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I. Introduction

This is the evaluative report of the comprehensive visit for the University of Arizona for the purposes of continued accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

The University of Arizona (UA) became affiliated with the North Central Association in 1917 and has been continuously accredited since 1919. The university itself is older, having been founded in 1885. The first classes were convened in 1891. The university now consists of three campuses. The original campus is located in Tucson. The South Campus, formally established in 1988, is located in Sierra Vista adjacent to the branch campus of Cochise Community College. The Arizona International College (AIC) was established in 1996 as a separate campus but has since moved back to the main campus to build an enrollment warranting physical separation or organizational independence (Self Study Report 20). At this time, UA-South's application for NCA candidacy has been postponed until the current review of UA has been completed, and AIC is accredited with UA.

The team found the institutional self-study (SSR) and the background materials supplied to be extraordinarily useful in preparation for the visit. The team is also particularly appreciative of the self-study coordinators, who were able to accommodate, with good grace and remarkable flexibility and creativity, several changes wrought by events that left the site team short-handed at the last minute before the visit. Their ability to do so bespeaks the degree of careful planning that has characterized their efforts with the self-study.
The University of Arizona made use of the self-study to address two other issues in addition to the GIRs and Criteria, engaging in strategic planning while also evaluating progress toward its goal of becoming a "preeminent student-centered research university." While this is the report of the evaluation of UA for continued accreditation, it also contains advice from the team in its role as consultants. During the team visit, members interviewed all campus level administrators and school/college deans; open meetings were held for faculty, staff, and students; and the team met with members of the Board of Regents, several alumni, community members and with individual faculty and students. These meetings provided ample opportunities for the team to become familiar with the University of Arizona. (One member of the team, Dr. Chapman, had to withdraw at the last minute; however, prior to his withdrawal, he provided the rest of the team with his written analysis of the self-study and he spoke by telephone with the Dean of the Medical School.)

This report begins with a discussion of the university's response to the last site visit by the North Central Association. It then reviews the university's satisfaction of the General Institutional Requirements and Criteria for Accreditation. Comments upon areas worthy of praise, caution and advice, and the team's final recommendation to the NCA complete the report.
II. Response to the 1989-90 Visit

In 1990, the NCA team expressed seven formal concerns; UA's response is found in Chapter 2 of the Self Study Report. Those concerns and responses are summarized below.

1. The 1990 team described a lack of support for the administration's affirmative action policy, describing it as only "minimally accepted by a predominantly white, male faculty" despite the administration's "genuine intent" to increase the hiring, promotion and tenure of women and minorities. The university cites statistical changes since 1990 that show a general increase in the number of women and underrepresented groups among tenured and tenure-track faculty, with particularly good progress made among tenured women (SSR 22).

The team had mixed responses to the university's attention to this concern. One member of the team "saw no indication of particular interest, much less any programs, for increasing diversity of faculty and administrators," while others found reason to praise the high degree of ethnic diversity among the students. The team's sense is that UA's faculty and administration are aware of the need to further enhance the diversity of the faculty and the staff. Although progress has been made to increase the diversity of the students, efforts should not languish. Indeed, the university's geographical location might afford the opportunity to focus on local Latino and Native American populations, where its expertise and resources may contribute to an understanding of and outreach toward these ethnic populations. (For example, the Art Museum, the Arizona State Museum, and the Udall Center for Public Policy represent extraordinary opportunities for outreach in different forms.) Efforts across campus would benefit from better
coordination and the sharing of success stories in efforts to enhance campus diversity, keeping in mind that successful programs in retention and outreach are not subject-specific: strategies that work in one department may work in a different context. The team encourages UA to continue its efforts in this regard to this concern.

2. The 1990 team asked UA to clarify the "Target of Opportunity" program. The university reports that this program has been replaced by "concerted recruiting and retention efforts" and a program of "attracting faculty and other personnel of exceptional distinction" (SSR 22).

3. The 1990 team challenged the university to develop an overall plan for the Arts and Humanities while increasing the status of service courses these areas provide as essential elements of UA's instructional mission. In 1995, the College of Arts & Sciences was divided into four separate Colleges (Science, Fine Arts, Humanities, and Social and Behavioral Sciences); in 1998, a new general education curriculum provided largely by these four new Colleges took effect (SS22). Funding and resources have been allocated to better serve that general education curriculum.

4. In 1990, the team expressed concern about funding for undergraduate education, a particularly urgent demand on the College of Arts and Science. The reorganization of the College and of the general education curriculum seems to have addressed this issue.

5. In 1990, "gridlock" in the College of Arts and Science (caused by the conflict between course requirements and the inability to offer seats for all students) was complicated by the fact that the university had not been gathering data on the extent of this problem. Access problems have been helped by the reorganization cited above, as well as by the creation of an oversight position responsible for ensuring that ample general education class sections are available (SSR
23). The Self Study Report's reliance on information suggests that data is collected and used to make programmatic decisions.

6. The 1990 site team described a lack of effective, coordinated and clearly expressed strategic planning. Materials submitted for the current review support the assertion that this has been a "top priority" for the university. Each unit (academic and non-academic) must develop a strategic plan, the university prepares and submits a strategic plan to its Board of Regents and the legislature. Goals and performance measures are identified, etc. (SSR 23-24), and a number of planning committees exist. Each of these is driven by a series of fundamental and operating planning principles articulated by the new university president, who advocates their use in making many kinds of decisions throughout the university (SSR 24). This planning has informed the institution's articulation of its desire to be a "Student-Centered Research University."

7. The 1990 team described a dual problem found in the faculty's apparent lack of involvement in decision-making on important academic matters and the administration's lack of effective communication with the faculty. Again, this has been a priority in the past decade. A series of "Guidelines for Shared Governance" were reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate and the University Administration in September 1997; that document was later amended to further extend the principles of shared governance to others on campus (SSR 24).

Overall, the University of Arizona is to be commended for having addressed concerns identified by the site team in 1990. While more may always be done to address complicated issues such as enhancing diversity; improving the viability of the arts and humanities; and planning for the economic future of the institution, the University of Arizona has demonstrated to the team's satisfaction that it has met the challenges posed ten years ago.
III. General Institutional Requirements

The General Institutional Requirements are addressed in the first chapter of the *Self Study Report*. Since the university’s responses to these requirements are complete and satisfactory, the team finds that the University of Arizona meets the twenty-four General Institutional Requirements of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

The University of Arizona’s discussion of Federal Compliance is included in the *Self Study Report* (SSR 9-10). By evidence provided in that discussion, the team also finds that the university is in compliance with all relevant Commission policies (*I.C.9, I.A.5, IV.B.2, III.A.1, III.A.3,* and *IV.B.4*).
IV. Criteria for Accreditation

I. The institution has clear and publicly stated purposes consistent with its mission and appropriate to an institution of higher education.

The University of Arizona is an AAU and land-grant public university with a three-fold mission of teaching, research and public service. It is one of three public universities in the state governed by a common Board of Regents. The Governor appoints the members of the Board subject to confirmation by the Arizona State Senate. The Board of Regents, in turn, employs the President, who is the Chief Administrative Officer of the university.

The University of Arizona consists of the main campus in Tucson, the Arizona Health Sciences Center (also in Tucson), the UA-South campus in Sierra Vista, Agricultural Research and Extension Centers at numerous locations, and various other programs throughout the state.

