REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

TO

Washington University in St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri
September 22-24, 2014

FOR

The Higher Learning Commission
A commission of the North Central Association

EVALUATION TEAM

Dr. Augustine O. Agho, Dean and Professor, Indiana University and Purdue University, Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN 46202

Dr. Mark E. Clasen, Professor Emeritus, Wright State University, Springboro, OH 45066

Ms. Jo Beth Cup, Vice President for Administration, Adler School of Professional Psychology, Chicago IL 60602

Ms. Ingrid Gould, Associate Provost for Faculty and Student Affairs, University of Chicago, Chicago IL 60637

Mr. Eric Johnston-Ortiz, Vice President for Business Affairs, Eastern New Mexico University – Roswell, Roswell, NM 88202

Dr. Daniel I. Linzer, Provost, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208

Ms. Judith Siminoe, Special Adviser to the President, St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, MN 56301

Dr. W. Randy Smith, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, Chair

Dr. David Ward, Chancellor Emeritus, University of Wisconsin – Madison, Washington DC 20037, Chair

Contents

I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

A. Purpose of Visit

Comprehensive site visit

B. Institutional Context

Washington University in St. Louis was established in 1853. It is an independent institution with a very strong research profile, approximately 12,500 students (almost equally divided between undergraduate and graduate), and 12,000 faculty and staff. Students are drawn from 100 countries and all 50 states. Entering freshmen have an average SAT of 1478. The six year graduation rate is 94%. Its faculty is nationally recognized, through its external funding and prestigious awards. Faculty commitment to undergraduate education is outstanding and also well-known and respected across the country.

The University is located on two adjacent (separated by the large Forest Park) urban campuses. The Medical Campus, includes the Washington University School of Medicine and associated hospitals and programs. The School of Medicine has a strong national reputation and is an important component of the University budget, staffing, and programming. The Danforth Campus is home to the Faculty of the Arts and Sciences and the professional schools – Business, Design and Visual Arts, Engineering, Law and Social Work. The Team visited both sites.

The University operates in a highly decentralized manner – primarily at the school level. However since 2006, with full participation by the 7 schools, the University has been engaged in a process that produced the Plan for Excellence (2010-2020). Much of what has been occurring in recent years – academic programming, infrastructure, resource allocation – can be related to that Plan. Aligned with it, is the new development campaign Leading Together (2012-2018), with a goal of $2.2 billion (with $1.13 billion collected) that has targeted areas for attention: academic programs, endowment for faculty support, endowment for student support, facilities, and an annual fund.

The University benefits from excellent leadership. Mark Wrighton has served as Chancellor since 1996, and support for him from the Board of Trustees and the University community is clear. He is a visionary and articulate leader. In 2009, in an important move, he re-established the Provost position, filled at first by an internal colleague, and then in 2013, by an external person, Holden Thorp, for whom, already, there is visible support throughout the institution. A new Vice Provost for Diversity has recently been appointed, as has a Vice Provost for Graduate Education. Several of the deans have been appointed in recent years. This changing leadership team, as a team, is working aggressively to implement the Plan for Excellence. Relationships with the Faculty Senate are robust.

Today the University, in a strategic way, is working to maintain the momentum that it has developed in recent years – and the quality of all that it does, and for which it is widely known and respected. To ensure that it could understand the current institutional context, the Site Review Team met with University leaders at the beginning of the visit for overview sessions on the current status of academic programming, research, and finances; had a session with all the deans; devoted considerable time to better understand the special nature of the School of Medicine; gave detailed attention to the status of student learning outcomes; and interacted with faculty, students, staff, trustees, and alumni.

C. Unique Aspects or Additions to the Visit

None

D. Additional Locations or Branch Campuses Visited (if applicable)

Washington University School of Medicine

E. Distance Delivery Reviewed

Historically and today, distance education has not/does not represent a major component of the University's academic offerings. However, over the past decade or so, it has initiated a small number of programs based largely on online methods of delivery.

University College, the institution's professional and continuing education division, offers a number of online courses that count as regular course credit toward a University College program. It also has a 2-year Master of Science in Biology for Science Teachers that consists of online course work completed through two 3-week summer institutes in residence. Open to teachers nationwide, it began as an National Science Foundation pilot teacher institute.

The School of Law, in 2013, initiated its online LLM degree program for foreign trained attorneys to earn a Master of Laws in US Law. The program integrates live classroom sessions with streaming video and self-paced content and includes an interactive social technology platform permitting students to interact with fellow classmates and professors. It is a small program – approximately 10 students.

The University, as part of a small consortium of top-tier colleges and universities, and through the College of Arts and Sciences, engaged in Semester Online, a pilot program where select undergraduate courses were offered online for credit. The course platform connected students and professors using both synchronous and asynchronous modes of online instruction through a virtual classroom environment and interactive platform. Recently, the faculty in Arts and Sciences chose/voted not to continue in the consortium's pilot, and soon after, the entire effort – all institutions involved – ended (Autumn 2014).

As of Autumn 2013, the University offered a total of 40 online courses taught using several different learning management systems: Semester Online:11 courses (platform by U2, Inc.); LLM Program: 6 courses (U2 Inc.); other online: 14 courses (Blackboard); and other hybrid instruction: 9 courses (Blackboard). Methods of verification of the identity of students enrolled in online courses were identified and verified by the Team.

It is clear that quality of faculty, depth and rigor of courses, level of student support, and measurement of learning outcomes are important elements of the modestly growing integration of a distance learning component into the delivery of education at Washington University.

The Office of the Provost reviews and evaluates all schools' online budgetary components and strategic planning, and going forward the Office of Assessment and Accreditation will monitor the effectiveness and rigor of distance learning and report to the schools as needed. A biennial approach to reviewing these offerings occurs. Team members reviewed assessment reports for distance learning offerings and can confirm the rigor with which the process occurs and its alignment with all other assessment efforts.

Going forward, the University is taking a "bubble up" approach to development, and the new Provost is meeting with faculty from across the campus to determine current views about, and possible next steps for, this mode of delivery.

The University was reminded that it needs to remain vigilant to comply with the ongoing national effort on state authorizations.

II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW

A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process

The self-study process was led by a 20-member Steering Committee chaired by a Vice Provost/ Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, with a subset of its members (7) serving as an Executive Committee. A committee for each Criterion was created, along with committees for Federal Compliance and Operational Support. Administrators, staff, and faculty served as members of these groups. In addition, each of the 7 schools produced a report, and a representative from each one made up the School Report Representative Committee.

Beginning in May 2014, the Chair of the Steering Committee interacted periodically with one of the Chairs of the Site Review Team for updates on progress with the Self Study. On August 7, 2014, that Chair of the Site Review Team visited the University, and met with senior administrators and others who had been involved with the self-study process. That visit helped with establishing the schedule for the site visit itself, and with ensuring that the Resource Room was adequate for the Team's needs.

The Team believes that the process was thorough and inclusive, and all those with whom the Team met were aware of the process and pleased to be able to show the progress made since the last site visit in in 2004.

B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report

The University produced a detailed, well organized Self- Study Report that included, beyond the 5 criteria, chapters on, and from, each of the 7 schools. It also provided a complete virtual Resource Room for the Team to use before, during, and after the site visit. The Team met with a large number of individuals during the visit, all of whom appeared fully engaged in the process, and spoke openly and frankly about the institution, their views, experiences, and expectations.

C. Adequacy of Progress in Addressing Previously Identified Challenges

In 2004, the Site Review Team identified 11 areas as challenges for future development. Several (6) dealt with how the institution operates (its decentralized nature, finances and budgeting, contracts for business services, space for students). In the Self Study, and through this review, the Team determined that the institution acknowledged those issues and clear progress on each continues.

Another set (3) addressed diversity issues – students, faculty and staff. Progress is being made, but this issue continues to be a challenge and is addressed in this Report (Criterion 1).

Assessment of student learning was identified. This Report gives considerable attention to the substantial progress made by the University in this important area (Criterion 3).

Graduate education, notably at the Ph.D. level, was identified as an area for attention. Progress on this issue has occurred and the recent appointment of a university-level administrator for graduate education and the new Provost's commitment to graduate program assessment should ensure continued work on this issue.

The Team believes that progress, substantial progress in most cases, has been made in all areas.

D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment

A call for Third Party comment went out through a set of publications (hard copy and online) with a request for comments by August 21, 2014. The Higher Learning Commission informed the Site Review Team that no comments were received – an unusual outcome in this review process.

It should be noted, however, that the Team did meet with a set of alumni, whose association with the institution covered a span of 50 years. They spoke frankly about their experiences, including the challenges they faced as students, and the nature of their interaction with the University now. In addition to the University's Board members, each school has an external national advisory board, so throughout the institution there is <u>continuous interaction</u> with external constituencies. The Team saw, through interaction with members of those groups, very strong support for this University – the leadership team and directions being pursued.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

Met; see accompanying document.

IV. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

CRITERION ONE: MISSION. The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Core Component 1A: The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

> **Subcomponent 1.** The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.

> **Subcomponent 2.** The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.

> **Subcomponent 3.** The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
__ Core Component is met with concerns
__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The mission of Washington University in St. Louis is to: discover and disseminate new knowledge; protect freedom of inquiry through research, teaching and learning; create an environment to encourage and support an ethos of wide-ranging exploration; and enhance the lives and livelihoods of students, the people of the greater St. Louis community, the country and the world. The <u>goals</u> cited in the mission: excellence, diversity, and student development.

The development of the mission occurred through a thorough, inclusive process that began in 2006, in preparation for a strategic plan for 2010-2020. The University operates in a highly decentralized manner and each of its 7 academic schools was involved in the process at the local level. In 2009, a Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees, in close collaboration with the Chancellor, produced the Plan for Excellence. In 2012, the mission statement was updated to its current version, ratified by the Faculty Senate, and approved by the Board of Trustees. The process adopted clearly reflects the nature and culture of the University.

- Elements of the mission can be seen within and across its academic and academic support programs. With regard to the excellence goal, this is a leading research institution with a growing level of interdisciplinary activity. The faculty has a high profile nationally, is heavily involved in scholarship and creative activity, with memberships in prestigious agencies and academies, and with numerous awards/honors. The School of Medicine is among the very best in the US. The institution's commitment to excellence in undergraduate education is evident in the caliber of students applying and admitted, their retention and graduation rates, and the fact that for 25 years many of its undergraduate programs have been, and remain, ranked among the top 20 nationally by US News and World Report. Similarly, several of its graduate programs, Social Work for example, also are among the best in the nation.

