REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT
To

The University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado
February 22-24, 2010
for

The Higher Learning Commission
A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

ASSURANCE SECTION

ADVANCEMENT SECTION

TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS for statement of affiliation status (PDF p 58)

ORGANIZATION PROFILE (PDF p 59)

NOTE: Sections are bookmarked and have internal page numbers as well as red PDF page numbers.

http://www.colorado.edu/accreditation Received as Colorado Assurance Section 5242010.PDF

ASSURANCE SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

To

The University of Colorado at Boulder

Boulder, Colorado

February 22-24, 2010

For

The Higher Learning Commission
A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

Nancy Ellen Talburt (Team Co-Chair), Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Administration Bldg 422, Fayetteville, AR 72701

Mark S. Wrighton (Team Co-Chair), Chancellor, Washington University in St. Louis, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1192, St. Louis, MO 63130-4899

David C. Bosserman, Vice President for Administration & Finance, Oklahoma State University, 206 Whitehurst, Stillwater, OK 74078

Peggy F. Harrel, Director of Graduate Studies and Sponsored Research, University of Southern Indiana, 8600 University Blvd., Evansville, IN 47712

Lon Kaufman, Vice Provost for Planning and Programs, University of Illinois at Chicago, 601 S. Morgan St., 2732 University Hall M/C 103, Chicago, IL 60607

Elaine M. Klein, Assistant Dean & Director, Academic Planning, Program Review and
        Assessment, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 307 E. South Hall, 1055 Bascom Mall,
        Madison, WI 53706

Natalie Krawitz, Vice President for Finance and Administration, University of Missouri, 215
        University Hall, Columbia, MO 65211-3020

Thomas L. McPhail, Professor of Media Studies, University of Missouri-Saint Louis, 236 GSB,
        One University Blvd, St. Louis, MO 63121

Kenneth J. Moore, Professor of Agronomy, Iowa State University, 1571 Agronomy Hall, Ames,
        IA 50011-2035

Morteza A. Rahimi, Professor and Vice President, Information Technology, Northwestern
        University, 633 Clark Street, Evanston, IL 60208

Rex D. Ramsier, Associate Provost, Policies, Procedures, Reviews; Professor, Physics and
        Chemistry, The University of Akron, 302 Buchtel Common, Buchtel Hall 106, Akron,
        OH 44325-4703

W. Randy Smith, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, The Ohio State University, 190 North
        Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210

Ben van der Pluijm, Professor and Senior Counselor to the Provost, University of Michigan,
        Office of the Provost, 503 Thompson Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

George E. Walker, Vice President for Research and Dean of the University Graduate School,
        Cleveland State University, 2121 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44115-2214

Contents

I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

A. Purpose of Visit
A fourteen-member review team conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the University of Colorado at Boulder (CU-Boulder) for continued institutional accreditation. No Change Requests had been submitted for review.

B. Organizational Context
The University of Colorado at Boulder is the flagship campus of the University of Colorado. It was founded in 1876 as one of the first acts of the legislature of the newly formed State, and today CU-Boulder is key to the vitality of Colorado. In the Chancellor's State of the Campus address in October of 2009, he defined the organizational context for CU-Boulder from his perspective of 36 years, referring to the following aspects of campus size and achievement among many others. The enrollment this year is 30,196 students, the most in the institution's history. A record for campus federally-sponsored research of $340 million broke last year's record by $60 million and underscores the relevant, essential, and life-saving work of the faculty. Numbered among the students are 23 new graduate students holding National Science Foundation fellowships, about three times as many as the typical number. The campus legacy of environmentalism and sustainability received another boost when Sierra Magazine recently named CU-Boulder the No. 1 green campus. The institution's plan for where to go from here is laid out in Flagship 2030 whose eight core initiatives are intended to maintain competitiveness and whose ten transformational initiatives are designed to create a model flagship university for the 21st century global economy. Despite these achievements and enthusiasm, CU-Boulder faces daunting challenges in finding and keeping the resources necessary to achieve its goals in a climate of vastly diminished state funding.

C. Unique Aspects of Visit
The team co-chairs conducted a pre-visit to Boulder to plan for the team visit.

D. Sites or Branch Campuses Visited
No off-campus sites or branch campuses were visited.

E. Distance Education Reviewed
The Division of Continuing Education and Professional Studies (CEPS) provides a large array of credit and non-credit course offerings to nontraditional students including high school students, non-degree students, professionals, international students, and members of the local community. The CEPS also administers summer session and evening classes and supports the development and delivery of online courses. Courses offered for credit are overseen by academic departments. The Leeds School of Business provides an assortment of lifelong learning opportunities through Executive Education (formerly Center for Business Education (CBE)) which offers all non-credit business administration courses for working professionals and non-business undergraduate students. Limited numbers of degree programs are presently available at a distance. The Center for Advanced Engineering and Technology Education

(CAETE) serves professionals and industries by providing targeted certificate and degree programs at a distance. Master of Engineering (ME) and Master of Science (MS) degree programs in Aerospace Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Telecommunications are currently offered as are ME programs in Computer Science and Engineering Management. Courses in these programs are delivered as streaming video of lectures recorded on campus. Instructors and students interact through email and WebCT and CULearn. The Flagship 2030 strategic plan includes goals for enhancing lifelong and distance learning. Development of an online undergraduate degree completion program is being considered as is the expansion of online professional MS degree and certificate programs.

F. Interactions with Constituencies (See Appendix 1)

G. Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed (See Appendix 2)

II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW

A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process
The self-study process provided the review team with extensive information and evidence regarding institutional accomplishments, performance, and planning. It was detailed and focused and supported by many resource materials available on line as well as documents on paper. The process included special attention to the responses made to the previous visit and to making the experience useful to the institution. The team compliments the institution on the breadth and depth of the self-study process. The culmination of the process during the team visit was characterized by exceptional cooperation between the campus and the team and strong support provided to facilitate the team's work.

B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report
The self-study report, when tested in campus discussions with different constituencies, proved to be reliable and sound in the facts and perspectives provided to the team. Making use of the reaccreditation process as a way of gaining value for the institution was a goal. The report is written to address major constituencies with important information and arguments as well as to provide evidence required for the reaccreditation decision. The report links the major planning initiatives with the report contents in useful ways.

C. Adequacy of Progress in Addressing Previously Identified Challenges
The team considers the response of the organization to previously identified challenges to be good, although some issues continue to exist that are not within the authority of the institution to solve on its own. Indeed, the institution had begun to address challenges when the Chancellor responded to the visiting team report ten years ago.

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

Requirements were fulfilled.

Notices appeared both within and beyond the campus before the visit of the team. The team addressed third-party comments with campus representatives.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

See Appendix 3.

IV. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA

CRITERION ONE: MISSION AND INTEGRITY. The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

1. **Evidence that Core Components are met.**

   1a. The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments.

   c. Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.

   The mission and related documents are clear and widely available within and outside the University. The University mission remains linked strongly to Colorado's revised statutes and highlights its distinctive nature in terms of research orientation, selective admissions, and wide array of programmatic offerings. Since 2006, the University has been developing, and is now implementing, a new strategic plan, Flagship 2030, to help define a "new kind" of flagship institution. The plan emphasizes, and demonstrates, the University's continuing commitment to "mission driven planning." The plan was developed with widespread input from within the University and across the state, and faculty, students, and staff express strong support and appreciation for the process.

   1b. In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other relevant constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

   - The University defines diversity broadly and appears to be serious in its efforts to achieve a diverse population and provide a better place in which to create, disseminate, and apply new knowledge. The philosophical and financial commitments necessary to achieve the significant increases in the graduation rates for underrepresented minorities, along with the inclusion of diversity statements in prominent locations within commonly shared documents, such as the University Catalog, are evidence of a campus that is sincerely and vigorously committed to achieving its clearly stated diversity goals.

   - The University's long-term commitment to diversity (Blueprint for Action, 1999 – updated in 2006) continues and is evident throughout the new Flagship 2030 plan. In 2007, a new Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement position was created. In 2008, the Office of Diversity, Equity and Community

Engagement was expanded to include the Center for Multicultural Affairs, Disability Services, and the Pre-College Development Program. There are numerous initiatives and achievements documented in the 2009 *Report on Diversity* (e.g. Chancellor's Diversity Advisory Board; Diversity Summit)

- Performance measures to determine progress toward meeting goals show steady, long term (nearly two decades) increases in selected areas relating to students, faculty, and staff.

1d. The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

- The University of Colorado's Boulder Campus is the flagship campus of the University of Colorado system and is led by its Chancellor, who reports to the President of the system. The President is appointed by, and reports to, an elected 9-member Board of Regents. There is a well-defined administrative structure both within the system and within the Boulder Campus.

  Externally, there are formal connections with the University President, the Board of Regents, and state level agencies and the Chancellor enjoys strong support from the President and the Regents. Internally, the Chancellor, who is a long-serving and widely admired and appreciated member of the Boulder Campus, has a relatively small Cabinet and a larger Executive Committee. It is a strong leadership team. Many of its members also have had long distinguished careers at the campus, and some, in key positions, are in interim roles. There will be opportunities for appointments to such positions to build on the diversity of the leadership team. Faculty, staff, and students have formal governance bodies with good working relationships with the administration.

- The minutes of meetings of these various groups [Board of Regents, Chancellor's Cabinet, Chancellor's Executive Committee, Boulder Faculty Assembly, Council of Deans, Staff Council, University of Colorado Student Union, Assessment Oversight Committee] reveal a regular, frequent pattern of meetings, with agendas that cover a wide range of academic and academic support topics [finances, curriculum, diversity, planning]. Based on documents reviewed and confirmed by interviews, it is clear that there is open, ongoing communication and discussion of important issues for the University. Faculty members, students, staff, and administrators express support for the current governance structure, the transparency associated with it, and the impacts that result. Faculty, particularly, note that new initiatives are encouraged by the administration and that many of those initiatives arise from faculty-driven processes that ultimately receive support from the administration. Faculty members also note that the Campus has a strong culture of cross-college/school collaboration. There is also collaboration on proposed legislation and government affairs generally reflecting a good approach to issues such as transfer of credit and tuition.

1e. The organization upholds and protects its integrity.

- There is clear evidence of the full range of guidelines, services, and activities related to institutional integrity (academic freedom, campus safety, audits), and transparency (handbooks, websites) associated with each. Student government has a particularly important and well-defined role among these processes.

- In recent years, special attention has been given to new initiatives relating to commitment to equity (Provost's 2007 task force on lecturers and instructors), student conduct (student classroom and course-related behavior policies), and grievance procedures (for faculty, "established in the Laws of the Regents and Faculty Handbook….monitored by the University's system-wide Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure") that demonstrates a strong commitment to each.

- The athletic program faces the difficult task of increasing revenues through donations and ticket sales during the severe economic downturn, and within the context of how its teams are performing and the resulting impact on fan enthusiasm. Some women's sports facilities need improvement, and the construction of a new practice facility will help improve training conditions for women. The Athletic Department personnel appear to be genuinely committed to monitoring and resolving Title IX issues. The Department's financial sustainability depends upon the University's support, and net operating revenues are reaching the point where little operating fund flexibility remains.

2. **Evidence that one or more core components need institutional attention**

1b. In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other relevant constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

For sustained progress in diversity initiatives, the institution needs to address, on a continuing basis, each of the following matters:

- Despite progress in many areas, and as the institution acknowledges, there remain challenges, particularly with regard to students of color at the graduate level, percentage of Colorado high school graduates of color enrolling as new freshmen, and first year retention of Colorado freshmen of color.

- In addition to the Annual Diversity Summit and a new campus diversity retreat (which the team urges that the campus continue), the team suggests that the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement identify a more formal senior leadership team, including representation from the campus communications office, through which the Vice Chancellor can develop and enact policy, communicate regularly to the campus about initiatives and their successes, and help coordinate communications through the campus' normal communication outlets.

- During the past 10 years the campus has made strong progress toward developing a centralized structure with campus-wide initiatives and programs. These efforts have been extended to the college level through the CU-LEAD and other college-level programming. However, if these initiatives are to be sustainable then deans and department chairs will need to encourage more faculty to become involved, and the campus reward system(s) should reflect that commitment.

- If the campus intends to celebrate its diversity successes during the past 10 years, and maintain diversity as an integral part of the Flagship 2030 plan, it cannot marginalize the funding for its diversity activities during the current budget situation.

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up
None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)
None

Recommendation of the Team
Criterion met. No Commission follow up recommended.

CRITERION TWO: PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE. The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

1. Evidence that core components are met.

2a. The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

The University of Colorado at Boulder has prepared, and is in a continuing process of enhancing such preparations, for a future shaped by economic, societal, and other issues outside of its control. The University is implementing a comprehensive strategic planning initiative called *Flagship 2030: Serving Colorado, Engaged in the World* (Flagship 2030), which aspires to the following: a) an increase of at least 300 new tenure-track faculty members over the next 10 years to improve education and research and enhance the diversity of the scholarly community; b) an increase in investments in research and creative work by five percent each year; c) an increase in the number of graduate students to represent 20 percent of the total student population; d) an increase in the standard stipend rate and funds available for graduate fellowships; e) an enhancement of student financial support doubling both merit and need based financial aid within the next five years; f) an increase in the number of talented and creative staff members to support the university's educational and research mission; g) an investment in new technologies, campus facilities and library

collections to support outstanding education and scholarship; h) development, implementation, and assessment of university strategies to improve the diversity of faculty, students, and staff, as well as to foster a supportive, more inclusive community; and, i) creation of a coordinated, targeted and expanded outreach program that strengthens connections between the university and Colorado communities.