The university’s formal mission statement, adopted by the Board of Regents in September 1999, reads as follows:

The University of Arizona, a distinguished, land-grant educational and research institution, is dedicated to preparing students for an increasingly diverse and technological world and to improving the quality of life for the people of Arizona and the nation.

This mission statement is appropriate for a major public research university concerned with teaching, research and service. The team found the mission was well understood by the shareholders of the university, including faculty, students, staff, administration and Board of
Regents. The university is committed to the three distinguishing features of a land-grant public university: student access, breadth of academic programs (including research), and outreach of its expertise to the public. The university offers the baccalaureate, Master's, doctoral, professional, and specialist degrees.

The current president has built on the existing base and has embraced the 1995 characterization of the university as a "student-centered research university." A vision has been articulated that has broad-based support. The well-qualified, dedicated, and productive faculty values teaching and supports its consideration as an important factor in tenure review. A significant number of senior faculty teach lower-level undergraduate courses. The quality of the student body is good and is steadily improving. Student services are comprehensive and appear to be of high quality. Diversity exists throughout the academic community and is most noteworthy within the student body. Communication appears to be open and encouraged among the different campus sectors, and there is an impressive record of scholarship.

The institution's overall funding level is improving even though the percentage of the total budget funded by the state is decreasing. There have been modest increases from student tuition, state appropriations, gifts, grants and contract sources. The university is planning a major capital campaign to be announced in the Fall of 2000. Because of the shift in funding sources, there has been a shift in how the university budget is expended. The proportion of total expenditures has increased for research, public service, scholarships and fellowships while it has decreased for instruction, academic and institutional support. This is troubling for an institution that strives to be known as a pre-eminent student-centered research university.

The Arizona Health Sciences Center strategic plan includes a mission statement that
focuses on the center's unique characteristics. Its mission mirrors that of the university as a whole and also emphasizes its own role as the state's education and training resource for health care professionals. The Center is a major strength of the university because of its contributions to medical education and research.

The University of Arizona South has its own mission, which may be briefly described as serving the needs of the citizens of that region who seek liberal arts and professional instruction; "enriching" instruction via technology, for both resident and distance learning programs; and serving the area by fostering economic development and sharing the expertise of faculty, staff and students. Growth and community support have led UA-South to seek independent NCA candidacy; that decision is pending the completion of this site evaluation.

The mission of the University of Arizona is understood and supported throughout the university community and by its Board of Regents. The information provided to the NCA team and the observations while on campus have led the team to conclude that the institution has clear and publicly stated purposes consistent with its mission and appropriate for an institution of higher education. The University of Arizona meets Criterion One.

II. The institution has effectively organized the human, financial, and physical resources necessary to accomplish its purpose.

Credit the importance of improved planning, decision-making and committee structures, the Self Study reports that UA has made "notable progress in organizing its human, financial and physical resources" (SSR 39). The improvements have been both broad and deep: individual administrative positions have been realigned, faculty governance has been expanded,
and strategic planning processes seem to have been employed throughout.

At the campus level, three "different but highly interdependent" decision-making structures arise from the administrative, advisory and governance areas of the university. During the 1990s, a series of changes to the first of these included redirection and realignment of various vice president-level positions to concentrate better on key areas (undergraduate education, campus life, university advancement, and information technology) and affirmed a degree of independence for the Health Sciences Center (SSR 40). At the advisory level, senior administrators meet with a wide variety of committees engaged in planning -- the most significant of which may be the development of a Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee. The substantial restructuring of this important committee in 1995 enhanced the degree of faculty representation, underscoring the university’s commitment to faculty governance.

The increased representation of faculty seems to exemplify that "the varied makeup of the Faculty Senate ensures that virtually every university group is represented in policy and curriculum deliberations. No new curricular program, academic degree, or major personnel policy can take effect without Faculty Senate approval" (SSR 43). The university’s efforts to develop "participatory decision making" has included broad assessment of all programs (academic and non-academic) to develop a set of shared institutional priorities; the development of a Continuous Organizational Renewal (CORe) program (which has particularly helped the University Libraries); and the development of a shared governance agreement developed by administrators and faculty.

Human and Financial Resources. Trends in staffing levels are consistent with institutions
of similar size and breadth. Budget reallocations of the early 1990s are cited as the cause of reductions in some areas, and the reduction in ranked faculty relative to the increase in temporary and other faculty is described as "an important feature of university staffing today" (SSR 47). Since the last NCA site evaluation, the diversity of UA employees has increased slightly overall, with similar increases in both the classified-staff and appointed personnel categories. Salaries, affected by a decade of limited financial resources, fall lower than the national average, and a 1999 survey of all UA colleges found salary differentials to be "particularly influential in retention failures" (SSR 48). This situation is likely to improve only to a limited extent, as 2-4% salary increases over the next few years will not bring UA faculty salaries to the national average; indeed, university salaries will fall still further behind the national averages.

Information Technology. Reliance on Information Technology and development of new computation facilities has grown at UA as at many other research universities. The university enjoys a high-speed and well run network with excellent connectivity to high-speed national networks. The university has invested heavily in creating state-of-the-art smart classrooms throughout the campus. There is ample computational power, or access to computation power, to support the research of the faculty. Although investment in these facilities is exemplary, there does not seem to be sufficient on-going funding to ensure maintenance and upgrade of these facilities. There is clear commitment and successful action to provide UA students with excellent computing. The same does not seem to be true for faculty in the departments that do not normally receive major research grants. It is important that funding mechanisms be put in place to allow the faculty to periodically upgrade their computers.
The central IT does have excellent working relationships with IT groups throughout the university. However, a much closer coordination is needed to maximize the buying power of the university. The university will do well to standardize around a smaller set of software tools and applications.

The present salary structure for IT workers makes it difficult for the university to retain experienced staff. The university has recognized this problem through special salary adjustments. However, the increasing reliance of UA teaching, research and administration on the availability of experienced IT workers makes it essential that further attention be paid to this issue.

It is recommended that the central Information Technology group be empowered to lead a community-based effort to create a high-speed network in Tucson and vicinities. This is important for making the university faculty and staff more productive and giving off-campus students e-services nearly equal to students that live on-campus. Such an effort would be good for the community and could make Tucson a more attractive place for businesses to locate. Given the government structure of Tucson and the County, it is unlikely that such an initiative could come without the leadership of the university.

The University Library. The University of Arizona Library is an integral part of the university's teaching and research mission. The Library has made significant progress in tailoring its programs and services to meet the needs of faculty and students. The Library's hours of operation are generous and its staff is dedicated to improving students' access to both print and electronic information. The Integrated Learning Center, which is under construction adjacent to the Library, will feature an "information commons" -- equipped with high-end workstations and
staffed by librarians having the expertise to teach students how to become information literate and to provide them with the skills for life-long learning.

These achievements are even more remarkable when placed in the context of a decrease in staff of some 30 positions since the last NCA report. However, additional staff will surely be needed to provide services in the Integrated Learning Center when it is completed, and to provide a basic level of services to students and faculty on the South Campus.