- With regard to the student development goal, students are provided with a rich array of opportunities for their personal and professional development and the integration of research, teaching and learning. Undergraduate research, with strong faculty mentoring, is very much a part of the university and 60% of undergraduates are so involved. There are opportunities for global engagement, and 42% of all undergraduates (50% in Arts and Sciences) have a study abroad experience of some length. The University also offers an interdisciplinary program that leads to a Global Certificate. The overall learning environment for students (see also Criterion 3) is excellent, with 12 libraries, impressive open spaces of all sizes, and the new (2008) Danforth University Center. Students openly acknowledged and expressed their appreciation for it.

- Also with regard to the student development goal, the University is particularly attuned to addressing/enhancing student success. There is a First Year Center with related orientation programs, a set of Cornerstone Programs that includes ones for peer mentoring, first generation students, and students with disabilities, and a Career Center that helps connect students, alumni, and employers. With regard to outside the classroom activities, there is a Student Involvement and Leadership resource center helping students select co-curricular experiences. There is an Undergraduate Council for information sharing, the Habif Health and Wellness Center, and a strong commitment to a vibrant residential life – residential colleges that are complete living centers.

- As shown more fully in Criterion 5, planning and budgeting priorities align with the mission. Indeed the mission is well known throughout the institution. Members of the University are well aware that it is a major research university that also gives strong attention to student learning, as well as to the communities within and beyond the campus; they also recognize that resources and planning must demonstrate the commitments.

Core Component 1B: The mission is articulated publicly.

Subcomponent 1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.

Subcomponent 2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of

the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.

Subcomponent 3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
__ Core Component is met with concerns
__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The mission statement is presented on the University's website, the provost's page, in handbooks and various reports. It appears in periodicals linked to the University. Given the methodical process through which it was developed, and the decentralized manner in which the institution operates, it is obvious to the Team that the internal and external communities are aware of it through a variety of well-defined, very public avenues.

- The mission statement can be, and was, in all documents provided to the Team and in meetings with various groups during the Site Visit, linked directly to: the 5 components of the Plan for Excellence (enhance diversity and inclusiveness of the Washington University community; continue to strengthen the undergraduate program; develop world leadership in graduate and professional education and research; build on the top ranked status of the School of Medicine and School of Social Work; and increase financial resources with a focus on scholarships and fellowships); the 4 components of the Leading Together: The Campaign for Washington University (preparing the leaders of tomorrow; advancing human health; inspiring innovation and entrepreneurship; and enhancing the quality of life); along with current 6 Key Initiatives (global engagement; diversity; community service; public health; energy, environment and sustainability; and religion and politics.

  The alignment of the mission with these three important planning documents is impressive and it shows a seriousness of purpose that is distinctive.

- The University is understandably proud that the elements of the mission and its goals are evident in its programs and services. With regard to student development for example, 75% of undergraduate classes have fewer than 25 students; and 75% of undergraduates complete multiple majors or a major/minor combination; and there are clinical services such as the Law clinic, and experiential learning opportunities such as the South 40 residential area where student-run businesses operate. With regard to excellence of service to the community, there are strong examples of links to the local K-12 sector: MySc Resource Center for STEM education, sponsorship of the KIPP Inspire Academy, a middle school with approximately 250 students from mostly economically disadvantaged families, and the Lofts of Washington University a student residential and retail space investment in a nearby area.

Core Component 1C: The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

Subcomponent 1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.

Subcomponent 2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                        __ Core Component is met with concerns
                        __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Since the 2004 site visit, when diversity was identified as a topic that needed institutional attention, it has been identified as a top priority for action, and now appears prominently in the mission statement, the Plan for Excellence and as one of the Key Initiatives. From priority statements, and planning perspectives, the University formally addresses its role in a multicultural society – and from local to international scales. It specifies in writing and verbally that diversity of thought and experiences strengthen academic vitality, and the University embraces differences in its many forms, including: gender, race, ethnicity, geography, socio-economic status, age, religion, disability, and sexual orientation.

- In 2005, the Coordinating Council for Diversity Initiatives was established. It was a group of faculty and administrators that monitored progress and made recommendations to strengthen efforts - and stressed the importance of diversity being a full institutional responsibility for all members of the University community. With that input, the Board of Trustees, in 2009, identified strengthening diversity as a key priority in the Plan for Excellence. More recently, the University produced the document: "Washington University's Commitment to Strengthen Socioeconomic Diversity" that serves as a base for both short-term and long-term institutional actions. Included are commitments to serving a larger number of students from low-income families, funded in part through philanthropic gifts; the Washington University Pre-College Program – a 2 week Summer program for high school freshmen, then 3 weeks after sophomore and junior years, with opportunities to earn college credit; and expansion of sponsorship of charter schools in the City of St. Louis.

- With regard to faculty diversity, a Vice Provost for Diversity position was recently developed and filled with a dynamic, respected new campus leader. Efforts are being made to partner with ongoing diversity initiatives that affect both the University community and the community at large. There has been an important set of hires of faculty and key administrators. Signature Diversity Programs have been implemented: a Diversity and Inclusion Grant Program, a Distinguished Visiting Scholars Program, and Faculty Leadership Workshops. There are established groups that focus on diversity issues: Academic Women's Network; Diversity and Inclusion Forum for Faculty and Staff (DIFFS); the Black Alumni Council; and Latino Link, among others. Moreover, there are more than 70 student groups related to diversity issues. A strong base from which to build has been established.

- Several institutional leaders emphasized the importance of student, faculty, and staff diversity, and the role of the University in a diverse society, but that promise for the future is not yet seen through the results of recent years. The focus on undergraduate admissions has apparently been on the highest achieving students, as measured by test scores, with the deployment of financial aid resources to attract those students who might otherwise choose to enroll at peer, elite institutions.

   During the Team visit, an article in the local newspaper, followed by an editorial in the student paper, criticized the University for low enrollment of Pell-eligible students, and the student editorial pointed to the need-aware admissions process as problematic in this regard. This was a topic that emerged in many of the meetings that Team members had during the visit, and was addressed openly and strongly across the campuses by the senior leadership of the institution.

The Team believes that the institution is fully and formally aware of the issues that it is facing with regard to diversity, with students and more broadly. Indeed diversity is a central element of <u>all</u> its planning efforts underway, as noted above. It has the resources and the will to address these issues, and throughout the Site Visit it was very evident that the institution currently is moving forward formally to do so.

Clearly, how the financial aid budget is allocated will have a significant impact on the diversity of the freshman class, but that is not the only answer. The University could do more in its outreach efforts and partnership with programs known to be effective in connecting elite universities with underrepresented students. The recruitment of underrepresented minority students has also lagged, and demands more attention. Only within the past few months has the University opened a multi-cultural center, and that may now provide a more welcoming environment to underrepresented students. At the faculty level, the Provost's Office is moving more effectively and energetically to support "bottom up" initiatives to enhance diversity and to train search committees. The senior administration now models increased diversity with more women and underrepresented minority leaders. The new Vice Provost for Diversity represents an important step.

The Team urges the University to continue these efforts aggressively, and to ensure that it has the leadership team in place that speaks and acts with one voice in doing so.

Core Component 1D: The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

Subcomponent 1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.

Subcomponent 2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.

Subcomponent 3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met

__ Core Component is met with concerns

__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The institution's community service takes many forms – volunteerism, advocacy, education, and philanthropy. Examples include Service First, its largest community service program with more than 1000 students involved; K-12 Connections in high-needs urban school districts in the St. Louis region, and the KIPP Inspire Academy (identified above). Faculty, students, and staff all commented enthusiastically about their involvement with, and support for, these efforts. A helpful map of the University's community service activities has been produced.

- Many of the institution's new initiatives in education and research directly address the public good. The University is capitalizing on its strength in both medicine and social work to create a new Institute for Public Health. The Gephardt Institute for Public Service, the McDonnell International Scholars Academy, the International Center for Advanced Renewable Energy and Sustainability, and the Danforth Center on Religion and Politics, are all new enterprises,

that address important public needs, and again, importantly <u>build on existing University strengths</u>. Through its research mission, the University is bringing discoveries to bear on human health and well-being, and a new online LLM degree program in the Law School is providing lawyers in business and government in other countries with access to education to advance their work in amore globalized society.

- By educating outstanding students, through strong academic programs, the University is graduating future leaders who will have an impact on the public good throughout the world. In addition however, the institution offers a range of leadership programs for students: the Fall Leadership Summit for emerging and established leaders; Nexus, a monthly event for undergraduate student leaders to connect; along with the Women's Leadership Experience, for undergraduate women, Leadership Through Service, a pre-orientation activity for new students, the TRiO Leadership Program for first generation college students, low-income students, or those who have learning or physical disabilities, and the International Leadership Program for Arts and Sciences freshmen with a foundation in international and area studies. In a more formal way, The Master of Science in Leadership in the Olin Business School, develops leaders for service as senior federal executives – linked to the Brookings Institution.

- the educational responsibilities of the institution are foremost in its actions. Evidence of funding for new buildings, expansion of existing structures, and deferred maintenance are clearly evident and documented, and strong, formal, transparent processes exist for those activities. In addition, the University provides about $170 million in scholarship support annually, with a goal of raising $330 million in the ongoing campaign for scholarships and fellowships, and a goal of $625 million for support for faculty (including endowed professorships).

- The University has a substantial economic impact on the St. Louis region as one of the largest private employers, with 12500 full-time employees (with related wages and payroll taxes); $121 million in construction and capital outlays; $620 million (2012) in research funds that came into the institution/community; and over $100 million in student buying power.

Team Determination on Criterion One:

    X Criterion is met
    __ Criterion is met with concerns
    __ Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

The Team believes the University has a clear, publicly articulated mission that guides its operations. Washington University, over the past decade, has made a remarkable commitment to establishing a strategic planning process that produced a new mission statement, and a <u>Plan for Excellence</u> that is now directly related to a development effort, <u>Leading Together</u>, and to its <u>Key Initiatives</u>. All have widespread support within the University. The institution is staying the course. Efforts at enhancing diversity have occurred, but today the University acknowledges that more needs to be done, knows that it has the resources to do so, and demonstrates that it is moving forward on several fronts. Its community interactions are multidimensional, with foci on key activities such as K-12 education. Its educational responsibilities are foremost in its actions.

