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In developing this EIE Self-Study, input from the university and larger community was solicited using several approaches:

1) Members of the above drafting committee sought material and feedback from colleagues in their colleges, departments, and administrative units in the writing of the report. These requests for input were targeted at specific NWCCU Standards.

2) A draft of the EIE report was posted on the university’s accreditation page (accreditation.utah.edu) during August 2022, and members of the university community were invited to review and provide feedback.

3) In addition, during May/June 2022, the University of Utah published ads in two local newspapers (Salt Lake Tribune and Deseret News) inviting members of the general community to send feedback directly to NWCCU regarding the university’s qualifications for regional accreditation.
The Institution/Mission

Preface

Founded in 1850, the University of Utah (the U) is the state's flagship institution of higher education, with 17 schools and colleges, more than 110 undergraduate and 245 graduate degree programs, and an enrollment of more than 33,000 students. In 2019, the university joined the Association of American Universities, an invitation-only, prestigious group of 65 leading research institutions marked by excellence in academic expertise and research impact, student success, and securing resources in support of this mission.

A high standard of educational and research excellence is exhibited by the U's world-class faculty—many of whom are international experts in their fields, members of elite academic organizations, and winners of coveted awards, which include the National Medal of Science, the Nobel Prize, and recognition as fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and/or the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. The university emphasizes and supports quality in its educational offerings through mechanisms that enable faculty members to continuously strengthen their teaching and optimize student learning. As learners at a research university, U students have the opportunity to engage firsthand with the generation of knowledge—whether through working with faculty on research or learning in class from faculty who are making path-breaking discoveries. Increasingly, the breadth and caliber of programs at the University of Utah are attracting students from Utah and beyond who want a top-quality education in an extraordinary setting. Motivated students wishing for a transformative college experience—one that enables them to compete in the global workplace—are discovering rigorous opportunities throughout the U's many areas of study. Our combination of world-class education in the context of a research institution situated in the Intermountain West differentiates the U from other top-tier institutions. Our focus encompasses a forward-thinking, problem-solving perspective that positions graduates as leaders in critical domains such as energy, environmentalism, sustainability, and urban planning; internationalism and entrepreneurism; genetics, bioengineering, and health sciences; and the fine arts and humanities.

In 2019, the university-wide community created Strategy 2025—a "One U" approach for the future. One U leverages the strengths and talents of both the main and health campuses at the University of Utah to accelerate the university’s rise as it focuses on four overarching goals: student success, knowledge transfer, community engagement, and institutional vitality. Strategy 2025 provides an enhanced, detailed description of the university’s 2016 and 2018 goals and core values. Strategy 2025 includes data-driven projections of the population growth of the state of Utah, changes in the regional economy in response to local and national opportunities and challenges, and the shifting demographics of Utah and regional populations. Strategy 2025 challenges the University of Utah to develop innovative approaches that nimbly respond to the continually evolving landscape of higher education, health care, and technological
development. The reports also explore strategic pivoting of universities to address regional, national, and international challenges and opportunities, such as the COVID-19 epidemic. Implicit throughout Strategy 2025 is the university’s core value of creating a more equitable, diverse, and inclusive society.

The University of Utah seeks to provide every undergraduate student an exceptional educational experience. As described in previous reports, including the 2021 Year Six Report to NWCCU, the University of Utah’s Learning Framework has sought to empower students and the institution to articulate, describe, assess, and demonstrate the holistic student experience. With new leadership in undergraduate education, a concentrated effort is now underway to expand the dynamic efforts documented in the university’s 2018 Student Success Report, “Clearing the Path” as well as in the 2018 Mid-Cycle Self-Evaluation to NWCCU. At present, the Learning Framework—an integration of the learning experience through four foci on community, transformation, knowledge and skills, and impact—is being reconceptualized as the “E³ Framework” to elevate the Exceptional Educational Experience (E³) as the university’s strategic approach to an integrated, sustained, and holistic student experience designed for and with students.

Figure 1: The learning experience at the U is centered through community, transformation, knowledge and skills, and impact

Redefining the previous framework through a data-informed, student-driven, and evidence-based approach, E³ is poised to amplify the university’s student success
agenda in new ways and accelerate the extraordinary improvements in student persistence and graduation over the last decade.

Alongside the E³ and its framing of an exceptional educational experience, from the innovative startups and companies based on student and faculty collaboration to faculty-driven research agendas, the U boasts an impressive $641 million (fiscal year 2021) research enterprise. University of Utah Health, for example, is an economic engine unlike any other in Utah. With more than 20,000 faculty and staff, it is one of the state’s largest employers. University of Utah Health is the only university health care system in the state of Utah and provides patient care for the people of Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, and much of Nevada. It is also the training ground for most of Utah’s physicians, nurses, pharmacists, therapists, and other health care professionals. The U’s emphasis on excellence in health care services, medical training, and patient satisfaction is revealed in impressive levels of recognition for both hospital quality and the quality of the patient experience.

Additionally, the University of Utah serves as a resource to the Salt Lake City community through a wide range of lectures, concerts, museums, gardens, theater offerings, and athletic events. In turn, the U is enriched through the participation and engagement of community members through a network of University Neighborhood Partners from diverse backgrounds whose involvement is essential to ensure the long-term relevance, vibrancy, and diversity of Utah’s flagship university.

President Taylor R. Randall (appointed the University of Utah’s 17th president in fall 2021) commissioned the Operation Bold Transition Team to review the recommendations and metrics of Strategy 2025 and develop a university vision matrix for full implementation of the recommendations. At he time of the writing of this self-study, he has also embarked on extended tours across the state of Utah to discuss the university’s mission with business and community leaders, local officials, leaders of other state colleges and universities, and alumni statewide. Through the cultivation of connections and collaboration across the state, President Randall is rededicating the University of Utah as the state’s flagship institution of higher education and expanding its mission to serve the entire state.

Policy changes

With the advent of COVID-19, advancements in technology, and a changing landscape in higher education that calls for responsiveness, the U has initiated several policy changes related to students, faculty, research, human resources, record retention, university resources, and safety. Details regarding changes to university regulations, including the most recent changes to university policy, can be found online. (See Appendix for complete list and date of changes.)

Students:
The U adapted some policies that impact students—such as temporarily suspending SAT or ACT scores as an admissions requirement—as a direct result
of COVID-19. Other policies were enacted to decrease behavior that could be motivated by bias or prejudice and establish a process to review student fees, as part of developing a more inclusive and transparent campus. Student policy updates are:

- Interim Rule 6-404C: Undergraduate Admissions - SAT or ACT Scores
- Interim Rule 6-404C: Undergraduate Admissions - SAT or ACT Scores
- Policy 6-400: Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities ("Student Code")
- Interim Policy 6-407: University General Student Fees, and the University General Student Fees Advisory Board
- Policy 6-407: University General Student Fees, and the University General Student Fees Advisory Board

Faculty:
From establishing guidelines to approve travel to expanding the university’s ability to recognize distinguished professors and streamlining the process of appointing faculty, several policies were enacted to provide clear leadership, navigate interpersonal dynamics, and expand parental leave benefits. Faculty policy updates are:

- Policy 3-030: Travel Policy
- Policy 6-300: University Faculty -- Categories and Ranks
- Board of Trustees’ Approval of Faculty and Administrative Appointments
- Policy 6-002: The Academic Senate and Senate Committees: Structure, Functions, Procedures
- Policy 6-001 and Related Rules: Academic Units and Academic Governance- Roles of Faculties, Committees, Councils, and Academic Senate
- Policy 6-315: Faculty Parental Benefits — Leaves of Absence
- Interim Rules 1-012A Discrimination Complaint Process Rule and 1-021B Sexual Misconduct Complaint Process Rule

Research:
The U became a member of the Association of American Universities in 2019, joining the ranks of 65 top research institutions with the goal of extending the impact of our research into our surrounding communities. Several policies have been updated to follow best practices in gathering and presenting research. Research updates are:

- Interim Policy 1-006: Individual Conflict of Interest Policy and Interim Rule 1-006C: Individual Conflict of Interest in Research
- Policy 7-020: Determining Authorship in Scholarly or Scientific Publications
- Policy 7-001: Policy for Research Misconduct and Related Changes to Policy 6-011: Functions and Procedures of the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee and Policy 6-316 Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities
• **Policy 1-006: Individual Financial Conflict of Interest Policy and Related Regulations**

**Human resources:**
As with other universities, the U is mindful that our employees have many options when it comes to where they wish to work, and we want to be the primary choice for educators and experts in a multitude of fields. In the last few years, the U updated its guidelines for evaluating employee performance as a means of providing feedback and potential promotions, expanded parental leave benefits to graduate students, and fine-tuned policies that protect employees from abusive conduct. Human resources updates are:

- **Policy 5-141: Performance Management — University Staff (Other than UUHC Staff)**
- **Policy 6-303: Reviews of Tenure-Line Faculty Members (RPT Criteria, Standards, and Procedures)**
- **Policy 5-108: Transfer of Benefits Eligible Staff Members (Non-UUHC)**
- **Policy 6-409: Graduate Student Parental Leave and Rule R6-309A: Postdoctoral Fellows Parental Leave**
- **Policy 4-010 University Individual Email Policy**
- **Policy 1-021 Abusive Conduct and Rules 1-021A, 1-021B, and 1-021C**
- **Policy 5-211: University Independent Personnel Boards & Procedures for Complaints Under the Utah Protection of Public Employees Act**
- **Procedure P3-100D: Gift Card Purchases and Requirements**

**Record retention and management:**
The U is committed to being transparent to the community, while also protecting data and making sure that it is secure. We have updated some of our records retention policies to reflect best practices for saving and disposing of our financial records and institutional data. The policy changes for record retention and management are:

- **Policy 3-014: University Financial Record Retention**
- **Policy 4-001: University Institutional Data Management Policy**

**University resources:**
As a public institution, the U recognizes that our employees must be accountable for the use of our resources—from the use of cameras and computers to university property—while following proper procedure for procurement. We have updated several of our policies to reflect these best practices, from university software to use of the World Wide Web on campus. The policy changes for university resources are:

- **Policy 3-041: Accountability for Noncapital Equipment**
- **Policy 3-100 University Procurement and Related Regulations**
- **Rule R4-050B: University Software**
- **Policy 4-050: University Software Policy**
- **Policy 4-003: World Wide Web Resources Policy**
- **(Deleted) Policy 3-042: Property-Insurance Program**
- **Policy 3-019: University of Utah Internal Audit Policy**

**Safety and security:**
Campus safety is a top priority for the U, and this includes students, faculty, staff, and visitors to campus. The U has updated several policies to increase campus safety, including installing and maintaining building access systems and area surveillance systems. We also developed guidelines for body-worn cameras for university police, and enhanced our policies to foster an environment that is free from discrimination. The policy changes are:

- **Policy 3-234: Building Access and Surveillance Systems**
- **Rule 1-011A: Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras**
- **Interim Policy 1-012: University Non-discrimination Policy**

**Personnel changes**
Figures 2.1 and 2.2 show significant campus leadership appointments since September 1, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN CAMPUS LEADERSHIP APPOINTMENTS</th>
<th>APPOINTEE</th>
<th>PREVIOUS INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Taylor Randall</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Martell Teasley</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Advisor to the President</td>
<td>Natalie Gochnour</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>Lori McDonald</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion</td>
<td>Mary Ann Villarreal</td>
<td>California State University, Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Chief Marketing and Communications Officer</td>
<td>Chris Nelson</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Vice President for Research</td>
<td>Erin Rothwell</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Advancement</td>
<td>Heidi Woodbury</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President and Chief General Counsel</td>
<td>Phyllis Vetter</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Safety Officer</td>
<td>Keith Squires</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>Thomas Chase Hagood</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President for Faculty</td>
<td>Sarah Projansky</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Global Officer</td>
<td>Brian Gibson</td>
<td>George Mason University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Real Estate Officer</td>
<td>John Creer</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President and Dean for University Connected Learning</td>
<td>Deborah Keyek-Franssen</td>
<td>University of Colorado System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Dean, David Eccles School of Business</td>
<td>Rachel Hayes</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, School for Cultural and Social Transformation</td>
<td>Kathryn Bond Stockton</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, College of Education</td>
<td>Nancy Songer</td>
<td>Drexel University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, S.J. Quinney College of Law</td>
<td>Elizabeth Kronk Warner</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Dean, College of Social Work</td>
<td>Philip Osteen</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Science</td>
<td>Michelle M. Camacho</td>
<td>University of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, College of Humanities</td>
<td>Hollis Robbins</td>
<td>Sonoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, College of Nursing</td>
<td>Marla De Jong</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Huntsman Mental Health Institute</td>
<td>Mark Rapaport</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President, Health Policy</td>
<td>Brian Shiozawa</td>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President, Health Sciences Education</td>
<td>Wendy Hobson-Rohrer</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Eccles Health Sciences Library</td>
<td>Catherine Soehner</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Marketing &amp; Communications Officer, University of Utah Health</td>
<td>Robyn Reynolds</td>
<td>MultiCare Health System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President, U of U Health Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion</td>
<td>Jose Rodriguez</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Philanthropy Officer, U of U Health</td>
<td>Marika Jones</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Wellness Officer, U of U Health</td>
<td>Amy Locke</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of U Health Associate Vice President, Clinical Affairs</td>
<td>Sam Finlayson</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Natural History Museum of Utah</td>
<td>Jason Cryan</td>
<td>NC Museum of Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Experience Officer</td>
<td>Andrea Thomas</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1: Significant main campus leadership appointments since September 1, 2018
In accordance with Utah State Board of Higher Education policies, the University of Utah’s Board of Trustees has approved a substantial number of minor changes in its program offerings, as well as several divisional organizational changes. In addition, the university has increased the number of degree programs that offer 50 percent or more program content through online/distance delivery. The Utah State Board of Higher Education has been notified of these changes.

All changes through September 1, 2022, have been submitted as minor changes to the NWCCU, and all of the minor changes have either been approved or are in the process of being approved. Divisional reorganizations have not generated any changes in degree or certificate program names, content, delivery, or student learning outcomes.

**Response to topics previously requested by the Commission**

The NWCCU Commission notification following the U’s 2018 Mid-Cycle Review confirmed that there are no open recommendations or topics that needed a response.

On July 27, 2022, NWCCU Senior Vice President Gita Bangera requested clarification of how the University of Utah is moving forward in response to the tragic death of undergraduate student Zhifan Dong in February 2022. Additionally, SVP Bangera requested a summary of the university’s plans to provide a safe environment to the university community, including students. A response to this request was submitted by
email to SVP Bangera on July 29, 2022, and also was included as an attachment to the University’s Yearly Report to NWCCU. A copy of this response is found in this self-study in Appendix A.
Standard One: Student Success, and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

*The institution articulates its commitment to student success, primarily measured through student learning and achievement, for all students, with a focus on equity and closure of achievement gaps, and establishes a mission statement, acceptable thresholds, and benchmarks for effectiveness with meaningful indicators. The institution’s programs are consistent with its mission and culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, credentials, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs. Programs are systematically assessed using meaningful indicators to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes for all students, including underrepresented students and first-generation college students.*

**Institutional Mission 1.A.1:** *The institution’s mission statement defines its broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement*

The University of Utah Mission Statement defines the university’s broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement. The University of Utah’s mission statement describes the university’s Four Core Goals (promote student success, develop and transfer knowledge, engage communities to improve health and quality of life, and ensure the long-term viability of the institution) that provide guidance for strategic planning, allocation of resources, and new initiatives that are delivered in alignment with the University’s Core Values.

**Mission Statement**

*The University of Utah fosters student success by preparing students from diverse backgrounds for lives of impact as leaders and citizens. We generate and share new knowledge, discoveries, and innovations, and we engage local and global communities to promote education, health, and quality of life. These contributions, in addition to responsible stewardship of our intellectual, physical, and financial resources, ensure the long-term success and viability of the institution.*

**Four Core Goals**

The University’s Mission is embodied in the Four Core Goals:

1. Student success
2. Develop and transfer knowledge
3. Engage communities to improve health and quality of life
4. Ensure the long-term vitality of the institution
All strategic and resource allocation decisions at the university are evaluated according to their support of the advancement of the Four Core Goals. Moving forward (summer 2022), university leadership is defining a university vision matrix that operationalizes the university’s progress toward the Four Core Goals through an integrated set of five-year and 10-year plans. The vision matrix is intentionally designed as a dynamic document to accelerate fulfillment of the university mission. Target goals and strategies are continually assessed, and when specific target goals are achieved, these target goals may be revised or replaced with new ones. At the time of the drafting of this report, the matrix is only partially complete. A complete matrix will be made available to NWCCU at the time of the peer visit in October 2022.

Several alternate articulations of the university’s Four Core Goals have been recently developed and used with specific groups and stakeholders (e.g., alumni, donors, state legislature, peer USHE institutions). Examples include the University’s Core Values and the University’s Six Commitments. Each of these alternate descriptions are rooted in the University Mission Statement and Four Core Goals. These alternate descriptions are used only for public dialogue, and progress in these alternate descriptions is not formally tracked using traditional metrics and thresholds. Consequently, these alternate articulations are generally not used in strategic and resource allocation decisions, or for assessment of institutional effectiveness.

