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Introduction

University of Washington is the largest university in the Northwest Commission region, enrolling more than 50,000 students on three campuses: Seattle, Bothell, and Tacoma, and with a workforce of over 4,700 faculty members (tenure track and non-tenure track), and approximately 25,000 non-academic employees. In addition, over 47,000 individuals each year participate in UW Educational Outreach programs, which include online and classroom-based degree and certificate programs as well as continuing professional development opportunities.

UW is one of 63 members of the Association of American Universities and is a perennial research powerhouse, with funded research of $1.47 billion in fiscal year 2012. Over 200 faculty members are members of the Institute of Medicine and National Academies. The University manages a portfolio of approximately 2,200 awarded/pending patents. The University operates four hospitals, which provide one quarter of the total charitable medical care in Washington State.

The Bothell campus enrolled 4,160 students in fall 2012. It offers over 20 undergraduate majors and 11 masters programs. The Tacoma campus enrolled 3,907 students in fall 2012. It offers 31 bachelor-level programs and 13 graduate programs. The Seattle campus enrolled 43,485 students in fall 2012. It offers 165 undergraduate majors and more than 300 graduate or professional programs (source: http://admit.washington.edu/AcaLife/Majors; and https://www.grad.washington.edu/admissions/programs-degrees.shtml). All three campuses, as well as other sites, also offer continuing and professional education. Across all three campuses, UW awards close to 15,000 degrees per year, approximately two thirds of which are bachelor degrees, 24% masters, 5% doctoral, and 4% professional.

About one third of UW undergraduates receive Pell Grants; almost as many are the first in their families to attend college. Over 13% of undergraduates and 10% of graduate/professional students are from under-represented ethnic groups (African American, American Indian, and Hispanic). The participation of URM students is increasing; for example, more than 17% of incoming freshmen in fall 2012 were from under-represented ethnic groups. Approximately 20% of undergraduates are from out of state, a percentage that will increase slightly in the future.

The institution is highly selective, admitting fewer than 60% of freshman applicants. Incoming freshmen have an average high school GPA of 3.75. Approximately four out of every five incoming freshmen graduate within six years. The graduate programs at UW attract close to 30,000 applications each year, and have grown by 50% over the last decade. Given the broad and deep applicant pool, the UW can admit students who are highly qualified for undergraduate and graduate study.
UW has a major economic impact on the State. Nearly 300 companies have been started by UW faculty and students or with UW-developed technology. The University is the third largest employer in Washington. Charitable care by the hospitals has an estimated value of $140 million, students provide over 346,000 hours of service, and UW supports roughly 70,000 jobs statewide. Overall economic impact is calculated to be $9.1 billion.

Over the past five years, the University experienced a precipitous drop in state support, as a result of the financial downturn. Funding from the State dropped from $401.7 million to $209.5 million between FY 2009 and FY 2013. The University responded to this crisis with significant tuition increases (and an increase in return-to-aid, to protect access for low income students); modest enrollment growth, including a slight increase in the representation of non-resident students; and cost-cutting (including salary and hiring freezes), especially in administration. This year, UW received a modest increase in State support, although not to prior levels.

The University is governed by a 10-member Board of Regents appointed by the Governor. Orin Smith currently serves as chair. With the exception of the one student Regent, members serve 6-year terms. The Board meets 9 to 12 times per year, with additional special meetings as needed. In addition to its fiduciary responsibilities, the Board grants final approval of new degree programs. UW has experienced a number of recent changes in administrative leadership. Michael K. Young began service as President of the University on July 1, 2011, and Ana Mari Cauce became Provost six months later.

UW operates under a shared governance model. The faculty Senate maintains purview over scholastic and educational policy, curriculum and the rules and procedures of appointment, review, promotion, and tenure. The Senate also appoints faculty members to 12 University Faculty Councils, which address issues ranging from Academic Standards to Benefits and Retirement.

The 2013 Accreditation Visit

A team of 10 reviewers (see Appendix A), chaired by UCLA Chancellor Gene D. Block visited UW from October 7-8, with feedback meetings on October 9. During the two-day visit, the team met with approximately 165 administrators, staff, faculty and students across all three campuses, as well as several Regents (see Appendix B). This does not include the attendees at open meetings held on each campus with faculty, staff and students. Approximately 7 faculty, 7 students, and 6 staff attended the meetings on the Seattle campus; approximately 10 faculty, 12 students, and 20 staff attended the meetings at UW Bothell; and approximately 15 faculty, 6 students, and 25 staff attended the meetings at UW Tacoma. In addition, the team reviewed numerous documents, reports, websites, brochures, and other materials ranging from data dictionaries to student assignments. The UW Year Seven Self-Evaluation Report provided critically important information about how the University has addressed the Northwest Commission Accreditation Standards and its own core themes.
Standard 1 -- Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations

UW has a mission statement first drafted in February 1981, revised in February, 1998 and again (with minor changes) on July 11, 2013. The statement is appropriate for a public institution of higher education, first through its statement of the primary mission of *preservation, advancement and dissemination of knowledge*, but also through the stated concern with broad representation and the support of outreach activities for non-traditional students and the community at large.

The University has elaborated three core themes that are in direct alignment with the mission statement: 1) Research and Scholarship, 2) Teaching and Learning, and 3) Service. Each theme is associated with a number of indicators.

These are broad themes that capture much of the work of a modern public research university. As such, determination of mission fulfillment is necessarily multidimensional and complex. The University provides a wide range of measurement methodologies and metrics to assist in determining mission fulfillment. The long list of metrics exhibit some lack of coherence and specificity but overall seem appropriate measurements for how well the institution is performing.

The two branch campuses of the University of Washington have separate mission statements that reflect the students and communities they serve. While the missions are distinct, they complement the mission of the overall University by providing UW education, research, and service to previously underserved regions. Their small class sizes and emphasis on interdisciplinary programs provide an engaged and supportive learning environment. Students and faculty address issues in their surrounding communities through education, research, and public service, resulting in a close connection between the external community and the campus. As a result of these unique experiences, the two campuses have established an identity and culture that is now drawing students and faculty to each campus as a destination of choice.

A minor quibble is UW’s adherence to the requirement that the mission statement be “widely published.” At present, the home page of the main campus does not provide intuitive access to the mission statement (which is under “discover” link on the home page). Surprisingly, a word search using the UW search engine, available on the home page, brings up the mission statement of UW schools and centers, the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, but not the main campus mission statement. It seems reasonable (and easy to fix) that the first listing on UW’s own search engine should be the University’s mission statement.

The First Year accreditation report offered two recommendations relevant to Standard 1, to which UW has responded.

*Recommendation 1:* The panel recommends that the University articulate institutional accomplishments or outcomes that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment (Standard 1.A.2; Standard 1.B.2). Over the past three years, the UW standing accreditation working group reduced the number of metrics associated with the core themes to focus on those most central to the University’s mission, but chose to maintain a wide range and variety of indicators, both qualitative and quantitative. The University also compared its own
performance to that of various comparison institutions, for those indicators where comparative data were available.

The individuals with whom the Evaluation Committee met clearly intend to use these indicators to track UW progress – both over time and compared to its competitors. For example, the University closely tracks the amount of extramural support it receives and strives, not only on a year-to-year basis, but also relative to other research universities and relative to the amount of federal research funding allocated. It seeks to increase its share of these funds, even if the decline in research funding makes an absolute increase in the dollars infeasible. Similarly, the Committee was told that every department at UW has its own diversity plan, with explicit goals for faculty hiring.

For the most part, however, UW has not articulated targets, goals, or minimally acceptable thresholds for indicators that lend themselves to such an approach. For example, Committee members could not identify or obtain goals for such simple metrics as number of undergraduate students engaged in research or number of people participating in grants and contract management training. The University has done an excellent job in identifying indicators of mission fulfillment and in collecting data and information relevant to these indicators.

 Recommendation 2: It is recommended that the University put into place a learning assessment process and criteria and ensure that the indicators of achievement are not dependent on assessment measures that are not yet fully in place (Standard 1.B.2) UW has a wide array of information and data, both qualitative and quantitative, for learning assessment. The Evaluation Committee describes UW as a “data-rich” environment. The institution has made strides in ensuring that all departments have learning outcomes and also indicators of achievement.

**Standard 2 -- Resources and Capacity**

**2A. Governance**

The institution is a three campus university where governance follows the traditional university model which takes into account the views of faculty, staff and students.

The governing board consists of 10 members, nine with six year renewable terms, and a student member with a one year term. The board annually holds 10 one-day meetings (also a dinner meeting the night before). The board exhibits good governance practice in taking responsibility in setting their own agenda, in nearly full participation at every meeting and engages in an annual, comprehensive review of the president’s performance. The board is responsible for approving the budget. The board consists of highly talented members of the community, appointed by the governor, and deeply dedicated to the success of the University of Washington. This is a most impressive group of individuals.

Faculty share in governance through a number of delegations that give the faculty authority to formulate policy regulations and procedures in areas of traditional faculty responsibility, including educational policy, regulation of student conduct, admissions policy, graduation requirements, tenure and promotion, and recommendations concerning the University budget.
Faculty on all campuses are represented through a well-established Faculty Senate. The chair of the Senate is an ex officio member of the Board of Regents. The Faculty Senate appears well organized and viewed as the spokesperson for faculty concerns. Meetings with the Faculty Senate leadership revealed concern about faculty salaries in general and the inversion that has occurred as new faculty are recruited at competitive but higher salaries than some of their more senior peers. The provost meets regularly with Faculty Senate leadership and the relationship, characterized by a lack of trust in the past, has turned significantly more positive under the current provostial leadership.