There are many good examples of how CU-Boulder is responding to a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends. Among them are the following: multi-year residential academic experiences; plans to establish a new education model featuring mentored, self-directed, and customized learning tracks; experiential learning opportunities; collaboration with other regional universities, businesses, government and federal laboratories to establish educational research opportunities; establishment of a new center for global studies; and expansion of student and faculty exchanges around the world

2b. The organization's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

CU-Boulder continues to take decisive steps to utilize all available resources to meet its campus master plan's estimate of new construction needed to support current and anticipated growth in student enrollment, increases in the number of faculty, and research needs. Ten years have passed since the University's 2001 Campus Master Plan was developed. The 2001 plan began with additional space needs of 2.5 million square feet to support the growing campus. During the 10-year period, one million square feet of space was added but changing parameters added additional space needs to the original planning estimate. As the University moves into the Flagship 2030 plan it is developing a new campus master plan to support the Flagship 2030 initiatives. In addition, the University recognizes and is planning for library, athletic, and information technology infrastructure, as well as other programmatic facility needs on campus. The University is preparing for a public announcement of a major capital campaign. In the meantime, $3.5 million per year in resources have been funded through the physical plant for maintaining and repairing existing campus facilities and $11 million per year has been funded through Housing and Dining Services for maintaining and repairing existing facilities in that area. The university also has a strategy for sustaining undergraduate and increasing graduate enrollments and is on a trajectory for taking the institution to new heights despite the precipitous decline in state dollars for the campus. The emphasis of resource allocation certainly is driven by the Flagship 2030 Strategic Plan, which emphasizes student enrollment growth, growth in faculty numbers and continued growth in research.

2c. The organization's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

The University takes evaluation and assessment seriously and uses it effectively in decision making. A new, robust academic program review process developed in 2006 is in the early stages of implementation. The new process, Academic Review and Planning (ARP), was revised to emphasize use of results in planning and to integrate more seamlessly with the budget process. Academic programs are reviewed in clusters in order to identify common challenges and solutions. This promotes cross departmental interaction and planning. Self-studies are aligned with the Flagship 2030 strategic plan through a requirement to identify how the unit would propose to engage with the plan. The review process is now governed by the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee, and the Vice Provost for Planning and Budget participates on the review team. The Provost and deans are responsible for implementing recommendations arising out of the review process or justifying lack of implementation. Academic units are required to report annually on progress toward addressing recommendations. A strength of the new ARP program is also its requirement that units address student learning assessment as part of the self-study.

The University has had a broad set of university-wide performance indicators that were tied to the 2001 strategic plan. This set of indicators includes measures on undergraduate and graduate education; student participation in alternative learning opportunities such as honors, study abroad, independent study and internships, research experiences; diversity programs; use of technology; access and affordability; and administrative support measures including training, customer satisfaction, productivity and efficiency. While a valid set of measures, the set has not yet been updated for the Flagship 2030 plan. The goal is to have the measures updated within the next six months.

2d. All levels of planning align with the organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

The CU-Boulder has vigorously implemented a planning process that is derived from its mission and values. All relevant constituencies, both on and off campus are involved in planning and implementation processes. Six broad themes emerged during the University's vision process as identifiers of what the University aspires to become. These themes are included in the Flagship 2030 Strategic Plan and incorporated within the comprehensive planning processes of the University thus tying them irrevocably to the overall mission of the institution. The strategic planning process also included an effective dissemination component, which ensures that all campus constituencies are informed and meaningfully engaged in the process.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention

CU-Boulder leadership acknowledged in the Flagship 2030 Plan significant constraints on their ability to manage. Leaders noted that state funding is at or near the bottom of the funding at the

Association of American Universities (AAU) public universities; that the state's contributions to Colorado resident students is at the bottom of their peers and is over $8,000 per in-state student below the peer average; that current tuition and fee rates for resident undergraduates are more than $1,000 per academic year lower than the average for peers; that non-resident students represent one-third of enrollment, yet two-thirds of tuition revenue; and that the University's dependence on out-of-state student tuition creates fiscal volatility when enrollment fluctuates even slightly. University leadership also recognized that the statutory limits on the proportion of non-resident students also create constraints on enrollment management. While strategic enrollment management is offered as a strategy in the self-study plan, it cannot be the only strategy for resolving CU-Boulder's financial plight over the coming months and years. The University also acknowledges the need for additional external funding support from its foundation while recognizing that current national and state trends for fund raising are not favorable. With constraints on resources due to low and declining state support, a very modest endowment, and high dependence on tuition, the University needs to maximize other funding opportunities. It appears much more is needed from the development arm of the University. There was considerable discussion by the evaluation team about the lack of a single focused (CU-Boulder) foundation to support the Flagship 2030 development initiatives for the university. In any event, significant organizational attention will have to be applied to the main revenue generators for the University, especially enrollment management and development funding, to ensure meeting the Flagship 2030 goals and objectives.

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up
   None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)
   None

Recommendation of the Team
Criterion met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION THREE: STUDENT LEARNING AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING. The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

1. Evidence that core components are met.

   3a. The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

   CU-Boulder has articulated learning outcomes primarily at the undergraduate level for a wide variety of its educational programs and activities that support student achievement. STEM

disciplines lead the way in this endeavor in particular, and in assessment (as a collective enterprise) more generally. Articulation of discrete learning goals is not well-developed at the graduate level. Learning goals have also been articulated in some co-curricular areas, with the best example found in the case of the Student Affairs "Student Experience Developmental Themes.".

The College of Arts and Science has, in issuing "The Colorado Challenge," articulated college-wide learning goals that reinforce the value of liberal education. This challenge is supported across the institution in the form of the core curriculum that is administered by the College. These learning goals are widely circulated and appropriate to the College mission, and may ultimately make possible the institution's ability to participate in national conversations about the role and value of liberal education (such as that expressed in the initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, Liberal Education and America's Promise). Expanding on this effort, and in consideration of activities undertaken at other large public institutions that have expressed institution-wide learning goals, the Assessment Oversight Committee (AOC) has established a set of goals for CU-Boulder undergraduate learning outcomes, which will be shared with the deans and faculty of all schools and colleges. These goals are appropriate to what might be expected of a graduate from an institution of higher education and may be reviewed at the website http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/ug_goals.htm. The challenge will be to articulate more clearly how these goals intersect with other, more local, aspirations to identify what it is that distinguishes a CU-Boulder student from any other.

The Arts and Sciences Core Curriculum review that is currently under way seeks to ensure that courses conform to established criteria aligned with college-level learning goals and to ensure that courses have not drifted from those goals. The process of this review has led to changes in the curriculum, as courses that do not meet the criteria are either revised or dropped from the core course array. When asked about steps that might be taken upon completion of this review, the project leaders indicated that it will likely begin again in an effort to pursue ongoing and essential maintenance of the curriculum. While this is not an assessment of student learning, it makes possible assessment activities in the future.

CU-Boulder has provided evidence that, having evaluated the quality of student learning and found it wanting, the institution will invest in changes that promote improvement. An example is found in the renovation of the institution's approach to introductory writing instruction, which has been completed since the last accreditation review. In former years, writing requirements were minimal and students could easily exempt from the requirement using Advanced Placement and other test scores; today, few students are exempt, considerable support is given to writing instruction, and the Program in Writing and Rhetoric is an integral part of students' first year experience. The investment of resources in this area is founded on evidence that students who complete writing courses in their first year do better overall. Similarly, evidence about student learning led to a remodeling of Quantitative Reasoning courses, in which modular online Mathematics courses were abandoned when found not to work; the new approach uses an instructional model of small courses that use small groups to facilitate discussion of mathematical concepts in addition to traditional examination.

3b. The organization values and supports effective teaching.

The CU-Boulder Faculty Teaching Excellence Program (FTEP) uses strategies as varied as individual mentoring, direct and video observation of teaching, and courses (e.g., instructional technology in the classroom) to promote effective teaching. In the past two and a half years, the program has served 1065 faculty from 79 departments. The program is regarded as a valuable resource for the support of new teachers, and is used as an intervention when an individual's teaching requires improvement. The faculty tenure review committee refers individuals in need of improvement to the FTEP, and some departments have incorporated referral to the FTEP into early reviews so improvements can be achieved early in the tenure process.

The institution also provides opportunities for instructional improvement for future faculty via the Graduate Teacher Program (GTP). Graduate teacher certificates and a professional development certificate are available as credentials that document students' interest in developing these skills. These are seen as meaningful credentials that enhance graduates' chances in a competitive job market. Through the several programs overseen by the GTP, CU-Boulder has been able to position itself as an institution with distinctive strength in preparing graduate students well for these professional responsibilities.

Great teaching is rewarded with prestigious and substantial honors. Winners of the annual university-level Hazel Barnes prize receive a substantial award and are feted in various ceremonies and venues. University-wide awards such as the Robert Stearns Award and the Boulder Faculty Assembly Teaching Excellence Award, as well as college and department level awards, are granted to outstanding teachers. This activity signals that teaching is honored among faculty peers.

The effectiveness of the course evaluation system received mixed reviews. Results are used to provide feedback to instructors to promote individual improvement, and to provide data for decision-making by department heads and deans for purposes of tenure and merit allocations. In addition, since teaching evaluation results are provided to students, these data also help students make choices about courses to take. The self study reports that there is a general consensus that the instrument has improved; however, various participants still see more room for improvement. For example, a further enhancement to the evaluation of teaching is offered through the FTEP, which oversees a *Classroom Learning Interview Process* in which a facilitator will lead a discussion with students enrolled in the course (with the instructor absent) for purposes of providing rich, detailed feedback to the instructor.

3c. The organization creates effective learning environments.

At CU-Boulder, the University works hard to develop and promote learning environments that are context-driven, engaging, and learner-centered. The institution takes very seriously the challenge of engaging students via co-curricular and a broad range of learning opportunities. Students reported a high level of support and strong value for experiences that include various living/learning communities, the Undergraduate Research Opportunity

Program, as well as access to instructional environments like the Integrated Teaching and Learning Program and Laboratory (ITLL) and the Discovery Learning Center (DLC). All of these endeavors have processes for evaluating the impact these initiatives have on learning. While many of these processes involve surveys of students (and, to some extent, small focused discussions that approximate a focus group style approach), several have taken the initiative to involve the Institutional Analysis staff to understand patterns of student behavior after engaging in these programs. While the data are presented with appropriate caveats (noting, for example, that students self-select and that causal relationships are hard to evaluate), the overall impact of these programs is positive. Team members heard reports of higher retention and completion rates, better academic performance, and increased student and faculty satisfaction. Initiatives such as the Residential Academic Programs have been sufficiently substantive and meaningful that the institution views this as an area worthy of future support (i.e., by incorporating the aspiration of increased access to a range of high impact learning experiences in the *Flagship 2030* plan). More practically, the Dean of Students reported that students who participate in high engagement activities seem to have fewer contacts with the student judicial system, and that students who do run into trouble are often counseled to pursue opportunities to engage in learning in these ways.

As has been the case at many institutions, the concept of the learning environment has expanded at CU-Boulder to include online, virtual learning spaces and tools, "smart classrooms," flexible and multi-disciplinary learning labs and creativity centers, residential communities that blend "living and learning," and LEED-certified "green" buildings that reinforce values expressed by the campus community. Innovations since the last accreditation visit include the ITLL, where teams of students from across the engineering disciplines work together on projects that demand of them real-world learning and problem-solving skills (from communicating with team members to allocating tasks on projects, to learning how to machine and create the equipment needed to reach their goals). First-year students are able to engage in these processes, and have special classrooms dedicated to team-based learning. Finally, student input was sought and heeded in the design of the ITLL, where a large number of team study rooms are available to students working on projects. Similarly, the DLC is designed to help students engage in projects with real world applications. The success of this center's work is exemplified in the Colorado Space Grant Consortium, where student/faculty/industry collaborators have recently worked together on two award-winning satellite projects.

3d. The organization's learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.

The CU-Boulder library system consists of six facilities (Norlin Library and five branches in topical areas). Like other academic libraries, the system is redefining the role of the modern library as a place that merges cutting-edge technologies and information management with scholarly tradition. Furthermore, the library engages in these activities in partnership with students, who provided the funding that helped to establish a 24-hour learning commons located in Norlin Library. Thus, in addition to being at the center of a research network, libraries are gathering places for students and scholars. The facilities are modern and pleasant; when team members visited the Norlin Library, students were everywhere, using the space as a meeting/gathering place, working on research, homework, and studying, taking

classes at the Writing Center, having coffee or tea with friends, and napping. The University Libraries' strategic plan, which envisions the library as an intellectual commons, contains a portfolio of pragmatic and ambitious goals intended to achieve a higher profile and better integration of the library into the intellectual and social fabric of the institution – a goal it seems well on the way to achieving.

CU-Boulder has created a web portal to provide information to faculty, staff, and students such as announcements, news, forms, events, course information, grades, and rosters. Almost every course has an online component. Relations among campus leaders for information technology services are collegial, and there is a keen awareness of the need to participate in ongoing and effective planning for such services both at the campus and system levels.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention

3a. *The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.*

The variation in expression of student learning goals at the level of individual majors/programs may be due, in part, to the suspension of this activity while the program review guidelines were being revised. The new guidelines require specific discussion of assessment as one of the four areas on which reviews focus. The new process has been through two groups of reviews, and the Assessment Oversight Committee (AOC) is working with the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee to review responses to these prompts. Based on the results of the initial review, the AOC has recommended revisions that will elicit more detailed and better information about how an understanding of student learning is used to stimulate program improvement. A cursory comparison of two rounds of assessment responses submitted under the different prompts suggests that the revisions have had a positive effect. The ARP process is an opportunity to provide counsel regarding assessment. Institutional attention will be needed to ensure that momentum in this area is not lost.

