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criteria for accreditation

1
mission
Arizona State University’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

2
integrity: ethical conduct and responsible research
Arizona State University acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

3
teaching and learning: quality, resources and support
Arizona State University provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

4
teaching and learning: evaluation and improvement
Arizona State University demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

5
resources, planning and institutional effectiveness
Arizona State University’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. Arizona State University plans for the future.
mission
To establish ASU as the model for a New American University, measured not by who we exclude, but rather by who we include; pursuing research and discovery that benefits the public good; assuming major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and health and well-being of the community.

core values
ASU is committed to Excellence, Access and Impact in everything we do. We measure ourselves by the outcomes our students achieve, the accomplishments of our graduates, the research we contribute to the public good and by the economic, social and cultural vitality of the communities that surround us.

design aspirations
ASU is a New American University, promoting excellence in its research and among its students, faculty and staff, increasing access to its educational resources, and working with communities to positively impact social and economic development.

1. leverage our place - ASU embraces its cultural, socioeconomic, and physical setting.
2. transform society - ASU catalyzes social change by being connected to social needs.
3. value entrepreneurship - ASU uses its knowledge and encourages innovation.
4. conduct use-inspired research - ASU research has purpose and impact.
5. enable student success - ASU is committed to the success of each unique student.
6. fuse intellectual disciplines - ASU creates knowledge by transcending academic disciplines.
7. be socially embedded - ASU connects with communities through mutually beneficial partnerships.
8. engage globally - ASU engages with people and issues locally, nationally and internationally.
ASU goals statement (established in 2006)

access and quality for all

- Expand university access to match Arizona diversification and growth
- Improve freshmen persistence to 90 percent
- Enhance university graduation rate to 70-75 percent as soon as possible
- Develop ASU culture that represents a commitment to quality and community outreach
- Enroll 100,000 continuing education and degree completion students (including our contribution to AZUN)
- Enhance linkages with community colleges so as to expand baccalaureate degree production
- Enhance student development and individual student learning

national comprehensive university by 2012

- Become a leading center for interdisciplinary science and technology discovery and development
- Become a leading center for discovery and scholarship in the social sciences, arts and humanities
- Enhance research and discovery competitiveness to more than $300 million (in 2006 dollars) in annual research expenditures
- Enhance regional economic competitiveness through research and discovery and value-added education programs

establish national standing in academic quality and impact of colleges and schools in every field

- Attain national standing in academic quality for each school
- Attain national standing in the value added to our graduates in each school
- Become the leading university academically (faculty, discovery, research, creativity) in at least one core subject within each school or college

enhance our local impact and social embeddedness

- Enhance linkage to local and regional social and community development groups
- Establish/develop/enhance linkages and partnerships with local, regional and national NGO’s, governments and public agencies, and private sector firms with a focus on community development
- Undertake applied sustainability research that impacts the social, environmental and economic evolution of the southwest
- Provide an objective and ongoing monitoring role for the region’s progress through the ASU Indicators Project
a message from the President

Arizona State University is committed to serving the people of Arizona. That commitment demands that we demonstrate excellence in all we undertake, provide capable Arizona residents access to the highest-quality education possible, and have a significant positive impact on the state. We measure ourselves not by who we exclude, but rather by who we include. We pursue research and discovery that benefits the public good. We assume major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and health and well-being of the community.

Our dedication to those values and expectations requires us to be transparent in how we carry out our work, as well as to provide assurance to the people of Arizona that we are delivering on those commitments.

For those reasons, I am pleased to welcome representatives of the North Central Association's Higher Learning Commission (HLC) to ASU during Spring 2013. That Commission is an independent regional accrediting body that holds its member institutions accountable for meeting a set of Criteria for Accreditation and other institutional expectations which assure the public that the institution is operating in a manner consistent with the public trust and has the capacity to continue to do so. Every academic program offered on every campus and online at ASU is accredited by HLC, an accreditation that is reviewed in-depth every ten years.

As one component of that review, this Self-Study Report has emerged from the intense scrutiny we have given to every aspect of the institution to provide the Higher Learning Commission and the public full assurance of the quality and soundness of our programs. Our desire for transparency and accountability also are reflected in this large body of evidence. The product of thousands of hours of effort from the entire ASU community over the past three years, our document:

- Provides compelling evidence supporting the renewal of ASU's accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission based on the Commission's established Criteria for Accreditation;
- Reflects the distinctive nature of the mission, vision and goals of ASU as the New American University;
- Summarizes the major changes that have taken place at ASU since the last accreditation reaffirmation in 2003;
- Accurately presents the contexts, opportunities and obstacles that ASU faces in carrying out its mission;
- Contains background and evaluative perspectives on all operations of the institution;
- Demonstrates ASU's compliance with all federal higher education legal requirements;
- Will serve as a baseline for measuring future efforts towards improving and enhancing ASU's service to Arizona, the nation, and the world.

Thank you for your review of this information. We welcome your interest and your own ideas to advance ASU as a model of the New American University.

Sincerely,

Michael M. Crow
President
Dear Reader,

This Self-Study Report culminates a major part of the activity devoted over the past several years aimed at securing a reaffirmation of ASU’s institutional accreditation. While it is impossible to accurately capture every aspect of one of the largest universities in the United States, we have focused here on providing you, the reader, with the information needed to fairly and accurately assess how ASU satisfies the expectations of the North Central Association’s Higher Learning Commission. Equally impossible as the attempt to encapsulate this large university is the task of keeping up with the changes in one of the most rapidly innovating higher education institutions in the world. While the likelihood of new developments in one or more aspects or mechanisms is almost certain by the time you read this, this snapshot freezes an image of ASU in late 2012, at the end of a decade-long period of massive transformation to a new model of what a major public research university should be. Thus, with this document, we have not produced a snapshot of yet another fossil preserved in amber, but rather a glimpse of a new rocket in flight.

Those people who have helped refine this report have come from across all ASU campuses, with contributions and suggestions provided by members of the faculty, staff, student body and administration. Of special note, of course, are those who devoted significant contributions to this effort by participation on the various teams that led this effort: the Steering Committee, the Criterion Team Co-Leaders and those who worked with them, the Resource Team, the Editorial Team, and the Data Team. Most of these individuals are identified in the Background section of the report, but many others too numerous to name have also been willing throughout this institution-wide effort to drop whatever they were doing to pitch in. In particular, we benefited from assistance and contributions by Chuck Barbee, Art Blakemore, Gene Burgess, Angela Creedon, Adam Farn, Patty Feldman, Kwang-Wu Kim, Michelle LeFevre, Virgil Renzuli, Rich Stanley, and Bert Valenzuela. As the Criteria for Accreditation evolved during the three years leading up to our visit, teams steadfastly remained focused, reorganized as necessary, and kept up the pace to pull off this massive task.

I thank you for taking the time to read this report, and I join my colleagues in hoping that you will find this report to be accessible, informative, and complete, as well as interesting.

Sincerely yours,

Barry G. Ritchie, Director
2013 Higher Learning Commission
Re-Accreditation and Self-Study
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preface: ASU’s transformation into a New American University
a new model for the American research university

Since the last institutional accreditation review by the North Central Association’s Higher Learning Commission (HLC) during the 2002-2003 academic year (AY2002-2003), Arizona State University (ASU) has undergone the most far-reaching period of change in its history. This era began in the midst of the last accreditation review process, when Dr. Michael M. Crow became the university’s sixteenth president on July 1, 2002. In his inaugural address, President Crow described a vision for a new “gold standard” in higher education:

The new American university would cultivate excellence in teaching, research, and public service, providing the best possible education to the broadest possible spectrum of society. The new American university would embrace the educational needs of the entire population—not only a select group, and not only the verbally or mathematically gifted. The success of the new American university will be measured not by who the university excludes, but rather by who the university includes, and from this inclusion will come its contributions to the advancement of society.

President Crow’s inauguration began the transformation of Arizona State University into a new model for American higher education, “the New American University.” This metamorphosis has reshaped nearly every aspect of the life of one of the nation’s largest public research universities. This Preface provides context to understand the nature of this new approach to higher education, how this transformation has been carried out at ASU, and some of the changes brought about by this transition over the decade since the last accreditation review. This Preface also provides a map of how some of these changes are reflected in the evidence presented within this Self-Study Report for meeting the Higher Learning Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation.

Arizona State University as a New American University

As outlined in President Crow’s address, the “New American University” is an institution that is committed to simultaneously striving for Excellence, Access, and Impact in all it does, pursuing research that contributes to the public good, and assuming major responsibility for the welfare of the communities that surround it. The steady compass for ASU’s transformation has been its Mission Statement and set of Core Values, which inform the actions of the institution; these documents are presented here and inside the front cover of this Self-Study Report for reference throughout the document. As will be described in Chapter 1, these foundational statements have established a widely-known set of goals for the institution over the past decade.

As ASU has undergone transformation to become the model for the New American University, sweeping changes have spread across its physical, organizational, and human landscapes. As dozens of new buildings have been added, hundreds of new faculty members have been hired, and tens of thousands of students have matriculated, a massive institutional reorganization has also taken place along lines predicated by that new model, including significant

ASU’s mission statement

To establish ASU as the model for a New American University, measured not by who we exclude, but rather by who we include; pursuing research and discovery that benefits the public good; assuming major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and health and well-being of the community.

ASU’s core values

ASU is committed to Excellence, Access, and Impact in everything we do. We measure ourselves by the outcomes our students achieve, the accomplishments of our graduates, the research we contribute to the public good, and by the economic, social and cultural vitality of the communities that surround us.
changes in many of its programs, schools, and institutes. Through this transformation, the trajectory of the university has been fundamentally altered as ASU consciously reevaluated the roles it plays in society, in the economy, and in education at all levels. In doing so, the longstanding and crucial relationship between ASU and the people of Arizona has been profoundly changed, greatly deepened, and strengthened.

Eight Design Aspirations have provided a road map for the transformation, serving to orient and inspire every activity undertaken; these Design Aspirations are also printed here and in the inside front cover. These aspirations represent new standards, new guiding principles, and new ways to measure progress at ASU. These goals have also spurred new ways of thinking about problems, offered new ways to serve our constituents, and continuously called upon the creative potential of our academic community to imagine anew what the institution should be. Using these Design Aspirations over the past decade, ASU has become a powerful force for positive societal impact.

In following these three foundational documents — the Mission Statement, Core Values, and Design Aspirations — ASU not only has created a new physical and intellectual environment for learning and discovery, but it has changed the community of people inhabiting that environment, enlarging that community and increasing its diversity.

ASU has moved away from the common organization for learning and discovery by fusing traditionally separate disciplines to form new colleges, schools, and departments that encourage trans-disciplinary collaboration. To facilitate and further the fusion of disciplines, ASU has created new kinds of university structures that promote academic partnerships with the community, industry, and government. It has increased research, residential, and learning spaces throughout its locations, including building an entirely new fourth campus in downtown Phoenix. With this transformation, the goals for the people inhabiting that environment as well as for the institution as a whole have been recast.

The success of students, both during their education at ASU and after they leave the institution, remains the university’s highest priority. As a model of the New American University, ASU is measured not by who it excludes, but by who it includes. Access trumps elitism. Rejecting the traditional path of achieving elite status among its peers by “accepting the best and excluding the rest,” ASU has committed to access for all Arizona students qualified for college-level work. This redefinition of ASU’s academic community has meant drawing new groups of students into higher education and strengthening ties between the institution and its constituents. An overview of this trajectory toward greater ethnic and economic diversity is provided in Chapter 1.
A New American University takes responsibility for the well-being of its constituents, listening to the needs those communities express, and working together on solutions. Thus, ASU intentionally acts as a force that creates meaningful change, with a focus on producing knowledge that translates into action. As one of the nation’s largest universities, ASU has the capacity to investigate multiple approaches to any network of problems to seek an option that best serves its constituents. ASU tackles large challenges with multiple, coordinated solutions and recognizes sustainability as one of the most important issues facing society today. Sustainability involves a host of problems, solutions, stakeholders, values, policies, geographies, and people. ASU confronts sustainability questions through a global interdisciplinary institute, a school (the first school of sustainability in the United States), and a wide variety of initiatives undertaken by individuals across the university.

These new objectives help ASU help others. ASU not only deals with difficult issues, but also produces knowledge that leads to action. ASU finds ways to bring these solutions to as many people as possible. These include new national and global partnerships to address pressing concerns of the state, nation, and world, such as those described throughout the chapters in this Self-Study. With creativity, ASU researchers have pursued goals based on societal needs, immediately applying research results and energizing progress towards an enhanced connection between society and the new knowledge developed.