Institutional Effectiveness: Standards 1.B.1 – 1.B.4

Improving Institutional Effectiveness 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.

Assessment of institutional initiatives is conducted at multiple levels at the University of Utah, using systematic and evidence-based practices. University-wide assessment is undertaken through committees and offices embedded at the university, college, and departmental levels, guided by senior leadership, the president, and the two senior vice presidents, and disseminated through the campus dashboards. Progress on institutional effectiveness is reported regularly to the University of Utah Board of Trustees, who are formally empowered by the Utah State Board of Higher Education to make governance decisions for the University of Utah.
Figure 3: Offices and committees at the university that are involved in the assessment of mission fulfillment

UU Board of Trustees

The university’s Board of Trustees is composed of 10 people, eight of whom are appointed by the governor with the consent of the Utah State Senate. The president of the University of Utah Office of Alumni Relations serves as a member, as does the president of the Associated Students of the University of Utah (ASUU). Appointed members to the board serve four-year terms. The board is responsible for overseeing the effective and efficient administration and operation of the university. The board is responsible for approving all university policies and the university’s annual budget, as defined by USHE Policy R220.

According to USHE Policy R-208, the university president meets twice annually with the Board of Trustees’ Resource and Review Team, which is comprised of two trustees and the chair and vice-chair of the Board of Trustees. The objective of these meetings is to identify ways the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Trustees can better assist the president, update the Resource and
Review Team regarding progress on the institution’s strategic goals, and to discuss ongoing or potential issues important to the president and the institution. The team reviews the institutional mission and the president’s vision for the institution and the strategic goals associated with that vision. The team meets with the president to discuss progress toward accomplishing the goals. The team also interviews the president’s executive team regarding the strategic goals, whether the president effectively communicates their priorities, and the president’s overall performance.

Presidential Budget Committee

The Presidential Budget Committee (PBC) reviews annual reports from the vice presidents (VPs) of all divisions that report to the president of the university. These reports outline the division’s priorities, the use of resources to advance priorities, and strategies that the division would like to employ to strengthen its goals in support of the university mission. The PBC members also attend budget meetings with each senior vice president (SVP) and offer input and advice to the president on resource requests made by the division, and strategies and tactics that can assist the division in advancing the division’s priorities in support of the university mission. This process is beneficial in increasing knowledge of shared priorities around the campus, engaging support toward shared goals, and improving decision-making and transparency on resource generation and use.

The PBC is chaired by the president of the university. Members of the PBC are selected by the president and include the university’s Chief Financial Officer (Cathy Anderson), Director of Budget (Sandy Hughes), AVP Budget and Planning (Mark Winter), and Executive Director of Budget and Finance (Jason Atuaia).

President’s Cabinet

The President’s Cabinet is composed of senior university leaders who provide advice and counsel to the university president. Membership on the cabinet is at the discretion of the president. The President’s Cabinet develops university strategy through consultation with university and public stakeholders, including business leaders, government officials, faculty, staff, and students. The cabinet reviews assessment data from the university offices, broader campus-wide units, and external assessment datasets and surveys. The cabinet works with the university president and the Board of Trustees to provide strategic assessment and leadership for the attainment of university mission fulfillment. The cabinet works with stakeholders across campus to develop and implement the Presidential Dashboards that track mission fulfillment of the university’s Four Core Goals and the development of dynamic five-year and 10-year strategies for mission fulfillment, as outlined in the university vision matrix.

Campus Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC)
CBAC reviews annual reports from each college that reports to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA). These reports outline college priorities, the use of resources to advance priorities, and strategies that the college proposes to strengthen its profile and/or promote student success. CBAC members are also asked to attend budget meetings with each college and offer input and advice to the SVPAA on resource requests made by the colleges, and strategies and tactics that can assist the college in advancing academic priorities and financial vitality. This process is beneficial in increasing knowledge of shared priorities around the campus, engaging support toward shared goals, and improving decision-making and transparency on resource generation and use.

The membership of CBAC is selected by the SVPAA and includes key members of the senior administration, college deans, the president of the Academic Senate, senior faculty, and senior staff leaders from across the university.

School of Medicine Executive Committee (SOM-EC)

SOM-EC reviews annual reports from each division in University of Utah Health Sciences, including the School of Medicine. SOM-EC reports to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences (SVPHS). These reports outline academic division priorities, the use of resources to advance priorities, and strategies that the divisions propose to strengthen their profile and/or promote student success. SOM-EC members attend budget meetings with each academic division and offer input and advice to the SVPHS on resource requests made by the division, and strategies and tactics that can assist the divisions in advancing academic priorities and financial vitality. This process is beneficial in increasing knowledge of shared priorities across Health Sciences, engaging support toward shared goals, and improving decision-making and transparency on resource generation and use.

The membership of SOM-EC includes the SVPHS, all of the Associate Vice Presidents of Health Sciences, and the Health Sciences Controller/Budget Director. The SOM-EC meets directly with the SVPHS to develop yearly budgetary and long-term strategic priorities.

Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment, Undergraduate Studies

The Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment (LAOA) manages data queries and presentations for Undergraduate Studies (US) units, oversees US surveys, manages the institution’s use of the Civitas persistence prediction software, and works with academic departments on the assessment of their learning outcomes. This work includes helping departments comply with the portion of university Policy 6-001 that requires departments to have an active curriculum management plan that includes direct assessment of student learning during the three- and five-year milestones of their seven-year program review cycle.
Civitas was implemented in 2016 as a tool to help the institution assess and understand the factors associated with increased persistence and completion rates. Civitas has four modules that are vital to this work. **Inspire** allows advisers to understand factors related to persistence and completion for students in their caseload. **Illume Student** allows an analyst to disaggregate the population in almost any conceivable way across gender, race, ethnicity, college or department major, high impact program, year in school, etc. to help the institution understand what factors are the most powerful in predicting persistence or completion. **Illume Courses** also allows for any kind of disaggregation by demographic and academic variable, and identifies courses where students are having the most trouble and courses where a grade is an indicator or potential future persistence or completion threat. Finally, the **Impact** module allows the institution to enter a set of IDs for students participating in a program and conducts a propensity score-matching analysis that matches those students with other similar students to indicate whether participation in the program is associated with increased persistence. Through its investment in Civitas, the institution has improved its understanding of how participation in high impact programs, majors, courses, and other initiatives is related to increasing persistence and completion.

The Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment works with academic departments and programs across campus to develop learning outcomes assessment plans and provide resources for collecting, analyzing and reporting data. This allows the university to document students’ attainment of targeted learning outcomes and to use these data to improve programs. LAOA manages a [website](http://example.com) with helpful materials on conducting learning outcomes assessments. LAOA also meets with curriculum committees and leadership of departments and colleges to brainstorm and discuss good assessment practice, and to review drafts and reports.

Completed departmental assessment plans and reports are publicly available, see example in **Figure 12**.

Each fall, the LAOA meets with all of the departments/programs that will go through the third or fifth year of their seven-year program review cycle to make sure they are on track to produce their third- or fifth-year learning outcomes assessment report that is required under our new policy. LAOA also meets with departments that have their seven-year Graduate Council program reviews during the following academic year. The purpose of these meetings is to inform programs about the services and resources of the Office of LAOA, and to make sure they are assessing their learning outcomes and prepared to write the learning outcomes assessment section of their Graduate Council program self-study. Each program has been asked to map their learning outcomes to the Exceptional Educational Experience (E³) Framework so that we can assess these across the institution.
General Education serves all undergraduate students at the university and fulfills the policy of the State of Utah’s R-470 requiring the delivery of a general education program. The Office of Exceptional Education (formerly Office of General Education) in US, via the General Education Curriculum Committee, manages the ongoing review and assessment of the approximately 800 courses that meet one or more of the General Education and/or Bachelor’s Degree requirements. In conjunction with LAOA, the Office of Exceptional Education is also responsible for the assessment of the General Education Learning Outcomes. This assessment work includes the collection of direct evidence of student learning from classroom assignments and evaluation of those assignments using faculty committees applying rubrics.

Finally, US assesses its own academic and student success programming. These have been organized into threads of programs that meet the objectives of the E³ Framework. The threads and their programs are as follows: Undergraduate Education and Exceptional Education, Faculty Success and Academic Innovation, Student Access and Community Engagement, and Student Success and Transformative Experiences.

US Unit Heads meet regularly (within US and with stakeholders throughout the university) and have designed learning outcomes for their respective units as well as for ongoing collaborations. Additionally, regular program-level assessment, annual reporting on newly established cross-cutting goals and key performance indicators frame the Office of Undergraduate Studies leadership of the E³ approach to the student experience as the primary organization shepherding undergraduate education and student success at the university. The following mission of Undergraduate Studies was refreshed with new leadership in summer 2021:

**Mission of Undergraduate Studies**

From admission to graduation, the units of the Office of Undergraduate Studies at the University of Utah provide every student with an exceptional educational experience that empowers them to lead transformational lives wherever their educational and professional futures take them.

**Students:** Your possibilities are immense. The U’s curriculum provides every student with a wide range of fields engaging the most exciting, challenging, and essential topics to enable you to live transformational lives. The innovative pathways and programs of undergraduate education at the U seek to bring the world into your classroom, engage you with peers and mentors, create shared moments of belonging you won’t find in traditional classes or at other universities, and prepare you to lead impactful lives for Utah, the nation, and the world. Our commitment is to your success and sharing transformational experiences and an exceptional education that you will value the rest of your life.
Faculty: Your passion, expertise, and commitment to student success make exceptional education happen. The U's excellence in teaching, mentorship and research transforms the lives of students, imparts deep knowledge and skills, and develops a sense of belonging and community that leads to our faculty making a deep impact.

Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis (OBIA)

The Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis (OBIA) is the official source of information for the University of Utah and is primarily responsible for institutional-level data collection, analysis, reporting and presentation. The activities of OBIA provide the core resource for the University’s assessment of mission fulfillment; this core role is reflected in its central position in Figure 4. Specifically, this office processes data related to retention, graduation, enrollment, course-taking, course performance, faculty and staff census, salary, and faculty academic and research productivity benchmarks. This office provides official data to state and federal agencies such as USHE and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), responds to internal and external inquiries for single use or ongoing data analytics, and provides routine and one-time-only reports. These data requests come from all types of entities, ranging from external policymakers and legislators to internal units such as Housing and Residential Education, Academic Advising, Enrollment Management, Financial Aid, academic deans, department chairs, and program managers, among others. Tools have been developed and deployed to allow the generation of a wide range of data on demand.

Integrated within OBIA is a Data Management and Reporting team that is responsible for making institutional data available to multiple audiences, developing methods to deploy the data securely and in multiple formats, and generating new analysis as well as designing visual presentation of complex, multi-variable data in a manner that easily conveys understandable meaning. This Data Management team emphasizes data presentation where the visual indicators of the data are concise, clear, intuitive and appropriate to the type of data presented. This team also serves as a resource to assist other areas across campus in developing and visually presenting their own data in a similar manner. OBIA has created strategic data dashboards for colleges and departments, the Graduate School, and the Associate VP for Faculty Affairs. It has also created dozens of individual tools used by the senior administration to analyze department, college, and area data related to performance in finance, scholarly productivity and academic excellence. OBIA has also created an institutional dashboards for the president’s website that displays critical indicators relevant to measuring our level of mission fulfillment across the university’s Four Goals.

Graduate & Undergraduate Council Seven-Year Review Process

All academic programs undergo an extensive Graduate Council or Undergraduate Council Program Review on a seven-year cycle (Figure 4). The
Graduate School administers the Seven-Year Program Review process for the institution for all programs that offer graduate and undergraduate degrees. This process is a comprehensive evaluation of program quality and includes written evidence of program effectiveness, as well as curriculum evaluation that often leads to specific program revisions (driven by student learning outcomes assessment, as well as trends in the field). These reviews require an extensive departmental self-study using a combination of departmental data and dashboard indicators (e.g. IPEDS data, faculty and staff census, student enrollment trends, university profiles, student credit hours taught, research funding profiles etc.) provided through OBIA.

**GRADUATE SCHOOL REVIEW PROCESS**

![Diagram of Graduate School Review Process]

Figure 4: Graduate council seven-year review process administered by the Graduate School

Six areas of scrutiny and evaluation are included in the academic program reviews: Program Overview, Faculty, Students, Curriculum and Programs of Study, Program Effectiveness–Outcomes Assessment, and Facilities and Resources. Faculty-collected student outcomes assessments are a required part
of the self-study. Per university policy, each academic unit must have a Curriculum Management plan and conduct student learning outcomes assessment at three-year and five-year interims, as well as produce a seven-year report during the seven-year Graduate Council program review cycle. Academic units are required to provide interim reports and the seven-year report to LAOA; the seven-year report is also included in the Graduate Council Seven-Year Program review self-study. Additional data used in the self-study include external indicators and databases, such as Academic Analytics (including Alumni Insight, which provides a 10-year longitudinal tracking of graduate student and postdoctoral placement, employment sector, salaries, and geographical location) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). In 2022, the university joined the Postsecondary Data Partnership (PDP) and is in the process of integrating information from the PDP into the Graduate Council reviews. The data is used to evaluate the unit’s level of fulfillment of their strategic plan in support of the university mission and core themes.

Onsite evaluation of the academic unit’s level of mission fulfillment is performed by visiting teams of internal and external reviewers who both critically evaluate the self-study and conduct in-person interviews with faculty, staff, and students. A summary program review report is created by the Graduate Council after review of the self-study and internal and external peer reports. The final Graduate Council program review report is sent for approval to the Academic Senate, the university Board of Trustees, and the Utah State Board of Higher Education. All Graduate Council Seven-Year Program review reports are available as public documents on the meeting agenda websites for the Academic Senate, Board of Trustees, and Utah State Board of Higher Education.

The Graduate Council program review reports are used to develop a signed memorandum of understanding (MOU) among the individual program director, dean of the relevant college, dean of the graduate school, and cognizant senior vice president. The MOU details the agreed steps and resources that will be used to address recommendations of the Graduate Program review. Department chairs use review recommendations as direct guides for shaping strategic plans in collaboration with their faculty members.

University academic programs that offer only undergraduate degrees are reviewed by the Undergraduate Council. The seven-year program review process by the Undergraduate Council follows the same structure and guidelines as the seven-year Graduate Council program review, above. The associate dean of the Graduate School (who is also in charge of the seven-year Graduate Council review) is a member of the Undergraduate Council and therefore participates in the Undergraduate Council review of undergraduate-online degree programs across campus. The participation of the associate dean of the Graduate School in the Undergraduate Council Program ensures alignment and quality control between the reviews of the two independent councils.
At the grassroots level, assessment resources are developed and collected from resources located across the university and through external sources. These resources include:

Unit Level Assessments

Individual academic and administrative units are responsible for developing Unit Level Assessments of their strategic plans and objectives. For academic units, these assessments are developed within the framework of curricular learning and program outcomes, and ongoing assessment of the level of fulfillment of these outcomes using an outcomes assessment plan. LAOA works with colleges and departments to develop learning outcomes and assessment plans, and to provide resources for collecting, analyzing and reporting unit level assessment data. The Unit Level Assessments for academic units are centrally collected and posted on the LAOA website.

For administrative units, each unit has identified key activities, goals and outcomes in support of its strategic plan. Unit level assessment plans are aligned at the departmental, division and institutional level to provide a multi-dimensional view of the level of fulfillment of the unit’s strategic goals. Departments “close the loop” by documenting the findings from assessment projects through annual reports that show departmental progress toward goals. These reports are also used in support of the yearly assessment and revision of the unit’s strategic plan.

Student Affairs Assessment & Analytics

Student Affairs Assessment and Analytics (SA-A&A) serves the Division of Student Affairs through strategic planning and assessment of general and learning outcomes of programs and services. SA-A&A also serves the institution through the coordination and development of many institutional surveys, such as the Graduating Student Survey, which is a key data source of student outcomes for the entire institution. SA-A&A works closely with Enrollment Management, Institutional Analysis, the Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies and Facilities Management to provide a coordinated approach to survey administration. Within Student Affairs, SA-A&A works with more than 20 separate departments that are organized into five separate reporting lines, including the Vice President of Student Affairs/Strategic Initiatives, Dean of Students, Student Development and Inclusion, Finance and Operations, and Health and Wellness. Each reporting line has specific data needs that are coordinated through SA-A&A to support a unified approach to data management.

In turn, Enrollment Management utilizes data from both Institutional Analysis and SA-A&A to support a strategic enrollment management approach throughout the student life cycle. The Dean of Students’ reporting line utilizes data related to student conduct, engagement and use of facilities. Both Health and Wellness and Student Development and Inclusion focus on support for student success and utilize data that are protected by HIPAA as well as broader engagement and
service delivery metrics. Finance and Operations utilizes metrics that encompass engagement, facilities usage and cost and needs assessment.

