2007 ([Appendix 34](#)).

To put UC Merced retention rates in context, the one-year persistence rate for the Fall 2010 cohort for all UC campuses was 93%, ranging from 97% at UCLA and UC Berkeley to 89% at UC Riverside and 85% at UC Merced. Nationally, rates for the Fall 2009 cohort were 80% for all four-year public colleges, 78% for public research universities classified by the Carnegie Foundation as high research activity, and 87% for public universities with very high research activity (Tables A and B, [Appendix 41](#): First Time Freshman Retention & Graduation Comparisons).

Tracking, and accurately interpreting, graduation rates at UC Merced also are complicated endeavors. Our initial first-time full-time student cohort enrolled in Fall 2005, so we have graduation rates for only five such cohorts – Fall 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 -- to consider. Four-year graduation rates for those five cohorts are low, but consistent, at about 30%. Five- and six-year rates are higher, the former averaging about 52% and the latter, 58% ([Appendix 34](#)).

As noted above, there are considerable differences among the cohorts, for example, in terms of size and incoming student characteristics. The university also has changed a great deal, and quickly, in ways that

affect undergraduate persistence. One factor is the number of academic majors has increased. This means more programs are available to meet more student needs and interests; in the early years, students might have been unable to complete the academic programs of interest to them without transferring to another institution. The rate and magnitude of changes in both students and the university create challenges for drawing valid and reliable conclusions about levels of, and variations in, graduation rates over a fairly short period of time, including for the purposes of improvement. There's little that's consistent over time, which makes identifying problems and solutions very difficult.

Also, some of the differences among the incoming classes of students are fairly easy to measure (e.g., low-income status, first-generation status, race/ethnicity) and some are not (e.g., intent to graduate from UC Merced, motivation to persist at UC Merced). We can assume, based on current data, that at least some students in the first few entering cohorts came to UC Merced with the intent to transfer to another college or university (even another UC campus). In fact, in the early years of the campus, a shared-experience program allowed students to complete two years at UC Merced and then transfer to another UC campus. In Spring 2010, approximately 30% of the Fall 2006 cohort had graduated from UC Merced. That is a very low graduation rate, of course, but it's interesting to note that another 55% of that Fall 2006 cohort was either still enrolled at UC Merced or enrolled at another postsecondary institution. After six years, 60% of the Fall 2006 cohort had graduated from UC Merced and another 15% had graduated from another college or university. Almost 10% were still enrolled in a postsecondary institution ([Appendix 42: UC Merced Profile](#)). Thus, about 85% of that Fall 2006 cohort persisted in higher education, despite the low four-year graduation rate at UC Merced.

In fact, it is still the case that, as the WASC Commission Action Letter of 2011 noted, "UCM students succeed at levels beyond what the demographic data might predict." For example, UC Merced students are retained and graduate at rates significantly higher than predicted, given their SAT (total and reading + math) scores ([Appendix 43: UCM Grad & Retention Dependence Upon SAT](#)). Also, Pell recipients who are not also first-generation students graduate from UC Merced at higher rates than students who are both Pell recipients and first-generation students *and* students who are neither; the same is true for first-generation students ( p.7, [Appendix 44: Analysis: First Year Success & Four Year Grad Rates](#)). In addition, the four- and five-year graduation rates are improving and the six-year rate is stable ([Appendix 34](#)).

That is not to say, however, that efforts to improve retention and graduation rates, as well as other markers of student success, are not necessary, even urgent. Retention and graduation rates at UC Merced lag behind those of the other UC campuses (Tables A and C, [Appendix 41: First Time Freshman Retention & Graduation Comparisons](#)), though incoming student characteristics, and the short institutional history, have substantial bearing on those results. The many ways UC Merced faculty and staff continue to strive to improve student retention and graduation rates are described in the next section.

*Transfer Student Retention:* Rates of retention and graduation for UC Merced transfer students have been even more variable over the short history of the campus than those of the freshman cohorts. This variability hampers our ability to identify and respond to trends. The number of transfer students at UC Merced also has been variable, as well as small ([Appendix 45: Transfer Enrollment](#)). In 2005, our first year of undergraduate enrollment, we had 130 transfer students; the low point was Fall 2006, when 100 transfer students enrolled, and the high was 207 in Fall 2010. In Fall 2013, we were back to around 100 incoming transfers, which reflects some recent decisions about transfer admissions made by UC Merced faculty; those decisions are discussed below.

