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Introduction

The University of Oregon begins this year one self-evaluation report to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities with a reaffirmation: The overriding goal of the university is the creation and dissemination of knowledge worthy of its status as an American Association of Universities (AAU) institution and the best of its peers internationally.

The University is committed to teaching and learning; research and discovery; and service to the state of Oregon and society at large. Further, the University of Oregon is committed to the integration of these activities in ways that bring direct benefit to the students who attend the University of Oregon. These students are the primary reason for our existence as a public university, and our goal is to bring to campus students who are prepared to both benefit from and contribute to academic excellence at the University of Oregon.

With formal approval from the NWCCU, the University of Oregon approached its 2007 decennial review in an intensive manner that can now be seen to presage the “mission-based” approach in the region’s institutional reviews. Thus, the four core themes that follow build on the work from that decennial review. The articulation of the four core themes also builds on the work subsequent to 2007 that formed the University’s Academic Plan and its Assessment Plan.
Institutional Context

Founded in 1876, the University of Oregon (UO) is the flagship research university of the Oregon University System, a network of seven public universities across the state that also includes Oregon State, Portland State, Eastern Oregon, Southern Oregon, and Western Oregon Universities, and the Oregon Institute of Technology. Now designated a Carnegie “Doctoral/Very High Research Activity” institution, UO is a world class public teaching and research institution that offers nearly 300 comprehensive academic programs providing breadth and depth in the liberal arts and sciences as well as professional programs.

In recognition of the quality of its teaching and research, the University is one of 64 members of the Association of American Universities, and one of only two AAU universities in the greater Northwest. Although similar to its fellow AAU members in the quality of its research and teaching, UO’s character is distinctly different – smaller, more intimate in educational experience, with a research and teaching profile that has always been highly multidisciplinary.

The University’s academic programs are organized into eight degree-granting schools and colleges: School of Architecture and Allied Arts, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Education, School of Law, Lundquist College of Business, School of Journalism and Communication, School of Music and Dance, and Graduate School. UO has particular strength in the sciences (biology, chemistry, physics, and geoscience); neuroscience, cognitive sciences, materials, education and education research, sustainable architecture, journalism, entrepreneurship and sports business, environmental law, creative writing, anthropology, geology and geography, East Asian languages and literatures, and interdisciplinary programs like environmental studies and comparative literature. The University has the oldest four-year Honors College in the country.
Preface

A. Brief Update on Institutional Changes since the Last Report

A.1. Leadership Changes

Change of President

On July 1, 2009, Dr. Richard W. Lariviere became the sixteenth president of the University of Oregon. Dr. Lariviere succeeded Dave Frohnmayer who had served as President for fifteen years, from 1994 to 2009. President Lariviere, a distinguished religious studies and Sanskrit scholar came to Oregon most recently from the University of Kansas where he had served as Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost from 2006 to 2009 and from the University of Texas where he had established his academic career and engaged in administrative responsibilities that culminated with his Deanship of UT’s College of Liberal Arts, the largest such college in the world.

Change of Provost

On July 1, 2008, Dr. James Bean, replaced Dr. Linda Brady as Senior Vice President and Provost when Dr. Brady accepted the Chancellorship at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Dr. Bean, who had served at the University of Oregon since 2004 as the Dean of the Lundquist College of Business had previously served as the Associate Dean of Engineering at the University of Michigan.

Change of Vice President for Student Affairs

Dr. Robin Holmes replaced Dr. Anne Leavitt as Vice President for Student Affairs on July 15, 2007. Vice President Holmes reports to the Senior Vice President and Provost.

Change of Vice President for University Relations

Dr. Michael Redding replaced Vice President Allan Price on January 1, 2009. Vice President Redding reports directly to the President.

Introduction of Vice President Position for University Development

The University of Oregon designated a new vice presidency specifically charged with development on May 1, 2010, appointing Vice President Mike Andreasen to the position. This vice presidency reports directly to the president.
Introduction of Vice President Position for OIED

On July 1, 2009, Dr. Charles Martinez was designated as Vice President for Institutional Equity and Diversity reporting directly to the President. Previously Dr. Martinez had fulfilled similar functions with the designation of Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity.