**measuring progress in ASU’s transformation**

Ten years into what *Newsweek* magazine described as “one of the most radical redesigns in higher learning since the modern research university took shape in 19th century Germany,” measurements by a number of metrics (e.g., degrees awarded, six-year graduation rate, freshman persistence rate) demonstrate the depth to which this transformation has reshaped how ASU carries out its mission: academic excellence and access, impact through knowledge creation and development, investment in the institution, organization transformation, major partnerships and collaborations, infrastructure investments, and community engagement.²

**academic excellence and access**

At the time of the last accreditation review, ASU was a large emerging public university with an uneven academic reputation. Since that time, guided by its Core Values and rejecting traditional approaches for improving academic reputation, ASU has aggressively pursued the expansion of institutional access while simultaneously increasing academic rigor and quality. These concerted efforts to advance access to the academic excellence of the university has grown to a level of success such that ASU students, faculty members, and academic programs are consistently ranked among the best in the nation and the world (e.g. “Academic Ranking of World Universities” compiled by Shanghai Jiao Tong University, *Times Higher Education *“World University Rankings”, *U.S. News and World Report* rankings of “Best Colleges” and “Best Graduate Schools,” and the *Wall Street Journal*). At the same time, ASU has grown more diverse than ever before, as described in Chapters 1 and 3.

In tandem with advances in academic excellence, ASU has greatly increased access to the university, becoming more reflective of the demographics of Arizona in our faculty, staff, and student populations, attracting an increasingly ethnically and economically diverse student body. With respect to economic diversity in the student body, the past decade has seen ASU make major progress in delivering on its promise that no Arizona student be denied access to a college education based on ability to pay. To do this, the university moved from a model of low-tuition/low-access to a moderate-tuition/high-access approach. As a result, ASU has been consistently ranked as one of the best institutions for ethnic minorities by top publications focused on diversity. These changes and achievements are discussed in Chapters 1, 3, and 5.

ASU awarded 18,045 degrees in academic year 2011-2012, a 60 percent increase from the 11,261 who graduated in AY2002-2003. The six-year graduation rate for the freshman cohort entering in 2006 advanced to 56.8 percent, up 15.4 percent from the 49.2 percent rate for the cohort that entered in Fall 1995. Freshman persistence rates for the Fall 2010 cohort had increased to 83.5 percent, nearly 7 percent higher than the Fall 2002 cohort. These improvements came through continuously assessing and improving how well ASU’s academic programs performed, as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4.

**impact through knowledge creation and development**

Answering larger questions requires more resources. Because ASU has broadened the challenges it addresses, in FY2011 total research-related expenditures reached a record high of $355 million, an increase of almost 190 percent from the $123 million in FY2002. In FY2012, university researchers
sought more than $1.24 billion in funding through proposals, receiving more than $315 million in awards. According to recent National Science Foundation (NSF) surveys, among U.S. universities with research portfolios exceeding $100 million in expenditures, ASU was among the nation’s fastest growing research enterprises during the five-year period 2006-2010. In 2010, ASU ranked within the top twenty U.S. universities for non-science and engineering research expenditures and also ranked among the top 20 universities without a medical school for total research expenditures. More information on these achievements is provided in Chapters 1 and 3.

**investment in the institution**

At the time of the last accreditation review, ASU relied primarily on state funding. The low-tuition model in effect at the time provided few resources for financial aid, which meant that assistance was unavailable to those who needed it most. Compared with institutions of comparable size, private investors in the university were relatively few.

Since then, ASU has worked tirelessly to demonstrate to local and state governments, students and their families, and private investors the value of investing in the institution. And, over the past decade of transformation, the evidence clearly shows ASU has earned their confidence. Local governments have made significant investments in ASU in terms unprecedented for a state university. The City of Phoenix allocated more than $220 million in voter-approved bond money specifically to enable the creation of the Downtown Phoenix campus. The City of Scottsdale donated a $42 million parcel of land with $45 million in infrastructure improvements to build SkySong, a global, entrepreneurial innovation center. In 2011, the City of Mesa invested $15 million for additional road and utility infrastructure for the Polytechnic campus. And in 2012, ASU and the City of Chandler linked efforts to create the ASU-Chandler Innovation Center, an alliance to house multi-purpose engineering and technology studios and “proof-of-concept” labs to support innovation and technology development.

Investment in ASU by the State of Arizona through state appropriations grew by nearly half, from $312 million in FY2003 to $468 million in FY2008 (before rescission). However, severe economic stresses in Arizona forced declines in state investment, dropping to $308 million in FY2012, a reduction of over one-third since the FY2008 peak. Even so, ASU’s total net assets have increased by nearly 43 percent, from $876 million in FY2003 to $1.25 billion in FY2012. Total revenue for the university over the same time period more than doubled, from $846 million to $1.74 billion.

Private individuals have also demonstrated increasing support for the mission and work of ASU. Since 2003, the university’s endowment has grown by 127 percent, from $221 million in 2003 to $501 million in 2012. For the same period, the total assets of the ASU Foundation expanded by 153 percent, from $313 million to $792 million, while the number of individual donors grew by 10 percent. Between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2012, the ASU Foundation raised over $1.37 billion dollars in funds to enhance the institution, with $132 million for ASU scholarships, $64 million in support of endowed faculty positions, and $116 million for capital projects. The strategic planning associated with these physical and financial resources is outlined in Chapter 5.

**organizational transformation**

Since the last accreditation review, ASU has rapidly evolved from a university based strictly on traditional academic departments into a truly inter- and trans-disciplinary institution. As described in Chapter 3, more than two dozen new interdisciplinary schools have been formed during the past decade, either through combining and refocusing existing academic units or creating a school completely de novo. The university has also expanded its academic portfolio to meet the needs for a highly skilled, innovative workforce by adding more than 50 new bachelor’s degrees, more than 40 master’s degrees, and 31 additional doctoral degrees. The entire research enterprise has been redefined and expanded, with more than four dozen new research centers and institutes added since FY2002.

**major partnerships and collaborations**

As a New American University, ASU has worked to be globally engaged in service to the state, the nation, and the world. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, the university has developed an extensive and expanding array of major domestic and international partnerships over the past decade that span the intellectual diversity of the institution, including for example, linkages with Banner Health, the Barrow Neurological Institute, the Mayo Clinic, Teach for America, and the Translational Genomics Research Institute. These alliances empower ASU and its partners to address some of the biggest challenges of the 21st century.

**infrastructure investment**

At the time of the last accreditation review in 2003, ASU’s infrastructure was inadequate for its existing student population, let alone to serve the burgeoning numbers of qualified Arizona high school graduates needing near-term access to higher education. Classrooms, research laboratories, and offices were often crowded and inadequately equipped. Major institutional software systems needed replacement. Few residence halls were available, forcing most students to live off campus even as freshmen, exacer-
bating problems with retention and graduation. The university had one main campus in Tempe with two “satellite” campuses that were too often perceived as providing duplicate programs of lesser quality than those offered on the Tempe campus. Relations with the City of Tempe were strained by concerns over traffic congestion and the negative impact on property values due to the large numbers of students living in off-campus rental housing. While buildings on the West campus were relatively new and in good condition, many buildings on the Tempe campus were in significant disrepair, and the Polytechnic campus was composed of World War II-era Air Force base buildings retrofitted for use as classrooms, offices, research labs, and residences. No building on any ASU campus had been designed and built with consideration for minimizing utility costs or regard for ameliorating negative impacts on the environment.

To meet these challenges, the university initiated a comprehensive development planning process in 2003—bringing together all the university’s stakeholders including local governments, utilities, and other suppliers—to assess the current state of ASU’s infrastructure and to establish a long-term build-out plan that would meet the needs of all. Since 2005, the resulting “Comprehensive Development Plan” has guided all construction and renovation of existing facilities.

The plan recognized the reality that ASU must grow to accommodate 100,000 students by 2020 in order to meet ASU’s Core Value of Access and its commitment to the citizens of Arizona that no qualified Arizona student would be denied access to a college education. A strategic redesign of the entire university, called “One University in Many Places,” established distinct—yet equally significant—missions for all ASU campuses, as will be discussed in Chapter 1. The strategic redesign required that academic quality be equally rigorous for all programs at all campuses, allowing the majority of the growth detailed in the plan to include campuses other than the Tempe campus.

As will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5, over the past decade ASU’s classroom, laboratory, library, office, residence hall, and other spaces have increased by 79 percent (i.e., 10 million square feet) as a result of the strategic redesign. A new campus was added, a global innovation park was developed, and capacity was expanded in existing locations. Through investments of almost $600 million in renovations and new facilities, research laboratory space increased by over 60 percent. The university’s information technology organization and infrastructure was overhauled, replacing high-cost, internally-developed applications such as e-mail with free, state-of-the-art programs provided by Google and other companies. Wireless network service was deployed on all campuses, and fragile legacy software was replaced with new platforms that greatly enhanced the student experience, allowing the university to meet its student enrollment growth objectives. ASU also implemented changes to set the stage for a significant expansion of online course delivery.

**community engagement**

In the past ten years, mutually beneficial partnerships with the communities ASU serves were greatly expanded to nearly 500 community outreach programs in over 170 locations with over 700 outreach opportunities. In addition to participation by over 120 units within ASU, students have also poured themselves into this community service effort. This focused attention on community engagement was recognized in 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2012 when ASU was named to the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, the highest federal recognition a university can receive for its commitment to volunteering, service learning, and civic engagement. More details on the expansion of community engagement are provided in Chapter 1.

**summing up**

Over the past decade, Arizona State University has been remolded through the focused, collective efforts of its faculty, staff, and students into a new model for the American research university. ASU is creating an institution that is committed to Excellence, Access, and Impact; that pursues research that contributes to the public good; and that assumes major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality of the communities within which the institution is embedded. This transformation resulted in an exemplary institution intensely focused on being a force rather than a place, and one that is committed to meeting the promise implicit within the vision for a New American University set forth by President Crow a decade ago. These changes embody and exceed the expectations present in the Criteria for Accreditation, as the following evidential chapters of this Self-Study will show.
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background: ASU accreditation history and the self-study process
introduction

The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools has continuously accredited Arizona State University since 1931. HLC is one of six regional accrediting bodies for institutions of higher education recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. As a participant in HLC’s Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality (PEAQ), ASU’s institutional accreditation is comprehensively reviewed every ten years, with the last review occurring in 2003. The standards for meeting accreditation are the Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation.¹

This background section provides the accreditation context for the following chapters, giving an overview of the history of the institution, a summary of the challenges faced during the period since the last review, and an overview of how the self-study process was undertaken at ASU.

a brief history of ASU

Since its beginning, Arizona State University has evolved with the growth and changing needs of Arizona and the Phoenix metropolitan area.² In March 1885, after the vigorous efforts of Territorial Representative John S. Armstrong, the 13th Territorial Legislature enacted legislation that established a Normal School in the Territory of Arizona in response to the growing demand for educated teachers and leaders in the region. Less than two months later, George and Martha Wilson donated the twenty acres of pasture-land that would form the core of what was called the Territorial Normal School. In 1886, the school opened with Hiram Farmer as its first Principal, a title that was changed to “President” in 1904.

For the first three decades after the Territorial Normal School opened, the school continued to grow despite limited resources. In 1902, a decade before Arizona became a state, the California State Board of Education provided the first accreditation of the academic programs of the Territorial Normal School.

The completion of the Roosevelt Dam in 1913 and the consequent expansion of irrigated farming led to an urgent need to add agriculture to the curriculum in 1915, and, as a result of this and other needs, the institution diversified beyond its early teacher-training focus. New programs emphasized sciences and experimental scientific research in support of the expanded agricultural mission.

In 1925, the Territorial Normal School was renamed the Tempe State Teachers College, and was author-"
In November 1958, the people of Arizona voted two-to-one on a state ballot proposition in favor of changing the name of the institution to Arizona State University.

The demand for greater access to higher education in Arizona has consistently increased since the institution’s founding in 1885. In addition to on-campus offerings, the institution began to offer extension classes in 1927, introduced correspondence courses in 1935, established televised classes in 1955, and established off-campus sites and centers in 1975.

The rapid population growth in the western part of the Phoenix metropolitan area that began in the late 1960s increased demand for access to higher education in that area. In response, off-campus extension courses were offered, and in 1984 a state statute established “ASU West,” and the campus received its first students in Fall 1986. Though initially envisioned as a comprehensive, nonresidential, upper-division campus, ASU West began to offer lower-division courses in Fall 2000, and now offers a range of undergraduate and graduate degrees. It opened its first residence hall in 2004.

As the southeastern metropolitan Phoenix area experienced explosive growth during the last two decades of the 20th century, the Legislature established a third campus, “ASU East,” in 1996. Now known as Arizona State University at the Polytechnic campus, the grounds are located at the site of the former Williams Air Force Base, and the first programs at the campus were agribusiness and technology programs relocated from the Tempe campus. As with the West campus, it now offers a range of undergraduate and graduate degrees.

During the decade of the 1990s, under the leadership of President Lattie F. Coor, student enrollment across the ASU campuses grew by nearly a quarter, making ASU the fifth largest institution in the nation. During that time period, the makeup of the student body also evolved from a demography predominately composed of transfer students to a composition more similar to that of a traditional four-year university; the proportion of the student body represented by first-time, full-time freshmen grew markedly, with the number of students in that group increasing by more than 75 percent. Research funding grew from $56.5 million in FY1991 to more than $99 million in FY2001. ASU attained the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education “Research I” classification in 1994.