With regard to the Library’s support for faculty and graduate student research, it is clear that the acquisitions budget needs to be increased, particularly in view of the continuing high inflation in the costs of scholarly resources (digital as well as paper-based). Although the size of library collections and overall expenditures are only gross indicators of effectiveness, the fact that the Library has seen a drop in its comparative ranking among research libraries from 23rd to 31st (see SSR 51) during the decade of the 1990s should be viewed as a signal that additional support is needed.

Physical Resources. Despite the last decade’s many building projects (most of which have addressed a classroom space deficit identified ten years ago), UA "still lacks more than one million assignable square feet (nasf), according to the Arizona Board of Regents guidelines" (SSR 52). Shortages keenly felt in research laboratory space also affect the library, classroom laboratories and offices. Pressure on classroom use -- including an anticipated increase in enrollment -- has not gone away. While careful planning is employed to address classroom upgrades, use and scheduling, attention must be paid to renovations and development of new space to address shortages for all types of rooms that will doubtless follow enrollment increases.
The development of new space and growth for the campus must be made in light of nearly fixed geographical boundaries, posing a challenge that will require careful planning.

Financial Resources. The University of Arizona has a constitutionally mandated low tuition policy. While overall state appropriations to UA have increased in the past decade, the state's share of UA revenue has decreased by 6.6%, a decline that "reflects the national trend toward erosion of state appropriations for higher education as a percentage of personal income (tax base)" (SSR 54). In response to the financial constraints noted at the time of the last NCA evaluation, the university has successfully expanded its resource base. One effect of this shift is that several projects that "enhance the UA's evolution as a student-centered research university" have been supported by grant and contract funding and scholarships -- areas of growth which have helped offset the decline in state appropriations. Yet while the university is perceives this shift both as a reflection of the faculty's success in generating support and as an opportunity to enhance the student experience, it does not overlook two areas threatened by allocations that have not met the need for improvements: central technology resources and the university libraries. Given the anticipated limited funding in these and other areas, the team commends the university for its efforts to link strategic planning to budgetary concerns.

The University of Arizona fulfills Criterion Two, having effectively met the challenges of the last decade through careful, effective planning and the expansion of governance. Yet, as the Self Study Report observes, the university's concerns about the future are not insubstantial. Expanding UA's financial base, increasing investments in libraries and in its technological infrastructure, addressing space shortages and raising faculty salaries to competitive levels will continue to require a commitment to planning and effective management of key resources.
III. The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes.

The UA Self Study Report identifies the integration of the institution's three-part mission (teaching, research and service to other) as being central to efforts ensuring continued success.

Instruction

The 1990 site team evaluation identified several concerns related to undergraduate education. Since then, a series of sequential efforts have been made to ensure the university's ability to fulfill its teaching mission, and the Self Study outlines substantial institutional efforts in support of realizing the university's vision of a student-centered research university. The development of this vision has been remarkably successful in securing the endorsement and support of the broad university community. The concept incorporates a range of ideas, and the process of campus discussion has deepened and enriched the overall understanding of the integration of teaching, research, discovery, and learning in the life of a university with UA's complex mission.

The university operates under a mandate to be broadly accessible. It admits students of a much broader ability range than its peers, including a significant tier of students that are considered to be at risk. This results in much lower retention and graduation rates than is commonplace in most universities of comparable academic stature. The open access policies of the university present the university with the challenge of serving a student body with very disparate academic needs. This has led to the creation of a large and successful Honors College of almost 4,000 in 1998-99, but at the price of increasing ability segmentation in enrollment patterns. The general circumstance of pre-professional students and undergraduates undecided
about their educational goals has been well served by the creation in 1996 of university College, which serves as a home for these students, offers general education advising, and administers the interdisciplinary major. In addition, the development of the student affairs group into the campus life organization has contributed significantly to the quality of the student experience. The special challenge of coping with the needs of inadequately prepared students is particularly severe given the limited resources available to the university. Despite strain created by large numbers of students requiring special academic support, there is a strong sense of professionalism on the part of the staff in programs serving these students. Indeed, many of these programs are exemplary in a national context, and the student-support staff is exceptionally dedicated and effective. However, the needs of the less well-prepared students exceed the capacity of the system to provide truly adequate support. The effects of the admissions policy of the university merits careful review given the extraordinary demands it places on the campus. The current admission policy will need to be changed to better articulate with the missions of different campuses within the state system, or the university will need to adopt a comprehensive approach to anticipating and addressing the needs of different tiers of the student body.

The university has developed an array of innovative, interesting and diverse learning experiences for students at all levels. The university-wide General Education Requirements, which were approved in 1997 and put in place in Fall, 1998, counter the trend toward the development of College requirements described as "complex" and "specialized." The implementation of this general education program is unusually strong and has been a substantial success in involving diverse areas of the campus in greater support of lower division instruction.
However, there are substantial continuing pressures on Colleges carrying the heaviest loads in general education instruction.

Another area of special strength is the integration of the Library into the instructional program. The Library is positioned as a strong service-oriented unit and is serving the instructional mission of the campus well with the resources available to it. Significant progress has also been made in development of classrooms supporting technology, and the overall program of classroom improvement on the campus is substantial. The broader information technology plans of the university support both on-campus and off-campus instruction.

The university is to be commended for the ethnic diversity within its undergraduate student body. The achievements of the university in building diversity at all tiers of the student body are substantial and admirable. It is particularly noteworthy that minority students constitute 22% of all honors students. This record in building ethnic diversity in the student body is not matched, however, either in the record of attracting and retaining minority faculty or in support of globalization and international issues. The university needs to give focused attention to strategies for attracting and holding minority faculty. The level of student participation in study abroad is low compared to most peers, and the support for on-campus international activities involving visiting speakers, faculty, and conferences is inadequately developed to serve the needs of future graduates whose careers increasingly will involve global involvements.

The Arizona International College has recently been integrated with the main campus, and its programs will benefit from the fuller interaction that the change in location will afford. University of Arizona-South in Sierra Vista was created to better address the needs of place-
bound students in the south central and southeastern regions of the state, and it was officially
designated a branch campus in 1995. An office in Douglas was added in 1997. UA-South has
vigorous and effective leadership, a committed staff, and the strong support of the community.
Its mission of providing selected degree programs is being realized with a high level of
dedication. UA-South benefits from relationships with Cochise Community College and Fort
Huachuca; the latter relationship has contributed to particularly noteworthy developments at UA-
South in applications of technology in support of language learning. UA-South is serving "new
traditional" students by offering late day or evening classes, scheduling classes in area high
schools and its Douglas office, and working with community colleges to help students complete
lower level requirements elsewhere. Yet since UA-South imposes the same degree
requirements as the main campus, differences in faculty, resources and mission pose difficulties.
Resources at UA-South are limited, and increases in the number of regular faculty, development
of flexibility permitting curricular designs consistent with its mission and staffing, and access to
library materials need to be addressed in the near term to sustain long term quality. It is not
apparent that UA South warrants consideration for separate accreditation at this time. UA-South
has expressed interest in receiving independent accreditation, but there is not now a consistent
realization of independence for the campus. Overall UA-South's programs remain linked to those
on the main campus and would benefit from higher levels of involvement for some of the faculty
development and programmatic goals of the UA-South campus. The university needs to
formulate more clearly its goals for its branch campuses, particularly UA-South, and to put in
place well articulated management strategies for working with each campus and realizing the
desired level of interconnection with the main campus.
Graduate education is of high quality at the university, and as would be expected, it is closely integrated with the research mission. New areas of inquiry are being explored through Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs, and the university's support of interdisciplinary graduate education is to be commended as an attractive and promising feature of graduate education at Arizona. Under-enrolled programs have been reduced while enrollments (both FTE and headcount) have been increased. Programs have been developed to improve recruitment, enrollment and retention of minority graduate students, the enrollment of women in under represented areas of study, and to enhance academic, professional and social support for all graduate students. At the same time, there are significant challenges faced in graduate education, including the need for more course work in some areas and increased financial support for graduate students. The Self Study observes that "many departments consider graduate student stipend levels not competitive with peer institutions," and if unaddressed, this will make maintaining the quality of the graduate programs difficult or impossible long term.

