

State of Washington  
Joint Legislative Audit & Review Committee (JLARC)



# **Assessing the Impact of Tuition on Access, Affordability, and Institutional Quality**

## **Project Update**

January 7, 2014

*Upon request, this document is available in  
alternative formats for persons with disabilities.*

---

## **Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee**

1300 Quince St SE  
PO Box 40910  
Olympia, WA 98504  
(360) 786-5171  
(360) 786-5180 Fax  
[www.jlarc.leg.wa.gov](http://www.jlarc.leg.wa.gov)

---

### **Committee Members**

#### **Senators**

Randi Becker  
John Braun, *Vice Chair*  
Annette Cleveland  
David Frockt  
Janéa Holmquist Newbry  
Jeanne Kohl-Welles, *Secretary*  
Mark Mullet  
Ann Rivers

#### **Representatives**

Cathy Dahlquist, *Assistant Secretary*  
Tami Green  
Kathy Haigh, *Chair*  
Ed Orcutt  
Gerry Pollet  
Derek Stanford  
Hans Zeiger  
*Vacancy*

#### **Legislative Auditor**

Keenan Konopaski

### **Audit Authority**

The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) works to make state government operations more efficient and effective. The Committee is comprised of an equal number of House members and Senators, Democrats and Republicans.

JLARC's non-partisan staff auditors, under the direction of the Legislative Auditor, conduct performance audits, program evaluations, sunset reviews, and other analyses assigned by the Legislature and the Committee.

The statutory authority for JLARC, established in Chapter 44.28 RCW, requires the Legislative Auditor to ensure that JLARC studies are conducted in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, as applicable to the scope of the audit. This study will be conducted in accordance with those applicable standards.

# Assessing the Impact of Tuition on Access, Affordability, and Institutional Quality Project Update

January 7, 2014



STATE OF WASHINGTON

JOINT LEGISLATIVE AUDIT AND  
REVIEW COMMITTEE

## STUDY TEAM

Eric Whitaker  
John Bowden

## PROJECT SUPERVISOR

John Woolley

## LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

Keenan Konopaski

Copies of Final Reports and Digests are  
available on the JLARC website at:

[www.jlarc.leg.wa.gov](http://www.jlarc.leg.wa.gov)

or contact

Joint Legislative Audit & Review  
Committee  
1300 Quince St SE  
Olympia, WA 98504-0910  
(360) 786-5171  
(360) 786-5180 FAX

## In Brief

In 2011, the Legislature passed a bill granting temporary tuition-setting authority to the State's four-year higher education institutions. The Legislature also directed the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) to conduct an audit of the "impact of tuition-setting authority on student access, affordability, and institutional quality." This project update reports on how JLARC staff are approaching data collection for the project and how staff are defining and measuring access, affordability, and quality.

JLARC staff plan to collect annual data for all six of the public institutions to cover a ten-year period. The data will come from state agencies, including the Office of Financial Management's (OFM) Education and Research Data Center (ERDC), the Washington Student Achievement Council, and the institutions themselves. JLARC staff will collect this information regardless of whether an institution exercises statutory tuition-setting authority.

There is considerable agreement in academic research and among legislators for how to define and measure higher education "access" and "affordability." The JLARC study will use the common measures reflected in the academic research.

There is no consensus in the literature on how to measure "institutional quality," and the Legislature has not defined the term. Based on JLARC staff's research, discussions with legislators and the institutions, and a review of the institutions' accreditation reports, JLARC staff will use, at a minimum, the following three indicators for institutional quality: graduation rate, retention rate (first-year-to-sophomore) and mean time to degree. It is also an option that the Legislature could explicitly define institutional quality in statute.

## JLARC DIRECTED TO EVALUATE WHETHER TUITION CHANGES IMPACT ACCESS, AFFORDABILITY, AND INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY

In Washington, as in many other states, tuition and fee increases at public colleges and universities have been used to help offset decreased state support for higher education. Between academic years (AYs) 2001-02 and 2011-12, tuition and fees more than doubled for resident undergraduates.

