Mid-Cycle Evaluation Peer Evaluation Report

University of Utah

Salt Lake City

October 29-30,

2018

A confidential report of findings prepared for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Table of Contents

Evaluators

Report prepared by:

Nancy Cornwell (Chair)	Professor, Montana State University
Sheila Bonnand	Research and Instruction Librarian (retired), Montana State University
Les Steele (NWCCU Off-Site Staff Liaison)	Senior Vice President, Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Introduction

The University of Utah ("the U") is a public research university founded in 1850 that today serves over 32,000 students at the graduate and undergraduate level with 134 undergraduate programs and 203 graduate programs. Professional programs include medicine, dentistry, nursing, law and business. It was mentioned several times during the site visit that the university has grown both in terms of enrollment and physical size and has been transformed more fundamentally because of its shift from a commuter school to a top-tier research university. Even today, the U remains in a period of enrollment growth and continued physical expansion, including the addition of more residential housing and growth of the campus.

During the mid-cycle visit, the team was asked to consider the U's progress on assessing mission fulfillment and its use of data for quality improvement, with particular attention paid to student learning outcomes. Additionally, the team was asked to assess progress on Recommendations Two and Three from the Year Seven Report:

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

> Recommendation Three:
> The evaluation committee recommends that the institution continue to fully implement a student learning assessment plan that identifies quality standards for all programs. Student learning outcomes assessment would include direct measures of student learning. Additionally, the evaluation committee recommends that the institution use the results of its assessment for continuous improvement (Standard 4.A.1, 4.A.3, 4.A.4, 4.A.5, 4.A.6, 4.B.1, and 4.B.2).

Assessment of Institution's Self-Evaluation Report & Support Materials

A Mid-Cycle Self Evaluation narrative provided an overview of the Institutional Assessment Plan and the committees involved in the assessment activities that institutionally explain comprehensive planning. The report and supporting materials, including those requested before and during the Mid-Cycle visit, helped illuminate the activities and efforts related to the accreditation standards and recommendations under review. Some of the specific and most innovative efforts were not fully documented in the report, but evaluators were provided the materials upon request before arrival and during the visit.

The report also provided an overview of the institution's learning outcomes assessment program. Included were several representative examples. The first was course level assessment from Writing 2010, the culmination of the first-year writing series. The second example was a college level view of assessment from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, with evidence provided by the departments of Economics, Sociology and Political Science.

Links within the document provided access to information and data available via the U website. The U uses dashboards with visualized data to track progress toward meeting specific performance indicators of the U's "Four Goals." These dashboards are customized for different unit heads and provide current progress on indicators supporting objectives under each goal.

Compliments

- The report was clear and understandable. Because of the complex effort undertaken to assess student success, the report covers a dense process within a limited amount of space.
- The radar plot provided was an excellent visual representation of the complex engagement in the strategic goals of the university. The program assessment examples were excellent; each provides a different and effective way of assessing student learning.
- The demonstrated plans for leveraging technology to manage workload issues resulting from their comprehensive assessment process was well presented and demonstrates real innovation around the nagging issue of workload associated with authentic and rich student learning assessment and program learning outcomes assessment.

Feedback

In anticipation of the Year Seven self-evaluation, the following feedback on the Mid-Cycle Self-Evaluation is offered:

- Robust explanations of how the U met Recommendations Two and Three showing how actions taken are specifically aligned with the standards included as part of the recommendations would strengthen the report.
- Some of the links mentioned in the report were not functional and couldn't be reviewed in depth prior to the site visit. When notified, the document was corrected and resent to the team. Other documents mentioned in the report were not linked nor available on the website e.g. Institutional Assessment plan, the BPC (Business Planning and Consolidation) website, and the Learning Frameworks.

- Supplemental materials that completed the assessment cycle were not included in the report, e.g. a sample of a Graduate Council program review would have been helpful, since those reviews are essential data for comprehensive planning (the team received them upon request, shortly before the visit).

Mission, Core Themes and Expectations

Standard 1.A.1 Mission

The current University of Utah mission states that the university:

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.

This mission statement is published on the University President's homepage, which also hosts, quite prominently, key descriptors of the U including the university strategy and Four Goals (core themes) with key objectives. It is a strength to have these appear first on the President's web page. It is not clear, based an online search, that the mission is published elsewhere. That said, a clear sense and understanding of institution's mission permeated conversations with faculty, staff and administrators.