Change of Director of Intercollegiate Athletics

In August of 2010 the University of Oregon designated Rob Mullens as the new Director of Intercollegiate Athletics reporting directly to the President.

A.2. Additional Significant Institutional Changes

Development and Implementation of an Academic Plan

Under the leadership of Senior Vice President and Provost James Bean, the University of Oregon developed and implemented a comprehensive academic plan in 2009. That plan with associated documents is available at http://provost.uoregon.edu/academic-plan/

Development and Implementation of an Institution-wide Assessment Plan

In response to the recommendations from the 2007 NWCCU Review, the University of Oregon developed and implemented an institution-wide comprehensive learning-outcomes assessment plan. Led by Dr. Ken Doxsee, Professor of Chemistry and Associate Vice Provost, the plan and its guiding assessment council are now fully operational. For information on the plan, go to the website: http://assessment.uoregon.edu/.

New Designation in Carnegie Classification System

In January of 2011 the University of Oregon become one of 108 universities designated to receive the Carnegie Foundation’s top category of “Very High Research Activity.” This is a particularly remarkable achievement considering the comparably small size of the University as well as the absence of medical, engineering and agricultural schools that attract large federal investments.

Opening of Portland Center

In March of 2008, the University opened its “University of Oregon in Portland” facility. Designed to extend the University’s programming to this critical population center, Portland Center is located in the historic
“White Stag Building” on the Willamette River. For further general information on Portland Center see: http://pdx.uoregon.edu.

For substantive change relating to new programming in Portland see: http://accredit.uoregon.edu/pdf/Appendix8 _TheUniversityofOregonAndPortland.pdf

Development of Policy Library

In response to the recommendation stemming from the 2007 decennial review and to address widely recognized need on the campus, the University of Oregon developed and implemented a new policy library in 2009. Further, the University hired a policy coordinator within the office of the Senior Vice President and Provost. The UO policy library is accessible at: http://policies.uoregon.edu/

Development and Adoption of a Shared Governance “Constitution”

Subsequent to the transition from President Frohnmayer to President Lariviere, the University engaged in an intensive review of the structures of campus governance. Such reviews of governance at the beginning of the service of a new president are suggested by the Internal Management Directives of the Oregon University System. In May of 2010, the statutory faculty of the university recommended a structure to President Lariviere who subsequently approved the recommendation. For information on the shared governance structure at the University of Oregon see: http://int-gov.uoregon.edu/.

Proposal Introduced for New Partnership with State of Oregon

In the spring of 2010, President Richard Lariviere announced an initiative to establish a New Partnership with the state of Oregon designed to sustain and strengthen the institution’s public mission. Under this model, the UO proposes establishing an institutional public governing board—a majority of its members appointed by the governor—which will focus on the UO’s mission and public responsibility. The current Oregon University System will be involved with the UO as a coordinating board responsible for setting and monitoring educational outcomes such as degree attainment, and will have authority to coordinate with other universities to prevent duplication of programs.

The New Partnership proposal also proposes a change in institutional funding. It creates a new $1.6 billion endowment based an issuance
of public bonds to be matched by private philanthropy. Information on the New Partnership is available at: [http://newpartnership.uoregon.edu/about/](http://newpartnership.uoregon.edu/about/)

**Growth of Student Body**

Between Fall 2007 and Fall 2010, total enrollment rose 14.8%, increasing from 20,376 to 23,389. The undergraduate population rose at an even higher rate, increasing from 16,681 in Fall 2007 to 19,534 in Fall 2010.

### A.3. Significant Changes in Physical Plant

**2008:**
- Hayward Field Improvements ($12.4M)
- Music School Additions & Alterations ($19.3)
- Miller Theatre Complex ($7.9M)

**2009:**
- Central Power Plant, Phase 1 (Chiller) ($34.4M)
- HEDCO Education Building and Renovations/Remodel ($52.8M):
  - MNCH Curation Facility ($2.8M)