Success in the area of professional education is evident, and examination records succinctly suggest success. The James E. Rogers College of Law takes pride in the success of its graduates, 89% of whom pass the Arizona Bar examination on the first attempt (a rate that exceeds the state average). The highly ranked College of Pharmacy has an impressive 100% pass rate on the 1998 North American Pharmacist Licensure Examination. While the Self Study Report's information about the UA College of Medicine is limited, the college recently completed a self study and was favorably reviewed by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education. That review and the concurring opinion of the NCA team suggest that the strength of
the College of Medicine is remarkable, particularly in light of the funding challenges it has faced.

In sum, the UA Self Study suggests and the team's inquiries affirmed that the university brings a broad, integrated perspective to the support of its instructional mission. An array of programs provides academic support for a diverse student body. The technology infrastructure is viewed as integral to innovation in learning. Classrooms are renovated with the goal of producing a positive effect on learning. Faculty development is geared toward supporting excellence and innovation. Faculty rewards supporting excellence in teaching, research and service are augmented by a number of special awards conferred specifically to recognize outstanding teachers. The university has taken an equally wide-ranging approach to ensure that "discovery and cooperation" are fostered in a safe, diverse and varied campus environment.

Research

The UA Self Study asserts that "research and creative activity are indispensable to the university's vision of a pre-eminent student-centered research university" (SSR 91), and the university is a leader, in particular, in optics research and development. Research awards have increased over the past ten years, as have the number of funded projects, despite a shift in funding sources that reflects a relative loss of share from the Department of Health and Human Services and concomitant gains in non-federal support. Research expenditures have been generally high, with the exception of the College of Medicine, which, despite having the highest expenditures in 1998, posted a below-average gain in research expenditures since 1991. The return of a significant portion of the indirect costs of grants and contracts back to the schools and colleges provides an important resource to deans, and incentives to faculty.
National Research Council rankings reflect well on the university. Of 28 programs ranked, 16 were in the top third; eleven of fifteen program improved their ranking between 1982 and 1993. As the SSR notes, "the highly ranked disciplines are diverse and are not restricted to a single college" (SSR 93). The NSF ranks UA in the top 15 public research institutions and in the top 20 institutions overall, and the university’s ranking in R&D expenditures have improved.

The university has a strong tradition of interdisciplinary research and has been able to duplicate its success in research with success in interdisciplinary graduate programs (IDPs). The 19 IDPs attract a large and increasing proportion of graduate students, and there are well-established mechanisms for funding these programs. Participation in interdisciplinary activities, including IDPs, is explicitly included in faculty evaluations (annual as well as promotion and tenure). Notable recent recognition of the university’s success includes the NSF awards of a Science and Technology Center (STC) in Hydrology and an Integrative Graduate Education and Research Training (IGERT) grant.

Research strengths at the university have helped drive the selection of targeted economic development priorities in state policy. The Science and Technology Park, with infrastructure acquired from IBM at minimal cost, has become a significant contributor to economic development in the region. Articulate support for research at the highest levels of the university appears to be having positive effects at the level of the Regents and, less clearly, the legislature. There is also an increasingly strong collaboration among chairs, deans, and the VP for Research to encourage and support faculty research and creative work.

Undergraduates are increasingly integrated in a meaningful way into the research mission of the campus. However, the overall number of students participating in faculty research
projects is limited and the quality of their experience varies. This is due in part to the deficit in laboratory space. Despite these challenges, many faculty members view this as one of the most positive aspects of the "student-centered research university." The university has procedures and plans in place for thorough training in research integrity for faculty and graduate students. This plan needs to be implemented, so that the concept of integrity in research (and all that includes) not only becomes ingrained in current (and future) faculty members, but that the procedures for dealing with accusations of misconduct are clear.

Overall, the achievements in research and scholarly activities at the university over the last decade have been especially remarkable, considering they occurred in spite of an extremely difficult fiscal environment.

Concerns about research resonate with issues raised elsewhere in this report: The shortage of research space is pressing, and particular attention must be paid to renovations and new research space to address a critical shortage. The location of the Research and Technology Park presents a challenge to integration with on-campus activities. On-campus responsibilities make it difficult for students and faculty to get to and from the park, which cannot realistically be considered as "surge space" to make up for the lack of research space on campus. The ability of the library to support research and graduate education is in jeopardy, and additional resources are needed. The overall lack of sufficient resources to support the research infrastructure affects the ability to attract and retain top faculty and places the very successful programs at the university in an increasingly fragile position.

The self-study claims both that "it is essential to support highly ranked programs at current or higher levels and to enhance the quality and visibility of disciplines not currently
ranked in the top 1/3 nationally." The team questions how the university proposes to do this, observing that clear academic leadership will be required to develop a coherent vision of where the university wishes to go in research, scholarship, and creative work.

Two areas of the university are not currently attracting external funding according to the expectations of the rest of the campus. The School of Medicine has exhibited a rate of growth significantly below the institution as a whole, and as a result the proportion of total university funding from the NIH has dropped, despite the substantial growth in the NIH budget. The university has recognized the problem, and is taking steps to deal with it, including facilitating interdisciplinary collaborations between science programs and medical researchers, and setting up in-house career development awards for clinicians. While funding for the arts and humanities constitutes only about 1% of all sponsored research, the team found a marked reduction in such funding during the period reported in the self-study. Although it would enhance the visibility of the scholars in these disciplines to seek NEH Fellowships, for example, the team was told that it is "not in their culture" to apply for funding. This is an area where faculty culture can and should be changed.

The development of graduate education, especially the IDPs that are a hallmark of the campus, may be further enhanced if the Graduate Dean were part of the Academic Council. This is necessary for effective collaboration between the Graduate Dean and the Deans of the other schools and colleges, and to assure that the graduate mission of the university literally has "a place at the table". It is also important to effectively represent the faculty and students in the 19 IDPs that report to the Graduate Dean.
Outreach

UA's outreach mission is seen as an extension of the other two, extending both beyond the boundaries of the campus. The *Self Study* reports that this concept has been embraced by "all academic programs and units of the institution," although efforts highlighted relate specifically to the College of Agriculture's Cooperative Extension and Agricultural Experiment Station, the UA Health Sciences Center, and the Extended University (SSR 111, 112). The University of Arizona has some longstanding and successful programs that provide a foundation for the university's outreach mission. Some are traditional, widely used in other states: for example, the agricultural extension offices in each county provide a range of services to many categories of citizens, including children. Some outreach programs are innovative; for example, the Telemedicine initiative, which effectively increases the quality of rural medical delivery services to an impressive degree.