Students play a role in governance through the Associated Students of the University of Washington (for undergraduate students university-wide) and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (Seattle). In addition, the leadership of these organizations are ex officio members of the Board of Regents. Other opportunities for input are provided by the Provost’s Advisory Committee for Students, established in 2012.

According to materials, staff also appear to play a role in governance through a Professional Staff Organization; however, discussions with staff suggest that many view themselves as underappreciated and underrepresented.

Shared governance is evident at both of the branch campuses. Students and faculty have organized governing bodies that meet regularly with leadership and also have the opportunity to participate in governance. Staff report that they also have opportunities to meet with campus leadership and feel that their concerns are addressed.

All relevant policies and procedures are firmly in place, and the Committee has no concerns about institutional integrity. They Committee reviewed, for example, policies and procedures related to academic freedom, conflict of interest, copyright and intellectual property, students’ rights and responsibilities, enrollment and degree-completion, finances, and human resources.

2B. Human Resources

The University of Washington maintains two central offices to support the employment of University personnel. Both offices -- the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (AP) and UW Human Resources (UWRH) -- provide support, training and tools to the University regarding hiring, retention and compensation of all University personnel.

Human resource support is highly decentralized on the campus. Each department is assigned a human resources consultant and a human resources technician. These professionals provide support in building a diverse and adequate pool of applicants and ensuring that all expected hiring rules are followed. They also provide technical support throughout the recruiting and hiring process. However, the decentralization has led to local variations in hiring practices and approaches.

The Department of Human Resources has created an extensive survey of the customer experiences of UW staff and faculty at the medical school. There are plans to craft a similar survey for other schools, colleges, and administrative units.
As a result of the recent budget shortfalls, UW has combined administrative functions and identified efficiencies wherever possible. There is evidence that many of the administrative areas that experienced reductions are being built back, but the impact of cuts still resonates among the various administrative units. A number of interviewees suggested that some administrative areas have a lower census than is optimal. As the institution’s financial outlook improves, benchmarking staffing levels in the administrative areas may be helpful.

Administrators and staff are evaluated on a regular basis. There is a clear understanding among staff that regular evaluation is a value and an imperative of the institution.

The Office of Academic Personnel assists schools and colleges in employing an appropriately qualified faculty that is sufficient in number to achieve the mission of the University. Decisions about faculty hiring have changed as a function of the transition to activity-based budgeting. Previously, the Provost’s office exercised more control over the faculty lines in individual schools and colleges. Under this new model, deans of schools and colleges have increased discretion to use their resources for faculty positions or other needs. The Provost still approves hiring plans, but these are often presented as general targets rather than individual slots.

The Provost uses her approval of hiring plans to encourage hiring at the junior level. As faculty members retire, she encourages deans to replace senior faculty with junior hires, to restore a more balanced distribution of the faculty.

UW is seeing a change in the composition of the faculty; schools and colleges are increasing their instructional workforce without growing the tenure track faculty and are exploring other kinds of educational models, including faculty with different kinds of relationships with the University. The Faculty Senate is monitoring this closely.

It appears that faculty responsibility and workloads are commensurate with the institution’s expectations for teaching, service, and research. Setting expectations and ensuring that teaching obligations are met is delegated to each unit, college or school. An annual letter to the provost documents how courses and instruction were distributed across the academic year among the faculty.

UW faculty are regularly (in most cases, annually) evaluated by their peers, with final decision-making at the level of the dean (promotion) or President (salary). All faculty are evaluated for performance in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, consistent with the expectations of the faculty member’s appointment. Inputs to the evaluation include but are not limited to teaching evaluations, an annual activity report, and, for pre-tenured or non-tenure track faculty, an annual conference with the department chair and/or dean.

The institution provides opportunities for professional growth and development. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) offers a wide array of teaching resources and innovations to faculty, staff and graduate students. Examples of new and continuing programs to support faculty development include: the Faculty Fellows Program, learning communities for faculty, instructors, staff educators, and graduate students; and First Fridays for graduate students.
Although the faculty as a whole demonstrates impressive qualifications and productivity, faculty salaries at the University of Washington lag behind its peer institutions. This is a significant concern, discussed further in the Sustainability section of this report.

2C. Education Resources

The University of Washington offers hundreds of degree options from baccalaureate through doctoral levels, including numerous professional degrees and certificate and continuing professional education programs. The programs offered are highly diversified and reflect both local needs and cultures as well as the mission of a large public research university. In addition to the Seattle-based programs, the academic offerings at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell represent a dedication to addressing local community desires for higher education opportunities. Appropriate processes are in place to ensure that program content and rigor is consistent with the University’s mission and core themes.

Development and assessment of learning goals have become substantially more robust in recent years, and the 2011-13 Assessment in the Majors report provides evidence that academic departments have invested significant effort in assessment of student learning. Assessment methods include but are not limited to course evaluations, formal program reviews coordinated through the Graduate School, plans established by each department, and a variety of surveys and evaluations. The Office of Educational Assessment assists units in realizing the benefits of various assessment methods at the departmental level. However UW’s decentralized assessment activities render aggregate assessment (i.e., at the university level) challenging.

At UW, course and program learning outcomes are appropriately identified and published in various venues, including program websites. Adequate institutional structures exist, including the Curriculum Committee, which demonstrate that credit and degrees are based on documented student achievement.

Appropriate faculty involvement and administrative oversight mechanisms were evident in program development and assessment. Proposed curricular changes are first reviewed at the relevant program or department level, and then subsequent levels of review occur up through the University level. All review levels help assure coherency of curricular design and appropriateness of academic content of proposals.

Planning for new academic programs is guided by well-defined structures and processes, and faculty assume the primary responsibility for curricular review. Specifically, the Faculty Senate’s Council on Academic Standards and its Subcommittee on Academic Programs examine proposals for compliance with University-wide program standards. Additionally, UW’s well-established program review process provides a comprehensive review structure for both graduate and undergraduate degree programs.

The UW Library has dedicated significant resources in support of students, faculty and staff to assist academic units in achieving their learning goals. Although instructional support has been a long-standing service of the Library, its Teaching and Learning Group (TLG) has provided a transformational experience for students through faculty engagement and enhanced technology.
In collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning, the TLG has assisted faculty with online resources to enhance student learning. The TLG has worked directly with faculty to promote curricular integration of information literacy and research skills with course content. Integration of library resources into UW’s learning management system (Canvas) and the development of two Technology Enhanced–Active Learning (TEAL) classrooms in Odegaard Library are examples of effective engagement with academic programs to improve student learning.

Credit for prior experiential learning is in compliance with all of the elements of the NWCCU standard. Well-articulated institutional policies provide adequate guidance to academic departments, which is the level at which decisions are made regarding awarding of credit. Credit awarded for prior experiential learning at UW is very minimal.

Transfer credit is evaluated in the Admissions Office based upon institutionally-approved policies. That office maintains a robust course-equivalency database, in collaboration with the respective UW academic units that assess and establish those course equivalencies. That database is largely populated with courses offered at community colleges within Washington and other northwest states. A newly-adopted degree audit software program now assists students and faculty in viewing transfer credit evaluations.

Undergraduate Education. Each campus has defined its own undergraduate learning goals. Seattle, for example, articulates 15 distinct learning goals addressing knowledge, skills and methods (e.g., critical thinking, research, quantitative reasoning, team work), written and spoken communication, values and ethics (e.g., appreciation for diversity; ethical practices in a discipline), civic engagement, and personal/professional development.

Students entering as freshmen on any campus are required to complete a general education curriculum that is intended to promote the campus learning goals. Although requirements vary across campuses and programs, all use a distributive model that consists of a combination of English Composition, Additional Writing, Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning, Foreign Language, and Areas of Knowledge (which include visual, literary and performing arts; individuals and society; and the natural world). UW Tacoma also offers a core curriculum through which participating students enroll in four GE courses with the same cohort, thereby building a learning community.

The GE curricula span the disciplines and focus on building basic knowledge, intellectual skills, and preparation for the major. UW has demonstrated the synergies between its institutional learning goals and its general education goals (e.g., Figure 5, page 142 of the UW self-study).

Every undergraduate program on the Seattle campus also has an established set of student learning goals. Given the variety in the nature of the degree programs, departments have different criteria. The five criteria found most commonly inform larger institutional goals in teaching and learning: master a body of knowledge; think critically; write and speak effectively for specific audiences; conduct research and use appropriate methods of inquiry; and understand and value diverse people and cultures. A wide variety of other learning goals also emerge at the departmental/program level, ranging from working effectively as team members and leaders to
understanding and practicing creativity.

Every department has been asked to report learning goals and methods for determining if those goals are being achieved. This information is summarized in the Biennial Assessment reports, available on the web. A variety of research methods are employed. All departments use course evaluations. In addition, most employ exit surveys or interviews of graduating seniors or a review of capstone courses or experiences. Other methods include focus groups, surveys, external reviews, student self-assessments, learning demonstrations through internships or practica, and achievement of external standards such as proficiency or professional examinations.

The President and Provost place a high priority on excellence in undergraduate teaching and learning. They are actively encouraging involvement of tenured and senior faculty in undergraduate teaching, and they are supporting innovation and experimentation with teaching approaches, including the use of educational technology, coupled with careful assessment and adjustment. One noteworthy effort is the new online bachelor’s degree program in Early Childhood and Family Studies, which is targeted to individuals who accumulated at least 70 transferable college credits in the past but never completed a bachelor’s degree.

Graduate and Professional Programs. University of Washington offers a broad and deep set of graduate and professional programs, including arts and sciences, engineering, environment, business, law, medicine, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, information, social work, education, built environments, and public affairs.