The mission statement, ratified by the Academic Senate, the Board of Trustees, and the Utah State Board of Regents, incorporates the U's Four Goals which are further detailed immediately after the mission statement with a list of objectives under each goal. The Four Goals included in the U's mission statement are appropriate, known and incorporated into campus culture, as evidenced by evaluation team interviews with staff, faculty, and administrators.

The Mid-Cycle Self Study provided a list of leadership changes. It should be noted that the U has experienced a significant change in leadership since its last review (2016 Year-One); this includes a new President, Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs, several deans, and other key positions. The new President served the institution as Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs, so the institution has benefitted from that continuity at the highest levels. As a result and throughout these changes, the institution has remained committed to its 2016 mission statement and has continued work toward mission fulfillment.

Compliments

- In addition to the institution's Mission Statement, evaluators found that most of the colleges and academic units have or are in the process of developing strategic plans that intersect with the Four Goals (core themes).

Feedback

- The Mission Statement with its Four Goals can be found on the President's Strategy web page but is not widely shared on the U's website or publications.
- External constituencies, the public or prospective students looking for a typical strategic

plan (or searching on the website for "strategic plan") might be foiled as the U's Strategy is not meta-tagged as a strategic plan. Additionally, there is no clear link to data supporting progress on the plan, without digging into a two-level drop-down menu on the President's page and understanding a priori that "Dashboards" provide progress on key objectives in the strategic plan in an otherwise excellent presentation using data visualization.

Standard 1.A.2 Mission Fulfillment

According to the Mid-Cycle report, "the University interprets mission fulfillment according to the level of fulfillment of the Four Goals." The U has developed and is refining a cycle of continuous assessment to monitor mission fulfillment. This continuous assessment model has been embraced widely at all levels of the institution and contributes to data-informed decision making. The following summarization documents are data-driven compilations designed to inform key stakeholders on progress towards mission fulfillment. An Institutional Assessment Plan that defines the objectives, strategies, and performance indicators associated with each of the Four Goals.

1. Institutional Dashboards, including one organized around the Four Goals as well as unit level dashboards
2. Graduate Council Program Review (every seven years)
3. Oversight via regular meetings of CBAC (Campus Budget Advisory Council), UBAC (University Budget Advisory Committee, and the newly formed UAAC (University Assessment and Accreditation Council

Institutional Dashboards

The U maintains institutional dashboards that provide key data demonstrating progress on the objectives that make up the Four Goals. There a high-level critical indicator dashboard maintained on the President's webpage that provides broad visualization of progress towards mission fulfillment and it is updated regularly. There also are more focused dashboards for colleges, departments, and the Associate VP for Academic Affairs along with individual tools that measure specific objectives (e.g. finance, scholarly productivity). The Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis (OBIA), which maintains federal reporting data and works closely with Business Intelligence, provides the backbone for the dashboards and provides appropriate data visualization for the dashboards.

Graduate Council Program Review

The U's Graduate Council Program Review is a long-time, robust, internal/external review process that has now been integrated into institutional assessment in a manner that helps provide long-term aspirational strategic planning through a data driven method. All academic programs that have a graduate level component provide a self-study that examines students, curriculum, facilities and resources, and outcomes assessment (required at the 3- and 5- and 7-year marks). The review is an evidence-driven, comprehensive evaluation of program quality using data on department effectiveness (OBIA data, Learning Outcomes Assessment, Academic Analytics NSSE and relevant external indicators). These self-assessment studies that is are reviewed by the Graduate Council on a seven-year cycle. From there an MOU is drafted for review and

commitment by program directors, relevant deans and vice presidents. The MOU prioritizes the challenges, opportunities and goals as they align with the University Mission and Four Goals. One notable added strength in the Graduate Council Seven-Year Review is that program-level learning outcomes assessment is now included in the report. In the spirit of continuous and long-term improvement, academic programs are using student learning outcomes data on an annual basis to address curricular matters and then collectively on a seven-year basis for long term planning.

Note that the few undergraduate-only academic programs go through a similar process but are reviewed by the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

Campus Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC)
Carefully aligning budget priorities with the mission and goals is an essential element of comprehensive planning. The CBAC is charged with reviewing annual reports from each college (these include progress towards prioritized goals rising out of MOUs as well as other relevant and emerging priorities). Membership of the committee is representative of the units whose budgets are overseen by the CBAC. The CBAC meets with colleges and provides input to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA), reviews college resource requests, and considers budgets in terms of the alignment of such requests with institutional priorities. Recommendations of the CBAC are advisory to the President and SVPAA.