University outreach has begun to look beyond agriculture and medicine, seeking creative ways to bring the teaching and research originating on campus to Arizona citizens in various walks of life. To this end, it has created an extensive "Outreach Inventory," detailing every activity which might be construed as outreach. This Inventory is to be placed online, where it can be updated regularly and links can be added among related activities, whether through a common target audience, a common off-campus location, or in some other fashion. While the evaluators questioned some activities as marginal examples of outreach (*i.e.*, the presentation on-campus of traveling productions of plays or musicals), others hold great promise.

The College of Education has provided a promising model by offering continuing education to high school teachers in the high schools, rather than on campus. Although this
model places a burden on university faculty, it is surely much appreciated by the schools. The College of Fine Arts has developed a number of programs which take advanced education in creative arts to the population at large. University Extension has begun to offer parenting, life skills, and character education classes, serving a population (social service clients) that has not been well served previously.

The UA uses familiar electronic media effectively to disseminate learning. For example, the local PBS television outlet regularly offers some 20 classes, including some in high technology areas. However, newer electronic media for outreach have not been as well used. In part, this is because of the state's mountainous geography, which makes installation of networking facilities very costly. The need for web-based instruction on the part of citizens in rural Arizona is not being fully met. It is to be hoped that efforts currently under way, under Regents auspices, will soon identify strategies, including funding strategies, to meet this growing need. Evaluators also heard reports that hardware for video-conferencing is not sufficiently available, and that existing facilities are heavily over booked. A bright side is found in the Learning Technologies Partnership, which is supported by able and energetic staff and faculty and deserves enhanced support.

In addition to increased needs for communications networks and hardware, a further expense to be incurred in expanding the university's outreach is training of university faculty in new learning technologies. The Faculty Learning Center located in the Center for Computer and Information Technology seems underutilized, perhaps because incentives are lacking to persuade already very busy faculty to take time out for technological education. More incentive programs,
affording faculty released time or other professional development funding or assistance, would undoubtedly be worth exploring. Other universities have successfully developed teams for faculty education in learning technologies.

Overall, evaluators felt outreach could be better coordinated, recognized, and rewarded. The university is doing an excellent job of outreach in some areas, but integration of function in certain areas (for example, publicity and facilities) would enhance the accomplishment of the overall mission significantly.

Assessment

The University of Arizona has an assessment plan with the key components necessary for a sound assessment program (higher administrative support, linkages to the mission of the institution, an individual with ultimate responsibility for assessment, a respected coordinating committee, faculty ownership, appropriate resources for planning and assistance, a process that incorporates assessment into the functioning of the institution, and a broad scope of general outcomes). While only some of the units have a fully implemented program (i.e., at the stage of using the assessment information), these units (which will serve as models for others) have used multiple measures and sources for assessment information. Overall, assessment is viewed as a resource for efforts toward improvement of student learning.

Yet the plan does not ensure that students are informed about their role in and the importance of the assessment program at UA. For example, students are not typically found on campus wide or unit assessment committees. The Undergraduate Catalog describes the university-wide General Education Structure, and includes an overview of the four goals of the
program. More could be said of the importance of general education, or of student responsibilities in the program for improvement.

Despite apparent overlap in some student outcomes goals between the academic program and student life, the latter is not represented on some of the key campus wide committees that address assessment. However, some connection to student life is developing through collaborative articulation of general student outcomes for which the entire community is responsible.

While the assessment plan provides the groundwork for a sound assessment program, far less than a majority of the academic units (estimated to be no more than one-fourth) have well developed or mature assessment programs in which information is being collected and used for making improvements. The majority of the units with more mature programs are those with assessment requirements for specialized accreditations. Few of the graduate programs have well developed assessment programs.

Specific discussion of the conclusions discussed above is explored in greater detail in Section IV of this report; that section is offered in the spirit of advice as well as in consideration of the team’s request for a progress report on assessment.

Based on the above discussions and the investigations of the site team, the University of Arizona satisfies Criterion Three.

IV. The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness.
As observed elsewhere in this report, the last decade for the University of Arizona has been one characterized by remarkable change: university planning processes have been made more extensive and inclusive, and both the sources and allocation of financial resources have become more varied. The concerns expressed in the 1990 NCA Evaluation Team report had "made the case for significant change if the university were to maintain its status as a top-tier, nationally respected institution" (SSR 141). The university has now changed to the extent that, where once there were complaints about scarce opportunities for faculty involvement in decision-making and the notable absence of data-gathering that might inform decisions, the university can now confidently assert that "at all times, including periods of uncertainty or change, [it] promotes inclusive participatory planning and decision making, informed by data and assessment" (SSR 142). The willingness to undertake such change is admirable; the commitment to continue in this direction is no less so.

Yet challenges remain. Because the assessment program was only recently initiated, few units are fully engaged in assessment. The current profile of the units that have adopted the assessment process and the extent to which they have achieved the various stages of assessment (e.g., few have reached the completion of the cycle to use the information gleaned) appears to be consistent with an institution with only a few years' experience with assessment. Given the sound program and excellent progress made in these few years, and given the evidence that the institution can continue to support the program (as outlined in greater detail in Section IV), most or all of the units can be expected to have a fully developed assessment program within five years.
While variously interpreted by different faculty, professional staff, and students, it is clear that the institutional vision of "the student-centered research university" is functioning for all constituencies as: (1) a lure and aspiration; (2) a statement of institutional commitment; and (3) an iterative fact in a continuous improvement cycle. These elements appeared repeatedly in the various "voices" encountered on the UA campus.

This vision has supported UA well in its attempts to exhibit itself as a Carnegie I Research University committed to the balanced support and recognition of both research and teaching in the promotion of learning. Two major emphases were given in interpreting this balance: (1) that all students at UA should participate in a research experience; and (2) that increased attention should be given to promoting the quality of the undergraduate experience. Both have affected the programs developed to actualize the vision.

In response to its vision, UA has created and implemented faculty development programs supporting faculty with the introduction of new pedagogies and technologies. It has provided motivation to faculty through the recognition of outstanding teaching with institutional awards and prizes. The promotion and tenure activities of a number of units have been modified to more directly balance the reward for research and teaching. In the case of post tenure review, many faculty are being given the right to define their roles with an expanded emphasis on teaching. However, it does not appear that this vision has had as much effect in the hiring process as might have been expected. Similarly, while faculty members are being recognized for their facilitation of learning and supported in the development of new skills toward this end, this recognition is not uniform across the university.
It’s clear that UA’s vision has influenced the development of curricula. For example, the new All-University General Education Requirement and the Tier One, Tier Two and Skills courses developed to meet it will, over time: (a) support faculty conversation across disciplines and units, (b) increase student-faculty interaction, (c) expose students to faculty outside their own areas, and (d) increase student participation and communication skills. However, unless something is done to control for the size and/or the diversity of academic background of the incoming freshman class, the benefits of all this All-University General Education initiative could be lost.

This vision appears to have influenced students, particularly undergraduates, to play a more active role in their own education, not only because they do more written and oral presentations in the first two years, but also because they participate in research, outreach or Preceptor Program, and projects with their professors. Again, it is essential that UA not allow the increase of student numbers or radical spread in academic preparation to overrule this advance. For example, despite the high quality of UA’s professional advisors, the advising system is no match for student demands if one considers the ratio of students to advisors.