The transformation of Arizona State University into a model of the New American University began with the inauguration of President Michael M. Crow in 2002. Two major planning efforts – the Comprehensive Development Plan and “One University in Many Places” – directed the physical and academic changes undertaken since that time. As a result of these plans, the administrations of the individual campuses were consolidated into a single central administration.

The longstanding strong public support for the institution, seen in its founding in 1885 and its designation by public referendum as Arizona State University in 1958, was affirmed again in 2006 by an unprecedented display of massive support for a public university. The citizens of Phoenix – the fifth largest city in the U.S. – voted to tax themselves to provide nearly a quarter-of-a-billion dollars in city bonds for construction of the Downtown Phoenix campus. That campus received its first students in August 2006. Since that time, the campus has been energized and empowered by a vigorous construction program and the relocation of several colleges to that campus. In its first six years of existence the Downtown Phoenix campus has more than tripled in enrollment, from about 2,800 students upon opening to an enrollment in Fall 2012 of more than 9,800 students. This campus also offers a range of undergraduate and graduate degrees.

From a fledgling teacher-training school with 33 students drawn from the sparse and scattered frontier families within the Arizona Territory, Arizona State University has grown to become the largest public university under one administration within the fifth largest city in the United States, with an enrollment of more than 73,000 students drawn from across the U.S. and more than 110 other countries. ASU’s deep commitment to education and service, a legacy from the 19th century Arizona pioneers who founded it, today empowers ASU to enhance and expand opportunities for an ever-growing 21st century global community.

### Summary of the Accreditation History of Arizona State University

The North Central Association granted initial accreditation in 1931 for the academic programs of what was then known as Arizona State Teachers College at Tempe. Since 1931, continuing accreditation has been granted at the required intervals for the Tempe campus, with the most recent review occurring in 2003.

At the time of the last institutional accreditation review in 2003, the names for the existing ASU campuses were ASU Main (located in Tempe), ASU East (located in Mesa), and ASU West (located in northwest Phoenix; accredited separately at that time from ASU Main and ASU East as discussed below). In July 2005, these campus names were formally changed to ASU at the Tempe campus, ASU at the Polytechnic campus, and ASU at the West campus, respectively. A fourth campus, ASU at the Downtown Phoenix campus, accepted its first class of students in August 2006.
For accreditation purposes, ASU East was included under the ASU Main accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission from its inception in 1996. ASU West originally was included under the ASU Main accreditation from its inception in 1984, but was separately accredited by HLC beginning in August 1992.

In 2006, ASU requested approval from HLC to move the accreditation of ASU at the West campus under the ASU institutional accreditation. A focused visit by an evaluation team from HLC to the West and Downtown Phoenix campuses in February 2006 noted that ASU had “provided massive documentation showing detailed long range planning and designs for the physical campuses; program coordination and re-alignment with the campuses; partnerships with academic, civic, private, and other entities; curriculum planning and coordination; capital financing; data related to enrollment management planning; as well as records of committees and task forces that demonstrate involvement and participation by virtually all university constituencies in planning, reorganization, and coordination.” The focused visit evaluation team identified no items needing additional organizational or HLC attention.

After a review of the report from the focused visit, HLC approved the request to combine the accreditation of all ASU’s campuses into a single ASU institutional accreditation effective May 2006. The report also affirmed that the date for the next comprehensive review for all academic programs on all ASU campuses was to be during the 2012-2013 academic year.

In 2009, the HLC worked with ASU to identify three off-site “additional locations” for review. The summary comments from that review noted:

Arizona State University clearly serves and supports its students at off-campus sites with the same quality as it does on-campus students. The programs and curricula are seamless in every case, matching exactly the curricula for on-campus students. Faculty and on-site coordinators provide the same consistency in services and support as those enjoyed by students on-campus. The University has established and continues to maintain appropriate infrastructure and resources to assure consistent quality throughout its locations and sites.

ASU takes pride in its strong and positive history in working with the HLC. In keeping with HLC’s “Institutional Obligations of Affiliation,” ASU has submitted Annual Institutional Data Updates in a timely and accurate fashion, has been candid and transparent in its dealings with the HLC, and regularly submits notifications on additional locations and distance-delivered programs. In addition, ASU has requested permission in a timely fashion to pursue its two contractual relationships and submitted substantive change requests as required. Currently ASU has the following general profile as approved by HLC:

- Permission to offer: associate, bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees
- Additional locations: 22 active
- Contractual arrangements: 2 contract partners; 16 programs
- Distance delivered: 60 degrees/certificates

**significant changes and challenges since the 2003 self-study**

The progress toward the transformation of ASU to a model of the New American University, as outlined in the Preface, has occurred during a period of significant changes and challenges for the state of Arizona. As affirmed in its Mission Statement, Arizona State University assumes “major responsibility for the economic, social and cultural vitality of the community.” As one of only three public universities serving the entire state, the challenges and opportunities that have faced the people of Arizona over the past decade have had a strong influence on the rapidity and way in which ASU has transformed itself. ASU’s foundational documents – the Mission Statement, Core Values, and Design Aspirations – during those challenging times have consistently oriented, prioritized, and shaped the decisions and adjustments required to meet those challenges and opportunities.

The key changes and challenges faced by Arizona and ASU during the past decade can be summarized as rapid population growth, increasing diversity, and severe economic stress.

**rapid population growth and increasing diversity**

Arizona’s population grew by nearly one-fourth between the 2000 and 2010 U.S. censuses, a growth outmatched only by Nevada; the estimated population of Arizona today is over 6.48 million. As a result of this rapid growth, Arizona has become the 23rd most populous state in the country. By comparison, Arizona’s population increase of 1.26 million people during the period between censuses was larger than the entire population of any of the nine smallest states. As summarized in Table B-1, this growth was
pronounced in Maricopa County, the county within which ASU is located; the county grew by nearly one-fourth, adding nearly three-quarters of a million people due to immigration to, and population movement within, Arizona. Similarly, between 2000 and 2010, the population of the Phoenix metropolitan statistical area also increased by nearly 30 percent. During the same decade, the diversity of Arizona’s population grew markedly, with total minority populations growing by nearly one-third and the Hispanic population up by nearly half.

Not surprisingly, as an institution deeply involved in the well-being of Arizona, the number of students served by ASU also increased, growing even more rapidly than the state population. Enrollment at ASU swelled from 57,543 to 73,378 between Fall 2003 and Fall 2012, a growth of nearly 30 percent, representing an increase of almost as many students as the entire enrollment for Fall 2012 of the Flagstaff campus of Northern Arizona University. Guided by the Core Value of Access, ASU increased minority enrollment by nearly half during that period, with three out of ten students in the Fall 2012 student body designated as coming from minorities.

**econom**ic stress

As one of three public universities in Arizona, a significant share of ASU’s budget comes from the General Fund of the State of Arizona through appropriations by the State Legislature. State appropriations in the FY2013 All Funds Budget are 15 percent of the total budget as compared to 37 percent at the time of the last site visit.

The economy of Arizona grew robustly in the first part of the decade after the last accreditation visit, as did student enrollment. Historically, funding for enrollment growth was addressed by a “base plus” formula that adjusted the base funding of the institution based on enrollments at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate student levels. Yet, during this last decade of rapid growth, the state legislature failed to consistently provide enrollment growth funding as calculated by the enrollment growth funding formula. This underfunding resulted in a deficit of nearly $50 million in resources during a critical growth period for the institution. Due to the economic downturn, no enrollment growth funding at all was provided in FY2010, FY2011, or FY2012.

The downturn in the Arizona economy that began in FY2008, coupled with new state spending measures, led to a series of increasing cyclical and structural state budget shortfalls. Since Arizona’s Constitution requires a balanced state budget, and since the state legislature requires a super-majority to raise taxes, these deficits forced sharp reductions in discretionary spending once the downturn began. All state agencies were severely affected by these reductions, but the educational system in Arizona was particularly impacted. From FY2008 to 2010, Arizona reduced funding for the state K-12 system by 20 percent, and the university system absorbed cuts of nearly 30 percent. Even though Federal stimulus funding through the American Recovery and Re-Investment Act of 2009 helped temporarily ameliorate these cuts, the educational system in Arizona still was forced to adjust to markedly lower levels of state investment. Most states found it necessary to reduce funding during the downturn, but one independent national comparison found that the 25.1 percent decline of in-state appropriations for Arizona for higher education between AY2010-2011 and AY2011-2012 was the second largest decline in the nation.

**ASU’s response to these changes and challenges**

One or more of these challenges – population growth, increasing diversity, and economic stresses – have been faced at lower levels by most public universities in the U.S. Because these challenges occurred during this period of financial stress and transformation at ASU, they also tested the institution’s resolve to stand by its Core Values.

ASU responded by using those challenges as multiple opportunities to evaluate its programs while reaffirming its continuing commitment to its Core Values and intensifying efforts that were most consistent with its transformation trajectory. Consonant with progress toward the Design Aspiration of Fusing Intellectual Disciplines, consolidations of academic units at the department, school and college levels were implemented. All academic program offerings were examined, and low-enrollment programs were eliminated so that necessary new academic offerings would have resources to begin. These changes are explored more fully in subsequent chapters, particularly Chapters 3 and 5.

Overall, the FY2008-FY2012 state funding reductions, combined with enrollment growth commensurate with the state’s population growth, represent a decline in
the amount of state resources per full-time equivalent (FTE) student of 52 percent. To protect the quality and breadth of the institution, ASU responded to these reductions in multiple ways. Three primary tools used to deal with the shortfalls were permanent increases in other sources of revenue, targeted cost reductions focused on administrative and academic efficiency, and using temporary sources of support. The overall result, described below, limited the impact of the budget reductions to a level that preserved program quality and outcomes.

Tuition increases in FY2009, FY2010, FY2011, and FY2012 were substantial. ASU tuition rates for Arizona residents and non-residents were well below national averages in FY2008, providing adequate room for rate increases consistent with programs of high quality. Annual base undergraduate tuition was raised by a total of $3,799 or 70 percent between FY2009 and FY2012. The new resident undergraduate tuition rate of $9,208 is still below the FY2012 median tuition rate of ASU’s peer institutions ($9,471). When combined with proportional increases in institutional financial aid, ASU has been able to continue expanding student enrollment and diversity. Non-resident undergraduate tuition rates were raised by $4,950, or 29 percent over the same period, with resident graduate student tuition rates increased in similar amounts. ASU was able to replace about 68 percent (on a per-FTE student basis) of the revenue lost to state appropriation reductions through these increases in tuition. ASU proposed a hold on tuition rates for FY2013 for resident undergraduate students and an increase of three percent for both non-resident undergraduates and also graduates students; these proposals were granted by the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR).

Substantial targeted budget reductions were undertaken at the same time that tuition rates were being increased. As of the start of FY2012 a total of 2,055 positions that existed in FY2008 were eliminated through the layoff of 1,175 employees, the non-replacement of 120 employees who retired, and the elimination of 760 vacant positions. In addition to the position eliminations, non-personnel costs were trimmed by over $25 million.

The 2,055 positions eliminated included 350 non-tenure-track faculty positions (along with the reassignment of their teaching responsibilities to tenured/tenure track faculty). To safeguard the quality of the academic programs, the institution committed to the protection of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Thus, staff employees were hit hardest by the reductions, followed by faculty associates (individuals hired on a term-to-term basis to specifically teach one or more sections of courses). In FY2010 and FY2011, a voluntary retirement program for tenured faculty members who had been employed by ASU at least 10 years and were over 60 years old resulted in 72 faculty retirements, saving $8.6 million annually. Cost reductions also were addressed by consolidations of departmental support structures into new and more efficient administrative units capable of supporting growing enrollment. The introduction of innovative teaching methods in areas such as introductory mathematics and expository writing, as well as expanded use of online resources in many classes resulted in additional reductions. Cost savings were reinvested in new faculty hiring to support the growing enrollment while still reducing the overall demand on resources from general sources.

A number of temporary actions were taken to spread the impact of tuition increases and the budget reductions over time. Some cost reductions were implemented more gradually through the use of Federal stimulus funds amounting to about $750 per full-time equivalent student over FY2009 and FY2010. Additionally, in FY2009, every ASU employee took an unpaid furlough that ranged in length from 10 days for classified staff, 12 days for faculty and most other staff, and 15 days for senior administrators; these furloughs represented a pay reduction in the range of 9.3 percent to 14 percent per employee for that fiscal year.

Despite the 52 percent net reduction in state appropriation per FTE between FY2008 and FY2012, the investment from tuition (net of financial aid), state appropriations, and other general revenue per FTE declined by only 10.3 percent (from $14,800 in FY2008 to $13,278 in FY2012); when those figures are adjusted for inflation, the difference amounts to less than 4 percent as a result of the proactive adjustments taken.

