

University of Washington

Two-Year Interim Progress Report



**Submitted to the
Northwest Commission on Colleges
and Universities
April 2005**



Two-Year Interim Progress Report

2005

Submitted to
The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

For Additional Copies, Write or Call:

University of Washington
Office of the Provost
340 Gerberding Hall - Box 351237
Seattle, WA 98195-1237
(206) 543-6616

University of Washington
TWO-YEAR INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

SECTION I

Recommendation 1	1
Presidential Task Force	1
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy	3
Task Force on Administrative Framework	4
Reports to Legislature	5
Summary	7

SECTION II

Recommendation 2	8
Seattle Campus	9
Resources	10
Conception	11
Table 1: Components and Progress, 2003-2005	12
The College of Arts and Sciences:	13
Building Goals for All Academic Units	
Learning Goals for All Academic Units	13
Focused Work on Departmental Learning Goals	14
Focused Work on Course-Based Learning Goals	15
UW Bothell	16
UW Tacoma	17
Summary	19

PROGRESS REPORT SUMMARY	22
--------------------------------------	----

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	23
Appendix B	25
Appendix C	26
Appendix D	27
Appendix E	28

Two-Year Interim Progress Report

This report constitutes the progress report to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) as required by the 2003 comprehensive evaluation and reaffirmation of accreditation of the University of Washington.

The University of Washington takes the process of accreditation very seriously. The decennial self-study is an important mechanism for the University to evaluate itself, and we appreciate the care and thoughtfulness of the Evaluation Committee's recommendations for improvement. The University of Washington considers this progress report as an important occasion to reflect upon the advice provided by the Evaluation Committee, and we welcome the opportunity to report to the Commission on our progress in addressing the identified areas.

On June 26, 2003, in its letter reaffirming the accreditation of the University of Washington, the NWCCU requested that the University of Washington provide a progress report that would address General Recommendations 1 and 2 in the Evaluation Committee Report.

Section I of the following report provides details about Recommendation 1 and the University's progress to date in addressing the issues identified in that recommendation.

Section II provides details about Recommendation 2 and the University's progress to date in addressing the issues identified in that recommendation.

Section I

Recommendation 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 I.A.1).”

The University of Washington appreciates and takes seriously the comments made by the Evaluation Committee regarding the relationships among the three UW campuses. Because the University of Washington, Bothell and University of Washington, Tacoma are still relatively new institutions, the relationships of these two campuses to each other and to the Seattle campus continue to evolve. As both UW Bothell and UW Tacoma increase enrollments, develop new programs, and shape identities that reflect the regions in which they are located, those relationships will continue to change. This is, we believe, a healthy and necessary feature of a multi-campus university.

Conversations about the relations among the University of Washington’s three campuses have moved forward in multiple ways since the completion of the decennial accreditation report. They include: 1. a Presidential Task Force; 2. the work of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Affairs; 3. completion and implementation of a report on the “Administrative Framework for the Three-Campus University of Washington”; and 4. the completion of reports to the State Legislature regarding possible expansion of the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses to four-year undergraduate programs. These conversations have been purposeful in nature and organized in a manner that connects both internal and external constituencies that guide and lend support to the University of Washington.

1. Presidential Task Force

The decennial accreditation process brought forward the opportunity to discuss further the relationships between the three campuses of the University of Washington. Shortly after receiving the Evaluation Committee Report, President Lee Huntsman appointed on January 30, 2004 a Presidential Task Force “to Evaluate Future Options for the Three Campuses of the University of Washington.” The Task Force membership included broad representation from the three campuses, including faculty, administration, and staff. Leadership for the Task Force was provided by the Faculty Senate. The Task Force was given the following direction:

“The time appears right for an extensive appraisal of the current state of and future possibilities for our three-campus university. We have arrived at an interesting intersection of circumstances and issues that argue for a broad and inclusive exploration of academic ambitions and administrative structures.

“What models can we learn from and what unique attributes, resources, and conditions will have a significant impact on our growth and behavior? How can we best anticipate change and plan for the evolving relationships among the Seattle, Bothell, and Tacoma campuses? What ambitions and challenges face our students, faculty, and staff, and the communities that support us?”

The Task Force took as its primary charge to identify options for the multiple possible futures of the University and to list, as realistically as possible, the benefits and disadvantages of each possible model. In order to achieve this goal, the Task Force conducted an extensive information-gathering process, investigating the ways in which multi-campus universities across the country are organized, looking in some detail at Arizona State University, Louisiana State University, Pennsylvania State University, University of Colorado, University of Connecticut, University of Houston, University of Michigan, and the University of Minnesota. In addition, the Task Force brought in consultants in order to learn not only about existing models but about the ways in which these models are themselves changing to adapt to new circumstances in higher education nationally and in their communities locally: Kenneth Mortimer, Senior Associate with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems; Barbara Holland, Director of the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse; and Hal Dengerink, Chancellor of WSU-Vancouver. The progress of the Task Force was reported as an information item to the Regents of the University of Washington in September of 2004.

As a result of these investigations, the Task Force Steering Committee identified six possible models for organizing multi-campus universities, running on a spectrum from fully integrated to completely independent:

1. Integrated
2. Federated
3. Coordinated
4. Parallel
5. Autonomous
6. Independent

The goal of the Steering Committee was not to make recommendations about particular models but to gather information that would enable the University of Washington community to undertake a more informed and productive discussion of its own future possibilities.

The Task Force Steering Committee work culminated in a three-campus retreat in October of 2004. At the invitation of President Mark Emmert, over 90 members from all three campuses of the University of Washington community gathered in October of 2004

“to think together about the future organization and operation of the three University of Washington campuses.” The 90 participants included faculty, staff, and students from all campuses, as well as several UW Regents. President Emmert’s invitation outlined the work of the retreat as follows:

“Our students, faculty, staff, Regents, communities, legislature and the Governor all recognize the challenges and opportunities facing our state. To move forward effectively, we must understand the pros and cons of the various models and structures that might evolve. . . . We anticipate an extensive analysis of the structural, programmatic and fiscal issues faculty the University in assessing the status of the three campuses.”

At the end of the two-day retreat, nine working groups put forward the results of their deliberations regarding key aspects of the three-campus discussion as they were affected by the differing models for multi-campus universities:

1. Management
2. Campus Integration
3. Finance/Staff/Human Resources
4. Academic Programs
5. Baccalaureate Options
6. Faculty
7. Students/Access/Enrollment Policy
8. Support Services
9. Research Models

The retreat was, by all accounts, very successful. The two days sparked lively and rigorous discussions about the future directions of the three campuses of the University of Washington. In addition, the retreat provided an opportunity for faculty, staff, and students from the three campuses to develop closer and more effective working relationships. Perhaps most importantly, the retreat helped to clarify and enhance the culture of a three-campus university. In addition to outlining the pros and cons of various organizational models in each of these key areas, the working groups developed topics for future discussions of the University of Washington’s three campus future. The reports of the working groups, along with the extensive resource materials developed by the Task Force, are now available through the website of the Faculty Senate at the University of Washington (<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/tri-campus/index.html>). These materials will be made available to the next Provost of the University of Washington for further information, continuing discussion, and implementation.

2. Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy is, according to the University of Washington Handbook, “responsible for matters of academic and non-academic policy between and among the campuses of the University of Washington.” The Council’s membership

includes representatives from the three University of Washington campuses and provides an important opportunity for the governance bodies of the three campuses to work together on common issues.

Since the completion of the decennial accreditation report, the Council has taken up two significant issues of three-campus relations: 1. revisions to the University of Washington Handbook, and 2. the development of a three-campus curriculum review process.

1. Revisions to the University of Washington Handbook:

- In the 2003-2004 academic year, the Council devoted its efforts to updating the Faculty Code of the University of Washington Handbook to reflect the three-campus university. The actions brought the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses into the Faculty Code by insuring they are clearly referenced and identifying the faculty and administrative structures of the campuses that were in place in June 2003.
- The Council worked with the University administration to change the existing structures and allow for collegiate level units on each of the UW campuses. These changes enabled the development of the first college-level unit at the UW-Tacoma campus: the Milgard School of Business.

2. Three-Campus Curricular Review Process

- In the 2004-2005 academic year, the Council took up the task of developing a mechanism for insuring that curriculum proposals from individual campuses were vetted properly across the three campuses. A February 3, 2005 Executive Order now requires the President to refer undergraduate program changes to the Faculty Senate for coordinated faculty review by all three campuses, including undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs, or substantive changes to the same. The purpose of this process is to enhance the quality of undergraduate course offerings through peer review, to promote coordination and communication among the campuses, and to promote faculty collaboration that can lead to greater quality and optimal use of resources. While coordination is required, no campus has the power or authority to veto a program or program change proposed by another campus. The review is designed to generate feedback at a point in time where the proposals are developed but not approved so that the originating campus can make full use of any feedback that is provided. To date, this process has been used successfully for three proposals. (See Appendix A for an outline of the review process.)

3. Task Force on Administrative Framework

In March of 2002, President Richard McCormick asked the Executive Vice President to convene a Task Force to “develop a refined statement of the broad operating guidelines for our three campuses and of the appropriate communications that will enable and

promote the proper evolution of the campuses.” The Task Force included the Executive Vice President and the Chancellors of the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses, each of whom consulted with appropriate members of their staffs to gather information for the report. That Task Force completed its work in 2003 and submitted its final report to President Lee Huntsman on February 17, 2004. The report, entitled “Administrative Framework for the Three-Campus University of Washington,” describes the framework for central University of Washington versus campus decision-making. As the report articulates,

“The centralized offering of certain administrative and operational services for all three campuses yields efficiencies and economies across the University while ensuring compliance with Regents’ policies and State law. To the extent appropriate, local services are allowed in order to promote the effectiveness of each campus in addressing its mission and goals.”

The following areas were identified as those University functions that either require Regents’ approval or represent a University-wide service/responsibility:

1. Academic Programs and Curriculum
2. Admissions
3. Budget
4. Planning
5. State/Federal Relations
6. Development
7. Investments and Finances
8. Human Resources
9. Purchasing and Contracts
10. Risk Management
11. Environmental Issues
12. Information Technology

The identification and articulation of the administrative framework of University decision-making is a first step. After approving the report, President Huntsman authorized the appropriate offices to begin the work of developing new procedures to implement and improve the processes by which business is conducted between the campuses and the University. To date, the majority of that work has been completed and implemented; for those items not yet implemented, plans are in place to do so.

4. Reports to Legislature

In March of 2004, the Washington State legislature passed Substitute House Bill 2707, charging the four branch campuses at the University of Washington and Washington State University – UW Bothell, UW Tacoma, WSU Vancouver, and WSU Tri-Cities – to conduct studies regarding possible transitions to becoming four-year institutions. The legislature asked that:

“Each branch campus shall examine its instructional programs, costs, research initiatives, student enrollment characteristics, programs offered in partnership with community and technical colleges, and regional context and make a recommendation . . . regarding the future evolution of the campus.”

Specifically, the reports were to address:

- (a) The model of education that best suits the campus, including the possibility of continuing as a two plus two model. . . making a transition to a four-year university, or some other alternative;*
- (b) The mission that best suits the campus, including the possibility of focusing on upper division baccalaureate education, combining instruction and research targeted to support regional economic development, or some other alternative;*
- (c) Data and analysis that illustrate how the model will increase baccalaureate and master’s degree production; and*
- (d) An estimate of the costs to implement the recommendation.*

UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses each undertook serious and thorough processes for developing their respective responses to this legislative mandate. Each campus gathered research on existing and expected student demand in their regions, economic development priorities in their region, surveys with students and families about their desire for a University of Washington education, college attendance rates for feeder high schools, and data on income differentials that resulted from baccalaureate attainment. In addition, each campus worked intensively with partner community colleges to discuss opportunities for increased collaboration and effectiveness in serving student needs. Extensive community input was sought as well, both internally and externally. In addition to having community members on the advisory boards for the development of the reports, numerous open meetings were held that gave opportunities for broad feedback on the expectations for each campus’s future.

These processes yielded detailed and comprehensive reports that outline the potential at each campus for transitioning to four-year institutions. The reports are available on the web at:

UW Bothell: <http://www.uwb.edu/hb2707/masterDoc10.17.04.pdf>

UW Tacoma: <http://www.tacoma.washington.edu/uwtfuture/>

Both of these studies examine the future needs of the regions in which each campus operates. A common thread emerges: the demand to meet future increased transfer enrollment is best met by expanding upper division educational access on these campuses. Demand from an increasing number of qualified Washington state students to attend the University of Washington is not likely to be met by commensurate undergraduate growth at UW Seattle. The studies reaffirm the University’s partnership with the community colleges to ensure that their graduates have a UW place to go, with the bulk of these new transfer students going to UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.

The University of Washington Board of Regents formally adopted a Resolution endorsing the substance of the reports and formally conveying the reports to the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Most importantly for this accreditation report, the Board concluded by saying:

“The Board recognizes that the growth and development of all three campuses of the University of Washington must be well coordinated, and that it is therefore essential that the issues of any one campus always be considered in the context of a three-campus University.”

These reports are of significance to this progress update for several reasons. First, they provide blueprints for future growth of the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses. An important component of considering the relationships between the three campuses is in identifying and sharing the plans for growth that exist for each campus independently so that they may be considered within the plans for growth for the University of Washington as a whole. Second, the reports to the legislature provided opportunities for UW Bothell and UW Tacoma to gather important feedback from their regions about projected needs and areas for development. In this way, each of the reports reflects the increasingly distinct identities that the newer UW campuses have developed in their brief histories. The development of a cohesive three-campus University of Washington is predicated upon understanding and respecting the distinctive identities of each campus as they contribute to the overall goals and mission of the University.

Summary of Section I:

The University of Washington has taken significant steps to address the Evaluation Committee Report’s concerns regarding the “inconsistencies in perceptions of future relationships among the three UW campuses.” While we have done so because we give serious weight to the advice and recommendations of the Evaluation Committee and to the accreditation process as a whole, we have also done so because the coordination of our multi-campus university is key to the future success and excellence of the University of Washington. We have addressed the issue of a multi-campus university in some of its most important aspects: administrative structure, curriculum development, and plans for enrollment and programmatic growth. We have done so through thorough and inclusive processes of benchmarking, community surveys, research, consultation, and internal deliberation. One item to which we will pay particular attention in the future is the impact that the evolving relationships between the three campuses may have with respect to the accreditation process.

