

**Northwest Association of Schools and of Colleges and Universities
Commission on Colleges and Universities**

Evaluation Committee Report

University of Washington
Seattle, Tacoma and Bothell, Washington
April 8 - 11, 2003

A Confidential Report for the Commission on Colleges and Universities
Representing the View of the Evaluation Committee

Evaluation Committee
University of Washington
April 8 - 11, 2003

Dr. Peter Likins, Chair
President
University of Arizona

Dr. Stan Albrecht
Executive Vice President and Provost
Utah State University

Dr. David Ambler
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Emeritus
University of Kansas

Dr. Gary Bubenzer
Professor Emeritus
Biological Systems Engineering
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Dr. Ruth M. Covell, M.D.
Associate Dean
School of Medicine
University of California, San Diego

Ms. Janet Hamilton
Vice Chancellor, Emeritus
University of California, Davis

Mr. Robert Lashaway
Director of Facilities Services
Montana State University

Dr. J. Lawrence Mitchell
Head, Department of English
Texas A&M University

Dr. Ann Morey
Distinguished Research Professor
College of Education
Director, Center for Educational
Leadership, Innovation and Policy
San Diego State University

Dr. Risa Palm
Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Mr. Thomas Shaughnessy
Director of the University of Minnesota Libraries (Retired)
University of Minnesota

Dr. Herbert F. Wang
Associate Dean for Natural Sciences
Professor, Geology & Geophysics
College of Letters and Science
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Dr. Jan George Womack
Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs
Chair, Allied Health Sciences
College of Allied Health
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center

Dr. Sandra Elman Ex Officio
Executive Director
Commission on Colleges and Universities

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation Committee Roster

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	I-1
II. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	II-1
III. STANDARDS	
1. Institutional Mission and Goals.....	III-1-1
2. Educational Program and Its Effectiveness.....	III-2-1
3. Students	III-3-1
4. Faculty.....	III-4-1
5. Library and Information Resources	III-5-1
6. Governance and Administration	III-6-1
7. Finance	III-7-1
8. Physical Resources	III-8-1
9. Institutional Integrity	III-9-1
IV. CONCLUSIONS	
General Commendations	IV-1
General Recommendations	IV -3

I. INTRODUCTION

The University of Washington (UW) was visited by the referenced thirteen member Evaluation Committee representing the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the Northwest Association of Schools and of Colleges and Universities on April 8 – 11, 2003. Although the Committee spent most of its time on the Seattle campus, the Tacoma Campus and the Bothell Campus were visited by separate three member delegations from the Committee for half-day sessions.

Preparation for the visit included review of a 242 page self-study report entitled “2003 Decennial Accreditation,” which was augmented by a CD and numerous references to web-based information. A substantial body of additional written information was provided during the site visits, in addition to information obtained through oral exchanges with students, staff, faculty, administrators and Regents, including some visits arranged spontaneously at the request of Committee members.

The cooperation and responsiveness of UW personnel were splendid, greatly facilitating the work of the Evaluation Committee.

The Self-Study Report is an extensive document organized for convenient reference to the Standards of the Commission. The committee’s requests for data not in that report were met with alacrity.

The University of Washington is an institution of distinction by national standards, well recognized among America’s leading research universities (typically ranking at or near the top in grants and contracts from federal, foundation and industry sources, which totaled over \$800 million in FY 2002). With over 40,000 students in its regular program and an additional 120,000 students throughout the world in its Educational Outreach programs, UW ranks high among America’s institutions of higher education.

Like virtually all public universities in America, the University of Washington has been challenged by the changing patterns of state taxpayer support for higher education, exacerbated at the time of this site visit by a persistent, national recession. The story that is playing out at the UW today is quite substantially about the university’s response to that challenge.

In what follows the Evaluation Committee seeks to highlight distinctive aspects of its observations and conclusions without attempting to characterize every facet of the university in explicit reference to the standards for accreditation. When a particular college, school or program is not mentioned in the context of specific performance indicators, that omission is to be construed as signaling the satisfaction of the Committee, with no indication of any particular concern. Not every observation of excellence is incorporated in the document. Those concerns and commendations

documented in the text that rise to the level of General Recommendations and Commendations are summarized in the Report Section entitled CONCLUSIONS.

Although this committee Report is designed to conform to standards defined by the Commission, its several sections were written independently, following different modes of presentation, before the entire Evaluation Committee provided its unanimous concurrence with the content of the entire report.

II. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Before an institution can be reviewed for accreditation by the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the Northwest Association of Schools and of Colleges and Universities, it must meet certain Eligibility Requirements, as most recently revised in December 2000.

Those requirements, twenty in number, are all met comfortably by the University of Washington, which is formally sanctioned by the State of Washington as a degree-granting institution of higher education with the characteristics required for accreditation eligibility.

III. STANDARDS

Standard 1: Institutional Mission and Goals

The current Mission Statement of the University of Washington was adopted by the Board of Regents in February, 1998. This statement appears on the UW website and in numerous publications, such as The University Handbook.

The Mission Statement accurately describes the current activities of the University in broad and general terms.

The Board of Regents has established and focused upon six goals since 1999, reaffirming these goals each year and establishing annually a list of one-year performance measures related to these goals. Progress on these one-year targets is assessed annually, reported to the Board of Regents and made available to the University community.

The six standing goals are as follows (with the number of quantitative targets for FY03 noted parenthetically):

Goal 1: Establish a solid resource base to support excellence in education and research, now and in the future (5 targets).

Goal 2: Provide equitable access for all citizens of the State of Washington and promote diversity at the UW (4 targets).

Goal 3: Work with our state's other educational institutions to meet the educational aspirations of students at all levels (3 targets).

Goal 4: Position the UW to contribute in the 21st Century (2 targets).

Goal 5: Stay on the cutting edge of innovation in education, research, and technology (5 targets).

Goal 6: Promote the integration of research, education, and service (2 targets).

Planning at the University of Washington is an ongoing activity that pervades the institution, but plans are empty promises without the means of implementation. At the UW two financial devices have been adopted to facilitate the implementation of plans: (1) The Tools for Transformation Awards (one-time funds), and (2) The University Initiatives Fund (continuing money obtained biennially from a 1% "tax" on all state budgets). Awards from the latter source are systematically reviewed after five years, and either sustained or withdrawn in accordance with performance against stated goals.

Planning at the academic department level is evaluated by means of decennial Academic Program Reviews. Academic Profiles are used by departments for continuing self-evaluation, including not only operating data but also satisfaction feedback from recent graduates.

Planning decisions are based on benchmarking peer institutions in such areas as funding per FTE student and faculty compensation.

In the State of Washington a shared student database permits course-performance comparisons of transfer students and students who began at UW as freshmen, providing feedback to both UW and Washington's community colleges.

Although most strategic planning activities necessarily occur in the operating units of this complex, decentralized research university, the Office of Institutional Studies maintains centralized databases to assure that decisions are based on consistent and reliable information.

Just as the mission, goals and objectives of UW Seattle are clearly defined and consistently interpreted, the same can be said of UW Tacoma and UW Bothell. However, each campus community is quite distinctive in these matters, and that distinctiveness is difficult to reconcile with the characterization in the self-study of the University of Washington as being transformed from "a university with three campuses to a coordinated multi-campus university." It is not the role of the Commission or its Evaluation Committee to prescribe the future relationships among the three campus communities of the UW, but it must be noted that the current inconsistency of perceptions of these future relationships, both within and among the three campus constituencies, is a cause of concern to the Evaluation Committee.

Standard 2: Educational Program and Its Effectiveness

Comment

Because the University of Washington is organized as one comprehensive College of Arts and Sciences surrounded by fifteen specialized or professional schools or colleges with quite different characteristics, this section on Standard 2 is organized correspondingly.