**2010:**
- John E. Jaqua Academic Center for Student Athletes
- Chiles Business Center Remodel ($2M)

**2011:**
- Matthew Knight Arena (estimate $200M)
- Underground Parking Structure ($18M)

**Underway:**
- Anstett Hall Renovation (2011) ($8M)
- Fenton Hall Deferred Maintenance/Remodel (2011) ($8.1M)
- Ford Alumni Center (2011) ($21.2M)
- Allen Hall Expansion and Remodel (2012) ($15M)
- East Campus Residence Hall (2012) ($75M)
- Lewis Integrative Science Building (2012) ($65M)
B. Response to Recommendations and Issues Requested by the Commission from the 2007 Decennial Review

The University of Oregon underwent a full decennial review by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities in 2007. The Commission conveyed formally the following eight recommendations from that review:

1. Commission Policy 2.2 *Educational Assessment* requires that institutions develop and maintain an assessment plan that is responsive to their mission and needs. Apart from externally mandated *programmatic assessment for some specialized programs, the University has not developed a plan or* strategy systematically to assess student learning across the campus. However, the new provost and her managerial team are aware of this need and are committed to the implementation of systematic *assessment on the Eugene campus and wherever the institution offers academic programming*. The Committee recommends that the University of Oregon develop and implement an assessment plan in accordance with Policy 2.2 *Educational Assessment* as quickly as feasible.

2. The University of Oregon has taken several essential steps to generate alternative sources of revenue to help maintain its instructional and research quality at the AAU level, including increasing its external research support, attracting private funds, and increasing its proportion of out-of-state students. But it must identify its particular strengths and the way it will continue to serve the state. The Committee recommends that the University of Oregon undertake an academic planning process to identify what research, instructional and state services areas it will be known for in the future and use that process to concentrate its capital and operating resource allocation decisions (Standard 1 JO).

3. The University of Oregon prides itself on its status as an AAU institution. However, with the expectations for research, concern is expressed that the University may not have funds for needed laboratory and research space; therefore, the Committee recommends that the University take the necessary steps to ensure that facilities are planned and resources identified to support essential continued research growth (Standards 4.B.4; 8.A.2; 8.A3; 8 A.6).
4. Standard 8.C Physical Resources Planning requires that the institution plan for and identify resources for remedying deferred maintenance. However, the evidence suggests that the level of deferred maintenance at the University of Oregon is high and that necessary building renovations are problematic given the unavailability of resources to address the needs of the physical plant. The Committee recommends that the University undertake a planning process that addresses the physical plant of the institution and that the process include constituencies from across campus to develop a building renewal agenda (Standard 8.C)

5. Commission criteria assume that there will be a commonly understood and uniformly employed set of institutional policies, rules, practices, and procedures that are employed at every level of administration. These policies should foster open communication and goal attainment. However, the Committee is concerned that the University of Oregon does not currently have these operational policies in place and that campus based decision-making procedures appear to be idiosyncratic and not uniformly applied. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the University of Oregon take steps to enhance internal communication and to review its operating policies in regard to Standard 6, Governance and Administration; Standard 4.A, Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare and Development and Standard 7.C, Financial Management.

6. Commission criteria state that faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the institution. Student enrollment at the institution is at a record high but the institution has not responded with any concomitant increase in instructional resources, particularly full-time, tenure track faculty. The faculty is concerned at the prospect of growing enrollments and greater use of non-tenure instructional faculty while some students report limited access to faculty as a hindrance to their education. The Committee recommends that the institution should more closely monitor faculty teaching obligations and provide greater instructional resources to facilitate student learning (Standard 4.A.3).

7. Despite the extensive use of interlibrary loan, Standard 5 requires a core collection adequate in quality, depth, diversity and currency to support graduate curricula and research in a number of programs. The Committee recommends that the University take steps to address the sufficiency of core library holdings needed to support the institution's instructional and research missions (Standard 5. A. 1:5.)
8. Commission Policy A-2 Substantive Change mandates that major substantive change proposals be submitted to the Commission for review and approval prior to implementation. The Committee recommends that the University work closely with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities regarding its intention to expand off-campus academic offerings in Portland and elsewhere (Policy A-2).

In the spring of 2009 the University hosted a Focused Interim Evaluation after which the NWCCU conveyed, in correspondence of July 31, 2009, approval of the University’s work to address recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8. That correspondence from the Commission also conveyed, regarding recommendation 1 (assessment of student learning outcomes), that the University “meets the Commission’s criteria for accreditation, but needs improvement” and requested a progress report for the spring of 2010 to address Recommendations 1 and 7.