The University of Washington has put in place structures that will continue to work on issues regarding the relationships between the three campuses as they arise. Because we now have an effective mechanism for identifying and addressing university-wide policy concerns, we will be able not only to become aware of such issues in a more timely manner but to respond to them effectively and efficiently as well. Many aspects of the

relationships between the three campuses will not be set in stone; indeed, they should not be, given the continuing shifting terrain of higher education, both regionally and internationally. Nonetheless, the actions taken in the past two years have enabled the University to articulate a clearer and more effective framework for proceeding towards that future in a coherent and productive manner that best serves our mission and goals.

Section II

Recommendation 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).”

The University of Washington is proud of the work we have done in increasing the importance of student learning goals in our educational practices. We appreciate the recognition by the Evaluation Committee that “the University’s overall assessment activities, and the SLO program in particular, [are] innovative and have clear potential for providing meaningful information for program assessment.” We also take seriously the Evaluation Committee’s subsequent observation that “no university wide plan exists for the systematic measure of actual student learning across [the University’s] various colleges and programs.” The University of Washington has undertaken significant and methodical activities since the Evaluation Committee report in order to continue and institutionalize the work begun under the SLO program. It was our judgment that, while the SLO program provided an important general framework for assessment activities, continued work needed to be done to apply that general framework at the departmental and course level. The following pages describe our efforts in these directions.

As the NWCCU noted in its 2003 report, we have tracked assessment in a variety of ways at the University of Washington, through both biennial assessment reports from departments and the UW Study of Undergraduate Learning (UW SOUL). Through such methods we have documented how assessment at the UW has become an organizing principle in such routine practices as course redesign, review of new course proposals, and curricular revision.

As is true for our peer research institutions around the country, our professional schools have led the way in assessment-driven program review and redesign. In line with the goals set by national disciplinary accrediting bodies, the UW professional schools have moved assertively forward in integrating student learning goals into their curricula. As reflects national conversations, other components of the University of Washington have

been less engaged historically in these activities. For this reason, much emphasis at the University of Washington has been given to insuring that learning goals are effectively adopted in parts of campus for which this has been a less focused conversation. At the Seattle campus, for example, particular emphasis has been placed on the College of Arts and Sciences, where the majority of undergraduate students receive their education. In the College of Arts & Sciences, some units are already assessing learning outcomes and using that assessment to drive curricular reform. Others are still generating learning goals. However, since 2003, all are engaged in increasingly explicit, context-specific and collective conversations about teaching and learning. This report highlights the results of some of those conversations, and outlines the many institutional steps we have taken on all three campuses to build sustainable cultures of assessment. This section of the report includes the following sub-headings:

- Seattle Campus
 - Resources
 - Conception
 - Progress
 - UW Schools and Colleges
- Bothell Campus
- Tacoma Campus
- Summary

Seattle Campus

The Seattle campus of the University of Washington serves approximately 27, 700 undergraduates in nine schools and colleges that grant baccalaureate degrees. This section of the report describes the assessment work of the Seattle campus since 2003. We begin by discussing the resources that have been made available for assessment work, then move to our conception of how creating a culture of assessment must occur. Next, we detail our progress since 2003 in this regard, focusing primarily upon the College of Arts and Sciences, which serves 78 percent of our undergraduates on the Seattle campus; in the appendices we have included cases to illustrate that work.

Resources

The progress made at the University of Washington Seattle campus since 2003 can be attributed to the work of many areas and to specific projects that have generated change. The commitment of resources from several areas, is as follows:

- The Office of the Provost has provided purposeful leadership and financial support.
- The Office of Undergraduate Education has contributed to the assessment effort by: linking its work with that of the College of Arts and Sciences; overseeing the work of its Office of Educational Assessment in tracking and reporting the work of colleges and schools; assigning oversight of and participation in assessment work to its Associate Dean; engaging its faculty advisory committee in these efforts; involving

the UW Teaching Academy¹ in this project; integrating instruction in the articulation and assessment of learning goals into all of its teaching training programs for faculty; and working with faculty in newly created University Courses to identify and assess learning goals for these courses.

- The College of Arts and Sciences has provided several frameworks for this work (including Foundations Courses, web-enhanced foreign language courses, learning in the major, and writing), developing and implementing teaching and learning initiatives that call for project proposals that incorporate assessment. The College has allocated the time of its Dean, Divisional Deans, and Assistant Dean to the work, particularly the time of two administrators and their assistants in the office who supervise the projects. Furthermore, the College supports and integrates the help of research scientists from the Office of Educational Assessment, of experts on technology, and of faculty who have experience with assessment. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the College has provided consistent visible and forceful leadership in relation to the development of learning goals and their assessment.
- The Faculty Senate has been involved in assessment work, primarily through the efforts of two of its Councils. The Faculty Council on Instructional Quality has been working with a committee from several departments on campus to create a technological system to allow students to track learning goals across the curriculum. This system would allow a student interested in the family, for example, to identify courses in Psychology, Anthropology, and Sociology that focus on family, as well as to identify courses across the institution that focus on writing, speaking, or other skills. In addition, the Council joined with the Faculty Council on Academic Standards in spring 2004 to endorse the direction of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Undergraduate Education.
- The Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) and the Center for Instructional Development and Research (CIDR) have committed staff and other resources to projects in both Arts and Sciences and in the Office of Undergraduate Education.

Fiscal resources committed to this work since 2003 have been significant. The Provost's Office has committed more than \$350,000 over the past two years to projects that involve the development of learning goals and outcomes that require ongoing assessment. In addition, the Office of Undergraduate Education has contributed close to \$75,000 to assessment projects that respond directly to the [NWCCU](#)'s charge. In addition, departments have supported assessment with monies available to them, as well, and both OEA and CIDR have contributed resources to assessment work on the Seattle campus.

¹ The Teaching Academy is made up of faculty who have won the UW Distinguished Teaching Award, the S. Sterling Munro Public Service Award, or the Graduate Mentor Award. The Academy engages in initiatives, workshops, and events to promote instructional excellence at the UW. For more information on the Teaching Academy see <http://www.washington.edu/oue/academy/>.

Conception

Our approach to “continuing and accelerating efforts” to identify and assess learning goals for all our undergraduates is informed by our earlier experience, by research on learning, and by the culture of the University, which embraces a wide range of methods, beliefs, and practices represented by the disciplines that comprise it.

Prior to 2003, the Student Learning Objectives (SLO) system was introduced to the University of Washington Seattle campus as a way of gathering information about learning. This system asked faculty to determine what percentage of their courses focused on a selection of general skills that had been identified nationally as components of undergraduate education. In addition, the University created a website to provide information on student learning outcomes and how to use them for assessment². These steps proved useful because they successfully initiated a conversation among faculty and administrators about learning outcomes, and they put in place a technological system that could be incorporated into the next phase of this project. In addition, the SLO system highlighted the need to focus work at the Seattle campus in the departments and, further, to situate much of this work in the College of Arts and Sciences. The information gathered by the SLO system as well as through research on learning and teaching have informed the University’s approach since the Commission’s 2003 report. The SLO system brought forward many department-specific learning goals; work since that time has been devoted to building upon this information in a systematic and deliberative manner.