The 2011 Legislature passed a bill granting temporary tuition setting authority to the governing boards of the state universities, the regional universities, and The Evergreen State College (E2SHB 1795). In the same legislation, the Legislature expressed concern regarding the lack

of transparency involving the uses of tuition revenue and how this revenue stream relates to outcomes. The Legislature directed the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) to conduct an audit of the “impact of tuition-setting authority on student access, affordability, and institutional quality.”

Also in the 2011 session, the Legislature passed a separate bill creating the Opportunity Scholarship and Opportunity Expansion programs (ESHB 2088). The goals of these programs are to help mitigate the impact of tuition increases; increase the number of degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and health care fields; and better meet employer demands for employees with specific qualifications. The Legislature directed JLARC to conduct an audit to examine the administration and effectiveness of these programs in achieving their stated goals.

JLARC staff issued a combined scope and objectives outlining the major research questions for these two assignments in May 2012 and findings for both studies are due by December 2018.

The purpose of this project update is to summarize JLARC staff’s efforts on the tuition-setting study. It explains the rationale for JLARC staff’s intent to collect annual data for the state’s public higher education institutions and identifies how JLARC staff are planning to define and measure access, affordability, and institutional quality.

## **The Legislature Seeks Information about the Impact of Tuition Changes Regardless of Who Changes Tuition**

The Legislature seeks to know whether changes in tuition and fees have a discernible impact on access, affordability, and institutional quality at each public baccalaureate institution. JLARC staff assume legislators seek this information regardless of whether the Legislature or the governing boards of the institutions set tuition and fee rates. The Council of Presidents (COP) interprets the obligations of the institutions to work with JLARC staff as necessary only if an institution chooses to exercise tuition-setting authority. To date, only the University of Washington has exercised tuition-setting authority for a single academic year (AY 2011-12).

JLARC staff plan to collect annual data, over a ten-year period (2006-07 AY through 2015-16 AY) for all six public baccalaureate institutions in Washington, regardless of whether they have changed tuition or who made the decision to change tuition. Some of the information will need to come from the institutions themselves. For example, institutions will need to provide detailed information about the amount of money from operating fees set aside each year for student aid and how they are disclosing cost information to students and families on tuition billing statements.

## **How JLARC Staff Are Defining and Measuring Key Concepts**

Because “access,” “affordability,” and “institutional quality” are not defined in statute, JLARC staff spoke with legislators and reviewed various reports and documents to gain an understanding of these three concepts. JLARC staff found considerable agreement in definitions and measurement of access and affordability.

Staff’s review did not find agreement in how to define institutional quality. JLARC staff again talked with legislators and reviewed various sources and documents, and reviewed the institutions’ accreditation materials, requested specific measures from the institutions, and met with the Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) Public Centralized Higher Education Enrollment System (PCHEES)

stakeholder group. The next two sections summarize our approach to defining and measuring access, affordability, and institutional quality.

### ***There is Considerable Agreement about How to Define and Measure “Access” and “Affordability”***

Consistent with academic research, the JLARC study is defining **access as the year-to-year change in enrollment for different demographic subgroups of students**. This approach is consistent with both the research and statutory language mandating analyses that account for “changes in undergraduate enrollment, retention, and graduation by race and ethnicity, gender, state and county of origin, and economic status” (E2SHB 1795, Section 31 (2)(a)).

Also consistent with academic research, the JLARC study is defining **affordability** in two ways: 1) **tuition and fees divided by family income**, and 2) **tuition and fees minus financial aid divided by family income**. The first measure captures the up-front “sticker price” whereas the second captures the actual “out of pocket” expense after receiving aid to offset students’ cost. This is an important distinction as the sticker price may serve as a disincentive for some students, particularly those who are academically qualified but whose families are of limited economic means. Accounting for both measures will provide more detailed information for the Legislature.

Most of the data necessary to track these access and affordability indicators is available from two sources: OFM’s Education and Research Data Center’s (ERDC) data warehouse and the Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC). However, data on income and financial aid is limited to those families from which students applied for financial aid and enrolled in a post-secondary institution in Washington. To the extent that additional data (e.g., loan debt at graduation) may augment the income-based affordability indicator, JLARC will work with COP and the institutions to develop a more robust set of measures.