CRITERION TWO: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct. The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Core Component 2A: The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met

__ Core Component is met with concerns

__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- It becomes clear in reading the Washington University Self-Study, reviewing materials referenced there, and interviewing campus representatives that Washington University engages in precisely the sort of internal review and adjustment that a healthy institution must to deliver on its commitment to integrity. The scope of this reaccreditation review begins in 2004, the year Washington University was last accredited and the year its Compliance Office was established. The Executive Director of Audit and Compliance reports to the Board of Trustee Audit Committee and to the Chancellor.

- Between 2004 and the present, two ombudsperson positions have been created to provide informal confidential assistance to individual faculty members on the Danforth and Medical campuses respectively.

- The Chancellor's decision to strengthen the role of Provost appears to be both a result of this reflective evaluation and the catalyst for recent significant change. Tension, primarily healthy, between and among the largely autonomous schools, helps assure that resources are managed responsibly across the institution. The Provost and other senior leaders take care not to unduly restrain Deans, Chairs, and faculty as they engage in living up to their respective visions. Upon the arrival of the current Provost, Washington University has evolved its budget review process to consist of three scheduled and structured interactions including each Dean and Business Manager of the respective school with the Provost, the Executive Vice President for Administration, the Vice Chancellor for Finance, and the Director of Financial Planning.

- Several years ago, when Washington University's endowment performed consistently less well than its peers', the University studied other schools' approaches to endowment management. The Board of Trustees concluded that Washington University would benefit from an in-house Chief Investment Officer and professional staff, such as peer schools used, rather than relying on the Board itself and outside advisers. The substantive change was implemented, and an oversight board, which functions much like a Board of Trustee committee, was established. The results have been a decided improvement.

- The creation of an institutional Chief Information Officer is another example of significant transition to assure accountability across the institution. If nothing else, the sheer magnitude of the investment required to deliver these pedagogical and administrative tools and resources confirms the wisdom of centralizing the management and planning for instructional technology. Having joined Washington University only one year ago, the Chief Information Officer introduced for further campus discussion a model of University IT governance the

week of the Team's visit. The model is well articulated and available at this site: http://cio.wustl.edu/governance/

- Washington University's Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer meet regularly with the University Librarian, who joined the University only two years ago, and the Director of the Teaching Center. Their individual and combined efforts have resulted in greater attention to wireless availability, planned investments in electronic resources, access to specialized software and efforts to identify and provide a basic level of access to technological resources across the campuses. Further, the University Librarian, Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer and others have engaged in analyzing security needs and initiated planning related to continuity of operations after emergency situations.

- As at any responsible institution, a full suite of policies governing ethical conduct, such as intellectual property, research integrity, conflict of interest, academic freedom, non-discrimination, academic integrity, etc. exists. These policies apply to all members of the Washington University community, and are abundantly accessible online to those at and outside the institution. Equally importantly, these policies are clear and well-written and explicitly identify where to find additional guidance and assistance.

- While the Human Resources policies posted on the website provide information that is consistent and generally comparable across schools, a few staff members at the Open Meeting reported considerable variability in compensation and certain benefits depending on where within the University one worked. Of particular note was leave provided for the birth of a child. Washington University may wish to consider reviewing whether a minimum level of benefit across the institution is warranted and how best to allay concerns about disparities.

Core Component 2B: The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                             __ Core Component is met with concerns
                             __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The Admissions Offices are frequently the first point of contact for many seeking information about Washington University. The admissions websites and print materials prominently and candidly lay out degree requirements, transfer credit policies, costs, majors and minors as well as areas of specialization, and other comparative information to assist prospective students in making wise, informed choices about schools and programs. Washington University is also committed to keeping its current students up-to-date about changes in these essential statistics. For example, the Chancellor and Provost write each undergraduate and undergraduate's parents about the annual increase in tuition and fees.

- The Academics and Schools section of the Washington University web page provides easily accessed and understood information to inform and facilitate student decision-making related to their educational programs. Information is available about all programs and degrees, making it possible for students to apply for federal financial aid and to go about transferring into the University and among the schools. The type of information that is important to students regarding fees and access to faculty is also available. The institution's commitment to advising is made clear. It is an extraordinary commitment since the University provides

each student with a four-year adviser but also provides separate advisers for majors and minors.

- The University produces *The Bulletin*, a comprehensive document containing program requirements, transfer credit rules, deadlines, tuition and fees, faculty-student ratios, specialized accreditations, key policies and resources. Each school has its version cataloguing school-specific policies as well.

Core Component 2C: The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

Subcomponent 1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.

Subcomponent 2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.

Subcomponent 3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.

Subcomponent 4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                              __ Core Component is met with concerns
                              __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Approximately 50 Trustees constitute Washington University's Board of Trustees. Alumni, parents, and areas business leaders are the primary trustee categories. Elected by the Board itself, members serve eight-year terms. After a one-year interregnum, a former Trustee may be invited to rejoin the Board. Board members are expected to serve on at least one committee. Shepley Trustees, individuals who are chosen for their high character, proven leadership and devoted service to Washington University, are invited to join for four-year, non-renewable terms. A Shepley Trustee, an architect with a practice anchored in sustainability, met with members of the visiting team. In addition, two non-voting student members and two non-voting faculty members attend Board meetings to contribute their perspectives to the discussion. The Trustees with whom the visiting team met spoke highly of the usefulness of faculty and student participation.

- Once a year, the Board meeting includes an in-depth discussion of a topic of special, often timely, interest to the institution. (The Trustees anticipate diversity, inclusion, and the impact of recent events in Ferguson, MO, as the topic for this December's meeting.) A sizable, engaging, and well-researched volume is written and assembled for Board members to read in preparation. After some further explication to all attending, the Board members break into small groups for intensive discussion and idea-generating. In this way, the Board enhances its understanding of significant factors that affect Washington University and develops strategies to advance the institution and its mission, which extends beyond the campus itself and the city, the region, and, indeed, the world.

- Board members annually sign a conflict of interest form and an outside interests disclosure.

The four Board members who met with the Team, including the chair, were frank, thoughtful, enthusiastic, and knowledgeable about the institution and eager to serve it well and honorably.

- Each school has a faculty council that oversees academic policy and other matters within the individual school's purview. The University Faculty Senate Council composed of faculty members from across the institution considers and weighs in on matters of broader interest such as diversity, which is also a local concern; safety and security; and salary equity. The University Faculty Senate Council has a pair of committees responsible for ensuring proper tenure procedures are followed. The Advisory Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom investigates the matter. If it is unable to resolve the matters and recommends further examination, it is referred to the Hearing Committee, which rules on the concern. The three University Faculty Council members who met with the Team have confidence in the system and its outcomes, and emphasized that it examines the integrity of the decision-making process, not the decisions themselves.

Core Component 2D: The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                             __ Core Component is met with concerns
                             __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Washington University fulfills its commitment to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning as evidenced by the policies that govern faculty, students and administrators in their academic and administrative work. The Faculty Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure launches from the AAUP Red Book but provides evidence that the document has been reviewed and revised over time and reflects the commitments of the University. Commitment to academic integrity and alignment with the expertise and ethical judgment of members of the faculty are protected interests in this policy. Allegations of discrimination, prohibited by Section II, are investigated by individuals who are trained to do so. If policy violations are found the results return to the University Council for sanctions to be determined.

- Policies have also been adopted to provide guidance to students regarding their conduct and protected ability to think for themselves and follow ethical guidelines. Student complaint processes are decentralized and diffuse, which likely leads to a larger number of informal resolutions— typically preferred. Each school and the College of Arts and Sciences has an ombudsperson or an individual designated by the Dean to assist students in resolving concerns. The Chancellor's office also receives concerns of students and forwards them to appropriate decision makers across the University for follow-up. It is possible the decentralization may lead to inconsistency, but the Team was presented with no evidence or concern that this occurs. Students, like all members of the University community, can also use the Compliance hotline, which is a confidential means of making anonymous reports of concerns. As part of its Federal Compliance outline, Washington University has organized its suite of policies and record of complaints that reach the Vice Chancellor for Student Services. Importantly, evidence was also presented of a couple of instances where a pattern of student complaints has led to policy or program changes at Washington University.

- The Policy Statement on Demonstrations and Disruption stands out as an example of the support for individual members of the University community to exercise their freedom of expression and pursuit of truth. It opens with the statement that "[i]n pursuit of its mission to

promote teaching and learning, Washington University in St. Louis encourages students, faculty and staff to be bold, independent, and creative thinkers." Members of the community are encouraged to explore and discuss questions of interest, express opinions and debate issues energetically and publicly and to demonstrate their concern by orderly means. The policy acknowledges the University's commitment to free speech, assembly, and expression and also its obligation to maintain a safe and secure atmosphere, preserve the dignity and seriousness of University ceremonies, and create an orderly forum for speakers.

Core Component 2E: The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

Subcomponent 1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.

Subcomponent 2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

Subcomponent 3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                             __ Core Component is met with concerns
                             __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- In order to assure that Washington University students arrive on campus understanding the ethical use of information resources and principles of academic integrity, each student must complete online instruction modules during the summer prior to attending. Students verified that they were required to achieve 100% on the academic integrity quiz taken online, and it was verified that this is an expectation for each international student as well. In addition, as part of the orientation for international students, emphasis is placed on cultural differences that may impact the expectations of faculty regarding academic integrity.

- As the Self-Study explains, Washington University expects academic honesty from all students. A policy establishes the institution-wide standard, and a school may choose to use it or to adopt a school-specific complement. Each school has an Academic Integrity Officer, who is responsible for oversight of academic integrity. This Officer communicates with all entering students to stress the significance Washington University places on adherence to this policy. This message is formally reinforced in another meeting six weeks into the term, after the blizzard of orientation programs and materials has subsided and when students may better absorb the message. The University also reaches students via *The Bulletin*, multiple websites, course syllabi, in-class statements of faculty expectations, and various other means. The breadth of the effort to educate students on the imperative of doing their own work is truly impressive and amply demonstrates the importance of this institutional value.