Studies of learning in college have demonstrated that not only do content and methodology vary across the disciplines, but so does the acquisition of skills once considered “general.” What it means to write and to think effectively in Art, for example, differs from what it means to write and think effectively in Biology.³ Furthermore, research shows that effective pedagogy also differs across disciplines.⁴ Therefore, our conception of the assessment work for the Seattle campus from 2003-05 has been rooted in this understanding about knowledge creation and transmission. Because both are particular in many ways to the disciplines engaged in those activities, our focus has been first on departmental learning goals and courses taught by faculty within those departments and second, on threading these goals to those set by Colleges and Schools. With this in mind, our work is divided into six stages that overlap and inform each other. These are:

1. Identify and articulate learning goals for students. Our focus is on what students should *know* and be able to *do* at both the course and the departmental levels.

² <http://depts.washington.edu/grading/slo/SLO-Home.htm>

³ Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R., eds. for the National Research Council. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press; Donald, J. G. (2002). *Learning to Think: Disciplinary Perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; and Bazerman, C. (2000). What written knowledge does. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

⁴ Shulman, Lee S. (1988). [A union of insufficiencies: strategies for teacher assessment in a period of educational reform](#). *Educational Leadership* (46), 3. 36-42.

2. Map goals through the curriculum. This step includes mapping course-level learning goals through the class structure and/or mapping course-based learning goals to learning goals for majors.
3. Identify and use methods for assessing how well students have met those goals. Assessment occurs both at the level of the classroom and the level of the major.
4. Use assessment to inform curricular revision and change. Assessment can inform course design as well as departmental change.
5. Coordinate departmental learning goals with those of the college.
6. Develop a program review process for college-wide assessment. A model for this process is already in place at the University of Washington’s Seattle campus in the undergraduate program in Nursing (see Appendix B).

Work on the Seattle Campus can be identified in eight components. These components and the progress on each are illustrated in Table 1. Brief discussions of each component follow.

Table 1: Components and Progress, 2003-2005

Project Component	CURRENT PROGRESS
College of Arts and Sciences. Identify learning goals at the college level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafted • Committee review, 2005
Learning Goals for All Academic Units. Begin with Arts & Sciences; follow through with other Colleges and Schools	In process
Focused Work on Departmental Learning Goals. Identify learning goals for four targeted departments and programs and map curricula (see Appendix C for departmental status)	Implemented in two stages
Focused Work on Course-Based Learning Goals--	Implemented in several stages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundations Courses: Identify and assess learning goals for 7 gateway courses into the majors 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web-enhanced Foreign Language Initiative: Identify learning goals for revised foreign language courses in Spanish, Japanese, and German 	Implemented in several stages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University Courses: Identify learning goals for new interdisciplinary undergraduate course(s) 	Implemented
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing: Identify learning goals for required composition course—English 131 	Implemented
Faculty Training in the Development and Use of Learning Goals.	Implemented: Faculty Fellows, Institute For Teaching Excellence, Large Class Collegium, Provost’s Workshops
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate instruction in learning goals and their assessment into teaching training programs • Create “how-to” manual/website for faculty and departments, including identification of “best practices” from all three campuses 	
Learning Goals for Diversity. Develop campus wide diversity learning goals for the Seattle campus	Implemented
A Technology for Tracking Learning Goals. Develop technological tools to track learning goals and other information across the University	Piloting with Nursing

<p>Forms. Include a “learning goals” section on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New/revised course applications • Instructor course descriptions (ICDs) • Catalog descriptions 	<p>Drafted for course applications. Will be proposed to Faculty Council on Academic Standards in 2004-2005</p>
---	--

The College of Arts and Sciences: Building Departmental Learning Goals

Since 2003, we have focused our efforts at the Seattle campus on the College of Arts and Sciences for three reasons. First, it serves about 78 percent of undergraduates at the Seattle campus; therefore, changes in Arts and Sciences have the broadest possible impact on undergraduate learning. Second, as is true of most colleges and universities in the nation, the College of Arts and Sciences has been slower to join the assessment conversation than other colleges and schools because of its size and complexity. Engineering, Nursing, and Social Work, for example, have identified and assessed learning goals for majors and at the course-level for many years. Finally, a third reason for locating our efforts in the College of Arts and Sciences is because the Dean’s office of that College, with the help and support of the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Provost’s Office, has provided significant leadership for integrating assessment into the regular departmental practices in the College.

The college identified learning goals for all its graduates and included those goals as part of its mission statement in 2001. These goals, available on the College’s website⁵, are as follows:

Our students learn to think rationally, creatively and critically; to communicate clearly, correctly, and persuasively; to gather and interpret data; and to engage the arguments of others with understanding and respect... We prepare our students to become leaders in an increasingly diverse society.

While the College is working with its 42 departments to thread their learning goals to its goals, it has also identified a college-wide committee that will begin working in spring 2005 on the review and revision of the goals it identified four years ago.

Learning Goals for All Academic Units

It is our goal that faculty in all undergraduate departments, programs, and colleges articulate learning goals and use those goals to formally assess students’ performance. As a first step in this process, we are tracking which departments have already incorporated learning goals into their majors, which are working on doing so, and which have not yet begun this work. The Office of Undergraduate Education asks departments to submit assessment reports biennially in even-numbered years. These reports include information about departmental learning goals, assessment methods, and curricular change resulting from assessment, and they are summarized and placed on the Office of

⁵ <http://www.artsci.washington.edu/mission.asp>

Educational Assessment's website.⁶ A chart allows the UW to track the development of learning goals for schools, departments, and programs. (Appendix C provides preliminary results from the 2004 assessment reports.)

Focused Work on Departmental Learning Goals

In 2004, the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Educational Assessment gave small grants to three departments -- the Department of Women Studies, the Jackson School of International Studies, and the Department of Geography -- so that they could complete assessment processes already begun and serve as models for other departments in Arts and Sciences. This process was initiated as a mechanism to follow up on the excellent work that had been completed in the initial phase of the Student Learning Goals initiative in order to insure that student learning goals were adopted throughout departmental programs. Departments were funded for one year to do the following:

- Identify learning goals in the major and revise them as the process revealed needed change
- Identify learning goals for courses
- Develop curricular maps that integrate course-based learning goals into departmental goals
- Identify methods/sites for assessment
- Redesign gateway and/or capstone courses to bring them into line with departmental goals
- Identify assessment strategies, both at the classroom level and at the level of the major
- Implement assessment in 2005-06

Departments will complete their projects in spring 2005 (see Appendix D for summaries of the work done to date in these units). The College of Arts and Sciences is currently speaking with larger departments about beginning the same process in summer 2005.

In addition, the Geography Department, having identified learning goals and tracked them through its curriculum years ago, was given support to develop and pilot a longitudinal assessment study of undergraduate learning (Geography SOUL). This innovative project tracks the learning of about 10 percent of the majors as they move through their course of study, collecting data on what they learn and where they learn it and pulling together portfolios of student work that faculty will later evaluate. This study is also on track, and preliminary results will be available in summer 2006.