### ***There is Relatively Little Consensus about How to Define and Measure “Institutional Quality”***

Institutional quality is not defined in statute, and opinions vary on it.

In researching institutional quality, JLARC staff reviewed academic studies and articles, and talked with legislators. Researchers do not agree on a core set of indicators, and legislators offered diverse perspectives. JLARC staff also asked the six public baccalaureate institutions for advice regarding their own efforts to track and evaluate institutional quality. The institutions directed staff to their accreditation reports and various institution-specific initiatives, but this provided little guidance for identifying standard measures that would narrow the scope of defining institutional quality.

The accreditation process provides regular opportunities, over a seven year cycle, for colleges and universities to engage in both self- and peer evaluation processes. The review is administered by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), an independent, regional, and nonprofit organization recognized by the United States Department of Education. The accreditation process serves multiple functions: 1) summarizes the efforts of institutions to meet broadly accepted standards of quality and effectiveness; 2) permits self-evaluation and peer review of efforts to fulfill missions and meet goals; and 3) provides counsel and assistance to institutions.

JLARC staff inventoried all of the indicators identified in each institution’s most-recent Self-Evaluation Report, a part of the accreditation process. This review found considerable variation in both the number and type of indicators proposed by the institutions. Exhibit 1 shows the number of indicators per institution and the last row tallies the number of indicators currently used by all six public baccalaureate institutions in Washington. In general, there is some overlap in the indicators selected by most institutions, but there is little similarity across all six public baccalaureate institutions.

**Exhibit 1 – The Number of Accreditation Indicators Vary Widely by Institution**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
CWU	47
EWU	39
WWU	38
TESC	49
UW	97
WSU	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>300</b>

Source: JLARC staff analysis of institutions’ accreditation reports.

In addition to the number of indicators identified by each institution, the type of measures used varies considerably across all six institutions. For example, all institutions are measuring some aspect of “student development and progress.” However, there is diversity in how institutions measure a concept such as student development and progress. Exhibit 2 provides two example indicators drawn from each institution’s accreditation report. This exhibit demonstrates how institution-specific, accreditation-based indicators do not permit equivalent comparison, as these efforts involve numerous and often disparate indicators and, presumably, diverse data and sources. Appendix 1 includes the complete list of all indicators currently used by each institution.

**Exhibit 2 – The Type of Accreditation Indicators Vary Widely by Institution**

Institution	Example Indicators for Student Development and Progress
CWU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-graduation job and graduate school placement rates</li> <li>• Survey questions asking students about “active engagement in the learning process in and outside of the classroom”</li> </ul>
EWU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional support for academic scholarship</li> <li>• Number and type of graduate degrees and certificates earned after six years from initial enrollment</li> </ul>
WWU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admission rates to graduate school</li> <li>• Survey questions asking students about the “frequency of critical thinking; synthesizing information; evaluating information, arguments, and methods; and applying concepts and theories to new problems”</li> </ul>
TESC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students demonstrate integrative, independent critical thinking</li> <li>• Students reflect on the personal and social significance of their work</li> </ul>
UW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of undergraduate students engaged in research</li> <li>• Number of academic programs that specify learning goals and methods for assessing them</li> </ul>
WSU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of seniors who have studied abroad</li> <li>• Library expenditures per student FTE compared to peer averages</li> </ul>

Source: JLARC staff analysis of institutions’ accreditation reports.

Note: All examples are drawn from the “Core Themes” section of each institution’s accreditation report. In general, these sections list the indicators used to assess student development or progress. However, each institution labels this section differently: CWU (“Teaching and learning”); EWU (“A rigorous and engaged student learning experience”); WWU (“Foster student success”); TESC (“Integrated, interdisciplinary learning”); UW (“Teaching and learning”); and WSU (“Provide a premier education and transformative experience that prepares students to excel in a global society”).