- Discussion with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and others confirmed that Washington University, like most schools, has some faculty members who endeavor to handle matters one-on-one with a student rather than engaging an official academic integrity process. Washington University recognizes that this compromises consistency and impedes identification of patterns of student dishonesty. Assistant Deans, staff of the Teaching Center, the Dean herself, and others take every opportunity to speak with faculty directly about (1) the lenient, educational approach taken with first-time undergraduate violators of this policy—

the major concern of the faculty—and (2) the simplicity of the formal process should it need to be engaged—because faculty members may be reluctant to become involved with what they fear will be a time-consuming process for them.

- The Teaching Center opens its doors to all instructors and pays extra attention to cultivating good, well-reasoned habits in graduate students, who are often age peers of the undergraduates. In a similar vein, workshops exclusively for junior faculty are held. Without their senior colleagues present, assistant professors are more apt to ask questions that convey their inexperience and genuine concerns, leading to candid, productive, and responsive sessions. This sort of thoughtful, rational unabashedly labor-intensive approach for a worthy purpose seems a signature characteristic of Washington University.

Team Determination on Criterion Two:

  X Criterion is met

  __ Criterion is met with concerns

  __ Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

The Self-Study, websites, documents, and discussions during the Team visit provide abundant and solid evidence of the value that Washington University places on accountability and integrity in its operations. Washington University links its operational integrity to its high expectations of integrity for those who work, study, and guide the institution. Additionally, the University has established a tradition of scanning for needed—or desired—changes based on campus experience, regulatory changes, best practices, and the like to ensure that its policies are current and maximally serve the institution.

CRITERION THREE: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support.
The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Component 3A: The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

 Subcomponent 1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

 Subcomponent 2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.

 Subcomponent 3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met

        __ Core Component is met with concerns

        __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Discussions with academic and administrative leaders and faculty validate that all schools have appropriate procedures for reviewing and evaluating courses and programs. Reviews of documents (such as catalog and handbooks) confirm that course content and academic programs are current and require levels of student performance appropriate to the credential awarded, and the institution has a process for reviewing and evaluating the currency of courses and programs. For example, the responsibility for reviewing new courses and recommending guidelines for majors and minors is assumed by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee in the College of Arts and Sciences. The Olin Business School is currently accredited by ACPSB, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science is an ABET accredited program, so there are regularly reviewed national standards for them. Graduate schools are autonomous units, but benchmark themselves against national rankings and standards. The paramount theme of Washington University is research and scholarly endeavor. The Medical School is recognized for its National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding, and the accomplishments of its faculty and students in the discovery and creation of new knowledge and treatment modalities.

- Washington University has clearly defined standards for learning objectives <u>at all levels</u>. The University's schools, departments, and programs articulate publicly their learning goals and related assessment reports.   Learning objectives and goals are set departmentally and are differentiated for undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. Each school has developed procedures by which courses and programs are evaluated. Reviews of catalog and handbooks, as well as discussions with faculty and academic leaders, confirm for the Team, that learning objectives are consistent with the mission statement articulated by schools, departments, and programs.

- The undergraduate curriculum is designed to assure synergy between major and minor course offerings as well as capstone projects in major field(s) of study. Co-curricular offerings are structured to enhance student understanding of real world applications of their major. Conversations with academic and administrative leaders and faculty confirm that credit earned in all courses approved and delivered in any format (i.e., in-class, hybrid, fully online, supervised independent or directed research) count toward the total credits required for undergraduate degree at Washington University.

- As a strong research institution, graduate education is important to its mission, and the University has outstanding graduate programs. The Site Review Team, in 2004, suggested that the institution give attention to reviewing graduate education, and soon after some activity occurred. As the institution identifies excellence as a goal within its mission, as a new University-level leader for graduate education has been appointed, and with a Provost who has indicated that attention needs to be given to Ph. D. programs, the University could use this confluence to begin a thorough review of graduate education.

  While it might be embedded within the existing program review process, the frequency of those reviews – every 10 years - does not necessarily provide the best approach. An alternative process could now be developed, one that includes both an internal and external review component.

Core Component 3B: The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

Subcomponent 1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.

Subcomponent 2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning

outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.

Subcomponent 3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.

Subcomponent 4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

Subcomponent 5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met

__ Core Component is met with concerns

__ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- A review of the "Arts & Sciences Distribution Requirements Revision: Review and Implementation Summary," confirms that Washington University has taken measured steps to ensure that its general education program is appropriate to its mission. Students enrolled in the College of Arts and sciences and in professional undergraduate schools are given the opportunity to have a liberal arts education experience. The Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate, and professional degrees offered by Washington University have been in place for many years and all of the professional programs are reviewed by national accrediting bodies.

- Campus administration provided extensive documentation to demonstrate the institution's efforts to promote learning in an interdisciplinary environment. Undergraduate students are able to pursue second majors or minors outside their home school and take courses in international/global studies. The liberal arts experience for undergraduate students is grounded in the framework established by the University and is consistent with those in most colleges and universities. The outcomes are clearly articulated and addressed by the 22 "Integrated Inquiries" as outlined in the revised Arts and Sciences curriculum.

- Washington University ensures that degree programs offered by the institution engage students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information in multiple ways, including undergraduate student research, capstone seminars, projects, upper-level writing-intensive courses, and student presentations at symposia, on and off campus. Availability of service-learning opportunities and internships represent mechanisms used by the institution to prepare students to develop skills they will need to adapt to changing environments.

- The academic programs offered at Washington University ensure that student have cultural competency skills to live and work in a pluralistic society, by encouraging them to take coursework in global studies and participate in multi-cultural engagement. The McDonnell International Scholars Academy, the Washington University Programs in Washington, DC, and the Global Certificate Program have positioned the University to enable students to appreciate human and cultural diversity.

- Faculty and students reported being involved in scholarly and creative work. The Team confirmed, for example, that the Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship program in Biology and Biomedicine and the Merle Kling Undergraduate Honors Fellowship Program have enhanced the opportunity for faculty and students to contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of new knowledge. The University's Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR) serves as a resource to encourage and support undergraduate students to do faculty-sponsored research. OUR staff proactively communicates the value of undergraduate research opportunities at prospective student events, new student orientation, and throughout first-year workshops. While this Office serves as a central point of information and communication regarding undergraduate research opportunities, students can apply for funding through the Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship for research in Biology and Biomedicine, through the Merle King Undergraduate Honors Fellowship Program for research in the Humanities and Social Sciences, and through direct solicitation of a receptive faculty community across the undergraduate and graduate/professional Schools. Through the proactive communication and encouragement provided to undergraduate students, 42% of undergraduate students participate in faculty-supervised research projects, and more than 50% engage in international service-learning experiences.

Core Component 3C: The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.

Subcomponent 2. All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

Subcomponent 3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.

Subcomponent 4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

Subcomponent 5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

Subcomponent 6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                              __ Core Component is met with concerns
                              __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- As noted in the Self-Study Report, and confirmed in all meetings related to this criterion, Washington University has allocated significant faculty resources to meet the learning, mentoring, and advising needs of students inside and outside of the classroom. Fall 2012 undergraduate enrollment was 6,483 with an average SAT score of 1484. The overall faculty/student ratio is 1 to 8 and average class size is 18. In the ten year period from 2002 to 2012, undergraduate enrollment grew 9%. The six-year graduation rate for undergraduate students is 94%. Conversations with students confirm that they have easy access to faculty

for advising, and faculty reported that the services provided by the Teaching Center are comprehensive, accessible, responsive, and effective in promoting the use of innovative instructional technology.

- Discussions with academic and administrative leaders confirm that expected academic credentials of faculty are clearly outlined by schools and that all faculty members with teaching responsibilities are credentialed with terminal degrees in their respective fields. In 2012-2013, full-time faculty members who did not have a terminal degree in their field were in the category of performing artists, creative writers, and language teaching specialists.

  While the Team found the staff to be both competent, and well-versed in the current trends and issues within their professional arenas, funding for professional development varied by both school and department. In some departments, funding was limited, with the result that professional development was offered to some but not all staff members. In other departments, all staff had access to a robust array of development opportunities. The University may want to review this degree of variation.

- Discussions with academic and administrative leaders and faculty validate that all schools have appropriate procedures for reviewing and evaluating faculty. Untenured faculty members are reviewed by their departments and schools. While the procedures for reviewing tenured faculty vary by school, reviews of school-specific faculty policies and procedures indicate that the standard method of assessing tenured faculty is for each faculty member to submit an annual performance report to the respective department chair and Dean. The process used by Washington University to assure that faculty members are current in their disciplines and adept in the teaching roles, involves adherence to rigorous tenure review process and reviews of student teaching evaluations.

- Conversations with academic and administrative leaders and faculty validate that the "Policy on Faculty Residency" adopted in May 2012 and amended in February 2013 has had a positive impact on the accessibility of faculty to students. The policy outlined the University's expectations for faculty to be "physically present on campus and available to students and colleagues throughout the period of their appointment." As stipulated in the Washington University Handbook for Undergraduate Advisors, advisors are expected to make themselves accessible to students by maintaining regular office hours and publishing their office phone numbers and email addresses.

- Reviews of academic credentials validate that the university has recruited and retained highly qualified staff members who are responsible for providing student support services. The University provided the Team with an extensive list of advanced degrees possessed by staff, the professional associations to which they belong, the professional associations staff members have served as either board members or president, and the specialized training they have completed.

Core Component 3D: The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

Subcomponent 1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.

Subcomponent 2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.

Subcomponent 3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.

Subcomponent 4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).

Subcomponent 5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                             __ Core Component is met with concerns
                             __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The team found that Washington University provides an array of comprehensive support services through several units (i.e., First Year Center, Office of Residential Life, Disability Resources, TRIO, Writing Center, Office of International Students and Scholars, Career Center, Health and Wellness Center, Greek Life Office, Community Service Office, Office of Student Activities) to meet the needs of its student population. Services are tailored to meet the specific needs of freshmen and transfer students, students with physical and learning disabilities, LGBT students, and students from educationally and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. The First Year Center provides workshops uniquely designed to provide students with information on programs, events, and opportunities addressing their needs as freshmen. Students can utilize the Office of Residential Life to tap into Faculty Fellows (faculty living in the dorms), Faculty Associates (faculty with ongoing relation to the residential unit), and Residential Peer Mentors assigned to each residing freshmen.