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up
None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)
None

Recommendation of the Team
Criterion met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION FOUR: ACQUISITION, DISCOVERY, AND APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE. The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met.

4a.The organization demonstrates through the actions of its board, administrators, students, faculty and staff that it values a life of learning.

The quality of the scholarly productivity of the faculty is reflected in numerous awards, honors, and other performance measures beyond those concerned with federally funded research. For example, CU-Boulder faculty include four Nobel prize winners, four winners of the National Medal of Science, seven winners of the MacArthur "genius" grant, 11 recipients of Packard Fellowships, nine NEH Fellows since 2000, 15 Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowships since 1998, 22 elected members of the National Academy of Sciences, 13 members of the National Academy of Engineering, two members of the Institute of Medicine, 19 members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and four members of the National Academy of Education. Many departments and faculty are highly ranked and rated, and the graduate programs attract numerous fellowship students. Internal resources which support scholarly production and specific programs such as the Faculty Fellowships and the President's Teaching Scholars demonstrate that the institution places value on a life of learning across the disciplinary landscape.

Many research and learning initiatives are grass roots in nature, and the administration is willing to support those that build on existing strengths, have critical masses of faculty established and collaborating, and align with state and national agendas. There seems to be no formal faculty governance process with respect to forwarding one initiative over another, but the campus culture is one of cooperation and general collegiality.

CU-Boulder has managed to maintain fiscal health in difficult (national and state) budgetary times. Significant effort has been placed on monitoring and controlling the student body mix in order to maximize revenues, and faculty salaries have been brought closer to peer institution averages. Creative mechanisms, such as the guaranteed flat tuition for non-resident undergraduates, the Provost-subsidized tuition for international graduate students, and the facilities fee support by the University of Colorado Student Union (UCSU), all demonstrate the ability of the campus to adapt to changing economic times and still advance its mission of excellence in learning.

Marketing of the CU-Boulder campus, and fundraising, are on the rise and the support of the current President and Governor are well recognized and received on campus. CU-Boulder could focus its external message on jobs creation, health and quality of life, and business attraction, as well as the quality education that undergraduates receive from truly world-class faculty. There are serious statewide concerns about what will happen to higher education when the federal stimulus funds cease to flow.

4b The organization demonstrates that recognition of a breadth of knowledge and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs

Undergraduate students are aware of the opportunities for study abroad which should, in principle, enable students to be better equipped to live and work in the increasingly globalized society. Approximately 25 percent of the undergraduate students study abroad, and according to the Study Abroad Office, the current economic downturn provides the main impediment to more students going abroad to study. Moving the Study Abroad office from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs has resulted in positive fundraising opportunities for the Study Abroad program.

CU-Boulder has in place an infrastructure of interdisciplinary institutes through which faculty leverage significant external funding and provide many opportunities for students. Institute directors indicate that the culture enables collaboration, and that they meet on a regular basis to strategize. Transparent decision making encourages collaboration between or among institutes. Institutes share post-doctoral researchers and other resources, and faculty and students in departments with institute connections have access to extended resources and opportunities. Institute faculty members have tenure homes in academic departments and teach courses and mentor research students. However, the potential for friction exists to the extent that institute faculty do not have central roles in the admission of graduate students to departmental programs. There is a tradition for federal researchers at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), who are not CU-Boulder faculty and are not required to teach, to participate in the teaching and learning enterprise by teaching courses on the campus. Overall, the whole is greater than the sum of the individual entities.

CU-Boulder has effectively leveraged its major academic institutes to generate active interdisciplinary collaborations with significant levels of external funding. New academic initiatives in biotechnology, energy, and aerospace have been successfully developing which build upon the campus' strengths and potential for continued and expanding funding. Other initiatives discussed in the self-study, although less well established, make sense academically as long as resources are available.

4c.The organization assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

- CU-Boulder has recently redesigned its program review process and embarked on a re-evaluation of the courses contained in the Arts and Sciences Core Curriculum. Significant changes worthy of note have occurred in the writing program, for example, and other positive indicators are the objectives of the quantitative reasoning section of the Core which focus on providing students with analytical tools and developing their reasoning

skills. These efforts demonstrate that the educational programs, through the curriculum, emphasize the learning of useful skills by the students.

- It is apparent from a review of the disciplinary accreditation documents available within the resource room that CU-Boulder fares exceptionally well at the programmatic level. No serious concerns or weaknesses were evident in these documents written by experts in their respective fields. Items that resonate with those found during the current comprehensive visit include strong research faculty and quality academic programs, as well as outdated equipment and facilities, insufficient funding for graduate assistants, and the need for better assessment of student learning outcomes.

- Research universities' success is measured by the quality of their research and scholarship and short term contribution to the society's economic well-being, so they could easily ignore attending to the learning needs of the undergraduates and limit investments in IT infrastructure for learning. But, CU-Boulder, like many other research universities, has used IT to enhance the quality of traditional instruction dramatically. This allows students to be active participants, be anywhere in the world, learn by themselves or as part of a team, and to work with realistic models instead of easy to handle caricatures of the real problems and issues. Even the notion of who the students are has changed to include high school students, alumni, government officials, corporate friends, etc. So in the past ten years, CU-Boulder has gone from using technology to enhance what learning institutions have done for centuries to a point where the institution can actually apply new learning concepts to benefit large numbers of students. The teaching spaces, computer laboratories, support system, and support personnel in place are excellent. The budget for refreshing technologies in support of teaching is built into the central IT budget.

4d. The organization provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover and apply knowledge responsibly.

- The Office of Research Integrity and the Department of Environmental Health and Safety provide substantial information, oversight and guidance for the faculty and student researchers at CU-Boulder. Data are available via these units' websites which indicate that training (initial and refresher) is provided and that the number of laboratory safety violations identified annually has decreased significantly. It appears that the infrastructure in place to support ethical and responsible research is robust, and that the level of participation by the researchers themselves is appropriate.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need attention.

4d. The organization provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover and apply knowledge responsibly.

The Institute for Ethical and Civic Engagement, founded in 2005, seems to be one area designed to enhance the education of all CU-Boulder students with respect to ethical behavior. However, evidence was not presented to suggest that widespread curricular modifications have occurred as proposed. In addition, the sparse calendar of events accessible through the web site and the lack of a list of Advisory Board members raise questions about the impact that this institute has on the average student. It is also not clear how this institute interacts, or overlaps, with the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program, which is another logical venue to encourage curricular and pedagogical modifications on campus.

It is not clear that a holistic view of responsible attainment and application of knowledge is present on campus. Intellectual property and technology transfer are handled well, and checks and balances are in place for funded work, but not necessarily for unfunded projects. Electronic effort and time reporting is in place, and new faculty are trained in compliance issues. There is no formal student training for responsibility in research, but this is forthcoming to meet demands of NSF/NIH. Concerns, or limitations, may be that there is no research foundation, and that Testing/Technical Service Agreements do not necessarily go through the research office, but via another route with the funds going directly to the unit without central oversight.

3. **Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.**
   None

4. **Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)**
   None
   .
   Recommendation of the Team
   Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION FIVE: ENGAGEMENT AND SERVICE. As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met.

The University of Colorado at Boulder recognizes engagement and service as integral to their mission as a state-supported institution. The "term 'outreach' [is used] to describe the various ways in which the university extends its expertise for the direct benefit of Colorado communities and other external audiences" which are identified as parents, alumni, donors, local communities, higher education, business and industry, federal agencies, international organizations, and the general public. The Council of Deans recently endorsed the following definition of outreach and engagement: *"At CU-Boulder, we define outreach and engagement as the ways faculty, staff and students collaborate with external groups in mutually beneficial partnerships that are grounded in scholarship and consistent with our*

role and missions as a public, comprehensive research university. For faculty, outreach rooted in scholarship enhances teaching, research, creative work and service while addressing larger societal issues. For students and staff, community engagement and service projects link campus teaching and learning to civic responsibility and community well-being. For communities, partnering with CU-Boulder increases the capacity to address important social, economic and cultural issues. At their best, outreach and engagement activities provide significant learning and growth opportunities to faculty, students, staff and partnering communities. Whether through research projects, teaching activities, civic engagement or service learning, the reciprocal nature of outreach and engagement enriches both our academic mission and the communities we serve." (February 16, 2010).

5a. The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.

The institution is committed to serving its constituencies and interacts with them in planning their engagement and outreach activities. In preparing the new strategic plan, Flagship 2030, an Outreach and Engagement Task Force recommended development of a "coherent and deliberate campus strategy for outreach and engagement."   Key constituencies were consulted in preparing the report which also recommended nurturing faculty participation in outreach and engagement and expansion of lifelong learning, professional development, and online learning opportunities. These recommendations, however, are under review and have not yet been implemented by the university administration.

5b. The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.

The University of Colorado at Boulder commits significant resources to serving its engagement and service mission. The division of Continuing Education and Professional Studies (CEPS) provides a large array of credit and non-credit course offerings to non-traditional students including high school students, non-degree students, professionals, international students, and members of the local community. The CEPS also administers summer session and evening classes and supports the development and delivery of online courses. The Center for Advanced Engineering and Technology Education (CAETE) of the College of Engineering and Applied Science serves professionals and industries by providing targeted certificate and degree programs at a distance. The School of Business provides an assortment of lifelong learning opportunities through Executive Education which offers only non-credit business administration courses for working professionals and non-business undergraduate students.

The Outreach Committee provides startup funding of $210,000 per year for a broad array of projects that cut across the sciences and humanities. Most grants are on the order of $5,000 for one year, but the committee will award some grants for up to three years. Many projects funded through the Outreach Committee involve undergraduate and graduate students who benefit from the experience of applying their knowledge through engagement activities. An important goal of the Outreach Committee is to make outreach a logical extension of the

faculty member's research and teaching. Many funded projects incubated via this mechanism have later received significant extramural support from federal agencies and other sources.

Finally the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement has a number of multicultural activities. One in particular is the Leadership Education for Advancement and Promotion (LEAP) Project. It seeks to assist in the retention of women in science and engineering disciplines. This Office is also assisting with two workshops aimed at addressing questions and concerns which prospective minority students have about entering the legal profession.

5c. The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.

The University of Colorado at Boulder strives to impact the communities it serves by connecting its faculty and students with constituencies in the local community, state, and beyond. Emphasis is placed on leveraging the unique knowledge and skills of the university in addressing issues and solving problems occurring in the communities it serves. Faculty members are encouraged to engage students in service learning and are supported in doing so by a number of programs and resources. As mentioned above, the Outreach Committee funds small projects to establish service learning objectives and activities in courses offered in a broad array of disciplines. The residential learning program also includes service learning activities in several courses offered as part of their program.

The university has also developed continuing education certificate and degree programs for key constituents. The Executive Education provides noncredit business administration courses to working professionals and non-business undergraduate students. The Center for Advanced Engineering and Technology Education (CAETE) provides certificate and degree programs at a distance to engineers and technical professionals. However, despite these programs and the efforts they represent, there appears to be a strong opportunity to expand distance learning offerings to a broader audience. Interactions with community colleges and other institutions of higher learning in the state with whom CU-Boulder could potentially collaborate with to provide educational opportunities to students seem to be nonexistent. A notable exception, and perhaps a model for building future relationships, is the collaboration with Mesa State College in offering a Mechanical Engineering bachelor's to Boulder students in residence at Mesa State.

Science Discovery is an experience-based educational outreach program of the CU-Boulder School of Education. Its mission "is to stimulate scientific interest, understanding, and literacy among Colorado's youth, teachers, and families by interfacing with university resources and academic expertise." Activities vary among afterschool and summer classes, wilderness camps, and specific programs offered in collaboration with local schools, museums, and other institutions. The Museum of Natural History, an academic unit in the Graduate School, offers exhibits and programs for the local community and visitors. The museum offers graduate and certificate programs in Museum and Field Studies and engages faculty and students in a number of outreach programs.

Another example is that the School of Journalism and Mass Communication offers seminars on a variety of workshops dealing with current topics at local community colleges. The School also has articulation agreements, as do other schools, with area community colleges to assist with a seamless transition to the university.

5d. Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.

Many of the institution's outreach programs have been recognized by state and national organizations. The College of Architecture and Planning has a newly established program that requires students to engage in a broad range of service learning activities. The faculty program director was recently awarded the Outreach Award in recognition of his leadership in establishing these programs. In 2007, the university received the Presidential Award for Community Service. Finally, in 2002 a progressive Civil Engineering professor started an organization entitled Engineers Without Borders. Today it has over 14,000 members working on projects in 48 countries around the world.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention.
   None

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention and Commission follow-up.
   None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)
   None

Recommendation of the Team
Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

V. STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS

   A. Affiliation Status
      No change.
      Rationale for recommendation: The institution did not request any changes nor did the team find any reason for recommending changes.

   B. Nature of Organization

      1.   Legal status
              No change.

      2.   Degrees awarded
              No change.

   C. Conditions of Affiliation

1.   **Stipulation on affiliation status**
     No change.
     Rationale: The institution did not request any changes.

2.   **Approval of degree sites**
     No change.
     Rationale: The institution did not request any changes.

3.   **Approval of distance education degrees**
     No change.
     Rationale: The institution did not request any changes.

4.   **Reports required**
     None

5.   **Other visits scheduled**
     None

6.   **Organization change request**
     No change requests were made during this visit.

E. Summary of commission review
     Timing for next comprehensive visit (academic year – 2019-2020)

     Rationale for recommendation: the University of Colorado at Boulder clearly and unambiguously meets the criteria for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association. The circumstances, leadership, and operation of the campus as documented by the extensive materials and interviews on campus assure the team that the institution will continue to do so.