JLARC staff were able to identify three indicators used by most of the six public baccalaureate institutions and found in some research reports. This data is collected by OFM and reported as part of their Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard.

At a minimum, JLARC staff will use the three institution-level measures summarized in Exhibit 3 as indicators of institutional quality.

**Exhibit 3 – JLARC Staff Will Include Three Indicators of Student Progress  
and Completion to Assess Institutional Quality**

<b>Quality Indicators</b>	<b>Institutions Using Indicators in Accreditation Reports</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
Graduation Rate (Annual)	CWU EWU WWU UW WSU	Provides an aggregate measure of degree production; can be constructed to follow cohorts over specific durations; and data is widely available as federal law mandates this information be disclosed to prospective students.	The traditional calculation does not count all students; graduation rates may be influenced by admissions criteria; and assumes full-time status.
Retention Rate (first-to second-year)	CWU EWU WWU UW WSU	Provides a measure for the proportion of students who persevere; and data is widely available.	Does not account for potential withdrawals at other times; and cannot account for why students do not persist.
Mean Time to Degree	CWU WWU UW	Provides an aggregate measure of the average enrollment duration leading to degree attainment.	Cannot account for why students take more or fewer credit hours; may be based on calendar year rather than academic year; and may not account for student transfers.

Source: JLARC staff analysis of institutions' accreditation reports.

Note: The second column identifies institutions currently using each measure in their accreditation review. The Office of Financial Management's [Statewide Public Four-Year Dashboard](#) reports this information for all six institutions.

While the selected indicators can be identified for each institution, education analysts recommend using caution when comparing different institutions with unique missions. A more prudent approach, according to the analysts, is to compare each institution to itself over time. With this caution in mind, the three selected indicators provide legislators with two important pieces of information: 1) each provides a baseline by which to assess each institution on common indicators over time, and 2) together they offer a first step towards achieving one of the Legislature's stated goals: increasing transparency by evaluating "whether increasing tuition dollars gives students, their families, and Washington taxpayers a high-value return on investment" (E2SHB 1795, Section 1 (1)). However, it is also an option that the Legislature could explicitly define institutional quality in statute.

## Next Steps

JLARC staff will work with Office of Financial Management's Education and Research Data Center, the Washington Student Achievement Council, and the institutions to compile data to carry out the audit. JLARC staff will also work with the Council of Presidents and the higher education institutions to determine whether additional indicators and data sources might augment the current approach.

## Update

---

It will be critical for institutions to cooperate and provide all requested data in a timely manner. This is necessary regardless of whether an institution has invoked statutory tuition-setting authority or not.

In addition, consistent with the audit mandated in ESHB 2088, JLARC staff will continue to monitor the work of the Washington State Opportunity Scholarship Board and the College Success Foundation's administration of the Opportunity Scholarship and Opportunity Expansion programs.



# APPENDIX 1 – ACCREDITATION INDICATORS BY INSTITUTION

JLARC staff solicited advice from the six institutions regarding how to assess “institutional quality” for this study. Specifically, we asked:

- 1) How does your institution define “institutional quality”?
- 2) What measures do you currently have in place to evaluate institutional quality? Please provide a list and description of all such measures.
- 3) For each measure, please indicate how the data is collected (e.g., student surveys, departmental reports, etc.) and how frequently you collect the data.
- 4) Are there additional indicators or metrics you are considering or plan to use?

Most institutions directed JLARC staff to their accreditation reports. This appendix includes the entire list of indicators identified by each institution in their respective accreditation reports. Collectively the indicators are meant to capture the breadth and scope of each institution’s central priorities. The indicators are the end result of an iterative refinement process that breaks down an overarching mission statement into “core themes.” The themes are then subdivided into “objectives” or “outcomes” and paired with identifiable indicators for the purpose of measuring performance. In addition to the full list of indicators included below in Exhibit 4, the complete list is duplicated [here](#), along with annotation that connects each indicator to a specific objective or outcome, identifies its location in the report, and, when available, provides the data source.