- A tour of campus facilities and discussions with faculty and students confirm that Washington University has invested significant resources to provide faculty and students with accessible and up-to-date classrooms, laboratories, etc. to support effective teaching and learning. The University has outstanding space for students to study, relax, learn, and interact with other students. All students are given free city transit passes to enable them to navigate the campuses and community.

- By re-envisioning the provision of library services, Washington University improved the capacity of students to effectively use available research information resources and adopt new technologies. Academic and administrative leaders acknowledged the "many improvements in the physical plant and services, but the library budget is outpaced by faculty and student demands." Steps have been taken to reduce "unmet needs", but this situation needs continuous attention. Moreover, the institution has venues for undergraduate students to present their findings (i.e., Undergraduate Research Symposium) and publish their scholarly work (i.e., Washington University Undergraduate Research Digest and Washington University Senior Honors Thesis Abstracts).

- Academic support is provided by Cornerstone: The Center for Advanced Learning, where students can seek testing and accommodation plans for disabilities. The Center also provides academic mentoring, tutoring for any course, and programs for first generation students (TriO). The Writing Center provides all levels of writing support starting with the freshman Writing 1 course through support of student thesis and capstone project development. With students from more than 50 countries, the Office for International Students and Scholars provides support for international students to become successfully integrated into the University community. In Team meetings with faculty, staff, and students, the importance of

these and many other student support structures was evident, providing evidence of how these support programs affect student success at Washington University.

- Meetings with student support staff revealed a staff that is articulate, well-informed, and genuinely dedicated to Washington University students. Staff commented on the University's robust and attentive advising system for undergraduate students consisting of three levels of advisement. Students are assigned a four-year advisor with whom they meet once or more per semester throughout their undergraduate studies. Additionally, when students declare their major(s), they are assigned a major-advisor who guides their academic path toward successful completion of their degree. Students who have interest in graduate or professional training are assigned a professional advisor, who serves to guide their progress toward application to their intended graduate or professional training. All advisors are required by policy to be available to students by telephone and email and to have posted office hours. In our conversations with students, they articulated high levels of satisfaction with the quality and availability of advising, and the ease with which advisors could be reassigned if not the right "fit" for the student.

- Discussions with faculty and students confirm that Washington University conducts a well-coordinated orientation for all new students, ensures that academic advising is available to all students, and provides academic enrichment programs for talented and high achieving students. Several activities, the Summer Academic Program, Biology Summer Scholars Program, and Freshman Summer Academic Programs, for example, are designed to direct new students to courses and programs for which they are most prepared.

    - The University has instituted a system to identify and provide support for students who are experiencing academic difficulties. Specialized advising and support services and scholarships and fellowships are also available to high achieving students. Faculty members are expected to conduct their work on campus and be available to students by publishing office hours. Feedback from students confirmed that faculty members are accessible and available to meet with them in person and via emails. The Team learned that the University has appointed a Vice Chancellor for International Affairs and provision is made for faculty to visit students taking courses at international sites on an annual basis.

Core Component 3E: The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

Subcomponent 1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

Subcomponent 2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                            __ Core Component is met with concerns
                            __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The University has well-funded co-curricular programs ranging from the Student Union, funded by 1% of the student activity fee and supporting over 300 student groups, to service-learning programs, to overseas programming. Service-learning is emphasized through numerous programs with a dedicated Community Service Office in the Gephardt Institute for

Public Service that facilities community service events in the local public schools and through "Leadership through Service," a pre-orientation program for incoming students interested in community service. Additionally, students prepare for global immersion through the Overseas Program which offers more than 100 programs in 50 countries.

- Discussions with student leaders validate that Washington University has an array of co-curricular and cultural programs, service learning opportunities, and Overseas Programs designed to enrich the educational experiences of its students.   Washington University students consistently presented a description of their student experience as one that combined their academic interests, research interests, global program interests and student organization involvement. It would seem that students combine these opportunities for an integrated and seamless experience that is a blend of these important curricular and co-curricular elements.

Team Determination on Criterion Three:

Χ Criterion is met
__ Criterion is met with concerns
__ Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

Washington University has a remarkable record of admitting, retaining, and graduating very strong students. Its degree programs have learning goals consistent across all modes of delivery. Its highly credentialed faculty are rigorously reviewed; they develop, review, and revise the general education program, and degree programs to show the institution's commitment to developing the knowledge and skills for an educated person who can recognize the human and cultural diversity of the modern world. Faculty-student interaction is strong and highly valued. The University has produced a learning environment for students, including co-curricular activity, research opportunities, study abroad and service learning, that is outstanding.

CRITERION FOUR: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Core Component 4A: The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

Subcomponent 1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

Subcomponent 2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning.

Subcomponent 3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

Subcomponent 4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and

faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

Subcomponent 5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.

Subcomponent 6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                            __ Core Component is met with concerns
                            __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Conversations with academic leaders and faculty suggest that academic units at Washington University have adopted systematic approaches to conducting regular internal and external program reviews based on input from multiple sources and that departmental and school curriculum committees at Washington University maintain and exercise authority over the determination of rigor of courses, necessity of prerequisites, expectations for student learning, and methods of evaluating courses. The qualification of a faculty member and readiness of a graduate student to teach a course are determined by the department chair or administrator in charge of the unit with input from faculty. Activities of faculty-led review committees (i.e., Academic Planning Committee of the Arts and Sciences, Curriculum Implementation Committee, University College Coordinating Council) demonstrate the University's commitment to continuous improvement of general education curriculum, teaching outcomes and program effectiveness.

  The Office of Accreditation and Assessment is the unit responsible for all assessment activities and the Committee for the Assessment of the Undergraduate Experience, a committee of 22 faculty and staff from departments across campus, has played a critical role in promoting the culture of assessment on campus. Feedback from the assessment committee validates that all courses and tenure-track faculty are reviewed annually and there is broad institutional support for the work of the committee.

- The University assesses teaching outcomes through program reviews of academic departments once every ten years. Assessment of student learning is conducted on an ongoing basis with each department program and interdisciplinary centers biennially. Each school and/or department employs processes specific to their needs. Arts and Sciences, which enrolls the largest proportion of undergraduate students, conducts external reviews of its departments through the Academic Planning Committee. The review includes input from external stakeholders and provides the Dean with an assessment of the department's strengths and weaknesses, opportunities for excellence so the Dean can make decisions about teaching priorities, faculty resources, and infrastructure needs. The reports from these reviews were available to the site team during the visit, and both the Assessment Committee members and faculty could articulate curricular changes that resulted from the process. A review of the accreditation status of professional schools at Washington University confirmed that all of the programs are accredited and in good standing with their respective

accreditation bodies.

- Several schools engage in program review within the context of specialized programmatic accreditation for the specific degree programs. Examples offered during the site visit include the Olin Business School, which conducts program reviews on a five year cycle in conjunction with AACSB reaccreditation cycles. The School provides a report to AACSB detailing program characteristics that comply with AACSB curriculum requirements, and then is subject to peer review and a campus visit. Other examples included the School of Engineering and Applied Science's program reviews happening through the context of their accreditation by the Engineering Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and aimed at satisfying ABET program criteria for each of its degree programs. Similarly, the Brown School, the School of Law, and the Medical School all conduct program review in relation to their programmatic accreditation. Related program review records were made available to the team during the site visit process.

- Academic units at Washington University have a robust system of evaluating and accepting courses and credits completed by students to satisfy the requirements for a major or minor. All schools have an internal curriculum committee. For example, the Curriculum Committee in the College of Arts and Sciences has an established process of evaluating new and existing undergraduate and graduate courses, making changes to the curriculum, and evaluating transfer credits. The documents and reports reviewed by the Team confirmed that Washington University has policies that assure the quality of credit it accepts in transfer. These policies are consistent with standards at other institutions. The University has a well-defined procedure for awarding academic credit for non-Washington University college-level courses, including AP or IB credits. Academic units (i.e., Olin School of Business, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Sam Fox School of Design and Visual Arts) and administrative offices at Washington University have developed measures to collect data and evaluate the success of graduates. For example, discussions with students and staff indicate that the Career Center conducts surveys and collaborates with faculty and advisors to collect data about internships, job placement, student success in gaining admissions into graduate and professional schools, and success rates in external fellowship applications.

- The University's growing culture of assessment includes assessment of co-curricular areas. In the area of Overseas Programs, assessment includes on site evaluation by University faculty and staff who follow a process of assessing both the academic and cultural learnings as well as safety and logistical impact of the programs. Five key areas are evaluated that include academic rigor, foreign language proficiency, intercultural competency, student satisfaction, and overall quality as applied against the Overseas Programs. Related reports were available during the site visit process and clearly identified recommendations for program improvements and for expanding integration with campus based programs (i.e. matching specific overseas programs with specific degree majors).

  Additionally, credit is evaluated at the department or program level and by the school's Curriculum Committee. Departments are responsible for reviewing their own undergraduate or graduate courses (including independent study, internships, etc.) according to standards approved by their faculty. In the School of Arts and Sciences, where the majority of undergraduates are enrolled, the Curriculum Committee receives and endorses curricular changes and then recommends them to the Faculty of the Arts and Sciences for final approval. This committee also reviews new classes or programs of study. All schools have internal Curriculum Committees with ongoing review processes. Several schools' Curriculum Committees (School of Engineering & Applied Science, Olin School of Business, Brown School, School of Law, and School of Medicine) are tied to programmatic accrediting standards.

Core Component 4B: The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

Subcomponent 2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

Subcomponent 3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

Subcomponent 4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                            __ Core Component is met with concerns
                            __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Discussions with academic leaders and faculty indicate that each school at Washington University uses University-wide learning goals as a frame of reference in developing clearly articulated goals for student learning and processes for assessing student learning and achievement of learning goals.   In compliance with accreditation standards, professional schools (i.e., Olin School of Business, School of Engineering and Applied Science) have well-defined general learning goals that are communicated to faculty, students, and accreditors via departmental and school websites, bulletins, and biennial departmental program assessment reports.

- The Self-Study report presents the approaches used by non-departmental academic programs to assess undergraduate student learning. Discussions with faculty highlight the active role of the Committee for the Assessment of the Undergraduate Student Experience (CAUSE) in assessing student growth, development, and learning both inside and outside the classroom. Co-curricular assessment is supported directly by CAUSE and provides assessment of the First Year Center, Cornerstone Center for Advanced Learning, Gephardt Institute for Public Service, Civic Scholars Program, Office of Undergraduate Research, Career Center, and many other service departments across the University. The impact, productivity, and related student satisfaction are assessed biannually. Assessment findings are published through the University's website as well as shared during workshop presentations.