Although units such as the Center for Teaching and Learning focus primarily on undergraduate instruction, the teaching of graduate students is monitored and evaluated carefully by many of the schools and colleges to comply with external accrediting and licensing bodies. These external groups offer explicit frameworks for aligning the graduate curriculum, especially in the professional schools, with the expectations of the professions and disciplines. The external scrutiny added to the professional commitment across the UW faculty ensures that the depth of study and breadth of the curriculum are appropriate for the graduate degrees offered.

The professional and graduate programs incorporate internships, field experiences, and clinical practice into nearly all graduate degrees. Teaching experience and research experience add to the depth of experiential learning that students pursue while earning graduate degrees. In addition the UW offers a very deep array of community engagements in which graduate and professional students work with faculty and each other in addressing community needs and significant social and economic challenges.

UW has expanded the number and enrollment of graduate degrees offered on-line and fee-based. Since 2003, the enrollment in these programs has more than tripled, and now represents roughly 40% of the graduate enrollment. These programs often enroll adult students who may also be working or have other significant life responsibilities. The programs are often interdisciplinary and closely tied to specific professions and technical skills, in fields such as nursing, engineering, or education. The fee-based programs are self-supporting, and do not receive state
funding. They are often offered through the Office of Educational Outreach, with the UW faculty from relevant academic departments responsible for curriculum and instruction.

Graduate programs have a high level of expertise, originality, and critical analysis. High levels of expectation are enforced through faculty responsibility for the curriculum and instruction in each school or college that offers graduate degrees. The Graduate Council (composed of faculty representatives from across the three campuses) thoroughly reviews and approves all proposals for new graduate degrees. The Graduate School conducts reviews of each graduate program every ten years to ensure that each degree offers a powerful and appropriate learning experience.

Evidence of success in these objectives can be found in the competitive success of UW in attracting high quality applicants, and in the success of UW students in national competitions, such as the NSF Graduate Student Research Fellowship program. The high quality of the programs has made it possible for UW faculty to be successful in attracting external support for graduate student training. For example within the School of Medicine, nearly 200 students are currently supported with funds from NIH Training Grants, and the NSF-funded Engineering Research Center supports graduate students in engineering and related fields. UW continues to be one of the largest producers of Ph.D. degrees in the United States.

**Continuing Education and Non-Credit Programs.** UW offers extensive continuing education and non-credit programs at all three campuses, primarily through the UW Educational Outreach (UWEO) division. The UW mission statement acknowledges the importance of Educational Outreach to serving non-traditional students and “extend[ing] educational opportunities to many who would not otherwise have access to them.” Under University policy, UWEO programs are fee-based and self-supporting.

UWEO offers thousands of individual courses, approximately 120 certificate programs (both online and classroom-based), 35 masters programs (all fee-based/self-supporting, both online and classroom-based), and both on-line and evening baccalaureate programs. The unit runs summer sessions for the University, provides English language and other instructional opportunities for international students, offers customized courses and programs for industry partners, and sponsors a wide variety of special events and programs serving high school and college students, working adults, and retirees. Most participants are working adults, with the exception of those participating in summer sessions.

Already expansive, UWEO aspires to continued growth in enrollments, programs, and partners. Its growth plans are linked firmly to the mission of the University and the needs of the State. As just one example, UWEO is planning new programs related to climate change, sustainability, and the need for a “green” workforce.

Through the academic departments, Faculty Senate and the relevant University Faculty Councils, faculty control all academic elements of degree programs, including curriculum, admissions and graduation requirements, and other academic policies. UW faculty are integrally involved in EO program planning and assessment.
2D. Student Support Resources

The University of Washington is committed to providing a transformational experience for its students. A collaborative relationship between the Division of Student Life, Undergraduate Academic Affairs and the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity is notable and has resulted in creative, high-touch, quality undergraduate experiences throughout the University.

The institution is dedicated to enhancing the student experience—both curricular and co-curricular. There is ample evidence that advising, counseling, leadership development, living-learning communities, career development, financial aid and scholarships, co-curricular offerings, and student engagement are carefully attended to, and a multitude of programs and services are offered in support of student success.

Ensuring that UW students have a positive classroom experience is a priority. Recent renovations of several buildings exemplified in the “Restore the Core” renovation program started in Fall 2012, have eased the demand from increased enrollments and aging facilities. Overall space utilization for classroom seats has increased from 65% of seats filled on average in Fall 2007 to 71% of seats filled in Fall 2012.

The institution makes adequate provision for the safety and security of its students both on campus and in the near campus neighborhoods. A review of websites, brochures, posters and other media reflect a concerted engagement of safety, health and wellness education across the campus. There is a well-functioning “students of concern” committee (Consultation and Assessment Team--CAT) that meets regularly. The UW Police Department and Seattle Police collaborate to ensure that the campus and surrounding areas are safe. UW Tacoma and UW Bothell have their own public safety departments and law enforcement services. Students are regularly given tips about how to remain safe and secure and have the information they need to make good decisions. Especially notable is the partnership between the Associated Students of UW (ASUW), the Offices of Student Life and others to provide safety, health and wellness education to the campus. The ASUW has demonstrated a strong commitment to provide leadership, resources and support of these efforts.

Preventing and responding to sexual assault is an important safety consideration for any university. Although there appears to be adequate sexual assault prevention programs as well as a commitment to reducing high risk behaviors that increase the likelihood of an assault, policies and procedures governing response after a sexual assault were less clear. A UW student should be able to quickly and easily find information about how to report a sexual assault and receive support, and that information should be prominently displayed on a variety of websites. Given recent scrutiny of many U.S. universities from the Department of Education and the Office of Civil Rights regarding universities’ sexual assault policies and response, the Committee encourages UW to consider simplifying and more broadly disseminating information in order to ensure compliance with national standards. Similarly, information regarding the UW Conduct Code was also difficult to find and not particularly student-friendly.

Building a student population that is diverse and academically talented is a strong goal of the University. Websites, high school visitations, outreach to school counselors, and college fairs
are just a few of the ways that the University strives to reach prospective students from a variety of economic and sociocultural backgrounds and provide them with the information they need in order to gain admission to UW.

The institution appears to recruit and admit students in a manner consistent with its mission. Admission to UW is quite competitive, especially at the Seattle campus; yet is apparent that the University pays close attention to access related issues. A full file review that rates students in a holistic manner is utilized, allowing for consideration of a variety of student factors along with the student’s academic achievements.

The faculty at UW guides the admission standards at the University. A Faculty Council on Academic Standards develops admission policies, and a subcommittee of this Council focuses specifically on admission-related or graduation-related matters. Special admits for student-athletes are carefully considered and tracked by a faculty oversight committee.

The institution makes efforts to inform students about program elimination and/or any significant changes that may affect time to graduation. A robust FAQ is available on the registrar’s website that appears to answer most commonly asked questions and provides information about crucial deadlines and important resources. Publications that describe requirements for entry into occupations or professions are provided through the various schools and colleges. For example, the FAQ on the Teacher Education website provides students with abundant information about the teacher preparation and licensure process.

The institution provides information about retention of student records, student privacy, and adequate training and response to the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The Registrar’s Office offers an on-line assessment and training to ensure best practices for faculty/staff when handling student records. Additionally, information about FERPA is displayed on several University of Washington websites.

The University of Washington is dedicated to access and serving the citizens of the State of Washington by providing high quality education. Evidenced by the successful Husky Promise, the University does a commendable job of admitting and enrolling low-income students. Information about institutional, state and federal financial aid and scholarships is available on the Financial Aid website.

The University has been successful in maintaining a low average loan debt for undergraduate borrowers relative to its peers ($20,316 for 2010-11 compared to the 2010-11 national average of $25,000) and a reasonable Direct Loan and Perkins default rate (2.3 percent and 3.4%, respectively). A recent new on-line tool was added to the Student Personal Services system that now allows students to gain information about their student loan status as well as on-line repayment tools, 24/7.

Maintaining robust student advising for all students is extremely important to the University and a key component of student success. The decision to co-locate the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity and the Office of Undergraduate Academic Affairs in Mary Gates Hall has had a positive impact on the academic support and collaboration among units, and it is apparent that
students are benefiting from this “one-stop” approach to academic support services. Additionally, the cross-training opportunities that naturally occur when staff members are in close proximity is increasing efficiency while building staff competencies and skills.

Co-curricular activities and programs are an important component of the overall student experience at the University of Washington. A large number and variety of student engagement activities offered through the offices in Student Life, from fraternities and sororities to Recreational Sports, produce a robust, well-rounded student experience. The recently renovated student union (“The Hub”) is an excellent gathering space for community interaction, events and student support services. New residence hall communities are growing, as are residential learning communities on the campus. Career Services is effectively partnering with Undergraduate Academic Affairs and various academic schools and colleges to create career options for students that map onto a wide variety of majors. Health and wellness is given a high priority, with programs and services that care for the whole student and attempt to imbue healthy habits for a lifetime. Service learning and undergraduate research opportunities are well conceived and extremely popular with students. Abundant leadership and interpersonal, intercultural learning reflect the University’s values and prepare students to be active, global citizens.

Senior administration has been particularly effective in forging a strong partnership and working relationship with the student leadership at the University of Washington. The provost has extensive, regular meetings with the Associated Students of the UW (ASUW) and with the Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS). She has also established a student advisory committee. UW Tacoma and UW Bothell have their own student governance; student leaders also meet regularly with their Chancellors and also have a link to ASUW. There were multiple examples of the administration listening and responding to the concerns and needs of students as well as sharing the vision and goals of the University. The ASUW and GPSS are outstanding examples of effective, positive shared governance among undergraduate, graduate students and administrators.