College of Arts and Sciences

Standard 2A. General Requirements

The College of Arts and Sciences consists of approximately 890 faculty who reside in close to fifty departments, programs, and units. Many faculty are internationally renowned in their field, including a Nobel Prize physicist, a National Book Award recipient, and seven MacArthur fellows. The College is committed to change as demonstrated through the recent mergers of its Department of Genetics with the Medical School's Department of Molecular Biotechnology into a Department of Genomics, the Departments of Botany and Zoology into a Department of Biology, Departments of Geology and Geophysics into a Department of Earth and Space Sciences, and the Department of Speech Communication and the School of Communications.

Standard 2B. Educational Program Planning and Assessment

Demographic information about the nature, source and graduation rates of students is thorough and widely available on the UW web in the form of the University Factbook. The University clearly recruits large numbers of its students from the Seattle-Tacoma metropolitan area, and has made significant efforts to make itself attractive to a blend of students by gender and ethnicity. Graduation rates, selectivity, and grading trends are carefully tracked and made available to decision-makers at the college and departmental level.

Mid-program assessments are particularly elaborate and meritorious, warranting commendation. The UW SOUL program (Study of Undergraduate Learning) is a longitudinal study of students who entered UW as freshmen or transfer students in the autumn quarter of 1999. Three hundred students are tracked to discover what students learn and how they learn it with respect to writing, problem solving/critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, understanding and appreciating diversity and general growth as learners. Students participate in interviews, focus groups as well

as quarterly surveys. Among their interesting findings are a set of 11 recommendations concerning “how professors demonstrate that they care about students’ learning.”

These findings (including such items as being accessible in a variety of ways, getting to know something about the student’s personal experience or interest, having high expectations and standards for students’ learning) are presented to faculty at the several opportunities faculty members have to consider ways to improve their teaching - including the teaching academy, the new faculty pre-autumn orientation program and other programs to promote excellence in teaching.

End of program assessments are also numerous and worthy of commendation. Examples of such programs available on the web include assessment of the majors (including goals for student learning, assessment of student learning and plans for next steps) as well as research and assessment reports of teaching and learning at the program level (including student evaluation of courses, classroom assessment, capstone course assessment, internship assessment, exit surveys, focus groups reports, the use of outside assessors for student work, student self-assessment, standard proficiency exams, and internal studies of student performance).

Although the College of Arts and Sciences has a strong commitment to student assessment, differing opinions about assessment methodology developed by the Provost’s office have led to sporadic participation in the SLO project by Arts and Sciences faculty.

Standard 2C. Undergraduate Program

General education has been carefully considered and requires students not only to master basic skills of writing and inquiry but also to develop awareness of a variety of fundamental areas of knowledge. Majors are carefully defined and many are assessed regularly for student learning. The instructional program exhibits clarity and is also flexible enough to accommodate changes in disciplines and the inclusion of new interdisciplinary areas.

The College of Arts and Sciences promotes mastery of skills including language, reasoning and writing in context, areas of knowledge and a major. General education courses are required to include at least 20 credits (quarter credits) in each of: visual, literary and performing arts, individuals and societies, and the natural world. In addition, students must master English composition, a single foreign language and courses in quantitative/symbolic reasoning. The rationale for this component is published in clear and complete terms in the undergraduate catalogue. General education focuses not only on the disciplines but also on the interdisciplinary connections between major fields of study.

COMMENDATIONS

- 2C. The College of Arts and Sciences is to be commended for developing “Discovery Seminars” in collaboration with the Division of Continuing Education to provide 4-week long courses for entering freshmen before the Autumn quarter begins to orient students to academic life and engage in intensive interdisciplinary study.
- 2C4. The institution’s policies for transfer and acceptance of credit are not only clearly articulated but the University receives a large number of successful transfer students from Washington community colleges.
- 2C7. The faculty of the College are outstanding for the educational levels offered, with many departments ranked among the top 10-20 in the United States.

Note: 2C5 Academic Advising

The practice of employing professional advisors for pre-major and major advising at the undergraduate level is noted. The College might explore the experience of other institutions in more closely involving faculty in both levels of advising, particularly for the non-technical mentoring and career advising that marks a collaborative and productive relationship between faculty and students.

Standards 2D and 2E. Graduate Programs, Graduate Faculty and Related Resources

The graduate program in Arts and Sciences resides primarily in its departments and in interdisciplinary units within the Graduate School. Regular program reviews consist of a self-study followed by a review committee. These documents are the basis for reviews by the Arts and Sciences College Council and the Graduate School’s Advisory Council. Both groups consist of elected faculty representatives who provide thorough reviews and action plans with the view of improving the graduate program. In some cases, significant action is taken such as the division of the Department of Romance Languages into a Division of French and Italian and the Division of Spanish and Portuguese. The advisory council also reviews numerous initiatives to develop new graduate programs and certificates. They are less active in pruning programs that show low enrollments. The Graduate School develops considerable data using exit interviews and surveying graduates periodically as alumni. The University’s commitment to interdisciplinary studies is demonstrated by eleven successful graduate programs. Within Arts and Sciences, the Ph.D. program in Physics Education is to be commended for its significant contributions nationally to the furthering of physics education at all levels. Graduate students in the sciences were pleased with their experience. They found internationally recognized faculty to be readily accessible. The Physics Department has also significantly improved its placement of first-year graduate students in research programs.

The Graduate School is to be commended for its leadership in a project “Re-envisioning the Ph.D. to meet the needs of the society of the 21st Century.” This \$415,000 project funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts has a frequently visited web site, which provides the basis for a national and local conversation among the many stakeholders from industry to liberal arts colleges to government and which brings together best practices for broad dissemination.

Policy 2.1: The General Education standard is met through requirements for all undergraduates, independent of major, in the form of breadth requirements (natural world; individuals and societies; and visual, literary, and performing arts). The current work in assessment is moving the institution away from breadth defined by courses to breadth defined by learning objectives.

Specialized or Professional Schools and Colleges

Standard 2.A. General Requirements

The professional programs are cognizant of and respond to the University-wide missions and goals and transforming principles articulated for the future. Although some of the facilities are showing their age and state budget problems continue to loom, the various resources required to carry out the educational programs are adequate at present. Variable access to non-state funds understandably creates significant differences among individual program units.

The faculty assumes responsibility for design and implementation of the curriculum. Programs are well designed and adhere to clearly defined objectives at all levels of the curriculum. University-wide policies and procedures for adding, deleting, and modifying courses and programs are in place and adhered to. The requirement that all new programs and courses, including those in the professional schools, be submitted to the Provost forwards the goal of increasing multidisciplinary education as that office has the opportunity to suggest other faculty/activities on campus who might be interested in and able to contribute to a course or program.

Standard 2.B. Education Program Planning and Assessment

The University of Washington academic program planning and review processes are comprehensive, thoughtfully developed, and effectively implemented. All undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs must submit to a rigorous approval process that begins at the individual faculty, department, or unit level, and then progresses through the college or school, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards or the Graduate School Council, and then the central administration. In depth academic

reviews of all programs at the university level occur at least decennially. The review committee found the institution's processes for program planning and review to be clearly defined and effectively integrated into the overall academic planning process used by the University.

On the assessment front, the institution has worked very hard over the past 10 years to create a culture of assessment. This has included an impressive commitment of both financial and personnel resources to more effectively quantify student learning objectives and outcomes. In many areas, this effort has been highly successful and the evaluation committee commends the University for both effort and accomplishment in this area.