First, however, it's important to note that one-year retention rates for UC Merced transfers have increased steadily from 81% for the 2005 cohort to 93.7% for the Fall 2012 cohort ([Appendix 35](#)). These rates compare favorably with the one-year retention rates for transfer students for all UC campuses; for example, in Fall 2010, the UC Merced one-year transfer retention rate was 88% and the all-UC rate was 93% (Table A, Appendix 46: Transfer Retention & Grad Rates UC Campuses).

The two-year graduation rate for UC Merced transfers has gone up and down ([Appendix 35](#)), and up again, starting with 48% for the Fall 2005 cohort (N=130), dropping to a low of 16% for the Fall 2008 cohort (N=138), then rising again to 42% for transfers entering in Fall 2011 (N=170). The three-year graduation rate has followed the same trend: 67% for the Fall 2005 cohort (Note: the three-year graduation rate for all UCs for Fall 2005 transfers was 80%; Table B, Appendix 46), 51% for the Fall 2008 cohort, and 67% for the Fall 2010 (N=207) cohort. Finally, four-year graduation rates for UC Merced transfers have ranged from 73% for Fall 2005 entering students, to a low of 61% for Fall 2008 transfers, and then up to 74% for the Fall 2009 cohort (N=144).

Detailed analyses of UC Merced transfer student persistence and graduation rates found the following factors to be associated with graduation in two years: (1) good academic standing in the first term of attendance at UC Merced, (2) gender (women are more likely to graduate in two years than men), (3) school of major (students in the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts are much more likely to graduate in two years than students in Natural Sciences or Engineering), and (4) first-generation status (first-generation students are more likely than non-first-generation students to graduate in two years). Two factors were found to have a significant positive relationship with transfer student graduation in four years: (1) good academic standing in the first term at UC Merced, and (2) gender (again, women were more likely to graduate in four years than men).

As a result of faculty concerns about academic performance and persistence of transfer students at UC Merced, the Undergraduate Council, an Academic Senate committee, changed the transfer admission guidelines. As of Fall 2013, UC Merced transfer applicants must fulfill school-level (Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts; Natural Sciences; Engineering) requirements for major preparation in addition to meeting all previously required transfer admission selection criteria. For example, transfer applicants who intend to major in Biological Sciences at UC Merced must have completed the equivalent of Biology 01 (plus Bio 01 lab) with at least a B, and must have completed the following with at least a C: General Chemistry I and II, Calculus, and Introduction to Physics. As a result of these changes, the transfer admit rate dropped from 48% in Fall 2012 to 41% in Fall 2013 ([Appendix 47: Admit Rate & Yield by Student Type](#)). Time will tell whether this has any impact – positive or negative -- on transfer student retention, persistence, and graduation rates. Efforts to provide support for transfer student success are described in the following section.

*Undergraduate-Focused Student Success Efforts:* At this point in time, the focus of student success efforts at UC Merced is fourfold. First, we are working to better understand predictors of student success to help distinguish the students most likely to succeed within our growing applicant pools. (Between 2012 and 2014, the number of undergraduate applications to UC Merced increased from 15,054 to 17,469; [Appendix 48: Fall Applicants by UC Campus](#).) Toward this end, the Admissions Office has worked extensively with Institutional Research and Decision Support to analyze a range of factors, i.e., high school grades, SAT/ACT scores, participation in academic preparation and AP/IB programs to determine which are correlated most closely to subsequent academic success. We now have eight years of data on our own students' retention rates and success in key, gateway courses. Among our findings is that applicants with a Math SAT score below 400 are not as likely to be academically successful. All of these analyses have been shared with UC Merced's faculty Admissions Committee who has agreed upon

new minimum test scores and weights and ranking of criteria used in the comprehensive selection process.

Second, many initiatives aimed at academic adjustment and success are in place, with several significant new efforts since initial accreditation. These include – but are not limited to -- the ASCEND Conference, a one-day, intensive orientation program prior to the first day of classes in the fall (Appendix 49: ASCEND Conference Schedule); the [STEM Resource Center](#) for tutoring and other forms of academic assistance, which opened in Fall 2013; midterm grade reports for first-year students – now permanent and no longer subject to renewal by the Academic Senate - and required learning workshops for students in academic difficulty; the [DARTS program](#) for transfer and returning students; and expanded undergraduate research opportunities, particularly in STEM fields and for students from groups historically-underrepresented in higher education, coordinated by the new Undergraduate Research Opportunities Center ([UROC](#)).