The University of Washington has a competitive, highly successful Division-1 athletic program. The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics strives to ensure a well-rounded experience for their student-athletes. The graduation and retention rates for student athletes are notable, and have consistently been in the top 2 or 3 in the Pacific 12 Conference for the last several years.

Student-Athlete Academic Services are well organized and successfully support student-athletes toward their academic goals. Student-Athlete Academic Services has a joint report to general academic advising, ensuring seamless integration and consistent services.

There appears to be acceptable oversight and institutional control in regards to intercollegiate athletics. The Athletic Director is a member of the President’s cabinet and is involved in senior leadership. Additionally, the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics is a well-functioning academic committee that advises the President on all matters pertaining to academic and financial integrity of the department of intercollegiate athletics as well as the academic and personal well-being of the student–athletes.
2E. Library and Information Resources

Library resources are at an appropriate level of currency, depth, and breadth to support the institution’s current mission, core themes, programs, and services, wherever offered and however delivered. The UW Libraries have long enjoyed a well-deserved reputation for one of the nation’s finest collections, ranking 14th among the 115 members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) with more than 7 million volumes.

The budgetary resources allocated to the Libraries have been well managed through the current transition from print to digital collections. Library collections are truly available anywhere and anytime with over 105,000 full-text electronic journals and half a million e-books available to the UW community, including Bothell and Tacoma. At the same time librarians have built deep research collections of rare and unique materials in special collections (e.g., Pacific Northwest, book arts, 19th c. American literature, and photography) and area studies (e.g., Canada, Central Asia, East Asia, Russia/East Europe, Scandinavia, South Asia, Southeast Asia).

A concern is the Libraries’ ability to continue to build area studies collections as available funds diminish and costs of acquisitions increase. During the budget crisis beginning in 2008 the Libraries’ collections budget was reduced by about 20% ($2.361 million), but through a combination of a restoration of funding from the Provost in FY12-13, and careful management of funds and resources, the library administration has been able to maintain collection depth and currency, though maintaining levels of traditional book purchases continues to be a challenge. By expanding consortial purchases of databases and e-book collections, using document delivery for lesser used items, relying on expanded endowments, and rigorously evaluating per-cost uses for electronic journals and database, the UW Libraries managed to ensure the survival of one of UW’s greatest resources. Also during the budget crisis, staffing was reduced by about 9% and has not significantly recovered, leading to growing concern about retention and recruitment.

In general the 17 library facilities are in good condition, ranging from the newly remodeled Odegaard Undergraduate Library to the older Art, Drama, and Music libraries which will need to be replaced. The main Suzzallo/Allen Libraries are flourishing and contrast the traditional elegance of the old main reading room with the new modular Research Commons: both are well used by students. The Odegaard Library contains two extraordinary state-of-the-art Active Learning Classrooms. One Computer Science faculty member commented that only now in using one of the Active Learning classrooms was he able to fully realize the potential of technology to transform student learning and to achieve his classroom goals. The Library is to be complimented on its experimentation with Active Learning Classrooms and taking a leadership role for the University.

Planning for library resources is guided by data that include feedback from affected users among faculty, staff, and administrators. Formal planning has long been established in the Libraries. Under the direction of the Libraries’ Director for Planning and Assessment, a strategic planning team has guided the planning process for more than 20 years. Beginning with full-scale strategic planning, the team has modified and refined the process to concentrate on strategic directions now on a three-year cycle. The team uses multiple measurement methods to gather data, has promoted strategic thinking, and monitors outcomes. Within the University’s governance
structure, the Faculty Council on University Libraries plays a major role in planning for library resources. In addition, the Graduate and Professional Student Library Advisory Committee, the Health Sciences Library Graduate and Professional Student Advisory Committee, the Libraries Student Advisory Committee, and the Research Commons Advisory Group provide planning input. Finally, subject librarian liaisons consult regularly with faculty and students in their academic departments.

The Library has put significant resources into providing appropriate instruction and support for students, faculty, staff, administrators, and others (as appropriate) to enhance their efficiency and effectiveness in obtaining, evaluating, and using library and information resources that support its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered. Library instruction has long been part of the services offered by the Library, but the Libraries’ Teaching and Learning Group (TLG) has transformed traditional library instruction through partnerships, faculty engagement, and enhanced technology. In partnering with the Center for Teaching and Learning, the TLG has provided instructors with online resources and assistance to enhance student learning. The TLG has worked directly with faculty to promote curricular integration of information literacy and research skills with course content. In utilizing technology, the TLG has worked to integrate library resources into the Canvas learning management system, and has developed the two outstanding Active Learning Classrooms in Odegaard Library which support case-based learning, guided inquiry, and peer learning. The Libraries administration and the TLG are to be complimented on creating an effective engagement with academic programs to enhance active learning.

This partnership extends beyond Seattle to Bothell and Tacoma. Students and faculty at the branch campuses were uniformly supportive of the UW Libraries. It is an excellent example of how the strength of the Seattle campus can be leveraged by the branch campuses. Library staff at the branch campuses are very engaged with regular instruction, and many faculty commented on their collaboration with Library faculty.

The Library has a variety of ways to evaluate the quality, adequacy, utilization, and security of library and information resources and services, including those provided through cooperative arrangements, wherever offered and however delivered. Under the direction of the Director for Planning and Assessment, the Metrics Team has administered a large-scale triennial survey of faculty and students since 1992 (the longest continuous cycle in an academic library). On off years an in-library use survey has been administered with the intention to respond to identified issues and create positive learning environments. The combination of these and other surveys and sources of assessment have informed decision making in collection development, facilities, instruction, and research support. In some instances, specific issues have been identified and rectified as a result of survey comments. Significantly, the UW Libraries are planning, assessing, and closing the loop to inform practice and future planning. This culture of planning and assessment has garnered the Libraries a national reputation and the Libraries administration is to be complimented on its commitment to developing and maintaining this culture.
2F. Financial Resources

Proper financial planning and appropriate risk management have resulted in a strong financial position for the University of Washington. The strong balance sheet, continued annual increases in net assets, and strong credit ratings are evidence of the University’s accomplishments in and capacity for financial management.

While the economic downturn put pressure on the University of Washington’s finances, the institution has been able to successfully manage its resources to advance the mission. UW has sufficient cash flow and reserves to support its programs and services. This is evidenced by a strong balance sheet, continued annual increases in net assets, and a large capacity to issue additional debt due to strong credit ratings.

A review of the institution’s 2012 Financial Report and discussions with University personnel support the strong balance sheet position. UW has net assets of $5.7 billion, with $1.4 billion of that amount being unrestricted. The liquidity position is strong with $1.2 billion in available cash and investments.

The University was able to demonstrate positive increases in net assets in each of the last three fiscal years (the period reviewed). Since 2010, the institution has generated $979 million in net assets.

UW has very strong credit ratings. The institution is rated AAA by Moody’s Investor’s Services (the highest rating assignable) and AA+ by Standard and Poor’s (one level below the highest rating assignable). Additionally, the University does not have debt limitations imposed by the Board of Regents, giving the institution plenty of capacity based on the strong credit ratings.

The University has a comprehensive resource planning process that includes the 2y2d Initiative, the Sustainable Academic Business Plan, and Activity Based Budgeting. Resource planning decisions are driven by the institution’s vision and values. Over the last four years, planning efforts have focused on how to absorb significant General Fund reductions. Additionally, the University is limited by zero percent tuition increases for the next two academic years.

Tuition revenue is projected as one aspect of a broader enrollment planning and management process. Enrollment planning focuses on the number and mix of students. A committee composed of the President, Provost, Vice Provost for Planning & Budgeting, Senior Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs, Vice President for Student Life, and the Assistant Vice President for Enrollment makes decisions based on projected graduations, persistence for current students, and the expected size and quality of new applicant pools.

Projections of grant revenue are based on a variety of factors that include: (a) grant awards received in the current fiscal year, (b) submitted grant proposals, (c) projected mix of grant awards, (d) projected changes in federal research funding, and (e) estimates of changes in research space. Projections of private giving are based on historical data and recent fund raising experience. The institution is one of the top fundraising universities in the United States.
Projections of other non-tuition revenue sources are developed by local units and reviewed by the Office of Planning & Budgeting.

UW has a comprehensive and transparent process for financial planning and budget development. The Office of Planning & Budgeting provides information to faculty, staff and students that describes the process and provides historical budget data. The Board of Regents’ budget approval process includes campus-wide consultation and a public comment meeting. Each annual budget incorporates input from the Board of Regents, the deans and chancellors, the President’s Cabinet, the Faculty Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, students and staff.

UW uses a legacy accounting system that is over 30 years old. While limiting flexibility, the system meets the institution’s immediate needs and is in compliance with generally accepted accounting principles.

The University is currently audited by KPMG LLP and has received an unqualified opinion. The Internal Audit Department conducts independent audits and consultations designed to evaluate and promote the system of internal controls.

Capital budget decisions are driven by the institution’s mission and goals. The institution has a comprehensive 10-year capital plan (“One Capital Plan”) that identifies long term capital needs and prioritizes projects. Any proposed capital project over $5 million requires approval by the President and the Board of Regents.

The One Capital Plan is used to project and manage the amount of debt UW will be issuing. The institution has an official debt policy that covers topics related to debt issuance, management, and servicing. Each capital project is evaluated in terms of incremental revenue that will be generated to pay debt service, and the financial impact on the University as a whole.

The University’s auxiliary enterprises operate on a self-sustaining basis. They are required to cover both operating and capital needs from their revenue base. Auxiliary enterprises neither depend on financial support from central resources nor support the institution’s education and general operations.