APPENDIX 1
Interactions with Constituencies

1. Chancellor
2. Interim Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
3. Senior Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
4. Vice Chancellor for Administration
5. Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement
6. Interim Vice Chancellor for Research
7. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
8. Vice President for Development, CU Foundation
9. Managing Senior Associate University Counsel
10. Senior Advisor to the Chancellor and Self-Study Director
11. Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Communications
12. Interim Dean, Leeds School of Business
13. Dean, College of Engineering and Applied Science
14. Dean, School of Law
15. Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
16. Dean, Continuing Education and Professional Studies, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Summer Session
17. Dean, School of Education
18. Dean, College of Music
19. Dean, School of Journalism and Mass Communication
20. Dean, University Libraries
21. Interim Dean, Graduate School
22. AVC for Planning, Budget and Analysis and Controller
23. AVC for Undergrad Education, Director IECE
24. Director of Institutional Analysis
25. Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management
26. Director of Financial Aid
27. Registrar
28. Director, Center for Advanced Engineering and Technology Education
29. Police Administrator
30. Director of Judicial Affairs
31. Dean and Co-PI of iSTEM
32. Professor and Co-PI of iSTEM
33. 2030 Task Force Co-Chair, Faculty
34. Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning
35. Affirmative Action Program Coordinator (for faculty and staff)
36. Assistant Dean for Curricular Affairs, Arts and Sciences
37. Assistant Dean, Continuing Education
38. Assistant Dean, School of Journalism & Mass Communications
39. Assistant Professor, Psychology & Neuroscience
40. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Community Engagement
41. Associate Director of the Science Education Initiative.
42. Associate Athletic Director, Compliance
43. Associate Athletic Director, Senior Women's Administrator
44. Associate Dean for Research, College of Engineering and Applied Science
45. Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, College of Music
46. Associate Dean, Arts and Humanities and Professor
47. Associate Dean, School of Education
48. Associate Director of Science for LASP
49. Associate Director, Farrand Residential Academic Program
50. Associate Professor, Philosophy

51.   Associate Vice Chancellor - University Communications
52.   Associate VP for Technology Transfer, U. of Colorado System
53.   AVC Faculty Affairs and Professor
54.   AVC for Information Technology Services and Chief Information Officer (CIO)
55.   AVC for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
56.   Campus Architect, Director, Planning Design and Construction, Facilities Management; 2030 Implementation Task Force Chair, Facilities
57.   Chair, Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee
58.   Professor and Chair, Art and Art History
59.   Distinguished Professor and Chair, BFA Budget and Planning Committee
60.   Chair, Committee on Women
61.   Professor and Chair of Master Plan Task Force, East Campus
62.   Chair, Political Science
63.   Chair and Assistant Professor, Psychology and Neuroscience
64.   Chair, Responsible Conduct of Research Task Force
65.   Professor of Physics, Chair Science Education Initiative Professor and Co-PI of iStem
66.   Co-Chair, Internationalization Task Force
67.   Co-director, Colorado Learning Analysis Studies
68.   Co-director, Integrated Teaching and Learning Program and Laboratory
69.   Compliance Director for Conflicts of Interest and Commitment
70.   Dean and Co-PI of iSTEM
71.   Alumni Association, Interim Executive Director
72.   Director for Academic Technology
73.   Director of Academic Programs and Assessment of Engineering; member Assessment Council
74.   Director of Housing and Dining Services
75.   Director of CU-Boulder Environmental Center
76.   Director of Parent Relations
77.   Director, Alliance for Technology, Learning, and Society
78.   Director, Center for Advanced Engineering and Technology Education
79.   Director, Center for Asian Studies
80.   Director, Chancellor's Leadership Residential Program
81.   Director, Children, Youth & Environment Center
82.   Director, Colorado Space Grant Consortium (representing one of the Discover Learning   Center laboratories)
83.   Director, Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences
84.   Director, Disability Services
85.   Director, Diversity Affairs, Leeds School of Business
86.   Director, Engineering Honors Program, Andrews Hall
87.   Director, Entrepreneurship Center for Music
88.   Director, Environmental Health and Safety
89.   Director, Faculty Teaching Excellence
90.   Director, Farrand Residential Academic Program
91.   Director, GLBT Resource Center
92.   Director, Global Studies Residential Academic Program
93.   Director, Graduate Teacher Program
94.   Director, Institute for Behavioral Genetics
95.   Director, Institute of Behavioral Science
96.   Director, Institute of Cognitive Science
97.   Director, Institute for Ethical and Civic Engagement
98.   Director, International Student and Scholar Services
99.   Director, INVST, Communication Studies Instructor
100. Director, JILA
101. Director, Judicial Affairs
102. Director, Learning Assistant Program; Co-Director, CU Teach
103. Director, Miramontes Arts and Sciences Program
104. Senior, MCD Biology

105. Director, McNeil Program
106. Director, Museum; Professor Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
107. Director, Natural Resources Law Center
108. Director, New Student Orientation
109. Director, Office of Contracts and Grants
110. Director, Office of Discrimination and Harassment, Human Resources
111. Director, Office of Research Integrity
112. Director, Ombuds Office,
113. Director, Parent Relations
114. Director, Pre-College Services
115. Director, Service learning
116. Director, Student Abroad Programs
117. Director, Student Academic Services Center
118. Director, Student Organizations Finance Office
119. Director, Special Undergraduate Enrichment Programs
120. Director, Student Outreach Retention Center for Equity
121. Director, University Outreach
122. Executive Director of Environmental Sciences
123. Executive Director for Student Success
124. Executive Director for Summer Session and Access
125. Executive Director of Continuing Education, Assistant Dean for Summer Session
126. Executive Director, Human Resources
127. Faculty Director, Faculty Diversity and Development
128. GK-12 Director
129. Spokesperson and director of Media Relations
130. General Manager of the Left Hand Water District
131. Manager, Business Office, Athletics
132. Teacher at Silver Creek High School and Head of Social Studies Department
133. Top Scholarships Director and Assessment Coordinator, Assessment Council
134. Professor, Civil, Environ & Arch Eng
135. Professor, Applied Mathematics
136. Professor, Architecture & Planning, Director-Children, Youth & Environment Center
137. Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry
138. Professor, Computer Science and Chair of BFA Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
139. Professor, Endowed Chair (Civil Engineering), Director Mortenson Center
140. Professor, English, and Director, Service Learning
141. Professor, Geological Sciences
142. Professor, History and Director, Center of the American West
143. Professor, Institute for Arctic & Alpine Research
144. Professor, Journalism
145. Professor, MCD Biology
146. Professor, Physics, and Faculty Director for Faculty Diversity and Development, Office of Faculty Affairs
147. Professor, Psychology and Neuroscience
148. Professor, Sociology
149. Researcher, Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics
150. Senior Instructor, Leeds School of Business and Director of MS Accounting Division
151. School of Education representative
152. Doctoral Student in Physics
153. Former GTP lead-TA
154. Former non-degree student in Continuing Education, now a Junior in Political Science
155. Freshman, Marketing, participant in Residential Academic Program
156. Geography Senior and Participant who studied abroad in Viet Nam
157. Government Relations Manager
158. Graduate Student in Civil Engineering
159. International Graduate Student in Computer Science from Germany

160. Junior Geography
161. Junior in Chemical Engineering
162. Junior in Civil Engineering and alumnus of the pre-Collegiate Development
163. Program and CU-LEAD scholar in Engineering BOLD program
164. Junior, Humanities
165. PhD candidate, Integrative Physiology
166. SEI Science Teaching Fellow
167. Senior in Broadcast Journalism and member, Student Athlete Advisory Committee.
168. Senior, Accounting, and Student Senator for Leeds School of Business
169. Senior, English Literature and Chair, Honor Code Council
170. Senior, Political Science, Sustainability Director for USCU Environmental Board
171. Senior, Psychology
172. Senior, Sociology
173. Sociology Master's degree candidate
174. Sophomore, Accounting
175. Tri-Executive, University of Colorado Student Union, Senior in Sociology
176. UCSU Liaison to Student Affairs; Member of Tuition and Aid Advisory Board;
177. Junior in International Affairs
178. UG Learning Assistant
179. UG NSF-Noyce Fellow

Eight faculty members attending the open meeting for faculty
Other members of iSTEM Team
Leadership of Student, Faculty, Staff, and Administrative governance: four students and three each from the other groups;
Eighteen graduate students from the following disciplines: Astrophysics and Planetary Sciences, Classics, Psychology, TBG, History (2), Philosophy, Applied Mathematics, Aerospace Engineering, English, MCD/Biology, Geology, Chemistry/Biochemistry, Geography, Mechanical Engineering, Political Science (2), Education,
2 students (junior, Biochemistry majors)
5 student Ambassadors
Director, a Professor, and a Student from Institute for Arctic and Alpine Research
Staff members attending open meeting included 34 staff members, approximately 25 percent classified and 75 percent exempt
Other   unidentified   constituents

APPENDIX 2
Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed
[Some materials may be listed more than once]

Printed documents sent with self-study report or before visit by HLC
Welcome letter from Chancellor Phil DiStefano
Shaping the New Flagship: *Self-study for Re-accreditation*
Just the Facts 2009
A Celebration of Faculty Achievement Fall 2009
Ralphie's Guide to Student Life, 2009
Flagship 2030: Serving Colorado Engaged in the World – A strategic plan for the University of Colorado at Boulder, 2007
Boulder Colorado USA – Visitor Guide from Boulder Convention and Visitors Bureau
November 2000 letter from the North Central Association to President Byyny
August 2000 letter from President Byyny to NCA
April 17-19, 2000 Report of a Visit to the University of Colorado-Boulder – NCA Accreditation Review   Report
May 2003 letter from the HLC to President Byyny

Electronic Documents with access provided with self-study report
Catalog 2009-10
            Catalog2009-10.pdf, from http://www.colorado.edu/catalog/catalog09-10/
           Financial Statements for U. of Colorado System and Boulder campus
                CU -SystemBlended2008.pdf
                  From https://www.cu.edu/controller/documents/CompleteCUSupplemental2008.pdf
                CU-System&BoulderSupplement2008.pdf (includes portions for System and Boulder)
                  From https://www.cu.edu/controller/documents/Supplemental_08.pdf
                CU -SystemBlended2007.pdf
                  From https://www.cu.edu/controller/documents/CompleteCUSupplemental2007.pdf
                CU-System&BoulderSupplement2007.pdf (includes portions for System and Boulder)
                  From https://www.cu.edu/controller/documents/Supplemental_07.pdf
            Faculty Handbook – CU-System
            FacultyHandbook-CU-System.pdf, from https://www.cu.edu/content/faculty-handbook
            Faculty Desk Reference – Boulder
            FacultyDeskReference-Boulder.pdf, from http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/deskref/
            Human Resources Website
            HumanResourcesWebsite.pdf, from http://www.colorado.edu/humres/Faculty Roster and Salaries,
            2008-09 -- FacultySalaries_2008-09.xls
CU Boulder average salaries by rank, last three fiscal years
Comparison to public, AAU salaries, most recent year, by rank
Comparison to public, AAU salaries, new hires, most recent year only, by rank
Additional similar comparative salary data

Resource Room Documents and Web Sites Consulted

Minutes of Major Organizational Committees
CU Board of Regents
Chancellor's Cabinet
Chancellor's Executive Committee
Boulder Faculty Assembly
Arts and Sciences Council
Assessment Oversight Committee
Boulder Campus Planning Commission (BCPC)
UCB Self-study (Planning Board, Steering Committee)
Dean's Council

Staff Council
University of Colorado Student Union (UCSU)
Reports Referenced in the Self-Study Report
IPEDS Data Feedback Report: 2009
Institutional Characteristics: Fall 2009
Fall Enrollment Survey: Fall 2008
Degree Completion: 2008-09
Finance Survey: 2007-08
Human Resources Survey: Fall 2009
Graduation Rate Survey: Fiscal Year 2008-09
Financial Aid Survey: Fiscal Year 2008-09
Enrollment Snapshots—Comparing Fall 99 to Fall 08
Resource Allocation Process
Performance Contracts
Glory Colorado, Volumes I and II
An Academic Review and Planning Profile, (ARP)—Department of
Psychology and Neuroscience
Strategic Planning for Individual Schools, Colleges and Organizations
Policies and Procedures Related to Curriculum
Regent Policies
Office of Faculty Affairs Review and Planning
Graduate Course Proposal Form
Curriculum Policies and Procedures for Individual Schools/Colleges
Policies on Learning Resources
Intellectual Property Policy on Discoveries and Patents for Their Protection
Intellectual Property That is Educational Material
Library Circulation Policy

Other Documents and Web sites Consulted

Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty Members and Roles and Professional Duties of Department   Chairs
UCB Steering Committee Information Site for Visit Participants
        http://www.colorado.edu/accreditation/downloads/presentationFeb2010.pdf
Outcomes Assessment and Program Review Site
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/
University of Colorado Foundation (*documents that were either in the document room or that were*
        requested)
        1 Governance Structure
        2 Committee Charters
        3 Bylaws
        4 Operating Agreement Between the University of Colorado and the CU Foundation
        5 Agreement for Development Services
        Performance Metrics December 31, 2009 – Quarterly report
Five-year Capital Construction Program FY 2010-FY2011-FY2014-15
Master Plan 2001 Site
        http://www.colorado.edu/masterplan/history/Final%202001%20Master%20Plan.pdf
Campus Master Plan 2001 http://www.colorado.edu/masterplan/history/previous.html
Campus Master Plan 2009 http://www.colorado.edu/masterplan/index.html
College Portrait Site http://www.collegeportraits.org/CO/CU-Boulder
Assessment Oversight Committee Site http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/aoc/
Assessment Oversight Committee Annual Report 2008-2009 http://www.colorado.edu/pba/planning/
Entire IPEDS page - all reports http://www.colorado.edu/pba/ipeds/
Data feedback report 2009 http://www.colorado.edu/pba/ipeds/2009BoulderMarkup.pdf
Enrollment snapshots - comparing fall 99 to fall 08   http://www.colorado.edu/pba/records/snap/087997/index.htm
College of Arts and Sciences http://www.colorado.edu/ArtsSciences/overview/strategicplan.html