University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC)
Similar in the function of the CBAC, the UBAC includes most nonacademic units and units that report to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. The UBAC is advisory to the President.

University Assessment and Accreditation Council (UAAC)
The UAAC was originally created to help facilitate the Year Seven NWCCU Accreditation self-evaluation and subsequent team visit. Its continuation is evidence of high-level continuous improvement and institutional advancement. This council membership includes the CFO, the Director for Assessment, Evaluation and Research, and representation from undergraduate education, graduate education, and the Office of Learning Outcomes Assessment. The UAAC maintains the Institutional Assessment Plan and monitors progress and updates on the Four Goals, supporting objectives and strategies, performance indicators and thresholds.

Compliments
- Continuing the work of the UAAC is a real strength and evidence of institutional commitment to data driven comprehensive planning. Evaluators were struck by the opportunities presented by the high-level ongoing conversations facilitated through this group.
- The Graduate Council Seven Year Review is part of a substantive process of program review that considers the needs of individual programs, the balance and alignment of college level needs, and includes a negotiated process of identifying alignment of strategic goals from the program level to the provost level in service to the University Mission and Four Goals. The robust role of data drawn from OBIA, program learning outcomes, and internal and external reviews create a comprehensive picture of program quality.

- The particular way in which the U works through a robust external program review every seven years is commendable.
- The fact that the U leverages professional accreditation data while insuring that any data gaps are filled in through the seven-year program self-evaluation provides the best balance of complete comparable data and minimizes duplication of effort at the program level.

Feedback
- The process used for the seven-year program reviews is excellent, yet complex. The quality of the process the U has established will benefit from careful explanation for the NWCCU Year Seven Review.

Standard 1.B Core Themes

The University of Utah's mission is accomplished through four core themes (the Four Goals):

1. Develop and transfer new knowledge
2. Promote student success to change lives
3. Engage communities to improve health and quality of life
4. Ensure long-term viability of the University

Each goal is associated with a set of goal objectives which then have multiple strategies and performance indicators. Altogether these comprise part of the U's Institutional Assessment Plan which is overseen by the UAAC. The Four Goals and several key performance indicators are present on the President's Dashboard with progress displayed through data visualization. The data on this dashboard is a collection of performance indicators selected from the Goal's objectives and used as priority metrics. One can see the U's progress from the data presented, which is often compared with external data. What is not present in the President' Dashboard are thresholds that provide insight into success. Conversations during the site visit suggested that the focus is on trends and comparative performance which is more fluid. More detailed objectives under each goal, along with strategies and performance indicators, are largely completed and maintained as an internal document. The U does not yet have thresholds or results tied in to them.

Core Theme/Goal One: **Develop and Transfer New Knowledge**

Mission fit
The core theme/goal is directly articulated in the U's mission statement as "we generate and share new knowledge, discoveries, and innovations." The U, by focus and effort, is a top public research institution with over 200 professional and graduate degree programs. The University of Utah Hospital and Clinics function as teaching and research facilities.

Composition of the assessments
The U identifies four areas of objectives, each with supporting strategies and performance indicators. A selection of these indicators is pulled up to "top level" indicators and used to look at the progress towards Goal One. Multi-year data for these priority indicators is provided on the President's Dashboard (publicly available, yet a bit difficult to find). In some cases the PAC-12

or RU/VH institutions are comparisons. The President's Dashboard does not consistently provide clear thresholds, but functions more like trend data showing patterns of growth in comparison to PAC-12 or RU/VH institutions. In other cases, there is no comparison or clear threshold, just a goal of increasing them (e.g. number of named appointments).

Results

Trend patterns map against PAC-12 and RU/VH institutions, rising and falling together, without a significant reduction in the gap. It appears from an updated assessment data spreadsheet from October 2018, that total graduate and professional degrees awarded is at par with PAC-12 peers and thus at threshold, research expenditures and awards remain below peers, patents continue to increase, and the number of start-ups meets the threshold.

Core Theme/Goal Two: **Promote Student Success to Change Lives**

Mission fit

The U's second core theme/goal appears in the mission statement: "The University of Utah fosters student success by preparing students from diverse backgrounds for lives of impacts as leaders and citizens." The objectives involve improved retention and completion rates as well as growth in student engagement.