The institution has a written agreement with the University of Washington Foundation (UWF), a nonprofit organization that performs fundraising activities on behalf of the University. Gifts and grants that are made to the UWF are immediately transferred to the University.
2G. Physical and Technological Infrastructure

The institution owns buildings and infrastructure with an original cost basis of $4.2 billion. In addition, UW has $721 million in construction-in-progress. The facilities and grounds look well-maintained and adequately support the University’s mission, core themes, and activities. UW Seattle, UW Tacoma, and UW Bothell have each developed a comprehensive Campus Master Plan that is consistent with their mission, core themes, and long-term educational and financial plans. Recent capital investments include new student housing, renovation of Husky Stadium, expansion of the University of Washington Medical Center, renovation of the Husky Union Building, a new Molecular Engineering building, and replacement of Balmer Hall (business school).

The University has an executive level policy for creating, maintaining, and enhancing an environment that is safe for all individuals, including students, faculty, staff, hospital patients, and visitors. UW Seattle’s Environmental Health & Safety unit provides guidelines, technical expertise, procedures, and specialized services to academic, research, and central service units in support of the University’s efforts to maintain safe, healthful, and environmentally responsible places of research, education, and service. Numerous other units also commit resources to carry out the University’s policy.

The institution owns furniture, fixtures, and equipment with an original cost basis of $1.2 billion. Basic furniture and equipment for the three UW campuses is generally provided as part of the initial capital budget for major new construction and renovation projects. UW Seattle allocates equipment budgets to the campuses, schools, and colleges, and they in turn are responsible for prioritizing and allocating funding to the departments and units.

Through the vision of “anytime/anywhere/any device” access to resources, UW Information Technology (IT) supports the ongoing transformation of the University. UW IT works closely with departments to identify opportunities for improving technology capabilities, for reducing service duplication, and for exploiting new marketplace trends, including cloud computing and mobility. In support of teaching and learning, recent IT initiatives include pilot deployment of cloud-based learning management and lecture capture systems, as well as local development of a tool for students to more easily organize and plan their academic program. Not including those in the medical centers, there are approximately 1,100 professional staff employed by the University supporting IT. The infrastructure and support are adequate for an institution of this size and scope.

IT services support the University community through a help desk, one-on-one assistance, orientations, documentation, and websites with information and links to other resources. They support faculty who use classroom presentation and digital media technologies. Student labs are staffed with student workers who answer questions and help with technology use. In addition, the Academic and Collaborative Applications unit within UW IT works with faculty and departmental staff to provide support for teaching and learning technologies. This includes start-up assistance, on-going consulting, and assessments.
UW IT sponsors or participates in at least a half dozen committees that relate to planning and management of information technology. A Strategy Board provides high-level governance and a Service Investment Board makes recommendations for IT services, including the level of investment in new products and applications. Both of these bodies include faculty representation. Other groups include the Service Management Board, which seeks to align UW-IT services with institutional IT strategy and priorities; the Academic Advisory Group for Enterprise Reporting; the Data Management Committee, and the Technology Recharge Fee Advisory Committee.

The institution conducts an annual service assessment and large-scale surveys to address the current and future IT needs for faculty, staff, and students. An outside customer satisfaction survey assesses areas for improvement. The planning process and procedures are adequate for the size and scope of the institution.

**Standard 3 – Planning and Implementation**

**3A. Institutional Planning**

UW engages in a number of disciplined planning exercises, from departmental and school planning, to 10 year capital planning, to IT planning, to disaster preparedness planning, to an institutional annual budget planning effort. In addition to the recurring budget planning cycle, the institution has engaged in episodic institution-wide strategic planning, most recently in response to the financial crisis beginning in 2008. UW is currently engaged in planning for an upcoming capital campaign. Although there are benefits to a more periodic strategic planning process, changes in leadership have probably hampered establishing a regular cycle of strategic planning. This would be advisable given the breadth, complexity, and size of this institution. Nonetheless, it appears that competent planning occurs at many levels of the institution.

The last major planning effort, the Two Years to Two Decades (2y2d) initiative, engaged a large number of members of the academic community during a time of great change and stress for the University. The steering committee included opinion leaders from academic and non-academic areas of the campus. Its members developed a high level framework and conducted a gap analysis, leading to a vision for the future that was rooted in institutional values and strengths while also recognizing the inevitability of change to keep the University viable. The overarching framework of the plan has generated numerous projects for institutional improvement, informed decision making to avoid local optimization, and kept academic leaders coming back to big goals. The process, originally designed to be a two year effort, has evolved into a rolling two year framework, so that the steering committee and academic leaders can always be looking ahead. The process has been open, with updates and decisions posted on web site, and announced publicly to campus, which has enhanced acceptance of difficult decisions.

The 2y2d plan has provided vehicles for informed decision-making. The 2y2d planning exercise was an impressive effort that led to some clear recommendations on how best to cope with the new reality of lessened state support. This is a commendable undertaking with significant value to the institution.
The Sustainable Academic Business Plan, a product of the 2y2d vision for the future, offers a second powerful example of institutional planning. Accreditation committee members heard compelling examples of ways in which the integration of financial and academic considerations has helped UW provide the same (or better) level of service while reducing costs. The initiatives that have emerged from the plan have built consensus around important changes in teaching, research, and organizational processes. Some notable accomplishments include breaking down barriers to interdisciplinarity, to online teaching, and to shared services; fostering collaboration, leadership training and succession planning; and improving the student experience.

Another major advance in planning is linked to the implementation of the Activity Based Budget model on the Seattle campus, which allocates revenues to the units generating it. ABB is intended to strengthen undergraduate education and provide incentives for undergraduate teaching. It is an important tool for planning because it demonstrates where revenue is generated and which units are subsidized. (The Bothell and Tacoma campuses do not use ABB; the chancellors of these campuses stated that their small size and rapid growth require them to be more strategic in their budgeting.)

There are a number of ways in which the UW’s comprehensive planning process is informed by the collection and analysis of data. Three mechanisms that are employed are: 1) the Academic Program Evaluation Initiative, 2) the Organizational Effectiveness Initiative, and 3) the use of performance dashboards by a number of UW administrative units. In addition, the institution actively surveys students, staff, faculty, and (increasingly) alumni; it also monitors student outcomes (e.g., retention and graduation rates, time to degree) using institutional data. Together, these appear to be highly informative. The institution appears “data rich,” which we suspect is appropriately mined to help in decision-making throughout the University. Unfortunately, the self-study was not particularly revealing and helpful in understanding how institutional research is applied effectively to decision-making. Nonetheless, interviews as well as reports, websites, and displays provide numerous examples of how UW collects and analyzes data to determine progress toward its goals.

For example, the 2y2d process began with an extensive series of focus groups, which contributed to the vision statement that resulted. The website for the Organizational Effectiveness Initiative (OEI) (http://www.washington.edu/2y2d/organizational-effectiveness/) offers a variety of analytical resources, including templates and tools for data collection and analysis. OEI also works with a range of academic and administrative units to conduct evaluations or needs assessments. As the following section will discuss in more detail, the University collects and integrates into its planning and decision-making data about research, teaching and learning, and service.

3B. Core Theme Planning

The Evaluation Committee found that planning for each of UW’s core themes is consistent with the institution’s comprehensive plan – in fact, the manner in which the core themes have been addressed largely emerge from the comprehensive 2y2d and Sustainable Academic Business Plan processes. Core theme planning has contributed to UW’s continued effectiveness and
success during a period of significant financial constraints. Planning has been informed by data collection and analysis.

**Core Theme #1: Teaching and Learning.** UW identified four objectives for the core theme of teaching and learning. First, the institution seeks to provide leadership for innovative and effective teaching. The Evaluation Committee found ample evidence that this objective is being achieved, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Units such as the Center for Teaching and Learning support teaching innovation, including the integration of educational technology into courses and curriculum. UW faculty members have demonstrated sustained attention to curriculum and degree requirements, including development of new degrees to capitalize on the changing disciplines and professional challenges. Experimentation is evident across the schools and colleges, including new offerings that build on community engagements, use of summer workshops and institutes, hybrid teaching, international engagements, and industry partnerships.

Second, UW aims to provide transformative learning experiences. A number of programs offer such opportunities. A notable example is the array of programs offered by the Center for Experiential Learning and Diversity: 1) Carlson Leadership & Public Service Center: facilitating service-learning and community leadership; 2) Early Identification program: making advanced educational opportunities available; 3) Global Opportunities: advising and support for students interested in study abroad; 4) Jumpstart: pairing UW students with low-income Seattle preschool children to build skills for school success; 5) Mary Gates Endowment for Students: supporting engagement in research and leadership; 6) Pipeline Project: providing opportunities to tutor and mentor K-12 students locally and regionally; 7) Undergraduate Research Program: developing and extending research opportunities in all disciplines; 8) Office of Merit Scholarships, Fellowships, & Awards: impacting students through scholarship opportunities and resources; 9) Ronald E McNair Program: preparing low-income and first-generation or underrepresented students for doctoral study and whose goals are to teach and research at the college level. (This listing and the descriptions of the programs is drawn from the Center’s website [http://expd.washington.edu/about-us/center-for-experiential-learning-and-diversity-facts.html.](http://expd.washington.edu/about-us/center-for-experiential-learning-and-diversity-facts.html.) UW has devoted resources to and has had significant success in helping its students win national awards (Rhodes, Fulbright, etc.), as well as campus-based scholarship and fellowship opportunities. An aspiration articulated by the Provost is to provide 90% of the students with a premium, hopefully transformative experience, an ambitious goal given the size of the undergraduate population and the resources required for such programs.