- The Team confirmed that assessment of student learning is led by the University Assessment Committee, a committee that is comprised of administrators and faculty representing both curricular, student support, and co-curricular areas. This committee has created resources, University wide awareness and more importantly, broad level engagement in student learning assessment. It has also created guidelines for student assessment, training programs for new and existing faculty, and workshops in topics such as the development of learning objectives and use of metrics. Across the seven schools, all academic programs are participating in student learning assessment, most on a biennial cycle. Academic units submit reports of their findings biennially to the Vice Provost. In response, to these reports, the Vice Provost provides detailed feedback regarding each assessment category and specific suggestions for improvement. Additionally, assessment reports are shared with program and department heads, the Deans, and Vice Chancellor for Students, and the Board.

During its meeting with the University Assessment Committee, the Team was impressed with both the commitment and competence of the group, as well as the level of engagement achieved across the University in the area of student learning assessment. For example, in the last five assessment cycles, 100% of departments submitted the required reports, with programs nearing 100% compliance. It is apparent that a culture of assessment has been established and continues to evolve.

- In the meeting with the Assessment Committee, it articulated a concentrated focus and priority on the assessment of undergraduate general education literacy and numeracy. This priority can be seen in the Committee membership with faculty and staff from relevant areas including the Assistant Director of Assessment, the Executive Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Director of the Writing I requirement. Student's literacy and numeracy skills are assessed annually, and reports detailing assessment processes and methods are provided to the Vice Provost and Assessment Committee for review. General education literacy is assessed via a pre /post-test measure that is administered in the first few weeks of class and again near the end of their junior or senior year. Both groups write for approximately 50 minutes, with the resulting 400-500 essays per year being evaluated through a rating system on specific criteria noting key characteristics, strengths, weaknesses, and mechanical problems. Reports and assessment scores are shared with the Vice Provost, the Department of English and Director of Writing I, the Teaching Center, and instructors of writing-intensive courses across departments. The related evidence plans and execution were available to the Team throughout the visit.

Core Component 4C: The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.

Subcomponent 2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.

Subcomponent 3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

Subcomponent 4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Team Determination: **X** Core Component is met
                                        __ Core Component is met with concerns
                                        __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Discussions with academic leaders and Trustees confirm that the University has a defined and attainable goal of being ranked by the U.S News & World Report as one of the top 10

private research universities in terms of its first-year retention and 6-year graduation rates. The University is now ranked among the top 15 private research universities on both of these metrics. Based on the evidence of strong commitment to student success that was shared with the Team, it is clear that the University has developed a systematic approach to collecting and analyzing retention, progression, and graduation data. During the visit, faculty and staff presented retention and completion rates for undergraduate students for first -year retention (96%) and six-year graduation rates (94%).

- Discussions with faculty and students validated that schools use retention, persistence, and completion data in making adjustments in programming and advising. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences has a process of tracking and proactively working with students who are having academic difficulties or failing to make progress in their study. The University uses results of advanced placement tests taken by incoming students to place students in appropriate courses. According to the Registrar and other administrators interviewed by the team, although there is a formalized process of reviewing and accepting transfer courses or credits, the process needs improvement, and the University should consider addressing this issue.

- The Team determined that Washington University's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs are consistent with those used by other major research universities. With robust orientation and new student supports, exemplary multi-tiered academic advisement, low faculty to student ratios, a strong culture of holistic student development, the University has achieved a strong track record of student achievement for its undergraduate population. Information pertaining to student retention, persistence, and completions is shared widely with the undergraduate programs and student support departments as well as the Vice Provost. There is evidence that the academic and student support departments have used this data to make changes to how they inform and support different groups of students.   The registrar as well as faculty and staff were able to share examples of how they used persistence and completion data to revise student advisement processes and to improve communication to incoming international students resulting in higher student persistence.

Team Determination on Criterion Four:
      X Criterion is met
      __ Criterion is met with concerns
      __ Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

Washington University admits, retains, and graduates high ability students. It gives continuous attention to the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and has made remarkable progress on student learning outcomes assessment since the last site visit. It can be affirmed that a culture of assessment, particularly at the undergraduate level, exists at the University. The University analyzes this dimension of its mission (student development) rigorously and continuously. That foundation is an important base for the University as it commits itself to addressing continuous improvement in this area going forward.

CRITERION FIVE: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Core Component 5A: The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

Subcomponent 2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

Subcomponent 3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.

Subcomponent 4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

Subcomponent 5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Team Determination: _X_ Core Component is met
                                 __ Core Component is met with concerns
                                 __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- Washington University has significant fiscal resources, that have been built over the last few years, via return on investments, foundation contributions, and operational funding. At the end of FY2013, the University's investments were valued at $6.327 billion, and the endowment was valued at $5.717 billion dollars. The University's operational budget for FY 2013 had revenues of $2.370 billion and expenditures of $2.287 billion. While these values are truly outstanding and position the university quite favorably for the future, Washington University is not resting on these fiscal achievements. It is actively pursuing fund-raising campaigns based on new initiatives, that will continue to position the University as a world leader in education.

- Each individual school has its own budget and budgeting employees. The budget requests are sent to the University's Central Administration for review and approval. Through a series of meetings, at least three a year, Financial Planning staff meets with each of the schools to review and update financial information. Any re-budgeting issues are discussed at these meetings, which will assure that the resources will be available for the schools to maintain their individual operations. All with whom the Team met during the visit, commented upon and showed strong support for, this approach.

- The physical plant is a tremendous resource for the University. The Danforth Campus is set in a tranquil neighborhood and is set on the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Fairgrounds. Many of the buildings date back to the Exposition, that was held in 1904. However, the

buildings have all the requirements needed for an institution in this day and age, and meetings with physical space leaders revealed that deferred maintenance receives serious and appropriate attention. As new buildings and renovation of existing buildings take place, care is given to maintain the architectural traditions created by the World's Fair.

- In addition to the Danforth Campus, is the striking and renowned Washington University Medical School, located about 3 miles from the Danforth Campus. The Medical School is connected to a medical complex that includes 2 hospitals, various research centers, a nursing school and a pharmacy school, neither of which is directly associated with Washington University.

Core Component 5B: The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

Subcomponent 1. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.

Subcomponent 2. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

Subcomponent 3. The institution enables the involvement of its administration, faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Team Determination: _X_ Core Component is met
                                         __ Core Component is met with concerns
                                         __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- This institution is very decentralized, with each school having significant autonomy in terms of operating processes, budget, and academic priorities. The University does provide a wide variety of services through the Central Administration. To provide support for them, the University uses a complex set of allocations that captures the revenue needed to support these services.

- The Faculty Senate Council meets six times a year to discuss issues with the Chancellor. Although there is a Faculty Senate that represents the entire faculty, each individual school also has faculty organizations that meet to discuss faculty issues. In interviews with members of the Faculty Senate Council, it was stated that a significant amount of influence can be generated by the faculty organizations at the school level, mostly because of the interactions and influence many of the deans have with the senior administration. A meeting with all the Deans confirmed this situation.

- The Board of Trustees is a large (50+ members) group of dedicated individuals who have a vested interest in Washington University.   The Board consists of local and national leaders in business, education and other various endeavors. Through their leadership and in conjunction with Senior Administration, the university continues to be one of the leading institutions in the world. The relationship between the Board and the Chancellor is long and

strong. Subsets of Trustees sit on various committees, along with selected Senior Administrators. The committees include; The Asset Management Committee, The Audit Committee, The Compensation Committee and The Education Policy Committee. These committees make recommendations to the entire board on various significant issues.

Core Component 5C: The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

Subcomponent 1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

Subcomponent 2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

Subcomponent 3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

Subcomponent 4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

Subcomponent 5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Team Determination: _X_ Core Component is met
                              __ Core Component is met with concerns
                              __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- The strategic planning of the university has been driven by the Plan for Excellence. The University indicates five areas that are considered priorities: Diversity and Inclusion in the Washington University Community, Undergraduate Programs, World Leadership in Graduate and Professional Education and Leadership, Build on Top-Ranked Status in Medicine and Social Work, and Enhance Financial Resources: Focus on Scholarships and Fellowships. The University has been successful in achieving these goals, although the impetus for more Diversity and Inclusion continues (as noted in Criterion 1). Virtually all members of the University with whom the Team met, were well aware of the Plan and its influence on institutional decision-making.

- The Plan for Excellence has a robust financial goal for fund raising in order to support all the priorities as outlined. This amount equals $3.450 billion dollars. The University has been very successful in this fund-raising. According to the Chancellor, the university has over $2.7 billion collected towards the Plan for Excellence goal.

- The institution uses a very complex formula for allocated overhead and administrative fees throughout the campus. The 87-page document, entitled 'Prorations,' was discussed with the Team by the university leadership, and was reviewed by Team members. It describes all the calculations used to allocate from the various cost pools to the Central Fiscal Unit. These cost pools include; Academics, Student Services, Institutional Services, Operations and Maintenance and other smaller classes.

- While strategic planning is now well established and well understood within the institution, several members of the University with whom the Team met, noted that the University is

approaching the mid-way point in the 2010-2020 Plan, and with new faculty and administrators arriving in recent years, it may be time to "refresh" the Plan in some ways. The University leadership might consider the value of that suggestion and determine the manner in which it could be done.

Core Component 5D: The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

  Subcomponent 1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

  Subcomponent 2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Team Determination: _X_ Core Component is met
                             __ Core Component is met with concerns
                             __ Core Component is not met

Evidence:

- As part of its normal operations, the institution conducts an external audit to insure that all financial statements are presented fairly, in accordance with generally accepted accounting practices. Through a review of the last 2 audits and a draft of the most recent audit, there is evidence of financial improvement: an increase of total assets from $9.293 billion in 2011 to $10.799 billion in 2014, an increase of 16.21%; and during the same time period, total revenues grew from $2.245 billion to $2.472 billion, an increase of 10.11%.

