O UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

April 15, 2010

Dr. Sandra Elman, President
NW Commission on Colleges and Universities
8060 165th Avenue NE Ste 100
Redmond WA 98052-3981

Dear Dr. Elman,

Attached is our progress report on two recommendations that stemmed from our decennial accreditation review in 2007. This brief report builds on the report and appendix we submitted on April 27, 2009 in preparation for the focused interim visit.

This current report conveys the significant progress the University of Oregon is making, particularly in the area of learning outcomes assessment. We have excellent leadership in such assessment from Dr. Kenneth Doxsee, Associate Vice Provost, and we are effectively integrating assessment plans and activities across our curriculum. Further, we are addressing the recommendations on library resources in a productive manner with strong leadership.

We look forward to your commentary on our activities. If you have questions about any part of this report, please direct them to my colleague, Dr. David Hubin, Senior Assistant to the President and Accreditation Liaison Officer for the University of Oregon.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Lariviere
President

cc: James Bean, Senior VP and Provost
        Russell Tomlin, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
        Kenneth Doxsee, Associate Vice Provost
        David Hubin, Senior Assistant to the President
        Deborah Carver, Philip H Knight Dean of Library

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Progress Report
on Two Recommendations from
2007 Decennial Review

April 16, 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction

Following its decennial review by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, the University of Oregon received seven recommendations from the Commission; these included a statement that the University was not in compliance with Commission Policy 2.2 on Educational Assessment. In the Spring of 2009, the University submitted an interim report and hosted a focused interim visit. The Commission accepted the report and indicated that the University was now in compliance with all policies and that no further reporting was necessary on five of the recommendations. The Commission required, however, a follow-up report on our institution's progress on Educations Assessment and on steps to address the sufficiency of library collections. This report conveys that the institution's work in these two areas has been focused, purposeful and productive.

Progress on Recommendation One since April 27, 2009 Report

Recommendation One: "The Committee recommends that the University of Oregon develop and implement an assessment plan in accordance with Policy 2.2 Educational Assessment as quickly as possible."

Update on Assessment Activities

Assessment within the Major

Building from our comprehensive set of current assessment practices, presented on our assessment website (http://assessment.uoregon.edu/node/67), and guided by the assessment plans prepared by our six model departments (Art, Music and Dance, Journalism and Communication, and three College of Arts and Sciences departments – English, Mathematics, and History), we have now received draft assessment plans from the vast majority of the degree-granting academic units within the CAS. Each of these assessment plans, currently under review by the Office of Academic Affairs, are being cross-read by a second department within the same subgroup within the CAS (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences) and by a department in a different subgroup, using a rubric currently being generated for the evaluation of assessment plans. This cross-reading is expected to have multiple impacts:

- Enhancement of assessment plan quality through critical review and evaluation by other academic units;
- Enhancement of faculty engagement in the effort, helping to ensure that the assessment effort is not seen as an administrative burden imposed from above, but rather an ongoing effort "in the trenches" for academic improvement;
- Effective "cross-fertilization," with departments and faculty guided, motivated, and/or inspired by the assessment efforts and approaches of their peers;
- Effective demonstration of the utility of rubrics in the evaluation of work products, reducing distrust of the concept of rubrics arising from lack of information about and experience with them.

A workshop on learning outcomes and assessment was presented to over 50 department heads and administrators. (This was an extraordinarily high attendance level for an Academic Affairs workshop, with even our "how to prepare for the promotion and tenure process" workshops attracting significantly fewer participants.) The workshop presentation is available on-line through our assessment website (http://assessment.uoregon.edu/node/70). Covering the essential elements of the theory and practice of development of learning outcomes statements and means of assessment, the core theme of this workshop was that assessment is of great value to us as faculty and as an institution and not something to be cynically viewed as an administratively-imposed

burden. The message seemed very well received, and our faculty appear to be actively engaged in the on-going process.

Interest in the on-going efforts of our electronic portfolio group continues to expand, with various academic units recognizing the potential value of portfolios as key components of their assessment efforts. In collaboration with our Office of Information Services, the School of Architecture and Allied Arts is actively developing a pilot e-portfolio project, for which we expect to hire a research and instructional technology specialist. In order to enhance the impact of this pilot project and accelerate adoption of e-portfolio strategies throughout the University, discussions have been initiated with the Department of Chemistry, selected given their relatively weak focus on assessment vehicles in their current draft assessment plan.

