

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

A REGULAR INTERIM REPORT

University of Washington
Seattle, Tacoma, and Bothell Campuses
April 21-22, 2008

Prepared by

Dr. Robert Ackerman, Chair
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

and

Dr. Jonathan Lawson
Idaho State University

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities
That represents the views of the evaluators

INTRODUCTION

In June of 2003, following a full scale review, accreditation of the University of Washington was reaffirmed. The Evaluation Committee Report that resulted from that review included six recommendations with a progress report on Recommendations 1 and 2 set for 2005. That Progress Report was submitted in June, 2005 and accepted by the Commission. Between 2003 and 2007 the University and the Commission communicated regarding several substantive changes which were accomplished without issue.

Consistent with the policy of the Commission, this was a regular interim evaluation, the purpose of which was to review changes, to monitor compliance with eligibility standards, and to evaluate progress made by the University in addressing the recommendations contained in the 2003 Evaluation Committee Report. The University prepared and submitted a report entitled “2008 Interim Accreditation Report” that was comprehensive and would have been more helpful to the Reviewers had it been more focused.

These documents were made available to the Evaluation team by the campus:

- Orientation for Academic Program Reviews
- Planning for Academic Program Reviews Site Visits, 2007-2008
- Self Study Guidelines for Review of Exiting Degree Programs
- Selected Outcomes of Academic Program Reviews
- University Organization Chart
- All High School Applications Report
- Fact Sheet, Office of Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
- Relational Model of Learning Goals, College of Arts and Sciences
- Academic Human Resources Report
- 2007-2008 New Faculty Hires Report
- 2006-2007 Faculty Separation Report
- 2007-2008 New Faculty Hires Reports
- Report to the NWCCU for the University of Washington’s 2008 Five-Year Interim Accreditation: Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences/Professional Doctorate in Audiology
- Master in Strategic Planning for Critical Infrastructures: DRAFT Five Year Status Report (2004-2008)

In addition the Reviewers met with the following individuals:

President Emmert; Provost and Executive Vice President Wise; Executive Vice Provost Wadden; UW Bothell Chancellor Chan; UW Tacoma Chancellor Spakes; UW Tacoma Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Rushing; UW Bothell Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Jeffords; Interim Vice Provost and Chief Management Information Officer Gomez; Vice Provost, Academic Personnel Cameron; Interim Vice

Provost, Office of Planning and Budget Quarfoth; Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School Ortega; Vice Provost and Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs Taylor; Dean, College of Arts and Sciences Cauce; Dean, College of Forest Resources Bare; Dean, Foster School of Business, Jimbalvo; Dean, College of Education, Wasley; Dean, Information School, Bruce; Dean, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, Friedman; Dean, College of Engineering, O'Donnell; Dean, School of Social Work, Uehara; Associate Dean, The Graduate School, Antony; Associate Dean, School of Dentistry, Steiner; Vice Dean, School of Medicine, Norris; Vice Associate Dean, School of Nursing, Motzer; Associate Dean, School of Pharmacy, Weber; Assistant Dean, Evans School of Public Affairs, Borys; Senior Associate Dean, University Libraries, Chamberlin; Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs, DeCosmo; Assistant Dean, College of Art & Sciences, LaPore; Associate Dean, The Graduate School, Gething; Chief Information Security Officer Bailey; Director, Office of Educational Assessment, Lowell; Research Scientist, Office of Educational Assessment, Beyer; Associate Director, UW Educational Outreach, Dvorak; Director of Financial Accounting and Reporting Follman; Professor Beresford; Vice Chair, Faculty Senate, Lovell; Chair, Faculty Senate, Luchtel; Chair Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, Stygall; Director, Center for Information Assurance and Cybersecurity, Endicott-Popovsky; Assoc. Vice President Technology Services Mah; Chair, Urban Design and Planning, Blanco; Associate Professor Primomo; Professor Killien; Chair, Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences, Folsom; Students: G. Chakraborty, B. Scholler, V. Nhan, and A. Asfaw.