Moving forward from this experience, ASU has formulated a comprehensive strategic business planning framework for the coming decade that further diminishes the institution’s historic reliance on state appropriations to sustain and build institutional quality. The new strategic business planning framework relies upon modest tuition rate growth and the development of substantial new revenue sources, such as online programs and international student enrollment, as well as continued innovation in cost effectiveness. This business planning framework is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

As the economic downturn eased during 2012, the Arizona State Legislature began allocating new funds in 2012 to the state universities for the first time in five fiscal years. The Legislature adopted a new performance-based budgeting approach for the three state universities, replacing the enrollment-growth model used historically. The new approach, focused on educational outcomes rather than increased student enrollment, allocates enhancements to each institution’s base budget based on increases in the number of degrees awarded, number of student-credit hours generated, and external research and public service funding awarded. These enhancements to the base are independent of other enhancements to the base, such as special university initiatives, funds for new academic programs and colleges, cost-of-living increases, etc. A $5 million pool was set aside from the base funding for the three state universities for redistribution among the three institutions during FY2013 based on the three outcome metrics. Along
with this performance-based funding, the Legislature allotted $12 million directly to ASU as an initial step toward remediying disparities generated by the old enrollment funding model, with the intention to provide $12 million per year for the next four years, effectively more than erasing the $50 million enrollment funding shortfall discussed earlier.

responses to observations from the 2003 comprehensive visit report

The report from the last comprehensive evaluation visit to ASU in 2003 found no items which required both institutional attention and commission follow-up. It affirmed the institution met all twenty-four of the General Institutional Requirements. All the then-current Criteria for Accreditation were judged to have been met.

The report did provide observations about five items that needed institutional attention. Those observations are summarized here, along with descriptions of the institutional responses undertaken since that visit.

observation 1: handling student complaints

On the concerns expressed in ASU’s 2003 Self-Study Report about the handling of student complaints, the report commented:

_The self-study expresses concern that having multiple policies and points of entry for addressing grievances offers "the potential for confusion in knowing where to go for any particular complaint." Students are encouraged to "initiate their complaint at the most local and immediate source," and, in keeping with the desire to keep contacts at the most appropriate local level, communication about complaint processes appears to be delegated to colleges and units. A review of formal complaint records and interviews with staff members and ombudspersons who address complaints indicates that, whether formally lodged in writing or informally discussed with an ombudsperson, complaints are resolved in a timely and effective manner. The institution’s concern about potentially confusing pathways through the complaint process might be mitigated by providing more information about the various points of entry and their suitability for addressing particular concerns. For example, although the names of academic and student services ombudspersons are published in the Schedule of Classes, their role is not clearly explained._

Since the 2003 site visit, ASU has worked vigorously to enhance the processes and efficiency with which student complaints are addressed, including the addition of a hotline operated by a third-party vendor to ensure anonymity for complainants. The roles of the Ombudsperson Committee have been better defined, and information on that avenue now appears on the institution’s web site. The avenues for addressing student complaints are documented in the Federal Compliance appendix to this Self-Study Report, and summaries of reports from the various avenues for responding to student complaints will be available for the Site Visit Team in the Electronic Resource Room. Considering ASU’s size, the number of student complaints remains extremely low.

observation 2: clarifying the institution’s mission and vision

With regard to what was then called Criterion One, “Mission and Integrity,” the report noted:

_The 2003 site visit coincides with a moment in which the vision and mission statement of the institution may appear to be misaligned; however, this is an understandable effect of the institution’s evolving vision. As the vision develops, care should be taken to ensure broad support throughout the institution and that the mission statement is updated and clarified to reflect the evolving vision as it affects the increasingly distinct missions of ASU East, West, Main and Downtown._

Arizona State University, working with its constituents and the Arizona Board of Regents, devoted great attention and care to develop and refine the mission, vision, goals, and aspirations for the institution. The four physical campuses and ASU Online are now all guided by the same foundational documents. As discussed in the subsequent chapters, ABOR has also developed new goals for each of the state universities in the Arizona University System in its Vision 2020 document; these goals, in turn, map onto ASU’s foundational documents.

ASU consistently uses these statements to guide all activities at all levels of the institution. Further information on how these guiding documents have shaped ASU during its transformation as a New American University is provided in Chapter 1, and examples are seen throughout this Self-Study report.

observation 3: limited resources, and faculty and staff compensation

The report provided two observations needing institutional attention within what was then called Criterion Two, “Preparing for the Future”:

- _Continued limited resources for both operations and capital improvements may impede progress toward achievement of ASU’s mission and vision._
Faculty and staff compensation in comparison to peer institutions remains a continuing challenge for the University. In order for the University to progress in meeting its faculty diversity goals and expanded faculty research competitiveness, success in the improvement of faculty and staff compensation will be critical.

The concerns expressed in the site report about limited resources for operations and capital improvements continue to be serious challenges, and ASU has responded as detailed above. Working with its sister institutions and ABOR, ASU has relentlessly sought to increase and carefully manage state investment in higher education. While Arizona did increase state investment during the first years following the last site visit, the large cyclical state budget deficit resulting from the state’s economic downturn in 2008, coupled with ongoing serious structural deficits in the state budget as well as the state legislature’s decision to decline to fully fund student enrollment growth during four of the years since the last site visit, all conspired to seriously impact the institution. However, as detailed above, ASU has been able to sustain its investments in academic programs at strong levels through actions to counter the reductions in state appropriations and to closely watch priorities for expenditures. These actions included strengthening non-state sources of financial resources, inclusion of increased tuition revenue, expansion of external research and creative activity funding, and increased philanthropic donations from the public. Even during this period of financial stress, ASU has been able to make substantial progress on many fronts, including retention rates, degree output, enrollment levels and increased diversity. ASU has expanded its commitments to financial aid, research expenditure volume, and capital program expansion.

Against this backdrop of state funding declines, ASU has continued to keep pace on faculty and staff compensation competitiveness since the last site visit. In AY2011-2012, ASU’s average faculty salary ranked 14th among the 16 institutions in its ABOR-approved list of peer institutions; within the ten public universities in the PAC-12, ASU was 5th highest. These comparative rankings were slightly better than the comparative positions ASU held in AY2002-2003, as seen in Tables B-2 and B-3; ASU moved up one spot in each comparison. While the continued decline of the state’s fiscal situation diminished the gains made in previous years, and while no state-appropriated funds have been made available for salary increases since 2007, the average faculty salary across all ranks increased by nearly 30 percent at ASU since FY2003. Among the ten PAC-12 public universities, this increase was the sixth largest.

Observation 4: financial aid availability

Within what was then called Criterion Three, “Student Learning and Effective Teaching,” the report expressed the concern that “[t]he percentage of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>institution peers</th>
<th>AY2002-03 average salary</th>
<th>AY2011-12 average salary</th>
<th>% increase since AY2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>$91,800</td>
<td>$124,500</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rutgers University at New Brunswick</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Maryland at College Park</td>
<td>$87,800</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>$81,700</td>
<td>$108,900</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>$106,300</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$106,200</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ohio State University - Main</td>
<td>$79,100</td>
<td>$105,400</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>$82,600</td>
<td>$103,100</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>$78,400</td>
<td>$101,200</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td>$100,800</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Minnesota - Twin Cities</td>
<td>$82,700</td>
<td>$100,200</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>$78,400</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$99,800</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>$74,700</td>
<td>$96,800</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Madison</td>
<td>$81,400</td>
<td>$95,400</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>$69,800</td>
<td>$89,200</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-2: average faculty salaries (top 3 ranks) for AY2002-2003 and AY2011-2012 for ASU and ABOR-approved peer institutions.
revenues available for financial aid may not be sufficient to provide access.”

As declared in its Mission Statement, ASU measures itself “not by who we exclude, but by who we include.” Thus, the concern expressed in the 2003 comprehensive evaluation site visit goes to the heart of how a New American University defines itself.

Since FY2003, ASU has made major progress in delivering on its promise that no Arizona student be denied access to a college education based on ability to pay. To accomplish this, the university moved from a model of low-tuition/low-access to a moderate-tuition/high-access approach. Even with the substantial tuition increase since the last site visit, resident tuition and mandatory fees for undergraduates are still lower than twelve of the fifteen ABOR-approved peer institutions for ASU and lower than six of the ten public universities in the PAC-12, as shown in Table B-4.

Through set-asides, the increases in tuition have consistently expanded the funds available for financial aid. Over 45 percent of Arizona residents attending ASU now receive institutional financial aid packages (which averaged over $7,000 for full-time resident dependent undergraduates in FY2012), and nearly 85 percent of resident undergraduate students receive some form of financial aid.

The number of students using Pell Grants to enable their study at ASU more than doubled from 10,344 in AY2002-2003 (the year of the last accreditation review) to over 26,000 in AY2011-2012. Much of this growth in Pell grant recipients has occurred since the economic downturn, with the number of recipients growing by over 90 percent from 13,334 in AY2008-2009.

Taken together from all sources, the total financial aid awarded to ASU students topped $971 million in AY2011-2012, having grown from $486 million only three years earlier in AY2006-2007. Of the $971 million of aid disbursed in AY2011-2012, over $202 million was provided through ASU-funded scholarships and grants, nearly tripling the $76 million awarded in AY2006-2007.

ASU has been consistently ranked as one of the top institutions for ethnic minorities by top publications focused on diversity due in part to these increases in financial aid. The financial aid resource increases over the past decade have enabled ASU to increase the percentage of students who come from ethnic and racial minorities by nearly 50 percent, from 22 percent of the student enrollment in Fall 2003 to 33 percent in Fall 2012. The percentage of first-time, full-time students from minorities increased by 56 percent, from 25 percent in Fall 2003 to 39 percent in Fall 2012.
The report observed:

- The pattern of underfunding the state formula per student and for physical plant maintenance conflicts with the Governor's statewide report, Arizona at Risk: An Urgent Call to Action, which called for a significant strengthening of Arizona higher education by recommending enhanced funding support from multiple revenue streams to increase student enrollments, expand research and business development provided by universities, and increase financial support for faculty salaries, capital assets and information technology.¹³

- ASU has faced both substantial increases in student enrollments and changes in the student body profile; projections suggest that these trends will continue and may even be accelerated by the changing demographics of the state. In addition to challenges ASU may face in addressing further (substantial) continued growth, the institution has also expressed the desire to enhance the quality and reputation of its programs. Although the response to the changes noted above has been effective, current resources are strained.

Both concerns revolve around the issue of serious underfunding of required needs.

Limited success has been achieved in addressing underfunding of enrollment growth. It is important to note that, rather than advancing the quality of the institution, state enrollment growth funding is needed simply to provide essential resources required to maintain the status quo. As noted above, the underfunding of the state enrollment growth funding formula grew during FY2003 through FY2006, leaving the institution nearly $50 million underfunded. Coupled with other state appropriation cuts, ASU was faced with severe financial stress, and as outlined above, has reacted to increase other revenue sources and to improve cost efficiency to successfully maintain program quality, student outcomes, and faculty productivity.

ASU continues to make its case for the importance of increased state support, including the successful pursuit during the 2012 State Legislative session of an additional $12 million in “disparity funding” from the state legislature for FY2013 noted earlier. That appropriation was part of a “down payment” on a five-year $58 million plan to address the historical underfunding of the state enrollment formula.¹³ The adoption of the new performance-based funding model, as described earlier, should also provide additional funds as ASU’s performance along the three outcome metrics—degrees awarded, student credit hours generated, external funding awarded—continues to grow.

The maintenance of the physical infrastructure of the campuses is typically addressed with “building renewal funds.” Since the last site visit, no state appropriations for building renewal have been made, with the exception of a single installment of $6.5 million in FY2007. This is particularly critical considering the enrollment growth that has taken place. The total deferred maintenance for all academic and support buildings on all campuses has quintupled since FY2000, reaching $292 million in FY2012.¹² Deferred maintenance projects at ASU include life-safety issues such as obsolete fire sprinkler systems and outdated electrical components, and structural problems such as leaking roofs and cracking exterior walls.

In the face of these needs, ASU has devoted a larger proportion of its capital spending to address the worst of the problems, and successfully worked with the state to establish the Stimulus Plan for Economic and Educational Development (“SPEED”) bond matching fund program, in which State of Arizona lottery proceeds will provide an up-to-4:1 match for university funds to service the bonds over the ten-year life of the bonds. ASU has now committed a total of $34 million to deferred maintenance activities from this source.¹⁴

ASU strategic investments, initiatives, and planning efforts have remained consonant with its foundational documents despite the fiscal constraints faced since the last accreditation visit. These efforts over the past decade have greatly expanded the physical facilities for the campus to accommodate the increased number of students served. Over 7 million square feet of space has been added to the institution since the last site visit, including nearly half-a-million square feet of research space and an entirely new campus in downtown Phoenix. More detail on the expansion of facilities is presented in Chapter 5.

To meet the expanding needs of a growing student enrollment, ASU continues to aggressively pursue appropriations to address these facilities issues. The institution will continue to use its foundational documents to orient, prioritize, and implement changes in response to the availability of resources.