 Leeds School of Business
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/planning/LeedsSchoolofBusinessDraftStrategicPlan081001 .ppt
Alignment with Flagship 2030   http://www.colorado.edu/pba/planning/LeedsSchool_Flagship%202030v3.doc
School of Education http://colorado.edu/pba/planning/SchoolofEducationStrategicPlan1-31-05.pdf
College of Engineering and Applied Science http://engineering.colorado.edu/engineering2020/
Division of Administration http://www.colorado.edu/VCAdmin/plan.html
Information Technology Services http://www.colorado.edu/itplan/2006/index.html
Alumni Association http://www.colorado.edu/pba/planning/AlumniAssociationStrategicPlan2009.doc
Flagship 2030 Phase 1: Subcommittee Reports
        http://www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/downloads/allReports_050107.pdf
Flagship 2030 Phase 2: Task Force Reports http://www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/implementation.html
Flagship 2030 Phase 3: Chancellor's Review and Action Plans
        http://www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/implementation.html
Budget Data Books (Fiscal Years 2005-09) http://www.colorado.edu/pba/budget/reports/bdb2010.pdf
Annual Financial Audits (Fiscal Years 2004-09) https://www.cusys.edu/controller/financial-rpts.html
        https://www.cu.edu/controller/documents/AR2009.pdf also 2008, 2007
        https://www.cu.edu/controller/documents/Supplemental_09.pdf also 2008, 2007
Current Funds Expenditures by Unit for Fiscal Year 2009
Current Perspective for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010
Intercollegiate Athletics Accountants' Report (Fiscal Years 2007, 2008, 2009)
Campus Performance Measures
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/perfmeas/C2_2007/C2_numbers.pdf
The Arts and Humanities: Review snd Planning Proceedings
        http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/2009_Review_Procedures.pdf
Human Resources website

Materials specifically requested before the visit by Criterion 3 group. Queries from the site team are in italics; CU-Boulder responses in plain text.
Our Criterion 3 group, having reviewed what is available to them at this point, would like to confirm that the following materials will be available to the team in the resource room on campus:
Any department/program/major-based assessment plans and reports more recent than those posted online (http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/units/unitindx.htm), most of which seem to be of 00-01 vintage. Ideally, we'll see some from the College of Arts and Sciences.
The self-study describes, and provides links to, the considerable assessment activity surrounding cross-departmental initiatives in science, mathematics, and teaching. Participants in these initiatives will be in meeting #23, Update on Innovations in science and math education.
The website listed above largely pre-dates the AOC's formal role in the academic program review process; as described in the self-study, this role has itself had its ups and downs as program review paused and revised.
The physical resource room will contain, from the academic program review process, unpublished materials including
    Answers by the arts and humanities units undergoing review in 2008-09 to questions on assessment, undergraduate education, and graduate education. All these units are in Arts and Sciences except the College of Music.
    Notes by the AOC chair, for AOC discussion, on feedback to the arts and humanities units
    Answers by the natural science units (all in Arts and Sciences) undergoing review in 2009-10 to questions on assessment, undergraduate education, and graduate education.
    The entire outcomes assessment website (http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/index.htm) is slated for revamping.

    Any completed (even if not publicly released) program reviews conducted under the new guidelines, containing assessment information (plans, activities, impact).
    The physical resource room will contain a set of communications from the academic review and planning committee to individual arts and humanities units reviewed in 2008-09. Each includes a summary of findings and recommendations.
    The procedures guidelines for 2009-10 will also be in the resource room.

Any sort of annual report of the AOC documenting regular, progressive activity and impact of assessment results on decisions (since campus wide initiatives may have suspended unit-level work). Barring documentation, we'll need to talk with the AOC chair to get the story that would have been told in those reports.
The AOC annual report for 2008-09 is at
http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/aoc/AOCAnnualReport09MCGrev.doc
Since the annual report, the AOC has revised and approved a set of learning goals for all undergraduates, campus-wide. These are posted at http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/ug_goals.htm.

Colorado Space Grant Consortium Newsletter, *Consortium Happenings*
"Fact Sheet on Critical-Thinking Courses in the College of Arts & Sciences" (Press release)
Brochures:
CU Teach at UC Boulder (informational brochure aimed at involving undergraduates as "Learning Assistants" in STEM disciplines, to enhance K-12 education)
UC-Boulder Learning Assistant experiential learning program model (2010 edition of training program materials)
iSTEM (explains mission, focus, and goals of the Integrating STEM program)
"Campus Visit Programs"
"Broaden your CU-Boulder Experience"
"Recreation, Sports & Student Groups"
"Just the Facts 2009"
UC-Boulder FTEP
"An Academic and Education Development Program for Faculty: Levels and Contexts" Overview and information
"Achieving Course Goals: Gathering Evidence About Student Learning"
Presentation: "UC President's Teaching and Learning Collaborative, 2006 to Present"
FTEP Services statistics

Assessment Oversight Committee (AOC) annual report, 2008-2009 website
Strategic Planning – website
Flagship 2030 document – website
Flagship 2030 Phase 1: Subcommittee Reports – website
Flagship 2030 Phase 2: Task Force Reports
Flagship 2030 Phase 3: Chancellor's Review and Action Plans
Regent Policy 4-J: Interim Policy and Procedures for Approving New Degree Program Proposals
Archive of Public Reports from the Program Review Panel – Through 2007
Recommendations of the Program Review Reform Task Force, May 2007
2008-9 –review of Arts and Humanities Units
Review procedures, Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee
Unit responses to questions on undergraduate education, graduate education, and assessment
AOC chair notes for AOC communication to 2008-2009 academic review and planning units re:their assessment responses
Core Review
Graduate School Curriculum Policies and Procedures
Graduate School Course Proposal Form
Law School Curriculum Policies and Procedures
Policies on learning resources, including libraries, and formal agreements for the shared use of learning resources
Intellectual Property Policy on Discoveries and Patents for Their Protection and Commercialization
Intellectual Property That is Educational Materials
Library Circulation Policy
Information Services for Information Consumers; Public Services Code of Service
Interlibrary Loan Service Policy
Electronic Reserves Copyright Guidelines
Circulation Loan Policies
Chinook System
Campus Master Plan 2009
Faculty Desk Reference Guide
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion
Honor Code

Student Conduct Code
United Government of Graduate Students Bylaws
Arts and Sciences Council Bylaws
Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) Materials
University of Colorado Student Union Materials
United Government of Graduate Students Materials
Faculty Salary Roster
Board of Regents materials
University of Colorado Foundation
Reports from other agencies or accrediting bodies for Business, Clinical Psychology, Education, Engineering and
Applied Sciences, International English Center, Journalism, Law School, Music, Speech, Language and Hearing
Sciences, University of Colorado Museum, Wardenburg Health Center
ACE Internationalization Laboratory Preliminary Report
iStem Initiative Information
Graduate School Rules, 2001
Graduate Student Appointment Manual
Faculty Handbook CU System
Performance contract with State of Colorado:
        http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/PerformanceContracts/Final/cu.pdf
New degree program overview:
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/degrees/10YearOverview.htm
Faculty salary overview:
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/facstaff/facsal/time/
AOC 2003 report:
        http://www.colorado.edu/accreditation/downloads/ncareport0304.pdf
Arts and Science Core curriculum:
        http://www.colorado.edu/ArtsSciences/students/undergraduate/core.html
Colorado Challenge:
        http://www.colorado.edu/ArtsSciences/facultystaff/administration/coloradochallenge_m1.html
Announcement of oral assessment project:
        http://www.colorado.edu/news/r/40c92d874183314e002226645b96db37.html
Performance indicators:
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/perfmeas/
Arts and Sciences Council:
        http://www.colorado.edu/ArtsSciences/ASCOUNCIL/
Board of Regents laws:
        http://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/Article5D.htm
System policies:
        https://www.cusys.edu/policies/
Arts and Sciences policies:
        http://www.colorado.edu/ArtsSciences/facultystaff/policies/A&Spolicies.html
Engineering policies:
        http://ecadw.colorado.edu/engineering/facultystaff/college_policies.htm
Boulder Faculty Assembly:
        http://www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance/
Presidential home page:
        https://www.cu.edu/content/about-president-benson
Budget planning:
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/planning/
2007 performance measure goals:
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/perfmeas/C2_2007/C2_text.pdf
Graduate School planning:
        http://www.colorado.edu/GraduateSchool/aboutus/planning.html
Enrollment planning:
        http://www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/strategicplan/5enrollment.html
2008 enrollment task force report:

http://www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/downloads/implementation/TaskForceEnrollment.pdf
Out-of-State tuition guarantee:
http://www.colorado.edu/pba/budget/tuitionfees/guarantee.html
Program review task force recommendations:
http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/PRP_Taskforce_Recommendations.pdf
Program review reports:
http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/PRP-Archive.htm
Academic review and planning:
http://www.colorado.edu/pba/depts/arp/
Instructor/course database:
https://fcq.colorado.edu/UCBdata.htm
Outcomes assessment:
http://www.colorado.edu/pba/outcomes/
Quantitative reasoning section of Arts and Sciences Core:
http://www.colorado.edu/ArtsSciences/students/undergraduate/as_core.qrms.html
Institutional research and links to data: http://www.colorado.edu/pba/ia/
UROP: http://www.colorado.edu/UROP/
DLC: http://engineering.colorado.edu/DLC/
ITLL: http://itll.colorado.edu/
FTEP: http://www.colorado.edu/ftep/
President's Teaching Scholars Program: http://www.colorado.edu/ptsp/
2008 Top American Research Universities: http://mup.asu.edu/research2008.pdf

Institutes:
INSTARR: http://instaar.colorado.edu/
IBG: http://ibgwww.colorado.edu/
IBS: http://www.colorado.edu/ibs/
ICS: http://ics.colorado.edu/
CIRES: http://cires.colorado.edu/
JILA: http://jila.colorado.edu/
LASP: http://lasp.colorado.edu/
RASEI: http://rasei.colorado.edu/
ATLAS: http://www.colorado.edu/atlas/
IECE: http://www.colorado.edu/iece/iece_programs.html

Initiatives:
CIMB: http://cimb.colorado.edu/
AS^3E: http://www.colorado.edu/aerospace/as3e.html
Technology transfer: https://www.cusys.edu/techtransfer/policies/
Graduate student survey: http://www.colorado.edu/pba/surveys/grad/05/
Graduate education task force recommendations:
http://www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/downloads/implementation/TaskForceGraduateEd.pdf
Honor code: http://www.colorado.edu/academics/honorcode/
Research integrity: http://www.colorado.edu/VCResearch/integrity/index.html
Contract and grant policy: http://www.colorado.edu/VCResearch/research/index.html
Professional rights and duties of faculty:
http://www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance/policies/Professional_Rights_and_Duties.pdf

UC-Boulder Board of Regents, Laws of the Regents, Article 5. Faculty.
www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/Article5B.htm
FLAGSHIP 2030, Outreach and Engagement Task Force Final Report, August 2008.
www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/downloads/implementation/TaskForceOutreach.pdf
Continuing Education and Professional Studies.
conted.colorado.edu
Leeds School of Business, Executive Education.
leeds.colorado.edu/Executive_Education/interior.aspx?id=1350

Colorado Law, Continuing Legal Education.
  www.colorado.edu/law/academics/cle.htm
Office for University Outreach.
  conted.colorado.edu/programs/outreach/outreach-awards
Institute for Ethical and Civic Engagement.
  www.colorado.edu/iece/iece_programs.html
Children, Youth & environments, Center for Research and Design.
  www.cudenver.edu/Academics/Colleges/ArchitecturePlanning/discover/centers/CYE/
  Pages
College of Architecture and Planning Centers, College of Architecture and Planning.
  www.cudenver.edu/academics/colleges/architectureplanning/discover/centers/pages
CU-Boulder Puksta Scholars' website, A civic Engagement Program.
  www.colorado.edu/AcademicAffairs/UndergraduateEducation/pukstaweb
Career Services, Division of Student Affairs.
  careerservices.colorado.edu/students/PIIE.aspx
Access Colorado Program, Institute for ethical and Civic Engagement.
  www.colorado.edu/iece/iece_programs.html#access
Colorado Office of Parent relations.
  www.colorado.edu/parentrelations
Volunteer Resource Center.
  www.colorado.edu/studentgroups/vch
NVST Community Leadership Program.
  www.colorado.edu/communitystudies/clp
Service Learning Office.
  www.colorado.edu/servicelearning
Active Learning Program, College of Engineering and Applied Science.
  engineering.colorado.edu/activelearning/service.htm
Experiential Learning Program, Colorado Law.
  www.colorado.edu/law/academics/exp_learning.htm
Partners in Education, School of Education.
  www.colorado.edu/education/prospective/pie.html
Office for University Outreach Programs.
  conted.colorado.edu/programs/outreach/outreach-programs
Science Discovery Program.
  www.colorado.edu/sciencediscovery
Center of the American West.
  www.centerwest.org
Mechanical Engineering Partnership Program, Mesa State College.
  www.mesastate.edu/engineering
Museum of Natural History.
  cumuseum.colorado.edu

[See also listing of Compliance documents and websites consulted – Appendix 3]

APPENDIX 3

WORKSHEET ON
Federal Compliance Requirements

INSTITUTIONAL MATERIALS RELATED TO FEDERAL COMPLIANCE REVIEWED BY THE TEAM:

[See listing at end of Worksheet]

EVALUATION OF FEDERAL COMPLIANCE PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The team verifies that it has reviewed each component of the Federal Compliance Program by reviewing each item below. Generally, if the team finds substantive issues in these areas and relates such issues to the institution's fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation, such discussion should be handled in appropriate sections of the Assurance Section of the Team Report or highlighted as such in the appropriate AQIP Quality Checkup Report.