Third, as we launch new programs, we also seek ways to build capacity to improve student outcomes as the student population grows quickly in size and diversity. As the campus aims to enroll a student body of 10,000 students (9000 undergraduates) in 2020, these efforts are particularly urgent. Assessment of outcomes and evaluation of effectiveness of student success initiatives are an essential component of capacity-building, as are explorations of ways electronic technologies might provide assistance in predicting, and responding to, barriers to student success. We have many programs that meet the needs of small groups of students; whether and how to expand the scope of any or all of these programs is a critical question at this juncture.

Fourth, and, perhaps, most important, we are in the process of taking a more systematic and intentional view of undergraduate student success as an institutional challenge. As noted earlier, institutional environments are at least as important for student success as students' incoming characteristics. One step in this process is the hiring of a full-time Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education who has experience in both the scholarship and the practice of creating institutional conditions for undergraduate student success. Another step is the creation of the Undergraduate Student Success Committee, within the Enrollment Management Council (Appendix 50: EMC Subcommittees). The purpose of that committee is to bring together people in key roles to create a shared institutional definition of student success at UC Merced and generate a plan for action that reflects that definition. That group also will consider what institutional conditions present unnecessary obstacles to our students' success as well as ways to address those obstacles. In this way, we can give focus and impact to the myriad small initiatives while engaging the University community in "big picture" planning for coordinated institutional programs, policies, and practices for our undergraduate students' success.

Together, these efforts are intended to focus institutional resources, structures, and commitments to create meaningful, scalable student success initiatives consistent with the mission of the University, with our students' strengths and challenges, and with our plans for growth in the coming decade.

## **Graduate**

*Current Enrollment:* As of the Fall 2013 census, UC Merced enrolls a total of 358 active graduate students in seven graduate programs and associated emphases ([Appendix 51](#): Enrollment by Class Level; Appendix 2: Existing and Anticipated Graduate Programs). Of these students, 315 are pursuing doctoral degrees and 43 masters'. In 2013-14, the distribution of graduate students across school-affiliated disciplines was about 37% in the School of Natural Sciences, 31% in the School of Engineering, and 32% in the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts ([Appendix 52](#): Graduate Enrollment by Program).

Twenty-nine percent (29%) are international students ([Appendix 38](#)). Appendix 38 also includes additional data on enrollment by ethnicity. As of fall 2011, UC Merced enrolled a higher proportion of international (32%) and Hispanic (13%) graduate students as compared to the other UC campuses (average of 23% and 7%, respectively; Appendix 53: UC Graduate Enrollment by Ethnicity).

*Retention and Graduation Rates:* Between opening our doors and the conclusion of spring semester 2013, a total of 227 graduate students enrolled and left the campus, with or without a graduate degree. As noted above, UC Merced currently enrolls 358 active graduate students, a total far greater than the 227 who had come through our graduate programs in the first eight years of operation.<sup>8</sup> This comparison shows that UC Merced is still in an early, rapid stage of growth in graduate education.

Of the 227 students who have left UC Merced since we opened, 136 graduated with a Masters or Ph.D., which is a 60% overall graduation rate. This overall rate is in line with other UC campuses (Appendix 54: UC 10 Year PhD Completion Rates), and national norms, as reported by the Council of Graduate Schools<sup>9</sup>. As shown in Table 1 (Appendix 55: UCM Graduate Success Tables), nearly all of these students graduated with the degree they sought when they first applied to UC Merced.

Table 2 (Appendix 55: UCM Graduate Success Tables) provides time-to-degree data for the 136 students who left with a degree, and “time-to-leave” data for the 91 students who left without earning a degree. The table shows that most Ph.D. students (85%) graduated within 6 years, and most master’s students (77%) graduated with 3 years (63% graduated within 2.5 years). Also, of the students who left without a degree, most (71%) did so within their first two years.

In summary, our graduation rates and times-to-degree results are in line with national norms for academic Master’s and Ph.D. programs. Decisions to exit graduate programs are made early, before significant amounts of time and resources are spent. We believe these metrics show that our graduate programs are generally off to a good start, but we are always striving to increase graduate rates, and decrease times-to-degree and times-to-leave.