## Exhibit 4 – Description of Individual Accreditation Indicators

<b>Central Washington University</b>
Student performance data and outcomes achievement
Post-graduation job and graduate school placement rates
Second year retention rates
Graduation rates
Time-to-graduation
Number of degrees awarded per FTE instructional faculty member
Number of FTE students taught per FTE instructional faculty
Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) results pertaining to active engagement in the learning process in and outside of the classroom
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results pertaining to active engagement in the learning process in and outside of the classroom
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results pertaining to co-curricular and extra-curricular activities
Satisfaction with co-curricular and extra-curricular activities
Increase student use and impact of relevant and effective support services
Organizational climate
Use of communication systems

Appendix 1

Access to and use of university information systems
Recruitment and retention rates for faculty and staff from underrepresented groups
Faculty and staff satisfaction with the workplace
Recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for students from underrepresented groups
Student satisfaction (underrepresented groups)
Recruitment, retention, and graduation rates for students who have served in the US military
Student satisfaction (military background)
Recruitment, retention, and graduation of international students
Student satisfaction (international)
Number of students and faculty engaged in study abroad and exchange programs to and from CWU
Number and type of courses reflecting international/global integration
Number of publications, presentations, and performances by students, faculty, and staff
Number and type of courses reflecting research, scholarship, and creative expression
Number and amounts of grants and awards for research, scholarship, and creative expression received by faculty, staff, and students
Number of cultural, educational, and recreational events made available to the campus and external communities
Number of classes and certificate program offerings related to life-long learning opportunities
Number of grants and contracts with local agencies and businesses that strengthen the economic base of the region and state
Number of businesses or jobs created as a result of efforts by members of the university community
Financial data reflecting six year rolling balanced budgets at the division and unit levels
Correlation of revenues to workload at the unit level
Core expense report disaggregated by function
Enrollment targets
Fiscal targets
Opinion surveys measuring CWU's image among key stakeholders
Number of applicants who list CWU as their first choice
Endowment gift targets
Staffing plans reflective of six year rolling plans
Professional development activity and satisfaction surveys
Percentage of staff Performance and Development Plans with professional development plans
Professional development activity and satisfaction surveys
Satisfaction with facilities
CWU Electrical and Gas Cost Charts
Satisfaction with technology
<b>Eastern Washington University</b>
Retention and completion rates of first-time, full-time freshman as compared with IPEDS peers and WA public regional universities

## Appendix 1

Retention and completion rates of transfer students as compared with IPEDS peers and WA public regional universities
Retention and completion rates of underrepresented students as compared with IPEDS peers and WA public regional universities
Retention and completion rates of Pell-eligible students
Number and type of graduate degrees and certificates earned within 6 years of initial enrollment
Production of graduates in high demand majors
Percentage of students engaged in the campus community (e.g., University-sponsored activities and programs to support student achievement)
Percentage of students engaged in the community (e.g., internships, community services activities, and experiential learning activities)
Continued academic program relevancy
Institutional support for academic scholarship
Development, sustainability, and effectiveness of a portfolio of co-curricular programs and student services, including recruitment and admission programs
Student service and support (e.g., technology infrastructure)
Quality and utilization of university facilities and physical spaces (e.g., enhance student learning experience)
Availability of technology to faculty in developing or reconfiguring courses
Quantity and quality of support services provided to students for curricular and co-curricular success
Volume of scholarly and creative output by faculty
Number and percentage of student and student-faculty research activities
Number of faculty and staff recognized for excellence
Number and percentage of faculty and staff who participate in university committee work and planning activities
Number of supported research activities and productions
Number of externally funded researchers (faculty, staff, and students)
Amount of restricted expenditures from external sources
Number and percentage of EWU job posting placed in target venues to attract broad pools of applicants
Number and percentage of minority applicants for faculty and staff positions relative to the diversity of labor markets as established in the EWU Affirmative Action Plan
Number and percentage of faculty and staff who received cultural competency training
Number and percentage of faculty position postings with statement of performance expectations for teaching competence and assessment of learning
Percentage of faculty who are recognized for teaching effectiveness through an established peer review process
Number and percentage of faculty recognized for teaching effectiveness, scholarship and creative activities, and service through merit pay awards
Number and percentage of professional development opportunities for staff