As noted in relation to the College of Arts and Sciences, demographic information about the nature, source, and graduation rates of all undergraduate students is thoroughly and widely available on the UW web in the form of the University Factbook. Graduation rates, selectivity and grading trends are carefully tracked and made available to decision-makers at the college and department levels. Mid-program assessments are particularly elaborate and meritorious of commendation. The UW SOUL program (Study of Undergraduate Learning) is a longitudinal study of students in all colleges who enter UW as freshmen or transfer students in the autumn quarter 1999. Three hundred students are tracked to discover what students learn and how they learn it with respect to writing, problem solving/critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, understanding and appreciation of diversity and general growth as learners. Students participate in interviews, focus groups, and quarterly surveys.

As was the case with the College of Arts and Sciences, the Committee was particularly impressed with the effort that has gone into the development of the Student Learning Objectives Program. This program is innovative and unique, and we commend the University for the commitment it has made to its development and implementation. We recognize that this effort is yet in its early stages of implementation, but believe that it holds great promise for measuring more effectively student learning objectives across the university curriculum.

While the Committee commends the University on its efforts in this regard, we also note with some concern that assessment is quite unevenly applied across the different professional schools and colleges. As noted in the discussion of the College of Arts and Sciences, some programs, departments, and colleges are doing very well. This is particularly the case in those professional schools and colleges that must undergo regular program accreditation reviews. The expectations that programs will demonstrate comprehensive and effective assessment of student learning outcomes is well-established in these arenas. Often, longitudinal data are available in a form that allows clear evaluation of progress and improvement.

In other areas, however, there is a great deal of inconsistency and a need to demonstrate additional progress. In some units within the professional schools and colleges, as was the case within the College of Arts and Sciences, processes are in place for assessment and continuous improvement. Committees have been established to oversee assessment and quality improvement, and to measure student learning outcomes. In other units, assessment activities are at a relatively low level. For example, we noted units where the only example of assessment was an examination of writing skills and no evidence of continuous improvement was provided.

As was the case with Arts and Sciences, the committee notes with some concern that some elements of the University in the professional schools and colleges view the centralized assessment efforts, particularly those reflected in the Student Learning Objectives program, with a healthy level of skepticism. Several of those with whom we visited expressed concerns about the methodology used by the program. Others noted that the program was only a beginning, and failed to really measure student learning. Still others were concerned that while the SLO provided a meaningful exercise, it lacked any ability to effect meaningful change, particularly on the faculty side of the institution.

In sum, while we found the University's overall assessment activities, and the SLO program in particular, to be innovative and to have clear potential for providing meaningful information for program assessment, we were not convinced that the processes in place, particularly outside the programs that have professional accreditation bodies, provide sufficient information about student learning outcomes at a level that is essential to program evaluation and improvement. Some individual colleges and programs have developed and implemented assessment programs that measure student achievement of stated outcomes, and have demonstrated the use of this information in making decisions about program improvement. However, no university wide plan exists for the systematic measure of actual student learning across its various colleges and programs. The committee recommends that the University continue to build on its current efforts to fully meet the assessment Standard 2.B.2.

Standard 2.C. Undergraduate Program(s)

The undergraduate programs in the professional schools appear strong and meet the requirements of the Commission on Colleges and Universities Criteria. Faculty members appear to be highly qualified with many national and international leaders in the Schools and Colleges. The professional programs with undergraduates are dedicated to their undergraduate mission as demonstrated by their innovative approaches to education, efforts to include exploratory and service opportunities, provision for a variety of interdisciplinary experiences, and services designed to better equip students to succeed. The University's dedication to undergraduate teaching is further demonstrated by the commitment to recognize excellence in instruction in tenure

and promotion considerations and in providing training opportunities for both non-tenured and senior faculty.

The general education requirements for students are clearly defined in the catalog and provide for educational breath for the professional student.

Admission policies and acceptance of transfer credits are clearly included in the catalog. Transfer credits appear to be uniformly evaluated at the college and program level.

Management of scarce resources has thus far permitted adequate allocation to academic programs at the University of Washington. Innovative measures will need to be developed to maintain the excellence of these programs in this age of decreasing state resources.

Standards 2.D, 2.E, 2.F. Graduate Programs, Graduate Faculty and Related Resources, and Graduate Records and Academic Credit

The graduate programs in the professional schools and colleges at the University of Washington meet the Commission's standards in providing a set of advanced academic experiences beyond the baccalaureate level which warrant the award of a graduate degree. The Graduate Catalog describes each program offered.

The Evaluation Committee finds that the programs are consistent with the mission and goals of the University; the programs are well-defined and require greater depth of study and increased student intellectual and creative demands than the certificate programs; and doctoral degree programs have significantly greater levels of expectations, curricula and resources than programs at the baccalaureate and master's level. Students in the graduate programs of the professional schools were laudatory about relationships with faculty in mentoring and research roles. There is evidence of a number of interdisciplinary opportunities for departments, faculty and students to enrich learning research. Standards 2.D.1, 2.D.2, and 2.D.3 are met by the University of Washington.

The Evaluation Committee conducted a review of self-study reports and specialized accreditation studies and met with academic administrators, faculty and students. The Committee finds that the University of Washington meets the Commission's standards for 2.D., Graduate Faculty and Related Resources. There is a concern about the level of faculty salaries and the ability to retain the high quality faculty over time. Additionally, the Evaluation Committee found the University to be in compliance with Standard 2.F. Faculty are clearly involved in defining admission criteria, transfer of graduate credit and establishing graduation requirements.

Standard 2.G. Continuing Education and Special Learning Activities

The Committee commends continuing education and nontraditional credit programs at the University for the quality and breadth of their offerings. These programs extend and expand the considerable educational resources of the University to a very large number of individuals in the region and beyond. The use of a variety of instructional strategies appropriate to the context and needs of the learner further enhances the effectiveness of the offerings. Continuing education credit and non-credit programs and courses are consistent with the mission and goals of the University and involve appropriate faculty and administrators in planning and approval processes.

University of Washington Educational Outreach has been active in developing on-line courses and has built a supportive infrastructure, including a development/production unit. Educational Outreach is also helping selective academic units to change their degree programs to fee-based offerings. In its partnerships that are not regionally accredited, UW Educational Outreach policies and practices are in accord with the Commission's Policy A-6.

Standard 3: Students

All university student services on the Seattle Campus are provided by the Division of Student Affairs, the Minority Affairs Office and the Office of Undergraduate Education. The three units work cooperatively to provide services and programs that are well designed and administered to meet the contemporary needs of the students.

The Division of Student Affairs provides a wide variety of out of class programs and services that enhance personal and social development; the Office of Undergraduate Education offers special academic development programs that are designed to enhance a student's academic experience; the Office of Minority Affairs has the primary assignment of attracting and insuring the academic success of under-represented minority students. All three of these organizations have unique and high quality programs. Their ability to work collaboratively is the key to the University of Washington's outstanding, comprehensive program of student services.

The Division of Student Affairs is staffed by a competent and well trained group of dedicated professionals, many of whom have enjoyed long tenures of service with the University. The Division is led by a senior student affairs officer with a national reputation for his innovative management and program development in student affairs. A staff development program exists to insure that staff members remain abreast of "state of the art" practices in the profession.

The Division of Student Affairs is guided by a set of "Overarching Operating Principles" that reflect sound professional practice and are designed to insure effective service and fair and equitable treatment of students. These policies and procedures are operative throughout the Division's various departments and offices and are consistent with the mission of the University. Various advisory committees include faculty and student members and help define policies and design the services and programs of the Division.

The Tacoma and Bothell Campuses have developed unique student services programs, appropriate for the students attending these two special campuses. Many of these services are coordinated and integrated with those on the Seattle Campus. However, given the availability of electronic communications and the proximity of the three campuses, greater sharing of resources could be effected.