General Education Assessment

We have made significant progress on both the local and Statewide levels with regards to the assessment of general education outcomes.

Responsive to Oregon State Bill 342, which calls for greater portability of credit among Oregon institutions of higher education, a set of learning outcomes has been identified and agreed to on a statewide level, by each institution of higher education in the State of Oregon. This report, provided as an appendix to this document, comprehensively and concretely identifies learning outcomes for general education serves as a key vehicle in our assessment efforts.

The statewide learning outcomes and assessment (LO&A) working group has finalized its draft report to the State Board of Higher Education, scheduled for presentation to the Provosts' Council at their April meeting. This report, presenting a comprehensive platform for the assessment of learning outcomes and the reporting of assessment data, will serve as the implementation "roadmap" by which the outcomes identified in the above effort will be assessed. (See attachment to this progress report.)

The University of Oregon has finalized its membership in the Student Experience at the Research University (SERU) consortium and begins administration of this survey on April 19, 2010. Aiming at a response rate of 50% or greater, we anticipate that this survey will be much more useful than the NSSE (currently administered every three years, but, as is the norm for this survey, it will be administered to a much smaller student sample, limiting the ability to "drill down" to individual unit levels in any meaningful way).

The University of Oregon's Assessment Council has developed an action plan for the assessment of general education learning outcomes, focusing on comprehensive and creative analysis of student writing as evaluated through rubrics designed to assess multiple learning outcomes. This effort is greatly facilitated by the development of electronic portfolios, for which our pilot projects discussed above play a key role. As appropriate, this effort will be expanded to include critical evaluation of learning outcomes in mathematics and second languages.

Progress on Recommendation Seven since April 27, 2009 Report

Recommendation 7:

Midterm Report for the NWCCU Accreditation

> Despite the extensive use of interlibrary loan, Standard 5 requires a core collection adequate in quality, depth, diversity and currency to support graduate curricula and research in a number of programs. The Committee recommends that the University take steps to address the sufficiency of core library holdings needed to support the institution's instructional and research missions (Standard 5.A.1; 5.A.2).

Since the commission's response was issued, the university has provided several one-time allocations to the library specifically for collections. The last allocation was made earlier this fiscal year for an amount of $250,000. The total of $750,000 in one-time allocations has been made over the last three years. These cash infusions have allowed us to adjust the timing of the serials cancellation project and restore a portion of funding to the monograph lines. Nevertheless, due to the cumulative impact of inflation, the library had to move forward and cancel $770,904 in journal expenditures that took effect this fiscal year, along with a $73,012 cut in database licenses. The second phase of the cancellation project has been delayed, but in FY12 we will need to cancel another $67,000 in journal expenditures. The law library cancelled $150,000 in journal expenditures that took effect this fiscal year, and $200,000 that took effect last fiscal year. The pattern of cuts will continue as long as the current inflation rate on scholarly content is coupled with budget augments that are not indexed to inflation.

The Library (along with all the academic units) received a 2% permanent cut in FY10 due to the recession and a drop in state support. However, the cut was calculated on the beginning budget *excluding collections*. Compared to other public academic libraries across the country, the UO Libraries has fared reasonable well through these difficult economic times.

We continue to look for the most cost-effective purchasing plans, including multiple institutional licenses. For example, we have worked collaboratively with Oregon State University and Portland State University on acquiring Elsevier titles. The negotiated deal enabled all three schools to meet their budget targets and provide subscribed or shared access to hundreds of titles worth millions of dollars while simultaneously shedding titles with little use. The end result is that users at the UO, OSU and PSU should notice little or no adverse impact when consulting titles from this major publisher. In addition to this regional deal, we continue to make collaborative purchases through the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA). For FY09, we realized a 69% discount on products purchased through the GWLA.