Appendix 1

Colleges and department Advisory Boards
Strategic participation of faculty, staff, and students with local boards, civic groups, professional societies, and media
Deepening institutional relationships and partnerships with institutions having similar missions, focus areas, and strengths
International exchanges of faculty and students with partner institutions
EWU students participating in study abroad
International students as part of the EWU student body
Presence of programs supporting national initiatives on EWU campus
Grant applications made to national granting agencies
Participation in Fulbright teaching, learning, and research programs
Students engagement in internships, practicums, and field experiences with national organizations

<b>Western Washington University</b>
Proportion of seniors who rate their education experience as "good" or "excellent"
Opportunities for students to work collaboratively outside of the classroom
Graduation rates for students of color relative to WWU's IPEDS comparison group
Freshman-to-Sophomore retention rates
Document 1 million annual hours of community service by faculty, students, and staff
Achieve a statistically significant increase in WWU's four-year graduation rates
Engagement and service to local non-profits
Undergraduate and graduate headcount
Headcount of students served through Extended Education and Summer Programs (EESP)
Students of color (SOC), students with disabilities, veterans, Pell Grant recipients, and first-generation students (separately) as percent of total enrollment
Annual private contributions to student financial aid
Percentage of freshman retained to second year
Predicted versus actual retention for SOC, Pell Grant recipients, veterans, and first-generation students
Student-faculty interactions
Average time to degree
Percentage of students graduating in 4-, 5-, and 6-years
SOC graduation rate as compared to IPEDS comparison group
Number of graduates in majors designated by the state as "high demand"
Self-report survey questions: frequency of critical thinking; synthesizing information; evaluate information, arguments, and methods; apply concepts and theories to new problems
Growth from freshman to senior year in student's problem solving, analytical, and critical thinking skills
Annual number of student co-authors
Admission rates to graduate schools

## Appendix 1

Career Services employment survey
Alumni survey
Employer surveys and feedback
NSSE Question 11b: "Acquiring job and work-related knowledge and skills"
Total service-learning and community engagement hours served by students
NSSE Question 7: "Have done practicum or internship, community service or volunteer work"
Student Voice survey of employment experiences
Data from Residence Life Education Assessment Model
Number of students participating in study abroad programs
Number of exchange, international, and non-residents attending WWU
NSSE Question 11: "Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds" and "Working effectively with others"
Student community service hours (# of hours contributed)
Student community service participation (# of participants)
NSSE Questions 7 and 11: volunteerism, voting in elections, and contributing to community welfare
Peace Corps and Fulbright placement data
Number of community service hours contributed by members of the Western community (i.e., faculty, staff, and administrators)

<b>The Evergreen State College</b>
Percentage of programs that are broadly interdivisional of the following: art, humanities, natural/physical science, math/quantitative and symbolic reasoning, or social science
Students can appropriately apply modes of inquiry across disciplines
Alumni satisfaction with interdisciplinary approach to education
Participation in a culminating senior experience (comprehensive exam, capstone, thesis, project, etc.)
Students demonstrate integrative, independent, and critical thinking
Students demonstrate synthesis of learning
Students reflect on the personal and social significance of their work
Coursework promotes deep learning as evidenced by the Deep Learning Scale (integration, reflection, higher order thinking)
Students demonstrate breadth of learning
Students demonstrate depth of learning
Students demonstrate ability to use qualitative, quantitative, and creative modes of inquiry
Students participate collaboratively and responsibly
Students participate in our diverse society
Students engage in collaborative learning
Satisfaction with Evergreen's contribution to their ability to function as a responsible member of a diverse community and work collaboratively in a group
Students communicate creatively and effectively