WASC also requested that we disaggregate our student success metrics by disciplinary grouping and ethnicity. Because only 227 students have enrolled and left UC Merced since opening, disaggregation quickly leads to small numbers. These small populations are identified by the term “Small N”, which appears in cells with counts between 1 and 4 in our data tables (Appendix 55: UCM Graduate Success Tables).

Given the small numbers of students that have come through our graduate programs, it was not meaningful to disaggregate by individual program or individual ethnic group. To address WASC’s request with meaningful data, we disaggregated by school (Tables 3 & 4) and by underrepresented minority (URM) status (Tables 5 & 6; Appendix 55: UCM Graduate Success Tables). The schools<sup>10</sup> encompass broad but still meaningful disciplinary groupings, and the binary categorization of URM/non-URM captures the primary dimension along which ethnicity and student background is considered to be important for student success. The numbers were too small to further disaggregate each school by URM status.

---

<sup>8</sup> The first graduate students enrolled in 2004-2005, the year before the campus officially opened.

<sup>9</sup> 10 year completion rate of 56.6%; Sowell et al. 2008. Ph.D. Completion and Attrition: Analysis of Baseline Program Data from the Ph.D. Completion Project. Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, D.C.

<sup>10</sup> School of Engineering, School of Natural Sciences, and School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

Collectively, the disaggregated data show that our numbers of students are too small to draw any firm conclusions about differences along the lines of disciplinary groupings or ethnicity. However, we are tracking these data as we grow and look forward to the numbers becoming large enough to interpret.

*Job Placements:* Data were compiled for 34 Ph.D. students who received degrees since opening (~50% of PhD recipients). Thirty of these students reported having a job upon graduation. Of those who reported a specific job, three were tenure-track professorships, four were lecturer positions, thirteen were postdoctoral fellowships, three were scientist positions, three were technology/engineer positions, and two were administrative positions. To the extent that these results are representative, they indicate that our graduates are successfully finding the kinds of post-graduate employment typical of Ph.D. recipients. We plan to continue to improve our ability to track post-graduate placement.

*Student Success Efforts:* Graduate student success is determined by a number of factors that include (1) a good match between the student, and the program and advisor; (2) quality student training in terms of program coursework and mentorship; (3) student support in terms of research and teaching assistantships, and fellowships; and (4) student support in terms of extra-curricular workshops, tutoring, and professional development.

With regard to finding good matches, the Graduate Division has instituted [graduate visitation weekend](#). Prospective students are invited and paid to visit the campus, and meet with faculty, current students, and other prospective students. The visit helps all parties determine whether there is a good match between prospective student, program, and advisor (if applicable; some programs do not determine advisors till the second year). Visitation weekend was held for the past two years, and there were about 65 and 90 visitors, respectively. In AY2012-13, about 66% of the visitors admitted to a graduate program ended up enrolling at UC Merced, which was solidly above our yield of 52% for non-visitors. Also, over 80% of survey respondents rated the visit as helpful and well-organized for the past two years.

With regard to coursework, programs are creating more graduate courses, and teaching them more regularly, as the number of ladder-rank faculty increases. However, [yearly surveys](#) of continuing graduate students indicate that some programs are still lacking in the number of graduate student courses offered. The Graduate Dean has begun working with school deans and graduate group chairs to determine which courses are needed most. If these courses are not already planned for the near future, the deans will work with faculty to determine provide students with the training they need.

With regard to mentorship, the schools have instituted a program to provide junior faculty members with training and advice on how to mentor graduate students in their discipline. Each disciplinary area has one or more senior faculty mentors to provide this training and advice, and the Graduate Dean plans to provide overviews of mentorship for new junior faculty members.

With regard to student support, all of our Ph.D. students, and nearly all of our masters' students, receive some source of financial support each year. Comparisons with other UC campuses show that our graduate students receive financial support that is near the top of the UC system (Appendix 56: Grad Student Funding by UC Campus). The majority of this support is in the form of teaching assistantships, but it is well-known that progress to degree can be delayed by students spending too much time as teaching assistants. In AY2012-13, the Graduate Dean established a new source of student fellowships that increased the amount of fellowship dollars by over 50% more than the previous year (Appendix 57: UCM Graduate Student Funding AY10-13). It is too soon to gauge the effects of this support on student success.