Attachment

Learning Outcomes Relating to Recommendation One

(Report of Statewide Learning Outcomes and Assessment Working Group)

Outcomes and Criteria for
Transferable General Education Courses in Oregon

Background

This work was inspired by the need to identify the fundamental principles that shape General Education in colleges and universities throughout Oregon. The intent was to use the principles in two ways: (1) to create a rational basis for determining the equivalency of courses intended to transfer; and (2) to enhance General Education throughout Oregon by encouraging direct dialog among faculty in each of the disciplines within this rich curriculum. We recognized that these goals were ambitious, but we were optimistic because of the collegial attention that had already been given to General Education in Oregon. Creation of the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) degree in the late 1980's was possible because of our shared vision of the key disciplinary elements of General Education, and in 2005, the same spirit generated the Oregon Transfer Module (OTM). Our common understanding of the importance and overall purpose of General Education was articulated by the OUS Provosts' Council, and endorsed by the Community Colleges' Council of Instructional Administrators, in Fall 2004.

The Purpose of General Education

The education of undergraduate students is an essential activity of all Oregon colleges and universities. While undergraduate education needs to provide discipline-specific knowledge and skills through concentrated work in an academic major, it must also help students develop the habits of mind that lead to thoughtful and productive global citizenship. All parts of a well-designed education encourage these habits, but an effective General Education curriculum has this as its explicit goal. To this end, it seeks to promote:

- *The capacity for analytical thinking and problem solving;*
- *The ability to communicate effectively, including listening, observing, speaking, and writing;*
- *An understanding of the natural world and the role of humans in it;*
- *An appreciation of the arts and humanities and the richness of human experience and expression;*
- *An awareness of multiple perspectives and the importance of diversity;*
- *A sense of societal responsibility, community service, and global citizenship; and*
- *The ability to develop a sense of direction, with the self-discipline needed for the ethical pursuit of a purposeful life.*

4

What was the problem?

Although colleges and universities in Oregon embrace the value of General Education, most have developed their own unique philosophies and curricula that support these ideals. These varied curricula are a valuable resource for Oregon students, but the underlying mechanics are complicated sets of course and credit specifications. Emphasis on these details can reduce this coursework to a mere check-list of requirements and fail to communicate the opportunities for delight and discovery it offers. Moreover, when students transfer, General Education credits may be "lost" because of incompatibilities among variant curricula – leading to understandable frustration in the face of seemingly arbitrary decisions.

What did we do about it?

As educators, we knew we had the responsibility for improving matters. While General Education curricula depend on course and credit requirements to shape the intellectual experiences we desire for students, we know that a variety of structures can promote the qualities we're after. Thinking through the genetic underpinnings of cancer promotes analytical thinking, but so does dissecting the religious and cultural influences in 7th century Spain.

The Joint Boards Articulation Commission (JBAC) believed that what was needed was a collaboratively-developed framework within which to consider specific General Education courses. The framework would consist of two elements: (1) the broad outcomes we desire for students who take these courses and (2) the criteria for courses likely to achieve those outcomes. In addition to smoothing transfer, such a model had the potential to strengthen General Education in fundamental ways. By adhering to general principles rather than a rigid template, faculty would have the freedom to design General Education courses that exploit individual expertise and new insights. Students would benefit from faculty innovation in the classroom, while retaining assurance of the transferability of their coursework. Beginning in February 2006, JBAC led the effort to create this framework, through the steps outlined below.

What results do we anticipate?

Short-term: A clear statement of the intended learning outcomes of a General Education curriculum, regardless of its particular design, will help all of us communicate the key role of General Education – to students, parents, and Oregon citizens. The definition of criteria for effective General Education courses will be immediately helpful to faculty as they improve existing General Education courses and design new ones.

Long-term: We hope that the criteria for effective General Education courses will form the basis of a new, faculty-led procedure for making thoughtful decisions about General Education coursework. At present, equivalency decisions can appear arbitrary because they are made according to local campus guidelines that are not widely known. In the new system, transferability will not depend on identity of course numbering or content, but on more general characteristics that can be shared by courses on diverse topics. Perhaps most

important, we hope that the new system will foster a culture of substantive curricular discussions among faculty from diverse institutions. The collegiality of such groups was demonstrated during the creation of these Outcomes and Criteria statements, and we think their combination of disciplinary expertise and direct classroom experience is powerful. They are in the best position to communicate the nature of college-level work in their areas, and to stimulate interest in high quality General Education for students throughout Oregon.