1. Credits, Program Length, and Tuition: *The institution has documented that it has credit hour assignments and degree program lengths within the range of good practice in higher education and that tuition is consistent across degree programs (or that there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).*

> **The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.**

2. Student Complaints: *The institution has documented a process in place for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints as evidenced by the data on student complaints for the three years prior to the visit.*

> **The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.**

3. Transfer Policies: *The institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.*

> **The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.**

4. Verification of Student Identity: *The institution has demonstrated that it verifies the identify of students who participate in courses or programs provided to the student through distance or correspondence education.*

> **The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.**

5. Title IV Program and Related Responsibilities: *The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program. The team has reviewed these materials and has*

found no cause for concern regarding the institution's administration or oversight of its Title IV responsibilities.

- *General Program Requirements: The institution has provided the Commission with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*

- *Financial Responsibility Requirements: The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*

- *Default Rates, Campus Crime Information and Related Disclosure of Consumer Information, Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies: The institution has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.*

- *Contractual Relationships: The institution has presented evidence of its contracts with non-accredited third party providers of 25-50% of the academic content of any degree or certificate programs.*

> **The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and recommends the ongoing approval of such contracts.**

6. Institutional Disclosures and Advertising and Recruitment Materials: *The institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with the Commission and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.*

> **The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.**

7. Relationship with Other Accrediting Agencies and with State Regulatory Boards: *The institution has documented that it discloses its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditor and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence. **Note that if the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is currently under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor in the past five years, the team must address this in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report and provide its rationale for recommending Commission status in light of this information.***

> **The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.**

8. Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment: *The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comments. The team has evaluated any comments received and completed any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.* ***Note that if the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comment relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report.***

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.

INSTITUTIONAL MATERIALS RELATED TO FEDERAL COMPLIANCE REVIEWED BY THE TEAM:

Documents in Colorado University Boulder 2010 Self Study Appendix C
Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) Guidelines
  http://highered.colorado.gov/Publications/Policies/Current/v-partb-Guidelines.pdf
Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis- [Budget & Finances] – Tuition and Fees
  http://www.colorado.edu/pba/budget/tuitionfees/
Bursar's Office
  http://www.colorado.edu/bursar/now/tuitfeebill.html
Bursar's Office – Mandatory Fees- Fall 09 and Spring 10
  http://www.colorado.edu/bursar/now/mandfeesfallspg0910.html
Bursar's Office - Bill Estimator
  http://www.colorado.edu/bursar/now/bef/index.html
Bursar's Office – Bill Estimator – Undergraduate Resident - Engineering
  http://www.colorado.edu/bursar/now/bef/res/reseng.html
Student Appeals, Complaints and Grievances: A Brief Guide
  http://www.colorado.edu/policies/appealsguide.htm
Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis – Research and Analysis – FCQ – How to contact department heads with comments on instructors
  http://www.colorado.edu/fcq/contact.html
Transfer Admission Criteria – Transfer Credit Guidelines
  http://www.colorado.edu/prospective/transfer/admission/credit.html
Information Technology Services – IndentiKey Information
  http://www.colorado.edu/its/docs/accounts/identikey.html
Information Technology Services – Informacion sobre el IdentiKey
  http://www.colorado.edu/its/docs/accounts/identikeyinformacion.html
Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis – Admissions, Financial Aid, and Enrollment Projections – Enrollment of new and all students
  http://www.colorado.edu/pba/adm/
Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis – Cummulative Loan debt Accrued by Cu- Boulder Bachelor's Grads – Perry Sailor, PBA, October 2009
  http://www.colorado.edu/pba/records/debt/loandebt.htm
Report of the State Auditor – State of Colorado Statewide single Audit – Fiscal Year   Ended June 30, 2008 – Page 307 - Department of Higher Education
  http://www.colorado.gov/dpa/dfp/sco/audit/audit08.pdf

Ralphie's Guide to Student Life
University of Colorado at Boulder Reports of Criminal Offenses
        http://www.colorado.edu/ralphie/wordpress/wp-ontent/uploads/2009/06/Criminal-
Offenses.pdf
Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis: IPEDS Submissions and Comparisons
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/ipeds/
        [the report dates on the page are incorrect – Note: the report dates are correct, but the
        IPEDS naming conventions are misleading. CU-Boulder has annotated the posted
        documents to clarify.]
IPEDS Degree Completion 2008-9 [but is listed as 2007-8]
        http://www.colorado.edu/pba/ipeds/Complete2008-09.pdf
Human Resources: Annual Security Report Clery Act
        http://www.colorado.edu/humres/policies/CleryAct.html

Additional Documents Viewed While on Site
Materials for Staff, Faculty and Student orientation
Report on Student Complaints and Appeals AY 06-07, 07-08 and part of 09 (prepared   by
Michael Grant, AVC for Undergraduate Education, June 2009)
Requirements for Reporting Crimes at UC-Boulder – Clery Training
        (Prepared by University of Colorado Police Department Boulder, Colorado)
Office of Judicial Affairs Data Review 2009
Memorandum of Understanding with Federal Labs to Create UCB Institutions:
        NREL / RASEI
        NIST / JILA
        NOAA / CIRES
Student Records – Office of the registrar
        http://registrar.colarado.edu/students/students.html
Refund Policy
        http://colorado.edu/bursar/now/Refunds.html
Press Release for third party comments
        http://www.colorado.edu.news/r/5b78850431d5e016b7c0d918944e27b.html
Inside CU- The CU Boulder Faculty/Staff E- Newsletter
        http://www.colorado.edu./insidecu/editions/2009/12-15/story1.html
Alumni association Webpage
        http://www.coalum.org/2009/12/18/cu-boulder-seeks-public-input-in-accreditation-
        process/
Title IX Advisor Interim report
        http://www.colorado.edu/news.downloads.TitleIX report.pdf
Office of discrimination and Harassment fiscal Year 2008-9 Report
Preliminary Report from the Responsible conduct of Research (RCR) Task Force.

ADVANCEMENT SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

To

The University of Colorado at Boulder

Boulder, Colorado

February 22-24, 2010

For

The Higher Learning Commission
A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

Nancy Ellen Talburt (Team Co-Chair), Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Administration Bldg 422, Fayetteville, AR 72701

Mark S. Wrighton (Team Co-Chair), Chancellor, Washington University in St. Louis, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1192, St. Louis, MO 63130-4899

David C. Bosserman, Vice President for Administration & Finance, Oklahoma State University, 206 Whitehurst, Stillwater, OK 74078

Peggy F. Harrel, Director of Graduate Studies and Sponsored Research, University of Southern Indiana, 8600 University Blvd., Evansville, IN 47712

Lon Kaufman, Vice Provost for Planning and Programs, University of Illinois at Chicago, 601 S. Morgan St., 2732 University Hall M/C 103, Chicago, IL 60607

Elaine M. Klein, Assistant Dean & Director, Academic Planning, Program Review and
    Assessment, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 307 E. South Hall, 1055 Bascom Mall,
    Madison, WI 53706

Natalie Krawitz, Vice President for Finance and Administration, University of Missouri, 215
    University Hall, Columbia, MO 65211-3020

Thomas L. McPhail, Professor of Media Studies, University of Missouri-Saint Louis, 236 GSB,
    One University Blvd, St. Louis, MO 63121

Kenneth J. Moore, Professor of Agronomy, Iowa State University, 1571 Agronomy Hall, Ames,
    IA 50011-2035

Morteza A. Rahimi, Professor and Vice President, Information Technology, Northwestern
    University, 633 Clark Street, Evanston, IL 60208

Rex D. Ramsier, Associate Provost, Policies, Procedures, Reviews; Professor, Physics and
    Chemistry, The University of Akron, 302 Buchtel Common, Buchtel Hall 106, Akron,
    OH 44325-4703

W. Randy Smith, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, The Ohio State University, 190 North
    Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210

Ben van der Pluijm, Professor and Senior Counselor to the Provost, University of Michigan,
    Office of the Provost, 503 Thompson Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

George E. Walker, Vice President for Research and Dean of the University Graduate School,
    Cleveland State University, 2121 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44115-2214

Contents

I. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION

As the flagship of the University of Colorado, the University of Colorado at Boulder is widely recognized as a premier research university and attracts talented students and faculty from all parts of the United States and many other countries. Located in one of the most beautiful settings of any research university, CU-Boulder has been developed with architecture sympathetic to the environment and provides an especially attractive physical setting for research and learning. The institution has active and engaged faculty, staff, and students and has more than 90 research centers, institutes and laboratories. With wise leadership, it has managed to maintain fiscal health in difficult (national and state) economic times. However, the University has enormous potential to bring even greater value to its state, the nation, and the world, and this Advancement Section addresses areas of potential opportunity for CU-Boulder.

Many states face large financial challenges, but Colorado benefits from having a major research university to contribute to the state's ability to respond in such times. With experienced and committed leadership, CU-Boulder has developed an ambitious plan, Flagship 2030, to achieve greater quality and impact and thus increase and enhance the number and kinds of contributions the institution makes to the State. This plan and the process leading to it—along with the preparation for the visit by the Higher Learning Commission team—has given CU-Boulder new momentum. One team member suggested that the "beautiful environment in Boulder is worth $2 billion of endowment." Many observations below relate to possible ways the institution and state could use this momentum to raise awareness of and commitment to CU-Boulder's strengths and potential to move toward a more central role in the state. Without a stronger financial position and a faster growing endowment, the institution's excellence is in jeopardy.

II. CONSULTATIONS OF THE TEAM

The Higher Learning Commission team provides the following observations, suggestions, and advice related to the comprehensive review of the University of Colorado at Boulder. Topics addressed include issues raised and topics identified in campus discussions, in the self-study report, and in the institution's current situation as it has been presented to the team.

A. Mission and Governance

- Given its distinctive national and international reputation among research institutions, CU-Boulder needs to be celebrated more fully by the University of Colorado System, its Board of Regents, and the state of Colorado. The reputation of CU-Boulder may be better appreciated outside the state of Colorado than in the state itself. Those with a stake in the future of the state should be encouraged to embrace the University as a significant asset and invest in it. The Regents can be a powerful advocate for the University of Colorado, given that they are elected by the public. The President enjoys the confidence of the Board of Regents and is widely known and respected in the state and can continue to be a major force to contribute to increasing awareness of CU-Boulder.

- Colorado's population is growing; it has a relatively high per capita income, and a relatively high proportion of its adult population with college degrees. The University of Colorado at Boulder is a significant and powerful asset to the State. As a comprehensive research university, CU-Boulder provides educational opportunities at all degree levels and in many areas of vital importance to the future of Colorado, the nation, and the world. The institution is a major center of knowledge creation and currently brings to Colorado competitively awarded research grant funds well above $300 million – a major contribution to the state's economy. That function brings with it distinctive needs for specialized facilities –advanced instrumentation, laboratories, libraries, and information technology – and funds for recruiting and retaining leading teacher-scholars within a highly competitive market. The institution attracts people of exceptional ability from around the country and the world to its educational and research programs. Often they find Colorado to be the place where they continue their lives and careers beyond their formal educational experience. CU-Boulder should be an enormous source of pride to Colorado and receive commensurate investment from the state.

Yet the resources available to the Chancellor and University are astonishingly small considering the stature of the institution. Resource availability affects, within the context of institutional planning, the need to further develop research initiatives in areas such as biotechnology, energy and environment, and aerospace (all embraced by the state leadership), and STEM education initiatives. The Team suggests the following possibilities:

To help realize the aspirations of the Flagship 2030 plan, there should be an expanded and sustained investment in development activities - focused on garnering the financial resources needed to realize the key elements of the plan. The Chancellor should be the central figure in developing the fundraising strategy and in executing the effort with support from the CU Foundation and its leaders. He is in the best position to assure the effort is properly focused on the academic priorities of CU-Boulder. An expanded staff alone does not assure that the necessary expanded funding will be realized, but a larger, high quality, professional staff will be a necessary element in building a stronger program for the University of Colorado at Boulder. To establish the appropriate priorities, focus, and rates of development return for CU-Boulder, consideration should be given to whether that can be done within the current organizational structure for the Foundation.

Given that CU-Boulder has an exceptionally strong research program, much of which is supported by federal government agencies, it would likely benefit from a stronger presence in Washington DC, through professionals dedicated to helping it realize its unique mission and to fulfill its research potential, especially as many new research opportunities will be large, complex, interdisciplinary initiatives where the institution already has considerable strength. Pursuing earmark monies does not seem to be part of the institutional culture, and it may be worthwhile to revisit this issue since state support is very limited.

The state of Colorado should consider allowing international students to be recruited on the basis of merit, and not be limited to the requirement that CU-

Boulder have two-thirds of its students from Colorado. International students should make the following contributions: bring intellectual and cultural diversity to the campus; enhance the education of domestic students; participate in the economy of the state and nation by remaining in the United States after graduation. They will help advance the University of Colorado at Boulder as one of the world's leading research universities.