Residential learning communities and avenues for leadership development through co-curricular activities also contribute to this objective. The Husky Experience is an initiative to help students connect their learning inside and outside the classroom. It also defines the goals for a graduate of the University of Washington and provides a framework for the collaboration and integration of a complex set of offices serving students. UW was ranked first in 2013 for the number of graduates entering the Peace Corps, suggesting that many students are prepared for and continue to seek transformative experiences following graduation.

Transformational learning is integral to graduate education as well. One dean stated, with agreement from others, “transformational experiences are in our DNA; our graduate programs provide these experiences for all students.” When the faculty are engaged in efforts to address
significant social challenges (for example, efforts at the School of Education to reform the K-12 system), they engage graduate students in those efforts at transformation.  As another example, the School of Public Health has set the goal of having each of its graduate students complete a practicum.

Third, UW seeks to provide access to instruction and services that enable students to be successful in their postsecondary endeavors. An important step in this regard was the creation of a new position of Senior Vice Provost for Academic & Student Affairs in August 2012, which is charged with coordinating the work of three offices devoted to undergraduates (Student Life, Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity and Undergraduate Academic Affairs) as well as the Graduate School. This decision recognizes that student success is measured not only in terms of performance in a course but also in helping a diverse student population to navigate a large institution. In the same spirit, the Provost meets weekly with undergraduate and graduate students, providing data and seeking input. UW has also invested in strengthening the pipeline to graduate education through a range of programs such as McNair Scholars, ADVANCE, and attention to the quality and focus of academic counseling.

Fourth, recognizing the value of a diverse learning environment for all, the UW aspires to welcome and educate a diverse population of students and to recruit and support a diverse faculty and staff. The Evaluation Committee found a commitment to diversity on campus (it is one of six UW core values), and sustained, well-planned programs and investments that far exceed the relatively modest place afforded these efforts in the self-study. In recent years, the institution has become more strategic and intentional in trying to achieve diversity goals. Attention to diversity has broadened beyond race/ethnicity, to include consideration of providing an inclusive environment that welcomes students with disabilities, of all sexual orientations, and religions. Given the population of the state of Washington, efforts are also made to support students from disadvantaged socioeconomic status and from rural backgrounds.

The University Diversity Council, which includes senior administrators and faculty, has prepared a Diversity Blueprint as a guide for planning. The Blueprint offers goals and objectives for six areas: leadership and governance; student, faculty and staff diversity; curriculum and research; and institutional and classroom climate. Each unit has been asked to prepare a diversity plan based on the blueprint. In this way, diversity is not relegated to a single officer but instead is a shared responsibility: to cite one example, the provost holds the deans accountable for the diversity of their faculty recruitments.

UW’s Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity oversees programs aimed at increasing college access, promoting academic excellence and fostering community engagement. Among the “diversity pride points” are the increase in applications, acceptances and enrollment of underrepresented students (enrollment has increased by 23% over the last five years) as well as the six-year graduation rate for underrepresented students (71% at UW, 58% nationally).

Diversity of the faculty is critical to the achievement of inclusiveness for a diverse population of students. The University has explored strategies for increasing the diversity of the professoriate, including the creation of an Office of Faculty Advancement and some limited funding to assist in the hiring of faculty who contribute to diversity. To recognize the efforts of faculty members
who contribute to the diversity of the campus, in 2012, the University added language to the Faculty Code to make accomplishments related to enriching diversity in teaching, research and service considered, but not required in faculty appointments and promotion decisions. These changes were approved by more than three quarters of the voting faculty.

The University has identified specific ways in which diversity supports innovation for the intellectual agenda of the University, including in STEM fields. In a variety of academic units, including the UW Diversity Research Institute, key faculty and staff are working to support new interdisciplinary knowledge about diversity, social justice, and institutional transformation. Just a few among many examples include the Equity Team in the School of Education, an initiative on race in the Political Science department, engagement with diverse communities in Social Work, and the Engineering Research Center for Sensorimotor Neural Engineering that offers outreach to women, underrepresented minorities and people with disabilities. Majors and minors have been developed in fields of special interest to underrepresented students; at the graduate level an example is a graduate certificate in sexuality and queer studies.

The UW ADVANCE initiative has been underway for many years to increase gender diversity of the faculty in STEM fields. Its successful work continues to offer workshops for deans and chairs to reduce bias in the hiring process. In recent years, the ADVANCE staff has added some programming for graduate students and postdocs. The Office of Faculty Advancement has supported groups of faculty of color who have worked to get more minority faculty in tenured positions.

The Sustainable Academic Business Plan has enabled UW to focus on a limited set of very important tasks, including teaching and learning. The development of the Core Theme of Teaching and Learning engaged experts in the Provost’s office, and central offices, as well as faculty and staff in the schools and colleges. The conversations about teaching and learning occurred simultaneously at the level of the institution, at the level of departments, and at the level of courses.

In sum, the Evaluation Committee observed that the theme of Teaching and Learning is well-planned and implemented. UW academic programs and support services are broad, deep, and often at the cutting edge of the professions and disciplines. Leadership for innovative and effective teaching is evident throughout the University.

Core Theme #2: Research and Scholarship. UW is a research powerhouse, exceeding $1.47 billion in 2012 in research. UW is a member of the most prestigious academic associations (e.g., AAU) and employs distinguished faculty who have been recognized with many prestigious awards. The University’s pervasive, high-expectation culture for research and scholarship is sustained in large part because of faculty commitment to this fundamental core theme and administrative leadership in support of viable paths forward. Throughout transitions in State funding, federal research opportunities, and availability of private revenue sources, the University’s overall level of funded research has remained very strong. This is a significant accomplishment reflective of the high caliber of faculty that UW has attracted and retained during these times.
Equally significant responses to changing externalities are the efforts to build research collaborations within UW by forming research teams with investigators drawn from multiple units spanning departments, schools and colleges. Now those collaborations are being extended across UW campuses and outwardly with private industry and federal laboratories.

Examples of some of the support, encouragement, and enabling activities that are hallmarks of the culture of scholarship and research at UW include:

- **The Simpson Center for the Humanities.** This endowed center stimulates significant creative activity and scholarship in the humanities including, among other things, a faculty fellows program whereby faculty can be granted time to develop their own and collaborative scholarship, and Summer Institutes in the Arts and Humanities that fund 20 students and 4 faculty in intense, interdisciplinary research. Forward looking, the Simpson Center is initiating a fellowship program, Digital Humanities Commons, for either exploration of the use of digital technologies in the humanities or for studies of the digital culture itself.

- **The Royalty Research Fund.** This intramural program selects and widely distributes research funds. Funding has been distributed across the disciplines with very roughly 1/3 each to Arts and Humanities, Biological Sciences and Medicine, and Physical Sciences and Engineering.

- **Provost Bridge Awards.** These awards are institutional investments that provide funding to bridge research activity across interruptions in external funding. Extremely high (over 8 fold on average) fiscal return on investment has been realized. Perhaps an even larger value for UW is realized in sustaining the strong culture of research through this collegial safety net.

- **Undergraduate Research Experience.** The University of Washington enjoys a significant contribution towards fulfillment of both the research/scholarship and teaching/learning core themes through support and encouragement of a campus-wide ethic of undergraduate research. Of particular note are the UW Undergraduate Research Symposium where now approximately 1,000 research projects are presented annually and the on-line database that helps over 7,000 students find opportunities of interest. Facilitating undergraduate student research experiences is part of a larger portfolio held by the Center for Experiential Learning and Diversity. The CELD manages many programs that enrich student life including Community Engagement, Undergraduate Scholarships and Undergraduate Research.

- **Complex Proposals Management Group.** The Office of Research has formed this administrative group to help faculty meet the extremely complex requirements that go along with responding to large, collaborative integrated science and engineering research opportunities. The efficacy of the group is monitored on the iSTAR dashboard, which in itself is evidence of the dramatic way UW has embraced the outcomes of its 2y2d and Sustainable Academic Business Plan implementation.
• **Academic Organization.** Leadership at UW, and especially leadership in administration of OR, has allowed formation of centers of focus for academic pursuits as long as the concept is cogent and the center reports to a Dean (or group of Deans.) This latter constraint helps ensure the alignment of research activity with academic leadership and planning. However, the constraint doesn’t unnecessarily limit creativity in following the most recent discoveries in one field, integrating cross-discipline expertise, or taking advantages of funding opportunities.

Over the ten years since the comprehensive review of 2003, UW has exhibited nimbleness and survivability in a relatively rapidly changing context for research-intensive universities in the United States. To be where it is now is a remarkable demonstration of the resilience of the institution in response to a significant drop in state support.

However, several years of deferring increases in faculty salary resulted in significantly under-market salaries, on average, for Professors and Associate Professors. The situation has also produced severe compression, or even inversion in some units, of faculty salaries. If not addressed, this situation could lead to reduced morale, increased difficulty in recruiting and retaining top faculty, and eventually put the research enterprise at risk.

Another concern related to research is the relatively high teaching loads at the branch campuses (5 courses/year at Bothell and 6 courses/year at Tacoma), which reduces time for research and scholarship. Faculty have good support for research, but finding time is the largest impediment. There has been a focus on getting new faculty tenured and promoted to associate professor, but now faculty and leadership on these campuses need to think about how to bring distinction to faculty for promotion to full professor.

**Core Theme #3: Service.** Service to community is integral to UW’s mission and identity. The value is expressed in a multitude of policies and programs such as: the rich array of service-learning opportunities available to students; experimentation with MOOCs; the criteria for faculty promotion; the provision of health care for uninsured and indigent patients; the extensive Educational Outreach offerings; and the institution’s efforts to stimulate the local economy. It is noteworthy that UW’s plans for service including bringing the campus to the community (e.g., through community service and start-up companies) as well as bringing the community to the campus (e.g., visits to the Burke Museum or attendance at performances and public lectures).