Timeline for Creating General Education Outcomes and Criteria

February and April 2006:	Statements drafted by disciplinary faculty groups
May – August 2006:	Informal comment on draft statements via the JBAC website
Fall 2006 – Fall 2007:	Discussion of draft statements on all community college and OUS campuses
	Campus leaders collaborated with JBAC members to organize these discussions and encourage participation by faculty in the disciplines.
Fall 2006 – Fall 2007:	Feedback from campus discussions collected by JBAC
	Feedback from most community colleges and OUS campuses was collected and organized by JBAC.
Fall 2007 – Fall 2008:	Feedback organized and revision process overseen by K. Sprague (on behalf of JBAC)
Winter 2008:	Feedback returned to Writing faculty committee for consideration
	Feedback on the writing statements was the first to be organized and distributed to the original faculty drafters, many of whom were members of OWEAC (Oregon Writing and English Advisory Committee). OWEAC took the lead in responding to feedback and providing the final version of the statements.
Winter 2009:	Feedback returned to other faculty committees (Speech, Mathematics, Arts & Letters, Social Science, Science/Computer Science) for consideration
Spring – Summer 2009:	Consensus on final versions of statements reached in each area
Fall 2009:	Review of final statements by JBAC, OUS Provosts, and CIA
Fall/Winter 2009:	Adoption of statements by the Joint Boards of Education and Higher Education
After Fall/Winter 2009 Adoption:	Application of outcomes and criteria

Arts & Letters

Outcomes

As a result of taking General Education Arts & Letters* courses, a student should be able to:

- Interpret and engage in the Arts & Letters, making use of the creative process to enrich the quality of life; and
- Critically analyze values and ethics within a range of human experience and expression to engage more fully in local and global issues.

"Arts & Letters" refers to works of art, whether written, crafted, designed, or performed, and documents of historical or cultural significance.

Criteria

A course in Arts & Letters should:

1) Introduce the fundamental ideas and practices of the discipline and allow students to apply them.
2) Elicit analytical and critical responses to historical and/or cultural works, such as literature, music, language, philosophy, religion, and the visual and performing arts.
3) Explore the conventions and techniques of significant forms of human expression.
4) Place the discipline in a historical and cultural context, and demonstrate its relationship with other discipline.
5) Each course should also do at least one of the following:
   - Foster creative individual expression *via* analysis, synthesis, and critical evaluation;
   - Compare/contrast attitudes and values of specific historical periods or world cultures; and
   - Examine the origins and influences of ethical or aesthetic traditions.

Cultural Literacy

Cultural Literacy outcomes will be included in courses that meet the outcomes and criteria of a Discipline Studies requirement.

Outcomes

As a result of taking a designated Cultural Literacy course, learners would be able to:

- Identify and analyze complex practices, values, and beliefs and the culturally and historically defined meanings of difference.

Criteria

A course with the Cultural Literacy designation will:

1) Explore how culturally-based assumptions influence perceptions, behaviors, and policies.
2) Examine the historical bases and evolution of diverse cultural ideas, behaviors, and issues.

Each course *may* also do one or more of the following:

- Critically examine the impact of cultural filters on social interaction so as to encourage sensitivity and empathy toward people with different values or beliefs.
- Investigate how discrimination arises from culturally defined meanings attributed to difference.
- Analyze how social institutions perpetuate systems of privilege and discrimination.
- Explore social constructs in terms of power relationships.

Mathematics

Outcomes

As a result of taking General Education Mathematics courses, a student should be able to:

- Use appropriate mathematics to solve problems; and
- Recognize which mathematical concepts are applicable to a scenario, apply appropriate mathematics and technology in its analysis, and then accurately interpret, validate, and communicate the results

Criteria

A collegiate level Mathematics course should require students to:

1) Use the tools of arithmetic and algebra to work with more complex mathematical concepts.
2) Design and follow a multi-step mathematical process through to a logical conclusion and judge the reasonableness of the results.
3) Create mathematical models, analyze these models, and, when appropriate, find and interpret solutions.
4) Compare a variety of mathematical tools, including technology, to determine an effective method of analysis.
5) Analyze and communicate both problems and solutions in ways that are useful to themselves and to others.
6) Use mathematical terminology, notation and symbolic processes appropriately and correctly.
7) Make mathematical connections to, and solve problems from, other disciplines.