Composition of the assessments

Top level performance indicators include first-year retention rates, six-year graduation rates (overall and for diverse populations), percentage of students in Learning Communities, and percentage receiving financial aid. The U is also looking at NSSE data and the amount and nature of participation in engaged learning opportunities.

Results

The university has grown significantly from a commuter campus to an increasingly residential campus that is able to and intends to serve students across the country and around the world.

The student enrollment has been growing and diversity (especially geographically) has increased demand for resident living. Student Affairs and Auxiliary Services have been gathering internal and external data to inform decisions around the addition of residential housing. With third party data, an investment plan over the next five years is underway to respond to housing demands and address deferred maintenance.

In an effort to integrate student life and academic life (a nice example of how units across campus make use of the Learning Framework), the U is growing the opportunities for living/learning communities. The data reflects the efforts underway. The U already has met its threshold for first year retention, participation in learning communities, and percent of freshman receiving financial aid. Six-year graduation rates have shown improvement.

One evidentiary example of continuous improvement that has emerged as a priority at the U involves the need to focus more intently on diversity, equity, and inclusion. This is reflected in ongoing work on diversity and inclusion and, as relayed to evaluators in conversations with Academic Affairs, the administration's response to events of last fall—a town hall meeting and march in the aftermath of Charlottesville, racist posters on campus, and the visit of an ultra-

conservation white nationalist speaker, Ben Shapiro, to campus. The U drafted key statements about free speech, hate speech, and a list of "13 responses" to what was heard at the town hall meeting. A campus-wide training brought together almost three hundred faculty and staff to talk about microaggressions that occur in classrooms, residence halls and other places on campus.

New diversity initiatives have been funded, including faculty diversity initiatives, the Director for the Dream Center, Associate Director of the Office of Inclusive Excellence, a Diversity and Inclusion in the Classroom trainer position, and diversity projects in the Graduate Program. This prioritization process began with a set of responses to national issues as well as experiences on campus and included, in addition to the institutional conversation about micro-aggressions, the goal of diversifying the faculty and student body and the expansion of diversity training. Colleges are receiving support to develop goals around diversity and inclusion and to set implementation plans in place. The deans have been informed that diversity initiatives will be the top priority in the current year's budget cycle.

A second evidentiary success involves the data-driven recommendation to introduce higher benefit rates for graduate students, reduce minimum credit registration for dissertation work, and make graduate assistantship tuition benefits eligibility available year-round to a) encourage the offering of summer graduate courses and b) consequently reduce time to graduation.

Core Theme/Goal Three: **Engage communities to improve health and quality of life**

Mission fit
This goal appropriately comes from the mission: "…engage local and global communities to promote education, health, and quality of life." Specific objectives include community engagement in the U's educational programs (online, continuing education and health care), outreach to the community (primary and secondary schools, community service, cultural, creative and athletic events), and engaged diverse communities.

Composition of assessments
Top level indicators currently look at growth in online student credit hours, continuing education enrollment, and University Health Care patient satisfaction.

Results
Online education has grown at a rate and has reached a level that surpasses the current threshold. Continuing education enrollments have surpassed the current threshold. Health care satisfaction is measured by referrals and has exceeded the threshold.

Core Theme Four: **Ensure Long-Term Viability of the University**

Mission fit
The U's Mission Statement expands this core theme/goal as "responsible stewardship of our intellectual, physical, and financial resources ensures the long-term success and viability of the institution".

Composition of assessments
The top-level indicators look at undergraduate tuition compared to PAC-12 peers, annual private donations, and the Energy Utilization Index.

Results

All of the top-level indicators have exceeded the current thresholds.

Compliments
- It is evident that careful thought went into the selection of objectives and strategies and performance indicators for each goal, with only a few strategies waiting for indicators. It also is evident that the choice of objectives, strategies, and performance indicators is connected to the institution and its mission.

Feedback
- The top-level performance indicators visualized on the President's Dashboard include data over several years. The thresholds in some cases are not well defined. For example, in comparison to PAC-12 institutions, it is not clear if the U seeks to match them or surpass them, or some other threshold. The number of "Named Appointments" is increasing, but the threshold is not explicit (Total numbers? Or percentage of faculty?).