**the self-study process at ASU**

Following best practices identified by the HLC, ASU developed a Self-Study Plan that outlined how the Self-Study Process would be undertaken for ASU.¹⁵ Within that Self-Study Plan, the goals for the Self-Study process at ASU articulated by President Crow in his charge to the Steering Committee for the effort were presented. Fulfilling that charge, this Self-Study report:

1. Provides compelling evidence supporting the renewal of ASU’s accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission based on the Commission’s established criteria for accreditation;
2. Reflects the distinctive nature of the mission, vision and goals of ASU as the New American University;

3. Summarizes the major changes that have taken place at ASU since the last accreditation reaffirmation in 2003;

4. Accurately presents the contexts, opportunities and obstacles that ASU faces in carrying out its mission;

5. Contains background and evaluative perspectives on all operations of the institution;

6. Demonstrates ASU’s compliance with all federal higher education legal requirements;

7. Serves as a baseline for measuring future efforts towards improving and enhancing ASU’s service to Arizona, the nation, and the world.

This document is the written summary of the outcomes of the self-study process consistent with this charge.

self-study coordinator

In August 2009, Executive Vice President and University Provost Elizabeth D. Phillips appointed Dr. Barry G. Ritchie, Professor of Physics, to serve as Director of the 2013 HLC Re-Accreditation and Self-Study. In this role, he served as the Self-Study Coordinator. His roles and responsibilities as Self-Study Coordinator included providing day-to-day leadership and oversight of the entire self-study effort; developing and monitoring organizational structures for the Self-Study effort, including the recruitment of Steering Committee members and Criterion Team co-leaders; drafting background sections and appendices of the Self-Study Report, working with appropriate Steering Committee and Criterion Team leaders; assisting Criterion Teams in their efforts as needed, and serving as the primary spokesperson for the accreditation effort.

Following a review of recent HLC self-study efforts at other large public universities, the leadership structure for the ASU Self-Study process was based on the organizational diagram provided in Figure B-1.

For the final period of preparations prior to the comprehensive visit, Dr. Craig Thatcher joined the self-study effort as Associate Director in May 2012. His roles included working with all committees (especially the Editorial and Data teams) as well as the Steering Committee to ensure integrated functioning of those groups during the final stages of the effort.

steering committee

The self-study process had a six-person Steering Committee comprised of recognized university leaders, broadly knowledgeable and representative of the four campuses that make up ASU, including representation from the faculty shared-governance body, the University Academic Senate. The Self-Study Coordinator chaired the Steering Committee. Each member of the Steering Committee also worked with a specific Criterion Team.

Members of the Steering Committee in addition to the Self-Study Coordinator were:

- Dr. Maria T. Allison, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate College. Allison is also the University Accreditation Officer and the HLC Accreditation Liaison.
- Dr. Frederick C. Corey, Vice Provost, Dean of University College, and Director of the School of Letters and Sciences.
- Dr. Mark Lussier, President of the Tempe Academic Assembly and Professor of English.
- Dr. Eduardo O. Pagán, Bob Stump Endowed Professor of History, and former chair, Department of Languages, Cultures and History.
- Dr. Jean C. Stutz, Professor of Applied Science and Mathematics.

Steering Committee members provided overall leadership to the self-study process, and assisted in the work of the Criterion Teams, including service directly on one of the Criterion Teams. They also served as conduits for communication and information to the teams and reviewed drafts of the Self-Study Report. Steering Committee members also determined the format for the Self-Study Report, based on reviews of similar documents elsewhere, and reviewed and approved introductory and background chapters, appendices, and exhibits for the Self-Study Report. Members also facilitated communication of the Self-Study Report to the various constituencies of ASU, and worked with the Editorial Team to produce the
final version of the Self-Study Report. These members will also serve as hosts to the Evaluation Team during the site visit, and will provide effort for wrap-up and closeout of the accreditation reaffirmation process.

**criterion teams**

Criterion Teams were established for each of the five HLC Criteria for Accreditation, with two co-leaders for each team who were knowledgeable members of the ASU faculty with strong communication and organizational skills. The co-leaders were chosen from faculty members known to be broadly representative of the academic diversity of the institution, encompassed a working knowledge of all four campuses, and served as conduits of information between their teams and the Steering Committee. The names of the Criterion Team co-leaders are provided in Table B-5. Criterion Team co-leaders recruited appropriate members for their teams and organized and led their team’s efforts.

Members of the Criterion Teams acted as campus leaders in the self-study process, reviewed HLC materials and self-study documents from ASU and similar institutions to identify and utilize best practices for their particular criterion, and gathered evidence related to their particular criterion. The teams developed initial drafts for their specific chapter of the Self-Study Report, which were then reviewed and revised by the Editorial Team (discussed below).

As noted above, each Steering Committee member served on one of the Criterion Teams. The Steering Committee representative identified for each Criterion Team is indicated in Table B-5. The Steering Committee representative on each team facilitated communication and coordination between the Criterion Team and the Steering Committee, including progress reports on team activity and coordination of information requests.

**resource team**

In the course of the self-study process, Criterion Teams required additional insight, information and background on university procedures, policies, practices, statistics, and history with which the team members were unfamiliar. Evaluative assessments based on the Criteria for Accreditation also demanded access to, and focused analysis of, specific data sets in various offices within the institution.

To facilitate timely response to such needs, a Resource Team was assembled from persons very knowledgeable of specific portions of University operations, capabilities, and activities. Those individuals were drawn from ten ASU institutional offices primarily responsible for specific aspects of university operations, as shown in Table B-6. Requests for information from the Resource Team were routed through the Self-Study Coordinator.

**editorial team**

As shown in the organizational scheme sketched in Figure B-1, an Editorial Team, working with the Steering Committee, was organized and tasked to review and revise drafts submitted from the Criterion Teams, to address duplications and omissions, and to produce a more readable “single-voice” text. The Editorial Team interacted with the Resource Team as well as other faculty, staff, and administrators to gather information that supplemented the data provided by the Criterion Teams in their initial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mission</th>
<th>Robert Clinton, Foundation Professor of Law, Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Hinde, Director of Teacher Preparation, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee: Jean Stutz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity</td>
<td>Patricia Friedrich, Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Verdi, Chair, Supply Chain Management, W.P. Carey School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee: Eduardo Pagán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching and learning:</td>
<td>Duku Anokye, Associate Director, Division of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality, resources,</td>
<td>Jennifer Fewell, Professor, School of Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and support</td>
<td>Steering Committee: Maria Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching and learning:</td>
<td>Hilairy Hartnett, Associate Professor, School of Earth and Space Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation and</td>
<td>Chell Roberts, Executive Dean, College of Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement</td>
<td>Steering Committee: Mark Lussier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources, planning,</td>
<td>Douglas Olsen, Associate Professor of Marketing, W.P. Carey School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and institutional</td>
<td>Linda Vaughan, Associate Dean, College of Nursing and Health Innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td>Steering Committee: Frederick Corey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**table B-5** Criterion Team leadership for the self-study effort.
chapter drafts in order to offer a more complete body of evidence to assess ASU using the Criteria for Accreditation. The members of the Editorial Team are listed in Table B-7.

### the ASU self-study and the HLC “Pathways” Project

HLC is taking steps to ensure that the activity associated with accreditation represents an ongoing set of practices that ensure and advance the quality of the institution rather than an episodic decadal exercise. To this end, HLC has developed a set of approaches called “Pathways” to assure that accreditation represents a publicly-accessible assessment of the current quality of the institution rather than a snapshot provided perhaps once every ten years.

While the “Pathways” process is still under development, the Steering Committee agrees with HLC on the enhanced value of moving from an episodic to a more ongoing assurance process. Much of the information gathered for this self-study is intended to become part of the Evidence File for future accreditation reviews in the Pathway process. In addition to the goals provided by President Crow, the Steering Committee is committed to seek ways of documenting, developing, and incorporating mechanisms into the operations of the institution during the Self-Study process that will continue to provide ongoing evaluation and assurance that the institution maintains and advances the quality of its programs and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>area</th>
<th>representative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>Joanne Wamsley, Marilyn Mulhollan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Dean of ASU Online</td>
<td>Patricia Feldman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Educational Outreach and Student Affairs</td>
<td>Safali Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Enrollment Management</td>
<td>Kent Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the General Counsel</td>
<td>Cynthia Jewett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Institutional Analysis</td>
<td>Melinda Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics Administration</td>
<td>Dawn Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development</td>
<td>Tamara Deuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td>Shelly Potts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Technology Office</td>
<td>Kendal Burkhart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B-7 Editorial Team for the Self-Study Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>area</th>
<th>representative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria T. Allison</td>
<td>Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate College, University Accreditation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles R. Barbee</td>
<td>Senior Coordinator, University Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie L. Burford</td>
<td>Liaison, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn K. Eaton</td>
<td>Senior Strategic Planning, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly A. Potts</td>
<td>Senior Director of the University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy E. Reid</td>
<td>Assistant to the Self-Study Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry G. Ritchie</td>
<td>Self-Study Coordinator, Professor of Physics, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Thatcher</td>
<td>Associate Director, 2013 HLC Re-accreditation and Self-Study Effort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table B-6** Resource Team composition for the self-study. The Resource Team included a designated representative from each of the offices indicated for responding to information requests from Criterion Teams.
the revised Criteria for Accreditation

ASU began preparations for the Self-Study process in 2009. Since that time, HLC has engaged in a lengthy process of revisions to its Criteria for Accreditation. Because the comprehensive site visit for ASU is scheduled in March 2013, the institution will be assessed based on the revised criteria, which were finalized in March 2012 and presented to the public at the HLC Annual Meeting in Chicago in April 2012.

The team developing the ASU Self-Study Report kept abreast of the changes in the criteria as the revision process proceeded through multiple versions of the Criteria. The various stages of revision to the Criteria for Accreditation, about which the Self-Study Report is organized, have in turn required no fewer than four reorganizations of the materials to be covered by the individual Criterion Teams. These reorganizations resulted in adjustments of the timeline provided in the original Self-Study Plan so that the material submitted by each team properly addressed the Criterion for that team. The final timeline for the Self-Study is presented in Table B-8 (see following page).

organization of the self-study report

The HLC provides five Criteria for Accreditation by which academic institutions are assessed. Within each of the criteria are components that identify specific areas of focus related to the criterion. Further, within many of those components are subcomponents that elaborate on a given focus area. The Commission has also adopted a set of “Assumed Practices” that are considered shared expectations for all responsible institutions of higher education; obligations of affiliation that member institutions are expected to meet; and a set of core values that undergird the criteria, assumed practices, and obligations.

Consistent with these expectations, each of the following chapters is devoted to one of the Criteria for Accreditation, providing evidence supporting the conclusion that ASU has fully met or exceeded the expectations for that criterion and its components with no reasons for concern. Within each criterion chapter, each of the components for that criterion is addressed in turn. Subcomponents are usually then discussed in turn, but in some cases, for readability and to avoid repetition, two subcomponents may be discussed together. While not specifically required for the Self-Study Report by HLC, the evidence provided in the chapters for the Criteria for Accreditation will also be seen to document that ASU conforms to all Assumed Practices, and that it is acting in a manner consistent with the core values of the HLC; specific mention of the Assumed Practices is not made, however. Endnotes providing links to web pages, data sources, and original documents appear at the end of each chapter.

Immediately following the criterion chapters is a formal request that the accreditation of Arizona State University by the Higher Learning Commission be reaffirmed for ten years.

Following the request for reaffirmation of ASU’s accreditation, an appendix includes a section that describes how ASU meets all the requirements of HLC’s Federal Compliance Program; some of the material in the Federal Compliance section is repeated within the chapters devoted to the criteria for improved readability and ease of reference. The final section of the appendix is an “Institutional Snapshot” provided to give statistical data on ASU’s operations, as requested by HLC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dates</th>
<th>events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td>Self-Study Coordinator appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Self-Study Coordinator reviews 2003 ASU Self-Study Report, reports from similar institutions; drafts outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>Steering Committee (SC) members identified; SC begins planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9-13, 2010</td>
<td>Self-study representatives attend HLC annual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>President provides charge, goals to SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2010 – March 2011</td>
<td>Criterion Team co-leaders selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 2011</td>
<td>First organizational meeting of SC and Criterion Team co-leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8-12, 2011</td>
<td>Self-study representatives attend HLC annual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-May 2011</td>
<td>Criterion Teams and Resource Team formed, begin gathering data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 2011</td>
<td>HLC notification of upcoming review, selection of site visit dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2011</td>
<td>Self-Study Plan submitted to Provost for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 2011</td>
<td>Forum with senior administrators to introduce Self-Study Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Self-Study Plan revised as necessary and submitted to HLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-January 2011</td>
<td>Criterion Teams continue activities, write draft chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-December 2011</td>
<td>Resource Room established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>SC reviews draft reports from Criterion Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-April 2012</td>
<td>Editorial Team revises submitted drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Self-study representatives attend HLC annual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>First circulating draft of Self-Study Report reviewed by President and Provost, Steering Committee; revised as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June 2012</td>
<td>Revised circulating draft Self-Study Report distributed internally for comments to selected administrators and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>HLC sends list of proposed Evaluation Team members for review and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-Aug 2012</td>
<td>Self-Study Report draft further revised by Editorial Team and SC based on feedback received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August-Sept 2012</td>
<td>Self-Study Report available for ASU community; further SC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-October 2012</td>
<td>Focus groups held for comments on report from faculty, staff, and constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>HLC notification of Evaluation Team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-November 2012</td>
<td>SC integrates results from focus groups into Self-Study Report draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>Third Party Comment process: Invitation to public for comments to HLC concerning the institution’s accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Self-Study Report is finalized by SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Self-Study Report is provided to HLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-February, 2013</td>
<td>Site visit arrangements made by SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25-27, 2013</td>
<td>Site visit occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5-9, 2013</td>
<td>Self-Study representatives attend HLC annual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-May 2013</td>
<td>Draft Evaluation Team Report received for correction of errors of fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July 2013</td>
<td>Institutional response to final Team Report and selection of review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August or November 2013</td>
<td>HLC final action; notification of action one week after meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-8: Timeline for the self-study process at Arizona State University.
endnotes