In correspondence of July 2010, the commission approved the progress report that the institution submitted that spring. (All reports and correspondence are available at the University of Oregon’s Accreditation Website http://accredit.uoregon.edu/?page=intro)

C: Date of Most Recent Review of Mission and Core Themes

During the last twelve months, the University Senate, its undergraduate and graduate councils, and the administrative leadership have affirmed institution’s mission statement and its four core themes. Further, these bodies and other committees have engaged in dialogues that lead to the proposed metrics we associate individually with each of those themes. This campus-wide dialogue culminated with a formal affirmation of the themes and metrics in a meeting of the Leadership Council on January 10, 2011.
Chapter One: Mission, Core Themes and Expectations

Section 1: Standard 1.A

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION STATEMENT

The University of Oregon’s Mission Statement, as approved by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education in 1995, represents a consultative process of development. At a time of Presidential transition in 1994, the University engaged in a comprehensive review and revision process for the Mission Statement. Drafts prepared initially within the Council of Deans and with the president's executive staff were circulated to provost’s staff, the University of Oregon Foundation Trustees, the Faculty Advisory Council, and the Associated Students. Subsequent revisions and drafts formed topics of discussion at a retreat for all university department heads and, following further revision, were promulgated broadly to faculty for comments. The University’s mission statement was reaffirmed during the campus-wide self-study process for the NWCCU decennial review of 2007.

The university’s mission statement is thus a living document as well as a measure by which the university gauges and evaluates the success of its programs.

University of Oregon Mission Statement

The University of Oregon is a comprehensive research university that serves its students and the people of Oregon, the nation, and the world through the creation and transfer of knowledge in the liberal arts, the natural and social sciences, and the professions. It is the Association of American Universities flagship institution of the Oregon University System.

The university is a community of scholars dedicated to the highest standards of academic inquiry, learning, and service. Recognizing that knowledge is the fundamental wealth of civilization, the university strives to enrich the public that sustains it through

• a commitment to undergraduate education, with a goal of helping the individual learn to question critically, think logically, communicate clearly, act creatively, and live ethically

• a commitment to graduate education to develop creators and innovators who will generate new knowledge and shape experience for the benefit of humanity
• a recognition that research, both basic and applied, is essential to the intellectual health of the university, as well as to the enrichment of the lives of Oregonians, by energizing the state’s economic, cultural, and political structure

• the establishment of a framework for lifelong learning that leads to productive careers and to the enduring joy of inquiry

• the integration of teaching, research, and service as mutually enriching enterprises that together accomplish the university’s mission and support its spirit of community

• the acceptance of the challenge of an evolving social, political, and technological environment by welcoming and guiding change rather than reacting to it

• a dedication to the principles of equality of opportunity and freedom from unfair discrimination for all members of the university community and an acceptance of true diversity as an affirmation of individual identity within a welcoming community

• a commitment to international awareness and understanding, and to the development of a faculty and student body that are capable of participating effectively in a global society

• the conviction that freedom of thought and expression is the bedrock principle on which university activity is based

• the cultivation of an attitude toward citizenship that fosters a caring, supportive atmosphere on campus and the wise exercise of civic responsibilities and individual judgment throughout life

• a continuing commitment to affordable public higher education

Interpretation of Fulfillment of the Institution’s Mission

As noted in the preamble to the University of Oregon mission statement, this University is Oregon’s Flagship Association of American Universities institution. This status, affirmed by the Oregon University System Board sets a context for the considerations of institutional mission fulfillment. Founded in 1900 to advance the international standing of U.S. research universities, this invitation-only organization today focuses on issues that are important to research-intensive in their all aspects of
their work. The AAU consists of 64 of the most distinguished universities in the United States and Canada; thirty-two of those institutions are public. The AAU engages in robust information exchanges of quantitative data and qualitative descriptors relating to success of its member institutions.

A broadly accepted “interpretation of fulfillment of [the University of Oregon’s] is for Oregon to achieve the average of the 32 public institutions in the AAU on all salient measures.