UW identified three objectives for the core theme of services: addressing issues related to its community and beyond; fueling the economic engine of the Pacific Northwest; and providing highest quality healthcare to the region. These are well-established efforts with solid programs and infrastructure in place. The institution has demonstrated its ability to design and implement plans in each of these areas.

Planning related to this core theme takes place both centrally and within the academic units. For example, to enhance the institution’s ability to address societal needs, the President launched a collaborative initiative called *Tomorrow’s University Today*, focused on boosting UW’s
contributions to the community in: K-12 education and early learning; sustainability and clean energy; and health care and social welfare. This involves applied and translational research, technology transfer, direct service, and educating the next generation of leaders in these fields.

UW has integrated the value of service into both the curriculum and co-curriculum, with a particular focus on the first objective of addressing issues related to the community. One manifestation of the institution’s efforts and effectiveness is the large number of Peace Corps volunteers – ranked second on this metric in 2012 and first in 2013. This reflects purposeful planning that involves extensive outreach to students, faculty and staff.

UW is fortunate to have an endowment to support the work of the Carlson Leadership and Public Service Center, which sponsors approximately 100 service learning courses per year enrolling close to 3,000 students, as well as other service-learning and internship opportunities. It is noteworthy that the Center, rather than functioning as a stand-alone unit, is well-integrated into undergraduate education through its organizational placement with the Center for Experiential Learning and Undergraduate Academic Affairs.

The University also systematically plans its efforts to fuel the economy. For example, UW leadership assigns a high priority to commercialization and technology transfer. Innovative elements of this effort include a $20 million venture fund and a Center for Commercialization.

The Health Science enterprise at UW also plans carefully to ensure its ability to fulfill its service mission. In addition to its four hospitals, UW maintains over 200 outpatient and neighborhood clinics. It is a major source of health care for low income individuals and families, providing an estimated $325 million in uncompensated or charitable care in 2012. It also attends to future needs of the region by serving as a regional medical school for the states of Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana and Idaho (WWAMI program). This program, now 40 years old, has been instrumental in training primary care physicians who will work in underserved rural areas of the country.

Core Themes at the Branch Campuses. The three core themes of the UW are clearly evident at the branch campuses of Bothell and Tacoma. Their externally funded research programs are growing, the campuses show very strong commitments to teaching and learning, and a well-articulated public service mission is focused on local communities.

Standard 4 – Effectiveness and Improvement

4A. Assessment

The Evaluation Committee found that data collection and analysis are integrated into the functioning of academic departments and administrative units. Committee members were provided with numerous examples of empirical reports – some examples include a recent economic impact report; the focus groups associated with 2y2d; the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) as well as locally-developed student surveys; various projects by the office of Organizational Effectiveness (customer and employee satisfaction surveys; performance metrics); various projects by the Office of Educational Assessment (e.g., 2013 UW Academic
Challenge and Engagement Study, 2011 diversity goal attainment dashboard, 2009 UW Senior Research Study); and \textit{ad hoc} projects such as the Service-Learning Student Evaluation Report 2012-2013. Extensive data about the research enterprise are available, including cross-sectional and longitudinal information about extramural funding and research productivity as well as performance indicators for the Office of Research (under the initiative called “Improving Service to Advance Research”). The Institutional Research Office publishes statistical profiles of students and in partnership with IT has provided end users with direct access to data through the enterprise data warehouse; programs engage in a regular ten-year cycle of external review; course evaluations are well established; and every department has learning objectives and an assessment plan. The University regularly compares itself to a number of peer institutions on a variety of dimensions. The State of Washington, disciplinary accreditation agencies, and other external stakeholders also demand empirical evidence of educational effectiveness and organizational efficiency. Some of UW’s assessments have been shared with the larger educational community, including the 2013 \textit{Inside the Undergraduate Teaching Experience} and the 2007 \textit{Inside the Undergraduate Experience}. Thus, it is clear that UW engages in ongoing and systematic data collection and analysis at institutional, departmental, and course levels of analysis.

UW uses these data to evaluate accomplishments in multiple domains. With regard to the core themes, the institution has identified metrics for every objective and collected the corresponding data. The metrics include consideration of the effectiveness of relevant programs and services, academic and administrative. UW also systematically studies student outcomes such as time to degree and graduation rates for various subgroups of students. The evaluation of academic programs and support services is an important element of these efforts.

Finally, UW is reflective about its own assessment practices and seeks to improve them. The recent partnership between the Office of Planning and Budget and UW-IT to provide end users with access to the enterprise data warehouse and the new UW profiles represents an important step forward. The Profiles allow leaders to ask questions and make decisions based on systematic evidence. Data are now more visible and transparent to the campus. The Office of Planning and Budget is also creating a business and information portal for academic leaders that can be queried for real time access to critical information about performance on many of the core theme indicators. The creation of the organizational effectiveness and educational assessment units also represent examples of the manner in which UW strives to improve its assessment capacity and quality. The departmental assessment process is also maturing, with technical support from the Office of Educational Assessment. There is also a nascent effort to review criteria for faculty merits, tenure and promotion, with a focus on how to better assess (and reward) collaboration and interdisciplinarity.

Systematic collection of evidence focusing on the goals of meeting articulated learning outcomes and providing transformational experiences for students include student surveys, capstone experiences, and gathering evidence from students and faculty members about what makes learning transformative. Biennial departmental assessment reports are used to create and monitor progress toward institutional learning goals, so that general education goals are connected to the work done in the majors.
Over time, repeated cycles of assessment and feedback have altered the conversation about teaching and learning. Large and growing numbers of faculty have become familiar with the language of learning outcomes, and have developed approaches to assessment for their own students. The conversations among faculty and between faculty members and staff experts in assessment have made it possible to improve departments’ plans over time.

Finally, the Evaluation Committee notes that the findings hold across all three campuses. While not every metric identified for the Core Themes was measured at Bothell and Tacoma, there was evidence provided within each objective to demonstrate that the Core Themes were being accomplished. Examples for research include extramural and intramural support, undergraduates engaged in research, interdisciplinary educational opportunities, emerging fields, faculty research training, library services, and specialized research facilities. Examples for teaching and learning include course assessments, teaching support, awards, experiential learning opportunities, clearly specified learning outcomes for courses, programs, general education, and the campus, and a relatively strong culture of assessment (although this is still a work in progress for some areas). UW Tacoma has an Office for Equity and Diversity, and UW Bothell has just hired its first Director of Diversity and Campus Engagement. Both campuses are proud of their services for veterans. Examples for service include community-based learning, research collaborations, volunteer hours, and community participation on boards and committees. While the economic impact of the branch campuses is small compared to the Seattle campus, they are substantial economic development engines within their local communities.

The University has systems to support the collection of appropriate data at all three campuses. They all use a common course evaluation system and systematic alumni surveys are conducted of all University graduates. A challenge for the branch campuses is the antiquated student database system, reported as very cumbersome to use. Staff described it as being impossible to even train new employees - "they just have to watch others use it until they figure it out." There was acknowledgement that UW IT was trying to update data systems.

Based on the evidence in the self-study and provided during the site visit, the mission and core themes are being achieved at the branch campuses. Regular assessments at multiple levels of the institution are being used to improve programs and outcomes. The campuses have developed identities and cultures that will allow them to focus their efforts and resources on strategic initiatives that will give them comparative advantages in the future.

4B. Improvement

Core theme and student learning assessment results reflect institutional goals and values and are appropriately disseminated, generally in a timely manner. The Evaluation Committee focused some of its queries and interviews on the manner in which the institution uses assessment results to improve policies, programs, and practice. The decentralized nature of UW and its assessment activities creates challenges for reaching broad conclusions about this matter.

The Committee members received numerous anecdotes of meaningful, systemic change in response to assessment. These anecdotes, coupled with other interviews and the self-study, provide evidence of compliance with the standard. A few examples follow:
The two-year assessment reports asked departments to indicate changes that were made in response to assessment results. Many departments provided compelling responses. Dance, for instance, created several new courses (including a required course), modified others, added an internship opportunity, changed course descriptions, and modified policy for admissions to the major. Geography created six new courses in response to student feedback and assessment results and redesigned another course.

The course evaluation system provides data to each dean in each quarter about the highest scoring and lowest scoring course evaluations. The deans use the results to work with faculty who need improvement in graduate or undergraduate teaching.

The School of Nursing analyzed its faculty effort across instruction, research and service to develop new approaches for deploying its faculty most effectively;

The Diversity blueprint has brought focus to the issue of graduation rates for underrepresented students; strategies have been identified and implemented to lower barriers to academic success (e.g., more access to competitive majors, better advising) and to address some of the pressing financial issues facing low income students. Careful study of the reasons why students leave UW without completing their degree has focused attention on revising financial aid and reducing student debt.

Both UW Tacoma and UW Bothell have used portfolios and capstone courses for program assessment and improvement. Students and faculty attested to the value of capstone experiences to demonstrate students’ ability to apply the skills and knowledge from the program to issues and problems in their respective fields. The department of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS) uses a scientific sample of portfolios and a scoring rubric to evaluate two learning outcomes of the program each year. The Discovery Core at the Bothell campus also uses portfolios to assess the freshman year of learning outcomes. The results of these assessments have informed curriculum development and support services, including academic counseling.

The Improving Service to Advance Research initiative, in the Office of Research with support from the Office of Organizational Effectiveness, establishes metrics for customer satisfaction and operational excellence, the results of which focus management attention on areas in need of improvement.