The student services programs are generally blessed with good and attractive facilities commensurate with the standards of the University. Those self supporting units such as Housing and The Husky Union Building dedicate large amounts of their resources to maintaining and upgrading their facilities to insure that they will continue to attract and serve the students. However, of concern is the declining percentage of resources to operate the student services programs that come from the University's

educational and general budget. The use of “user fees” to offset these diminishing University funds holds the potential of denying access to them by the students who need them the most.

The University meets and exceeds the requirements of this standard.

General Responsibilities

The Division of Student Affairs uses a variety of formal and informal means to ascertain the needs of students and necessary modifications to its services. Every two years, the Vice President for Student Affairs sponsors a survey, “The University Life and Substance Abuse Survey,” to measure student attitudes about the University and their experiences with respect to drug and alcohol use. Different departments within the Division periodically survey students about needed service improvements and use this information accordingly.

There are many formal and informal opportunities for students to be involved with institutional policy development and change. The organized student governments- The Associated Students of the University of Washington and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate- have a history of effectively voicing student concerns and opinions to appropriate governing bodies and University officials. The President and various Vice Presidents have established a variety of means to consult with students and student leaders on a regular basis. As a commendable effort to improve communications between the central administration and students, a position titled Special Assistant to the President for Student Relations was created recently.

Policies on student rights and responsibilities, academic integrity, the protection of student records and information, and campus safety and security policies conform to professional standards and Federal mandates and are available to students through printed documents and electronic web pages. The University has a well designed and administered program for student and campus safety. New and prospective students have ready access to information on the University’s mission, admission standards and procedures, tuition and fee charges and the student life policies described above.

The University meets and exceeds the requirements of this standard.

Academic Records

The University of Washington follows good professional practice in the adoption and identification of admission standards and procedures. They are administered consistently and fairly. Application information and procedures are available in multiple formats and may be easily accessed from remote sites by internet web pages.

Student financial aid and scholarships are administered through several University offices, with the Office of Student Financial Aid being the primary source of need-based student aid. That office, however, must coordinate with other offices that award private or University funded scholarships in the development of financial aid packages for students with need. This office handles a large student aid program and effectively uses electronic means for sharing information and processing student applications. The large number of offices involved with the awarding of merit or University funded scholarships makes it difficult for students to learn of available aid for which they may qualify. A program to centralize information on the availability of all the University's scholarships and financial aid needs to be developed. The campaign to raise more than 25 million in private funds for both merit and need based scholarships is an impressive University wide commitment that includes the Board of Regents.

The University has been an innovator in efforts to improve academic advising. The use of professional advisers in a central advising office as well as in individual academic units appears to insure the availability of good advising to all students. The well designed web based enrollment system and program and degree audit systems permit many students to self enroll effectively and accurately.

The establishment of the Undergraduate Gateway Center by the Office of Undergraduate Education is an effective innovation that has been successful in assisting new and current students with good academic advising, academic skill development, career planning and personal development. It is a highly visible and utilized service and one that probably contributes to the good student retention rates posted by the University.

Specialized services- personal counseling, health and wellness, career planning services and services for students with disabilities- enjoy good reputations among students and are known for their effectiveness and their innovative use of technology. A common characteristic defining the success of these specialized services is their cooperative and collaborative partnerships with each other and academic units across the University. The financial and moral support of the Provost's Office has made it possible for the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities to insure that all such students have access to needed instruction support and other services.

Housing and Dining Services are in a continuous program to upgrade their facilities and programs to insure that the residential life program complements the educational mission of the University. It is particularly noteworthy that the Housing Department now provides internet access in all student rooms.

The Husky Union continues to be a popular community center serving the needs of students, faculty, alumni and visitors to the campus. It serves as a community and information hub for the approximately 500 student organizations that register on the

campus each year. It retains its good reputation with these groups; continuous efforts, however, will be needed to keep it abreast of contemporary styles and student needs.

The University meets and exceeds the requirements of this standard.

Intercollegiate Athletics

The University sponsors a model intercollegiate athletics program that is effectively organized and well managed, exhibits fiscal responsibility, provides good academic assistance for its students and enjoys many competitively successful men and women's sports teams. Its Director has a national reputation for integrity and innovation in intercollegiate athletics administration. Appropriate control and administrative oversight is provided through the President's Office and the President's Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. Retention and graduation rates for student athletes are some of the best in the nation and parallel those of the undergraduate student population at the University.

The University meets and exceeds the requirements of this standard.

Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment and Representation of Accredited Status

An examination of the major publications of the University, recruitment materials and electronic accessible information demonstrates that the University of Washington adheres to Policy 3.1 of the Northwest Association of Schools and of Colleges and Universities Commission on Colleges and Universities.

Commendations and Concerns

Several areas deserve commendation:

- The Division of Student Affairs, the Office of Minority Affairs and the Office of Undergraduate Education for their cooperative efforts in providing a creative, competent, contemporary and effective program of student and academic services that complement the academic mission of the University.
- The Division of Student Affairs for its effective use of technology in the delivery of services, programs and information for students.
- The Office of Undergraduate Education for the establishment of the Undergraduate Gateway Center as a highly effective set of academic services that enhance the students' entry and integration to the University.

- The Division of Student Affairs and the office of Undergraduate Education for the effective use of web pages to facilitate students in accessing important academic and student services information.
- The Division of Student Affairs and the Department of Recreational Sports Programs for the planned expansion and renovation of various recreational facilities that will greatly expand the opportunities for student wellness and fitness programs. Such programs can do much to improve the campus and student life environment.
- The University for its aggressive pursuit of private scholarship funds to assist students with financial need and to enhance the diversity of the student population. It is particularly pleasing to learn of the commitment to this effort by the members of the Board of Regents.

Two areas of concern were also noted:

- The growing practice of charging “user fees” for various student services and the decline in general use funds to support these vital services. Charging to access these services may prohibit the students who need them the most from being able to use them.
- The decentralized administration of University funded scholarships among a number of offices. Such decentralization can make it difficult for students to become aware of scholarships for which they may be eligible.

Standard 4: Faculty

There is much truth to the old adage that the quality of a university is determined primarily by the strength of its faculty. The University of Washington has an exceptional faculty. This strength is reflected in whatever indicator one may choose to examine—national and international recognition, research awards, etc. The quality of the institution, in turn, allows it to continue to attract strong faculty. Institutional quality seems to be holding even in the face of difficult economic times in the state.

Viewing the University as a whole, efforts at faculty recruiting generally are successful. Several of the colleges and schools report that they almost always are able to hire their first choice when they are recruiting. Other units, however, do report less success. Typically, the reason for not succeeding in attracting the candidate of choice is financial. Several deans reported losing top candidates to other institutions who offered substantially higher salaries. This challenge is compounded by the high cost of living in the Seattle area. Housing is a particularly difficult problem, especially for junior faculty. While the exceptional quality of the University of Washington and the overall quality of life in the Seattle area are positive factors in faculty recruitment, the high cost of living and the fact that salaries overall lag those of peer institutions are factors that inhibit successful recruitment.

Faculty salaries are a major source of concern—UW's most difficult problem in the words of the self-study (142). Some faculty are distressed with the failure this past year to implement what they regard as the agreed upon salary policy, although interpretations of commitments vary. While no new compensation dollars were included in the state budget, the system was designed to identify funds from other sources to provide some compensation increase, if only a modest increment. The failure to do that was frequently cited, although it was also noted that efforts are being made to identify funds for salary increases this year, even in the face of the absence, once more, of state support for compensation increases.