Recommendation Two

There is evidence that the U has taken assessment seriously and carefully developed a comprehensive, evidenced-based process. It also is clear that it has been well-resourced through third party technological solutions as well as internal data analysis by OBIA and Business Intelligences. The U has funded the Office of Undergraduate Studies (UGS) assessment in the form of salary support for staff, work buyouts, technological efficiencies, the University's Learning Framework model development, and fellows, workshops, etc. These efforts have both improved the quality of assessment and minimized one of the most common complaints for faculty relating to assessment: workload. The U has built direct student measures into short and long-term academic planning (2.C.2). The Graduate Council Seven Year Review is a working example of comprehensive assessment that makes long view use of program learning outcomes. All syllabi and programs have learning outcomes and data gathered is used for measuring program needs and effectiveness in a more responsive timeline (2.C.2). The flow of planning and priorities, that begins with evidence of student learning outcomes, is informed by robust academic reviews every seven years, aligned with the U's Four Goals and then presented for funding consideration at the CBAC during each budget cycle.

Compliments
- The U is making solid progress on using data to assess student learning and is rolling out a strong, well-resourced process across the institution.
- The structure and process for measuring student learning across the institution is notable and the phenomenologically-derived Learning Framework serves powerfully as a connective tissue across the student academic and co-curricular experience.

Feedback

- None

Recommendation Three

The U was asked to provide evidence of ongoing collection and evaluate/analysis of data that will be used as a basis for evaluating its core themes/goals (4.A.1, 4.A.4). This would include all programs and services and degrees (4.A.2, 4.A.3, 4.A.5). The U would use these data and subsequent evaluation for transparent, ongoing, meaningful, continuous improvement and comprehensive planning (4.A.6, 4.B.1, 4.B.2).

The structure and process in place at the U is evidence of robust data collection, including direct measures of program learning outcomes. Two of the four examples provided in the report represent the use of continuous improvement at both a program level and in a general education requirement.

Department of Political Science

Senior level papers are collected and a sample is analyzed annually by the Political Science Undergraduate Studies Committee. Five of the seven program learning outcomes were studied using these data (the other two outcomes required different data for analysis). The results of the assessment generated two changes in learning outcomes: combining the BA and BS learning outcomes and adding a new outcome assessing level of knowledge and critical thinking. The department also modified the assessment procedure to improve inter-rater reliability. This example shows the impact of the assessment on refining and improving the quality learning outcomes themselves.

Writing Program

This university-wide program was chosen to illustrate quality assessment and continuous improvement. The program sits in a free-standing department which helps create the sense of ownership indicative of its success. Graduate students and faculty support its service mission and are compensated for the extensive review work of student writing. The program's 2014-17 (three-year) report sought to refine threshold competencies and assess how well students were performing in the First Year Writing Series. Data from the first round of assessment (Fall 2014) showed a struggle with argumentation. The second cycle of assessment (Spring 2015) showed that students were strong in research but struggled with source use (synthesis and summary). The findings have led to innovations in teacher training to help them better understand and focus on the key learning outcomes of the First Year Writing Series. This program serves as a strong example of a full assessment cycle, including feeding results back into curricular decisions to benefit student learning. The Writing Program's next planned assessment will look at content knowledge in the program (socio-rhetorical knowledge).

There has been a significant effort to create an intentional assessment plan across the institution. Improvement is evident in student retention, persistence, and graduation rates. These tie to Core Theme/Goal Three and the efforts that emerged out of the strategic initiatives and that were subsequently prioritized through the UBAC funding with positive results. This shows a nice complete cycle of comprehensive planning around Core Theme/Goal Three.

It is clear that careful thought informed the design, rigor and data-driven effectiveness of the comprehensive planning to date. Professionally accredited programs have been completing accreditation self-evaluations on an ongoing cycle. The U is leveraging those data but also ensuring that professionally accredited programs include any additional data needed to complete the institution's required seven-year evaluation cycle. Programs without professional accreditation are at varying stages of the development, implementation and evaluation of program effectiveness. For the Year Seven team visit, the U will want to demonstrate this process broadly across the institution so that it is in place for all major resourced decisions that come through the comprehensive planning process.

Compliments
- The U has taken the time to thoughtfully and intentionally develop a comprehensive structure and process of assessment that serves the institution effectively.
- Particularly notable is the incorporation of multi-year program learning outcome data into the long-range planning of departments through the Graduate Council Seven Year Review Process.
- Using the Writing Program as an exemplar in the report is especially appreciated. The Writing Program touches all undergraduate students and illustrates how the U has bridged the frustration many institutions face - the issue of ownership - by creating a free-standing department (Writing and Rhetorical Studies) with a high-quality assessment of a general education program requirement that is cuts across academic programs.