When specific programs that enhance student success are developed (such as the Faculty Fellow or University Partners programs), they must be supported and allowed to expand rather than to languish. To date, the logic and structure of UA’s pilot programs, including its plan for assessing student learning and social development, are far more impressive than the availability of resources for expansion and implementation. Unless UA is able to seize upon its own successful innovation, it will certainly lose momentum, which will make future innovation even more difficult.
It would appear that this institutional vision has influenced a view of shared governance that emphasizes collaboration, cooperation, teamwork and commitment to continuous improvement. Many of the faculty, professional staff, and students speak enthusiastically of a new sense of inclusion in the process of planning and decision-making. However, while UA must seek to implement a comprehensive assessment program to inform decision making toward continuing improvement, it is not clear that it has budgeted this effort centrally to protect the program from the funding vicissitudes of particular schools, colleges, and units.

Finally, it would appear that the notion of the student-centered research university has not yet sufficiently matured as to yield the various outcome measures appropriate for the graduates of its different units. Of greatest interest are those measures that would indicate how having been a student at a student-centered research university has changed these individuals. It is anticipated that this will come with time as UA contests the stereotype of the Research University.

The team finds that the University of Arizona meets Criterion Four.

V. The institution demonstrates integrity in its practices and relationships.

As a public institution, UA is required by Regent policies as well as federal and state legislation to conduct itself with integrity, which seems to be a watchword at the University of Arizona. It is a guiding principle for many university programs and activities -- from intercollegiate athletics, to research experiments, technology transfer, and personnel policy. A university committee on corporate relations reviews proposed arrangements between faculty and the commercial sector. Similarly, another committee is charged with monitoring the university's
activities vis-a-vis its neighbors, especially those communities adjacent to the university.

The positive nature of the campus climate and the strong sense of community within the university are other indicators of integrity and the university's conscious efforts to be inclusive, fair, and respectful in its relations with its constituents.

The administration is committed to the concept of shared governance and as a result there are extensive opportunities for faculty, staff, and student consultation on campus issues, as well as mechanisms for participation in decision-making.

Yet an organization's integrity is a fragile attribute that requires constant attention and nurturing. To this end, the university's Office of Human Resources and other appropriate units should consider adopting a more pro-active posture with respect to integrity-related matters. Examples include training programs on research ethics, the responsibilities of principal investigators, student life skills (similar to the model program offered to university athletes), substance abuse, etc. Some of these topics should also be addressed in the Student Code of Conduct, which is in the process of being revised.

The Internet and electronic commerce present both benefits and challenges to higher education. Among the challenges are those relating to the responsible use of computing and telecommunication resources and the need for policies on intellectual property, including web-based instructional programs and course-ware.

The assessment of student learning is also a matter of integrity. Students and the general public have a right and a need to know that the institution and individual program units have clear outcome goals for students, that the institution places great importance on the high quality of the educational program, that the institution will expect students to fulfill their role in the
process, and that changes will be identified based on the information for the purpose of improvement in the student learning at the institution.

As noted in Section IV, prospective and incoming students are provided with few explicit and public statements regarding the institution’s expectations for student learning, e.g., student general education outcomes and student development outcomes that would apply to all undergraduates. Information is missing in the undergraduate catalog about these general outcomes, the general goal of the institution regarding quality and improvement, and the student role and responsibility in that effort.

The University of Arizona’s response to the 1990 NCA site evaluation team report demonstrates that the university is able to adapt for the purpose of improvement. Its determination to monitor and study key areas (e.g., affirmative action, ADA compliance, and gender-pay equity) to determine if inequities exist demonstrates a commitment to vigilance in these areas. The team finds that the University of Arizona meets Criterion Five.
V. Assessment

While the team has found UA to satisfy the overarching concerns of the Criteria for Accreditation, as consultants the team offers the following details related to the integration of assessment into the university's mission as the university prepares its progress report on assessment:

Administrative support. The higher level administrators are supportive of the assessment program with the philosophy of conducting assessment for the purpose of improvement. This support is found both in explicit public statements and through authorization of the services of various campus offices for the assessment efforts. For example, at a recent symposium on assessment at the university co-sponsored by the Office of the Provost, the President gave the opening address and the Provost provided a statement of support in the printed program. Additional evidence of the administration's support may be found in the authorization of the following special projects that serve to enhance the assessment program:

- Assessment Pilot Project (seminars, consulting, exemplary examples provided to twenty departments; these faculty and support staff will advise and mentor other programs in their colleges);

- Summer Support of Campus-wide General Education Subcommittee (thirteen general education faculty supported during summer 1999 to design course assessment and student learning outcomes in the general education Tier One and Tier Two curricula); and

- January 2000 Assessment Symposium (designed to promote better practice, improve
understanding of benefits, and contribute to view of assessment as fundamental to a
scholarly approach to teaching and learning).

Relationship of mission and educational objectives. Each unit's assessment plan and its use of
the results are a part of the Academic Program Review, a process that occurs at least every seven
years. The Academic Program Review Procedure Manual (September, 1999) indicates that each
academic program must address how the student outcomes identified for the assessment program
"are related to the mission and goals of the program, the college, and the university" (p. C5).

Coordinating committee. To assist in the charge to the Provost and Academic Council, a campus
wide coordinating committee was established in 1998. The Student Assessment Coordinating
Committee consists of administrators, faculty, and representatives from offices providing support
to the assessment activity. This committee is responsible for coordinating and facilitating
assessment in the academic units, the general education program, and student development areas.
They have been very successful in communicating the philosophy of assessment on the campus
to be a program for continuous improvement. A sub-committee of the university-wide General
Education Committee is in the process of planning an appropriate assessment plan for the Tiers
One and Two of the General Education Curriculum; the Foundations curriculum courses are
assessed within academic units in which they are delivered.

Faculty ownership. The University of Arizona has been highly successful in supporting the
planning and early stages of implementation of an assessment program that is owned by the
faculty. Many of the faculty have taken the opportunity to collaboratively determine the
educational outcome goals for their programs. In some units that are more advanced in their
assessment work, faculty are working together to determine appropriate measures for those
outcomes, and to identify improvements based on those results. Those units that have fully
developed assessment programs consider assessment to be a tool and resource, and as a way of
functioning in their department rather than an "add-on"; this orientation will serve them well in
the future in their goal for improvement. This orientation is consistent with the goals of the
institution and the Student Assessment Coordinating Committee to foster "a campus wide
transition from assessment as a reaction to demands for accountability - to assessment as a
continuous source of knowledge essential for instructional improvement" (SSR 135).

Level of adoption of assessment: The faculty involved in assessment at the University of
Arizona view assessment as a tool towards improvement. "Few (units), however, have attained
the objective of using assessment results to document and improve student learning" (SSR 134).
The programs that have made significant progress toward assessment are primarily professional
programs driven by external accrediting agencies.