The salary problem is clearly one that has developed over a long period of time. Currently UW salaries lag behind their peers by an average of 12.1%. In some cases, notably in the Arts and Sciences (the largest college), the situation is much worse, with differentials ranging above 20% even in large departments. Moreover, there seems to be no obvious correlation between the quality of ranking of a unit and the status of its salaries. Since UW has continued, and largely succeeded by its own account, in hiring competitively, salary compression and inversion have affected morale. The resultant loss of senior faculty, and even promising junior faculty, is reported as a serious problem in a number of departments, and may be widespread. The most recent losses, such as the 28 positions reported in Arts and Sciences, must be viewed as deleterious to the overall health of the institution. The good news is that the administration has devised some creative strategies, including reallocation of resources from programs that

can become fee-based, to address such salary problems. If department-wide salary adjustments are made within the context of academic program review, significant improvements in program quality and morale should be achievable. However, elective conversion to a compensation model relying upon outside sources for academic year salary increases would seem to be a tool of limited use from the perspective of professors in some of the most disadvantaged units (most of whom have little or no opportunity to supplement their academic salaries), unless benefits are somehow shared. The UW retirement plan (UWRP) is certainly adequate, though hardly “quite competitive,” as it is optimistically described in the self-study (143). For most faculty, the UW contribution averages 8.3% over a career. There are certainly peer institutions which offer far more generous contributions—in some cases as high as 15% as the institutional contribution. Faculty salary policies and practices should be deemed a matter of real concern (Standard 4.A.4).

Faculty are engaged in scholarship and research at a very impressive level. The University is to be commended for the very impressive amount of funded research generated by faculty, as well as for the support that is provided through such resources as the six-week junior faculty clinical research training program in the School of Dentistry, the collegial environment for planning and review of grant proposals in the Health Science schools, and the Center for Instructional Development and Research.

The faculty university-wide, as well as the level of individual programs, mainly hold full-time ladder rank positions with limited and appropriate use of part-time and adjunct positions. In keeping with national experience and reflecting heavy clinical service responsibilities, health professional school faculty profiles reflect a significant proportion of non ladder rank positions.

All the evidence suggests that faculty participate fully in academic planning, curricular development and review at the departmental level. Faculty play a role in institutional governance, specifically through the Faculty Senate Council (responsible for undergraduate course approval, etc.) and the Graduate School Council. Continuing Education (CE) also provides particularly persuasive evidence of the investment in best practices. Faculty appointments in CE are made in consultation with academic departments and faculty are given extraordinary support in course development. In the case of online courses (still a modality shunned by many), graphic designers and other technical experts work closely with faculty in ways that facilitate innovative course development and a robust and growing division of the institution (Standard 4.A.2).

While faculty workloads vary by discipline, they are entirely consistent with the mission and goals of a major research University, allowing an appropriate balance between teaching, research and service commitments. Recent changes in the Faculty Code have permitted development of differential teaching loads within the framework of individualized workload plans. Although it is not clear how often heavier teaching

assignments are mandated, there are potential risks attached to the introduction of such plans in a major research institution. Should, for example, a heavier teaching load be allowed to compensate for lack of research productivity in the determination of merit?

Faculty development (sabbatical) leaves and a number of other praiseworthy support programs run by the Center for Instructional Development and Research make UW fully competitive with peer institutions. Arts and Humanities faculty, many of whom have limited access to research funds, can take advantage of the grants available through the Royalty Research Fund. UW offers encouragement to pursue external funding from such sources as Fulbright, Guggenheim, NEH and NSF by making up the difference between the grant awarded and regular salary. UW deserves commendation for the variety of programs and practices it has developed that enhance faculty development (Standard 4.A.3).

A variety of approaches to faculty evaluation are used at UW. All faculty, including non-tenure track faculty, are required to administer student evaluations at least once a year. Peer reviews of teaching are also uniformly required, albeit at more frequent intervals for assistant professors. The requirement of peer evaluations for all tenured faculty is by no means universal among peer institutions and can, therefore, reasonably be interpreted as prima facie evidence of UW's commitment to quality teaching at all levels (Standard 4.A.5). UW merits commendation for its enlightened practices in this area.

UW takes some pride in the fact that it does not rely very strongly on the use of part-time faculty (145). Despite the difficult fiscal climate, the University has not, it would seem, developed an unhealthy reliance upon such faculty or used them to replace full-time faculty. While there has been a 15.6% increase in part-time appointments since 1998, total faculty have increased by about 8% in the same period. Much of the growth in part-timers can in fact be linked to programmatic growth in areas not served by regular tenure-track faculty. In any case, data on the hiring of part-time faculty are made available annually to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. The recruitment of part-time faculty is undertaken in conjunction with the appropriate academic department. Once appointed they are subject to the same regular evaluation procedures as full-time faculty (Standard 4.A.8., 4.A.9., 4.A.10).

Given that UW ranks first in the country in the generation of grants and contracts from all sources (federal and private), there can be little doubt about it meeting Standard 4.B. Moreover, review of selected faculty profiles across a range of disciplines confirms that there is ample evidence of the engagement of faculty in an impressive variety of research activities (4.B).

Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation

The University of Washington has well-defined policies and procedures regarding the selection of faculty, their evaluation, roles, welfare, and development. The quality of the faculty and the collegial environment for mentoring, evaluation, and supporting professional development were evident in discussions with faculty and with the academic administration.

The Committee finds the faculty evaluation process to be particularly well-defined and effectively administered. Elected faculty bodies play a critical role at all stages of the process. Comprehensive third year reviews are conducted for all new faculty and when problems are identified, efforts are made to implement appropriate course corrections.

Post tenure reviews are triggered whenever a faculty member experiences two years without a merit pay increase. Corrective actions are identified and if specified requirements are not met, termination can occur, although this has not yet happened through this process at UW.

The Committee commends the University on its faculty development program. This includes the program for new faculty included in the Center for Instructional Development and Research and the junior faculty development awards, as well as senior faculty renewal programs. Efforts to integrate new faculty into the university culture, and to provide them with the tools that will allow them to be successful, are particularly impressive.

The Committee has concerns about the potential of increased loss of faculty because of the current budget problems being experienced by the University. The loss of the faculty retention fund from the institution's budget from the State is troubling, and those State resources will need to be replaced with other funds if the University is to be successful in its efforts to match offers from other universities, or to make pre-emptive salary increases. Some units within the University have well-articulated counter-offer policies, while others rely more heavily on pre-emptive activities designed to reduce the gap between University of Washington faculty salaries and those of competing institutions. In either case, however, new funds will have to be identified to avoid increasing problems with faculty retention.

Standard 5: Library and Information Resources

The University of Washington Libraries rank among the top ten research libraries in North America, a ranking that they have held for many years. Collections are very rich in most subject areas and disciplines, and some are of international significance, but research collections are of little value unless they are organized for use and a well-qualified staff is available to assist users in capitalizing on them. Research collections also need to be accessible, properly housed and maintained, with the prerequisite equipment for accessing digital and multimedia learning resources. All of these requirements have been met, if not exceeded, at the University of Washington's Libraries.

One of the hallmarks of the University Libraries has been its commitment to integrating collections and services with the intellectual life of the campus. The Libraries' nationally recognized program of information literacy has helped the Libraries reach large numbers of students (over 50 percent) by means of classes taught in partnership with faculty and by means of library sponsored workshops and tutorials. While all components of the Libraries (including those in Bothell and Tacoma) are engaged in offering instruction on how to access learning resources in a wide range of formats, the Odegaard undergraduate library and the Health Sciences Library have truly outstanding programs.

With respect to the acquisition of new collections, the Libraries are allocating an ever increasing percentage of their budget to the purchase and licensing of electronic resources (approximately 25 percent). But at the same time, print collections continue to grow at a rate of approximately 100,000 volumes per year. This growth has required that less heavily used materials be placed in several storage areas due to lack of shelf space in the various library buildings. Most research libraries have had to adopt the same strategy, however the storage facilities used by the University have none of the climate controls needed for the preservation of paper documents. This is a matter that needs to be addressed, perhaps in cooperation with other libraries in the region.