- Many initiatives at the University are carried out by program and unit leaders who have been in their positions for some time and who work closely, and informally, with one another. Examples include those working on diversity initiatives, both centrally and locally, and those responsible for federal compliance issues. Given that the Flagship 2030 Plan will build on many of those initiatives, and given that leadership succession is inevitable in all areas, it would be helpful now to bring some of those working relationships into more formal structures such as working groups, committees, or the like.

  Flagship 2030 has generated widespread interest, involvement, and excitement among virtually all members of the university community, and its time frame is particularly distinctive. The team offers the following advice regarding its implementation:

  > It is important to begin, now, to identify the impact that the various plan initiatives will have on a wide range of academic support areas - Human Resources, Communications, Student Affairs, Police among others - so that resource implementation issues can be addressed appropriately and intentionally.

  > Soon the university will need to prioritize components of the 2030 Plan for action, specify metrics to monitor progress, and presumably identify benchmark institutions – all to assure accountability and transparency in the implementation process.

- Effective communication about ongoing and planned activities is critical to all universities and all constituencies within then. It is particularly important to large decentralized complex universities and the systems of which they are a part. The team received comments that stronger communication mechanisms need to exist between and among system institutions, and between and among the various levels of CU-Boulder. An important first step is to determine the most effective means of communication for the intended audience(s).

B. Preparing for the Future

- <u>Financial Resources</u> The institution's financial statements indicate that the university is in a fiscally sound position and it is financially well-managed by the administration in complete concert with the mission, vision, and values of the university. The Team's positive observations about the financial health of the institution are well documented by the university's financial statements using ratio analyses recommended by the KPMG, Prager, Sealy & Co., LLC and Bearing Point Publication Strategic Financial Analyses for Higher Education. Furthermore, the institution's organizational, managerial, and internal controls reflect sound management within the framework of statutory and regulatory

requirements and are administered fairly to all constituencies as evidenced by compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

- Development   The Flagship 2030 goals and action plans will require a significant infusion of resources to actualize. With constraints on resources due to low and declining state support, the University needs to maximize other opportunities for funding. Private philanthropy appears to provide an opportunity for the campus given the size of its alumni base. The University of Colorado at Boulder's endowment is smaller than one would predict given the alumni base and the historic wealth of the student body. The total financial resources per student at the end of FY 2008, at approximately $26,400, are well below $46,288, the median for Moody's Aa2 rated public universities. The campus, unlike other peer institutions, has not yet completed a $1.0 billion capital campaign. The current arrangement that manages all development activity through the Foundation may not allow the campus to optimize its potential in this area. It also appears that the campus is under-staffed relative to its peers in the development function. While there appear to be some compelling reasons to keep development in the Foundation, there is little evidence that supports the effectiveness of this arrangement.

- University Library The strategic direction identified and being followed by the university library appears to be a good one. The challenges facing the redefinition of the modern university library are well articulated in the self-study. Consciousness of these challenges will help the institution to engage in conversations with others that will help achieve the vision of recreating the library as an intellectual commons for the university community. This consciousness has practical value: by articulating these goals, institutional leaders will be better able to identify University development activities that contribute to the library's needs – for example, "friends of the library" drives may focus on particular initiatives, or the library could develop partnerships with learning communities and teaching efforts (e.g., as a satellite location for tutoring programs). The libraries might look also to extending services to the broader community, by extending the principle of the intellectual commons to the community.

- Information Technology   At the time of the last accreditation of the University, Information Technology (IT) had become an essential element of success in management, the teaching and learning process, and research in higher education. In response to that reality and recommendations made by the previous accreditation team, the University has invested in IT with excellent results. In particular, the team commends reorganization of the management of IT, replacement of all major enterprise systems, expanded facility for high performance computing, new tools and facilities for teaching and collaboration, a powerful and extensive wired and wireless network, and expansion of associated services.

  The present IT plan of the University is thoughtful and represents the varied interests of the campus constituents. The University has been thorough in executing the existing plan and has responded to some of the needs that have presented themselves outside of the plan. Under the leadership of a new CIO, a new IT strategic plan is being developed in support of the University's strategic plan. Given the rapid changes in the IT industry,

products, services, availability, and pricing, a planning process should be created which allows annual updating of the IT plan. It might be useful to create a multi-year plan, which is updated each fiscal year; for example, a running four-year plan modified and extended each year. CU-Boulder IT systems and services are in excellent shape except for some aspects of research support. This is not caused by neglect but by rapid growth of quality, scope and volume of research. Since building the research enterprise further is a goal of Flagship 2030, this issue requires substantial attention of the kind CU-Boulder has shown itself capable of giving.

- <u>Enhancing the Physical Campus</u> CU-Boulder appears to be responsive to student needs and views in regard to facilities, even to the extent of consulting extensively with students while engaged in the process of designing new buildings and learning spaces. The campus is a great asset and is very attractive. However, some aspects of the physical infrastructure need attention. Deferred maintenance, especially in selected areas such as the physical sciences, includes buildings more than forty years old that have not been renovated. To prevent future problems and ensure that facilities are efficiently utilized throughout their useful lifetimes, CU-Boulder now tries to build for larger groups with like interests instead of, for example, one institute. Attempts at developing a research park structure are welcomed by campus constituents, but funding for such projects requires additional capital. The development and maintenance of the physical infrastructure should be considered as one of the priorities for an enhanced resource development effort.

- <u>University-wide Performance Assessment</u> The University has a history of tracking institutional performance across key areas of teaching/learning, research, and administrative support through the use of a set of measures. Performance is presented over multiple years and is an important resource for planning. As the university updates its performance measures to align them with the Flagship 2030 plan, it might integrate the measures with specific areas of the strategic plan and identify multi-year goals/targets for selected measures. This expanded monitoring would provide a means by which progress on the plan can be reported out. This approach would promote accountability and transparency to internal and external constituencies in a way that the current set of measures does not do.

C. Student Learning and Assessment

- <u>Assessment as a foundation for evidence-based decision-making</u> is a key indicator for visiting teams. In many ways, CU-Boulder has achieved that goal. It has in place many mechanisms for knowing what its students are learning, that teaching is effective, and that various structures and processes support effective teaching and learning. This understanding of learning and teaching is pervasive, useful and used; the cycle of study, reflection, and improvement – while incomplete – shows promise of developing into an iterative, cyclical process that should allow continued progress in this area.

- <u>Sustaining the momentum on assessment</u> is very important. At the time of the mandated report to the HLC, the university had laid a good foundation for sustaining momentum in

assessment by integrating it into essential processes that are meaningful to the institution. The recent revision of academic program review (which includes assessment) and the meaningful inclusion of teaching effectiveness in the tenure process, make assessment a serious endeavor that provides useful data for making important decisions. Following through on the promise of the revised program review process, as well as continuing efforts to incorporate assessment information and information about teaching effectiveness wherever it seems reasonable to do so (e.g., in promotion decisions, in academic program development, in institutional awards) will continue to support this goal.

Focusing on assessment in program review is an important step in giving assessment of student learning stature, but more needs to be done to ensure that the practices are good and the results are used. The seven-year cycle for program review seems too long an interval over which to effectively maintain a substantial level of assessment activity. The Assessment Oversight Committee should consider how to design a process for preparation and review of interim reports to ensure that assessment activities are undertaken with regularity and actions taken are useful and timely. Such a process will also enhance the ability of a unit to report substantive progress made between program reviews.

- Assessment at the department level, based on a cursory review of online materials, appears to have little or no activity with the exception of College of Engineering, School of Education, and other externally accredited programs. External forces may periodically drive substantial assessment activity; however, there appears to be only slim attention paid to assessment at the department level, and biannual meetings of the campus-level assessment committee may be insufficient to sustain a deep commitment to assessing student learning.

- Assessment at the graduate level is not consistently articulated across the institution; this may mean that more effort is required to find ways to fully systematize practices associated with the usual mechanisms for graduate education (e.g., by evaluating, at a program level, results of qualifying examinations to consider patterns that transcend individual student performance). Efforts to measure and improve student learning at the graduate level will become increasingly important as *Flagship 2030* moves forward to expand – significantly – graduate professional and baccalaureate/post-baccalaureate degree offerings. Among the many types of metrics that might be used will be graduate retention and completion rates within and across disciplines, time to degree, and demographic profiles. It may also be useful, in support of graduate education, for the Graduate School to take a coordinated and systematic look at the graduate student experience, to ensure that any worrisome trends can be addressed.

Related to the goal expressed in *Flagship 2030* to expand master's level education such that it becomes the signature CU-Boulder degree, and to the aspiration that those degrees are professional degrees, the institution may wish to intentionally create equally advantageous connections between the professional and research programs. In the best case, cutting edge research will inform both the applied and the professional programs. It

will be important to underscore the specific quality and nature of student learning in these programs through the assessment for each.

- Effective campus approaches to assessment It may be that CU-Boulder is striving to identify the most effective stance to take on assessment: perhaps it is less important, given the broad emphasis at this institution for exemplary scientific and technical education, for rich understanding of the creative arts and humanities, and for a meaningful liberal education that will last a lifetime, for the institution to focus on program-level assessment. Perhaps it is more useful for departments to participate in coalitions of assessment activities, to engage in assessment across disciplines rather than within them. If, for example, the university's overall philosophy of assessment were to propose that any CU-Boulder student could achieve a particular standard in certain critical skills and fundamental realms of understanding (akin to the critical thinking assessment that is being piloted), those general assessment strategies could serve as well. Departments/programs should certainly be able to certify at the program level that students have met expectations – this is, after all, what is expected within a major – but the university may find it more useful to use institutional resources to measure and validate what *any student* may be able to do or know.

  Such an initiative will enhance the institution's ability to understand the impact of the many education-focused endeavors planned in the *Flagship 2030* plan. Just as program review activities may guide the way in helping the university identify trends, institution-wide assessment efforts will be essential to helping the university understand the impact of increasing access to program review documents, incorporating experiential learning into the classroom, expanding certain aspects of graduate education and increasing pathways through degree programs, and increasing efforts to diversify and internationalize the student body and faculty/staff profiles. These initiatives are intended to improve the student experience as well as to enhance the institution's ability to position itself as the new flagship – assessment of these initiatives will provide the feedback to know if they are working, require amendment, or should be abandoned in favor of more effective strategies.

Failing to maintain a focus on student learning and shifting attention to processes tangential to assessment of student learning may be a risk. This seems to have happened in the case of the now-defunct Quality Indicator System, which shifted from learning outcomes toward output measures. To maintain focus, it will be important to consider the following things:

1. Expand efforts to incorporate more direct measures of student learning into the institutional assessment portfolio.

2. Ensure that the examination of courses in the core curriculum does not end with the alignment of course array with learning outcomes. When complete, this activity should lead to the next logical phase of assessment: evaluating student learning in the core curriculum. Team members recognize the importance of the curriculum review; at the same time, CU-Boulder is encouraged to leverage this opportunity to engage in a more meaningful assessment of student learning with respect to the curricular goals those

courses are intended to achieve.

3. Leverage the Academic Program Review process, which has already "clustered" various realms of inquiry, to consider assessment projects that could evaluate student learning in those broadly defined realms, in parallel with the institutional committee's reflection on the review of those academic areas. The Team supports the recommended shift in emphasis – toward curricular goals – in the review process. This will likely contribute to the ability to regain (and then to maintain) momentum on assessment.

4. CU-Boulder is encouraged to capitalize on the momentum already under way in STEM disciplines. Success in these areas should inform strategies that promote more effective assessment (and more effective learning) in other areas. Obviously, this does not mean that the institution should adopt a "one-size-fits-all" approach to assessment; rather, the challenge will be to engage thoughtfully in seeking to understand how the STEM disciplines have been able to capture faculty interest and energy with respect to the topic of improvements in student learning, and then to test the possibility of engaging faculty in other areas to explore how their students might learn better.

5. The revised course evaluation system has been well implemented and is a familiar tool. It might be further improved were the institution to consider adding formative assessment (e.g., used at the mid-term) as well as to encourage programs to add questions related to program-level learning goals. The university might be able to capitalize on an already well-known process to generate more useful data.

As CU-Boulder contemplates budget reductions, the institution should recognize the responsibility of the flagship institution in the state to be sensitive to the impact made by the institution's decisions on the state-wide educational culture and on the public trust that resides in the institution. Communications regarding such matters may be better made or more easily conveyed if they come from the context of an institution that pays careful attention to student learning – assessment can help a university use its scarce resources more wisely, and more effectively, to make reductions without reducing learning. Also, while decisions to change the curriculum may need to be framed in terms of a cost/benefit analysis, that analysis is not solely financial.

D. Research and Valuing a Life of Learning

With respect to sponsored research, it is very clear that CU-Boulder has positioned itself as a leader. The recent $60 million increase in funding attests to the campus' ability not only to sustain, but to expand its presence in this highly competitive landscape. The long-standing institutes bring depth and breadth to the funding portfolio and offer faculty and students many opportunities that would not exist in their absence. The campus is encouraged to work to establish the newest institute, RASEI, on the same substantive footing as the other institutes as this could lead to increases in funding related to energy – an area underrepresented in the funding portfolio at present.

In addition, whereas the natural and social sciences faculty seem to leverage the institutes for a significant percentage of their overall funding, those in other disciplines do not appear to do so. The University might wish to consider whether interaction of business, education, engineering and other faculty with the institutes could be increased by stimulus, support, or removal of seeming impediments, if any. It could be that an institute such as RASEI, and the new biotechnology and aerospace initiatives, will open up opportunities for engagement of a wider range of faculty in cross-disciplinary work that will lead to even further expansion of the research enterprise at CU-Boulder. The campus is encouraged to give attention to the possibilities and potential for such engagement by faculty and students in additional disciplines as it moves forward to achieve its research goals.