Finally, with regard to co-curricular support, [Graduate Student Services](#) (GSS) provides workshops, events, information and support to enhance and enrich the educational experience of UC Merced graduate students. These services cover topics such as work-life balance, professional and personal leadership skills, and overcoming barriers to success. Specifically they include: [The Lyceum Series](#), [Summer Series](#), [Mix and Mingle Series](#), [Graduate Student Appreciation Week](#), Graduate and Research Orientation Week ([GROW](#)), [Graduate Peer Mentor Program](#), [Writing Services](#), and the [GSA<sup>11</sup> Professional Advancement Program](#).

*The 2020 Project and Graduate Student Success:* As part of the *2020 Project*, the Chancellor has set a goal of 1000 graduate students by the time our campus reaches a total enrollment of 10,000 students ([Appendix 7: UCM 2013 Long Range Enrollment Plan](#)). Given a current headcount of 358 graduate students and 5,837 undergraduate students, this is an ambitious goal. The Graduate Dean is working with campus leadership to identify strategies and mechanisms for reaching this goal. Many of these will depend on the outcomes of the current *Strategic Academic Focusing* initiative (see *Planning for Campus Growth* in the Section V of this report), but it is also clear that we will need to maximize graduate student success as much as possible. Current plans to do this include the following:

- UC Merced has hired [Stamats](#), a higher education consultant firm specializing in marketing, to help us identify the most effective ways to grow our graduate applicant pools, target applicants who best fit with our programs, and provide market-driven guidance on directions for future growth. Their work is underway, and will be completed in Spring 2014.
- Graduate student surveys will be edited and expanded to gather better information on reasons for graduate students leaving the campus without a degree.
- The Graduate Dean is working with campus leadership on fund raising, grant support for graduate students, and various other means of growing graduate support with a growing graduate student population.
- The Graduate Dean is working with the Provost and school deans to provide more predictability in the number of teaching assistantships available from year to year. Predictability, along with growing other sources of support, is essential for graduate programs to make as many attractive offers to applicants as possible.

---

<sup>11</sup> UC Merced Graduate Student Association



## V. Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

**Instructions:** This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred or issues that have arisen at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, addition of major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, unanticipated challenges, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described in the preceding section. This information will help the Interim Report Committee gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the actions of the institution discussed in the previous section have taken place.

### Planning for Campus Growth

UC Merced has set the goal of becoming a campus of 10,000 students by approximately 2020, an intention reflected in our new 2013 Long Range Enrollment Plan and in public representations of the campus' future. This includes the major priority of increasing our graduate student enrollment to 10 percent of total enrollment by 2020 and 12 percent by 2023 ([Appendix 7: UCM 2013 Long Range Enrollment Plan](#)).

Toward this end, the campus is currently engaged in two significant, mutually reinforcing planning and development processes. The *Strategic Academic Focusing* initiative is intended to refine the current and future directions of campus' academic programs, undergraduate and graduate ([Appendix 8: SAF Announcements & Materials](#)). The *2020 Project* is a plan to develop and finance the physical facilities necessary for a campus of 10,000 students ([Appendix 9: 2020 Project Summary](#)).

These two planning initiatives are significant. They enable the campus to mature as a research university, while preserving the unique character of a campus intentionally placed in California's San Joaquin Valley. They also allow the campus to continue to play an important role in fulfilling the UC's commitment to the California Master Plan. In doing so, these initiatives will continue UC Merced's distinctive contributions to the UC system and the State of California. By the time of the campus' re-accreditation review (2017-2018), the campus intends to have completed the first phase of additional facilities to support campus growth (*2020 Project [timeline](#)*), in keeping with the newly revised Long Range Enrollment Plan.

The campus is also engaged in negotiating a successor MOU with Office of the President to be in place by June 2014. This new MOU is expected to provide financial support to meet our goal of 10,000 students by 2020, including funds for enrollment growth, the start-up costs of hiring research-active faculty, and the expansion of the physical plant to accommodate 10,000 students. The relationship of the MOU, *Strategic Academic Focusing* initiative, and the *2020 Project* are described in more detail in the Section IV A (Financial Stability and Sustainability) of this report.

### Leadership Transitions

A number of leadership transitions have taken place since initial accreditation, following the natural cycle of organizational change and consistent with the needs of a growing campus. Following retirements, [Dorothy Leland](#) assumed the Chancellorship in July 2011; [Kyle Hoffman](#) assumed the position of Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Relations in May 2012; [Thomas W. Peterson](#) assumed the position of Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor in December 2012; and [Michael Reese](#) became Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services in December 2013 ([Appendix 58: Senior Leadership Org Chart](#)).