In view of the overall excellence of the Libraries, it should not be surprising that they have benefited from having visionary leaders. Planning, assessment and continuous improvement are ongoing processes with broad staff participation. The Libraries' program for the measurement of library use and user satisfaction has resulted in 10 years of longitudinal data on satisfaction rates and user behavior. This information is frequently referred to and used to modify existing services and plan new ones.

The Libraries' outreach to and engagement with the community extends far beyond the campus. As was suggested above, they hold the most significant research collection west of Minnesota and north of Berkeley. The Health Sciences Library serves as the regional medical research library for 4 states in the northwest. Cooperative

relationships have been established with other leading research libraries in the U.S. (e.g. Cornell) as well as with several Pacific Rim University libraries.

These accomplishments could not have been achieved without a staff characterized by a commitment to excellence and having academic qualifications such as advanced degrees. In 2000, the Libraries were cited by the Association of Research Libraries for their best practices with respect to staff training and development.

In conclusion, the University of Washington should take great pride in its Libraries. The challenge for the University is to nurture the treasure that it has by continuing to make the necessary investments in an era of declining state support. Areas of particular concern include:

- the very low levels of librarian salaries;
- the adequacy of funding for research collections; and
- the poor physical space in which the Health Sciences Library is housed.

Computing and Communications

The University's Computing and Communications division has done an excellent job in developing user-friendly web-based front ends for its legacy systems such as financial services, student records, and other administrative services. Their challenge is to find the funding to maintain and develop these systems, the alternative being the purchase of far more expensive systems which have come on the market. Also impressive is the overall quality, ubiquity and use of computing and information technology on all three campuses. Progress is also being made towards becoming a wireless campus, but this is also very much dependent on funding. Another resource issue is the need to replace on a fairly regular basis out-dated hardware and software. The primary area of concern, however, is network security. Significant investments are already being made in this area, but even more will be needed to guarantee privacy, especially with respect to patient records in the Health Sciences Center, and to prevent the misuse of the network and university systems. A related issue is the fact that the building that houses the University's central computing facility is not owned by the University. Indications are that the University will soon be addressing this important matter.

In conclusion, the University's Computing and Communications division seems to be well-organized and effectively administered, responsive to academic needs and interests, and forward-thinking in the approach to system-wide technology applications.

Standard 6. Governance and Administration

In the state of Washington each individual public university is ultimately governed by its own Board of Regents appointed by the Governor. The University of Washington Board of Regents is composed of ten members, including one student. The senior board members serve six year terms, renewable.

The Committee enjoyed a very productive meeting with the Regents, who are a diverse group of dedicated citizens in service to the University, deserving of commendation. Relationships between the Board and administration appear to be mutually respectful of appropriate roles, and quite positive.

In the State of Washington it is the Legislature that determines not only the budgeted allocation of State taxpayer dollars but also the tuition rates and campus enrollment goals for students enrolled in degree programs receiving State operating funds. The budget for the current year provides to the Regents greater latitude in setting tuition rates than has been customary in the past, and the team commends every effort to embed greater discretion on this front in statute, so the practice will continue.

The Committee recognizes the comparative scale of operations in Seattle relative to those in Tacoma and Bothell, but still urges the Regents, the Administration and faculty on all campuses to develop greater clarity in defining future relationships among these quite different enterprises.

At the time of the Evaluation Committee visit, the presidency was occupied by a veteran Provost in the role of Interim President, and the provost's position was occupied by a retired former UW provost serving as Interim Provost. This management team is to be commended for maintaining a critical continuity of cohesive leadership at a time of leadership transition in an era of scarce resources.

The current financial circumstances of the University of Washington present profound challenges to leadership. The problem is not simply a lack of funds in totality, but a rapid change in the sources and purposes of its revenues, purposes which are increasingly restricted by such funding sources as the federal government and private benefactors. Although the UW has navigated these perilous waters thus far without perceptible loss of quality in its core mission, the Committee recommends continued exploration of the full range of options to protect core program quality, even including the elimination of academic programs that no longer seem essential to the UW mission.

The roles of faculty and students in UW institutional governance depend substantially on interactions between constituency-based organizations operating in parallel, but also on integrated groups devoted to such common concerns as planning

and budgeting. The size and complexity of the institution make necessary for shared governance a major commitment to timely communication, which will never be quite good enough. This requirement needs continuing attention at the UW, as it does in every major research university.

The diversity agenda has received serious attention at the University of Washington for many years, but much remains to be done before all goals are met. It is noteworthy that in this environment the term “Underrepresented Minorities” embraces people who identify themselves as Black, Hispanic, Native American, Filipino or Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; other “Asians” are well represented, as are “Caucasians.” Over time these labels change their meaning, and they also have different contemporary meanings in different institutions and regions of the United States of America. The observations of the Evaluation Committee must be interpreted in context.

Over the last decade, UW has made consistent efforts to increase the number of underrepresented ethnic students, those classified here as “Underrepresented Minorities.” For example, it has had an active and successful EOP program. Currently efforts are underway to increase the number of privately supported scholarships for underrepresented ethnic students. Despite these efforts, the proportion of underrepresented ethnic students attending the UW has been somewhat disappointing. This is due to a number of factors including a reported image in Black and Hispanic communities of UW being an unwelcoming climate for students of color. Conversations with a few Black and Hispanic students on campus did not confirm this impression. Nevertheless, UW administrators acknowledged this image as a factor in recruitment to be overcome. Differences in graduation rates by ethnicity are apparent at the UW as they are elsewhere, and this disparity needs continuing attention.

Of special concern is the limited number of underrepresented ethnic faculty members (4%) who are on the non-research regular ladder track. Among colleges, the range is from 11% in Education to no representation in Pharmacy and Public Affairs. This representation is insufficient to support the University’s desire to prepare students who “must be able to communicate across cultural, geographic, and linguistic barriers and to appreciate perspectives different from their own.” Further, it does not represent the talented pool of especially Black and Hispanic faculty that are available nationally to research universities. Some Black and Hispanic faculty report that UW’s environment is not supportive of underrepresented ethnic faculty. Yet, UW has employed a number of incentives and strategies to attract and retain talented ethnic faculty and the Committee’s limited sampling provided only positive impressions of the environment for support. UW might want to explore additional strategies such as faculty exchange programs with historically Black and predominately Hispanic institutions, distinguished visiting scholars for variable time stays, co-teaching courses via instructional technology with faculty of color at other universities and cohort hiring in selected departments. The diversity enhancement programs currently in effect should also be continued.

Standard 7: Finance

The University is in several important transition phases. The State of Washington, like many other regions across the country, is facing some significant economic difficulties that will impact State general fund allocations to higher education institutions in the state -- now and into the future -- in ways not yet fully identified. The University has identified as one of its primary initiatives to transition from a state supported to a state assisted university in recognition of the strong likelihood that decreased State support is a permanent circumstance rather than a temporary aberration.

The University's resource planning allocation and financial management functions are clearly defined, widely respected and understood throughout the campus and highly collaborative in nature. Discussions with both academic and administrative leaders as well as functional managers from a variety of budgeting, planning and finance units showed a common understanding of processes, priorities, strategies and problems.