In all cases, UW personnel were responsive to our questions and prepared to discuss areas of interest to the Evaluators.

Part A

Review of General Recommendations from most recent decennial evaluation

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 be serious if not addressed carefully and thoughtfully, as the Committee now recommends. (Standard 1.A.1)

From the perspective of this Evaluation Team, the concept of a coordinated, multi-model campus university apparently is more difficult for outsiders to comprehend than it is for those who are functioning day to day in that environment. The 2008 Report submitted by the institution describes the University of Washington by offering this definition: “A coordinated multi-campus university is one in which each of the three campuses has a distinct mission, with a central, overarching set of institutional values that provide a common framework....” That reasonably describes the situation we observed.

The hallmarks of the multi-campus model are cooperation and collaboration, the prime example of which is found in the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy. The Council is responsible, according to the University Handbook, “for matters of academic and non-academic policy between and among the campuses of the University of Washington.” The work of the Council is encouraged by various activities including a 2004 Presidential Task Force that studied future options for the campuses and 2004 legislative action that called for studying the feasibility of UW-Tacoma and UW-Bothell (plus campuses associated with Washington State University) becoming four year institutions, a change that has since been realized. The Tacoma and Bothell campuses of the University are viewed as providing, in part, access for undergraduate and community college student transfer growth that the Seattle campus can not accommodate.

If cooperation and collaboration are hallmarks, so is autonomy and it is in that mix that the model is most interesting. For example, incoming undergraduates share common reading exercises across the three campuses, but students are admitted specifically to one of the campuses although they can transfer between campuses provided they apply and are accepted. Academic program reviews are conducted by teams from all campuses and faculty from all campuses serve on graduate student committees. Faculty tenure is decided at the University level but is held at the campus level. These and many other aspects of the relationships between the campuses are understood by those affected by them without apparent discomfort.

The University of Washington brand is important to both UW-Bothell and UW-Tacoma. There is also recognition that to an extent the future growth and development of the two newer campuses will be determined by decisions about the Seattle campus. The challenge both UW-Bothell and UW-Tacoma face is to find a place in sun when the shadow that UW-Seattle casts across the state is so large. Those concerns are important and are part of ongoing discussion but we found no confusion as to shared mission.

Recommendation 2.

The Committee commends the University’s multiple strategies for academic assessment, but still it must be noted that the University of Washington remains far from the objective of setting learning objectives for all students and measuring progress toward those objectives to facilitate continuous improvement. The Committee recommends continuing accelerated efforts toward these ends (Standard 2.B.1, 2.B.2, and 2.B.3, and Policy 2.2).

During the period of the 2003 Full Scale Evaluation, the UW-Seattle campus was developing a Student Learning Objectives (SLO) assessment program, a project which at the time showed potential, which the Team then noted. However, because it was top down and not department based, the one size fits all approach did not gain the faculty support necessary to sustain it. With the utility of SLO in doubt, The Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality supported an approach to student learning assessment that grew out of a longitudinal research study conducted by the University’s Office of Education. That study, the “ UW Study of Undergraduate Learning” (UW SOUL), considered student learning in terms of writing,

critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, information technology and literacy, understanding and appreciating diversity, and personal growth from the perspective of students' major area of concentration. The organization of the University is based on a comprehensive College of Arts & Sciences, plus a sizeable number of professional schools and colleges. In the College of Arts & Sciences approximately 90% of the departments have student learning objectives in place. The University is engaged in mainly successful efforts to implement UW SOUL across academic departments but much yet needs to be done to achieve the goal of measuring the progress all students are making and then using that information to introduce changes to the curriculum.

At the UW-Bothell campus, an Office of Institutional Research is being piloted during the current academic year with a decision as to its future some time off. The role of that office in coordinating assessment is unclear. The initial class of freshmen enrolled at UW-Bothell in 2006 and a learning assessment plan will need to be developed to cover four year programs. While there is evidence of some learning outcomes assessment at UW-Bothell, those activities are typically course based and not yet comprehensive across all courses and all programs. This is an area that requires attention.