2 A photographic history of ASU may be found at the University Archives library web site, “The New ASU Story”: http://www.asu.edu/lib/archives/asuistory/intro.htm

3 ASU Comprehensive Development Plan: http://cfo.asu.edu/fdm-campus-planning

4 ASU, One University in Many Places: http://president.asu.edu/oneuniversity

5 ASU Office of Institutional Analysis and ASU Fact Sheet, Enrollment number represent the Number of students taking courses in the physical location of the downtown campus: http://uoia.asu.edu/quick-facts

6 U. S. Census Bureau, State and County QuickFacts: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/04/04013.html


14 Stimulus for Economic and Education Development (SPEED), https://asunews.asu.edu/20080418_stimulusplan


16 Professor Barry G. Ritchie became Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, effective June 15, 2012.
chapter 1

criterion one. mission
Arizona State University’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

Arizona State University has undergone a radical and extensive institutional transformation to become an example of the New American University. As discussed in the Preface, ASU has used and is using its “foundational documents” – the Mission Statement, Core Values, and Design Aspirations – to guide its progress toward becoming an exemplar of a student-focused institution. ASU embraces its public purposes and responsibilities, and provides an education that prepares citizens for a global, technologically advanced society. The foundational documents (reproduced on the inside front cover of this report) have grounded strategic planning decisions during the past decade, and have provided publicly articulated metrics and touchstones which continue to hone ASU’s operations for continuous future improvement.

1. ASU’s mission statement and other foundational documents were developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and were adopted by its governing board.

The development of ASU’s foundational documents was initially overseen by the University Design Team appointed by President Crow in 2002, comprised of the Executive Vice President and University Provost and a number of vice presidents, deans, department chairs, and senior faculty members. The resulting Mission Statement, as well as the other foundational documents, were then reviewed and affirmed by the University Faculty Senate. The Mission and Vision statements were subsequently approved by the governing board of the institution, the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR).

While the broad and ambitious aims enunciated in the Mission and Vision Statements are clear, a number of approaches could be taken to implement them. To plot a particular path and to measure progress in achieving these aims, ASU adopted a specific set of challenging goals and measures in the period 2004 through 2006 that embodied these aims and provided clear targets for institutional improvement by the year 2012. The goals and measures collected in the ASU Goals Statement have informed all strategic planning at the university during the past decade, since their adoption by the institution and ABOR. (The ASU Goals Statement is presented on the inside front cover of this report.) Since its development, the Goals Statement has continuously served as a central tool to assess the institution and as a set of guideposts to direct strategic planning. Success with respect to those goals indicates how well ASU has progressed.

A. Arizona State University’s mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

ASU’s Mission and Vision Statements and its Core Values, developed according to the essential goals of a publicly-purposed research university, are clearly understood within the institution. These foundational statements guide academic planning, budgeting priorities, and actions.

ASU’s foundational statements are based on concrete measures and goals rather than vain and lofty speech about grand principles. In this review of the evidence that ASU meets and exceeds the expectations for this component of Criterion 1, the discussion of subcomponent 1 will also include an assessment of how well the institution has measured up to the Goals Statement, consonant with the charge provided to the Steering Committee. Subcomponents 2 and 3 are dealt with briefly here, since those items are addressed at length in the chapters devoted to Criterion 3 and Criterion 5.

ASU’s mission statement

To establish ASU as the model for a New American University, measured not by who we exclude, but rather by who we include; pursuing research and discovery that benefits the public good; assuming major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and health and well-being of the community.
towards becoming a model of the New American University, as well as indicating clearly how the foundational documents have guided the institution since their development.

Arizona Board of Regents: 2020 Vision

In addition to the guidance provided to ASU by the foundational documents, the three public universities in Arizona are also guided by the strategic directions set forth by the Arizona Board of Regents for the Arizona University System, which establishes the mission for public universities within the context of higher education in Arizona. (Legal and organizational features of ABOR are discussed more fully in Chapter 2.)

In 2008, ABOR adopted a long-term strategic plan entitled “2020 Vision” to provide a framework for the Arizona University System through the year 2020. The primary mission for the Arizona University System set forth in 2020 Vision is to:

- Increase the educational attainment of Arizona citizens by producing enough high quality university degrees for the state to be nationally competitive by the year 2020.
- Increase the prominence of the system’s research enterprise so that it can contribute to the knowledge economy and improve the quality of life in Arizona.
- Provide the educated workforce needed to fill shortages and to stimulate demand for higher paying jobs in Arizona.

ABOR developed four specific goals to accomplish these aims encompassing the areas of educational excellence, research excellence, workforce and community, and productivity. Those 2020 Vision goals are also provided on the inside back flap of this document. The four goals provided were established after ASU’s foundational documents, but those goals can be clearly mapped onto the ASU Goals Statement. The mapping of the 2020 Vision Goals to the 2006 ASU Goals Statement is provided in Table 1-1 (page 1-3).

To measure progress toward achieving these goals for Vision 2020, ABOR developed in 2010 a set of measures presented in a document entitled “The Arizona Higher Education Enterprise.” These measures of productivity, reproduced on the inside back cover of this document, are called the “Enterprise Metrics.” ABOR continually receives and review progress reports from each institution with respect to these benchmarks.

how does ASU measure up as a model of the New American University?

A decade into the transformation process, ASU can now take stock of progress towards becoming a model of the New American University. Such a self-assessment is consistent with the charge provided by President Crow to the Steering Committee for the Self-Study (discussed in the Background section), and also provides for the accreditation review a direct indication of how important these foundational documents have been in guiding the institution over the period since the last accreditation review. Assessing the success of ASU’s transformation process is possible using the measures provided in the ASU Goals Statement. The following discussion reviews the progress towards the goals using those measures as indicators.
Implicit in the measures related to the goal of “Access and Quality for All” is the assumption that the institution has the human, fiscal, and physical resources to achieve those metrics. The institutional structure at the time of the last accreditation review could not achieve the goals set for the New American University or ABOR’s 2020 Vision. At that time, ASU was a collection of isolated campuses with multiple administrations providing oversight of operations funded by multiple budgets. Resources for academic programs often were not shared efficiently between the campuses, and students experienced frustration and delays when they attempted to move from campus to campus. Academic quality across the campuses was uneven, and in some cases, academic programs were perceived as duplicative or inferior in quality.

Consistent with the goal and metrics comprising “Access and Quality for All,” ASU underwent a major strategic redesign effort for the entire institution in 2006 called “One University in Many Places.” This initiative set in motion a recasting of the institution as a single “school-centric” university, where all deans report directly to a single official, the Executive Vice President and University Provost, rather than to a campus provost. Academic operations were decentralized to deans, while non-academic operations were centralized for the entire institution rather than distributed across the physical campuses. The move gave much more autonomy to deans, with each dean responsible for academic excellence and student success within that school or college. With this reorganization, budget allocations were subsequently made to academic and administrative units rather than to individual campuses, as was done previously. Academic and administrative leaders were then evaluated by achievement of unit and institutional objectives, enhancement of student achievement, and the acquisition of new resources for their units.

With continuous assessment and improvements, that design plan has provided a unifying philosophy for the ongoing evolution of the institution. All physical campuses now share a common upper administration and organizational structure. The result is a single university which serves as a unified institution, providing a broad array of academic choices and student

---

table 1-1  the ABOR 2020 Vision Goals mapped onto the ASU Goals Statements and measures.
Arizona State University is advancing a new model for the American research university. We reject the notion that excellence and access cannot be achieved in a single institution, and are thus advancing the foundational model for the “New American University.”

President Michael M. Crow

life opportunities to a single student body. Many academic programs are offered at all physical campuses and online, while many other programs are centered on one or more specific campuses where those programs have access to the physical resources and the unique learning environments required for those programs. For example:

- The academic programs at the Polytechnic campus focus primarily on technology and applied science in an environment of classroom and laboratory spaces tailored to technical education programs.

- The West campus programs are primarily liberal arts and sciences programs with an intentional interdisciplinary focus, offered within an environment similar to a liberal arts college campus.

- The Downtown Phoenix campus programs focus heavily on health and human services, journalism, public policy, and criminology programs – all having a direct urban and public connection – using specialized facilities that are uniquely required for those programs.

- The Tempe campus focuses on research-intensive programs in the sciences, engineering, humanities, and the fine arts, as well as graduate education.

- Any college can offer programs through ASU Online to provide a rigorous curriculum with the flexibility and convenience of online access for students.

As shown in Figure 1-1, ASU’s physical presence spans the entire metropolitan Phoenix area. To enhance connectivity between the campuses, partnerships with local transit authorities have opened up opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to travel to and between the various sites with ease, including heavily discounted mass transportation passes. Bus routes have been strategically planned between sites. The recently launched Phoenix Light Rail Metro System has three intentionally planned stops along the line close to ASU locations at the Tempe and Downtown Phoenix campuses. Designated shuttle buses travel frequently and at regular intervals throughout the day between campuses. Each of these alternative transportation methods supports ASU’s commitment to access within ASU’s model of One University in Many Places.

For Goal 1, “Access and Quality for All,” several identified measures pertain to success in providing access to a growing state population. These measures include expanding university access to match Arizona’s diversification and growth, with a possible future enrollment of 100,000 students, and enhancing linkages with community colleges to expand baccalaureate degree production. In addition, each dean has enrollment goals managed by the Executive Vice President and University Provost to ensure that enrollment growth is strategic and predictable.

As evidence that the institution is moving toward increasing the number of enrolled students, ASU currently has over 73,000 undergraduate and graduate students pursuing degrees in 486 disciplinary and interdisciplinary areas of study. This reflects a student growth rate of about 30 percent in the past decade, somewhat larger than the nearly 25 percent growth in Arizona’s population. As seen in Figure 1-2, total student enrollment increased from 57,543 students in Fall 2003 to 73,378 students in Fall 2012.

ASU has expanded university access to match Arizona’s diversification and growth. ASU is a public university situated in a highly diverse state. According to the United States Census, the 2010 population of Arizona was 57.8 percent White (not of Hispanic origin); 29.6 percent Hispanic or Latino; 4.6 percent American Indian or Alaskan Native; 4.0 percent Black/African American; 2.7 percent Asian; 0.2...
percent Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders; and 3.4 percent persons of two or more races. A demographic study of census data conducted between 2004 and 2009 found that about one in seven Arizonans (14.7 percent) is foreign-born, and that about one in twelve (8.6 percent) is a military veteran. Arizona is also home to 22 federally-recognized Indian nations which collectively own and govern over a quarter of the land area of the state. In an advancement toward the measure of reflecting this ethnic diversity, ASU’s student enrollment profile now finds that 33 percent of its students are drawn from different ethnic and racial populations, roughly consistent with the demographics of Arizona. In addition, the student population contains an almost equal percentage of women and men in its undergraduate and graduate programs. This student ethnic/racial diversity profile has changed dramatically in the past 10 years. For example, while overall enrollment increased 27.5 percent, from 57,543 in Fall 2003 to 73,378 in Fall 2012, minority enrollment as a percentage of the total student population increased to comprise 33 percent of the student body. The international undergraduate student enrollment is at 3.9 percent (n=2,319); international graduate student enrollment is just over 20 percent (n=2,818). Figure 1-3 provides a snapshot of the diversity of the student population in Fall 2012. Additional detailed discussion of ASU’s commitment to diversity is found in the discussion for component 1.C below.

To expand baccalaureate degree production (both consistent with Goal 1 and one of the Enterprise Metrics), ASU has greatly enhanced its connections to local community colleges since the last accreditation. Arizona citizens have better access to higher education through selected undergraduate degree programs offered in conjunction with those colleges.

Partnership programs have been established with the Maricopa County Community College system (including all 10 campuses) and the other 12 independent community colleges around the state, offering students seamless transitions from two-year programs directly into baccalaureate programs at ASU. MAPP (Maricopa ASU Pathways Program) and TAG (Transfer Admission Guarantee) programs serve as tools for Arizona community college students seeking to complete baccalaureate degrees at ASU. Participation in either program requires students to sign a pathway agreement (committing them to a specified program of study), complete an associate degree with a 2.00 cumulative GPA or higher (4.00=A) or an AGEC (Arizona General Education Curriculum) with a 2.5 cumulative GPA or higher (4.00=A), and follow the prescribed pathway program (in a set time frame) in order to receive programmatic benefits. The benefits of such programs include: guaranteed admission into specific ASU degree programs, tuition incentives, and access to specific merit scholarships designated...
for transfer students. Since the MAPP and TAG programs began in Fall 2009, approximately 11,200 (unduplicated) students have entered this pipeline. As of July 2012, approximately 2000 MAPP/TAG students had enrolled at ASU.