Within Student Affairs, each unit has identified core objectives, goals and outcomes. Assessment plans are aligned at the departmental, division, and institutional level to provide a multidimensional view of Student Affairs. Departments “close the loop” by documenting the findings from assessment projects not only in individual progress summaries but also through annual reports that show departmental progress toward goals. To support a culture of evidence within Student Affairs, as well as the institution, SA-A&A provides ongoing assessment education through coordination meetings, trainings, and best practices. The Vice President/Strategic Initiatives area focuses on developing consistent measures across the organization to gauge overall effectiveness. Examples include utilization, satisfaction, sense of belonging, efficiency and meaningfulness, awareness, etc.

External Assessment Surveys and Databases

As part of the university assessment process, the university uses several external surveys and databases. These resources include independent national assessments and databases for comparison to peer institutions, such as Academic Analytics, the Vizient health care ranking, the Press Ganey Survey of Patient Satisfaction, and the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS). Externally administered surveys allow the University of Utah to benchmark student engagement and outcomes, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED), and the NSF Early Career Doctorates Survey (ECDS). The university is also in the process of integrating new Postsecondary Data Partnership (PDP) data into the university-wide program assessment through OBIA. These external databases and surveys provide well-designed, stable, robust, well-sampled, long-term data sets that can be used to compare University of Utah trends with national trends, as well as assess longitudinal improvement over multi-year timescales.

As described in Standard 1.C.7 of this EIE report, unit level and university level assessments have been used to advance student learning and success. Some examples of using these assessment to improve student learning and success are described in detail in the Appendices of this document.

Yearly Assessment Review Cycles

The University of Utah follows a well-defined and documented Business Planning and Consolidation (BPC) System, which includes mature training modules in BPC, publications of the SVPAA on budget principles and processes, and budget memos and guidelines for the current budget cycle. All elements of the budget planning process are guided by the principles of transparent, data-driven decisions with strategic priorities linked directly to institutional mission and core themes. The BPC website also includes a calendar of the annual budget planning cycle that defines key departmental, college,
and central administration deadlines and milestones. The budget planning cycle delineates the hierarchy and planning of the annual budget planning reviews.

Academic Unit Yearly Assessment and Budgeting Process

Departmental and College budget planning is developed according to the SVPAA Budget memo, which includes specific guidance for budget requests to delineate the relevance of all requests to the core campus priorities and the university mission. The annual budget planning and allocation process is data-driven, assisted by analysis of trends in historical data regarding student enrollment, graduation and retention rates, degrees awarded, revenue, operating expenses, research and teaching expenditures, etc., as provided by the OBIA. Seven-year reviews of college, departmental, and program statistics are also tabulated. These results are publicly available at the OBIA website, including a student success dashboard and summary tied directly to the success in achieving the university’s mission and core themes. In preparing their budgets, deans and directors are required to base their requests on results of yearly program assessments as well as statistical trends observed in the institutional OBIA database. These statistical trends are used to assess how changing student and financial trends may impact individual degree programs and affect the long-term vitality and sustainability of these programs.
Deans of individual colleges present their budgetary requests and priorities to the Campus Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC), including a review of assessment and OBIA trends (Figure 5). The SVPAA and the dean of the Graduate School also serve on the CBAC. Consequently, items agreed upon in the individual graduate program review MOUs can be targeted to receive priority in the annual budgetary planning process. The final annual budget plan is completed in conference between the SVPAA and the president’s budgetary committee, including final revenue and expense projections. The final budget reflects current budgetary priorities established through a review of the adequacy of current investments linked to program quality and assessment, and new initiatives directly linked to the institutional mission and core principles. Yearly budget expenditures and statistical summaries are reported to the Utah Board of Higher Education, as required by USHE policies.
Divisions within U of U Health Sciences follow a similar yearly assessment process, with the Senior Vice President for Health Science (SVPHS) taking the role of the SVPAA, and the SOM-EC assuming the role of the CBAC. The final annual budget plan is completed in conference between the SVPHS with the president’s budgetary committee, including final revenue and expense projections.

Administrative Unit Yearly Assessment and Budgeting Process

The administrative (non-academic) unit yearly assessment and budgeting process (Figure 6) follows a similar structure to the academic unit yearly process, with several notable differences. The cognizant Vice President (VP) of each administrative unit develops the budget under the guidance of the president's budget memo, and the VP develops the yearly report and plan after a comprehensive self-assessment of the unit’s strategic plan, strategies, and performance indicators. The VP of each unit presents their yearly report and budget request to the presidential budget committee, which advises the president on the priorities and balance of the budget portfolio. The final budget reflects current budgetary priorities established through a review of the adequacy of current investments linked to program quality and assessment, and new initiatives directly linked to the institutional mission and core principles. Yearly budget expenditures and statistical summaries are reported to the Board of Trustees and the Utah State Board of Higher Education, as required by USHE Policy.
Long-Term Assessment Review Cycles

Graduate/ Undergraduate Council Seven-Year Program Reviews

As previously described (Figure 4), all academic programs undergo an extensive Graduate Council Program Review on a seven-year cycle. These reviews require an extensive departmental self-study and evaluation by internal and external reviewers. Summary Graduate Council Program reports for each review are sent for approval to the Academic Senate and the University Board of Trustees, and reported to the Utah State Board of Higher Education. The reports are available as public documents on the meeting agenda websites of each level of review. The Graduate Council Program Reviews are used to develop an MOU among
the individual program director, dean of the relevant college, dean of the Graduate School, and cognizant senior vice president. The MOU details the plan of action and resources that are targeted to address recommendations of the Graduate Council review. Academic units are required to provide interim written reports during the third and fifth years of the review cycle documenting their progress in realizing the plan of action agreed upon in the MOU. The interim progress reports are reviewed by the graduate dean, and if progress toward completion of the action plans is inadequate, the department chair and dean are called to an in-person meeting to discuss the department’s progress and consider necessary revisions to the original MOU.

The departmental study, internal, external and Graduate Council reviews of the departmental programs provide important feedback for development of the departmental and college strategic plans. Results and recommendations from these reviews provide the basis for the development of the subsequent strategic plan for the department and college. The signed MOU, interim reports, and any revisions to the MOU also are incorporated into the development of the departmental and college strategic plans.

A small number of academic units that offer only an undergraduate degree are reviewed by an identical process, but with the Undergraduate Council assuming the role of the Graduate Council.

Administrative Unit Strategic Plans

The leadership of the University of Utah regularly reviews the adequacy of its resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations to ensure mission fulfillment. In the previously described annual process, VPs of administrative units develop annual self-assessment reports that summarize the goals of their unit(s), how these goals contribute to the larger university’s Four Core Goals, the strategies used to advance the unit’s goals, and metrics used to assess progress toward targets. In this way, administrative units regularly participate in strategic planning processes appropriate to their areas of responsibility. These annual reports and self-assessments provide a historical record for the development of the unit’s longer term, five-year strategic plan (Figure 7). These longer-term plans are developed by members of the president’s senior leadership team and discussed and refined through meetings with relevant stakeholders across campus, including other administrative units, academic units, faculty, staff, and students. Consultation with the broader constituency may include feedback from appropriately convened task forces, town hall meetings and public forums, and solicitation of online/email comments and feedback.
In developing a strategic assessment for long-term planning, senior members of the President’s Cabinet evaluate the adequacy of resources, capacity, and effectiveness for the areas of their responsibility using OBIA available resources, including university data and dashboards, internal indicators and surveys, external databases and peer comparison, and consulting external reviewers or external agencies. The president requires members of their cabinet to establish metrics in these strategic plans to measure progress toward the university’s core goals as well as comparison to appropriate peer institutions. The five-year strategic plans are then used to guide the annual review and budgeting process.

**Evaluation and Updating the Institutional Assessment Plan**

President’s Cabinet
The Institutional Assessment Plan is periodically reviewed for its ability to support mission fulfillment. The evaluation process, outlined in Figure 8, is initiated by the President’s Cabinet at periodic intervals, or upon request by the president of the university.

The President’s Cabinet reviews the core themes of the university in support of the university mission and the current level of mission fulfillment. The cabinet reviews the strategic plan objectives, indicators, and thresholds, and performs longitudinal review of OBIA-managed data compiled in dashboard form, recording the historical trends of the objectives, indicators, and thresholds.

Figure 8: Process for evaluating and updating the institutional assessment plan

**PROCESS TO UPDATE INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT PLAN**
Improving Institutional Effectiveness 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.

Procedures for Assessing Mission Fulfillment

The 2016 University of Utah Mission Statement states:

The University of Utah fosters student success by preparing students from diverse backgrounds for lives of impact as leaders and citizens. We generate and share new knowledge, discoveries, and innovations, and we engage local and global communities to promote education, health, and quality of life. These contributions, in addition to responsible stewardship of our intellectual, physical, and financial resources ensure the long-term success and viability of the institution.

As the 2016 Mission Statement directly quotes the Four Core Goals of the university, the university interprets mission fulfillment according to the level of fulfillment of the Four Core Goals. In turn, each goal has several concrete objectives that support mission fulfillment. Strategies have been established to realize each of these objectives. Each strategy uses meaningful, assessable, and verifiable performance indicators that track progress toward accomplishment of the strategy. Each performance indicator directly assesses the level of fulfillment of the university mission. The university Four Core Goals, strategies, and performance indicators, and institutional thresholds for each indicator have been previously described in the University of Utah’s Year One Self Evaluation Report, submitted to NWCCU on September 15, 2016.

In 2019, the university-wide community joined together to create the Strategy 2025 roadmap that implements the “One U” approach to the future. As described in the three publicly available Strategy 2025 reports—Strategy 2025, U of U Health Strategy Refresh, and Educational Futures and Student Success Taskforce—updated mission outcomes and performance metrics were derived from a campus-wide, collaborative vision of the university’s mission and Four Core Goals, in concordance with the University’s Core Values. The progress of the University of Utah toward realization of the Strategy 2025 Core Goals is outlined in the measurable outcomes section of each of the University Core Goals in the Strategy 2025 Report, and progress toward realization of these outcomes has been updated as of October 2021.

Shortly after his appointment as the 17th president of the University of Utah in the fall of 2021, President Taylor Randall commissioned the “Operation Bold Transition” task force to review the recommendations and metrics of Strategy 2025 and develop the university’s plan for full implementation of the recommendations. With the delivery of the
task force’s recommendations to President Randall, the President’s Cabinet is operationalizing Strategy 2025 into five-year and 10-year initiatives, metrics, and thresholds in the University Vision Matrix. As the accomplishment of these strategies is a dynamic process, performance indicators of the University Vision Matrix are a work in progress. The university continually evaluates progress toward its goals using these metrics and thresholds, and strategies and resource allocations are continually refined and updated to reflect the achieved progress toward the five- and 10-year goals. In cases where extraordinary progress has resulted in early achievement of the five- and 10-year goals, the President’s Cabinet engages with the larger community to reassess how to adjust the metric and threshold to support continuous improvement in the university mission and four goals.

Many of the performance indicators for the University Vision Matrix are derived from the performance indicators described in the U’s 2016 Year One Self Evaluation report and performance indicators associated with Strategy 2025. As a consequence, we describe the university’s progress in terms of these two legacy sets of indicators: performance indicators on the Presidential Dashboards, and updated Strategy 2025 performance indicators on the Strategy 2025 webpage.

The university’s performance against each mission goal is assessed using well-defined, robust performance indicators representing each objective. The results for each indicator are directly compared to institutional thresholds to provide the most direct method of assessing the university’s fulfillment of each mission goal. Many of the institutional thresholds are linked to comparisons of regions and national peer institutions, including members of the Utah State Board of Higher Education, Pac-12 institutions, and national R-1 public research universities. These performance indicators directly measure the level of fulfillment of the objective of each goal. As described under Standard 1.D.3 of this EIE report, we use disaggregated studies of these performance indicators to compare our level of mission fulfillment with our peer institutions. The results of these comparisons are used to make decisions for reallocation of university resources on annual and multi-year timeframes. Figure 9 provides a brief summary of the evaluation of the university’s institutional effectiveness according to the Strategy 2025 Presidential Dashboard. Additional performance indicators, data and thresholds are found online on the Presidential Dashboards.
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Figure 9: Strategy 2025 performance indicators and progress
**Improving Institutional Effectiveness 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.

At each monthly meeting of the Academic Senate (which includes elected representatives of faculty, students, and deans) there are opportunities for stakeholders to participate in governance and comment on planning processes. The president, SVPAA, and SVPHS individually provide a brief report at each Senate meeting and answer questions from attendees. Senate meetings are open, and anyone may attend and take this opportunity to interact with the administration. At each Senate meeting there is a request for new business during which stakeholders can nominate items for Senate discussion or action. As time allows, Senate meetings end with open discussion. At one recent meeting we discussed campus safety and elicited from participants what makes them feel safe, or not, on campus. Another discussion centered on the question of belonging as we considered the impact of racism and bias in our community.

Students are formally integrated into this process. Associated Students of the University of Utah (ASUU) senators serve as voting members of the Academic Senate in accordance with university regulations and are responsible for studying, researching, questioning, and voicing student opinion on matters brought before the Academic Senate. The ASUU Senate may also propose university policies, procedures, rules and regulations in the Academic Senate. Additionally, the ASUU Senate Chair, along with the student body president/designee, and one student senator, attend monthly meetings of the Academic Senate Executive Committee as members with full voting privileges.

We have established the Senate Advisory Committee on University Strategic Planning, (SACUSP), which is composed primarily of faculty members and chaired by the past president of the Academic Senate. The university president and the two senior vice presidents (or their designees) also serve as ex-officio members. The committee provides advice on aspects of strategic planning for the university. This year, the committee conducted a faculty-wide survey seeking, among other things, input on how departments, colleges, and central administrators can better assist faculty in performing their teaching, research and service responsibilities. The committee provides an annual report to the Senate that is also shared with administration.

In addition to SACUSP, there are 30 Senate and University Committees that provide stakeholder input and planning for specific areas of campus policies, operations, and governance. The Senate president and/or president-elect also traditionally sit in on the annual budget meetings where individual college financial priorities, needs, and requests are discussed.
Students are also involved in a variety of planning and decision-making committees at the university as well. The ASUU Director of Campus Relations appoints student members to university boards and committees in coordination with the ASUU president and Academic Senate leadership. This position also facilitates regular meetings between a diverse range of students and both the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. The ASUU president (or designee) serves as a voting member of several formal organizations, including the Utah Student Association, University Board of Trustees, Academic Senate, Academic Executive Committee, U Student Fee Board, Board of Trustees Campus Master Plan Committee, Union Board, U Committee on Student Affairs, and Campus Events Board Advisory Committee. All of these organizations address current and future policy, structural, programmatic, and operational issues at the university. Students also serve on various college or academic department committees that address similar issues on a college or academic department level, as well as other university committees and ad hoc committees that are created by the Academic Senate.

**Institutional Effectiveness 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 University of Utah has multiple units, working groups, and task forces and engages multiple professional associations and national organizations committed to monitoring internal/external trends, patterns, and expectations. These groups include the American Association of Universities (AAU), the Association of Public Land Grant Universities (APLU) and its Powered by Publics transformation clusters, the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), Undergraduate Education at Research Universities (UERU), the Pac-12, the Council on Graduate Schools (CGS), the Western Association of Graduate Schools (WAGS), the Assessment Institute hosted by IUPUI, National Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, and NWCCU. These higher education leadership organizations maintain governmental relationship offices that provide rapid notification of senior administration regarding emerging national trends and patterns. Ongoing consideration, reflection, and integration of evidence-based practices through active memberships and engagement in these organizations shape the strategic position, directions, and planning of the university in academic and non-academic units alike. The following examples demonstrate the commitment of the university to intentional design, monitoring, and achievement of the goals of a leading research university.

University Government Relations
As the State of Utah’s flagship university and only Tier 1 research institute, the University of Utah has a tremendous impact across the state. The Office of Government Relations (OGR) serves as the University of Utah’s principal liaison to local, statewide, and national government and seeks to develop strong, collaborative relationships with policymakers. The office works with public officials to advance the university’s priorities as directed by the university president and to advance higher education in Utah as a whole. The OGR maintains a standing physical presence near both the state and federal capitals, including maintaining and distributing a legislative bill watch when the Utah Legislature is in session. The office advises university leadership regarding emerging trends and opportunities at all levels of government, and also serves to alert leadership about emerging risks to the university. The office is a resource for students, faculty, and others wishing to navigate government issues relating to the University of Utah.

University’s COVID-19 HERO Project Leadership

The strong link between financial decision-making and mission fulfillment has allowed the U to nimbly pivot resources to quickly respond to emerging challenges and opportunities. A highly visible example of this capability is embodied in the Utah Health & Economic Recovery Outreach (HERO) Project, which established a One U initiative for university faculty and research from main campus and health sciences in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Utah HERO Project provides rapid information regarding COVID-19 infection rates and economic impacts to key decision makers in government, healthcare, and industry. The HERO Project develops strategies to help Utah’s residents and economy return to normal in a safe and informed way. In April 2022, the National Bureau of Economic Research Coronavirus Response Report Card ranked the State of Utah as No. 1 in the nation. The report cited Utah’s strong economic performance during the pandemic, the rapid development of effective educational delivery policies, and a record of extremely low mortality in the Utah population. The success was a direct result of the university’s rapid establishment of the HERO guidance to local and statewide leadership. The guidance led to the development of a collaborative process that linked and balanced the needs and resources of businesses, educational institutions, and healthcare facilities across the state.