Feedback
- Approximately 60% of the programs will have fully executed an assessment cycle (include using data for continuous improvement) at the time of the NWCCU Seven Year visit. The U is encouraged to communicate with NWCCU to keep the Commission abreast of progress.

Conclusion and Summary
There were many excellent assessment practices in place at the U (some of the best this team has seen) that make the team confident that structure, process and funding for comprehensive planning, from robust data collection to tying evidence to institutional decision-making, to linking the budget process to said decisions, is in place and in practice. Because of that, the U is well positioned to make strategic decisions in service of mission fulfillment. While the institution is unlikely to complete full cycles of assessment for all units before the Year Seven team visit, the investment in developing this process and the shift in institutional culture to one of continuous improvement through evidenced-based decision making at all levels is notable.

Compliments
- The U has created and is implementing a well-resourced and robust structure and has a process in place for assessment across the institution.
- The evaluation team probed pretty closely and concluded there is institution-wide buy-in for the assessment plan the U has developed.
- Many, if not all, of the colleges have a strategic plan or similar planning document that

intersects with the U's four goals and practice evidenced-based comprehensive planning.

- The Learning Framework is an innovative approach to identifying commonalities in the student experience. It is used across campus - not just in academic affairs - and is a powerful tool to understand the college experience holistically. This is active and ongoing evidence of how academic and student life (and, arguably, other units) intersect to shape the student experience across the institution.
- The UAAC continues as a holistic high-level council to assess what constitutes success and to identify synergies, opportunities, and knowledge about effective practices. and It provides the space to think about what it means to assess a holistic learning experience for students. The decision to continue this committee after the last accreditation is notable.
- Dashboard visualizations are excellent; there is real synergy between OBIA and Business Intelligence.

Feedback
- None

Interview Roster

Ruth Watkins - President
Dan Reed - Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dave Kieda - Dean, Graduate School
Keith Diaz Moore - Dean, College of Architecture and Planning
Richard Brown - Dean, College of Engineering
Ella Myers - Associate Professor, Political Science & Director, Undergraduate Studies
Matt Burbank - Associate Professor, Political Science & Director, Undergraduate Studies
Henry White - Dean, College of Science
Alberta Comer - Dean and Director, Marriott Library
Cathy Anderson - Chief Financial Officer & Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning
Darryl Butt – Dean, College of Mines and Earth Science
Sandy Hughes – Director, Budget and Planning
Sarah George - Executive Director of the Natural History Museum of Utah and Adjunct Professor of Biology
Marti Bradley - Senior Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs & Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Ann Darling - Assistant Vice President of Undergraduate Studies (General Education and Learning Outcomes Assessment)
Jim Agutter - Associate Professor, Architecture and Planning
Mark St. Andre - Associate Dean, Assessment and General Education
Jane Hatter - Assistant Professor, School of Music
Chris Reilly - Professor, Pharmacology and Toxicology
Krista Carlson - Assistant Professor, Metallurgical Engineering
Fernando Rubio - Professor, World Languages, & Director, UOnline Curriculum Enhancement and Innovation
Katharine Ullman - Professor, Oncological Sciences & Associate Dean, Graduate School
Paula Smith - Professor, Educational Leadership & Policy
Julio Facelli - Professor, Biomedical Informatics & Academic Senate President-elect

Mardie Clayton - Professor of Nursing & Academic Senate Past President
Pat Hanna - Professor, Philosophy & Linguistics
Robert Allen - Professor of Accounting
Jay Jordan - Associate Professor & Chair, Department of Writing & Rhetoric Studies
Jennifer Andrus - Associate Professor, Writing and Rhetoric Studies
Bob Flores - Professor, College of Law & Senate Liaison to the Institutional Policy Committee
Tom Richmond - Professor of Chemistry & Academic Senate President
Jeff West - Associate Vice President for Financial & Business Services
Mike Martineau - Director Institutional Analysis
Tom Howa - Associate Director of Business Intelligence
Mark Winter - Executive Director, Office of Budget and Institutional Analysis
Stacey Ackerlind - Special Assistant to the Vice President of Student Affairs & Director, Assessment, Evaluation and Research
Barb Snyder - Vice President for Student Affairs
Mary Parker - Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
Jerry Basford, Associate Vice President for Business and Auxiliary Services
Lori McDonald, Associate Vice President & Dean of Students