At UW-Tacoma student learning objectives are individual degree program specific. Similarly, the manner in which learning objectives are assessed remains either with the program or the individual instructor. There is evidence of discussions about learning assessment but a cohesive plan is not yet in place. This, too, requires attention.

The 2008 Interim Accreditation Report includes the observation that with regard to assessment "we understand that this work is far from complete." The Evaluation Team agrees and while noting that promising steps have been taken, expresses a concern that without a focused, coordinated effort on each of its campuses, the University will not meet the challenge set forth by the 2003 Team in Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 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 program of diminishing priority (Standard 2.A.1).

In an effort to increase efficiencies there has been some merging of academic departments and programs. The University has in place a long standing, well-defined Academic Program Review Process that could be called upon to assist in the process of identifying academic programs of "diminishing priority." Rather than shrinking its offerings, an option that has merit and remains available, the University adopted several approaches to generate additional revenues. The leadership of the University is to be commended because at a time when institutions of higher education are facing fiscal crises, the UW has met unparalleled success in adding resources.

A capital campaign, “Creating Futures”, begun in 2000 and not yet ended, exceeded its goal of \$2 billion and also exceeded the revised \$2.5 billion goal. In addition, the University has realized increased revenues by changing the way endowment funds are managed. The University approached the state legislature with a “Meeting the Global Challenge” initiative as a way of making the case that an excellent state research university would be an economic benefit to the state. That campaign was successful, resulting in the largest increase in appropriated operating dollars since the 1987-1989 biennium and the most funding for capital project in over a decade. And, the University, for the first time, exceeded \$1 billion in external research funding in 2007.

Standing alone, any of the achievements would have been remarkable and in combination suggest the strong support the University of Washington has among its many stakeholders. That does not, of course, mean that the University has all of the resources it needs or would like to have, nor does it mean that all of the units have experienced resource increases. Several with whom the Evaluators met expressed concern about how the leadership of the University will respond given that the current economic downturn has impacted state revenues.

Recommendation 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 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).

The issue of competitive compensation is very much an institutional priority. The University of Washington has a compensation goal to reach the 75th percentile of its peers by 2010. The compensation goal that was included in the Global Challenge initiative presented to the state legislature in 2007 was the 60th percentile of flagship institutions with medical schools. The gap between UW faculty and the 75th percentile of peers is currently at about 4.7%, down from 10.1% in 2002-2003. Over the last five years salary increases for all faculty averaged 4.6%, a portion of which was funded from other than state appropriated dollars. Faculty also receive an increase of 7.5% at the time of promotion in rank and the University has identified funds to be used as part of a faculty retention policy. Retention increases of at least 5% were received by 545 faculty in 2006-2007 and 688 in 2005-2006. In 2006 academic units received additional funds to address issues of salary compression.

While progress continues to be made with regard to compensation for faculty there is no doubt from what we heard that this remains an issue for some. Adjustment to the market as the driver of salaries is unsettling for those who are in disciplines that the market does not competitively value and the legislative cap on tuition increases will likely limit the funds available to the University to address salary related issues. The 2% merit pool was part of these discussions but the team did not have sufficient time to gain a full understanding of how over 90% of the faculty qualify as meritorious.

Recommendation 5.

The Committee recommends that the concerns of campus information technologists regarding network security be addressed (Standard 5.E.3; Standard 8.B.2).

In 2004 the University achieved designation as a national center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance by NSA, one of only 85 such designations nationally. The Excellence in Information Assurance is determined by peer review that includes assessment of the institution's Information Assurance Awareness Plan, and having a qualified chief information security officer in place. This coordinated effort between the three campuses of the University involves the UW Center for Information Assurance and Cybersecurity, an educational, research, and outreach program. In interviews with information technologists, the Reviewers found the concerns in the Recommendation to be adequately addressed.