Rapid COVID-19 Instructional Pivot

The university’s pivot to fully online course delivery in March 2020 in response to the growing coronavirus pandemic provides another demonstrated example of the value of the One U approach. In January 2020, the university formed a COVID task force in response to the growing threat of rising COVID-19 infection rates to the university’s educational, research, and health care missions. Informed by expertise from University of Utah Health and academic Health Sciences leaders and faculty, the task force rapidly developed and disseminated
a comprehensive plan for the safe operation of university business under different levels of COVID risk. This plan included development of training modules and policies for online teaching, and pre-placement of critical technology and network resources in anticipation of a potential fast pivot to fully online telecommuting for faculty and staff. When the number of statewide COVID-19 cases rose dramatically in mid-March 2020, the university pivoted all academic coursework to online modalities during the spring semester break. At the same time, university faculty, staff, and research operations shifted to remote and digital work, with the exception of mission critical operations (for example, facilities, maintenance, laboratory work) that could only be performed on campus by greatly reduced crews and research teams. The University of Utah continues to provide updated guidance and policies regarding safe operations of the campus and community healthcare based upon evolving regional and national trends and policies.

Exceptional Educational Experience (E³) Framework

The Learning Framework sought to empower students and the institution to articulate, describe, assess, and demonstrate the holistic student experience. The dynamic efforts documented in the university’s 2018 Student Success Report, “Clearing the Path,” as well as in the 2018 Mid-Cycle Self-Evaluation to NWCCU refined the Learning Framework—an integration of the learning experience through four foci on community, transformation, knowledge and skills, and impact—into the Exceptional Educational Experience (E³) Framework as the university’s strategic approach to an integrated, sustained, and holistic student experience designed for and with students.

The E³ Framework has emerged through a data-informed, student-driven, and evidence-based approach. Ongoing learning analytics efforts detailed throughout this report (e.g., understanding high DEWI-rated courses through disaggregated data analysis via Civitas, understanding the student perspective through focus groups and more) have motivated the reconceptualization of E³ as the anchor of the student experience. Through continued and future campus conversations including faculty, students, staff, and administrators, E³ will amplify the university’s student success agenda in new ways and accelerate the extraordinary improvements in student persistence and graduation seen at the University of Utah over the last decade.

President’s Commission on Equity and Belonging

The President’s Commission on Equity and Belonging (PCEB) joins together members of leadership across the university to guide the U’s short-term approaches to address harm, bias-motivated violence, and hate on campus.

The PCEB leadership affirms that all members of the U should have an equal opportunity to thrive, and that systems and behavior centered in inclusivity and
equity are essential to ensuring our community has equal access and ability to contribute to the U’s mission.

The PCEB is committed to adding to the inclusion and belonging work already underway on campus by offering additional resources and foci on key initiatives. Amongst the PCEB’s charge is hosting a Day of Collective Action, strengthening the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Student Code), enhancing transparency around the Racist & Bias Incident Response Team (RBIRT) process, and establishing a Community Compact to hold ourselves accountable for making the U an inclusive community.

One U Thriving

Building upon President Emerita Ruth V. Watkins’ vision for the future of the One U, and united in serving the people of Utah and the nation as a flagship institution at the forefront of scientific research and innovation, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) launched One U Thriving as a synergistic approach in developing methods to achieve inclusion and equity throughout the university. One U Thriving fully embraces the daily practices of equity, diversity, and inclusion. It is a platform on which EDI communicates and leads structural change to build a more equitable, diverse, accessible, and inclusive campus where everyone feels a sense of belonging.

One U Thriving is supported by a steering committee with four teams, each designed to courageously name the issues and design equitable and inclusive solutions to address them: Anti-racism Committee, Racist and Bias Incident Response Team, Universal Design and Access Committee, and the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women.

EDI Strategy Council

The purpose of the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Strategy Council (launched in spring 2022) is to provide direction, support, and oversight for the work of the university to become more diverse, equitable, inclusive, and anti-racist through its policies, practices, and programs.

Our goal in creating the EDI Strategy Council is to bring together members from across campus to become the change agents who center equity at our institution. A successful transformation at this scale will require the complementary approach of a cohesive shared equity leadership vision with unique insights and efforts enacted at the unit levels. The EDI Strategy Council will offer a mechanism to honor current equity strategies while helping them move forward, offering support and guidance to areas that need equity strategies, while bringing our decentralized campus into one organized effort.

EDI Strategy Council Working Groups infuse equity, diversity, and inclusion leadership principles into existing work via four pillars:
1. Ensuring belonging for all: We are boldly determined to create a campus where everyone knows their authentic self is affirmed and supported in order to thrive at the University of Utah and beyond.

2. Fostering an inclusive climate: We will consistently assess the university policies, programs, and practices to ensure a culture that is equitable and inclusive of the diverse individuals represented throughout our community.

3. Amplifying community engagement: We actively cultivate community connections where trust is built and the structural effects of injustice are uprooted to transform the future of the university.

4. Securing health equity: We courageously and creatively develop institutional policies, practices, and programs that eliminate health inequities and ensure all patients and clients achieve equitable health outcomes.

Student Support

The University Counseling Center (UCC) facilitates and supports the educational mission of the University of Utah. UCC provides developmental, preventive, and therapeutic services and programs that promote the intellectual, emotional, cultural, and social development of University of Utah students. UCC has an ongoing program to assess student mental health needs and accessibility of UCC services and adjust delivery and resources to meet the needs of students. Recent changes to accommodate the rising need for counseling services during the COVID-19 and post-COVID era include the addition of additional counselors, provision of virtual counseling, and development of embedded UCC service counselors in colleges across campus to decrease wait time and tailor services to the unique needs of different colleges and departments. Additionally, Student Success Coaches housed in the Office of Undergraduate Studies—formerly Student Success Advocates—have been redesigned based on the program’s under-performance per several years of student impact data. Student Success Coaches will launch in fall 2022 through an evidence-based training and certification partnership with InsideTrack and a student strategic communications pilot with Penji to support various populations of students (e.g., first generation students, low-income students, and more).

Chief Experience Officer

As a result of being a decentralized campus, our students often face an unnecessarily confusing array of services, activities and initiatives. This confusion can lead to prolonged time-to-degree, delayed entry into majors, unnecessary frustration and a diminished overall student experience. In order to address this issue, a new cabinet-level position—Chief Experience Officer—was created by President Randall in Summer 2022. This position was created to help the university better address outside market pressures and internal coordination issues such as siloed systems and disconnected elements of the student lifecycle.
In her inaugural role, Chief Experience Officer Andrea Thomas is tasked with overseeing multidisciplinary teams of designers, data experts and other professionals who will look across, within and outside our organization to better understand the experience from the students’ perspective. In this role, Thomas will develop recommendations for strategic change to ensure students can succeed from start to finish with greater ease, deeper learning, and a more memorable experience. She will work with various campus leaders (e.g., senior associate vice president for academic affairs and dean of the Office of Undergraduate Studies; senior associate vice president for enrollment management; vice president for equity, diversity, and inclusion; vice president for student affairs), units and initiatives across the U to enhance the user experience of all Utah students. This team of colleagues will use evidence-based research to identify the bottlenecks and redundancies in our systems, the areas where we’re falling short in connecting student services, and ways we can foster collaboration.

Support for graduate students

The Graduate School has developed an ongoing partnership with representatives of graduate and professional students across campus in order to develop strategies to increase graduate student retention and reduce time-to-degree. Critical barriers to student success identified in the past have resulted in streamlining the dissertation approval process, provision of access to graduate student support services online, and the provision of career services across campus for all graduate students. Working with graduate students during the past five years, the graduate student medical insurance program has added vision and dental benefits, gender dysphoria coverage, and most recently, eligibility for domestic partner insurance and an increase in prescription drug coverage from 50 percent to 90 percent of the prescription cost.

In the 2021-22 academic year, the Graduate School worked with graduate students, postdoctoral research associates, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (OEO/AA), university faculty, the Academic Senate, and university administration to create a paid parental leave policy for graduate students and postdoctoral research associates. The Graduate Student Parental Leave and Postdoctoral Fellows Parental Leave policies were approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2022, and became effective July 1, 2022. This policy directly responds to the unique demographics of the graduate and postdoctoral student communities at the University of Utah, which include a substantial number of married students and researchers with young families.
Student Learning: Standards 1.C.1 – 1.C.9

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

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies the University of Utah as a large four-year public research university with very high research activity. The undergraduate program is classified as balanced (arts & sciences/professions, with high graduate coexistence), and the graduate program is listed as comprehensive doctoral with a medical school. A comprehensive searchable list of undergraduate and graduate degrees, minors, and certificates offered by the university is published in the online catalog, illustrating the balance of academic programs across traditional disciplines.

The creation of each new academic program is accomplished by a rigorous process of proposal and review, starting in the academic department and college and then progressing to the Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council (as appropriate), the senior vice president (Academic Affairs or Health Sciences), approval by the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees, and, ultimately, notification of the State Board of Higher Education and NWCCU. All degree programs articulate a clearly defined set of expected learning outcomes as well as the plan and measures used to assess learning outcomes and are supported in the assessment process by LAOA. These outcomes are then mapped to the Exceptional Educational Experience (E³) Framework institutional outcomes. Institutional assessments of program effectiveness and achievement of student learning outcomes are performed by the Graduate Council or Undergraduate Council (as appropriate) on a seven-year cycle. An extensive discussion of the sequencing of learning activities in individual programs, and the demonstration of the rigor of learning using student learning and program assessment is described under Standards 1.C.2 and 1.C.5 of this report.

Degree designators are assigned according to the depth and breadth of the degree curriculum according to requirements established by the policies of the Utah State Board of Higher Education. These policies include minimum requirements for number of credit hours to carry different degree designations, general education and bachelor’s degree requirements, requirements for graduate degrees, post-baccalaureate certificates, and postdoctoral certificates. The USHE degree designations and requirements are consistent with national standards. The university maintains curriculum and learning outcomes for specialized accredited professional and other academic degrees leading to degree designations consistent with accrediting body standards.
All academic programs are subject to rigorous internal review and subsequent external review by chief academic officers of other Utah System of Higher Education institutions at the time they undergo approval by the Utah Board of Higher Education. This process ensures high quality design, demonstrated need, financial sustainability, and learning outcomes that reflect generally accepted learning outcomes in higher education. In addition, many programs undergo ongoing periodic external review for specialized accreditation. The Graduate and Undergraduate councils are charged with conducting ongoing reviews of academic programs throughout the university on a seven-year cycle to ensure that credit and degrees are being awarded in a manner consistent with university policies. Each review begins with preparation of a departmental self-study document, two site visits by teams of internal reviewers and external reviewers, input from the department chair and dean, preparation of a summary report by the respective council, and a wrap-up meeting with the department chair, dean, and cognizant senior vice president to identify action items in response to the recommendations of the review and craft a Memorandum of Understanding between the university and the department. The Graduate Council Program Reviews guide contains a summary of the review procedures, which are also followed by the Undergraduate Council. Documentation of program reviews are maintained by the Graduate School for all programs except those having only an undergraduate component (e.g., the Honors College), which are maintained in Undergraduate Studies.

Degree programs follow depth, breadth, and course sequencing standards as determined by specialized accreditation requirements or, in programs without specialized accreditation, the depth, breadth, and sequencing of nationally recognized programs of study. As described under Standard 1.C.3, both degree/certificate program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes are published for every degree and certificate offered by the university, and are linked to student transcripts though explicit articulation in the University Catalog. The program learning outcomes, course requirements and sequencing are periodically reviewed to align with national trends through ongoing curricular review at the department level and external reviews on the seven-year cycle.

Sample programs of study have been created for every bachelor and graduate degree program. Learning outcomes of each course in a program are mapped to ensure the program learning outcomes are achieved. The programs of study outline a suggested sequencing of courses that can be found on the major pages of the General Catalog. The curricular design of undergraduate and graduate programs is presented on the websites and graduate program handbooks of the individual departments offering the degrees and certificates. These documents are reviewed by the Graduate or
Undergraduate council as part of the seven-year cycle of program reviews to ensure that programs are up-to-date and offered with the appropriate level of academic rigor. As part of the seven-year review cycle, Student Learning Outcomes and the results of outcomes assessment are explicitly reviewed, according to university policy. The Office of Admissions publishes specific admissions requirements for undergraduate and graduate study.

Graduation requirements for baccalaureate degrees are published in the university’s General Catalog, which includes major requirements for every degree. The Office of Undergraduate Studies maintains a detailed description of General Education and Baccalaureate Degree requirements. In addition, every undergraduate student can access the Degree Audit Requirements System (DARS) in the Campus Information System, which allows students to run degree audits upon request, including “what-if” queries to test the effects of changing or adding majors and minors.

Graduate students are required to develop an official program of study to satisfy the requirements of the degree for which they have been admitted. The requirements of the program of study are explicitly outlined in the program handbook for each graduate degree and certificate. The program of study is entered into the Graduate Records Tracking System, which can be viewed by the student in the Campus Information System. Students can conduct graduation audits to determine which degree requirements remain to be satisfied prior to graduation.

Student Learning 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 Catalog at the end of each degree description. University regulations require that course descriptions, which are published in course syllabi and distributed to enrolled students, clearly state the learning outcomes and activities that are essential to the award of credit. The Martha Bradley Evans Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) publishes a guide to the creation of course syllabi that are in compliance with university regulations and best academic practices.

The Undergraduate Council requires courses fulfilling a General Education or bachelor’s degree requirement to have syllabi that indicate which General Education learning outcome is addressed.

Programs enter their program-level outcomes and are mapped to institutional level outcomes in our Curriculum Management system (Kuali CM), and they are displayed in the catalog. Program changes are approved by the relevant department and college curriculum committees. Degree learning outcomes are published on the Program pages in the General Catalog.
Course-level learning outcomes and objectives of a course are published in the course syllabus, per University of Utah policy 6-100. Syllabi are made available to students for their enrolled courses at least one week prior to the first day of class (6-100.C.5).

The university is committed to the use of articulated student learning outcomes and assessment for every course, degree program and certificate offered by the university. The Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment (LAOA) in Undergraduate Studies consults with academic departments around the campus to comply with the portion of University Policy 6-001 that requires departments to have an active curriculum management plan that includes direct assessment of student learning during the three- and five-year milestones of their seven-year program review cycle. Academic units are required to provide interim reports and the seven-year report to LAOA; the seven-year report is also included in the Graduate Council seven-year program review self-study. LAOA manages a website with helpful materials on conducting learning outcomes assessments. LAOA also meets with curriculum committees and leadership of departments and colleges to brainstorm and discuss good assessment practice, and to review drafts and reports.

**Student Learning 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 University of Utah’s admissions requirements are clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible to students and the public on the Admissions webpages. Students and the public can find information based on their type of application and/or situation. Freshman student admissions, international student admissions, graduate student admissions, and transfer student admissions each maintain a helpful website detailing the requirements unique to these programs and/or student populations. In addition to these published requirements, students can easily connect with an admissions counselor who can provide answers to all applicants, including those with unique or less common situations. Checklists are available to students through these webpages and an integrated set of Major Maps have been developed to support students’ exploration of programs of study from student-centered, academic planning and co-curricular as well as experiential components of the student experience.

Graduation requirements are publicly accessible in the University of Utah general catalog and on an Office of the Registrar’s webpage. The graduation requirements are updated as required through proposals and annual updates in the Curriculum Administration’s Kuali management system. Kuali automatically handles approval workflows through the Undergraduate/Graduate Council, Academic Senate, Senior Administration, and Board of Trustees/USBHE. Curriculum management/Kuali automatically updates the Registrar for necessary changes as they are approved.
Students can monitor their individual progress toward graduation and graduation planning using the DARS system (undergraduate) or the Graduate Student Tracking System (graduate students). These websites are available to individual students when they log into the Campus Information System (CIS) with a university ID and password.

**Student Learning 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 university has a long-established seven-year program review cycle (see Standard 1.B.1, Figure 4) that is required for all degree programs. Section 5 of the seven-year program review requires the departments to describe their learning assessment process, findings from their assessment of their learning outcomes, and curricular and other changes undertaken in response to the learning outcomes assessments.

In 2015, the University of Utah received the following recommendation during its seven-year internal review:

> The evaluation committee recommends that the University of Utah allocate additional financial resources for measurable, direct student learning outcomes (Standards 2.C.1 and 2.C.2).

In response to Year Seven Commissioner’s Recommendation 2, the university has invested resources in assessment that resulted in all of the changes described in the rest of this section, all of which are toward the creation of, accomplishment, and assessment of direct, measurable student learning outcomes.