Science or Computer Science

Outcomes

As a result of taking General Education Science or Computer Science courses, a student should be able to:

- Gather, comprehend, and communicate scientific and technical information in order to explore ideas, models and solutions and generate further questions;
- Apply scientific and technical modes of inquiry, individually, and collaboratively, to critically evaluate existing or alternative explanations, solve problems, and make evidence-based decisions in an ethical manner; and
- Assess the strengths and weaknesses of scientific studies and critically examine the influence of scientific and technical knowledge on human society and the environment.

Criteria

A General Education course in either Science or Computer Science should:

1) Analyze the development, scope, and limitations of fundamental scientific concepts, models, theories, and methods.
2) Engage students in problem-solving and investigation, through the application of scientific and mathematical methods and concepts, and by using evidence to create and test models and draw conclusions. The goal should be to develop analytical thinking that includes evaluation, synthesis, and creative insight.
3) Examine relationships with other subject areas, including the ethical application of science in human society, and the relevance of science to everyday life.

In addition,

A General Education course in Science should:

Engage students in collaborative, hands-on and/or real-life activities that develop scientific reasoning and the capacity to apply mathematics, and that allow students to experience the exhilaration of discovery;

<p style="text-align:center">and</p>

Engage students in the design of algorithms and computer programs that solve problems.

Social Science

Outcomes

As a result of taking General Education Social Science courses, a student should be able to:

- Apply analytical skills to social phenomena in order to understand human behavior; and

- Apply knowledge and experience to foster personal growth and better appreciate the diverse social world in which we live.

Criteria

An introductory course in the Social Sciences should be broad in scope. Courses may focus on specialized or interdisciplinary subjects, but there must be substantial course content locating the subject in the broader context of the discipline(s). Approved courses will help students to:

1) Understand the role of individuals and institutions within the context of society.
2) Assess different theories and concepts, and understand the distinctions between empirical and other methods of inquiry.
3) Utilize appropriate information literacy skills in written and oral communication.
4) Understand the diversity of human experience and thought, individually and collectively.
5) Apply knowledge and skills to contemporary problems and issues.

Speech/Oral Communication

Outcomes

As a result of taking General Education Speech/Oral Communication courses, a student should be able to:

- Engage in ethical communication processes that accomplish goals;
- Respond to the needs of diverse audiences and contexts; and
- Build and manage relationships.

Criteria

A course in Speech/Oral Communication should provide:

1) Instruction in fundamental communication theories.
2) Instruction and practice of appropriate oral communication techniques.
3) Instruction and practice in the listening process.
4) Instruction and practice in comprehension, interpretation, and critical evaluation of communication.
5) Instruction and practice in adapting verbal and non-verbal messages for the listener and communication contexts.
6) Instruction in the responsibilities of ethical communicators.
7) Instruction in the value and consequences of effective communication.

Writing

Outcomes

As a result of completing the General Education Writing sequence, a student should be able to:

- Read actively, think critically, and write purposefully and capably for academic and, in some cases, professional audiences;
- Locate, evaluate, and ethically utilize information to communicate effectively; and
- Demonstrate appropriate reasoning in response to complex issues.

Criteria

A course in Writing should:

1) Create a learning environment that fosters respectful and free exchange of ideas.
2) Include college-level readings that challenge students and require the analysis of complex ideas.
3) Provide guided discussion and model practices that help students listen to, reflect upon, and respond to others' ideas.
4) Foster students' ability to summarize and respond in writing to ideas generated by reading and discussion.
5) Require a substantial amount of formal and informal writing.
6) Emphasize writing as a recursive process of productive revision that results in complete, polished texts appropriate to audience needs and rhetorical situations.
7) Foreground the importance of focus, organization, and logical development of written work.
8) Guide students to reflect on their own writing, to provide feedback on peers' drafts, and to respond to peer and instructor comments.
9) Direct students to craft clear sentences and to recognize and apply the conventions of Edited Standard Written English.
10) Provide students with practice summarizing, paraphrasing, analyzing, synthesizing, and citing sources using a conventional documentation system.
11) Require appropriate technologies in the service of writing and learning.

Information Literacy outcomes and criteria will be embedded in the Writing Foundational Requirements courses.