- Washington University has a vast inventory of survey instruments used to determine/ measure improvement in a number of areas. These surveys include the following: Alumni Survey, PULSE Undergraduate Survey, AAU Doctoral Exit Survey, Faculty Work Life Survey, Teaching Assistant Survey, Parent Survey, Senior Survey and Service Quality Survey. The results of these surveys allow the University to gauge the attitudes of campus constituents on various issues and make policy/programmatic changes as needed. Meetings with campus leaders and groups confirmed this process.

Team Determination on Criterion Five:

        _X_ Criterion is met
        __ Criterion is met with concerns
        __ Criterion is not met

Summary Statement on Criterion:

Washington University is in a financial position that not many other institutions can claim. Based on evidence presented, the institution has been successful in both investments and its endowment. These assets, along with operations that have provided net surpluses historically, will provide the institution the financial means to meet future commitments. The University also benefits from a very influential Board of Trustees, whose members are dedicated to the success

and legacy of Washington University.

Given the success that Washington University has achieved on many areas; financial, academic rankings, student success; it is admirable that it continues to strive to improve all facets of the institution. This continuous improvement mentality will be a pillar of strength in the future.

V. TEAM RECOMMENDATION

A. Affiliation Status

1. **Recommendation:** No change

2. **Timing for Next Reaffirmation Evaluation:** 2024-25

3. **Rationale:**

For almost a decade, Washington University in St. Louis has engaged in a thorough, open process to help shape its future. The result has been the development and implementation of a Plan for Excellence, a development campaign, Leading Together, and a set of Key Initiatives, all of which are aligned, are shaping the University today, and should continue to do so for the remainder of the decade at least. Indeed they easily can be seen translated in the 5 criteria for accreditation.

It is one the nation's leading research universities with a parallel commitment to its high quality students and their educational experiences. A well-defined, publicly-expressed mission exists and is linked to planning (academic and academic support) and resource allocation. There is clear, thorough evidence of ethical and responsible conduct in all that it does. Its commitment to teaching and learning, both resources allocated to it, and formal evaluation of the process, are very strong. Over the past decade particularly, a culture of assessment has emerged that will serve as a strong foundation for continuing commitments. It is fortunate to have a resource base, a planning process, and related evaluative mechanisms in place to help it move forward.

The Team has no hesitation in proposing its recommendation, and has provided some suggestions to Washington University in St. Louis for continued attention to diversity, graduate education, and selected operational matters, for institutional improvement.

4. **Criterion-related Monitoring Required (report, focused visit):**

   Monitoring: None
   Rationale:

5. **Federal Compliance Monitoring Required (report, focused visit):**

   Monitoring: None
   Rationale:

B. Commission Sanction or Adverse Action

   None

VI. EMBEDDED CHANGES IN AFFILIATION STATUS

Did the team review any of the following types of change in the course of its evaluation? Check Yes or No for each type of change.

( ) Yes   (X) No   Legal Status

( ) Yes   (X) No   Degree Level

( ) Yes   (X) No   Program Change

( ) Yes   (X) No   Distance or Correspondence Education

( ) Yes   (X) No   Contractual or Consortial Arrangements

( ) Yes   (X) No   Mission or Student Body

( ) Yes   (X) No   Clock or Credit Hour

( ) Yes   (X) No   Additional Locations or Campuses

( ) Yes   (X) No   Access to Notification

( ) Yes   (X) No   Access to Expedited Desk Review

( ) Yes   (X) No   Teach-out Arrangement

( ) Yes   (X) No   Other Change

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS

None

Appendix A
Interactions with Constituencies

Chancellor
Provost
Provost Emeritus
Vice Provost
Vice Provost
3 Board of Trustee Members
Executive Vice Chancellor for Administration
Executive Vice Chancellor for Medical Affairs and Dean, School of Medicine
Executive Vice Chancellor for Alumni and Development
Vice Chancellor for Finance
Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer
Vice Chancellor for Research
Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Relations
Vice Chancellor for Students
Vice Chancellor for Admissions
Vice President of Administration, Student Union
Associate Vice Chancellor and Associate Dean for Administration, Medical School
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Camus Planning and Director of Capital Projects
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Director, Student Health Counselling Services
Assistant Provost and Director of Institutional Research and Analysis
Assistant Vice Chancellor, University Administration and Computing
Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost for Graduate Education
Dean, Brown School of Social Work
Senior Associate Dean, Olin Business School
Dean, Sam Fox School of Design and Visual Arts
Dean, School of Engineering Applied Science
Dean, School of Law
Dean, University College
Senior Associate Dean for Education, Medical School
Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
Associate Dean for Diversity
Associate Dean and Director, Undergraduate Research
Associate Dean for Graduate Education, Medical School
University Librarian
University Registrar
Assistant Dean
Assistant Dean/Executive Director of Human Resources, Medical School
Faculty Ombuds – Danforth Campus and Stiritz Professor of Women's Studies
Faculty Ombuds – Medical Campus and Professor of Neurobiology
Faculty Senate Council Chair, Program Director, Audiology and Communication Sciences
Executive Director, Teaching Center
Director, Application Development and Support
Executive Director, Compliance and Audit
Executive Director, Program in Physical Therapy

Director, Student Financial Services
Director, Compliance and Audit
Director, Writing 1 and Professor of Practice
Director, American Culture Studies, Professor of History
Associate Director, American Culture Studies, Assistant Director, University Assessment
Director, Undergraduate Studies in Internal and Area Studies
Director, Overseas Programs
Director, Richard A. Gephardt Institute for Public Service
Director, Career Services
Director, Program in Audiology and Communication Sciences
Director, Educational Planning and Program Assessment, Medical School
Associate Director of Students and Director of Student Conduct
Associate Director, McDonnell International Academy
Program Coordinator, Center for Advanced Learning
Assistant Director, College Writing Program
Registrar, College of Arts and Sciences
Manager, Business Operations, Program in Occupational Therapy, Medical School
Manager, Admissions and Student Affairs, Program in Physical Therapy, Medical School
Application Design Manager
2 Students – Undergraduate Council Members
Student, 2015 Student Union President
Associate Dean, School of Law
Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
James S. McDonnell Distinguished Professor
Avis Blewett Professor of Music
Professor Social Work
Professor Emeritus
Assistant Professor, Surgery
Associate Professor, Physical Therapy
Lecturer, English
Project Manager
5 alumni – 1949, 1962, 1966(2), and 1983
Separate, open meetings with each of: faculty, students, staff

Appendix B
Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed

About WUSTL Mission Statement

Academic Credit for Internships

Academic Departments and Programs

Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure

Academic Integrity Cases - Undergraduate from 2004 - 2012

Academic Integrity - Undergraduates Policy

Academic Integrity - University College Policy

Academic Probation and Suspension

Academic Programs

Accreditation

Accreditation and Assessment Website

Administrative Suspension Policy

Admissions

Admissions - Undergraduates

Advising - Arts & Sciences

Advising - External Fellowship

Advising - Pre-Professional

Alumni Survey 2013 Details Tables by Class Year

Alumni Survey 2013 One Year Out WU by School

Appendix A - Part 1: Assignment of Credit Hours

Appendix A - Part 2: Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocation

Appendix A - Parts 3 and 4: Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation

Articulation Agreement - Student Exchange and Study Abroad

Articulation Agreement - Design & Visual Arts

Arts & Sciences Approval for Non-WU Course Credit

Arts & Sciences Bulletin Learning Goals

Arts & Sciences Committees and Councils

Arts & Sciences Curriculum Review and Implementation

Arts & Sciences Degree Requirements

Arts & Sciences Manual of Procedures

Arts & Sciences Online Courses - Resolution A

Arts & Sciences Placement and Credit

Arts & Sciences Transfer Requirements

Arts & Sciences Undergraduate Bulletin

Assessment Workshop

Audited Financial Statement Links

Board of Trustee Minutes*

Board of Trustees

Board of Trustees - Current

Board of Trustees - Emeritus

Board of Trustees Committees

Brown School - Accreditation Letter - Master of Public Health

Brown School - Accreditation Letter - Master of Social Work

Brown School - MPH Accreditation - Council on Education for Public Health

Brown School - MPH Accreditation - Council on Education for Public Health Overview

Brown School - MSW Accreditation - Council on Social Work Education Accreditation

Brown School - MSW Accreditation - Council on Social Work Education Curriculum
     Overview

Brown School Advisory Committee Roster*

Brown School of Social Work Vision and Mission

Bulletin - Individual Schools

Bulletin Undergraduate 2013-2014

Bulletin Undergraduate 2014-2015

Campaign for Washington University

Capital Plan Repairs Renovations and Upgrades*

Capstone Options

Career Center

Career Center Annual Report 2011-12

Career Center Annual Report 2012-13

Career Services Center

Catalog Undergraduate 2013-2014

Catalog Undergraduate 2014-2015

Center for Integrative Research on Cognition, Learning and Education (CIRCLE)

Center for Social Development

Children's Discovery Institute L.L.C*

CIRTL Program for Future STEM Faculty

Clery Reports & Logs

Clinical Research Training Center

Clinical Science Training Programs

Clinton Global Initiative

Code of Conduct

COFHE Senior Survey

College of Arts & Sciences

Commitment to Free Forum of Ideas

Committee for the Assessment of the Undergraduate Experience

Committee on Academic and Professional Evaluation of Students - Medicine

Community Service Office

Compliance and Policies

Compliance Hotline for Violations or Concerns

Compliance Office

Computer Use Policies

Computing Use Policies

Conflict of Interest Policy

Cornerstone: The Center for Advanced Learning

Course Listings and Schedule for All Schools

Curriculum Proposal Forms

Curriculum Review Narrative

Curriculum Workflow Documents*

D.O.E. Eligibility and Certification Approval Report*

Danforth Campus Crime Statistics

Danforth Campus Satisfactory Academic Progress

Danforth Capital Projects FY13-FY18*

Danforth Scholars Program

DBBS Diversity 2003-2013*

DBBS PhD Outcomes 2004 to 2010*

DBBS Viewbook

Degrees Conferred 2012-13

Department Assessment Reports*

Department of Education - Missouri Department of Secondary Education Certification Areas

Department of Education - Missouri Teacher Education Programs Certification Standards
     and Process

Department of Education - Washington University Title II Report 2011-2012

Department of Education - Washington University Title II Report II 2010-2011

Department of Education Certification

Department of Education Certification Information

Department of Education Certification Requirements

Department of Psychology - Clinical Science Training Program

Department of Psychology - PCSAS Accreditation Review*

Departmental Assessments - Suggestions for Assessment Reports 2013

Disability Resources

Distance Education Assessment Reports and Responses*

Distribution Requirements by School

Distribution Requirements Revision: Review and Implementation Summary - Arts &
     Sciences