In 2016, the Office of Learning Outcomes Assessment (now referred to as Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment—LAOA) was created, with Mark St. Andre and Ann Darling appointed as co-directors. This office was charged with developing and embedding direct, robust student learning outcomes and the assessment of those outcomes into the curricular management of each academic program across campus.

Also during 2016, the university invested in the purchase of the Kuali software system for integrating Curriculum Management with Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting.

In 2017, the university developed the Learning Framework as a set of university-wide outcomes that we want all students to achieve. Departments and programs are referred to the Framework when developing or revisiting their learning outcomes and are asked to make sure their outcomes cover and are mapped to the university-level outcomes in the Framework. As such, the Framework is used in discussions that LAOA has with departments and programs in the design and assessment of their student learning outcomes.
In 2017, to improve the frequency and usefulness of assessment in their program review cycle, the institution updated the curriculum management section of Policy 6-100 to require departments to submit two interim reports on their assessment of program-level learning outcomes during the seven-year review period. The policy suggests that these reports be submitted in the third or fifth year in the cycle, but that is left up to departments to decide as long as there are two interim reports and a final assessment report (Section 5) that is part of the seven-year program review. The assessment of program-level outcomes in the departments is a process that is approved and implemented by the faculty.

This change in policy has significantly improved the overall quality and frequency of program-level assessment. The Office of LAOA in the Office of Undergraduate Studies has been the primary office through which this new policy has been implemented for undergraduate programs. LAOA is in regular communication with departments each year if they are in the third or fifth year of their program review cycle or one year away from their seven-year program review. LAOA reaches out to departments to make sure they are on track to complete these interim assessments of their learning outcomes and offer consultation or access to assessment tools (see below) if it would help departments implement their assessment plans.

LAOA began keeping track of the submission of assessment plans and third- and fifth-year learning outcomes assessment reports for undergraduate programs in 2018, after the learning outcomes assessment policy was updated in April 2017. LAOA created a reporting table and website to keep track of these submissions so compliance with the policy could be tracked and examples could be provided to other departments who were looking for help in getting their own assessment work started.

The report table lists the assessment plan for each program (see example in Figure 12) as well as the third-, fifth-, and seventh-year reports that are available, organized by the year in which they are due for each department. If a department has a disciplinary accreditation that requires assessment of outcomes, those documents are provided and displayed in lieu of the required interim reports.

This assessment plan and report table serves as a tracking tool for LAOA, a reminder to departments about when they need to complete their reports (and if they have fallen behind), and a resource for faculty to look at examples of reports from other departments.

Beginning in 2017 (and discussed in the university’s mid-cycle review in 2018), the university invested resources in hiring two developers to begin building two tools to help facilitate and reduce the work necessary to assess learning outcomes using direct evidence from student work. These tools integrate with our curriculum management and course management systems to identify assignments and organize them for assessment in a new assessment ecosystem. These tools, now fully functioning and deployed for free use around the university, are called the Learning Outcomes Associator and the Learning Outcomes Reviewer.
The Learning Outcomes Associator (“The Associator”)

A prototype of this tool was shown to visiting accreditors during the University of Utah’s 2018 NWCCU mid-cycle visit. We have since completed development of this tool and it has been used by more than a dozen departments. The Associator is a simple tool that can be added to a Canvas course that imports the program-level learning outcomes for whatever program/s the course is associated with. The Associator displays the program outcomes and the assignments for the course alongside each other and allows the user to make associations between them. These associations are then stored in a database, where they can be accessed for assessment purposes in a separate application called The Learning Outcomes Reviewer.

The Learning Outcomes Reviewer (“The Reviewer”)

This is a standalone website that allows the user to design an assessment of a program-level learning outcome. Users log in with their university credentials and are given access to their own department/program and its outcomes. Using the Reviewer, an assessment coordinator can do the following:

1. Select the number of student artifacts they want to evaluate
2. Preview the pieces of student work
3. Design rubrics to use for evaluating the student work
4. Assign faculty
5. Email faculty their assignments
6. View graphical reports on the results of the assessment.

In addition to the two tools described above, in 2021 the University of Utah also began developing a way to visualize the relationship between program-level learning outcomes and the Learning Framework (now the Exceptional Educational Experience [or E³] Framework). This new tool is called the Learning Outcomes Visualizer:

The Learning Outcomes Visualizer (“The Visualizer”)

This tool is a graphical display of the connections between program-level learning outcomes, the courses that are used to inform those outcomes, and the university-wide learning outcomes described by the Learning Framework. As more departments map their departmental learning outcomes to the Learning Framework the Visualizer is getting populated with the connections and will eventually paint a complete picture of the relationship between the Learning Framework goals, program-level outcomes, courses, and the assignments and assessments being conducted to measure those outcomes.
These three tools constitute our Learning Outcomes Ecosystem. Screen shot videos and slides of the Associator and Reviewer are available, as well data from the Visualizer. LAOA also hosts a faculty-led Learning Outcomes Assessment Workshop each semester in which four faculty members give presentations on the assessment of their program’s learning outcomes. These presentations range from brainstorms about re-writing learning outcomes to presentations of final reports. The goal of these workshops is to create a culture of assessment by discussing expectations, conversations, and language around the assessment of learning outcomes.

LAOA has been running these workshops every semester (except for two semesters) for the past five years, with an average participation of around 60 faculty members over the past two years. As evidence of the creation of our culture of assessment, we have not had two presentations from the same department.

Videos and/or copies of all of the presentations that have been made over the past five years can be found on the Learning Outcomes Assessment Workshop Canvas page, to which LAOA regularly refers faculty members. Those presentations are organized by discipline so that faculty can see presentations and get ideas from faculty in their college. We believe this is strong evidence that the assessment process we have put in place is “faculty owned” and “faculty led.”
The creation of the Learning Outcomes Ecosystem and the Learning Outcomes Assessment Workshop series, along with our website of educational materials on assessment and the policy requiring two interim and one final report during the seven-year program review window have helped create a culture of assessment on our campus that has momentum. Our Learning Outcomes Ecosystem tools have also generated interest at conferences and we are now in talks to work with other campuses to potentially share this technology to help further develop its usefulness to other universities.

The LAOA office has also formed an Assessment Consortium among assessment professionals at other Pac-12 universities to share best practices and ideas around the challenges and opportunities that assessment provides. LAOA has hosted four meetings of this group over the past three years, and several members of the Pac-12 Assessment Consortium have attended LAOA’s last two Learning Outcomes Assessment Workshops (Fall 2021 and Spring 2022).

**Student Learning 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 of Utah adopted the VALUE Rubrics from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) in 2008. With 13 available learning outcomes and more than 1,300 courses carrying designations at the time, systematic mapping and assessment was fraught. The Office of General Education did engage in learning outcome assessment in 2015, 2016, and 2017 and the results suggested a need to reduce the number of learning outcomes, reduce the number of courses carrying designations, and engage in systematic alignment across the U.

In the summer of 2018, a university team attended an AAC&U Summer Institute on General Education (GE) with the goal to reimagine the GE experience at the University of Utah. The team set out to intentionally shift the university’s approach toward considering GE at a curricular rather than course-by-course level and to identify a coherent vision that could be translated into clear and easily codified learning outcomes, all while focusing on the student experience.

This new approach invited the opportunity to contemplate GE as the university’s curriculum that serves all undergraduate students at the university and, thus, required purposefully aligning GE at a higher level. The team considered university-wide goals—community, knowledge and skills, impact, and transformation—as articulated by the university’s Learning Framework, institutional policies, accreditation requirements, and
learning outcomes that prepare students with the skills, aptitudes, and perspectives needed to succeed in a changing society.

This resulted in the articulation of five unique GE Learning Outcomes (GELOs) that are situated at the intersections of the Learning Framework: the abilities to collaborate effectively, respond ethically, persist in addressing complex problems, respond creatively, and actualize and contribute. The General Education Curriculum Committee developed rubrics for each of these outcomes similar to and incorporating pieces of the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics.

The GELOs provide language for communicating a coherent narrative about the purpose of the Exceptional Education curriculum at the university. They are transparent to students and advisors, providing the opportunity to personalize and author the learning experience. They support development and assessment of a meaningful and coherent curriculum and further institutional goals.

The full rollout of the GELOs was delayed by the pandemic. In addition, changes in multiple levels of leadership now provide the opportunity to reimagine General Education as Exceptional Education at the University of Utah. Specific next steps toward this goal include:

- Collaborating with colleges and departments to ensure a robust set of course offerings at the appropriate levels that are fully accessible to first-year students, support meaningful exploration, and are consistent with USHE expectations around common course numbering.
- Systematically mapping the GELOs to all courses carrying designations.
- Via the Associator and with the support of LAOA, linking appropriate assignments to the GELOs to facilitate learning outcome assessment across Exceptional Education to facilitate assessment of the GELOs.
- Including GELOs on the class schedule so that advisors and students can search by outcome and not solely by designation to better craft students' learning experiences.
- Revising the course proposal and review processes for courses seeking GE or bachelor’s degree designations to support the shift to Exceptional Education.
- Via The Utah Experience, incorporating experiential learning opportunities for all undergraduate students in their first 60 credit hours at the university to facilitate connection to other students, faculty, staff, the institution and, ultimately, to increase persistence and completion.
- Via the Martha Bradley Evans Center for Teaching Excellence, designing comprehensive faculty development opportunities to ensure high quality pedagogy and assessment practices.

The rollout of the GELOs will begin with meetings with colleges and departments during fall semester 2022. During fall semester, the General Education Curriculum Committee will review and propose changes to the GE and baccalaureate requirements which are expected to be approved and require a year of curricular restructuring before
implementation. We project the GELOs will go into effect during fall semester 2024. We anticipate that the GELO mapping process will be completed by the end of AY 24-25.

**Student Learning 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.

Departments throughout campus are engaged in assessing their own program-level learning outcomes. This process allows them to understand the degree to which students are completing their programs with the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are reflected in their outcomes. If students are falling short of these outcomes, departments and programs can use these results to improve their programming through increased funding and resources for students, including improved classroom content or tutoring.

The three examples of program-level learning outcomes assessment reports included in the Appendix—Lower Division Writing Requirement Third-Year Report, the Department of Math’s Fifth-Year Report, and the Department of Communication’s Fifth-Year Report—all utilized assessment results to bring attention to programs or classes that needed to be improved to help students be successful. A separate document, “Recommended Changes from Example Assessment Reports” is included in the Appendix to bring attention to those assessment recommendations.

One of our institution-wide assessment efforts this academic year (2021-22) is studying the courses in which students have the highest rates of D and E grades, withdrawals, and incompletes (DEWI). The Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment (LAOA) (see full description in Figure 15 below) is disaggregating and studying those courses so we have a thorough understanding of which students are having trouble. We will design interventions and programming, largely through our Martha Bradley Evans Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) and the Learning Center, to help those students be more successful.

Outside of the classroom, the university’s support services and offices assess students’ learning outcomes and aim to support students’ academic success as well. Broadly, our Student Affairs’ Department of Assessment and Analytics plans to connect results from institution-wide surveys with data on students’ academic measures of persistence and success. The Graduating Student Survey and the National Survey of Student Engagement collect data about students’ involvement in co-curricular activities, perceptions on sense of belonging, and satisfaction with their overall experience at the University of Utah. Going forward, the department will connect information about co-curricular involvement with cumulative GPA, academic standing, and graduation status to better understand the connection between this type of involvement/engagement and students’ academic achievements.
Additionally, Student Affairs is working to partner with Undergraduate Studies to use technology to assess the probability that students will persist and graduate based on academic, demographic, internal, and external factors. Student Affairs’ Assessment and Analytics Department will add data points on co-curricular involvement and utilization of certain services that will act as independent variables in regression algorithms to calculate persistence and graduation. This information will allow Student Affairs to better understand the effects of involvement/use of its services on these academic outcomes.

Each Student Affairs department is responsible for assessing its programs and offerings to inform learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes. Some examples of these include:

**The Center for Student Wellness**

The Center for Student Wellness is the primary education and wellness resource office at the university. It administers a satisfaction and feedback survey to students who use its services. Based on these results, the center launched support groups and support spaces for survivors of interpersonal violence.

**Financial Wellness Center**

Based on one-month follow-up questionnaires sent to students who used the Financial Wellness Center’s one-on-one counseling services, 78 percent reported being able to work toward or accomplish the goals established during the appointment. The same amount also reported that the service helped them continue toward graduation. More than 83 percent indicated that their stress level decreased as a result of visiting the Financial Wellness Center.

**University Counseling Center**

The University Counseling Center uses the Counseling Center Assessment of Psychological Symptoms (CCAPS) tool and asks students to complete it at the time of intake and at every follow-up appointment. Of those who participated, 45 percent reported some level of academic distress—the fourth most commonly reported concern by students after depression, anxiety, and stress. This data, along with client feedback, informed the center’s development of a learning support workshop called Mental Coaching for Success, a free workshop designed to help students gain practical skills to help with planning, organization, time management, focus, and avoiding procrastination.

**Campus Recreation Services**

The Fitness Program Participation Survey, administered by Campus Recreation Services, found that 99 percent of participants left their fitness class feeling less stressed and more focused, strongly supporting the program’s benefit for overall health and quality of life and its ongoing commitment to development of the complete individual.
Undergraduate Housing

Students who live on campus during their first year are, on average, 12 percent more likely to graduate, after controlling for a variety of factors. Additionally, students who live on campus are retained at a higher percentage than those who live off campus. To help increase the number of students who are able to reap this benefit, the university is growing housing capacity by more than 1,200 units over the next two years, which is in addition to the 5,000 already available, with many more planned in the coming years.

Undergraduate and graduate advisors are annually trained on the availability of these student resources. The advising teams inform students about the availability of these resources in periodic student town halls, individual advising sessions, departmental webpages and emails, and program handbooks. The advising teams are also actively engaged in assessing the quality of these support services, and suggesting changes that lead to continuous improvement.

---

**Student Learning 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 is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic rigor, and quality.

---

Acceptance of transfer credits at the University of Utah depends upon the quality of instruction from the sending institution, comparability of the nature, content, and level of credit earned, and appropriateness and applicability of credit to the university and the student’s educational goals. For undergraduate-level courses, in accordance with University Regulation 6-100, the Academic Senate approves rules regarding acceptance of transfer credit based on recommendations made by the Credits and Admissions Committee. The committee is composed of 11 voting members, including nine faculty members and two student representatives. It has the authority to determine admissions policies, including the acceptance of transfer and prior-learning credit for undergraduate students. Transfer/prior learning credit policies are clearly articulated on the Office of Admissions website.

University of Utah policies are available online through the University Regulations Library. Utah Board of Higher Education policies are available through the state website. The rules and guidelines regarding transfer credits are available on the Office of Admissions transfer student website.

The Utah Board of Higher Education has developed an unusually strong system of common course numbering, course articulation, and credit transfer, particularly for courses that satisfy General Education degree requirements. Some aspects of
institutional practices for transfer of credit are dictated statewide by the Utah Board of Higher Education’s policies governing the transfer of credit. To ensure currency in implementing the statewide Board of Higher Education policies, faculty and staff from the University of Utah participate in annual “Majors Meetings” to discuss common courses and course materials being used at all institutions within the Utah System of Higher Education and to facilitate mobility of students. Articulation guides regarding specific agreements are maintained by the Office of Undergraduate Studies and are posted online. The Utah Board of Higher Education has also created the Utah Transfer Guide.

The University of Utah follows the American Council on Education (ACE) Military Guide to determine credit based on military training and occupations and will award credit that is ACE-recommended and parallel to coursework taught at the university.

A petition process is available for all students with coursework that was not initially accepted by the University of Utah through the Office of Admissions. Course descriptions and syllabi are provided to the Office of Admissions and are forwarded to the appropriate academic department for special consideration. Credit is posted to a student’s record with departmental approval and recommendation. If credit is denied, students are notified that the department will not articulate the credit.

For graduate programs, Graduate School policy limits the transfer of graduate credits from another institution to a maximum of six semester credit hours, subject to evaluation and recommendation by the director of Graduate Studies of the program and approval by the dean of the Graduate School. Graduate School policy allows up to six semester hours or two courses from the University of Utah (taken as a non-matriculated undergraduate student) to be counted towards a graduate degree, or up to 15 graduate credits from the University of Utah (taken as a non-matriculated graduate student). The acceptance of these credits is subject to evaluation and recommendation by the director of Graduate Studies of the program and approval by the dean of the Graduate School. A graduate student must earn half or more of their required graduate degree program credits as a matriculated graduate student at the University of Utah.

---

**Student Learning 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.
As a comprehensive doctorate-granting university with very high research activity, the University of Utah offers 312 graduate degree programs and 88 graduate certificates consistent with its institutional mission. The names, descriptions, curricular designs and expected learning outcomes for these degrees are in harmony with similar programs at peer institutions. For example, all of the Ph.D. programs offered by the university are consistent with the educational taxonomy utilized by the National Research Council in its Data-Based Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs in the United States.