## Appendix 1

Satisfied with Evergreen's contribution to their ability to write effectively, speak effectively, express themselves in creative/artistic ways, give effective presentations, and participate in class discussion
Students articulate and assume responsibility for their own work
Percentage of seniors who complete summative self-evaluation/academic statement
Alumni satisfaction with advising
Alumni satisfaction with their education
Students appropriately apply modes of inquiry to theoretical and practical problems
Programs include community-based projects and/or service learning
Student participation in practicum, internships, field or co-op experience, or clinical assignment
Coursework emphasized applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations
Student participation in community service or volunteer work
Greenhouse gas emissions/carbon footprint
Campus waste volumes
Percentage of food expenditures from local/organic food sources
Percentage of programs that include sustainability (by planning unit)
Satisfaction with Evergreen's contribution to their ability to understand the interaction of society and the environment, and understand and apply scientific principles and methods
Develop and initiate articulation of sustainability as a learning outcome
Number of organizations with active relationships with the Center for Community-Based Learning and Action
Number of active student organizations specifically involved in sustainability and social justice
Percentage of new residential students who participate in sustainability training and education
Percentage of new students who participate in Community-to-Community Day during orientation
Percentage of programs that address oppression, privilege, and difference
Students engage across significant differences
Ability to work in a culturally diverse environment and how much they attribute their preparation to their Evergreen education
Satisfaction with seminars (e.g., social climate, method of learning)
Satisfaction with tolerance and respect shown for different or opposing viewpoints
For WA residents: grants, scholarships and waivers as a percentage of total financial aid award for three categories of Estimated Family Contribution (EFC)
Percentage of faculty, staff, and students of color
Percentage of faculty, staff, and students with reported disabilities
Percentage of faculty, staff, and students who are veterans
Percentage of entering class who are low-income
Percentage of enrolled students who are low-income
Fall-to-fall retention of low-income students
Percentage of degrees awarded to low-income students

Appendix 1

<b>University of Washington</b>
Role of research and scholarship in tenure and promotion
Physical presence of research
Productivity: amount of scholarly and research work produced annually by our faculty
External support for research and scholarship: UW funded research, research funding from key national organizations, research funding from other sources, foundation support and recognition of research
Intermural support for research and scholarship: library resources, funding for research and scholarship by individual faculty, continued support for faculty research sabbaticals, support for faculty seeking and managing external funding, University advancement/fundraising for research and scholarship, and programs to encourage student-faculty collaboration in research and scholarship
Awards, honors, and fellowships that recognize faculty research and scholarship
Quality of publications, performances, etc.
Editorial board memberships
Journal editorships
Membership in academies and institutes
Elected/appointed leadership in national/international professional societies
Directing productive work by advanced students; training graduate and professional students
Nationally recognized, competitively acquired centers, institutes, and other research programs
Public scholarship
Path breaking research and scholarship, and centers in new fields
New organizational structures that reflect and sustain innovation
Interdisciplinary centers
Collaborations with off campus partners
Formal interdisciplinary programs
Integrated Graduate Education and Research Traineeship
Interdisciplinary initiatives
Faculty joint appointments
UW Center for Commercialization
Research and scholarship that is linked to local concerns and conditions
UW Economic Impact Study
Major initiatives (e.g., biotechnology, global health, alternative energy)
Institutional efforts to provide training for grants and contract management
Human subjects oversight
Institutional efforts to identify standards and monitor compliance
Efforts to impart standards widely, through training in research ethics for faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and students
Grant and contract management training
Human subjects, bioethics, and biorepositories