The essential elements are in place, however, to assure that such use will take place as the
program matures and more units reach the later stages of utilization and change. A key factor in
this closing of the assessment cycle for the units is the recently revised Academic Program
Review. Section G of each review report addresses assessment and requests the following
information: student outcomes, relationship of outcomes to mission and goals, involvement of
faculty, methods of assessment, reliability and validity of data, timeline for assessment
implementation, use of assessment results, incorporation of results into strategic planning and
curriculum review, and feedback mechanism of results to students and faculty. This represents a
model of an assessment program that will assure completion of the assessment cycle and assure
that assessment is an on-going process. As noted above, however, the institution has not
engaged in assessment for an adequate period of time to complete this cycle in a large majority of its programs. While not all programs have completed an Academic Program Review, the institution is not waiting until all reviews have been completed to encourage units to begin their assessment work: annual reports requesting information about progress in assessment assist in this effort, which also engages all units in assessment.

In addition to promoting faculty ownership, this model also includes other elements of a sound assessment program of clearly linking assessment to the budget and planning process, and encouraging useful, regular assessment feedback information to faculty.

The Academic Program Review asks departments to address both their undergraduate and graduate programs. However, the review reports appear to indicate that few of the units included assessment of graduate programs in Section G. The units seemed to have focused their efforts on assessment of undergraduate before assessment of the graduate programs.

Recognition and motivation. While also maintaining a successful research agenda, UA motivates and recognizes faculty efforts in their teaching through various means: teaching awards, Distinguished Professorships, Regents Professorships, and faculty development initiatives (Learning Technologies Partnership, Faculty Center for Instructional Innovation, Teaching Center, and various workshops and conferences). This support of teaching clearly also supports assessment. The institution also noted that proposals for competitive project support are viewed more favorably when course goals, outcomes and assessment techniques are included.

Scope of Assessment. Those responsible for the planning and conduct of the institution acknowledge the need for the assessment program to include the appropriate multi-dimensions of
knowledge, general education, and skills and competencies. This broad scope of assessment is
reflected in

1) the appropriate student outcomes goals to be assessed which have been identified by
most of the individual units including the general education program (student outcome goals are
currently being drafted for broad goals of student life and the undergraduate program) and

2) the actual collection of information about student development towards those
outcomes in those units that are at the stages of collection, review and use of information in their
assessment programs (estimated to be no more than one-fourth of the units).

Student understanding of assessment. In general, students appear to have little or no
involvement in the planning of assessment, awareness of the purpose of assessment at the
institution, or understanding of their assessment role and responsibilities. While some mention
may be made at orientation and some departments (most commonly the professional programs)
apparently explain the student outcome goals for their programs, this is atypical overall or not
effective for most students. To have the students understand the term "assessment" is not
critical. However, students have a right and a need to know that the institution does have clear
outcome goals for them, the institution seriously considers the quality of the education, the units
will gather information from students to determine the extent to which they have reached the
goals, and the unit faculty (along with input from the students) will identify what changes might
be made toward improvement based on that information. Prospective and incoming students are
provided with few explicit and public statements regarding the institution's expectations for
student learning, e.g., student general education and student development outcomes that would
apply to all undergraduates. Information is included in the undergraduate catalog about general
education and student development outcomes; information about the general goal of the institution regarding quality and improvement, and the student role and responsibility in that effort, could be added.

Use of multi measures. Generally, the programs with well developed assessment programs include multi measures such as paper and pencil tests, essays and writing, portfolios of work, focus groups, external evaluators, logs, journals, observations, performance reviews, national exams/locally developed tests, entrance and exit interviews, surveys of students, alumni, and employers, job placement. The institution is using the well-developed assessment programs and their faculty as resources for those departments less advanced in the assessment process. The principle of using multi measures is likely to transfer to the other units as they use the expertise of other departments.

As is typical in the early stages of assessment at an institution, some faculty remain unclear about some dimensions of assessment such as the following:

- the difference between the assessment they have always conducted through course examinations and the broader assessment of student outcomes
- the need to close the assessment loop after obtaining assessment information (e.g., a defense of a dissertation) by systematically reviewing the information and identifying strengths and possible areas for improvement (e.g., consideration by the unit faculty of the information from all defenses)
- the differences among assessment of resources (e.g., ranked faculty as instructors, class availability), processes (e.g., educational encounters such as collaborative learning) and student outcomes. While certain resources and processes have been identified as being
critical to successful student outcomes and such resource and process assessment information is necessary to provide direction for change, student outcome data are different from the other two and are a necessary component in a student outcome assessment program.

Administrative responsibility and support. While the development and implementation of a unit's assessment program are the responsibility of that unit, higher levels are ultimately responsible for the progress of the development and implementation, which takes place through the planning and budgeting process. The Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs monitors periodic review and updating of the assessment program. The Provost through the Academic Council of deans provides the incentives and mandates for the assessment program.

The assessment program at the institution has appropriate support from all levels of the administration. The chief academic officer and other central administrators have expressed public support for the program, have appropriately delegated the coordination to a broadly based committee and the implementation to the unit level, and have provided central support where needed. The institution provides resources and support for the assessment program through the following:

Institutional Offices

- Office of Assessment and Enrollment Research (offers consultation in research and evaluation design, portfolios, testing, writing assessment, surveys and questionnaires)
- Office of Academic Planning and Review (enhances effective decision making and fosters accountability by: facilitating strategic planning, facilitating assessment, facilitating the
integration of planning and budgeting processes, and providing clear direction to the members of the university community)

- Office of Decision and Planning Support (maintains data that are summarized and published annually in the Fact Book; provides on-line access to data for departments)

- University Teaching Center (provides instructional support resources, consultation and workshops) for instructional assessment activities

  **Institutional Committees**

- Student Assessment Coordinating Committee (coordinates programs of units, general education, and student development areas and generally supports the implementation of a sound assessment program)

- Sub-committee of the university-wide General Education Committee (will finalize an assessment program for Tier One and Tier Two general education curriculum)

  **Funds to support changes.** The decentralized decision making authority instituted in 1994-95 affords deans and departments the responsibility and authority to allocate resources to support changes indicated by assessment. The ability to respond, however, may be limited by the general level of support of the institution rather than any design of the assessment program or commitment to change.

  **Link to planning and budgeting.** The design of the academic program assessment program, as incorporated into the Academic Review Program, incorporates a procedure for the assessment information to influence institutional priorities in planning and budgeting.

  **Reporting Procedures.** Each academic program must provide an annual report which is submitted to the Provost that includes progress on the assessment program. Thus, the program
includes a procedure for an annual report of accomplishments, obstacles or other changes accommodated through modification of the previous year’s plan. As the institution gains experience with this new program review, the review of their assessment activity is likely to assume a greater importance for each unit.

On-going, continuous process. At this early point in the development of assessment at the institution, the planning and execution of the assessment plan in only a few units can be viewed as being continuous, involving a variety of constituencies, and providing useful planning information to students, faculty, and administration.

Concluding Remark. The team hopes that the detailed advice offered regarding assessment will be helpful to the university as it implements its assessment plan.
VI. Strengths

Among the many strengths identified by the team in the Self-Study Report, supporting documents, and during the site visit, the following are particularly worthy of note:

People:

- The University of Arizona is an economic, cultural, and intellectual treasure of the state and nation.
- The Regents understand the goals of the university and advocate for them keenly.
- The university has an articulate and committed senior administration that enjoys strong campus support.
- The university has an outstanding faculty and staff, with loyal alumni and students.
- There have been significant accomplishments in the shared governance of the university since the last NCA visit.
- There is a shared vision among the administration, faculty, and staff of the university’s direction.