For many years, it has been the practice of the University of Utah to program curricular design, relying in the first instance on department- and college-level expertise in specific disciplines and professions. The Graduate School, through the policy-making authority of the Graduate Council, supports departments and academic units to preserve and enhance the highest standards of excellence in their individual disciplines. Each department establishes policies that are enforced through the regulatory power of the Graduate School (admissions criteria and degree requirements). The Graduate School maintains a uniform set of university-wide policies (Graduate School Policies) that ensure each graduate program maintains quality standards for graduate education at the university. Graduate School policies are continuously reviewed and updated by the Graduate Council.

The Graduate Council relies heavily on the expertise of external reviewers, professional societies, specialized accreditation commissions, and national rankings for indicators of the academic rigor, quality, and standards of individual units, degrees and programs. Each proposed new graduate degree or ‘emphasis’ goes through a demanding multi-level approval process coordinated by the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council approval process requires clear articulation of graduate-level learning outcomes that advance the education of a baccalaureate student. The Graduate Council approval process also requires articulation of well-defined admissions requirements that require completion of a four-year baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university with a minimum 3.0 GPA in order to qualify for university admission to the program. The undergraduate coursework in each degree program is evaluated to ensure adequate preparation is in place so that the student will have a foundation for successfully mastering the more advanced graduate learning outcomes. For existing programs, potential problems are identified and remediated through the system of Graduate Council seven-year cyclical program review. These exhaustive processes for initial approval and regular reexamination ensure that each graduate program is rigorous, reflects national and international norms within a discipline, and provides a graduate educational experience that is substantially deeper and more advanced than a baccalaureate degree experience.
Student Achievement: Standards 1.D.1 – 1.D.4

Student Achievement 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.

At the undergraduate level, admission to the University of Utah is governed by University Policy 6-404, and is based on an individualized holistic evaluation process. The holistic evaluation process focuses on factors that the university has determined to have bearing on the success of the applicant as well as identifies their valuable contributions to the campus community. These are evaluated through an applicant’s excellence in academic achievement, intellectual pursuits, and creative endeavors; an understanding of and respect for historically underrepresented populations; significant commitment to service to others through public service activities, community engagement, leadership, or familial responsibilities; integrity, personal maturity, motivation, and resiliency; and the ability to contribute to and benefit from a culturally diverse learning community.

The objective of the Office of Admissions is to admit an undergraduate student body of highly qualified, intellectually curious, diverse and actively involved students. The university is committed to providing excellence in its teaching/learning environment, to promoting high levels of student achievement, and to offering appropriate academic support services. By identifying students with outstanding potential and fostering continued personal development in the classroom and the community, the University of Utah expects that future leaders of the state, the region, the nation, and the global community will emerge among its alumni.

Completion of new student orientation is required for new undergraduates, both freshmen and transfer students. Orientation provides information about university academic requirements and co-curricular activities. During these sessions, all students meet with academic advisors from specific colleges if their major is known and with the Academic Advising Center if they are exploring. In addition, to address issues of students delaying declaring a major and or changing majors, we require a proactive first-year advising requirement prior to registering for second semester classes and prior to a 45 credit hours threshold. To address the issue of students understanding what a major is and what is entailed we have developed Major Maps that students can use to browse majors and see what is relevant to their interests. This was designed with students to address their needs to understand and map their academic futures alongside their academic advisor. Student and parental feedback from the annual
orientation is solicited and used for continuous improvement of future event programming.

In response to reduced availability of standardized testing due to COVID-19, the university dropped SAT/ACT test requirements for applicants beginning with the Fall 2021 admissions cohort. The two-year pilot has been extended through the Fall 2023 admissions cycle. One direct result of this was the need to develop alternate strategies for student placement into coursework that previously relied on test scores—specifically, writing and math. Language placement has remained unchanged.

Writing Placement

Students are given the autonomy to complete their writing requirement with either a one or two semester course sequence (WRTG 1010 and WRTG 2010, or WRTG 2010). To assist with the decision, the Writing Program has developed an Informed Self-Placement (ISP) process that guides the student through an informative self-reflective process. Academic advisors and writing placement consultants are also available to assist students who are unsure what option is best suited for their needs.

Math Placement

Entry into math courses up to and including first level calculus is also by ISP. A series of videos were developed to help new students determine their optimal placement; students who are unsure of their placement can meet with an academic advisor, use a prior ACT or SAT score, or take an Accuplacer test on campus.

Language Placement

Students needing to demonstrate language proficiency are required to take a placement test unless they have a score of three or higher on an Advanced Placement World Language Exam, self-identify as a heritage speaker, or have extensive experience in the target language.

Accommodations

Students with documented disabilities can pursue a substitution of the Quantitative Literacy (math) or the Bachelor of Arts language requirement through the Center for Disability & Access and their major department.

Graduate and Professional Degrees

Student recruitment and admission to graduate degree programs are a shared responsibility between the Graduate School, the Office of Admissions, and individual departments and programs. The Graduate School sets minimum standards for admission to programs, while the Office of Admissions processes admission applications for all programs except JD and MD. For admission to graduate degree programs, the Graduate Council establishes minimum qualifications, including an earned baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution, a minimum grade point
average of 3.0, and a level of English language proficiency equivalent to a TOEFL iBT score of 80 or better. Each application is reviewed by a committee of departmental or program faculty, which makes recommendations for admission that are consistent with program capacity and program goals for academic excellence and diversity. 

Readmissions regulations are provided for under Policy 6-404. Programs review applications and make recommendations to the Office of Admissions for admission.

Once admitted, graduate and professional students receive information on orientation and advising directly from the academic program (usually the director of Graduate Studies or the graduate program coordinator). International students receive specialized advising and orientation from International Student & Scholar Services and the Graduate School International Teaching Assistant Program to ensure a smooth transition to graduate study as well as compliance with federal immigration and visa regulations.

The Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities clearly specifies the university standards and procedures for termination from an academic program or from the university. In addition, each department/college maintains a policy regarding the minimum academic requirement necessary to remain a student in good standing. The minimum GPA necessary to remain a student in good standing as an undergraduate student is published on the Academic Advising Center website, while the university standard for graduate students is published on the Graduate School’s website. Each graduate department is responsible for defining and publishing standards for maintaining good standing in their graduate degree programs. These standards include timing of coursework, mandatory exams, dissertation progress, and time to degree. These standards are included in the graduate program handbook for each program across campus.

In April 2022, the Student Code was updated to hold violators accountable for bias and prejudice-motivated behaviors.

These changes included:

- Adjusting the definition of discrimination and harassment and adding language to cover bias- or prejudice-motivated behaviors against members of a protected class so this language reflects the university’s existing nondiscrimination policy, which now includes: race, ethnicity, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity/expression, age, pregnancy, pregnancy-related conditions, genetic information, or status as an individual with a disability or a protected veteran.
- Adding framing language to explain the rationale for why violations motivated by bias or prejudice can receive enhanced sanctions.
- Adding “property of others” to be protected from attempted or actual theft, damage, or misuse.
- Adding language to direct hearing committees to consider enhanced sanctions for violations motivated by bias or prejudice.
These changes were made to ensure students’ free speech rights afforded by the First Amendment are not violated while holding community members accountable if they take harmful action that was motivated by bias or prejudice. The entire code is undergoing a detailed review during the 2022-23 academic year. The review will include a separation of the behavioral aspects of the code from those of the academic integrity of students which will be governed through a new Office of Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Studies.

Institutional and program graduation requirements for undergraduate students are published in the General Catalog, the Undergraduate Bulletin and Student Resource Guide, and other publications provided by academic departments at New Student Orientation and through the college.

University standards for masters and doctoral degrees can be found online. The Graduation Division of the Registrar’s Office verifies that graduation requirements for certificates and degrees are applied consistently. The Graduate School also maintains its own graduate records administrator to verify that all Graduate School requirements are met before issuing a clearance to the Registrar’s Office to award the degree.

**Student Achievement 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).

In 2016, the Office of Undergraduate Studies created the Office of Learning Outcomes Assessment. The purpose of this office was to bring more resources to helping departments write and assess program-level learning outcomes. This office helped update policy that requires departments to assess their outcomes three times during the seven-year program review, typically at the three-, five-, and seven-year milestones in the cycle.

In 2021, the Office of Learning Outcomes Assessment evolved into the Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment (LAOA) and was given two additional full-time analysts to help Undergraduate Studies (US) expand the degree to which it was examining, understanding, and sharing data on student achievement. This office is regularly building dashboards and doing predictive and statistical analyses of student achievement and participation in US’s General Education and high impact programs such as LEAP, undergraduate research, the Bennion Center (community engaged learning courses and activities), the Learning Center (peer tutoring), and the Academic Advising Center, among others (see Figures 13.1 and 13.2).
In the first several months that LAOA has existed, a large number of their analyses have focused on understanding equity gaps in achievement and participation in our programs. In particular, we have built several powerful dashboards that identify the courses with the highest rates of students receiving D’s, E’s, withdrawals, or incompletes (DEWI) and describe the gender, race, ethnicity, major and a variety of other factors associated with whatever courses are selected. This has allowed us to identify what populations are struggling in the most challenging courses, and develop strategies to improve the success of these populations in these courses (see description in Standard 1.D.4).

Another dashboard built on the same data gives a different view. It shows the rates of DEWI by category within important demographic and academic variables, including race, gender, ethnicity, first-generation status, transfer student status, veteran student, rurality, major, and participation in learning communities. US uses this information to engage faculty through the Martha Bradley Evans Center for Teaching Excellence and target these courses and these gaps through our Learning Center.

Standard 1.D.3 describes the identification of regional and national peers, and the identification of relevant indicators linked to the University mission and goals.

**Student Achievement 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 (OBIA) serves as the official source of information for the University of Utah, and as such, provides a wide array of student achievement metrics, both public- and institutional-facing. These reports are regularly presented in interactive dashboards where the user can define a variety of parameters such as major, demographic, or year. In general, these dashboards provide empirical evidence of student achievement at a few different levels.

Institutional-level comparisons

Among our public-facing reports, two are worth noting in this context. First, our Peer Comparison tool contains a variety of student metrics, benchmarked against different peer sets, including Research One, AAU, top 15 public institutions, and our system-designated peer set. The student-related metrics include enrollment, tuition and fees, and retention and graduation rates.
Second, the President’s Dashboards contain a wide offering of measures that directly align with the University of Utah’s four main goals, one of them being student success. The dashboards include multiple indicators of student success performance benchmarked against indicators for peer institutions at the regional and national levels, as well as Strategy 2025 goals. Student success indicators (peer institutions) include first-year student retention rates (Pac-12), six-year graduation rates (Pac-12), Pell grant participation (Pac-12 publics) and STEM degrees awarded (USHE). Additional strategic performance indicators related to student success include master’s and doctoral degrees awarded (Pac-12 Public, R-1 Universities) and total research expenditures (Pac-12 Public, R-1 Universities).

The disaggregated data from these peer dashboards is compiled and analyzed to assist in understanding the academic success of different student groups in key university metrics. Figure 1 illustrates the disaggregated six-year graduation rates for the University of Utah compared to USHE-designated peers for the 2020-21 academic year. The University of Utah’s six-year graduation rate has been below the USHE-designated peers, and part of the Strategy 2025 goal is to improve this rate to 80 percent, above the peer average. In order to understand the differential success of different ethnic/racial student groups, it is necessary to normalize out the USHE peer difference (multiply the U disaggregated rates by a factor of \( \frac{78}{67} = 1.164 \)). After renormalization, the disaggregated data demonstrates that Asian, international, and multi-racial student graduation rates are exceeding the rates of our USHE-designated peers. Other student racial populations (American Indian, Black/AA, Latina(a), and Pacific Islander) have renormalized graduation rates lower than USHE-designated peers. This deficit indicates the need for investment of additional resources and efforts to improve the graduation rates of these latter groups.

As demonstrated by the President’s Dashboards, the university is making steady progress toward the Strategy 2025 goal of a student body size of 40,000. Our need-based financial aid awards have remained consistent with our Pac-12 peers, and our first-year retention rate has consistently exceeded our Pac-12 peers. The University of Utah’s number of master’s and doctoral degrees has accelerated recently, significantly exceeding the average number from R-1 Public Universities and keeping pace with our Pac-12 peers. We have already exceeded the Strategy 2025 goal for the number of students taking at least one course online.
Figure 11: Disaggregated six-year graduation rates by ethnicity

College- and department-level comparisons

Our ability to improve student outcomes relies on efforts and assessment at the college and department level, therefore OBIA has invested significant efforts in producing timely and relevant dashboards tailored specifically for deans, department chairs, and other academic leaders both in public-facing and provisioned-access reports. Notably, these efforts have been such an institutional priority that OBIA has established formal partnerships with the majority of our academic colleges, where our select data analysts, funded jointly, act as liaisons who are solely dedicated to the data and assessment needs of those college partners. In our partnership, OBIA has created a central hub that serves as a single location for all of these custom reports where leaders can access all of the analyses that are custom to their area and students. Lastly, OBIA has built a set of comprehensive interactive dashboards for deans, containing metrics relevant to the university's strategic goals and pillars, custom to each college and department.
Student Achievement 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.

Assessment of program-level learning through student learning artifacts is the purview of faculty and the responsibility for such resides in individual programs. Creating an assessment plan and writing interim assessment reports in the third and fifth years of a seven-year program review cycle provide the opportunity for departmental faculty to collect, analyze, and report out indicators of student achievement. The university’s Policy 6-001: III.A.2.b.ii.c.2.a makes clear the expectations related to the assessment of program-level learning outcomes.

The Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment (LAOA) in the Office of Undergraduate Studies (US) consults with departments to help them accomplish the writing of assessment plans and the completion of the third- and fifth-year interim assessment reports and the assessment section (Section 5) of the seven-year program review. LAOA collects and publishes assessment plans and many assessment reports on their website, creating a transparent process that other faculty on campus can consult and learn from as they engage in their own assessment. Figure 12 shows a sample assessment report, highlighting the College of Social and Behavioral Science assessment plans and reports.
### College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (click department name for assessment plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>7-Year LOA (2017-18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-year LOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3-year LOA</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-year LOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Studies</td>
<td>3-year LOA</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-year LOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Supplemental Year 1 Report (2017-18)</td>
<td>3 yr. LOA</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th Year LOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>3-year LOA</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-year LOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>7-Year LOA (2017-18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-year LOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>7-Year LOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-year LOA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences undergraduate learning outcomes assessment plans and reports: 2018-22

As mentioned earlier, LAOA also runs a workshop series every semester in which representatives from four departments present their assessment plans or reports so other faculty can learn directly from others how they are doing this work. LAOA lists these presentations on their web page (see the Workshop Series image below).

LAOA has also created a [Learning Outcomes Assessment Workshop Canvas course](#) (see Current Assessment Workshops image) that allows visitors to view the presentations given at these workshops over the past five years, making this work transparent to the university community.
In its consultation with departments on assessing their program outcomes, LAOA stresses that one of the important outcomes of the assessment process is using results to identify where they can improve their programming in order to help students be more successful. All three of the example reports that are included in the Appendix—Writing Program, Department of Mathematics, and Department of Communication—are demonstrations of how assessment is being used to improve programming so that students have an increased likelihood of accomplishing the program’s outcomes. A separate document titled “Recommended Changes from Example Assessment Reports” is included in the Appendix to bring attention to those assessment recommendations.

At the program level, one example of the impact of LAOA’s analytical impact in shaping data-informed student success interventions can be observed in the recent transition of the Student Success Advocates program to the Student Success Coaches initiative. For almost a decade, the Office of Undergraduate Studies offered professional one-on-one student intervention services in the form of Student Success Advocates (SSA). The advocates were charged with engaging students toward increasing their connection to campus, aiding in goal setting, and learning about the students’ needs so they could provide a tailored support experience. Students who met with the SSA reported positive interactions and that there were a group of people who helped them feel heard and supported on campus. Though these connections, shown through qualitative data, indicated that students found value from the service, other outcomes, such as participant graduation rate, were not as strong.
A thorough program review and analysis of SSA data led by LAOA and assisted by OBIA revealed that there was a lack of evidence of a relationship between time spent with advocates and increases in retention and completion rates for students. It was decided that a change in direction and purpose were needed. The SSA position was replaced with the Student Success Coach position—with new job description, code, and program mission. Though similar in name, coaching emphasizes academic skills support, growing metacognitive skills, and helping students create positive habits that will help them excel in and outside the classroom. Additionally, the new coaches will undergo training, certification, and ongoing support through InsideTrack of Strada Education Network to establish a unified coaching framework and methodology. These program enhancements, along with aligning student learning outcomes with those of the Office of Undergraduate Education and the University of Utah’s emergent E³ Framework, will intentionally affect student retention and persistence while collapsing opportunity and information gaps one student at a time.

**Student Success for Every Student**

The Office of Undergraduate Studies has been examining opportunity/equity gaps in curriculum and student success programming over the last several years. This started with an examination of equity gaps in our General Education courses in the fall of 2020. This analysis was made public in a statewide conference that is held every year in which issues related to General Education are discussed among faculty from all of the Utah Board of Higher Education (UBHE) institutions. The theme of that 2020 conference was equity gaps. This analysis revealed meaningful and potentially significant equity gaps in our large General Education courses needing to be addressed. This was communicated to the relevant departments for awareness and action.