Diversity

Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity and Inclusion Grants

Diversity in PhD Programs 2012*

Diversity Mission Statement

Diversity Signature Programs

Doctoral Program Curriculum Site

Doctoral Program SiteE

East Campus Planning*

Efficiency Study*

Employee Handbook

Engineering ABET Accredited Program Results

Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET

Engineering Accreditor

Engineering Student Outcomes

Enrollment and Graduation Data

Enrollment and Graduation Reports

Enrollment History - Fall 1990 to 2012

Environmentally Sustainable Operations Strategic Plan

Equal Employment Opportunity Reaffirmation Chancellor Memo

Equity in Athletics Disclosure

Executive and Steering Committee Minutes

External Departmental Review Guidelines 2013

External Review Sample*

Faculty Appointment and Promotion

Faculty Awards Washington University

Faculty Development and Diversity

Faculty Information Handbook

Faculty Roster with Classes Taught 2012-2013

Faculty Senate and Senate Council

Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws

Faculty Senate Council Minutes*

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Work Life Survey 2011

Federal Student Aid School Eligibility Channel*

Financial Statement 2012

Financial Statement 2013

Financial Statements, Audited

First Year Center

First Year Center Summer Academic Programs

Sam Fox School of Visual Arts & Design (Architecture) Accreditor

Sam Fox School of Visual Arts & Design (Art) Accreditor

Sam Fox School Student Outcomes*

Freshman Summer Academic Program

Gender Pay Equity Report May 15 2012

General Education - Literacy Assessment Collection of Evidence, Plan and Execution -
     Freshman

General Education - Literacy Assessment Collection of Evidence, Plan and Execution -
     Seniors

General Education - Literacy Assessment Evaluation Rubric

General Education - Literacy Assessment Historical Scores 2006-2012*
General Education - Literacy Assessment Reports*
General Education - Literacy Assessment Scoring Guide
General Education - Literacy Assessment Student Guide
General Education - Numeracy Assessment Appendices*
General Education - Numeracy Assessment Summary Report*
General Education Assessment - Implementing Blackboard Outcomes
Gephardt Institute for Public Service
Global Certificate
Global Engagement
Governance
Government & Community Relations
Graduate Council
Graduate Professional Council
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Academic and Professional Integrity Policy
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Academic Integrity Policy
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Accelerated AB/AM Program
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Bulletin
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Certificate Programs
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Degrees Offered
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Doctoral Dissertation Guide
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Handbook
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Part-Time Employment of Full-Time Student Policy
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Review of Proposals for New Degree Programs
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Teaching Opportunities
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences Teaching Requirement
Graduate Student Handbook - Arts & Sciences
Habif Health & Wellness Center
HIPAA Privacy Office
HLC Accreditation
HLC Mark of Affiliation
HLC Program Listings
Human Resources
Human Resources Policies
I-CARES
Inspire Academy, KIPP
Institute for Public Health
Institute for School Partnership
Institute of Materials Science & Engineering
Institutional Research and Analysis
Intellectual Property Policy

Interdisciplinary Programs

International Agreements*

John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics

John M. Olin Library

Kemper Art Museum

KIPP, Inspire Academy

Law - AALS Executive Committee Report on Site Visit October 2013

Law - ABA Accreditation Committee Decision Letter*

Law - American Bar Association

Law - Student Identify Verification & Verification Process

Law Accreditor

Law Transfer Information

Leadership Through Service

Leading Together Brochures

Leading Together: The Campaign for Washington University

Learning & Development/Human Resources

Leaves of Absence Policy

LGBT Student Involvement and Leadership

Libraries – Washington University

Master of Public Health

Master of Public Health Culminating Experience Data (AY11-12)*

Master of Social Work Program

Masters of Arts in Education

Masters of Arts in Education, Instructional Process

Masters of Arts in Teaching

MBA/MPH Joint Degree Site

McDonnell International Scholars Academy

Medical School - Appendix 04 MD Accreditation Materials*

Medical School - Appendix 05 OT Accreditation Materials

Medical School - Appendix 06 PT Accreditation Materials*

Medical School - Standards for Satisfactory Academic Progress for Financial Aid Eligibility

Medical School Accreditor

Medical School Admissions

Medical School Constitution & By-Laws of the Faculty Council

Medical School Degree Programs and Tuition

Medical School Facilities Infrastructure Reinvestment and Maintenance FY14*

Medical School Faculty Practice Plan

Medical School Financial Assistance

Medical School FY 15 Budget Highlights*

Medical School Representative Samples of Curricula and Syllabi

Medical School Review of Student Objectives and Outcome Data

Medical School Review of Student Outcomes

Medical School Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies

Medicine Guidelines for Professional Conduct

Merle Kling Undergraduate Honors Fellowship Program

Mildred Lane Kemper Art Museum

Mission Statement

Missouri Teacher Education Program Certification Standards and Process

MO DESE Certification Areas 3-21-2013*

National Council Member Roster*

National Councils

New Course Proposals Arts and Sciences*

New Degree Programs 2003-2013

Nondiscrimination Statement Policy

Non-Discrimination Statement Policy

Non-Standard Courses for the HLC

Office for International Students and Scholars

Office of Student Activities

Office of the Ombuds

Office of Undergraduate Research

Olin Business BSBA Program Assurance of Learning

Olin Business School AACSB Accreditation Maintenance Report*

Olin Business School AACSB Report Recommendations*

Olin School of Business Accreditor

Olin Specialized Masters Program

Operational Committee Minutes

Organizational Chart 2014-15 WU Administration

Outside Activities Disclosure Form

Overseas Program Office

Overseas Program Site Visit Sample

P&T Committee Overview*

P&T Procedures Policy*

Parent Survey

Pathfinder Program in Environmental Sustainability

PhD Attrition Rates by Department 2003-2013*

PhD Completion Project

PhD Completion Project Quantitative Data

PhD Job Placement Data 2003-2013*

PhD Programs

PhD Time to Degree by Department 2003-2013*

Place and Credit

Plan for Excellence*

Policies, Reports, and Resources

Principles and Guidelines for Basic Service Contracts

Professional Leadership and Academic Network

Professional School Integrity Policies

Professor of Practice Policy*

Program Assessment Reports*

Programs with School Names

Project List Summary February 2013*

Project List Summary Greater Than 200K*

Provost

Provost Statement on Diversity

PULSE Survey

Registration, Payment of Financial Obligations, Withdrawal and Refund Policy - School of Medicine

Research

Research - Responsible Conduct

Research Annual Report

Research Centers

Research Integrity Policy

Research Mission Statement

Research Policies and Guidelines

Research Professorships*

Research Roles and Responsibilities

Residential Life

Residential Life Policies

Retention Graduation and Migration

Sam Fox - American Association of Museums Visitor's Report*

Sam Fox - American Association of Museums Accreditation*

Sam Fox - Landscape Architectural Accreditation Candidacy*

Sam Fox - Landscape Architectural Accreditation Letter*

Sam Fox - National Architectural Accrediting Board Visiting Team Report*

Sam Fox - National Association of Schools of Art and Design Accreditation Confirmation*

Sam Fox - National Association of Schools of Art and Design Commission Action Report*

Sam Fox - National Association of Schools of Art and Design Visitor's Report*

Sam Fox School - Architecture Accreditor

Sam Fox School Accreditor - Art

Sam Fox School of Visual Arts & Design (Architecture) Accreditor

Sam Fox School of Visual Arts & Design (Art) Accreditor

Sam Fox School Student Outcomes*

Sam Fox School Student Outcomes*

Scholarship and Fellowship Programs

Scholarship on Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

Scholarships & Financial Aid

School Accreditors

Semester Online

Semester Online Enrollment Addendum Form

Semester Online Policy Statement

Senior Surveys

Sexual Harassment and Discriminatory Harassment Record Reminder

Sexual Harassment and Discriminatory Harassment Reminder

Signature Diversity Programs

Skandalaris Center

Staff Employee Handbook

Standards for Satisfactory Academic Progress for Financial Aid Eligibility - Medical Students

Student Diversity Organizations

Student Financial Services

Student Financial Services Website

Student Health Services

Student Involvement and Leadership

Student Media

Student Programming

Student Union

Summary of Ongoing Surveys

Supervisor Policy and Procedure Manual

Sustainability

Sustainability Strategic Plan

Task Force For Undergraduate Education Members

Teaching and Learning at Washington University: A Statement of Best Practices and
     Expectations

Teaching Assistant Handbook - Arts & Sciences Graduate School

Teaching Center

Teaching Center Liberman Fellowship

Teaching Center Participation Data

The Teaching Citation

Third Party Comment - The Record

Third Party Comment South County Times

Third Party Comment St Louis American

Third Party Comment St. Louis Post Dispatch

Third Party Comment Webster Kirkwood Times

Third Party Comment WestEnd Word

Transfer Recap

TriO

Tuition Rates and Programs

U College Back to Back Online

U.S. News and World Report Graduate School Rankings

U.S. News and World Report Rankings

U.S. News and World Report Undergraduate School Rankings

U.S. News National Rankings

Undergraduate Advisors Handbook

Undergraduate Bulletin

Undergraduate Bulletin 2014-2015

Undergraduate Catalog 2013-2014

Undergraduate Catalog 2014-2015

Undergraduate Council

Undergraduate Council Minutes*

Undergraduate Research Symposium

Undergraduate Retention and Graduation Rates 1992 to 2011

Undergraduate Retention and Graduation Rates 1997 to 2011

Undergraduate Student Academic Integrity Policy

Undergraduate Student Academic Integrity Policy Form*

University Administration

University Affiliations - Bulletin

University Assessment Committee

University College

University Council

University Council Minutes*

University Finance Committee Reports, September 25, 2013*

University Judicial Code

University Key Initiatives

Washington Univeristy Faculty Trend Table*

Washington University Family Learning Center

Washington University Investment Management Company

Washington University Pre College Program

Washington University Report on Federal Financial Assistance Programs in Accordance with OMB Circular A-133 For the Year Ended June 30, 2012 Employer Identification Number: 430653611

Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Writing Center