Recommendation 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 (Standard 3.D.2; Standard 6.1).

As a way of placing emphasis on building a community based on inclusion and equity, the University has had in place for some time a vice president for minority affairs. In December, 2003 a Diversity Appraisal, a unit based assessment process, was conducted to identity the challenges on each of the three campuses. The outcome of the process was a series of recommendations that now guide ongoing efforts to improve diversity. There are efforts across many units and at each of the campuses that suggest that equity and diversity are important to the University; because achieving diversity is an ongoing process, a few of these efforts are cited here:

- Undergraduate admissions has adopted an Freshman Holistic Review Process in which two readers review each prospective student's application file applying a matrix that takes into account achievement and personal characteristics.
- Since 2007, in an effort to keep the UW affordable and to address retention, the Husky Promise program has provided low and middle income state residents with grant and scholarship support for both tuition and living expenses.
- The staff of the Graduate School includes a director of diversity recruiting with specific responsibility for managing the Graduate Opportunities and Minority Achievement Program, efforts that have met some success.
- Through conversations with students the Evaluators learned of a student initiated program called Dream Project that could serve as a model for

minority student recruitment and retention for creativity, simplicity, and effectiveness.

- Efforts to strengthen diversity through curricular initiatives include the establishment of a minor in disability studies and an interdisciplinary diversity minor.
- The President's Advisory Committee on Women collected data about the status of women at UW which will provide a baseline for future efforts.
- UW-Bothell, with support from the President's Diversity Appraisal Implementation Fund, initiated the Diversity Enhancement Project, a three pronged effort that includes research, curricular change, and community involvement.
- The Office for Equity and Diversity at UW-Tacoma, under the direction of an assistant chancellor for diversity and assisted by Diversity Task Force, leads a campus wide approach addressing issues related to diversity both as a teaching tool and as policy formation.

Diversity and equity are important yet elusive goals, characteristics they share with student learning assessment. And, much like assessment, to be successfully advanced requires both commitment and coordination.

Part B

Standard One – Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness

The University of Washington's Role and Mission statement remains unchanged since its revision in 1998 and is published in the *University Handbook*. Predictably, with the arrival of a new President and more recently a new Provost, new initiatives to guide the institution in pursuit of the mission have been introduced. After surveying and extensive campus conversations, the Leadership, Community, and Values Initiative is assisting with recognizing, enhancing, and sustaining leadership throughout the community and redefining the University as a workplace, affirming core values, and serving as a platform for additional projects.

In 2005 with the arrival of the new Provost, a process of re-envisioning began leading to a new vision statement that also produced a statement of core values and culture. Currently, the University is undertaking a comprehensive Reputation Building Initiative also aimed at bringing a clearer sense of identity thought useful in relationships with the institution's many publics.

Springing from the new Vision Statement is a set of goals and metrics designed to ensure general accountability to the vision.

Standard Two – Educational Program and Its Effectiveness

Changes to Institutional Graduation Requirements and New Programs and Substantive Changes to Existing Undergraduate Programs

The University of Washington has made no institution-wide changes in graduate requirements for degrees at all levels. The Interim Accreditation Report presents a comprehensive list of program additions and deletions since 2001 – 02, including new programs and substantive changes to existing graduate programs. Questions regarding Educational Assessment and student outcomes are addressed in the institution's response to Recommendation 2 and Part A of this report.

Review of Level II Authorization Programs

The University presented two graduate programs approved under Level II Authorization for review: Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) and Master of Science in Strategic Planning for Critical Infrastructure – both inaugurated in 2003-04.

The Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) is now a four-year American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA) accredited program, having migrated from three to four years of study following the national standards for this practitioner degree in 2005. Program completers are eligible to receive the Certificate of Clinical Competence in Audiology from ASHA. Located in the Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences with other existing graduate offerings, the Au.D. program is constructed with two years of broad training in audiology, a year of specialized coursework (pediatric, geriatric, educational, rehabilitation, or business foci), and a full twelve months of full-time clinical placement. Co-listing of courses with the existing Ph.D. advantages the program. Enrollment in the Au.D. has met expectations despite the move from three to four years of study. It is well staffed, well organized, and a model of practitioner programs according to public ratings.