Several positions have also been expanded to full time and/or established in response to the demands of continued growth. In December 2012, Daniel Feitelberg became the campus' inaugural [Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget](#), heading the newly established [Division of Planning and Budget](#). The Division was established to consolidate the management of financial, capital asset, and institutional planning resources and to provide decision support to executive leadership regarding the strategic allocation and use of campus resources. VCPB Feitelberg is also the campus' Chief Financial Officer. In July 2012, Christopher Kello assumed the role of Acting Dean of the [Graduate Division](#) and, in August 2013, Elizabeth Whitt became the campus' first permanent, full time Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education ([Appendix 59](#): Academic Affairs Org Chart). The title of Graduate Dean was formerly held by Samuel Traina, together with the position of Vice Chancellor for Research. Vice Chancellor Traina is now full time [Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development](#). A search for a fulltime Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate Division is nearly completed. Finally, in February 2014, Ann Kovalchick was appointed Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology and Chief Information Officer (CIO), succeeding Interim Chief Information Officer, Faust Gorham ([Appendix 60](#): CIO Announcement).

### **Growth of Academic Programs**

Since initial accreditation, the campus has also added four degree programs: bachelor degrees in English and Spanish in 2013, and graduate degrees in Chemistry and Chemical Biology (M.S. and Ph.D.) and Political Science (M.A. and Ph.D.). The English and Spanish degrees were derived from the Literatures and Cultures, B.A. which is currently being taught out.

Consistent with the existing MOU, a priority has been to increase the number of graduate degrees by transitioning emphases under the Individual Graduate Program into standalone degree granting programs. In addition to the two degree programs identified below, proposals for another six graduate degree programs stemming from IGP emphases are currently in the review process for standalone status; proposals for at least another four programs are in development ([Appendix 2](#): Existing & Anticipated Graduate Programs). As described in Section III (Institutional Context) of this report, this process requires campus and system-wide review and approval followed by WASC review for Substantive Change.

## VI. Concluding Statement

**Instructions:** *Reflect on how the institutional responses to the issues raised by the Commission have had an impact upon the institution, including future steps to be taken.*

The topics raised and addressed in this Interim Report – financial stability and sustainability, assessment of student learning and program review, and undergraduate and graduate student success - are core to our success as the newest campus within the University of California system. As such, they represent long term campus interests. By articulating our efforts in a single document, this report has illustrated our commitment to these areas, both existing and planned. It has also allowed us to examine and, in turn, confirm both our progress and our intended directions, while providing another context through which to communicate these efforts to a wider audience. As one reviewer concluded upon reading a partial draft of the report, “I found myself agreeing with the progress made with regard to program assessment at UC Merced. In particular, I agree with the statement that we are developing a “culture of assessment” for undergraduate and graduate programs on our campus.” Finally, the interim report has allowed the campus to more firmly locate our upcoming re-accreditation review, scheduled for 2017-2018, in the campus’s longer term planning. We look forward to discussing our findings, progress, and future plans with the panel of representatives from the WASC Interim Report Committee.

## VII. List of Evidentiary Appendices

The Appendices listed below are referenced by number throughout the report narrative above. They are available by number in one of two companion PDF files and, for those Appendices also available online, via the hyperlinked Appendix name below (or via links in the report narrative). Appendix names below may differ slightly from the names provided in the report narrative and the companion PDF files; in some instances, we have expanded the names to make them more informative.