## Appendix 1

Institutional efforts to create and monitor policy
Number of programs, centers, and initiatives that support effective teaching
Number of teaching development opportunities the UW provides for faculty and percentage of faculty who engage in them
Awards that recognize effective teaching
Number of faculty who do course evaluations
Number of departments or programs that utilize other ways of assessing teaching, such as peer review, and number of faculty reviewed with these methods
The role that teaching quality plays in tenure and promotion
Increased integration of technology into teaching and learning
Research into effective teaching and learning
Quality of teaching in undergraduate courses
Quality of teaching in graduate courses
Quality of teaching in undergraduate courses taught by TAs
Number of undergraduate degree programs
Number of students receiving degrees or certificates from undergraduate programs, with significant growth on the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses
Retention and time to degree numbers
Number of undergraduates receiving local or national scholarships, grants, or awards
Number of academic programs that specify learning goals and methods for assessing them
Number of departments reporting changes in curricula based on assessment of student learning
Number of courses identified by students as challenging
Student self-reports of the learning experience at UW
Experiential learning opportunities and number of students who participate in them
Academic assistance programs and number of students who participate in them
Cocurricular learning opportunities for undergraduates
Number of graduate degree programs
Number of students receiving degrees or certificates from graduate programs
Number of professional development opportunities (e.g., workshops, podcasts)
Number and kind of teaching training opportunities for graduate student TAs and number of participants
Post-graduation placement of graduate students
Number of undergraduates engaged in research
Number of graduate students engaged in research
Number of disciplines/degrees
Number of departments that include disciplinary learning goals
Number of interdisciplinary majors and minors
Number of graduate students outside the disciplinary structure
Number of faculty teaching in more than one department

Appendix 1

Number of interdisciplinary research groups
Number of underrepresented students receiving degrees or certificates from undergraduate programs
Retention and time to degree numbers for underrepresented students compared with others
Achievement gap tracking
Number of underrepresented undergraduates receiving local or national scholarships, grants, or awards
Percent of major units with diversity plans
Diversity-related programs for students that in turn help sustain an environment that fosters students success in the classroom
Training for faculty and other instructors in diversity-related areas
Classroom and campus climate survey result
Number of international students
Number of under-represented faculty and staff members
Number of lectures, concerts, performances, programs, exhibitions, and conferences available to the public
Number of public lectures delivered by UW faculty, staff, and students outside the university
Number of attendees at campus events available to the public
Number of organized visits for school children to campus museums, facilities, and events
Volunteer service by faculty, staff, and students
Number of community partnerships between UW entities and community schools, agencies, organizations, and businesses
Number of library users
Number of service-learning engagements
Number of Peace Corp volunteers
Number of co-op and clinical learning opportunities
Number of students participating in other forms of direct service (e.g., Alternative Spring Break)
Number of international website visits across a broad range of topics and disciplines
University's economic impact on the region
Number of start-up companies
Number of academic and external partnerships
Impact and value of the university's patient health care system provided across a wide range of disciplines and services
Number of statewide and regional health care clinics

<b>Washington State University</b>
Competitively funded federal research support minus USDA
Sponsored research dollars awarded
Total research and development plus public service expenditures
Number of faculty awards

Appendix 1

Number of publications/juried or adjudicated shows per tenured/tenure eligible faculty (Indicator used to evaluate Objective 1)
Citations - H index
Number of sponsored research awards where project includes PIs from more than one department
Total research and development expenditures
Federal research expenditures
Sponsored research dollars awarded
Sponsored research expenditures
Number of publications/juried or adjudicated shows per tenured/tenure eligible faculty (Indicator used to evaluate Objective 2)
Number of "interdisciplinary" proposals submitted
Sponsored research expenditures in identified/emerging areas of preeminence (Global Animal Health, Clean Energy Technologies, Agriculture and Plant Sciences, Brain Behavior/Sleep, Advanced Materials, Environmental Sciences)
Sponsored expenditures for "interdisciplinary" research/scholarship (including Centers/Institutes/Laboratories)
Number of Ph.Ds awarded annually
Library expenditures per student FTE compared to peer average
AAU research infrastructure indicators
Percent of seniors who have done work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements
Percent of seniors who have studied abroad
Percent of programs using assessment of student learning evidence to make changes
Freshman retention rate
Three-year graduation rate for WA community college AA transfer students
Six-year graduation rate
Percent of students who have participated in an educational, research, internship, or community-based "local/global" project
Total NSF research and development expenditures from industry
Number of start-up businesses resulting from WSU research and outreach
Results of a regular, institution-wide climate survey
WSU's ranking in the Chronicle of Higher Education's "Great Colleges to Work For" survey
Annual progress on federal AA/EEO goals