The Master of Science in Strategic Planning for Critical Infrastructure (MSPCI) is a fully on-line program developed in partnership with the Washington National Guard for officials in public and private infrastructure systems, emergency management, and homeland security. The program trains managers in the strategic decision-making required to prevent and counter threats to critical infrastructures and public health from natural hazards, normal accidents, or intentional acts, terrorist or criminal. The MSPCI has a well-organized curriculum; case and problem based instruction (also the base for its assessment activities), and a full statement of instructional and program goals. Housed in the Department of Urban Design and Planning, the cohort-based program's students are from public, private and military sectors and are drawn two-thirds from the western United States. Guided by an advisory board comprised of members of the professional communities associated with the program content and an interdisciplinary faculty, the program has developed a best practices approach to on-line

instruction and in the process of curriculum review with some changes anticipated for 2009.

The Reviewers found both programs to be operating well.

Changes to Special Programs and Distance Learning

Several minor changes are noted in this area. While there are no changes in summer session operation reported, there is an expansion of UW Educational Outreach's responsibility to manage EDGE (Education at a Distance for Growth and Excellence) that operates four DL degree programs in Engineering.

Undergraduate courses offered via on-line/distance learning no longer carry a "DL" designation in transcripts signifying a university confirmation that such courses undergo the same quality control and review as on-site courses.

Fee-Based Degrees

With full academic quality responsibility vested in the academic units, the University of Washington has expanded its fee-based degree programs. Forty-five such programs – with the exception of those in Law and Business – are currently provided fiscal and program management by UW Educational Outreach. A listing of these programs operating without state funding is presented in the self-study.

Other

While there are no significant changes in English Language Programs, Community Partnerships, or International Programs, the university reports several new credit based certificates offered through UW Educational Outreach. Currently, those credits are not institutionalized on the university transcript.

Standard Three – Students

Changes to Admissions

As described in detail in the institution's response to Recommendation Six, the Office of Undergraduate Admissions is in the third year of a holistic admissions process for entering freshmen and transfer students on the Seattle campus. The process has yielded for 2006 the strongest academic profile in the institution's history as well as gains in underrepresented minority students.

Both the Bothell and Tacoma campuses implemented freshman admissions in 2006 based on their own holistic admissions processes.

No significant University-wide change to graduate admissions is noted.

Grading Policies

No changes since the 2003 to undergraduate or graduate grading policies noted.

Non-Academic Student Programs and Student Support Services

Resulting from work by the new provost and a task force on the undergraduate experience, the university reorganized the offices that support student learning under the provost and academic affairs. A considerable range of new or reorganized offices and programs now support the undergraduate experience. An Undergraduate Academic Advising Council under Undergraduate Academic Affairs (AAU) has established a mission and vision under which a series of projects are enhancing the effectiveness of the advising function. Under the same auspices, the Undergraduate Research Program facilitates student involvement in faculty research in both the sciences and arts and humanities. Public service is supported through the Carlson Leadership and Public Service Center that assists faculty developing experiential learning opportunities for students.

With support from colleagues across campus, AAU has created the Teaching and Learning Consortium that focuses on faculty development around teaching and learning. A Center for Learning and Undergraduate Enrichment (CLUE) provides both drop-in tutoring and sessions for individual courses in multiple disciplines. The University Honors Program with additional university support is redesigning the Honors core curriculum around Honors-specific general education learning goals providing significant financial assistance for in-state and out-of-state tuition waivers.

Under the Office of the Vice Provost for Student Life, additional and closely allied efforts are enhancing the undergraduate experience through programs designed to enhance diversity and access, improve campus safety, enhance health and wellness, and, in general, foster greater student engagement.