This analysis led to an ongoing, increased attention to equity gaps in participation and achievement in all of our programming. For example, the next related effort was an examination of the university’s most challenging classes in the 2019-2020-2021 calendar years. An analysis was done to identify the 15 courses with the highest rates of students receiving a D or E grade, withdrawing, or receiving an incomplete (DEWI courses).

With the arrival of a new SAVPAA and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, a renewed approach to these educational and opportunity gaps across undergraduate courses is shaping our student-driven, data-informed work. To detect and address educational equity gaps through proactive approaches to student and faculty success, Undergraduate Studies built a specific equity dashboard that allows users to view the percentage of students receiving a DEWI score across a variety of demographic variables including race, ethnicity, gender, Pell eligibility, first-generation student status, rurality, and veteran status. On this dashboard users can select students from certain demographic categories (or combinations of categories) and view the courses that are the most challenging to that population.
Figure 13.1: Snapshot of demographic variables dashboard for Pell-eligible women

Figure 13.2: Snapshot of courses with highest DEWI percentage, shown in red, for Pell-eligible women

Figure 15 shows the selection of first-generation males with the courses with the highest rates of D, E, W, and I. Users can further filter the list to indicate what department is offering the course, what term it is offered, what modality the course is taught in (online, in person), whether the course is in the General Education program, contains a
community-engaged learning component, and more. Using these tools, we can now pinpoint exactly what courses are challenging to specific populations and work with the departments to develop strategies to address these gaps.

At present, we know that statistically significant opportunity gaps persist within various STEM (though not only STEM) introductory courses. Working with various academic departments through the course of fall 2022, a set of student and faculty interventions will launch in spring 2023 to confront these gaps through evidence and research-based approaches. As of summer 2022, these dashboards were completed and will soon be available to appropriate audiences so educational equity gaps within specific courses and programs of study can be addressed. These analyses will also be used in concert with the Center for Teaching Excellence, the units of US’ Student Success and Transformative Experiences, and other campus units to understand the complexities of opportunity/equity gaps and to implement solutions sets of interventions organized within the E^3 framework.
Figure 14: DEWI student profile for selecting demographics and academic characteristics
Learning Communities have been shown to be excellent tools for supporting students to persist and graduate. From 2018 to the present, the Office of Undergraduate Studies has organized a group of directors of Learning Communities from around campus into a Learning Community Consortium to discuss and share best practices with each other. That group also requested that a dashboard be built to better understand the differential experiences of various populations of students within learning communities. US continues to update that dashboard every year to show the participation, retention, and
completion rates of students in all of the university’s learning communities by gender, race, ethnicity, Pell eligibility, first-generation status, and rurality.

We are using this information to guide the management of existing programs and the development of future ones. For example, a recent analysis of this data revealed that we do not have a learning community experience that primarily serves, historically underrepresented male, first-generation students who are eligible for a Pell grant. As we define the upcoming “Utah Experience” requirement, we will use this and similar information to explore the development of such a program to serve this population. In addition, this data is helping us design faculty development efforts through the Martha Bradley Evans Center for Teaching Excellence.

Beyond assessing academic programs, the University of Utah participates in and administers the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which is a standardized, national survey that includes questions about student engagement inside and outside of the classroom.

A portion of the NSSE survey questions focus on students’ perceived belonging, sense of community, and value at the institution, which can be used to explore a sense of belonging. The NSSE asks students to respond to the following statements: “I feel comfortable being myself at this institution,” “I feel valued by this institution,” and “I feel like part of the community at this institution.”

About 90 percent of first-year and senior student respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they feel comfortable being themselves at the University of Utah, and 70 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they felt like part of the community and felt valued by the institution. However, approximately 10 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that they felt comfortable being themselves at the U, and about 30 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that they felt like part of the community at the institution or felt valued by the institution.

The University of Utah will continue to utilize this data and more to inform programming and outreach designed to improve all students’ experiences. These three questions were added in 2020, so the current data will serve as a useful benchmark to compare results from future iterations of the survey.

_Data in Figure 16 comes from 2020 and 2022 NSSE data, which surveys first-year and senior students at the University of Utah._
Student Affairs has deployed the Balanced Scorecard model to develop a strategic plan to guide its units into the future. This approach emphasizes four components that work
together to achieve the mission of supporting student well-being and success, which includes personal growth and fulfillment. These elements include organizational capacity, internal processes, finances, and students. To evaluate the effectiveness of the initiatives and objectives developed through this process, Student Affairs is currently developing a set outcomes and evaluation protocol.
Conclusion

The university’s Strategy 2025 framework provides a comprehensive structure for continuous improvement and ongoing fulfillment of the university’s mission. Strategy 2025’s use of demographic trends and projections allows the university to center its mission and goals in the continually evolving national and Intermountain West environment. Strategy 2025 provides a set of concrete themes, strategies, and measurable outcomes (benchmarks) that have now been embedded into our yearly and long-term strategic planning and resource allocations. This process has positioned the University of Utah to respond effectively to the growing Utah population over the next several decades, and expand the resources, infrastructure, and communities necessary to support the future needs of higher education in the state and beyond.

Through the President’s Dashboard and the Strategy 2025 report, the university has identified multiple metrics and benchmarks that are clearly linked to the level of performance of each of the university’s goals to promote student success, develop and transfer knowledge, engage communities to improve health and quality of life, and ensure the long-term vitality of the institution. The university is making steady progress towards the Strategy 2025 goal of enrolling 40,000 students, and has already exceeded several Strategy 2025 and peer institution benchmarks for first-year student retention, research awards, and number of graduate degrees. The university dashboards and metrics also indicate that there is still work to be done. For example, our six-year graduation rate (67-70 percent) significantly lags our Pac-12 public peer group (74 percent) and is significantly below the Strategy 2025 benchmark (80 percent).

Disaggregation of these benchmarks reveals relatively strong success of Asian, international, and multi-racial student populations, whereas BIPOC student success indicators are somewhat lagging compared relative to our peer institutions. The university is in the process of expanding resources and adopting a more intensive student-driven, data-informed set of approaches to address these challenges.

A few examples of these approaches include a more comprehensive student communications infrastructure following the recommendations of a cross campus collaboration of a Communications Insights Governance Committee. From our institutional data as well as educational research, we know students struggle with connection, persistence, and completion, often due to lack of timely, relevant information, which we are addressing through procurement and stand-up pilot stages. A second example of these new approaches include a new partnership with InsideTrack of Strada Education Network. Therein, the training and certification of Student Success Coaches will emerge as a best practice in comprehensive student support to assist all students on their academic journeys. The successful strides of the last decade and the future innovation potential of the University of Utah will be acknowledged later in fall 2022 as the university accepts the invitation to join the University Innovation Alliance (UIA). Founded in 2014, the UIA is dedicated to improving the United States’ economic potential by helping more students from all socioeconomic and racial backgrounds graduate from one of the nation’s leading public research universities. UIA member institutions work together...
to develop, scale, and share innovative solutions that help students overcome academic, financial, and personal obstacles to success and earn a high-quality college degree from a major research university and have seen great success in this work. Founding UIA institutions have now produced over 97,000 additional degrees above baseline projections and are on track to double their 68,000-degree goal by 2025. Shared innovations across campuses like Georgia State University, Arizona State University, Ohio State University, and additional peer and aspirant institutions will inform the university’s future high-impact projects like Completion Grants, Predictive Analytics, Proactive Advising, College to Career, Chatbots, Doctoral Research Fellows, and more.

The University of Utah’s forthcoming UIA membership, led by the senior associate vice president for academic affairs and dean of Undergraduate Studies, will enhance our future innovations in closing opportunity gaps for all students — focusing on an inclusive approach to empowering students from all socioeconomic and racial backgrounds to complete their degree(s) in a timely manner.

Making progress towards the Strategy 2025 goals, including ensuring equal opportunities for success of all of our students, requires the use of transparent, integrated, data-driven processes for strategic planning and resource allocation in support of continuous improvement. During the past seven years, the U has developed and refined transparent, integrated, student-driven, data-informed processes for the development of strategic planning in support of the university mission and the allocation of university resources that are strongly linked to the evaluation of institutional effectiveness at departmental, college, and university levels. These evaluations have led to the creation of impactful new initiatives and major investments in Proactive Advising, Student Success Coaches, various Student Affairs, and EDI programs all framed by the E³ framework. Analysis of longitudinal student indicators has indicated the effectiveness of these approaches and identified multiple opportunities for advancement of the institutional mission.

For example, the LAOA dashboard has identified several equity gaps in the 15 courses with the highest rates of DEWI courses. Pivoting from the Student Success Advocate framework to the more intensive Student Success Coaches framework was also based upon LAOA assessment results. Additional examples of using Learning Outcomes Assessment data to update curriculum and improve student learning—including requirements for prerequisites in capstone courses, and improvements to the lower division writing requirement (WRTG 2010)—are included in the Appendices of this EIE self-study. The insights provided by LAOA assessments guiding the new iteration of the E³ framework will be used by departments to develop initiatives that holistically address opportunity and equity gaps.

The university’s access to resources necessary to catalyze the changes necessary for the realization of Strategy 2025 continues to strengthen. As described in the university’s 2021 Annual Financial Report (see Appendix), total net position increased 11.8 percent from 2020 and 45.6 percent over the past five years, due to steady growth in most of the operating and non-operating revenue categories. These increases indicate steady improvement in the U’s financial condition, reflecting the university’s prudent
management of its resources. This surplus has been reinvested within the university to add to the margin of educational excellence, upgrade the university’s facilities, and provide a sensible reserve for contingencies. Total assets increased 10.3 percent from 2020 primarily due to increases in cash; strongly performing investments; and capital assets, such as the addition of new buildings and construction that is in progress. Consequently, the university’s financial position continues to strengthen, allowing it to make increased investments in faculty, staff, and facilities necessary to meet the challenges of Strategy 2025.

In summary, this Year Seven Evidence of Institutional Effectiveness Self Study demonstrates that the University of Utah is demonstrating continuous improvement and ongoing fulfillment of the university’s mission. The university has established an effective set of metrics, policies, procedures, assessment, and strategic budgetary management to meet the vision and challenges outlined in Strategy 2025. This highly integrated system, under the stewardship of U faculty, staff, and administration, has provided an effective mechanism for the university’s rapid rise in national prominence, and the upward trajectory of the university’s mission. Through our collective efforts, we continue to advance access to the benefits of higher education to an increasingly diverse community, promote life-changing successes for all of our students, be at the forefront of innovation and scientific discovery, engage in the service of our communities, and ensure the long-term vitality of this university.
APPENDIX

YEAR SEVEN | STANDARD ONE

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EIE)
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

AUGUST 24, 2022
A. Policy Changes

The following policy changes have been implemented since September 1, 2018:

1. Policy 3-030: Travel Policy (2/12/2019)*
2. Policy 3-041: Accountability for Noncapital Equipment (2/12/2019)*
4. Policy 5-141: Performance Management-University Staff (Other than UUHC Staff) (4/9/2019)*
5. Policy 3-014: University Financial Record Retention (6/13/2019)*
6. Policy 5-211: University Independent Personnel Boards & Procedures for Complaints Under the Utah Protection of Public Employees Act (7/1/2019)*
7. Policy 4-050: University Software Policy (7/1/2019)*
8. Policy 4-003: World Wide Web Resources Policy (7/1/2019)*
10. Policy 3-019: University of Utah Internal Audit Policy (4/14/2020)*.
12. Policy 6-303: Reviews of Tenure-Line Faculty Members (RPT Criteria, Standards, and Procedures) (7/1/2020)*.
15. Interim Policy 1-006 Conflict of Interest (2/25/2021)*.
17. Policy 7-020: Determining Authorship in Scholarly or Scientific Publications (4/13/2021)*.
18. 6-001 and Related Rules: Academic Units and Academic Governance- Roles of Faculties, Committees, Councils, and Academic Senate (7/1/2021)*.
19. Policy 6-315 Faculty Parental Leave (7/1/2021)*.
20. Interim Policy 6-407: University General Student Fees, and the University General Student Fees Advisory Board (7/1/2021)*.
21. Policy 4-010 University Individual Email Policy (8/10/2021)*.
22. Policy 6-407: University General Student Fees, and the University General Student Fees Advisory Board (10/12/2021)*.
24. Procedure P3-100D: Gift Card Purchases and Requirements (1/17/2022)*.
25. Board of Trustees Approval of Faculty and Administrative Appointments (2/18/2022)*.
27. Policy 6-300: University Faculty -- Categories and Ranks (3/11/2022)*.
29. **Rule R4-050B: University Software** (4/11/2022)*.
30. **Policy 6-400: Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities ("Student Code")** (4/13/2022)*.
31. **Policy 3-100 University Procurement and Revisions to Related Regulations** (4/13/2022)*.
32. **Policy 1-006 Individual Financial Conflict of Interest Policy and Related Regulations** (4/18/2022)*
33. **Policy 7-001 Policy for Research Misconduct and Related Changes to Policy 6-011 Functions and Procedures of the Senate Consolidated Hearing Committee and Policy 6-316 Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.** (4/18/2022)*
34. **Interim Rule 6-404C: Undergraduate Admissions - SAT or ACT Scores** (5/6/2022)*
35. **Policy 5-108: Transfer of Benefits Eligible Staff Members (Non-UUHC)** (6/16/2022)*
36. **Policy 6-409: Graduate Student Parental Leave and Rule R6-309A: Post Doctoral Fellows Parental Leave** (6/16/2022)*

*Details regarding changes to university regulations can be found under individual policy numbers at [http://regulations.utah.edu/](http://regulations.utah.edu/). The most recent changes to University Policy can be found at [https://regulations.utah.edu/regulation-update/index.php](https://regulations.utah.edu/regulation-update/index.php)*
B. Examples of Recommended Changes Made in Three Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports - Office of Learning Analytics and Outcomes Assessment

1. Department of Communication Fifth-year Learning Outcomes Assessment Report Excerpt

Recommended Changes
As mentioned, the Undergraduate Committee felt courses were meeting the selected ELOs but did recommend structural changes that will impact other ELOs assessed in future years. To address these concerns, the committee recommended four things.

- **Require substantive assignments to assess each ELO.** While one capstone course used a final paper to assess both ELOs, another class used a final project for one ELO and a short response – a paragraph in length – to assess another ELO. The committee found that paragraph-long responses lacked depth and resulted in a superficial review. As a result, the committee recommends that all assignments linked to outcomes be a minimum of 500 words in length.

- **Establish prerequisites for capstone courses.** Given the size and complexity of orchestrating course offerings for close to 1,000 students in four different emphases, the department has been judicious in not requiring too many prerequisites. The major concerns with having too many prerequisites are that they will hinder a student’s progress in the major and delay graduation. However, capstone courses are intended to be a culminating experience taken in a student’s last year and should provide an opportunity for reflection and synthesis as students complete significant papers and projects. In the review of artifacts from the 2019 capstone courses, it was clear that some papers and projects were written by students with a more advanced knowledge of the field and the relevant issues and theories. In a review of the composition of the students in the capstone courses reviewed, it was found that 30% of all students enrolled in capstone courses were juniors and 70% were seniors. In current capstone courses, non-senior students comprise 10%-38% of the course.

This gap in knowledge of the field can be challenging for instructors and will impact the future assessment of the ELO which expects students to demonstrate “upper-division knowledge of concepts and skills specific to the emphasis.” Ideally, the capstone course for each emphasis would have a prerequisite of a foundational, junior-level course. The committee was reticent to implement such a change as it would likely result in being a roadblock to graduation, especially in our current context of having a limited faculty. Already, the department struggles with a high student-to-faculty ratio which results in bottlenecks of certain course offerings that can delay graduation. To add a prerequisite, even if it would improve the learning experience for students, does not seem prudent at
As a result, the committee recommended a softer prerequisite for all capstone courses which would require that students complete a minimum of 60 credit hours, or the completion of a Communication/Writing (CW) requirement. The department’s advising team was consulted to determine if this prerequisite would be a significant roadblock for students’ progress to graduation and the advisors assessed that it would not be a major impediment.

- **Reduce bottlenecks in the Strategic Communication emphasis.** The Strategic Communication emphasis is the largest in the department with about 67% of all Communication majors pursuing this emphasis. Unfortunately, there are very few faculty whose expertise falls in this area which results in those few faculty teaching capstone courses every semester. However, even with this handful of faculty dedicating themselves to these courses, the department is still unable to meet student demands. To not impede a student’s progress to graduation, accommodations have been made where students are permitted to take capstone courses in other emphases that have an indirect focus on strategic communication. This lack of course offerings in Strategic Communication is amplified further if a faculty member in that area is on leave.

The hiring of a career-line faculty member in Strategic Communication has long been discussed and supported by the faculty but has yet to occur. The Undergraduate Committee recommends that hires be made in the Strategic Communication area so that the needs of our undergraduates can be better met.