The Program on the Environment, an interdisciplinary program administered by the Office of Undergraduate Education, also has been engaged in the process of identifying learning goals for its majors, mapping its curriculum to those goals, and identifying methods for assessing student learning. After a series of retreats, the faculty have agreed to a shared set of core goals for the major and are moving forward in their curricular

⁶ <http://www.washington.edu/oea/0301.htm>

planning. The Honors Program, also administered by the Office of Undergraduate Education, has begun discussions about learning goals for first- and second-year honors students.

In the Office of Undergraduate Education, the conversation about learning goals and assessment has spread to experiential programs as well. Programs that create and monitor undergraduate research opportunities, service learning experiences, and scholarship programs for undergraduates have begun identifying learning goals for their students and discussing ways they might assess such goals.

Focused Work on Course-Based Learning Goals

In addition to work with departments, both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Undergraduate Education have been working with individual and small groups of faculty on course-based learning goals. In an effort to integrate learning goals into key undergraduate courses, the College of Arts and Sciences requested proposals from departments to improve Foundations Courses for their majors. Foundations courses are defined as large entry-level classes that provide students with their first look into the foundations of disciplines. The College is providing extensive support for the Foundations Course projects submitted by seven departments: Accounting⁷, Biology, Chemistry, Economics, the Jackson School of International Studies, Physics, and Psychology. The Foundations Courses under redesign represent about 100,000 student credit hours/year, about 10% of the total undergraduate population. Changes in these classes include developing learning goals and methods for assessing them; connecting those gateway-level learning goals to those in the department; identifying, using, and assessing innovative active-learning strategies in the large-lecture classes that characterize these classes; and reporting results to others.

The College is also involved in extensive changes in first-year German, Japanese, and Spanish language courses. These courses are blending web-based technology with traditional first-year language instruction to create courses that are more efficient and less costly. The newly designed web-enhanced courses will also include learning goals and methods for assessing them. These courses will be offered in 2005-06.

Course-based learning goals are also part of the development of University Courses. These interdisciplinary courses, administered by the Office of Undergraduate Education, are large lecture classes with writing, speaking, and information literacy links. The Office is requiring each course to identify and assess learning goals for students. The first of these courses will be offered in spring 2005, and three additional courses will be offered in 2005-06.

While the focus of our current work in assessment is in the College of Arts and Sciences, we continue to monitor, encourage, and endorse the assessment work in other Schools

⁷ In partnership with the UW's School of Business

and Colleges on the Seattle campus. A brief summary of the work in those schools and colleges can be found in Appendix E.

UW Bothell

UW Bothell engages in a variety of teaching and learning assessments, and its various academic programs have incorporated learning goals and strategies since 1990 when the first degree in Liberal Studies began. Today the various undergraduate and graduate degree programs, including those in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Nursing and Computing and Software Systems, incorporate a variety of different capstone projects, ranging from portfolios, to senior seminar research projects, to applications and assessments of learning in applied settings and projects. Reviews of learning goals and their assessments on a course and curriculum basis are also undertaken.

For example, a Business Program task force recently completed a review of assessment “best practices” at business schools around the country and reported results to the program faculty. In the fall of 2005, when the faculty undertakes a review of its undergraduate program, their work will include development of a new set of learning goals and a new assessment plan for the program. New learning goals for the MBA were recently completed, and an assessment plan will be developed in the near future in conjunction with changes in the MBA program.

Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences also recently completed a major study of learning goals included in syllabi across the wide range of IAS courses in two majors and five concentrations. Results suggested that the development of critical thinking is a very strongly shared goal across virtually all courses. Program leaders are now developing a process by which faculty will soon review a wide range of course documents to examine and assess in detail the key components of critical thinking as a teaching and learning goal in IAS.

UW Bothell’s other programs, including Education, Nursing, and Computing and Software Systems, are similarly committed to on-going student learning assessment strategies and the development of courses, projects and/or capstone experiences that both further and demonstrate student success for both internal and external publics. In addition, the development, implementation, and assessment of teaching and learning goals at UW Bothell is enhanced by the workshops and leadership of the Teaching and Learning Center, as well as the Writing and Quantitative Skills Centers.

Importantly, UW Bothell is committed as a campus to identifying critical skills, abilities, and fields of knowledge important to contemporary and future students and the communities in which they work. The perceived importance of these skills, abilities, and fields of knowledge is regularly assessed through a variety of surveys and focus groups. In addition, UW Bothell graduates and alumni are surveyed about their satisfaction with UW Bothell’s contributions to the development of these learning goals, as well as about their own roles as students in furthering the accomplishment of these goals. The basic

critical skill components incorporated in these studies include: writing effectively, speaking effectively, critically analyzing ideas and arguments, working cooperatively in a group, defining and solving problems, and adapting to innovation and change. Respondents are also asked about the development of abilities in key arenas such as: understanding and applying computing skills, locating information needed to help make decisions or solve problems, understanding and developing leadership skills, understanding and applying quantitative principles and methods, and understanding and applying scientific techniques. The importance of and success in acquiring an understanding and appreciation of arts and humanities, workplace organizations, differing philosophies and culture, the global context of business and government, citizenship rights and responsibilities, and foreign languages are also queried in these regular surveys. UW Bothell anticipates a campus-wide review and potential revision of these critical skills, abilities and fields of knowledge during the coming biennium.

UW Tacoma

UW Tacoma engages in a range of regular assessments of teaching and learning, based primarily in the academic programs, and has done so since the campus was created in 1990. Among the factors motivating the assessment of teaching/learning and learning goals are the campus emphasis on and faculty commitment to excellence in teaching; the state's Higher Education Coordinating Board's requirement for new program proposals to address goals, outcomes, and plans for assessment; involvement in the Student Learning Objectives project; and the need for UW Tacoma's four professional programs with accreditation requirements to engage in significant assessment of learners, outcomes, and graduates. Currently, undergraduate programs in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, Environmental Science, Nursing, Business Administration, Computing and Software Systems, Urban Studies, and Social Welfare engage in formative and summative evaluation.

While summative evaluation of the achievement of learning goals varies by academic program, established learning goals, and curricular emphases, there are similarities. Each program, for example, assesses the ability of learners to achieve learning goals relative to writing and thinking critically and engages in student assessment of all courses taught. These efforts are supported not only by Center for Instructional Development and Research and the Office of Educational Assessment, based on the Seattle campus, but also by UW Tacoma's Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology, campus-based faculty development initiatives, and current activities of the Diversity Task Force. More recently, a campus-based committee on Information Literacy and Student Learning, consisting of faculty, staff, and librarians, has conducted a survey of faculty to identify where and to what extent information literacy is taught throughout the curriculum. With an eye toward ensuring that students achieve the goal of "critical thinking skills needed to find, retrieve, and analyze and use information," this work group is soliciting faculty input; a pilot undergraduate course in information literacy was recently offered and expanded prior to subsequent offerings. Clearly, the work in this area is just beginning and will continue for some time.

The Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS) program, the largest academic unit at UW Tacoma, has recently completed revision of specific learning goals for concentrations in the BA degree, including those for [American Studies](#), [Arts, Media and Culture](#), Communication, [Environmental Studies](#), [Ethnic, Gender & Labor Studies](#), [Global Studies](#), [Political Economy](#), Politics and Values, [Psychology](#), and [Self and Society](#). These are posted on the respective web pages. Documentation of students' abilities in communicating in writing and orally and working as part of a group are among the components constituting the portfolio in IAS; the portfolio is submitted prior to graduation for assessment. Faculty are planning to review the portfolio assessment process in the coming year.