Another new unit, Community Standards and Student Conduct has as its primary purpose safeguarding the learning environment by upholding the University's standards for student behavior. Its work reflects the long-term efforts of students, faculty, staff and neighborhood community members.

Capital planning in this area includes a remodel of the Husky Union Building and an expansion of student residences from 5,100 to 8,000 within approximately ten years. These efforts, focused on the Seattle campus, are impressive and intelligently conceived. They should serve the campus well in the difficult work of enhancing the undergraduate experience in a large and complex institution.

The reviewers found good evidence of maturing student services on both the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. The inauguration of student governance entities as well as the rise of student clubs and organizations should do much to foster a sense of belonging on the smaller campuses.

Standard Four – Faculty

While much of this Standard is addressed in the institution’s response to Recommendations Four and Six and the reviewer’s comments in Part A of this report, several additional items are noted here.

The 2006 award to the University of Washington of a grant from the Sloan Foundation and the American Council on Education to demonstrate innovative policies and practices in faculty career flexibility fostered three developments. It has led to review and publication of existing policy options, work on transforming departmental climate and culture, and a new program of teaching release for “Parent/Child Bonding” currently being piloted.

Faculty Evaluation

There are no major changes in faculty evaluation since 2003. Annual systematic reviews under the merit system, post-tenure evaluation, and the evaluation of junior faculty during the periodic reappointment process remain strong.

Standard Five – Library and Information Resources

Since the 2003 Evaluation Report that commended the University of Washington for services in this area, University Libraries received the “Excellence in Academic Libraries” award from the Association of Colleges and Research Libraries in 2004. The designation was the “top University library in North America.”

Planning

Since then, a new strategic plan (2006), Vision 2010, with four strategic directions was implemented. It envisions the Libraries as the crossroads of the University; the Libraries as workplace of choice; enhanced user services; and a future of building, maintaining and supporting diverse resources.

Assessment

To strengthen its widely recognized assessment efforts, a full-time Director of Assessment and Planning as well as a half-time Management Information Librarian were added in 2006.

Diversity

The Libraries developed a diversity plan in 2005, formed a standing Diversity Advisory Committee and appointed a half-time Diversity Officer to assist with extensive initiation and collaboration in wider institutional diversity efforts.

Student Learning

The Libraries continue to play an extensive role in student learning, including the promotion of information literacy, instruction to 35,000 students annually, and the development of online instruction materials through the UW Libraries Instruction and Information Literacy program. Working broadly with faculty, Teaching Assistants, and other offices that support teaching and learning, the Libraries are playing an impressive role in “leading development of an information smart learning community.”

Library Facilities

The reviewers note recent improvements to the Odegaard Undergraduate Library expanding computer lab space, more teaching and group presentation areas, new technology-enhanced spaces where students can create multi-media presentations and participate in video conferencing. Recent improvements have also been made to the Health Sciences Library.

Collections and Information Resources

Transitioning to online resources, the Libraries’ expenditures for online content have exceeded 50% of the collections budget. Despite partnering with other libraries to extend buying power, there are the inevitable challenges as costs outrun annual budget increases.

Standard Six – Governance and Administration

Since the arrival of President Mark Emmert in 2004 and Provost and Executive Vice President Phyllis Wise in 2005, a series of administrative restructurings have in some cases consolidated functions and in others launched new areas of responsibility. For example, Federal Relations, State Relations, and Regional Affairs as well as Marketing and Communications are now sensibly consolidated in the President’s Office under the Office of External Relations.

Among the most significant consolidations is the reorganization of the Office of the Provost to include responsibility for student affairs (including the UW Police Department) as well as some of the financial planning and budgeting responsibilities in the former Executive Vice President portfolio.

In addition to the creation of new Vice Provostships, the Office of the Provost is now responsible for Academic Personnel, Information Management, and Global Affairs. With new Chancellors at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma, a number of new deans recently appointed and other searches in progress, the transformation process in senior leadership appears near completion.