The ASU Colleges initiative, with its first campus developed in Lake Havasu City in western Arizona, will provide another opportunity for higher education outside the metropolitan Phoenix area. In addition, the program in Lake Havasu City promotes strong relationships with local school districts and Mohave County Community College. The ASU Lake Havasu location, focusing exclusively on instruction of high-demand undergraduate education with lower tuition rates for interested students in the area, launched in Fall 2012.

ASU also participates in the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education’s Western Regional Graduate Program and Western Undergraduate Exchange program. These programs offer students in designated western states the opportunity to pursue specific educational programs (undergraduate and graduate levels) at ASU at a reduced tuition rate.

To further stimulate progress toward reflecting the economic diversity of Arizona and the region, ASU also has made major progress in delivering on its promise that no Arizona student be denied access to a college education based on ability to pay. ASU’s energetic progress over the past decade from a low-tuition, low-student-aid model to a funding model with moderate tuition and greatly expanded access to financial aid resulted in an explosive growth in economic diversity in its student enrollment. From FY2003 through FY2012, the number of low-income Arizona first-time freshmen increased from just 49 students to 963 students. In addition, Pell grant recipients (first-time freshmen) nearly tripled from FY2003 to FY2012, from 1,209 to 3,493 students. In FY2011, ASU awarded a record $894 million in all forms of financial aid to 60,518 students, with $921 million disbursed in FY2011-2012.

Another measure under “Access and Quality for All” relates to enhancing student development and individual learning to facilitate student success. The ASU Goals Statement provides two measures associated with academic program performance: improving freshman persistence, and raising the university graduation rate. Tremendous progress in the freshman persistence rate resulted from specific actions, as detailed in Chapter 3. A 77 percent persistence rate for the Fall 2003 freshman cohort increased to 83.5 percent by Fall 2010, a total of 6.5 percentage points higher. While not yet at the target of 88.5 percent stipulated in the Vision 2020 document, ASU has made significant strides in continued improvement and monitoring of the systems which have helped raise the persistence rate. In addition, the six-year graduation rate for the freshman cohort entering in 2006 was 56.8 percent, significantly higher than the 49.2 percent rate for the cohort that entered in Fall 1995. The 2006 cohort performance rate is now slightly better than the most recent national average for public institutions with acceptance rates comparable to ASU (54.9 percent for the 2004 cohort). A total of 18,045 baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral degrees were awarded in in FY2012, representing a 52.9 percent increase from 2002-2003 and an increase of 32.5 percent during the past five years, as seen in Figure 1-4. Reviewing all the measures for Goal 1, the level of success attained by ASU in advancing the
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**Figure 1-4** Total degrees awarded from AY2002-03 to AY2011-12. Also shown are the number of degrees awarded for white, minority and international students.
goal of “Access and Quality for All” during the past decade demonstrates tremendous progress toward the ambitious goals. This progress has drawn national attention, including ASU’s ranking of 7th for “social mobility” for 2012 by Washington Monthly in its ratings of “national universities”; the social mobility ranking is based on success in recruiting and graduating low-income students.19

The rapidly growing but strategically managed size of the student body, the increasing number of degrees offered, the improved persistence and graduation rates, and the growth in the ethnic and economic diversity of the student body are direct results of focused attention and strategic actions with regard to those measures. All these observations and statistics demonstrate that ASU has empowered a growing student body from all socioeconomic levels and from around the world to enter its doors and succeed in keeping with its goal of access and quality for all.

goal 2 – a national comprehensive university by 2012

Four measures were identified in the ASU Goals Statement for assessing ASU’s progress over the past decade toward the goal of being a national comprehensive university by 2012. Two measures represent ASU’s progress in becoming a leading center in scholarly activity, while the remaining two target enhanced research competitiveness of ASU and Arizona.

To advance excellence in its academic programs, ASU undertook a major academic restructuring to provide a singular and more cohesive definition of the academic enterprise within the construct of One University in Many Places. Out of this redesign, several important operational features emerged that established greater accountability for advancing excellence within the institution.

- In contrast to the situation at the time of the last accreditation review, all school and college deans now report to a single official, the Executive Vice President and University Provost, and are equally responsible for building the national caliber academic programs within their intellectual niches.

- The number of schools and colleges has evolved from 26 to 17 through a process of realigning and streamlining academic programs into single colleges. A list of the schools and colleges at ASU as of Fall 2012 is provided in Table 1-2. These realignments and reductions in administrative structures have greatly increased accountability and transparency of the institution for its students and constituents. For example, at the time of the last accreditation review, ASU had three education deans on different campuses with different reporting expectations and the infrastructure needed to support all three. Today, ASU has a single education college, the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, with a single dean responsible for building and maintaining programs across the university.

| Barrett, The Honors College |
| College of Health Solutions |
| College of Liberal Arts & Sciences |
| College of Nursing & Health Innovation |
| College of Public Programs |
| College of Technology & Innovation |
| Graduate College |
| Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts |
| Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering |
| Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College |
| New College of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences |
| Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law |
| School of Letters & Sciences |
| School of Sustainability |
| University College |
| Walter Cronkite School of Journalism & Mass Communication |
| W. P. Carey School of Business |

A number of academic units with their respective degree portfolios were merged into more intellectually synergistic units. Addressing the problems of the 21st century requires a more fluid, responsive organizational structure, where faculty with radically different skills and experiences can work together to advance understanding and solve problems in ways that have not been possible before. These new multidisciplinary schools and units expanded and stimulated faculty connections between the formerly separate units, resulting in greater breadth of the academic programs offered by those new schools.

Through this academic transformation, ASU has made remarkable progress in expanding its intellectual enterprise from one that is based primarily on traditional academic departments to one that, through structure and process, embraces interdisciplinary study at every level. Hence, in the last decade existing programs/departments have been
fortified and over 30 new schools have been formed. Examples are:

- School of Sustainability (a new university, college-level enterprise engaging many units throughout the university)

- New schools in the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts include:
  - School of Arts, Media, and Engineering
  - School of Dance
  - The Design School
  - School of Theatre and Film

- New schools in the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering include:
  - School of Biological and Health Systems Engineering
  - School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment
  - School of Computing, Informatics, and Decision Systems Engineering
  - School of Electrical, Computer, and Energy Engineering
  - School for Engineering of Matter, Transport, and Energy

- Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication

- The School of Letters and Sciences

- New schools in the College of Health Solutions include:
  - School of Nutrition and Health Promotion
  - School for the Science of Healthcare Delivery

- The Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, created through merging the Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education (FIGSE) with the College of Teacher Education and Leadership.

- College of Technology and Innovation

- New schools in the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences include:
  - School of Social and Behavioral Sciences
  - School of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies
  - School of Mathematical and Natural Sciences

- New schools in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences include:
  - School of Earth and Space Exploration
  - School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning
  - School of Politics and Global Studies
  - School of Historical, Philosophical, and Religious Studies
  - School of Human Communication
  - School of Human Evolution and Social Change
  - School of International Letters and Cultures
  - School of Life Sciences
  - School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
  - School of Social and Family Dynamics
  - School of Social Transformation
  - School of Transborder Studies

- New schools in the College of Public Programs include:
  - School of Community Resources and Development
  - School of Criminology and Criminal Justice

The reorganizing and merging of academic programs has not only led to greater intellectual synergy across disciplines, but has also facilitated the development of new bachelor and graduate degrees. Ten years ago ASU had an academic portfolio that included 100 bachelor degrees, 91 master’s degrees, and 48 doctoral degree programs. Today that portfolio includes 144 bachelor degrees, 147 master’s degrees, 8 professional doctorates, 77 Ph.D. degrees, 63 undergraduate certificates, and 47 graduate certificates. The growth in the number of degree programs, including the increased number of interdisciplinary degree programs (covered extensively in Chapter 3), has added to the comprehensive nature of ASU’s academic platform for students.

To enhance research competitiveness as an institution, ASU has greatly expanded the resources available for scholarly work. For example, substantial new research space has been added, including massive new buildings specifically devoted to research enterprise and an entirely new campus. Over 78 research institutes and centers have been established at ASU since FY2003 to bring together researchers from across disciplines to address society’s most pressing problems. Examples of new ASU interdisciplinary research institutes and centers include:

- The Biodesign Institute is an interdisciplinary research institute focusing on three major areas, including innovation in biomedicine and
healthcare, energy and the environment, and national security. The institute is housed in 350,000 square-feet of award-winning, state-of-the-art, LEED-certified buildings, which is the largest research infrastructure investment in bio-science-related research in the state of Arizona.

- The Global Institute of Sustainability (GIOS) is the center of ASU’s sustainability initiatives. The School of Sustainability opened in 2007. GIOS advances research, education, and business practices for an urbanizing world. Its School of Sustainability offers transdisciplinary degree programs focused on finding practical solutions to environmental, economic, and social challenges. The far-reaching value of these efforts have been recognized through major gifts to ASU: In 2004, Julie A. Wrigley contributed $15 million to ASU to establish GIOS, followed by an additional $10 million gift from her in 2007. The Rob and Melani Walton Fund of the Walton Family Foundation donated $27.5 million in 2012 to further studies and leader development in problems related to energy, water, urbanization, climate, environment, social transformation, and decision-making.

- The Flexible Display Center is an ASU-led venture in which academia, industry, and government actively collaborate to create a new generation of information displays that are flexible, intrinsically rugged, lightweight, ultra-thin, and low powered. The Center was initially awarded a $43.7 million, five-year grant from the U.S. Army in 2004 to develop an array of devices that will revolutionize both commercial and battlefield communications. The Army renewed this award in 2009 for another five-year period, and the Flexible Display Center has been cumulatively awarded over $100 million by the U.S. military.

- The Center for the Study of Religion and Conflict combines the expertise of one of the largest religious studies faculties at a public university with the expertise of faculty in the social sciences, humanities, natural sciences, and engineering to address the challenges of religion and conflict in a global age. The Center stimulates new research by bringing together faculty and students from across the disciplines, fostering cross-cultural exchange, and by creating links between the academic world and that of professionals, policymakers, practitioners, and religious leaders.

Research partnerships and collaborations with local, national, and global industries, as well as medical organizations, have been crucial to achieving research excellence and productivity. Examples of major partnerships established by ASU in the past decade include:

- The ASU-Mayo Clinic partnership, established in 2002, includes research collaborations and joint educational efforts in the areas of law/medicine, business/medicine, and nursing. In September 2011, Mayo Clinic announced the expansion of Mayo Medical School in Rochester, Minnesota to Arizona, creating a branch called Mayo Medical School – Arizona Campus. All medical students will complete a specialized master’s degree in the Science of Health Care Delivery granted by ASU, concurrently with their medical degree from Mayo Medical School. Collaborative research areas include biomedical informatics, metabolic and vascular biology, and cancer, with shared lab and office space on both ASU and Mayo Clinic Arizona campuses. Mayo Clinic faculty members also have appointments in ASU’s Biomedical Informatics department which is currently located at the Mayo Clinic-Arizona.

- The Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication is the headquarters for News21, an investigative reporting program funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. Major media partners that published all or part of the most recent News21 project, “Who Can Vote?” include The Washington Post, NBC.com, National Public Radio, The Center for Public Integrity, The Philadelphia Inquirer, El Nuevo Herald, and nonprofit investigative online sites affiliated with the Investigative News Network and New America Media, which represents ethnic media.

- The ASU-Translational Genomics (TGen) partnership in genetic and molecular research resulted in more than two-thirds of TGen’s faculty members submitting joint extramural grant proposals with ASU faculty and staff in neurogenomics, cancer and diagnostics, regenerative medicine, and biological database integration and modeling research. Other partner initiatives include the maintenance of a joint cluster supercomputer facility, shared educational programs, and TGen’s assistance in recruiting ASU senior faculty hires and internships for ASU students.
These partnerships are fertile ground for developing new technologies that address critical issues in Arizona and the region; in turn, those new solutions can be adapted to address problems beyond the Southwest. In 2003, ASU established Arizona Science and Technology Enterprises LLC (AzTE) to accelerate the rate of technology transfer from university research laboratories to the marketplace. The result has been new approaches to technology evaluation, product development, technology marketing, capital formation, industry relationships, licensing, and commercialization. In FY2012, ASU faculty members were issued 26 patents, signed 24 new technology licensing agreements, and launched 9 startups. During the fiscal year, a record total of 239 invention disclosures were filed with AzTE. The commonly used entrepreneurial metric, the rate of invention disclosures per dollars received in research funding, rose to 6.6 invention disclosures per $10 million of research funding.

Both graduate and undergraduate students are actively engaged in research and creative activity as part of their degree programs. In FY2010, 91 percent of undergraduate degree recipients participated in a research related or culminating capstone (case study) experience as part of their undergraduate degree; data collected in the spring of 2012 show that this number is again near the 90 percent mark. In FY2012, 2,175 undergraduate students engaged in research and 1,599 were supported by sponsored research funding.