Information Literacy

Information Literacy outcomes and criteria will be embedded in the Writing Foundational Requirements courses.

Outcomes

As a result of taking General Education Writing courses infused with Information Literacy, a student who successfully completes should be able to:

- Formulate a problem statement;
- Determine the nature and extent of the information needed to address the problem;
- Access relevant information effectively and efficiently;
- Evaluate information and its source critically; and
- Understand many of the economic, legal and social issues surrounding the use of information.

Criteria

A Writing course infused with Information Literacy should include:

1) Instruction and practice in identifying gaps in knowledge and recognizing when information is needed.
2) Instruction and practice in finding information efficiently and effectively, using appropriate research tools and search strategies.
3) Instruction and practice in evaluating and selecting information using appropriate criteria.
4) Instruction and practice in research strategies that are recursive and involve multiple stages such as modification of the original strategy and revision of the topic.
5) Instruction and practice in the ethical and legal use of information and information technologies.
6) Instruction and practice in creating, producing and communicating understanding of a subject through synthesis of relevant information.

Recommendation 7:

Midterm Report for the NWCCU Accreditation

March 30, 2010

The NWCC's full report stated the following:

> Despite the extensive use of interlibrary loan, Standard 5 requires a core collection adequate in quality, depth, diversity and currency to support graduate curricula and research in a number of programs. The Committee recommends that the University take steps to address the sufficiency of core library holdings needed to support the institution's instructional and research missions (Standard 5.A.1; 5.A.2).

Since the commission's response was issued, the university has provided several one-time allocations to the library specifically for collections. The last allocation was made earlier this fiscal year for an amount of $250,000. The total of $750,000 in one-time allocations has been made over the last three years. These cash infusions have allowed us to adjust the timing of the serials cancellation project and restore a portion of funding to the monograph lines. Nevertheless, due to the cumulative impact of inflation, the library had to move forward and cancel $770,904 in journal expenditures that took effect this fiscal year, along with a $73,012 cut in database licenses. The second phase of the cancellation project has been delayed, but in FY12 we will need to cancel another $67,000 in journal expenditures. The law library cancelled $150,000 in journal expenditures that took effect this fiscal year, and $200,000 that took effect last fiscal year. The pattern of cuts will continue as long as the current inflation rate on scholarly content is coupled with budget augments that are not indexed to inflation.

The Library (along with all the academic units) received a 2% permanent cut in FY10 due to the recession and a drop in state support. However, the cut was calculated on the beginning budget *excluding collections*. Compared to other public academic libraries across the country, the UO Libraries has fared reasonable well through these difficult economic times.

We continue to look for the most cost-effective purchasing plans, including multiple institutional licenses. For example, we have worked collaboratively with Oregon State University and Portland State University on acquiring Elsevier titles. The negotiated deal enabled all three schools to meet their budget targets and provide subscribed or shared access to hundreds of titles

worth millions of dollars while simultaneously shedding titles with little use. The end result is that users at the UO, OSU and PSU should notice little or no adverse impact when consulting titles from this major publisher. In addition to this regional deal, we continue to make collaborative purchases through the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA). For FY09, we realized a 69% discount on products purchased through the GWLA.

NORTHWEST COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

NWCCU

Fax *Transmittal Form*

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities
8060 165th Avenue N.E., Suite 100
Redmond, WA 98052-3935
Phone: (425) 558-4224
Fax: (425) 376-0596
www.nwccu.com

To:	Dr. David Hubin, U of OR	From:	Ruth
Fax:	541-346-3017	Date:	2/24/10
Phone:	541-346-3036	Pages:	5, including coversheet
Re:		CC:	

☐ Urgent   ☐ For Review   ☐ Please Comment and Reply

Message...

NORTHWEST COMMISSION ON
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
NWCCU

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

SEP 2 2 2009

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

8060 165th Avenue N.E., Suite 100
Redmond, WA 98052-3981
425 558 4224
Fax: 425 376 0596
www.nwccu.org

September 18, 2009

Dr. Richard W. Lariviere
President
University of Oregon
1226 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1226

Dear President Lariviere:

In our letter dated 7/31/09, (copy enclosed for your convenience) the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities requested that University of Oregon submit a written progress report in spring 2010. In a concise manner, the University should respond thoroughly and carefully to the matters described therein.