The Vice Chancellor for Research has limited staff, resources, and funding to provide needed support for the research enterprise. Existing delays in processing are reported to impact the ability to recruit and retain high-quality graduate students, especially international students with visa issues. There is a need for additional resources and streamlining to ensure improved processing of grant funds in a timely manner. New graduate degree programs currently being added must demonstrate the potential for generating new income to cover program costs. Adding programs without this vital component in place may add an extra burden on the already financially challenged established programs and may lead to an overall decrease in program quality. The institution may wish to review this practice and restrict new ventures to those for which funding has been identified. In addition, the funding structure for graduate students seems to be limiting the ability of programs to attract quality students, in particular fellowship recipients. The Dean of the Graduate School has limited staff, resources and funding that might be used to initiate campus wide support services. Other instances of funding challenges and possibilities are listed briefly below:

a.   Graduate students on fellowships must pay out-of-state tuition and fees out of their fellowships, a practice which may turn away some of the best potential students. Students are being penalized, from their vantage point, for winning external fellowships. National and international fellowship recipients are typically the best students, and finding ways to attract and retain fellowship students often helps attract and retain excellent faculty.

b.   CU-Boulder's inadequate funding support for its teaching assistants and other graduate students, especially in the humanities, decreases the University's ability to recruit graduate students. CU-Boulder provides only 70 percent of the students' health insurance. The graduate students report that two of the greatest problems facing the graduate student body are health care and TA salaries. The proposal for creating Professional Science Masters' (PSM) degrees as a way to increase revenue for graduate student activities is unlikely to meet that goal. It is more likely that PSM students might fund themselves at best, but not enhance other programs.

c.   Significant entrepreneurial efforts include the flexibility of the School of Law to increase tuition in order to limit the subsidy required from the main campus and the new building funded by student fees. Also evident are collaborations that open

new opportunities, such as the revenue sharing model currently in place that improved the MBA program's enrollment. It also appears that at the state level the procurement requirements may be lifted that will enable more flexibility on campus; however, the "enterprise status" of the campus has not fully provided the anticipated benefits. Since the Boulder area is known outside the state as progressive and a great place to start a company, it would seem that more funding might be leveraged. Finally, Title VI grants could be aggressively pursued in order to enable more interactions and productive programs within the social sciences.

d. Interaction and connection between campus units and the CU Foundation (often referred to as the "Development Office") appears to need to be increased. The Office does not formally report to the CU-Boulder leadership, and there appears to be a high turnover in development staff. The Office needs assistance with creating a system of communication and collaboration with its campus constituents. The campus patrons need to know who to contact in the Development Office for assistance. The Development Office does not appear able to provide the institute directors or other campus constituents with appropriate contacts, but looks to them for the names of contacts. Although the Development Office services have improved substantially over the past 5 years, there are structural issues: they need dedicated people to assist with requests for funding large projects such as multi-million dollar buildings. The perception is that they are stretched so thin that they are constrained in their ability to provide the necessary assistance on large projects.

- The lack of assessment in graduate programs has been noted. There are disciplinary-based projects that though narrowly-focused are of high-quality in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) localized in select STEM disciplines, for example. There is unfortunately no formal connection of these projects to the Assessment Oversight Committee and campus-wide assessment plan. Concerns are that even within the Physics program, these SOTL efforts have not been completely integrated into the curriculum and have not significantly influenced the graduate students not specifically involved in the funded work. Pedagogical methods involving learning assistants and active learning environments with "clickers" are not equivalent to assessment of student learning, and no data concerning the impact on curricular revision and student learning outcomes are evident at the campus level.

- CU-Boulder promotes globalization, but it is not built into the College of Arts and Sciences Core Curriculum. While the core has been restudied in its 21 years of existence, it has not been revised, and although many international courses exist in the core, its global course requirements can be satisfied with domestic courses. CU-Boulder should consider whether a mechanism may be needed to aggregate or connect all international/globalization responsibilities, efforts, opportunities, centers, education programs, and assessment activities. The lack of central authority and responsibility appears to create a significant barrier to progress in this area. The first recommendation of the ACE Internationalization Laboratory Preliminary Report was for CU-Boulder to

create a new Associate Vice Chancellor for International Policies and Programs. In addition to the internationalization of the curriculum, opportunities for faculty exchanges with institutions in other countries could be enhanced. Related areas for attention include apparent lack of involvement of the Study Abroad program in the campus-wide assessment of student learning outcomes. Similarly, CU-Boulder does not appear to assess student understanding of globalization in any structured or formal way in courses or curriculum.

Graduate student concerns and issues and possible courses of action to follow:

- CU-Boulder provides opportunities for graduate students to interact informally across departments and colleges. The United Government of Graduate Students (**UGGS**) holds meetings and "happy hours," but their value and participation varies by department, program, and discipline. In such disciplines as behavioral sciences, interdisciplinary interaction is expected and encouraged. In engineering, multiple skill sets and interdisciplinary projects increase employability and fundability. In other disciplines, the students perceive that interdisciplinary activity may interfere with their employability in a highly competitive job market. The Team suggests that the Graduate School would be a natural convener to facilitate general meetings of graduate students across departments to discuss general academic and professional development issues.

- Some on campus have suggested that there is need to formalize the opportunities for graduate student experiences across disciplines. CU-Boulder institute directors would like to leverage opportunities for collaboration between or among students in different departments; however, structural barriers in the curricula are seen to stifle such interdisciplinary programs. The barriers at the departmental level reportedly make it hard to collaborate to create certain interdisciplinary programs. The structures to develop interdisciplinary research have worked; the structures to develop interdisciplinary learning and teaching are not yet in place. An inconsistency is noted between Document 3a1, Regents Policy #4 and the associated internal documents, which indicate that departments and colleges control the formation of new degree programs. This is inconsistent with reports from faculty and institute directors, who seem to believe that interdisciplinary programs could be approved by the Regents without departmental approvals. In addition, the University's strategic relations with institutions in other countries, and the "continuous enrollment rule," arose as significant structural barriers to developing dual degree programs, which CU-Boulder has been exploring with a number of other countries. Reviewing these situations and identifying institutional priorities for action and change could be productive for the institution, as many institutions face similar policy and practice constraints, yet interdisciplinary programs are increasingly popular to students and effective in addressing multi-faceted research toward social problems.

- Graduate students indicate that there is high attrition in selected PhD programs, possibly due to the nature of the admissions process in transmitting programmatic expectations, and inconsistent or changing assessment mechanisms with respect to comprehensive/qualifying exams. Students claim that mentorship by faculty is not rewarded at the level that they perceive as adequate, although it is extremely important to

the success of the graduate students. Some students report that examples of faculty mistreatment of graduate students exist in some departments; however, other students report wonderful experiences in their graduate training. The institution should consider having the Graduate School provide more general oversight of mentoring or provide other means of assuring that student needs are met.

- Graduate students report that information concerning availability of grants and fellowships and other sources of external support is difficult to find. They also report that the Graduate School does not provide services and information to help graduate students find funding sources, either internal or external; to help them apply for grants or fellowships; or to coach them in scholarly writing. The Graduate School may wish to examine its recruitment materials to be sure more complete and useful information is provided to prospective students and to consider whether additional services to assist graduate students to find funding might be cost effective to the institution as well as to the students.

E. Engagement and Service

CU-Boulder has visible commitment to engagement and service. The university has developed a clear definition of engagement and service and its expectations for faculty. There are many examples of excellent programs that reflect the institution's commitment to extending the knowledge and abilities of its faculty to external communities the university strives to serve. An opportunity, however, exists for better coordination of these programs. The team endorses the Outreach and Engagement Task Force's recommendation that the institution develop "a coordinated, coherent, deliberate campus strategy for outreach and engagement."

The team recommends that the institution build on the success of the Outreach Committee which provides incubator grants for up to three years. A number of recipients spoke about how they were able to leverage the data/results and receive major NSF or NIMH funding. The institution is encouraged to enhance the impact of the Outreach Committee by expanding the number and scope of projects funded. It is also encouraged to increase the number of community members on the committee, expand the humanities and performing arts areas in terms of applications and awards, and explore partnerships with departments or other units that are willing to offer matching funds.

Given the rising pool of Latino high school and community college graduates, the institution should consider more systematic and enhanced recruitment efforts for this growing demographic group. As many potential students in this group will represent first generation college students, the institution should engage them and their families early in their academic development through targeted outreach programs. The Office of Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement currently runs a number of pre-collegiate workshops aimed at assisting Latino applicants.

The institution's efforts in promoting service learning are commendable. The team recommends that a more visible reward/recognition structure be created for faculty engaged in these activities. Effort should be made to extend service learning activities into every curriculum. One notable

example is the Institute for Arctic and Alpine Research (INSTAAR) that focuses on climate change. The majority of its funding comes from federal agencies. The Institute provides a large number of K-12 outreach activities. In addition it has produced educational CDs and books, such as *The Lost Seal* for children. The Institute has also assisted the Smithsonian Museum with advice and expertise.

The institution has developed relatively few distance education programs. Programs in business and engineering effectively extend degree and certificate programs to off-campus students, but they do not necessarily employ best practices for delivering education at a distance. The institution should explore the potential of extending its educational impact by developing distance education programs for specific audiences of learners. In particular, the team suggests that CU-Boulder consider developing professional MS degree programs in academic areas of high demand. Institutional support needs to be directed to developing appropriate expertise and infrastructure for sustaining these activities.

CU-Boulder has built a fiber-based network with the Boulder City government and schools. Serious consideration should be given to extending the network to homes and businesses in greater Boulder. This would be an important service to faculty and staff and the two-thirds of the student body that live off-campus.

<p align="center">*****</p>

III. RECOGNITION OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND PROGRESS

The University of Colorado at Boulder has made significant progress toward many of its goals in the 10 years since the previous accreditation site visit. New facilities have been developed which sustain the architectural character of the campus while providing modern, state-of-the-art, buildings for leading programs. Some facilities including the new building for Law, the ATLAS Building, and the addition and renovation of the Koelbel Building for the Leeds School of Business have been developed with substantial support from the student capital construction fee. The campus is in the process of developing a new master plan for the period 2010-2020.

Effective changes in the administrative structure have been made in response to the NCA report from 2000, including the development of the position of Provost. The leadership team is an impressive, experienced group effectively guiding the development of CU-Boulder and its educational and scholarly programs.

Faculty members at CU-Boulder have received significant awards and honors, including three faculty members who have won the Physics Nobel Prize in the last decade. Overall, faculty members have been very successful in competing for research support, with a 67 percent increase in research support in a ten year period to $340 million in the last fiscal year. The growth in the quality and impact of the faculty is impressive across the entire institution. The dedication of the faculty to the University is a palpable asset in continuing a record of innovation in education and research. CU-Boulder is an internationally known and respected research institution. The University's attention to cross-disciplinary research in targeted fields of expertise is especially noteworthy.

As the flagship institution of the University of Colorado, CU-Boulder brings many benefits to the state. While well—educated graduates are an obvious benefit, the University has emerged as a source of technological innovation, cultural advance, and community service. CU-Boulder attracts talented people and substantial resources to Colorado, fueling economic prosperity for citizens of the state.

With its ambitious plans, its effective leaders, and its productive faculty and staff, the University is poised to become an even greater asset for the state of Colorado and the nation.

INSTITUTION and STATE: University of Colorado at Boulder, CO

TYPE OF REVIEW *(from ESS)*: Continued Accreditation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW *(from ESS)*:

DATES OF REVIEW: 2/22/10 - 2/24/10

Nature of Organization

LEGAL STATUS: Public

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

DEGREES AWARDED: B, M, D

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

Conditions of Affiliation

STIPULATIONS ON AFFILIATION STATUS: None.

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

APPROVAL OF NEW ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS: Prior Commission approval required.

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

APPROVAL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION DEGREES: Prior Commission Approval Required

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

REPORTS REQUIRED: None

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

OTHER VISITS SCHEDULED: None

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

Summary of Commission Review

YEAR OF LAST COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION: 1999 - 2000

YEAR FOR NEXT COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION: 2009 - 2010

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: 2019 – 2020

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE

INSTITUTION and STATE: University of Colorado at Boulder, CO

TYPE OF REVIEW *(from ESS)***:** Continued Accreditation

__x_ No change to Organization Profile

Educational Programs

		Program Distribution	**Recommended Change (+ or -)**
Programs leading to Undergraduate			
	Associate	0	
	Bachelors	61	
Programs leading to Graduate			
	Masters	52	
	Specialist	0	
	First Professional		
	Doctoral	49	

Off-Campus Activities

In-State:		Present Activity:	**Recommended Change: (+ or -)**
	Campuses:	None	
	Additional Locations:	None	
	Course Locations:	1	

Out-of-State:		Present Wording:	**Recommended Change: (+ or -)**
	Campuses:	None	
	Additional Locations:	None	
	Course Locations:	None	

Out-of-USA:		Present Wording:	**Recommended Change: (+ or -)**
	Campuses:	None	
	Additional Locations:	None	
	Course Locations:	None	

Distance Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

Master - 14.0101 Engineering, General. offered via Internet; Master - 14.0201 Aerospace, Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering. offered via Internet; Master - 14.0901 Computer Engineering, General. offered via

Internet; Master - 14.1001 Electrical, Electronics and Communications Engineering. offered via Internet

Recommended Change:
     (+ or -)
Correspondence Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

None