- Appendix 1: WASC Email Clarifying Focus of UCM Interim Report
- Appendix 2: Existing & Anticipated Graduate Programs
- Appendix 3: 2011 MOU & Codicil btw UCM & UC Office of the President
- Appendix 4: [UC Merced 2009 -10 Annual Financial Reports](#)
- Appendix 5: [UC Merced 2013-14 Annual Financial Reports](#)
- Appendix 6: [UCM Full-Time Equivalent \(FTE\) Annualize Enrollment](#)
- Appendix 7: [UCM 2013 Long Range Enrollment Plan](#)
- Appendix 8: UCM Strategic Academic Focusing (SAF) Announcements & Materials
- Appendix 9: 2020 Project Summary
- Appendix 10: 2012-13 Report of the Committee for the Review of PLO Reports
- Appendix 11: Undergraduate Writing Task Force Materials
- Appendix 12: Letter from SACAP to Unit Leads RE: Integrating evidence assessment engagement into personnel process
- Appendix 13: Example Graduate Chair Appointment Letter
- Appendix 14: 2012-13 Undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Reports - Abstracts
- Appendix 15: Figures illustrating the advancement of Academic Assessment Practices btw AY 2009-10 and 2012-13
- Appendix 16: Executive Summary of the 2012-13 Report of the Committee for the Review of PLO Reports
- Appendix 17: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators
- Appendix 18: Example Graduate Program Learning Outcome Assessment Report
- Appendix 19: SACAP to Grad Group Chairs RE: Annual Assessment 5.2012
- Appendix 20: [Undergraduate Program Review Schedule](#)
- Appendix 21: Example Program Review Self-Study & External Review Team Report
- Appendix 22: [Graduate Program Review Schedule](#)
- Appendix 23: General Education Subcommittee Report August 2013
- Appendix 24: General Education Curriculum Analysis Summary Figures
- Appendix 25: General Education Undergraduate Focus Group Summary Report Spring 2013
- Appendix 26: Student Affairs Program Review Status Summary
- Appendix 27: Student Affairs Program Review Summary Report to SACAP
- Appendix 28: Career Services Center (CSC) Program Review Departmental Response
- Appendix 29: Student Affairs Aggregate Departmental Scores for Annual Assessment Reports
- Appendix 30: Student Affairs Annual Meeting Agendas
- Appendix 31: Student Affairs Results of Divisional Outcomes Awareness Campaign
- Appendix 32: Student Affairs Definitions of Divisional Student Learning Outcomes
- Appendix 33: Student Affairs Undergraduate Focus Group Findings
- Appendix 34: [UCM First-Time Full-Time Freshman Retention & Graduation Rates, Fall 2005 – Fall 2012](#)
- Appendix 35: [UCM Full-Time Transfer Student Retention & Graduation Rates, Fall 2005 – Fall 2012](#)
- Appendix 36: [UCM Undergraduate Enrollment By First-Generation Status, Fall 2005 – Fall 2013](#)
- Appendix 37: [UCM Undergraduate Enrollment By Pell Recipient, Fall 2005 – Fall 2012](#)

- Appendix 38: [UCM Undergraduate Enrollment by Ethnicity, Fall 2009 – Fall 2013](#)
- Appendix 39: [UCM Undergraduate Enrollment by Gender, Fall 2009 – Fall 2013](#)
- Appendix 40: [UCM Undergraduate Enrollment by Primary Language Spoken at Home, Fall 2005 – Fall 2013](#)
- Appendix 41: Retention and Graduation Rate Comparisons for First Time Freshmen
- Appendix 42: [UC Merced Profile](#)
- Appendix 43: Dependence of UCM Graduation & Retention Rates on SAT Score
- Appendix 44: Analysis of First Year Success & Four Year Graduation Rates
- Appendix 45: [Transfer Student Enrollment, Fall 2005 – Fall 2013](#)
- Appendix 46: Transfer Retention and Graduation Rates by UC Campus
- Appendix 47: [Admit and Yield Rates by Student Entering Level, Fall 2005 – Fall 2013](#)
- Appendix 48: [Fall Applicant Numbers by UC Campus](#)
- Appendix 49: ASCEND Conference Schedule
- Appendix 50: Enrollment Management Council Subcommittee Charges and Membership
- Appendix 51: [UCM Enrollment by Class-Level \(Head Count\), Fall 2009 – Fall 2013](#)
- Appendix 52: [UCM Graduate Enrollment by Program, Fall 2005 – Fall 2013](#)
- Appendix 53: UC Graduate Enrollment by Ethnicity, Fall 2011
- Appendix 54: UC 10 Year Ph.D. Completion Rates
- Appendix 55: UCM Graduate Success Tables
- Appendix 56: Graduate Student Funding by UC Campus
- Appendix 57: UCM Graduate Student Funding AY2010-2013
- Appendix 58: [Senior Leadership Organization Chart](#)
- Appendix 59: [Academic Affairs Organization Chart](#)
- Appendix 60: CIO Announcement January 2014
- Appendix 61: [Draft Plan to Address the WASC Core Competencies](#)
- Appendix 62: UCM Draft Successor MOU with UC Office of the President