On the other hand, the Committee found some areas where ambiguity exists concerning the utilization and application of assessment findings. The Academic Program Review Process, for example, uses student learning and outcome data identified by faculty as relevant to academic planning. If the Review identifies areas for improvement or concern, the report calls for a three-year or five-year follow up. At that time, the reviewers examine whether the improvements have been made or the concerns have been addressed. Given the number of reviews conducted each year and the use of a new set of external reviewers for each program, the process cannot be expected to provide training for faculty in developing good indicators of learning outcomes for their graduate programs. Response to the reviews is uneven, some stimulating considerable
change and others leading to little in the way of discernible outcomes. Committee members noted this is fairly typical, especially given the relatively long (ten year) cycle.

Similarly, the institution participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement, but response rates are fairly low, and it was unclear to the Committee how findings have been used to improve the student experience.

The new Academic Profiles have the potential to strengthen unit-level academic planning, assessment, and improvement, but this tool is in a soft launch stage. It is important for UW to monitor units’ use of the data warehouse generally, and the academic profiles in particular, to determine if they are living up to their promise.

Standard 5 -- Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability

The University develops and publishes evidence-based evaluations regarding the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. It regularly monitors its internal and external environments to determine how and to what degree changing circumstances may impact its mission and its ability to fulfill that mission. It has demonstrated its ability to respond effectively to changing and emerging needs, trends, and influences to ensure enduring institutional relevancy, productivity, viability, and sustainability.

5A. Mission Fulfillment

UW argues convincingly that it fulfills its mission and goals, citing in support internal and external assessments of teaching and learning, research, and public service programs. The faculty, staff, students, administration and governing board can be justifiably proud of the accomplishments of this institution.

The institution has shown great resourcefulness in response to a dramatic reduction in funding. Disciplined planning followed by administrative action has resulted in blunting the effects of decrease in state funding that exceeded $200 million. Responses included increases in tuition, increased numbers of non-resident students, administrative efficiencies and restraints on expenditures including a prolonged salary freeze.

Although UW has extensive metrics and performance indicators, it does not consistently establish clear aspirations or goals. The Diversity Blueprint does this simply and effectively, by displaying quantitative baselines and targets (and the gap between them) for a variety of indicators linked to each thematic area. For the most part, however, the metrics and plans the Committee reviewed lacked this crisp presentation of explicit goals for improvement. For example, with research and scholarship, one could imagine a goal of improved average impact factors for publications per dollar of research activity; or, for service, a 10% increase per year in the number of Washington citizens reached by UW activities. The institution is a remarkable university, with an optimistic future, but would benefit by setting for itself “stretch goals” against which it could measure its progress over the next several years.
5B. Adaptation and Sustainability

The University of Washington continually monitors its performance, adapts to changing external and internal challenges and plans for a sustainable enterprise well into the future. On an operational level, the Regents annually approve University budgets and a 10 year capital forecast. Thus there is regular review of large investments and a regular review of resources and capacity. Planning exercises have yielded new efforts including initiatives dealing with Organizational Effectiveness (February, 2013), Teaching and Learning (January, 2013) and Fostering Collaboration (September, 2012). These initiatives grew directly out of the 2y2d planning. UW uses a number of mechanisms including a sizable External Affairs group to monitor/advise policy in Washington, in Olympia and regionally.

There are also a number of internal efforts to respond to changing trends in education and education financing including “Tomorrow’s University Today” an effort by the President that focuses on applying University knowledge to major societal problems – K-12, energy, sustainability and health. UW is also responding to the new financial model with more fee-based courses and to internationalization with robust programs such as the creation of the Department of Global Health.

The major threat to sustainability that the Evaluation Committee discerned is the gap in faculty salaries between UW and its peer institutions. The University has conducted rigorous comparisons to document this gap; the Senate and administration also express concern about compression or inversion, due to higher compensation for recent hires (and retentions) relative to faculty who have a longer tenure at UW. This is a significant challenge because the lack of competitive compensation strongly affects faculty recruitment and retention and, if not addressed, will ultimately erode institutional quality.

Similarly, graduate student stipends have fallen behind the median of global challenge peers, by a significant margin in the case of students in Arts and Sciences. In order to attract highly talented students, it is essential to maintain competitive financial support that will bring the best students to the University. This, of course, also carries implications for faculty morale and retention.

Eligibility Requirements

In addition to the five standards, accreditation reviews by the Northwest Commission are expected to determine if the institution is in compliance with 24 eligibility requirements. The Evaluation Committee reviewed the requirements, and no concerns were expressed. Many eligibility requirements overlap with the Standards. In most cases, the eligibility requirements could be verified by a review of the UW website and publications (i.e., Requirements 1-17, 20, 22); the others were considered in the context of similar Standards (i.e., Requirements 18, 19, 23, and 24). Thus, the Evaluation Committee finds UW to be adhering to the Eligibility Requirements.
Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations

1. The Evaluation Committee commends UW for its robust response to the fiscal downturn, marked by planning that engaged much of the University community. By remaining focused on the University’s mission and values, the institution was able to formulate and implement strategic decisions, and as a result UW has sustained its strong academic reputation. Notable outcomes of the planning process are the Sustainable Academic Business Plan, Activity-Based Budgeting, and the variety of organizational effectiveness efforts under the umbrella of the 2y2d initiative.

2. The Evaluation Committee commends UW for its commitment to access, which is exemplified by the high fraction of Pell-eligible and first generation college students on the UW Bothell, Seattle, and Tacoma campuses. As the population of the state changes over time, financial assistance programs such as the Husky Promise that expand access to higher education represent an important contribution to the wellbeing of the state.

3. The Evaluation Committee commends UW for its commitment to enhancing the undergraduate experience by providing a variety of high impact experiences, such as freshman interest groups, undergraduate research opportunities, the Husky Leadership Initiative, and an intellectually vibrant residential community. A climate of collaboration has been important to the success of these and other efforts, including: (a) collaborations among administrative units (notably Undergraduate Academic Affairs, Student Life, and the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity); (b) collaboration between student leadership and administration; and (c) collaboration among the library, academic programs, and student support services.

4. The Evaluation Committee commends the library for fostering effective collaborations with academic programs to enhance active learning, research, scholarship, and service.

5. The Evaluation Committee commends the University for its distinguished health science enterprise, characterized by innovative programs that include:
   a. A regional decentralized medical education program providing high quality medical education in a cost efficient manner to Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho;
   b. The expansion of interdisciplinary, center-based research space, such as the South Lake Union, which enhances the scientific capacity of the University; and
   c. The collaboration of the School of Medicine and the School of Public Health in establishing the Department of Global Health as a national and international resource.

6. The Evaluation Committee commends UW Bothell and UW Tacoma for developing programs and experiences that give their campuses an identity and culture that distinguish them from UW-Seattle, yet contribute to the mission and core themes of the University.
The branch campuses provide educational access to an underserved population, work closely with their communities to solve local problems and energize economies, and provide interdisciplinary programs for students and faculty. The campuses are growing and thriving, increasingly becoming destinations of choice for students and faculty.

7. The Evaluation Committee commends UW for its efforts to ensure that student-athletes across sports and affinity groups (gender, race, and ethnicity) demonstrate strong graduation and retention rates.

Recommendations

1) The Evaluation Committee recommends that the University develop a plan for bringing faculty salaries up to the median for its comparison group. The gap in faculty compensation between UW and its peer institutions is among the greatest long-term threats to the University’s ability to fulfill its mission and sustain excellence. The Committee recognizes that this may require new resources. [Standards 5.B.1, 5.B.3]

2) UW has selected three core themes: research and scholarship; teaching and learning; and service. The Evaluation Committee recommends that UW establish a small number of clear and measurable goals in each thematic area, using its impressive capacity for qualitative and quantitative research and analysis. Such goals would serve to focus planning, assessment, and coordination across units and campuses. [Standards 3.A.3, 3.B.3]

3) The Evaluation Committee recommends that UW build upon its robust culture of assessment to create a more coherent, integrated, and comprehensive approach to assessment to support its planning efforts. [Standard 3.A.1]

4) The Evaluation Committee recommends that the University consider ways to enhance communication between the staff and institutional leadership and find additional ways to show appreciation for staff contributions. [Standard 2.B.3]
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Lisa Graumlich, Dean, College of the Environment
Jim Gregory, Chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Michael Guralnick, Director, Center of Human Development & Disability
Gary Handwerk, Chair, Department of English
Caroline Harwood, Associate Vice Provost for Research
Judith Henchy, Head, Southeast Asia Section, Libraries International Studies
Steve Hiller, Director, Assessment and Planning, Libraries
Randy Hodgins, Vice President, Office of External Affairs
Amanda Hornby, Teaching and Learning Program Librarian
Judy Howard, Divisional Dean of Social Sciences
Nancy Huling, Head, Reference & Research Services Division, Libraries
Tim Jewell, Director, Information Resources & Scholarly Communication, Libraries
Lincoln Johnson, Associate Vice President, Student Life
Michaelann Jundt, Assistant Dean Undergraduate Academic Affairs
Charles Kennedy, Associate Vice President, Facilities Services
Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
Mindy Kornberg, Vice President, Human Resources
Connie Kravas, Vice President, University Advancement
Sandra Kroupa, Book Arts and Rare Books Curator, Special Collections, Libraries
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Dan Mandeville, Co-Chair of the Libraries Teaching & Learning Group, Nordic Studies Librarian
Kevin Mihata, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Lori Mitchell, CFO UW Medicine
Heidi Nance, Head, Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery Services, Libraries
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Zhijia Shen, Director, East Asia Library
Greg Sheridan, Senior Associate Vice President, University Advancement
John Slattery, Vice Dean for Research and Graduate Education, School of Medicine
Mani Soma, Associate Vice Provost for Research/Industry Relations
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