In addition, faculty teaching in the Bachelor of Science degree program in Environmental Science recently examined their transition course for new majors transferring from community colleges. Close examination of this course resulted in an evolution from a menu-based orientation and skills course to a survey/portfolio based design, where students participate in the documentation of what has been learned in a portfolio, benefiting the cohort of learners and providing documentation of achievement of a subset of goals. In addition, a capstone course required of seniors provides a learning setting in which the achievement of established goals can be verified and documented.

Nursing at UW Tacoma offers Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) and Master of Nursing (MN) degrees, linked through accreditation by CCNE to the School of Nursing at the Seattle campus and the Nursing Program in Bothell. Program and learning goals are posted on the program's web page and on course syllabi. The extensive assessment and evaluation activities of the Nursing Programs are detailed earlier in this document. One recent change resulting from examination of learning goals resulted in a curricular change to enable those learners to move more efficiently from an associate degree to achievement of an MN.

Business Administration's undergraduate degree prominently features in recruitment material, course syllabi and course materials five learning goals or "competencies" integrated throughout the undergraduate curriculum. These goals include teamwork, communication, strategic thinking, integrated business knowledge and professionalism. Summative evaluation occurs through a variety of strategies, but is emphasized in the seminar practicum on business competencies, focusing on each learner's integration and application of knowledge and competencies and involving construction of a career-related portfolio and analysis of competency development.

Urban Studies has built its curriculum around four goals emphasizing an understanding of the form and function of cities, an awareness of problems and issues confronting metropolitan areas, and the analytical skills needed to undertake research in an urban milieu, for example. Achievement of the learning goals is undertaken during the final quarter of the program, during which students undertake a major project involving research.

Computing and Software Systems includes learning goals related to possessing the theoretical and conceptual base to contribute to the profession, demonstrating confidence and the entrepreneurial spirit, as well as demonstrating the commitment to life-long learning critical to this rapidly evolving profession. Internships and research opportunities provide one avenue for demonstrating achievement of learning goals. Extensive surveys and interviews of graduates provide another avenue for assessing the extent to which learning goals are met.

The BA in Social Welfare, as well as the MSW, is linked to the School of Social Work at the Seattle campus through accreditation by the CSWE. Both programs engage in significant formative and summative assessment of learning goals; in the case of the BA in Social Welfare, such activities include practicum evaluations and surveys six to nine months post-graduation to determine the extent to which the program prepared alumni (in the context of learning goals) for employment. The seven learning goals consistent with accreditation requirements and the goals of the School of Social Work's programs are posted on program material.

UW Tacoma's most recently funded project provides support for the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program and other UW Tacoma faculty to take "next steps" toward a more holistic approach to assessment of learning goals. Among the aims of the project are to develop and use assessment tools to address student learning in an interdisciplinary program, to more effectively use current assessment tools, and to use student portfolios to engage in program assessment. Activities will involve consultation and faculty development opportunities, resulting in a toolkit to support IAS and UW Tacoma as they move toward creating a culture of assessment.

Summary of Section II:

The three campuses of the University of Washington have embarked upon a systematic effort to build assessment into the curricular review processes. Since the 2003 accreditation report, institutional incentives and resources have been provided to encourage faculty and departments to reconceptualize undergraduate education through the lens of learning goals and their assessment.

Our goal is to continue to institutionalize the assessment process so that all departments, programs, colleges, and other academic units measure student learning against objectives they have identified and use that assessment process. We wish to build a practice of academic units using assessment results to inform curricular change, understanding that assessment can provide the colleges and schools in which departments are housed with evidence about how well college-level goals for students are being met. This process is, of course, multi-directional: assessment of departmental and programmatic goals will shape college-level learning goals and planning priorities, which will, in turn, shape departmental and programmatic thinking about goals for majors. We expect that further steps in this effort may include:

- Incorporating learning goals development and assessment into the program review process.
- Continuing to support and encourage all programs, departments, and colleges to reflect upon what they want students to know and be able to do when they graduate and to assess progress toward those ends.
- Contributing to a three-campus conversation about the progress of institution-wide learning goals development.
- Developing an enhanced understanding of where we are in relation to other R1 institutions in building and assessing learning goals.
- Participating in national discussions of how learning goals are institutionalized on other campuses and sharing these developments with the UW community.

Continued work on learning goals is being supported by faculty training on all three campuses.

The UW offers retreats/workshops that help faculty at the Seattle, Bothell, and Tacoma campuses develop methods to improve teaching. These include the:

- Faculty Fellows Program, week-long instruction on teaching and learning for newly-hired tenure-track and three- and five-year faculty on all three campuses
- Institute for Teaching Excellence, an annual teaching and learning retreat for faculty at all levels
- Large Class Collegium, providing faculty with help in integrating active-learning strategies, technology, and assessment into large-lecture classes
- Provost's Workshops, which provide faculty with focused workshops on teaching and learning issues every fall.

All of these teaching training programs now include instruction in identifying and assessing goals for student learning, the relationship of learning goals and assessment to course design, and the connection between course-based learning goals and those for students in the major.

In addition to training sessions, the Office of Educational Assessment is putting together a manual that departments can download that will provide them with information about how to identify and assess learning goals in the major. This manual will include specific examples of processes others have followed, including some of the case studies in this report. The manual will be available to departments and faculty on all three campuses in the fall of 2005.

Importantly, discussions of learning goals on all three campuses are taking place in the context of how learning goals can further the University's broad goals regarding diversity. In 1995, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution urging all departments to develop courses that "teach students to think critically about cultural diversity," and the Office of the Provost provided funding for selected departments to develop diversity learning goals and new courses embedding these goals.⁸ In tandem with this process, the

⁸ See <http://depts.washington.edu/ctcenter/deptexamples.htm>

Center for Curriculum Transformation worked with a faculty advisory committee on developing liberal arts learning goals for all students (a project supported in part by a grant from the Ford Foundation). These goals, and representative courses, have been included in a guide, *The Learning We Need Now: What Every UW Student Needs to Know about Diversity* (2004, 2005), for students and faculty members. The brochure can be found at: <http://www.artsci.washington.edu/lwnn.pdf>.

Currently, foundational learning goals for diversity are being incorporated in courses for a new diversity minor being developed with funding from the Provost's Innovation Fund. The courses will be taught for the first time in 2005-2006, and student learning outcomes will be assessed. Assessment results will be used to refine the courses in the minor and be made available to faculty teaching other courses.⁹

Finally, the UW is in the process of identifying possible structural/institutional opportunities for integrating assessment into our regular practices. Currently, we are investigating how to incorporate language on learning goals and assessment into forms we require, including adding learning goals sections to:

- New/revised course applications
- Instructor course descriptions (ICDs)
- Catalog descriptions

We have drafted this change for new/revised course applications, and the changes will be proposed to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards spring quarter 2005.

The University of Washington has set a deliberative path toward implementing the next phase of the SLO Project summarized in our decennial accreditation report. These steps emphasize building upon the solid work that has been accomplished in professional schools and graduate programs. We have begun integrating student learning goals into departmental and course-based activities on all three campuses, in particular in those colleges and units that provide education for the largest numbers of University of Washington undergraduates. These activities have moved forward with the support of the Provost, the Deans, and the Faculty Senate so that assessment activities can become embedded in institutional activities at all levels.

