

August 15, 2003

Mr. Marcus S. Gaspard
Executive Director
Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lakeridge Way
P.O. Box 43430
Olympia, WA 98504-3430

Dear Marc:

Enclosed please find the UW Accountability Plan for 2003-2005. Please let me know if you have any comments or questions.

Sincerely yours,

Phillip Hoffman, Director
Office of Institutional Studies

Enclosures

c: Ms. Nina Oman, HECB
Mr. Harlan Patterson
Dr. David Thorud

**Accountability Plan
University of Washington
August 15, 2003**

Accountability Plan
University of Washington
August 15, 2003

The University of Washington continues its accountability for education and student progress, and for the stewardship of state resources.

What follows is a brief description of UW accountability initiatives centered around the five performance measures first adopted in the 1997-99 biennial budget bill. For each of the five measures, the plan includes:

- A description of the measure, goal, target, and baseline.
- A statement of institutional priorities in the areas of graduation rates, graduation efficiency, retention, faculty productivity, and the integration of research, service, and education.
- An implementation plan.
- Anticipated areas of improvement.

While this report focuses on the five legislatively mandated performance measures, it is important to note that the UW acts upon them in the context of broader commitments shared by the University, the HEC Board and citizens of the state. These include:

Access. The UW continues to take responsibility for more than the 40 percent of the state's enrollment in public universities. UW considers access as one of its most important budget and program priorities and will continue to do so as its funding and capital facilities permit.

Educational technology and partnerships. The UW has led the way—statewide, and nationally—in both of these arenas. Leadership in the development of the K-20 network, continuing development and implementation of accessible (distance) education, leadership of a consortium of Research I universities (R1.edu) to provide distance education and serve the needs of students by using the resources of multiple providers, program alliances with community colleges and others in underserved areas of the state, and bold programs of connection to K-12 public schools, all serve as evidence of that commitment.

Assessment. Long-standing initiatives in assessment including end-of-year program reviews for all undergraduate degree-granting programs, course evaluations, and the like, continue. Our innovative alumni surveys—addressed to UW graduates 1, 5, and 10 years after graduation—was repeated and proved to be exceptionally instructive. These survey results may be found at: <http://www.washington.edu/oea/0307.htm> , and <http://www.washington.edu/oea/0306.htm>

During Academic Year 2002-03 the University initiated an effort to enumerate, by course offering, Student Learning Objectives (see: <http://www.washington.edu/about/accreditation/slo/slo.html>) Better understanding of, from a student's perspective, student learning experiences is the goal of the University's Study of Undergraduate Learning (see: <http://www.washington.edu/oea/soul.htm>).

Diversity. No single subject continues to consumed more of the UW's attention, following I-200. Although the UW has had numerous programs of academic support for minority students, the number and scope of outreach and retention programs has increased substantially and will continue.

Academic and administrative efficiency. Efficiencies come from continuous assessment and dedication to improvement. Routine reviews of academic departments, deans, vice presidents, and

vice provosts all provide direction for change and improvement. Special initiatives are also an important source of efficiencies. In the last two years, the Executive Vice President's office continues to lead the way in finding administrative efficiencies and improved services to students. For the ten years ending with Academic Year 2002-03, University enrollment has grown by 19% while general operating fund faculty employment rose 8% and staff employment fell 5%.

Performance Goal: Graduation Rate

Goal: 65%

Target 2003-2004: 64.47%

Target 2004-2005: 65.00%

95-96 Baseline: 61.7% of 1990 entering freshman graduating by the end of academic year 94-95.

Actual 2001-02: 64.8%

Institutional Priorities:

- Long-standing and continuing commitment to the timely progress of students:
 - revised graduation requirements
 - reduced number of majors requiring more than 180 credits
 - improved articulation with high schools and community colleges
 - registration priority for graduating seniors
 - increased advising
- Dedication to ensuring efficient student progress toward degree:
 - remove remaining institutional impediments
 - improve students' choices about how best to use their opportunities at the UW

Implementation Plan:

The Course Access Initiative continues to prove its effectiveness. The number of denied registrations in Academic Year 2002-03 was 11,600 fewer than in Academic Year 1995-96 for a reduction of 21%. In "bottleneck" courses the number of denied registrations has been reduced by 6,300 or 23%, having the effect of raising the satisfaction of enrollment demand by 6 percentage points. Improvement efforts will continue.

Changes to the Course Drop policy became effective winter quarter 1998, and seem to be having their desired effect. The number of courses dropped after the second week of the quarter has declined from over 3,300 each term to 2,100 or fewer on a base of course registrations that increased 9%. The companion piece to the course drop policy—increased academic support for students—has also been a success. Further improvements are expected.

Looking Toward the Future:

- Continued emphasis on removing institutional impediments toward graduation.
- Continued emphasis on helping students make wise choices.

Performance Goal: Graduation Efficiency Index

Goal:	95% - for degrees to students beginning as freshman 90% - for degrees to students beginning as transfers
Target 2003-2004:	94.06% - for degrees to students beginning as freshman 88.46% - for degrees to students beginning as transfers
Target 2004-2005:	95.00% - for degrees to students beginning as freshman 90.00% - for degrees to students beginning as transfers
1995-96 Baseline:	Freshman - 89.1 Transfer - 80.4
Actual 2001-02	Freshman - 90.5 Transfer - 82.7

Institutional Priorities:

Improving selected GEIs, particularly focusing on transfer students intending to study science and engineering.

Implementation Plan:

The Degree Audit Requirement System (DARS) is now fully operational

The UW initiated shared advising positions with Shoreline and Bellevue community colleges. The assessment report from Shoreline is promising. The UW will expand the number of these shared advising positions, should the evaluations continue to show positive consequences for transfer students.

The UW Advising Center has stepped up its outreach to students and faculty (who serve as advisers) at community colleges. One of the outcomes of these collaborative projects is the development of the Associate of Science transfer degree, expected to smooth transition (and increase efficiency) for transfer students.

Renewed attention and application of the '210' credit rule requiring students to file graduation plans on a timely basis has begun. The University has formed a Task Force on Academic Progress (see: <http://www.washington.edu/oue/taskforce/>). This Task Force will examine institutional and student impediments to graduation and efficient instructional resources use.

Beginning Fall Quarter, 2003 every entering freshman will have a faculty advisor. The new student and faculty advisor will share and discuss University expectations for fair progress toward graduation and strategies for academic success. Faculty will share with students lessons learned from the University's Study of Undergraduate Learning (UW-SOUL).

Also beginning Fall Quarter, 2003 the new freshman registration process has been revised to emphasis preparation and use of an academic course work plan. All new freshman will be assigned to a planning group composed of eight to ten students and an advisor. Working together each student will be expected to prepare and maintain a course work plan.

Looking Toward the Future:

- Continued focus on transfer students and articulation with community colleges.

Performance Goal: Retention

Goal:	95% (Research Universities) 90% (Comprehensive Universities and Colleges)
Target 2003-2004:	93.67%
Target 2004-2005	95.00%
95-96 Baseline:	86.7% of fall 1995 undergraduates (freshman-senior) returned in fall 1996.
Actual 2001-02	88.5%

Institutional Priorities:

- Improve retention of juniors.
- Maintain excellent retention rate for freshmen and sophomores.
- Address one of the principal causes of the lower junior retention rate: access to majors.

Implementation Plan:

Improve access to majors, targeting resources to expand high-demand opportunities for students.

Allow for earlier entrance to majors, even as early as the freshman year, in selected cases.

Increase advising at all levels. Both the adviser availability hours and the number of student served has increased substantially. For instance, in one three-week pre-registration period, 671 more students were served, and advisers provided 66 more hours of advising than in the previous year, with essentially the same staff. A significant effort has been made to automate many advising tasks and to make use of the web to improve advising information access.

Increase targeted advising for students who are still unsure about their path of study by the end of the sophomore year. Although this strategy produced disappointing results in its first trial year (very few students responded to the adviser's overture), we will try again with a modified approach.

Looking Toward the Future:

- Continued focus on choice of and transition into major.
- Frequent and routine analysis and evaluation of progress in access to majors, indicating trouble spots for students.
- Serious consideration of accepting transfer students who are juniors into majors at the time of admission.

Performance Goal: Faculty Productivity

Accountability Measure:

The UW expects of its faculty both excellence in teaching and in research, as well as efficient use of instructional resources to meet student demand. To reflect the multi-dimensional nature of faculty productivity, the UW will focus on four important components of faculty productivity:

- (1) Efficiency:** Do professors offer the courses that students want to take? To measure this, the UW compares course offerings with student demand. High efficiency means that most of the student demand is satisfied: faculty are teaching what students need and want.

Percentage enrollment demand satisfied

Goal:	92%
Target 2003-2004:	90.65%
Target 2004-2005:	92.00%
Baseline:	83.50%
Actual 2001-02:	87.60%

- (2) Student satisfaction:** Do the students think that professors are teaching their subject matter effectively? The UW is proud of the teaching quality of its faculty, but there is always room for improvement. The UW course evaluations use a five-point scale ranging from poor (1) to excellent (5). Students trust faculty to teach them important subject matter. While this baseline number is high already, it is not good enough. Whatever students may think of a professor's teaching style, they must be able to expect to learn a significant amount in a given course. If students judge otherwise, it is our responsibility to ensure that improvements are made. The measure of instructional quality is the percentage of faculty whose average course evaluation rating by students for "Amount you learned in the course was" rated 3.0 (good) or above.

Student satisfaction with amount learned

Goal:	98%
Target 2003-2004:	97.44%
Target 2004-2005:	98.00%
Baseline	94.5%
Actual 2001-02	94.7%

- (3) Funding for research:** The distinctiveness and excellence of the UW in research—and in undergraduate and graduate education—comes from the research and scholarly achievements of the faculty. The UW depends upon the faculty to win competitive research funding through grants and contracts. The UW is among the top three universities in the nation in grant and contract awards. The UW expects its faculty to continue this level of excellence in an even more competitive and constrained funding environment.

In grants and contracts per faculty member:

Goal:	\$203,946
Target 2003-2004:	\$290,000
Target 2004-2005:	\$300,000
Baseline	\$197,948
Actual 2001-02	\$269,493

- (4) Quantity.** Each faculty member makes an important contribution to the education, not only of individual students, but of the student body as a whole. To do so, the faculty must offer enough

courses of reasonable size. Student Credit Hours per faculty FTE is an inadequate representation of that contribution, but at present, it is, regrettably, the best available measure.

Student Credit Hours per faculty FTE

Goal:	212.6
Target 2003-2004:	211.0
Target 2004-2005:	212.6
Baseline:	202.47
Actual 2001-02	210.56

Institutional Priorities:

- Best stewardship of state instructional resources:
 - To meet the access challenge of increasing numbers of students without worsening the student-faculty ratio.
 - To derive added efficiency through more careful choice of course offerings to match student needs.
- Support for faculty engaged in research, scholarship, and creative contribution, who:
 - provide unique research opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students
 - offer the possibility of transformation through discovery
 - develop expertise to solve community and industry problems
- Increased expectations for teaching performance, combined with support for those who need it.

Implementation Plan:

- Feedback to individual units about the effectiveness of their use of instructional resources.
- Additional support for the research infrastructure.
- Work with chairs to identify faculty who may need assistance in classroom teaching.

Looking Toward the Future:

- Sharper institutional focus on mission; faculty cannot continue to spread themselves ever-thinner.
- Intensive efforts to develop an improved measure of faculty productivity that captures the benefit to students of being educated by world-class research faculty.
- Continuing dialogue with the HEC Board, legislature, and governor about the future of higher education, and the faculty's contribution toward that future.

Performance Goal: Institution-Specific Measure

Performance Goal:

Integration of Undergraduate Education, Research, and Public Service.

The UW is a world-class research university which benefits undergraduate students, as well as graduate students, faculty, and the state. All of our undergraduates have the opportunity to learn from faculty who not only teach, but also create knowledge. Many students can meet their educational goals exclusively by taking classes and earning a degree in the major of their choice. However, some students want more: they want to enrich their educational experience through working with faculty in research. The UW will redouble its efforts to make these additional educational experiences possible in three ways:

- (1) For the most highly-motivated students, the UW will offer increased opportunities for intensive work (10+ hours/week) with a faculty member in research, for which students are paid or given credit. Our very best students will compete for these special opportunities. In 1995-96, there were 300 students who enjoyed these exceptional experiences. The goal is to double that number to 600, which, although it is a small proportion of the student body, involves more than one-quarter of the teaching faculty at any given time. (It is interesting to note that even though this may be the most significant learning experience of a student's career, it is teaching for which faculty receive no formal credit.) In our experience, these students often remain committed to the research project until they graduate.
- (2) Other students—still top academic achievers—will want to sample rather than fully commit to the research experience through a more intensive, individualized, instruction experience with a faculty member than is possible in a regular course. In individualized instruction, a student and a faculty member will agree on what constitutes a meaningful project and the associated number of credits, followed by routine and close supervision throughout the quarter. This is highly labor-intensive teaching for faculty, but can be a transformational experience for students. For that reason, the UW is committed to increasing opportunities for individualized instruction at the upper division level. At present, 4% of upper division credits are devoted to individualized instruction. It is our ambition to increase that to 5%. (Again, it should be noted that faculty do not teach fewer courses when they take on responsibility for individualized instruction, nor do they often receive formal credit for doing so.)
- (3) Finally, as a part of their regular course instruction, faculty are increasingly offering chances to students to play a part in research, whether it be through a design project in engineering, architecture, or art; to conduct an experiment in one of the sciences; or to participate in survey or interview research in the social sciences. The senior survey tells us that 20.7% of respondents report having a research experience with faculty during their course of study. While we find this number remarkable, we would like to make it even better; our goal is to see one-quarter of our students (25%) enjoy this opportunity sometime during their education at the UW.

There is another way in which students can extend the reach of their educational experience, and that is by taking what they have learned into public service internships in the community. Many students express a desire to do so, and increasing numbers of faculty are providing service learning opportunities, joining academic course material with internship experiences. It should be noted that this is not simply the placement of students in internships (which is valuable in its own right, and which the UW does enable). It is more than that: it is the explicit connection of knowledge and

theory with practice, guided by faculty and community leaders, for which students either receive credit or are paid, and which represents a significant commitment of time and energy (10+ hours/week). At present, there are 500 students involved. Our goal is to quadruple that number to 2000.

These are ambitious goals. They represent the UW's commitment to bring the best of its work to the undergraduates (while maintaining excellence in graduate education, as well). Faculty who work with undergraduate students in research often note that undergraduates are among their most important team members: fearless, imaginative, and dedicated community leaders say the same thing. Unleashing the power of our top students to do their best work is a goal worth pursuing, indeed.

	Goal	Target		1995-96 Baseline	Actual 2001-02
		2003-04	2004-05		
# of undergrads intensively involved in faculty research	600	552	600	300	3,258
% of upper division credits taken as individualized instruction	5.0%	4.81%	5.00%	3.8%	4.4%
# of undergrads involved in public service internships	2,000	1,760	2,000	500	3,561
% of undergrads having a research experience with faculty	25.0%	24.3%	25.0%	20.7%	28.4%

Institutional Priorities:

- Give students as many experiences as possible that encourage love of learning, effective team work, and writing skills.
- Emphasize the points of intersection between research and education beyond the classroom.
- Make good on the UW's responsibility to educate for citizenship.
- Help students to find paid work that enhances, rather than detracts from their studies.

Summary of UW Performance Measures - Targets and Goals

Measure	Baseline							
	1995-96	Goal	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
RATE OF INCREASE (HECB)			12%	14%	14%	14%	15%	16%
GEI								
A. freshman	89.10	95.00	90.69	91.52	92.35	93.17	94.06	95.00
B. transfer	80.40	90.00	82.99	84.34	85.68	87.02	88.46	90.00
Undergrad Student Retention	86.70	95.00	88.94	90.10	91.27	92.43	93.67	95.00
5-year Graduation Rate	61.70	65.00	62.59	63.05	63.52	63.98	64.47	65.00
Faculty Productivity Index								
a. % enrollment demand satisfied	83.50	92.00	85.80	86.99	88.18	89.37	90.65	92.00
b. student satisfaction	94.50	98.00	95.45	95.94	96.43	96.92	97.44	98.00
c. funding for research	197,948	203,946						
d. SCH per faculty FTE	202.47	212.60	205.20	206.60	208.00	209.50	211.00	212.60
Institution Specific Measure								
a. # of undergrads intensively involved in faculty research	300	600	381	423	465	507	552	600
b. % of upper division credits taken as individualized instruction	3.80%	5.00%	4.12%	4.29%	4.46%	4.63%	4.81%	5.00%
c. # of undergrads involved in public service internships	500	2,000	905	1,115	1,325	1,535	1,760	2,000
d. % of undergrads having a research experience with Faculty	20.70%	25.00%	21.90%	22.50%	23.10%	23.70%	24.30%	25.00%