Even though both the President and Provost are serving under interim appointments, the campus has not hesitated in its forward movement of academic and administrative initiatives nor is there any reluctance to take the actions and develop the strategies necessary to meet current fiscal challenges. While there is considerable concern about reductions in State support and general difficulties in the State and National economy, those in charge of financial functions are taking aggressive action both to increase revenues from traditional and newly identified sources as well as to increase authority to allow flexibility in resource allocation and decision management pertinent to financial management. All planning and budgeting functions are in the Provost's management portfolio. This includes allocation of faculty FTE, capital and operating funds and space. Implementation of financial transactions -- to include capital construction and procurement -- are with the Executive Vice President. The EVP also is responsible for all accounting functions including internal controls and coordination of both internal and external audit activities.

Working together these two functional units have instituted a highly consultative process for capital budget planning and project execution that includes the faculty senate, appropriate professional staff, deans and members of the President's cabinet. Another partner in ensuring the success of this process is the Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs. Planning for the recently initiated \$2 Billion capital campaign included those capital construction projects best suited to benefit from private support.

Formal project agreements that include concurrence from all appropriate academic and administrative decision makers are reached before a project is even bid

for construction. Funding Capital construction for the University of Washington has presented numerous challenges as State funding has decreased significantly over the past five years. Numerous alternative funding arrangements are utilized. These include debt financed, private support, institutional allocations, private developer financed arrangements, indirect cost recovery contributions as well as campus supported and State managed bond and COP financing. The University has worked aggressively to gain flexibility in managing these alternative funding processes at the campus level through one time agreements with the State and through changes in State law. One current example is a bill now in the legislature that would provide increased flexibility for managing debt supported construction at the campus level.

From a physical planning standpoint, UW faces significant difficulties in meeting the deferred maintenance needs of the campus and in renewing outdated facilities to meet current research and educational needs. Other difficulties include unfunded mandates for health and safety improvements, accessibility requirements, and compliance with funding agency requirements. These are problems shared by their peer research institutions across the country. The University of Washington does have the flexibility to allocate State general funds to these purposes but only at the expense of other high priority programs. The campus has conducted assessments of campus facilities to identify physical problems, to establish priorities and to bring a more structured approach to the process. Various reserve funds have been established to assist with solving these problems on a one time basis. All renovation, renewal and deferred maintenance projects are closely coordinated through an on-line matching process to ensure the limited funding is maximally utilized for all types of projects. There have been many innovative and aggressive strategies and approaches developed to meet the many and various needs. Both academic and administrative leadership, however, continue to share concerns about the institution's ability to meet these vivid, often unpredictable and critical needs.

The operating budget undergoes a similarly extensive consultation process that includes all constituencies of the institution in an advisory capacity to the President. While State funding of the institution's operating budget continues to shrink, the University of Washington continues to enjoy significant success in gaining funding for its remarkable research enterprise as well as a highly successful private funding program with a large endowment and profitable investment portfolio. Current strategies are designed to make more flexible use of funds available to the institution as well as to gain increased flexibility from the State Legislature in decision making critical to effective institutional management. For example, the institution now has authority this year for setting tuition for all student categories except resident undergraduates. Efforts are underway to change State statutes to allow the University to make all tuition decisions.

Other initiatives aimed at increased flexibility in managing operating funds include moving professional schools as much as possible to a fee based/self supporting status, establishing market-based differential tuition rates for professional schools and programs, revising the processes and strategies for allocation of indirect cost recovery and expanding the fund raising capabilities across all campus programs. Campus leadership has been mindful in all these strategies to ensure that financial aid resources meet identified requirements.

Campus service units under the Executive Vice President have a long (in most cases 12 years) history in effecting continuous quality improvement. Results of these efforts are published and widely distributed to the campus. The results are impressive. During this time, as endowment income, research dollars and space have increased dramatically, the funding for institutionally supported service units has continued to decrease. The Executive Vice President and representative service unit managers agree that facing the reality of changing State funding priorities, embracing strategies for more effective and efficient management, and making better use of technology have created better financial and business management for the campus. They also agree in their belief that continued reductions in resources can no longer be accommodated through efficiency measures. They believe there is great risk of reduced quality, both academic and administrative, without a new strategic planning approach. The EVP has initiated a process for identifying a 5% budget decrease through reducing and/or eliminating services. Senior administrators from throughout the campus, representing academic and administrative units, have assisted in identifying the five most important functions to be preserved in each of the EVP's primary functional areas. An ongoing consultative process will result in final decisions on those activities to be reduced and/or eliminated.

As part of the continuous quality improvement initiative, the Executive Vice President has developed a group of champions across the campus to invest in a web based mechanism called USER that provides online access to legacy administrative systems. Human Resources systems were first to be converted; a financial desktop is currently under development. This simplified approach to conducting daily business, while greatly reducing transaction processing time, also is expanding access to data warehouses and allowing for expanded, timely communication of critical data across the campus. Focused attention to modifying and simplifying these administrative systems also has assisted the campus in maintaining its ability to meet State and Federal reporting requirements, improving financial management and budget controls, tracking Federal grants and contracts, making adjustments to accommodate the frequently changing regulatory environment and engaging all campus constituencies in thinking strategically about this very complex campus in a rapidly evolving environment.

Standard 8: Physical Resources

The University's facilities appear to be safe, adequately maintained and sufficiently equipped to properly support the educational programs and services provided by the institution. Over the past decade the University has significantly enhanced its facilities by addressing over 2 million square feet of needs through a combination of new construction, major renovation, and deferred maintenance projects. The University's physical resources are planned, managed and maintained by a well defined, professionally administered and suitably configured series of facilities related operations. These include the Capital & Space Planning Office, the Capital Projects Office, the Real Estate Office, and the Office of Facilities Services. In addition, faculty, staff and students contribute to physical resource planning processes by participating on a well-orchestrated series of governance committees including the Capital Facilities Committee, the Academic Advisory Committee on Facilities, the Committee on Accessibility, and the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services. Recommendations from these governance groups, as well as input from project clientele, appear to be given proper consideration and appropriately influence project priorities and the University's planning processes. The University is applauded for its open, inclusive and collaborative capital projects and space planning processes and its capital projects delivery processes. Major customers of these services, such as academic entities, Athletics, Auxiliaries and research entities, expressed appreciation for the benefits provided in this area. Results of well-established space management, facilities condition assessment, code/ADA assessment, and capital development processes are consistently integrated to produce projects that combine a comprehensive array of important facilities issues to the greatest degree possible for each opportunity.

In 2002-03, the University completely updated its Campus Master Plan for the Seattle Campus and, in collaboration with the University Office of Regional Affairs, had the Plan approved by the Seattle City Council and the Board of Regents. The Plan provides a flexible, opportunity-sensitive framework to guide campus development, and forecasts the need for approximately 3 million additional square feet of facilities over the next decade in response to anticipated increasing student enrollment and research demands. The University is encouraged to build on this recently completed effort by establishing a dynamic, periodic review process to ensure the Plan's continued adaptability relative to changing conditions.

In response to the anticipated, continued, long-term decline in available state-funded resources, the University is placing a higher priority on investing capital resources to maximize operating efficiencies and increase utilization of existing facilities. Curriculum planning and classroom utilization policies have recently been reviewed and recommendations for improvements have either been executed or are currently in progress. The University is encouraged to continue the work of focus

groups, such as the Learning Spaces Consortium, to explore innovative ways of using traditional and non-traditional learning spaces to greatest efficiency. Maintaining quality of institutional physical resources in the face of declining state-funded financial support will require careful consideration.