**An Articulation of an Acceptable Threshold or Extent of Mission Fulfillment**

In response to this request by the NWCCU for “an acceptable threshold” mission fulfillment” the University reiterates an acceptable threshold of meeting the average of its distinguished AAU public comparators on all salient measures when adjusted for a per capita basis.

**Section II. Standard 1.B The University of Oregon Core Themes**

The multiple individual statements in the University’s mission statement can be categorized into four broad core themes: 1) providing the teaching and mentoring and supporting the learning and intellectual growth that are the heart of outstanding undergraduate education; 2) preparing future leaders, scholars, and teachers through graduate and professional education; 3) shaping the future through research and artistic creation and Discovering Knowledge and Creating the Future; and 4) providing service to society and humankind.

These are themes that would be at the heart of any AAU stature research doctoral university. What distinguishes the University of Oregon is a unique context for these themes. The University of Oregon is large enough to engage broadly and intensely with groundbreaking research, but it is also small enough that its sense of community leads to distinctive attention to the individual and to discussion among and across disciplines. This attribute has been described in various ways…”an internationally distinguished university of AAU quality that you can get your hands around”…or “an AAU Public university of moderate size” or, most recently (and informally) as an institution that is “Large Enough to be Great and Small Enough to be Greater.” We believe that we are large enough to bring extraordinary intellectual resources to accomplishing our mission and that our modest size allows us the suppleness to provide extraordinary quality in our teaching, our research and our service. An important and intended outcome of this quest to put our size to optimal use is the capacity to create and explore integrated “Big Ideas” that involve large portions of the institutions. Thus, although the strength of our size is not enumerated below as one of our core themes, we continually assess whether this “size factor” is producing the results we seek. An indicator of those results is the integration of the discovery of knowledge and the promulgation of that knowledge in creative ways that address pressing questions for humankind.
Thus, in this submission of the year one report to the NWCCU, the University addresses its four core themes within a context of AAU excellence on a human scale. To make that context clear, we quote now directly from the first goal (and a few of that goal’s subordinate objectives) of University’s academic plan developed in 2009.

To Achieve and Sustain AAU Excellence on a Human Scale

Our first goal is anchored to the University of Oregon’s current and distinctive standing as the Oregon University System’s flagship institution and only member of the AAU. Our AAU membership is critical to the State of Oregon as it enables a voice in important discussions of the future of research universities nationally and internationally. This goal marks our ongoing commitment to achieve and sustain the excellence embodied and required by AAU standards. However, we also recognize that our academic distinction is singularly and quintessentially Oregon—the “Oregon way” is marked by fierce but respectful independence of thought, a pioneering intellectual and industrious spirit, an unparalleled commitment to rigorous scholarship negotiated by and through an intimate community of scholars, and an institutional flexibility that can render results in a timely manner and, most notably, on a human scale. To achieve and sustain the excellence expected of an AAU institution, while maintaining a human scale and our quintessential identity, we envision a program of managed and marginal growth in line with the following objectives:

AAU Standards. Given the AAU’s current ranking system, the UO’s lack of certain professional schools puts our institution at something of a numerical disadvantage within that elite group. Nonetheless, our membership in the AAU remains an essential marker of our commitment to world-class excellence, and we intend both to guard and to improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate instruction and research by moving towards the AAU average in such measures as class size, library and IT infrastructure, faculty teaching load, student/teacher ratio, salaries, tenure vs. non-tenure-related faculty ratio and scholarly productivity.
Selective Flagship Institution. We seek to enhance our flagship status within the Oregon University System by attracting and admitting the most promising undergraduate students from Oregon’s diverse communities, other states, and the world. To this end, we will develop clear, comprehensive, and more selective admission standards that elevate our current admission criteria consistent with our academic mission and our role as the flagship university in the State of Oregon, while at the same time ensuring unbiased assessment of promise from all student groups. We commit to improving our student retention to the extent consistent with our public mission and to graduating most students within four years.

Access. We are committed to ensuring full access to the University of Oregon for all qualified Oregon high school students, regardless of financial need.