- **Reduce course caps for capstone courses.** As mentioned, the Department already struggles with a high student-to-faculty ratio. While capstone courses within the Journalism emphasis enroll no more than 20 students, in all other emphases the capstone courses are capped at, and consistently enroll, 36 students. This large course size impacts the level of student attention demanded for a meaningful and substantive capstone experience. While the Undergraduate Committee recognizes that little can be done at the current moment to address these large courses sizes, they do encourage the department to be mindful of future hires and how to establish more equity amongst course sizes.

In addition to working with the Undergraduate Committee, the Director of Undergraduate Studies obtained feedback from faculty who taught capstone courses and from the Department’s academic advisors. Their feedback involved some of the issues already addressed by the committee, but they also had additional recommendations:

- Reduce course caps so the focus can be on meaningful projects that provide students with in-depth mentorship.
- Require prerequisite to ensure all students have the skills to be successful when approaching a complex project or issue. Faculty recommended junior-level emphasis requirements of specific courses like COMM 4590 for Strategic Communication, COMM
3710 for Communicating Science, Health, and Environment, COMM 3555 for Journalism, and COMM 3030 for Communication Studies.

- Require an exit survey for graduating seniors that can be assessed by the advisors and the Undergraduate Committee. Since students are no longer required to meet with advisors to file for graduation, the Department lacks a means to conduct an exit interview as they did in the past. Requiring a survey would help bridge this gap.
- Provide a resource guide for faculty on the Department’s Canvas page regarding capstone expectations, ELOs, rubrics for assessing ELOs, a link/template for an exit survey, and a guide for how to navigate the Associator on Canvas.

2. Lower Division Writing Requirement Third-Year Learning Outcomes Assessment Report Excerpt

3.3 Revisions [to current assessment] Based on Previous Assessment
Two features of assessment that changed based on this previous assessment are 1) the rating scale was changed to a 5-point scale, leading to more nuanced scoring, and 2) the outcomes were revised to highlight the components of writing that are highly valued in the field and the department and folding in Textual Cohesion and Style & Mechanics across the outcomes, but especially in positioning them in Rhetorical Dexterity and Critical Literacy. We did this because embedding them into more high-level concepts is in line with both the field of writing studies, the values of the WRS, and the ways that students use these features of writing in their actual writing process.

[End of Report Implications]

6.0 Implications for Curriculum
Based on the presentation of data in this report, there are five implications for the curriculum in WRTG 1010:
1. Reduce DEWI numbers through curriculum and policy evaluation and revision.
2. Create standard policy frameworks for late work and attendance, especially.
3. Create outcomes for WRTG 1010 to bring divergent curricula together.
4. Research into international student satisfaction with and performance in WRTG 1010.
5. Based on the foregoing research and revision plans, revise the current standard curriculum, with an eye to reducing DEWI numbers.

The DEWI numbers in WRTG 1010 are abysmal, except for a few moments of reprieve they have been poor for quite some time. I believe it is time to investigate why. It is time to study and evaluate policies, and to create policy changes and standards that will positively impact and support students who are not doing well in WRTG 1010. More flexibility needs to be built into WRTG 1010 to support students in complex situations. In order to create accountable flexibility, we need to a) find out what issues and concerns are impacting students at risk of failing, and b) assess the policies instructors use to determine whether they support or undermine at-risk students. Finally, the current WRTG 1010 curriculum needs to be overhauled in order to better
meet the needs and concerns of WRTG 1010 students. Of note is the fact that this course meets the needs of women, students of color, international students, and to a slightly lesser extent, first-generation students equitably, with little grade disparity when proportional enrollments are taken into account.

Based on the presentation of data above, there are seven implications for the program and curriculum in WRTG 2010:
1. Sources and source use need curricular support in order to see outcomes improvement in the next assessment cycle.
2. Synthesis needs more support and resources to improve this outcome upon further assessment.
3. Research into low-achieving criteria in the Critical Literacy outcome is needed.
4. Explicit instruction in academic (and non-academic) genres is needed.
5. Research into grade distribution for students of color, international students, and first-generation students
6. International student success and satisfaction need to be researched.
7. Research the policy and curriculum changes that can positively impact the DEWI.

The foremost points raised by this report have to do with source use and synthesis. For the last six years, these numbers have remained flat, and frankly, too low. Both of these components of academic writing are essential in the university. Improving these assessment outcomes will impact student success across the curriculum. They will also impact flexible knowledge about academic genres. Curricular changes must address critical thinking about difficult and complex topics. These changes must be research and data driven. Improvement in this area will feed into increased facility with synthesis & sources use, and vice versa. Approaches to international student education must also be research and data driven. The experiences of international students will lead to improved learning and satisfaction with the course. Finally, though the DEWI numbers are lower than those in WRTG 1010, the figures in WRTG 2010 are still too high. We must assess the grading policies and late work policies for WRTG 2010 as is suggested for WRTG 1010, in order to create a flexible standard that will support student success.

7.0 Recommendations and Resource Request
7.1 Recommendations
Based on the foregoing analysis, this report makes the following recommendations:
1. Create a study that will assess student needs in WRTG 1010 and the related necessary supports for student success in the class.
2. Create a study that collects and analyzes classroom policies for both WRTG 1010 and WRTG 2010.
3. Create a study that collects and analyzes international student success in and satisfaction with both WRTG 1010 and WRTG 2010.
5. Develop flexible standard policies for grading and late-work, especially. These would be developed out of the research described in 1, 2, and 3, and they would be created by the First-Year Writing Committee.
6. Create outcomes for WRTG 1010 in the First-Year Writing Committee.
7. Revise the WRTG 2010 curriculum to create deeper instruction in source use, synthesis, academic genres, and critical thinking.
8. Create a study to investigate grade distribution issues for students of color, first-generation students, and international students
9. Based on the pandemic context in which the outcomes were assessed, a re-assessment before three years is recommended.
10. A yearly account of the DEWI rates, especially in WRTG 1010, is highly recommended.

7.2 Resource Request
The recommended measures will require resources to complete. I recommend the following:
1. Research funds to complete the WRTG 1010 curriculum, policy, and students’ study recommended above.
2. Research funds to complete a study that analyzes the Critical Literacy outcome in more detail.
3. Research funds to complete interrogation of grade distribution inequities.
4. Research funds to study the experiences of international students in WRTG 1010 and WRTG 2010.
5. Faculty support for the proposed, large-scale study of syllabi, policies, and student climate, regarding WRTG 1010. This should include a course release for

3. Math Major Fifth Year Learning Outcomes Assessment Excerpt

Relevant Sections of Instructor Course-Based Assessment Report

Questions to be answered by Instructor:
1. Did this course cover each of the topics above in sufficient detail? If not, please elaborate.
2. Which topics from the essential material were tested on the students’ final exams or final projects? Please provide the final exam questions, or the final project assignment.
3. Which percentage of students from the linked majors for this course demonstrated reasonable knowledge of the material from this course on the final exam? How many students from linked majors were enrolled in the course?
4. Which topics from this course, if any, should we seek to improve our instruction of?

MATH 5610: For high-lights: 18 students from the linked major were enrolled, and 67% of them demonstrated reasonable knowledge of the material from this course on the final exam. It was felt that topics of optimization were not covered sufficiently in the course.

MATH 2280: Of the 29 students from a linked major, 26 demonstrated reasonable knowledge of the material from this course on the final exam. Wave and Laplace equations were not covered in one section.

MATH 5600: Final exam and list of topics covered for this course are on following pages.
Instructor reports 75% of the 20 students from the linked major demonstrated reasonable knowledge of the material from this course. The topics were felt to be covered adequately well.

MATH 5620: 3 of 6 students from linked major performed adequately. Of the topics to be covered in the class, “Adapting basic DE methods to particular applications” was not covered. The instructor reports that not having required programming experience of students makes it difficult to cover all intended topics. The class project is contained in following pages.
C. Response to student safety questions

Response to student tragedy:

The death of any student at the U is a tremendous loss. The University of Utah is committed to examining the circumstances of such tragedies and improving school policies and procedures to prevent their occurrence. A record on the updates and changes the U continues to make to improve student safety follows.

Background

On Feb. 11, 2022, a first-year student from China, Zhifan Dong, was allegedly killed by a fellow student in an off-campus hotel in Salt Lake City. The death was reported in the local news and in the U’s digital newsletter. The U immediately began investigating the situation, but was prevented from sharing further information with the community based on a request made by the Salt Lake County District Attorney’s office.

During the investigation, it was found that more than 25 actions on behalf of Dong and her partner, student Haoyu Wang, who has been charged with her murder, occurred over a 29-day period, including meetings, texts, filing missing person reports, video conferences with the students and their friends, contact with family members and other offers to help. However, it was also determined that the university had some shortcomings in its response, including faulty communication, a need for clarity in the training of housing workers, and a delay in notifying the campus police department (UUPD) and the Office of Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, and Title IX of indications of intimate partner violence.

In the spirit of transparency and a desire to refine its policies and response, the U released the findings of its internal investigation in July, after the student newspaper published an article and the Utah State Records Committee overruled the Salt Lake County District Attorney’s office.

Previous response

In October, 2018, the death of student Lauren McCluskey rocked the University of Utah and led to significant changes in its policies and procedures. The U remains committed to constant evaluation and improvement in order to create an environment that is as safe as possible for our campus community.

The following 29 recommendations have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented as a result of an independent review of the circumstances surrounding McCluskey’s death:
1. Established the university’s chief safety officer position overseeing all police, security, emergency management and public safety responsibilities. The university filled this position with one of the independent investigators of the university’s response to the Lauren McCluskey murder, whose critical findings contributed to recommendations for how the U should improve its safety and security services.

2. Developed a Department of Public Safety to connect all public safety resources and reduce the potential for siloed services.

3. Improved recruiting and selection of police officer candidates with a strong emphasis on acquiring the best possible personnel who want to serve our specific community. More than 90 percent of the police officers are new to the department since 2019.

4. Improved communication and engagement in the Behavioral Intervention Team and recently created a new Racial Bias Incident Response Team manager position.

5. Created a professional standards component in the department to ensure that all complaints against university police and public safety personnel are thoroughly investigated, with consistent documentation and appropriate personnel action taken when sustained.

6. Implemented a personnel management system called Guardian, which documents and tracks all comments (complaints as well as compliments) related to the performance of Department of Public Safety personnel.

7. Created an Independent Review Committee that reviews all complaint investigations and department corrective actions of university public safety personnel. This committee is composed of students, faculty and staff.

8. Created a Public Safety Advisory Committee that meets regularly with the chief safety officer and leadership team.

9. Adopted an intelligence-led public safety model and created a crime data analyst position to help identify trending activity for resource allocation.

10. Created a public-facing dashboard of crime to provide data for evaluating the public safety department’s effectiveness.

11. Developed a Department of Public Safety communications plan committed to transparency and sharing information that helps everyone contribute to a safe campus environment.

12. Created a victim-survivor advocate team that works directly with our police and public safety personnel to provide ongoing support and resources for those who have been harmed.

13. Invested in state-of-the-art public safety facilities and equipment.

14. Significantly increased training efforts, with specific emphasis on de-escalation, behavioral health crisis response and managing implicit bias. Adopted a victim-centered and trauma-informed approach to policing and ongoing training to personnel on dealing with interpersonal violence. Adopted the Lethality Assessment procedure recommended by the Utah Domestic Violence Coalition.

15. Conducted a recent safety survey of students and staff to establish baseline data and measure the impact of recent safety infrastructure changes.
16. Implemented a campus sexual assault and sexual harassment climate survey every two years so that university students have the opportunity to voice their experiences.

17. Adopted the 30 x 30 pledge to increase the number of female police officers to at least 30 percent by 2030. Currently, women comprise 10 percent of University Police Department personnel and 33 percent of the command staff.

18. Increased supervisor involvement with detectives and conduct monthly audits of all cases to ensure they are being effectively investigated.

19. Improved police communication with campus partners. This includes allowing select partners in OEO, HRE and ODOS access to our records management systems for cases that impact their areas of responsibility.

20. Greatly improved communication and coordination between university police and our security divisions.

21. Created dedicated officer positions that liaise with student-athletes.

22. Increased number of 911 emergency dispatchers and applied best practice protocols for sharing criminal justice information between adjacent public safety agencies.

23. In process of attaining CALEA and IACLEA accreditation.

24. Currently migrating to the same records management system used by Salt Lake City Police Department and all other Salt Lake County public safety agencies. This will increase opportunities to share crime and criminal justice information between agencies for the benefit of all communities.

25. Developed a University Public Safety Student Ambassador program.

26. Developed a working relationship between university presidential student interns and the university public safety leadership team.

27. Currently reviewing and updating all department policies and procedures to reflect nationally established best practices.

28. Currently developing a working relationship with Huntsman Mental Health Institute MH1 team so they may assist officers on emergency calls with individuals experiencing a behavioral health crisis. Additionally, MH1 personnel will guide training to help officers better understand the needs of individuals experiencing behavioral health challenges.

29. Currently building a police team dedicated to working with U of U Health Hospital’s security and staff. This specialized team will allow us to more effectively serve the unique needs of these health service providers.

Changing for the future

An internal investigation into the circumstances of Dong’s death revealed some weaknesses in the U’s response to concerns Dong shared with Housing and Residential Education (HRE) employees about Wang. University leaders reviewed trainings, procedures and processes and determined that while HRE staff repeatedly contacted the students and offered support, they missed key indicators and did not immediately report the concerns to UUPD and other campus offices.
To address this, updates were made to the emergency protocols manual, and several additional improvements have been, and continue to be, implemented. The university also took corrective action with the housing employees involved in the incident. In addition, the following eight procedural changes have been implemented, or are in the process of being implemented:

1. A new HRE executive director started in March 2022, and immediately hired a consultant to review the department’s emergency procedures manual. This consultant’s recommendations are being implemented in HRE’s employee trainings and emergency response for the current 2022-23 academic year.
2. Housing restructured its organization and created a new position to support conduct and support processes and reduce the hierarchy for reporting. Additionally, it increased compensation rates for certain positions to be more competitive and address staffing shortages.
3. Housing, in collaboration with the Office of the Dean of Students, is creating a new position that will provide additional support to review cases submitted to both offices.
4. The emergency procedures manual was updated to more clearly define how and what information should be documented for all incident reports. Supervisors will conduct spot checks throughout the year to verify that staff members are documenting thoroughly and consistently.
5. The case management system used in housing was updated during the Spring 2022 Semester to more effectively notify other university partners, specifically the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action and the Behavioral Intervention Team. Now, all housing employees and student leaders can indicate whether an incident should be shared with these partners, rather than just supervisory staff. When an employee clicks these buttons in the case management system, the relevant offices are now notified automatically and receive a copy of the report. Additionally, instructions regarding this process, including screenshots, are included in the updated emergency procedures manual.
6. The definitions and procedures associated with wellness and welfare checks was updated in the HRE emergency procedures manual before the end of the spring 2022 semester. In-person trainings now emphasize the differences between these two types of checks and walk participants through various scenarios to discuss how they should be handled.
   A. In summary, a wellness check occurs when someone expresses a concern or worry about a resident, and it requires housing staff to make every possible effort to locate the resident. If there is any element of a mental health concern or risk to self or others, it should be elevated to a welfare check.
   B. A welfare check occurs when there is a concern related to harm to self or others. This check always includes UUPD presence and efforts to locate the resident do not end until the resident is located.
7. The procedures related to a missing resident were expanded upon and clarified in the housing emergency procedures manual before the end of the Spring 2022 Semester.

8. The process for obtaining and documenting updated resident contact information has been updated, and new, proactive efforts are in place to obtain the most accurate and up-to-date information possible. Housing officials receive student contact information from what is self-reported during the university and housing application process. If a student shares with a housing employee that their contact information has changed, housing staff are now trained in how to update this information in the database used to manage housing operations. Additionally, incoming residents are asked to verify their personal details when reserving their rooms, and staff will ask students to verify their contact information again during the move-in process.

Conclusion

The University of Utah is continuing to work toward a campus that cultivates safety for each of its students. In 2019, the Racist and Bias Incident Response Team was created to develop a coordinated approach to responding to racist and bias incidents on campus. The McCluskey Center for Violence Prevention at the U offers important resources and educational outreach in the effort to eliminate the relationship and sexual violence that is endemic in and beyond American society. Student Affairs offers multiple resources for mental and physical health, including the Sexual Assault Awareness & Response Support system offered through the Office of the Dean of Students.

The knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the death of Zhifan Dong continue to evolve as investigations by university and local law enforcement are ongoing. The university will provide periodic updates to NWCCU regarding any significant findings. As part of the October 2022 NWCCU peer visit to the University of Utah campus, a specific meeting will be scheduled to provide updates to the investigation, discuss the university's response and actions in response to the ongoing investigation, and answer open questions by the peer reviewers.

We pledge to continually seek for ways to improve and follow recommendations to create a campus on which every student feels safe.
D. Financial Report
E. Exceptional Educational Experience