⁹ See www.artsci.washington.edu/diversityminor.asp.

Progress Report Summary

The University of Washington has undertaken serious, deliberative, and inclusive efforts to address the issues raised by the Evaluation Committee report in Recommendations 1 and 2. These activities have been initiated with the full leadership and support of the President and Provost, as well as with significant engagement by the University of Washington Regents, the Chancellors of UW Bothell and UW Tacoma, the Deans of the Seattle campus, and the leadership of the Faculty Senate. Our focus has been on developing sustainable mechanisms for addressing tri-campus issues and student learning goals and assessment. In doing so, we have engaged the broad communities of the University of Washington: faculty, staff, students (current and prospective), administrators, and community partners. We have also engaged national consultants and conducted extensive research to assure that we have the nation's best examples to assist our activities.

Neither the relationships among the three University of Washington campuses nor the development of student learning goals and assessment is a project that will ever be "complete." In each of these arenas, continued assessment, analysis, reconfiguration, and innovation must be undertaken to meet our goals of fulfilling at the highest levels the mission of the University of Washington. The institutional frameworks that have been developed in recent years will insure that both three-campus relationships and student learning goals will receive the consistent and careful attention they deserve.

| **Appendix A:** Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, Review of Developed Proposals

Stage I

1. Each campus has the responsibility to develop its own curricular offerings. After a campus unit develops and approves a curricular offering, it should be forwarded to the curriculum review committee for that campus, i.e. Faculty Council on Academic Standards (Seattle), General Faculty Organization (Bothell) or the Faculty Assembly (Tacoma).
2. The curriculum review committee of each campus shall make an initial determination that the proposal is sufficiently developed to merit review. It shall also determine whether the proposed change is sufficiently substantive to warrant a tri-campus review.
 - a. If the proposal meets this threshold, it shall be forwarded immediately to the Secretary of the Faculty. Materials to be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty must include:
 - i. The applicable campus curriculum form, i.e. Form 1503
 - ii. The rationale for the proposal
 - b. If the proposal is not sufficiently developed to merit review, it shall be returned to the unit of origin for further development.
3. When the Secretary of the Faculty receives the curriculum proposal, it will be posted immediately for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 30 days.
4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the Secretary of the Faculty shall send an e-mail to (1) the voting faculty, (2) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs (DDC) list serve, (3) the Chair of each campus review committee, and (4) the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.
5. At the end of the 30-day period, the Secretary of the Faculty shall compile all comments made on the proposal and forward the comments to the Chair of the Curriculum Committee at the originating campus. That committee can then consider the inter-campus comments as part of their deliberative process.

Stage II

1. The originating campus curriculum committee will send the approved proposal forward to the appropriate campus bodies and ultimately to the President's Office.
2. The President shall forward the proposal to the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty. It shall be their responsibility to forward the proposal to the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy.

3. A subcommittee of the Council consisting of the chair (or designee) and two council members (one representing the faculty of each of the other two campuses) will convene and issue a report to the Chair of the Senate, for forwarding to the President and the Chancellors, within 14 days of the receipt of the proposal. Their review will consider only the following issues:

a. Was the final proposal made available for a 30-day comment period?

b. Were the comments received and responded to appropriately?

c. Did the campus curricular review body consider comments and responses in its review?

In short, at this stage the task of the Council will be to ensure that the process described in Stage I was followed.

4. Once this review is completed, the Council's report shall be given to the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty. The Chair will forward the results to the President and Chancellors. Matters of non-adherence to procedures or unresolved issues related to comments received will be the responsibility of the President.

Appendix B: Model of Program Review Process for College-wide Assessment

Nursing ~ Fully-integrated Curricular Mapping and Assessment Process

The School of Nursing is a model for best assessment practices at the UW. The key to Nursing's success at assessment-driven curricular reform, according to Associate Dean Susan Woods, is a review and reform system that "gives faculty full control of the curriculum. The faculty hold the faculty accountable."

Learning Goals in the Nursing Major

- The Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) program has 10 learning outcomes for majors that were derived from the program's mission and goals, faculty-generated, and approved by faculty in 1991.
- The UW BSN program outcomes comply with and complement with standards set by a national nursing accrediting agency, the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE).
- The curriculum of the BSN program is built on these outcomes.
- Selected components of each outcome are threaded throughout BSN courses.
- Prerequisite coursework is foundational to the BSN program, which builds on prior student knowledge so that students meet BSN program outcomes.
- Nursing has recently added a list of behavioral "essentials" that are part of its assessment of student performance.

Assessment Streams. Curriculum review is continuous, based on both formative and summative assessment data, which include:

1. Formative data:

- Connected teaching conversations: all faculty teaching in a given quarter meet weekly and talk about students, patterns, curricular needs, and pedagogy.
- Course-related data: student success in courses and course evaluations of teaching effectiveness provide data about desired changes that may increase student success.

2. Summative data:

- NCLEX pass rate and job placement. The BSN program measures first time pass rate on the national RN licensure examination as well as career placement as measures of its success.
- Employer surveys: Questionnaires are given to employers by UW BSN graduates who are new hires. A web-based survey has been created to improve response rate.
- Nursing Practice Advisory Board: Hospital and other CEO's from around the area advise the UW on trends in nursing and related needed curricular change, such as adding an informatics component.
- Capstone Course: All BSN students enroll in a 12-credit capstone course wherein instructors evaluate students at the beginning, middle, and end. Reflective thinking, communication, and nursing therapies are three skills that are measured in this course to evaluate program effectiveness.
- Alumni surveys: Surveys are distributed to BSN graduates at 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years post graduation to determine alumni perception of program satisfaction and effectiveness.

Why do this kind of evaluation?

- Informs program about effectiveness of admissions practices.
- Informs program about potential needs for faculty development.
- Informs program about how to modify the curriculum as needed.
- Improves student learning and success by using constant assessment feedback to improve program effectiveness.
- Fosters constant refinement of curriculum and re-examination of curricular outcomes.
- Inspires faculty self-reflection, pedagogical trouble-shooting, and teaching creativity.
- Informs students early and often about performance, supporting them in achieving success (learning contracts) or giving advanced notice of the potential for program dismissal.

Appendix C: Implementation Progress for Developing Learning Goals, Seattle Campus

Schools, Departments and Programs with Fully-Articulated Learning Goals	Schools, Departments, and Programs, and with Partially-Completed Learning Goals	Schools, Departments, and Programs That Are Just Beginning to Develop Learning Goals ¹⁰
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aero and Astronautics 2. Aquatic and Fisheries Sci 3. Architecture 4. Art 5. Biology (for each level) 6. Bioengineering 7. Chemical Engineering 8. Chemistry 9. Civil and Environ Engin 10. Communication 11. Community and Environmental Plan 12. Comparative Hist of Ideas 13. Comparative Literature 14. Computer Sci and Engin 15. Dance 16. Economics 17. Electrical Engineering 18. Geography 19. Germanics 20. Industrial Engineering 21. Landscape Architecture 22. Law, Societies, and Justice 23. Ling and Romance Ling 24. Materials Science & Engin 25. Mechanical Engineering 26. Nursing 27. Social Welfare 28. Speech and Hearing Sci 29. Technical Communication 30. Women Studies 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. American Ethnic Studies 2. Anthropology 3. Applied and Computational Math 4. Atmospheric Sciences 5. Drama 6. English 7. French and Italian Studies 8. History 9. Mathematics 10. Philosophy 11. Political Science 12. Scandinavian Studies 13. Sociology 14. Spanish and Portuguese Studies 15. Program on the Environment 16. Psychology 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asian Language & Literature 2. Astronomy 3. Business 4. Classics 5. Construction Management 6. Earth & Space Sciences 7. Forest Resources 8. Informatics 9. Jackson School of International Studies 10. Music 11. Near East Lang & Civilization 12. Physics 13. Slavic Languages & Literature

¹⁰ While not a degree-granting program, the Honors Program has begun to identify learning goals for core courses.