Standard Seven – Finance

The responses to Recommendations 3, 4, and 6 in Part A of this Report contains much of what has been accomplished since 2003. The reviewers confirm three additional changes noted here that should assist in consolidating the institution's financial base and facilitate long term planning:

1. Debt Authority

Over the past five years two key agreements with the state legislature have broadened the institution's debt authority. In 2003, the UW obtained authority to issue debt for research buildings, and in 2002, the UW obtained authority to issue debt for any purpose provided that it was repaid through local (not state) funds. Both developments speak clearly of the confidence the legislature has developed in UW's financial management and leadership. Debt planning and management processes and reporting are being approached carefully.

2. Implementation of State Tax Incentives

UW has been able to take advantage of two sales tax incentive programs: High Technology Tax Deferral and the Machinery and Equipment Exemption resulting in significant savings.

3. Limited Tuition Setting Authority

The 2003 legislative session granted limited local tuition setting authority (excluding undergraduate residential). Non-resident undergraduate and graduate tuition increases then increased but within 8% of resident undergraduate. Professional school tuitions increased rapidly, then leveled.

Financial Condition of the Institution

Superior (second highest level) ratings from both Moody's and Standard and Poor's speak to the strength of the institution's General Revenue platform.

Financial Management and Planning

No significant changes in the institution's financial management and planning were reported, but a new on-line tool – My Financial Desktop – launched in 2005 should provide immediacy in unit level information and assessment.

Standard Eight – Physical Facilities

The reviewers found that the period since the 2003 has been marked by extraordinary growth in new facilities and as well as significant renovations. All major projects projected in the decennial self-study for Seattle, Bothell, and Tacoma have been

completed and 2.1 million assignable square feet of space has been added. In total, the institution reports \$866,598,521 of projects completed or in construction.

Equipment and Materials

Since 2003, a total of \$23.5 million for general equipment and there were two special allocations (2004 and 2007) of \$13.15 million for research equipment. A decentralized decision-making process puts responsibility for prioritizing and allocating in the hands of the campuses, schools and colleges. The UW asset system carries 63,000 equipment items.

Standard Nine – Institutional Integrity

Procedures for assuring high ethical standards noted in the 2003 decennial report remain in place. An audit of internal investigations covering a five-year period documents the type of investigations undertaken and the resultant actions. It provides a sensible assessment for an institution of UW's size and complexity.

Collaborative Enterprise Risk Management

In 2005, UW launched an initiative to assess risks in the context of its strategic objectives to enhance its culture of compliance while preserving valued aspects of institutional culture. Assessment of four broad risk categories – compliance, financial, operational, and strategic – is guided by a presidential committee, the Compliance Council, and a process of formal risk assessments.

Violence Prevention and Response

The UW reports its response to a tragic shooting on campus – a comprehensive review of programs, policies and procedures for preventing violence and the creation in 2007 of the comprehensive Violence Prevention and Response Program.

SUMMARY

The Evaluators found the University of Washington to be an extremely complex organization that is strong, vibrant, dynamic, and fully engaged in the state, the region, the nation, and globally. It is also a place that takes accreditation and quality seriously as evidenced by the attention devoted to addressing the six recommendations made by the Committee following the 2003 full scale evaluation. To that end, the Regular Interim Evaluators offer no recommendations and make two commendations.

Commendations

1. There are impressive indicators of the confidence multiple stakeholders have placed in the University of Washington. Three examples are particularly noteworthy: the “Creating Futures” campaign that is projected to exceed an already enhanced \$2.5 billion goal; the recent work that resulted in increased if

not yet adequate state funding; and that in 2007 externally funded research surpassed \$1 billion. The University leadership and research faculty are commended for achieving these significant benchmarks.

2. The ongoing collaborations at various levels throughout the three campuses that comprise the University of Washington are commendable. While there are several examples, we note in particular the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy