Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (Y7)

Peer-Evaluation Report

University of Utah

Salt Lake City, Utah

October 19 - 21, 2022

A confidential report of findings prepared for the

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Table of Contents

I.   Evaluation Committee

Name	Role in Committee	Academic Title	Campus
Karen Carey	Chair	Chancellor	University of Alaska Southeast
JoAnne Bunnage	Evaluator	Assistant Vice Provost, Assessment and Accreditation	Oregon State University
Darren Blagburn	Evaluator	Director of Operations and Planning for Academic Affairs	Idaho State University

NWCCU Liaison to the Committee:

Gita Bangera

Senior Vice President

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

II. Introduction

A three-person evaluation team conducted a Year Seven Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EIE) visit to University of Utah from October 19 to 21, 2022. The visit covered Standards One in response to the *Year Seven Self-Evaluation Report* submitted by the university to the Commission on August 24, 2022.

III. Assessment of Self-Evaluation and Support Materials

The self-study was well-written but not always clear. The document did allow the reviewers to gather a general understanding of the University of Utah and demonstrated commitment to students. Relevant data were provided as was needed.

IV. Visit Summary

What the team did (e.g., number and types of people interviewed, forums convened), what you observed (in very general terms).

Meetings:

President

       Taylor Randall

President's Leadership Team

       Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, Mike Good

       Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Martell Teasley

Board of Trustees

       Chair, Christian Gardner

       Board Member, Maria Garciaz

       Board Member, Bassam Salem

       Chris Nelson, Secretary to the University

Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment

    Associate Dean, Mark St. Andre

    Senior Associate Dean, Jim Agutter

    Director Administration, Anne Cook

    Assistant Vice President, Karen Paisley

    Dean and Senior Vice President, Chase Hagood

President's Budget Committee

    Chief Financial Officer, Cathy Anderson

     Director of Accounting and Finance, Sandy Hughes

     Associate Vice President for Budget and Finance, Jason Atuaia

Cabinet

    Vice President for Student Affairs, Lori McDonald

    Vice President for Government Relations, Jason Perry

    Vice President for Research, Erin Rothwell

    Chief Human Resources Officer, Jeff Herring

    Chief Innovation and Economic Engagement Officer, Keith Marmer

    General Counsel, Phyllis Vetter

    Chief Financial Officer, Cathy Anderson

Campus Budget Advisory Committee

    Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Martell Teasley

    Associate Vice President for Budget and Finance, Jason Atuaia

    Director of Budget and Finance, Sandy Hughes

    Associate Director, Sharayne Farnsworth

    Associate Director, Ethan Hacker

    Dean and Senior Associate Vice President, Chase Hagood

    Dean of the Graduate School, David Kieda

    Associate Vice President for Faculty, Sarah Projansky

Health Science Budget Committee

    Associate Vice President for Health Sciences Education, Wendy Hobson-Rohrer

Associate Vice President for Health Sciences, Robert Fujinami

Associate Vice President and Dean of Dentistry, Rory Hume

Associate Vice President, Rachel Hess

Chief Operating Officer at University of Utah, Dan Lundergan

Senior Nursing Director, Rita Aguilar

Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis

Director of Institutional Analysis, Mike Martineau

Assistant Vice President, Karen Paisley

Business Data Analysis, Nichole Greenwood

Data Architect, Becca Baggett

Assistant Dean of the Honors College, Aaron Reynolds

Director of Strategic Initiatives, Beth Howard

Undergraduate Council

Associate Dean, Mark St. Andre

Dean and Senior Vice President, Chase Hagood

Assistant Vice President, Karen Paisley

Assistant Dean of Curriculum Katrina Green

Assistant Dean of the Honors College, Aaron Reynolds

Faculty Nursing, Cheryl Armstrong

Faculty Sociology, Claudia Geist

Faculty Member Philosophy, Ann Peterson

Graduate Council

Dean of the Graduate School, David Kieda

Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Studies, Karen Paisley

Associate Dean, Katharine Ullman

Librarian, Donna Ziegenfuss

Faculty for Social and Behavioral Science, Tabitha Benney

Senior Associate Dean, Jim Agutter

Program Review Administrator, Paula Spencer

Public Safety/Housing

Chief Safety Office, Keith Squires

Deputy Chief Safety Officer, Kimberly Barnett

Interim Police Chief, Jason Hinojosa

Special Assistant of the Chief Safety Officer, Brian Nicholls

Director of University Health Security, Glenn Smith

Executive Officer to the Chief Safety Officer, Heather Sturzenegger

Dean of Students, Jason Ramirez

Chief Relations Officer, Chris Nelson

Student Affairs Assessment and Analytics

Associate Director of Assessment, Jake Lemon

Dean of Students, Jason Ramirez

Associate Vice President for Student Health and Wellness, Sherra Watkins

Vice President for Student Affairs, Jerry Basford

Deans

Cultural and Social Transformation, Kathryn Bond Stockton

Undergraduate Studies, Chase Hagood

Social Work, Philip Osteen

Health, Scott Ward

Chief Information Officer, Steve Hess

Medicine, Wayne Samuelson

Science, Peter Trapa

Business, Rachel Hayes

Humanities, Hollis Robbins

Natural History Museum of Utah, Jason Cryan

Faculty

Amy Brunvand

Gwen Latendress

Catherine Staes

Carolyn Scheese

Cheryl Armstrong

Scott Black

Staci McIntosh

Thunder Galili

Rhonda Nelson

Sneha Kumar Kasera

Danielle Endres

Siva Guruswamy

Marc Galaf

Sarah Projansky

Randy Silverman

David Grainger

Benjamin Bromley

Jennifer Macali

Glenn Sjoden

Chris Macintosh

Kai Kuck

John Broughton

Adrian Palmer

Angela Wilkins

Lynn Leary-Meyers

Sondra Stegenga

M. Metzger

Adriana Coletta

Rachel Ernest

Lien Fan Shen

John Allen Sanders

Larry Hancock

Paula Spencer

Chris Dansie

Carla Asche

Ari Pirakis

Edmund Fong

Jia-Wen Guo

Matthew Pecsok

Students

Eleven students attended

Alternative Sites

Associate Vice President, Dean of Continuing & Online Education, Deborah Keyek-Franssen

Executive Director, University of Utah Asia Campus, Randy McCrillis

Chief Global Officer, Brian Gibson

GE Curriculum Committee/GELOS

Assistant Dean Undergraduate Studies, Robyn Moreno

Professor of Finance, Elizabeth Tashjian

Associate Dean of Music, Jared Rawlings

Associate Chair of Gender Studies, Kim Hackford-Peer

Assistant Dean of Nursing, Melody Krahulec

Assistant Professor of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, Jeff Rose

Faculty Psychology, Monisha Pasupathi

Faculty Math, Kevin Wortmann

Faculty Business, Dan Wardell

Academic Senate

Psychology/Math Faculty

Psychology

Jonathan Butner

Jeanine Stefanucci

Michelle Camacho

Math

Kevin Wortmann

Vahe Bandarian

Peter Alfeld

Aaron Bertram

Staff

Director of Advising, Beth Howard

Chief of Staff Academic Affairs, Laura Marks

Chief Human Resources Officer, Jeff Herring

Deputy Chief Human Resources Officer, Wendy Peterson

V. Standard 1: Student Success and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
a. Standard 1.A: Institutional Mission
i. 1.A.1

1.A.1 The institution's mission statement defines its broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement.

The institution's mission statement effectively reflects the university's commitment to student success and achievement while expanding on its commitment to the community and its long-term well-being. Several documents support the institution's attainment of its mission statement, including the vision matrix, a core values document, a six commitments document, and four core goals. These documents successfully revolve around the core goals which represent the essential elements of the mission statement.

b. Standard 1.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness
i. 1.B.1

1.B.1 The institution demonstrates a continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness, including student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement.

The institution successfully demonstrates that institutional-wide assessment is at the organization's core. Guided by all levels of leadership, the institution has a robust and effective assessment program. Annual and periodic reporting timelines support the academic programs and administrative units by providing opportunities to identify gaps and support continuous improvement. The institution utilizes multiple dashboards

focusing on internal measures as well as comparative measures against other nationally-ranked public and research universities to identify opportunities for improvement.

ii. 1.B.2

1.B.2 The institution sets and articulates meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators of its goals to define mission fulfillment and to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions.

The institution uses core goals to define mission fulfillment. The core goals tie directly to the mission statement and Strategy 2025, the Institution's strategic plan. Each core goal has three to six themes, or what can be identified objectives, and six to nine measurable outcomes or performance indicators.

Viewing the 2025 Core Goal Progress report, the institution shows an overall improvement toward meeting or exceeding many of its indicators. The President's dashboard displays how that institution uses data from peers and other external groups, like PAC 12 and High Research Activity Universities, to compare themselves with and aspire to improve. In addition to the Core Goal Progress Report and the President's Dashboard, the institution also uses a new Vision Matrix. Utilizing a new vision statement and presidential initiatives, the Vision Matrix directly aligns to the 2025 goals. The institution does not publicly display all of the indicators described within the strategic plan that evaluate mission fulfillment.

iii. 1.B.3

1.B.3 The institution provides evidence that its planning process is inclusive and offers opportunities for comment by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

The institution's planning process is inclusive and transparent. The Core Goals focus on institutional planning efforts as evidenced by the draft Vision document, the U of U Health Strategy, and the Educational Futures and Student Success Task Force. Membership on the committees reviewed included faculty, staff, and student representation. The reports generated recommendations that were adopted and led to university-wide improvements.

The institution has a well-established process to allocate resources by tying requests directly to assessment outcomes and priorities using the annual reports from academic and administrative units. To ensure alignment, the Presidential Budget Committee members participate in the Vice Presidents' budget development, which supports an understanding of the strategy used to set priorities and develop requests. The Vice Presidents' priorities emphasize achieving the divisions' goals, which translates to university mission fulfillment.

iv. 1.B.4

1.B.4 The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it considers such findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement of its goals.

The institution has established internal and external committees and relationships to maintain situational awareness of activities that concern students, faculty, and the university as a whole. Multiple task forces, committees, and services evaluate and act on issues surrounding diversity, equity, inclusion, and access by recognizing the ever-changing needs of the institution's students. The external organizations that the Institution partners with result in a broader understanding of challenges facing higher education politically, economically, and socially. The institution demonstrated how the leadership uses the environmental information and data it collects to guide decision-making and develop plans that improve student success and achieve institutional core goals.

c.   Standard 1.C: Student Learning
   i.   1.C.1
1.C.1 The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

A review of the catalog, governance structure, and processes reveals that the institution offers academic programs with appropriate content and rigor, consistent with its mission. The development, approval, and ongoing review of academic programs and credentials are governed by university and state of Utah policies and include appropriate involvement of faculty. Program requirements and learning outcomes are clearly identified in the institution's General Catalog.

   ii.   1.C.2
1.C.2 The institution awards credit, degrees, certificates, or credentials for programs that are based upon student learning and learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning.

The Evaluation Committee verified academic credit, degrees, certificates, and credentials are based upon student learning and student learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, and course sequencing. The institution requires that academic programs and unit proposals participate in an extensive process of review that begins with a departmental request and culminates in notification to the State Board of Regents and NWCCU. The institution requires that academic programs without specialized accreditation follow depth, breadth, and course sequencing of nationally recognized programs of study.

iii. 1.C.3

1.C.3 The institution identifies and publishes expected program and degree learning outcomes for all degrees, certificates, and credentials. Information on expected student learning outcomes for all courses is provided to enrolled students.

Expected learning outcomes for each degree program are published in the university's General Catalog. Additionally, university Policy 6-100: Instruction and evaluation requires syllabi to include goals and learning objects of the course, course expectations, and activities that are essential to the awarding of credit. University policy also requires essential course information be made available at least one week before the first day of class. Courses fulfilling a general education or bachelor's degree requirement are required to have syllabi that indicate which general education learning outcome is addressed. A curriculum management system (Kuali CM) is used to show mapped insertional level outcomes.

iv. 1.C.4

1.C.4 The institution's admission and completion or graduation requirements are clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible to students and the public.

The institution's undergraduate and graduate admission requirements are clearly defined and widely published for easy access to students and the public on the institution's Admissions webpages. Information for specific types of application (freshman, international, graduate, and transfer student admissions) are accessible on websites for the program and/or student population. Graduation requirements are publicly available in the general catalog and on an Office of Registrar's webpage. The university's curriculum management system, Kuali, handles graduation requirement proposals and annual updates.

v. 1.C.5

1.C.5 The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs.

The institution employs several assessment systems where faculty in academic programs can collect assessment data, analyze the data, and prepare assessment reports. The organization of assessment data and analysis allows faculty in academic units to effectively review data, analyze the findings, and make recommendations for action. The systems also allow administration to centralize and manage assessment efforts. Several educational and professional development efforts have taken place for faculty participation, including training about the Learning Outcomes Ecosystem, Learning Outcomes Assessment Workshop Series, educational materials on websites, and forming an Assessment Consortium with other Pac-12 universities.

vi. 1.C.6

1.C.6 Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.

The university has articulated five unique General Education Outcomes (GELOs) related to the Learning Framework. The General Education Curriculum Committee developed rubrics for each of the outcomes, using the VALUE Rubrics from the American Association of Colleges and University as guides. The full implementation of the GELOs was delayed by the pandemic. The rollout will begin during fall semester 2022 with meetings with colleges and departments. The university projects the GELOs will go into effect AY 2024-25. They anticipate the GELOs mapping process will be completed by the end of AY 24-25.
The institution has not evaluated the GELOS since 2017. This is a concern. The institution needs to immediately start assessing General Education Outcomes (GELOS).

vii. 1.C.7

1.C.7 The institution uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes.

As noted in Standard 1.C.5, the institution has a well-developed system for assessing student learning outcomes, and has examples of using assessment results to inform curricular change. Results of student learning assessment are shared within disciplines and available to use to improve courses and programs. Examples of curricular change based on learning outcomes assessment were noted during the visit.

In terms of general education, the institution has taken some strides in the last four years to refine its processes for assessing general education learning outcomes (GELOs) but more work is needed in this area.

viii. 1.C.8

1.C.8 Transfer credit and credit for prior learning is accepted according to clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible policies that provide adequate safeguards to ensure academic quality. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that such credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic rigor, and quality.

The institution has clearly defined and widely published transfer credit policies that provide safeguards to ensure academic quality. The credit transfer process is appropriate for its programs in terms of content, academic rigor, and quality. The Utah Board of Higher Education establishes a common course numbering, course articulation, and credit transfer. Rules and guidelines regarding transfer credits are available on the Office of Admissions transfer student website.

ix. 1.C.9

1.C.9 The institution's graduate programs are consistent with its mission, are in keeping with the expectations of its respective disciplines and professions, and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. The graduate programs differ from undergraduate programs by requiring, among other things, greater: depth of study; demands on student intellectual or creative capacities; knowledge of the literature of the field; and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or relevant professional practice.

The institution's graduate program offerings are in alignment with its mission as a comprehensive doctorate-granting university with very high research activity. Graduate programs require high performance from students and more in-depth study than undergraduate programs in the same discipline; graduate-only courses are distinguished not only from undergraduate courses, but also from courses open to both graduate and undergraduate students.

d. Standard 1.D: Student Achievement

i. 1.D.1

1.D.1 Consistent with its mission, the institution recruits and admits students with the potential to benefit from its educational programs. It orients students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information and advice about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

The institution uses a holistic process to admit students who are highly qualified, intellectually curious, diverse, and actively involved students. Completion of a new student orientation is required for new undergraduates and the institution requires first year advising prior to registering for a second semester.

ii. 1.D.2

1.D.2 Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

The Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment builds dashboards and does predictive analytics and statistical analyses of student achievement. The institution publishes graduation and retention rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity, age, gender, and Pell-eligibility, along with other variables.

      iii. 1.D.3

1.D.3 The institution's disaggregated indicators of student achievement should be widely published and available on the institution's website. Such disaggregated indicators should be aligned with meaningful, institutionally identified indicators benchmarked against indicators for peer institutions at the regional and national levels and be used for continuous improvement to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources.

The Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis provides both public and institutional achievement metrics. The interactive dashboards include a Peer Comparison Tool and the President's Dashboards which include multiple indicators of student success and are benchmarked against peer institutions.

      iv. 1.D.4

1.D.4 The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.

Information on indicators of student achievement is available and are clear. Dissemination of data seem widespread, and key metrics are included in the President's dashboard and the Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment. Dashboards could be more forward-facing to the general public.

VI.   Summary

Commendations and Recommendations

  a. Commendations
      i. Commendation 1:
         The evaluation team commends the institution for dedicating resources and processes which have facilitated the wide use of data across the institution.

      ii. Commendation 2:
         The evaluation team commends the institution for their use of data for decision-making and literacy.

      iii. Commendation 3:
         The evaluation team commends the institution for creating a culture that encourages transparency and collaboration across the institution.

  b. Recommendations
      i. Recommendation 1:

The evaluation team recommends that the institution should accelerate the development of the General Education learning outcomes (GELO) assessment (1.C.6).