Appendix D: Examples of Focused Work on Departmental Learning Goals

Women Studies ~ Gateway Course Redesign and Curricular Mapping
<p>Women Studies has shifted the focus from teaching to learning on several fronts. Working with both faculty and students, the department has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identified learning goals for the major• Generated a core set of learning goals that will apply across different instructors for the foundational Women 200 course• Developed a curricular map that shows how departmental learning goals are threaded throughout the curriculum and articulated in each course• Redesigned the required capstone course so that it can be used as a site for assessing departmental learning outcomes <p>The curricular map charts the extent to which six departmental learning goals are taught in the Women Studies courses that comprise the curriculum. These goals range from the development of key academic skills (“learn different modes of inquiry and practice methodological rigor”; “generate significant, meaningful, and innovative scholarship”,) to department-specific habits of mind (“students learn to think creatively, and critically reflect on the politics of knowledge production”). They emphasize core departmental values of social justice, community involvement, and “engaged citizenship”. The assimilation of these goals in each course is represented in a table indicating whether a particular goal is “taught” or “practiced, but not taught” (e.g., assumed to have been learned in prior courses), and documents the ways in which each goal is demonstrated in student products and projects.</p> <p>The curricular map also details how each learning goal translates into course material, offering a particularly rich, nuanced insight into the main themes, concerns, keywords, and habits of mind practiced by the discipline.</p>
Jackson School of International Studies ~ Gateway Course Redesign, 2004-5
<p>In the summer of 2004, a team of faculty members and students created a new Foundations Course for the entire School of International Studies. This course will be required by all seven majors in the prestigious Jackson School. The new course, a complete reworking of the existing SIS 201 class, focuses on political, economic, social, and cultural processes and forces that led to "The Making of the 21st Century." The course offers both a historical understanding and a contemporary focus on major global issues. It introduces learning goals already in place in other entry-level SIS courses, which include appreciation and mastery of interdisciplinary social-science-based theories, methods, and information relating to global processes and issues. In addition, the new course requires students to develop research, writing, and thinking skills necessary for writing complex arguments about international issues and events. Also, the course is designed to help students participate in discussions of core concepts and theories as members of the discipline. One aim of this curricular redesign is more uniform preparation of students for the SIS capstone "Task Force" courses, which may also ultimately be expanded into all majors within the School.</p>

Geography ~ Study of Undergraduate Learning (SOUL)

Geography has previously generated learning goals for all individual courses, program concentrations (such as economic geography, urban geography, etc.), and for the entire major. As a next step, Geography is now carrying out a two-year research project to assess students' performance and perceptions against departmental learning goals; identify paths that bring students to Geography and those that take them through the major; and determine what helps students learn, as well as the obstacles or challenges to learning that they face. Specifically, the study will:

- Assess the match between Geography's stated departmental learning goals and student perceptions of how well they are meeting those goals.
- Assess the match between UW SOUL's six study areas (writing, critical thinking and problem solving, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, understanding and appreciating diversity, and personal growth) and student perceptions of how well they are meeting those goals.
- Assess the match between Geography's learning goals and actual student performance (aka, learning outcomes).
- Enable a sample of Geography majors to articulate (represent) and assess their own learning, identifying what helps and hinders that learning.
- Inventory the frequency with which students develop and use analytical tools and skills on papers, labs and tests, tied to the production and interpretation of artifacts such as maps, charts, graphs, tables, spreadsheets, databases, particular software, surveys, and statistical tests.
- Inventory the actual work products that are demanded of our students across our curriculum: papers, group projects, labs, websites, annotated bibliographies, and literature reviews.

The study has three main aims:

- To determine if students show increasing sophistication in talking about ways they are developing as writers, researchers, problem solvers, critical thinkers, spatial and quantitative reasoners, and critical users of information technology.
- To determine if students are showing increasing sophistication in discussing such key geographic concepts as inequality, citizenship, globalization, and sustainability.
- To use faculty to review student portfolios to determine the alignment between departmental learning outcomes and learning goals.

Appendix E: Summary of Progress on Development of Learning Goals, Seattle Campus

Architecture and Urban Planning. The College of Architecture and Urban Planning incorporates learning goals into most of its academic programs for undergraduates and uses its studio classes as assessment sites. These classes often include community members as outside assessors. In addition, the Landscape Architecture program engaged in a creative assessment project that used student self-assessments taken at several points in the program as qualitative data to inform curricular design. The College of Architecture and Urban Planning was instrumental in fostering the design of a new UW course evaluation form specifically created for the assessment of studio and studio-like classes.

Business School. The Business School is new to the language of learning goals, but this year, in partnership with the College of Arts and Sciences, the Accounting program identified learning goals for two courses that serve as gateways into the Business major, as well as into the Accounting track in the major. In addition, Accounting faculty included a wide range of assessment measures in the course to investigate whether learning goals were met. Because of the School's popularity with undergraduates and the goal-driven culture of the world its majors enter, the Business School is likely to move forward quickly on developing and assessing learning goals in the near future.

Engineering. All Engineering majors have identified learning goals for majors and methods for assessing them, which were approved by their accrediting body, ABET, in 2001.

Forestry. Detailed learning goals have been identified for all curricular tracks in the School of Forestry, as well as a variety of assessment strategies that include review of capstone courses that focus on real-world projects that often include undergraduate research; review of senior thesis proposals and senior theses, which allow students to design, analyze, and report on their own research; and student self-assessment and evaluation of peer performance in small group activities that characterize activities in the four core courses of the major.

Information School. The I School is moving from its mission and goals statement to identifying learning goals for majors. The Dean of the I School is a partner and supporter of the new interdisciplinary University courses, developed by the Office of Undergraduate Education.

Nursing. The School of Nursing's assessment process is exemplary and has been discussed earlier in this report.

Deleted: ve

Ocean and Fishery Sciences. The College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences has developed learning goals for all of its majors, as well as assessment practices that include completion of a capstone project and presentation of that project to a broad community.

School of Social Work. For many years, the School of Social Work has had an assessment process in place for its undergraduate program that is quite similar to that of the School of Nursing. The program's 14 learning goals for majors were updated in 2003 to reflect current knowledge, skills and values needed by social workers in the current environment. These revised goals were approved by faculty in 2004. Student learning is assessed with a variety of methods, including video-taped interview skills assessment, external review by practicum supervisors, and detailed student self-assessment, to name a few of the methods used by Social Work.