Institution Size. We intend to increase the size of the incoming freshman class and to grow the campus to a total of 24,000 students (from 20,300 students). This managed and marginal growth will provide the critical mass of students and economic self-sufficiency necessary to achieve the distinctive excellence we envision. We intend, however, to remain one of the smallest public flagship universities in the country, holding fast to our core value of liberal education on a human scale.

Graduate Students. We intend to increase the proportion of graduate students (excluding law) from 15 percent to above 19 percent, which is more reflective of our AAU peers. Graduate students enrich both the research and instructional enterprise on campus as they provide the critical support and creative energy that are essential elements of a tier-one research university.
UO NWCCU Core Themes

UO NWCCU Core Theme One: Providing the Teaching and Mentoring and Supporting the Learning and Intellectual Growth that are the heart of Excellent Undergraduate Education

The University of Oregon has as its first core theme the provision of an excellent undergraduate program replete with the strengths inherent from intellectual and demographic diversity, the strengths of situating undergraduate learning in a context of an internationally renowned research institution, and the strength of individual attention to the needs of the student learner and the potentials of the teacher.

Applicable Measures for Core Theme One

Applicable measures of the effectiveness of the University of Oregon’s first core theme begin with, and focus consistently on assessment of learning outcomes. Beginning with careful analysis of what specific intellectual, personal and social outcomes are sought, the university measures itself in this core theme by the impact it has on students.

At the undergraduate level, the University of Oregon gives careful attention to both the breadth and depth of general education, as well as the way in which achievement of an undergraduate degree moves beyond being a process of completing a “checklist of requirements” to being the creation of opportunities for personal exploration—for enthusiasm about learning that serves the academic career and beyond.

A. Indicators of Faculty Quality (from Program Reviews, Faculty Reviews, and other measures)
B. Indicators of Teaching Quality (from Program Reviews, Faculty Reviews, Assessment Plans and other measures)
   a. Teaching Quality and Learning Outcomes
   b. Faculty Support—Departmental, Interdepartmental, Campuswide
C. Indicators of Student Engagement (NSSE and other indicators)
D. Direct Indicators that Student needs are met effectively
E. Indicators through internal and external evaluation of effectiveness of support programs
F. Total Degrees Awarded
   a. By level
   b. By Discipline
   c. By gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background, and geographic location
   d. Entering GPA and standardized test scores
G. Patterns of Retention and Progress toward degrees
   a. Retention from freshman to sophomore year (comparators to be public within the AAU)
   b. Graduation Rates at 4 year, 5 year, 6 year (comparators to be public within the AAU)
   c. Time to Degree (comparators to be public within the AAU)
H. Success of Graduates (Undergraduate Program)
   a. Number of graduates employed (1-5 years)
   b. Number of graduates accepted into graduate schools
   c. Earnings of graduates
   d. Satisfaction of graduates after graduation
   e. Satisfaction of employers
   f. Preparedness for job changes

The University of Oregon posits these metrics as those most relevant to Core Theme One. They are built around a foundation of “learning outcomes assessment” and they include those metrics which serve as proxies for, or indicators of the excellence of undergraduate education.
UO NWCCU Core Theme Two: preparing future leaders, scholars, and teachers through graduate and professional education.

The provision of an outstanding graduate and professional education is the second core theme of the mission of the University of Oregon. Graduate education involves an apprenticeship in the methods, skills, practices, history, and current state of a particular discipline or field. A graduate education should also teach citizens to think analytically, critically, creatively, and cooperatively. It is in the combination of these two crucial aspects of our mission that position the UO to prepare future leaders, scholars, and teachers to address the problems, complexities, and conflict in our communities from the local to the global scale.

Applicable Measures for Core Theme Two

In assessing our graduate programs we need to examine how we assure that our graduate students are being adequately trained in the most current knowledge of their fields and the extent to which these programs meets the scholarly, leadership and professional needs of society.

a. Program review, including internal and external, including NRC and other national reviews
b. Assessment conducted by the Graduate School through annual Exit Survey data and three-year cycle Graduate Student Experience Survey
c. Post-graduation placements of doctoral recipients (compared to our AAU comparator institutions)
d. Post-graduation placements of professional degree recipients
e. Time to degree rates compared to peer institutions
f. Completion rates compared to peer institutions
g. Percentage of doctoral students (receiving support for graduate study)

The Graduate School at the University of Oregon also has a goal of improving its assessment of graduate education outcomes and will work with the Office of Institutional Research and school/college deans to identify new metrics and data collection methods to achieve this.