The University's boldly stated strategic transformation from a state-supported university to a state-assisted university has important implications for the institution's physical resources. As the inevitable migration of financial responsibility progresses, the University is encouraged to guard against a potentially disproportionate enhancement of facilities associated with research and self-sustaining enterprises if it occurs at the expense of investment to maintain the quality of facilities associated with the traditionally "publicly-funded" humanities areas. While developing a funding transition strategy to address demands for new facilities and major renovation projects may be an initially seductive focal point, successfully developing a transition strategy to augment potentially diminishing funding for on-going maintenance and operations costs and to address existing deferred maintenance liabilities will require a persistent and well-informed commitment from University leadership. The University is encouraged to explore, develop and vigorously pursue innovative approaches to enhance non-state funding opportunities to address the inevitably widening non-state funded gap relating to O&M and deferred maintenance costs. These liabilities are usually viewed as relatively unappealing in comparison to raising funds for new construction projects, however, they represent an undeniably significant portion (~85%) of the life-cycle costs of physical resources, and cannot be successfully ignored for the long-term. Preservation of the "Metro Tract" revenue stream earmark for its historic support of university physical resources is also encouraged. The University is thoughtfully considering an appropriate level of reinvestment necessary to preserve the revenue generating ability of this valuable asset.

The University is appropriately exploring and prioritizing potential statutory and regulatory modifications that could assist its transition to a state-assisted university, facilitate greater operational flexibility and increase the ability to respond to changing market conditions more readily. Securing legislative approval for alternative contracting methods, such as Design-Build and GC/CM project delivery, has already proven its value to the University. Continuing to work with the City of Seattle to eliminate the restrictive "Lease-Lid" mandate should also prove beneficial, and is encouraged.

The University developed and maintains a database which records deferred maintenance backlogs and cyclic renewal data derived from facilities condition assessment audits. The University is recognized for its leadership in providing its facilities assessment software program as a model for the State Legislative Audit Committee's use in developing their own comparative framework for assessing deferred maintenance backlogs and repair needs throughout the state. The greatest percentage of the University's visible deferred maintenance appears to remain in some of its oldest

facilities such as Johnson Hall and some of the most heavily used 30-40 year old facilities such as the Health Sciences Center, which is burdened by both heavy use and outdated, insufficient student informal spaces, including its library space. Institutional planning processes have begun to draw attention to these issues and the University is encouraged to continue to increase the priority of modernizing these types of facilities.

The University's Hazardous Materials Management program has received awards from the State for its pollution prevention efforts. In addition, the Hazardous Materials Management group participated with a national consortium of universities, headed by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, to establish best practice guidelines for laboratory management of hazardous wastes. The resulting guidelines subsequently influenced congressional action relating to requirements and applications for Higher Education.

Both the Tacoma Campus and the Bothell Campus appear to have adequate, recently constructed, safe and well-equipped physical resources, which should accommodate the expected increases in student enrollments for those campuses for the near future. The sensitively executed urban renewal aspects of the Tacoma Campus have been enthusiastically embraced by its host community and the collaborative site development of the Bothell Campus fits well in its more suburban environment. The University is also recognized for its collaboration with the Cascadia Community College in developing new facilities that take advantage of shared efficiencies where appropriate.

The University is commended for the collaborative approach used to include the City of Seattle in the development and approval of the Seattle Campus master plan, for its award-winning Tacoma Campus master plan, and for the architectural and planning recognition received as a result of the development of the Bothell Campus facilities.

The University is also commended for the exceptional visual appearance of its buildings and grounds. The campus is inviting and safe and conveys a strong sense of respect and tradition. The pertinent departments' obvious attention to controlling litter and graffiti in such an urban environment is specifically noted.

Standard 9. Institutional Integrity

The evidence of institutional integrity is reflected not only in the extensive documentation of policies and procedures in written reports and web pages, but also in the character and quality of the Committee's interactions with students, staff, faculty, administration and Regents.

The University of Washington Handbook contains major policies of the University and information of special concern to the Faculty, including the Faculty Code. The Secretary of the Faculty is responsible for maintaining the Handbook and assuring its accessibility by physical and electronic means.

A myriad of more specialized documents describes conflict of interest policies, human subjects protections, and elaborations on the theme of academic freedom.

More important in many ways than the written declarations of standards of integrity is the attitude of the community toward the values of integrity. At every level, from students to Regents, the Committee was impressed by the candor of the exchange and the apparent honesty of the participants in the Committee's activities.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

General Commendations

1. The Committee commends the University of Washington and its faculty for sustained distinction among America's premier research universities, as manifested by its ranking at or near the top in external funding of research, and for its renewed commitment to undergraduate education, as particularly exemplified in the increasing engagement of undergraduates in learning through discovery.
2. The committee commends the University of Washington and its leadership for its commitment to multiple strategies for academic assessment, including the following:
 - Systematic surveys of alumni satisfaction after one, five, and ten years following graduation.
 - Years of exemplary utilization of service satisfaction surveys in the libraries.
 - Performance evaluations following investments of "University Initiatives Funds."
 - Experimentation in understanding the learning experience from the individual student's point of view through the Study of Undergraduate Learning (SOUL) project.
 - Development of the Student Learning Objectives (SLO) Initiative, which encourages faculty to identify the distribution of learning objectives in every course taught and permits both students and faculty to become aware of the accumulation by students (individually or in various aggregations) of experiences identified by faculty as advancing specific learning objectives.
3. The Committee commends the University of Washington for establishing an array of strategies for faculty development, such as the following:
 - New faculty fellows program
 - Senior faculty renewal program
 - Junior faculty development awards
 - Center for Instructional Development and Research
4. The Committee commends the University of Washington Libraries for exceptional service to students, staff development, and a commitment to planning and assessment of service.

5. The Committee commends the Board of Regents and the entire University administration for maintaining a critical continuity of cohesive leadership at a time of institutional transition.
6. The Committee commends the University of Washington financial management for its exceptionally competent and comprehensive efforts to manage operating budgets resourcefully and utilize scarce resources optimally in the planning and execution of capital projects.
7. The Committee commends the University of Washington for the aesthetically pleasing and intellectually stimulating physical environment of its campuses, and for its success in space planning and campus development as exemplified by:
 - Seattle Campus master planning
 - Tacoma Campus award-winning master plan
 - Bothell Campus and Cascadia Community College award-winning architecture and cooperative space planning.

General Recommendations

1. The Committee notes some inconsistencies in perceptions of future relationships among the three UW campuses. The self-study describes the continuing “transformation from a university with three campuses to a coordinated multi-campus university,” but these words appear to have little meaning on any of the three campuses. There is no apparent reconciliation of the clear diversity of the three campus missions and the concept of “one university.” The consequences of the resulting confusion may become serious if not addressed carefully and thoughtfully, as the Committee now recommends (Standard 1.A.1).
2. The Committee commended the University’s multiple strategies for academic assessment, but still it must be noted that the University of Washington remains far from the goal of setting learning objectives for all students and measuring progress toward those objectives to facilitate continuous improvement. The Committee recommends continuing and accelerated efforts toward these ends (Standard 2.B.1, 2.B.2, 2.B.3 and Policy 2.2).
3. The Committee recognizes the impressive success of the University of Washington thus far in managing scarce resources without perceptible loss of quality in its core mission, but recommends considering the broadest possible range of strategies to achieve this critical objective, even including the elimination of academic programs of diminishing priority (Standard 2.A.1).
4. The Committee observed a pervasive concern about the need to maintain (or restore) competitive compensation, even if this action requires reallocation of resources with locally adverse consequences. The Committee recommends that the University persist in its current plans to set a modest minimum goal for compensation increases to be achieved even in the face of revenue shortfalls that require budget cuts (Standard 4.A.4).
5. The Committee recommends that the concerns of the campus information technologists about network security be addressed (Standards 5.E.3, 8.B.2).
6. The Committee recognizes the sincere efforts to advance the diversity agenda at the University of Washington, but no one should be satisfied with the results. The Committee recommends that the UW undertake additional efforts to increase the number of faculty and students from underrepresented groups (Standards 3.D.2, 6.1).