The Commission requests the University provide eight printed copies and one electronic copy of the report at your early convenience, but not later than Friday, April 16, 2010. The *Accreditation Handbook*, 2003 edition, should be used in preparing the progress report. **Guidelines for reproduction and submission of the report are enclosed.**

It will not be necessary for representatives of University of Oregon to be present when the Board of Commissioners considers this matter at its July 12-14, 2010, meeting. Following the meeting, we will write to inform you of the Board's action.

If you have questions or concerns, please contact Dr. Sandra Elman, NWCCU President.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. Baker
Executive Vice President

RLB:sle

Enclosures: Letter dated 7/31/09
               Guidelines for the Preparation of Progress Reports

cc: Dr. David R. Hubin, Senior Assistant to the President

Recommendations

1. Commission Policy 2.2 *Educational Assessment* requires that institutions develop and maintain an assessment plan that is responsive to their mission and needs. Apart from externally mandated programmatic assessment for some specialized programs, the University has not developed a plan or strategy systematically to assess student learning across the campus. However, the new provost and her managerial team are aware of this need and are committed to the implementation of systematic assessment on the Eugene campus and wherever the institution offers academic programming. The Committee recommends that the University of Oregon develop and implement an assessment plan in accordance with Policy 2.2 *Educational Assessment* as quickly as feasible.

2. The University of Oregon has taken several essential steps to generate alternative sources of revenue to help maintain its instructional and research quality at the AAU level, including increasing its external research support, attracting private funds, and increasing its proportion of out-of-state students. But it must identify its particular strengths and the ways it will continue to serve the state. The Committee recommends that the University of Oregon undertake an academic planning process to identify what research, instructional and state services areas it will be known for in the future and use that process to concentrate its capital and operating resource allocation decisions (Standard 1.B).

3. The University of Oregon prides itself on its status as an AAU institution. However, with the expectations for research, concern is expressed that the University may not have funds for needed laboratory and research space; therefore, the Committee recommends that the University take the necessary steps to ensure that facilities are planned and resources identified to support essential continued research growth (Standards 4.B.4; 8.A.2; 8.A.3; 8.A.6).

4. Standard 8.C *Physical Resources Planning* requires that the institution plan for and identify resources for remedying deferred maintenance. However, the evidence suggests that the level of deferred maintenance at the University of Oregon is high and that necessary building renovations are problematic given the unavailability of resources to address the needs of the physical plant. The Committee recommends that the University undertake a planning process that addresses the physical plant of the institution and that the process include constituencies from across campus to develop a building renewal agenda (Standard 8.C).

5. Commission criteria assume that there will be a commonly understood and uniformly employed set of institutional policies, rules, practices, and procedures that are employed at every level of administration. These policies should foster open communication and goal attainment. However, the Committee is concerned that the University of Oregon does not currently have these operational policies in place and that campus based decision-making procedures appear to be idiosyncratic and not uniformly applied. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the University of Oregon take steps to enhance internal communication and to review its operating policies in regard to Standard 6, *Governance and Administration;* Standard 4.A, *Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare and Development* and Standard 7.C, *Financial Management.*

6. Commission criteria state that faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the institution. Student enrollment at the institution is at a record high but the institution has not responded with any concomitant increase in instructional resources, particularly full-time, tenure track faculty. The faculty is concerned at the prospect of growing enrollments and greater use of non-tenure instructional faculty while some students report limited access to faculty as a hindrance to their education. The Committee recommends that the institution should more closely monitor faculty teaching obligations and provide greater instructional resources to facilitate student learning (Standard 4.A.3).

7. Despite the extensive use of interlibrary loan, Standard 5 requires a core collection adequate in quality, depth, diversity and currency to support graduate curricula and research in a number of programs. The Committee recommends that the University take steps to address the sufficiency of core library holdings needed to support the institution's instructional and research missions (Standard 5.A.1; 5.A.2).

8. Commission Policy A-2 *Substantive Change* mandates that major substantive change proposals be submitted to the Commission for review and approval prior to implementation. The Committee recommends that the University work closely with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities regarding its intention to expand off-campus academic offerings in Portland and elsewhere (Policy A-2).