The University of Oregon posits these metrics as those most relevant to Core Theme Two. They are based on a graduate level concept of “learning outcomes assessment” and they include those metrics which serve as proxies for, or indicators of the excellence of graduate education. At the graduate level, placement of candidates is a valid measure of the learning outcomes of the student.
UO NWCCU Core Theme Three: Shaping the Future through Research and Artistic Creation

A third primary mission and core theme of the University of Oregon, as a leading public research university, is to sustain and transform society through the creation and dissemination of scientific and humanistic knowledge that addresses the economic, social, and environmental needs of Oregon, our region, our nation, and our world.

Research at the University of Oregon—broadly defined in this core theme to include scholarship and creative activity in its many forms—can be examined in the same terms as the university as a whole: interconnection, pluralism, and a commitment to sustaining future generations through innovations that elevate economic competitiveness, global stewardship, and quality of life. While many universities emphasize diverse research, plural in its interests but isolated in its process, the UO affirms both interconnection and pluralism. Work carried on within the diverse disciplines serves as a starting point for our discussion of research at the UO. Disciplinary research is conducted by tenured and tenure-related faculty members in every academic department. Such scholarship is central to establishing the reputation of Oregon’s graduate programs and faculty and significantly affects undergraduate teaching and learning. Faculty members within the UO’s schools and colleges are among the leading scholars in their fields and this outstanding faculty forms the basis for Oregon’s interconnected research initiatives and programs. These initiatives, in the many forms in which they are presently manifest, have their roots in a long tradition of interdisciplinary research at the University of Oregon. The research enterprise at the UO spans the arts, the humanities, the sciences, and the professions, and addresses the full cycle of innovation, from basic discoveries to technology transfer and societal application.

Applicable Measures for Core Theme Three:

The research quality of the University of Oregon is attested to, again, by its membership in the prestigious, invitation only, American Association of Universities. Measures of research effectiveness for the university would best be couched within the measures of the AAU but should be done so with an emphasis on the per capita measures, to account for our distinctive and purposeful moderate size.

A. Quality and Impact of Research Programs as determined by institutional ranking systems and other performance metrics
B. Research Support
   a. Funding
   b. Infrastructure
C. Measures of Disciplinary Research
D. Measures of Interdisciplinary and Collaborative Research
   a. Effectiveness of Centers and Institutes
UO NWCCU Core Theme Four: Providing Service to Society and Humankind

As a public research university, the University of Oregon’s mission includes a core theme of service to the people of Oregon through significant contributions to the economic, cultural, and political environment of the state and the world. The state’s economy will become increasingly knowledge-based, and will be driven by a strong high-technology industry and by traditional industries that effectively apply research and technology. This economy will be increasingly global in nature, requiring an effective integration of diverse cultural and societal perspectives, and will be dependent on the work force having access to lifelong learning opportunities for specialized training and retraining. Finally, the health of the state cannot be based solely on the workplace skills of its citizens the university must enrich and broaden the perspectives of all Oregonians through humanistic, culture-based education and experience.

Applicable Measures for Core Theme Four

A. Indications of visibility for the State and its educational institutions
B. Demonstrable enhancement of K-12 education through relationships with the university
C. Indications of Impact of Outreach activities related to university research and education
D. Production of Degrees in State Workforce Shortage Areas
E. Generation of Revenues from out-of-state sources
F. Indicators of Research expenditures impact on state economy and living standards
G. Indicators of direct employment and indirect employment opportunities produced by research
   a. Jobs created through research and professional activities
   b. Knowledge-based industries supported in region
H. Licensing, patents, consulting and pro bono benefits to Oregon companies and communities
I. Degrees/State Appropriation (comparisons to national)
J. Employment/State Appropriate (comparisons to national)
K. Innovation Index / Contribution to Innovation
Conclusion

The University of Oregon enters this new cycle of institutional self-evaluation with enthusiasm. We have engaged our institutional broadly in defining the core themes that are at the heart of our mission and we look forward to being measured productively on those themes in this seven-year recurring process.