The Undergraduate Experience:

- The university’s development of the vision of a student-centered research university has been enthusiastically accepted by its constituents.
- The General Education design process, product, and implementation represent an
extraordinary effort and commitment to the quality of undergraduate education.

- The library is a national leader in its integration with instruction and student learning.
- The transformation of the student affairs group into the campus life organization has contributed significantly to the quality of the student experience.
- The university has developed outstanding support programs for at-risk students that are staffed by dedicated and creative professionals.
- The Faculty Fellows Program is a model program that effectively engages students outside of the classroom. The current Faculty Fellows are enthusiastic and dedicated.
- The university has achieved admirable diversity within its undergraduate student body.
- Plans for information technology support both on- and off-campus instruction.

Graduate Students and Research:

- The university hosts an impressive array of scholarly and creative activities, many of which are widely recognized research programs and institutes.
- The university is notable for the success of its interdisciplinary programs.
- The Arizona Health Sciences Center is a major source of strength for the university.
- There is robust support for research at the highest levels of the university.

Outreach:

- The university can boast of impressive examples of outreach and extension activities.
- The university is doing a particularly good job in the area of community relations, having in place an Assistant Vice President for Community Relations and a procedure through which
monthly meetings (chaired by a member of the community) bring university representatives together with its neighbors. This group is also well-integrated into the university’s space planning process. Finally, the office has ensured that the local business community is very engaged with the university, which provides considerable help with the university’s legislative agenda.

Resources:

- Plans to supplement and diversify the university’s financial resources, including the research park and a major capital campaign, will contribute to the margin of excellence.
- Investments in the physical infrastructure, despite an absence of state funding, have brought needed improvements, albeit at significant cost to the operating budget.
- The university provides high quality support for students having learning disabilities and/or physical disabilities. Assistive technologies are prevalent.

Assessment:

- Student outcome assessment is well integrated into the Academic Program Review.
VII. Challenges

The NCA will ask UA to address the challenges cited below in the university's next review. This list summarizes concerns expressed in the report above.

Resources:
- A substantial deficit in tax and tuition income, combined with an apparent lack of appreciation and understanding of higher education by certain elements of State government and segments of the population, presents significant challenges for internal management and public advocacy of the university's goals, including:
  - support for academic programs;
  - the research library;
  - new buildings;
  - building refurbishment;
  - information technology;
  - and competitive faculty, staff, and teaching assistant salaries.

Undergraduate Education:
- The open access policies of the university carry with them an increasing challenge of serving a student body with disparate academic needs.

Graduate Education and Research:
- The location of the research park presents a challenge to integration with on-campus
activities. The park’s mission is to support emerging technologies and businesses through active engagement of faculty and students.

Outreach:

- The team is concerned that the university’s well-articulated and high ideals in outreach are not being fully realized, because of lack of coordination and the remoteness of communities to be served. Excellent outreach efforts in such areas as medicine, education, agriculture, the museums, and public policy could be better coordinated, achieving greater impact. Direct support of industry training, certification programs, and graduate education for non-traditional students represent opportunities to be explored.

Assessment:

- Most academic units have not completely implemented assessment plans; assessment of graduate education is less developed than for undergraduate programs.
- It will be a challenge to translate the vision of the student-centered research university into measurable student outcomes.

Planning:

- Closer coordination is needed among planning, budgeting, and final implementation efforts.
- A coherent plan is needed for the UA-South and other branch campuses.
- The physical constraints of nearly-fixed geographical boundaries presents challenges to the continued growth of the campus.
Diversity:

- Despite progress, strong leadership and a changed culture is still needed to recruit and retain a diverse faculty.
VIII. Advice and Suggestions

The team submits "advice" as consultants; the following are areas that could be considered as the university plans for the future.

- Given that the success of the "student-centered research university" depends on the vitality of the research mission of the university, sufficient attention needs to be paid to the infrastructure and priorities that will maintain research momentum.

- Awareness of increased globalization is not evident to the team, and increased attention could be given to the internationalization of the university as measured by student participation in study abroad programs and the number of and support for international visitors.

- The team recommends that the university select a more refined peer group for benchmarking faculty salaries. One suggestion is to report both aggregate salaries and salaries without including College of Medicine faculty. Insofar as possible, the university should collect market data on salary levels for appointed personnel.

- As the university enters the next phase of strategic planning, it will be important to create a process for refining the university's research agenda.

- The team suggests that the university utilize a variety of methods to share successful strategies for retention of underrepresented minorities.

- The team encourages the university to develop public, civic, and business partnerships to address the needs of Arizona communities, including efforts in housing, transportation,
diversity, growth, and policy planning.

- In addition to partnerships such as those suggested above, the university could consider opportunities to collaborate with Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University. As has been demonstrated by the cooperative agreements forged within the Consortium for Institutional Collaboration, investments in several areas may be leveraged for the betterment of all (such as library cooperation, technology transfer, faculty and staff training and development, to name only a few).

- Consideration should be given to including the Graduate Dean on the Academic Council in order to provide better coordination and integration of all academic programs.

- The university is encouraged to give careful consideration to the impact that debt-financing of current and future buildings is having on the operating budget.

- The assessment program would benefit from: (1) appropriate linkages between the academic programs and student life in assessment planning and activity; (2) student representation on college and program committees; and (3) effective communication to students about the purposes of assessment at the institution and their role in the program.

- The university should address graduate students concerns, including course offerings, workloads, compensation, research opportunities, and housing.

- The team vigorously recommends that the Regents reconsider current admission policies on a system-wide basis to insure the most appropriate match with the institutional mission. If the current admissions policy for the university is continued, the university should develop comprehensive plans to anticipate divergent academic needs of different tiers of the student body.
• The university should develop close working relationships with its branch campuses and develop management strategies based on this understanding. For example, it should address the lack of library resources and allow flexibility in curriculum design.

• The university's Office of Human Resources should develop a training program for new department heads on topics such as planning, assessment, EEO/AA issues, conflict resolution, etc. There is also a need for more campus-wide and college-based programs for faculty and staff development.

• The roles of appointed staff and support staff in university governance need to be more fully articulated.

• The university needs to continue to enhance relations with alumni and further encourage alumni participation in annual giving.

• Appointed staff members (professionals) typically have one-year contracts with 90-day notice of non-reappointment. A system of somewhat longer contracts for staff having 10 or more years of university employment should be considered.
IX. Recommendations and Rationale

RECOMMENDATION: Next comprehensive visit for continued accreditation visit in 2009-10, with a progress report on assessment due March 1, 2005.

Rationale: The Team acknowledges the excellent progress the university has made in assessment over the past few years. The delay in initial planning inhibited an adequate level of implementation by the time of this visit. Consequently, the assessment program varies greatly across units in the degree to which it has been implemented. The progress report should include evidence that the full evaluation cycle has been implemented and assessment results have been utilized for program improvement. The academic departments, general education program, and other units (e.g. campus life) with identified student outcome goals should provide information about:

- what types of assessment information were collected;
- what, if any, programmatic changes were made based on the information; and
- what, if any, changes have been made to the assessment programs themselves based on their experiences.
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