The fruits of these efforts to enhance the research competitiveness of ASU and Arizona are illustrated by the successes achieved in advancing research in biosciences, advanced materials, earth and space exploration, flexible electronics, sustainability and renewable energy, urban systems design, national security, and education in the STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). Total research expenditures in FY2011 reached a record $355 million, an almost 190 percent increase from $123 million in FY2002. In FY2012, ASU sought more than $1.24 billion in proposals and received more than $315 million in awards, including $60.1 million in National Science Foundation (NSF) awards, an increase of over 100 percent from the $29.4 million NSF funding level of FY2002. According to recent NSF data, ASU was one of the fastest growing institutions among U.S. universities with research portfolios exceeding $100 million in expenditures during the five-year period from FY2006 to FY2010, achieving a ranking among the top 20 research universities in the nation without a medical school for total research expenditures. ASU is one of only a handful of institutions (which includes the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the California Institute of Technology, and Princeton University) to surpass the $200 million level in research expenditures without either an agricultural or medical school.

Consistent with assuming major responsibility for the economic health of its communities, ASU established the Office of the University Economist in 2005. The office oversees the Productivity and Prosperity Project (P3), whose research incorporates literature reviews, empirical evidence, and econometric analyses to better inform business and government leaders through reports and articles. Among the reports it has produced is “The Contribution of Arizona State University to the Arizona Economy, Fiscal Year 2009”, which showed that ASU has had a profound positive effect on Arizona’s economy:

The total impact of Arizona State University on Arizona gross product is estimated to have been $3.2 billion in FY2009. The total employment impact of ASU, including university employees and all other jobs indirectly induced, was 54,790 jobs. The total labor income associated with these jobs was estimated to be $2.3 billion.

In the long run, the economic benefits of university research accrue largely to consumers throughout the world in the form of lower prices and a greater variety of products available. But despite the generally global dispersion of these benefits, research at universities can have important effects on production and employment in the city or region in which the university is located. Local impacts include the attraction of industrial laboratories, the start-up of new high-tech businesses, and competitive advantages enjoyed by local businesses when their technology is advanced by university research.

In making an overall assessment for progress towards Goal 2, the evidence presented above demonstrates that ASU now matches well with the indicators used to assess progress toward becoming a national comprehensive university. With a large, modern, and extensive academic program portfolio, many programs have achieved national and international recognition, including transdisciplinary and more traditional academic programs. The research competitiveness of ASU has been significantly enhanced; in FY2011 ASU reached $355 million in total research expenditures, exceeding the target specified in the measures for this goal of $300 million in 2006 dollars (equivalent to $344 million in 2012 dollars). Additionally, as indicated above, ASU has had significant and lasting positive impacts on Arizona’s economy.
goal 3 – establishing national standing in academic quality and impact of colleges and schools in every field

With Excellence as a Core Value, ASU is motivated to remain focused as individuals and as an institution on performing at the highest level possible. Achieving excellence places demands on the quality of academic programs, support services, facilities, and resources. The mechanisms and processes the institution employs to address those demands are described in the subsequent chapters.

An assessment of how well resources have been utilized to achieve national standing for ASU’s programs and schools can, as above, be demonstrated most simply by the national and international rankings of the colleges and schools, the quality of the students who have selected ASU and their achievements, and the accomplishments of ASU faculty.

As an institution, ASU is frequently ranked among the best universities in the nation and the world by a number of different ranking organizations. Examples include:

- The “2012 Academic Ranking of World Universities” compiled by Shanghai Jiao Tong University, ranked ASU as 79th out of 1,200 higher education institutions worldwide, and 46th among the schools ranked in the United States. ASU entered the rankings in 2003, achieved top 100 status in 2006, and since then has moved up steadily each year.

- The Times Higher Education “World University Rankings”, using data supplied by Thomson Reuters, placed ASU 127th in the world in 2011-2012, applying measures of excellence from three core mission-focused elements of a higher education institution: research, teaching, and knowledge transfer.

- The Washington Monthly rankings for 2012 placed ASU at 45th of 281 “national universities”.

- U.S. News & World Report ranked ASU in the top tier of national universities from 2007-2012. It was ranked fourth among “Up and Coming Schools” in 2009, 2010 and 2012, and was ranked second for that category in 2011.

- The Princeton Review named ASU one of the “Best 377 Colleges” in the nation in 2013. It also named ASU one of the nation’s 50 “Best Value” public colleges and universities, calling ASU “a leading research institution and a dynamic public university” and commending it for its “outstanding honors college” and leadership in entrepreneurial education.

- In 2010, The Wall Street Journal ranked ASU graduates fifth in its survey of Top 25 Recruiter Picks. Additionally, ASU’s W. P. Carey School of Business and the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering were recognized as “top picks” by companies recruiting recent graduates.

- ASU has been recognized as a national leader in advancing an agenda of stewardship and responsibility for the future of the planet, including the following recent awards:


Rankings also provide insight into the regard with which ASU’s academic programs are held. Many ASU undergraduate programs are regularly ranked among the best in the nation. For example, U.S. News and World Report (2012) ranked the W.P. Carey School of Business 24th in the nation for undergraduate business schools. The same rankings placed Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering undergraduate program in the top 25 percent of ranked U.S. engineering programs where a doctorate is the highest degree. In 2008, the Herberger Institute for Design’s undergraduate Interior Design program was ranked 10th in the nation and fourth in the western region by America’s Best Architecture and Design Schools. U.S. News and World Report (2012) ranked the College of Public Programs’ School of Public Affairs graduate program 16th nationally among nearly 300 schools considered in the report and among the top 10 public institutions. Several of the programs in the School of Public Affairs were also individually ranked; City Management and Urban Policy ranked second, Public Management ranked eighth, Public Finance and Management ranked 18th, and Non-Profit Management ranked 23rd. On a broader spectrum, in 2012 Forbes Magazine placed ASU at 84th in its list of 100 of “Americas Best Colleges” based on student satisfaction with instruction, post graduate employment success, and four-year graduation rates, to name a few of the more prominent criteria.

Similarly, many of ASU’s graduate programs have also been ranked very highly. For example, according to U.S. News & World Report (2013 edition of “America’s Best Graduate Schools”), graduate programs in law, education, business, public affairs, and fine arts are listed among the nation’s best. ASU’s Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law was ranked the 26th best graduate law program. The Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College was ranked 16th among public graduate schools of education. Overall, the W. P. Carey School of Business is rated as one of the top five business graduate schools in the West and the only Arizona business school to make the top 50. ASU’s Supply
Chain Management program ranked fifth, along with its Information Systems program ranked at 13th. ASU’s School of Public Affairs (in the College of Public Programs) ranked 16th overall, while the school’s City Management and Urban Policy Program ranked second, its Environmental Policy Program ranked 10th, Non-Profit Management ranked 15th, Public Finance and Budgeting program ranked 16th, and its Public Management Administration ranked 19th.

The Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication has finished in the top 10 nationally for the past 10 years, including first-place finishes for the 2008-2009 and 2006-2007 academic years. The school has placed first in the intercollegiate broadcast competition two out of the past three years and three out of the past six years. The contest is judged by professional journalists.

As another measure of quality, many of ASU’s Ph.D. degrees were highly ranked in the National Research Council (NRC) assessment of doctoral programs, released in 2011. The NRC study identified the characteristics that best represent doctoral graduate quality across universities and Ph.D. programs nationally. ASU submitted data for 26 Ph.D. programs in broad fields defined by NRC (Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, Mathematics, Engineering, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and the Arts and Humanities). A number of ASU’s Ph.D. programs ranked highly and comparable in the NRC rankings to many similar programs for institutions in the Association of American Universities (AAU), as seen in Table 1-3. The highly-selective AAU universities are generally considered the leading institutions of higher learning in the country.

The New American University foundational documents assert that access can be accomplished without compromising student excellence. Thus, another way to assess excellence is through measures of the quality and accomplishments of students. Over the past decade, a record number of ASU students were honored with national scholarships and awards, including the enrollment of 440 National Merit Scholars in Fall 2012 and 256 National Hispanic Scholars in Fall 2012 (a 164 percent increase since 2003). In addition, since Academic year 2003-04, ASU has produced 171 Fulbright Scholars and five Truman Scholars. Other in-progress and graduating students from ASU also have been recognized for their excellence in the classroom and in their chosen fields. For example, since 2007, a total of 117 Graduate Research Fellowships have been awarded through a partnership with Science Foundation Arizona (SFAz). The SFAz Fellowships are highly competitive, state-level Ph.D. fellowships awarded to students enrolled in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) programs who are pursuing critical needs related to diagnosis and prevention of disease, sustainable energy and the environment, and information and communications technologies at the human interface.

In addition to these measures of national and international prominence for the institution and its students, a number of metrics can be used to assess the standing of ASU faculty members in their fields. Faculty members who have earned national and international recognition for excellence in scholarship and research have become a growing and significant presence within the ASU faculty during the past decade.

Since the end of FY2002, ASU has added 181 new major award recipients, professional society fellows, and national academy members. Recognitions include three Nobel laureates (one of whom passed away in 2012), four Pulitzer Prize winners (with a total of six Pulitzers), one MacArthur Fellow, 25 Guggenheim Fellows, 11 members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, nine members of the National Academy of Engineering, 11 members of the National Academy of Sciences, two members of the Institute of Medicine, four members of the National Academy of Education, three members of the National Academy of Public Administration; three members of the Royal Society, 65 American Association for the Advancement of Science Fellows, five Sloan Research Fellows, one Rockefeller Fellow, 114 Fulbright American Scholars, 21 IEEE Fellows, 19 Alexander Von Humboldt Foundation Research Prize winners, eight American Council of Learned Societies Fellows, and 19 recipients of Ford Foundation Fellowships. In addition, 86 outstanding young faculty have received major early career awards from the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, and Army. Eight received Presidential Early Career Awards for Scientists and Engineers.

Overall, this brief review of the national and international rankings of the colleges and schools, the quality of the students who have selected ASU and their achievements, and the quality and accomplishments of ASU faculty members provides substantial evidence that ASU has been successful in meeting the goal of establishing national standing in academic quality and impact for many fields of study at ASU. Many of its programs now consistently rank among the nation’s best in their fields and many have achieved international prominence. While some academic programs may not yet have reached that level of performance, assessments through the academic program review process described in Chapter 3 have indicated that all programs are advancing in quality.

**goal 4 – enhance local impact and social embeddedness**

ASU’s foundational documents paint a picture of an institution that assumes “major responsibility for the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Ph.D. programs</th>
<th>survey-based rank(S)</th>
<th>regression-based rank (R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anthropology</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin,</td>
<td>University of Florida,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yale University,</td>
<td>Brown University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bioengineering</td>
<td>University of Southern California,</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Florida,</td>
<td>Purdue University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biology</td>
<td>Ohio State University,</td>
<td>UCLA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Cornell University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemical engineering</td>
<td>University of Maryland,</td>
<td>University of Iowa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>Brown University,</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Florida,</td>
<td>Washington University in St Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil and environmental</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University,</td>
<td>Cornell University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering</td>
<td>University of Colorado at Boulder,</td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>University of Kansas,</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Nebraska at Lincoln,</td>
<td>University of Missouri,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Columbia University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer science</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin,</td>
<td>Yale University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering</td>
<td>Vanderbuilt University</td>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economics</td>
<td>Columbia University,</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin,</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington University in St Louis</td>
<td>John Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electrical engineering</td>
<td>Duke University,</td>
<td>University of Southern California,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown University,</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>University of Minnesota,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>english</td>
<td>Columbia University,</td>
<td>University of Oregon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanderbuilt University</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geography</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University,</td>
<td>UCLA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oregon,</td>
<td>University of California at Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geology</td>
<td>University of Oregon,</td>
<td>John Hopkins University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Virginia,</td>
<td>Northwestern University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duke University, USC</td>
<td>University of Florida,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td>Rice University,</td>
<td>University of Virginia,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yale University,</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown University,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-3  ASU programs ranking highly in National Research Council assessment of doctoral programs, with examples of American Association of University peer institutions having similarly-ranked programs. Comparative rankings are based on either the NRC “Survey-based (S)” rank or the “Regression-based (R)” rank, as listed.
economic, social and cultural vitality, and health and well-being of the community.” When coupled with the Design Aspirations, those statements have committed the institution over the past 10 years to profoundly deepen its relationships with its local and regional constituents. As a result, ASU now makes a significant impact on those communities on a daily basis through a huge array of initiatives embedded throughout the university.

The measures for assessing progress toward this goal include building new innovative partnerships, enhancing existing linkages between ASU and local and regional development groups, as well as with NGOs and governmental agencies focused on community development. Another measure focuses on investigating the sustainability of the region through directed research, while a final measure involves ASU in monitoring the progress of the region through the ASU Indicators Project.

Although linkages with the community are addressed more fully under the discussion related to component 1-D, here it is noted that, since FY2003, ASU has vastly increased involvement with its communities, serving their needs through mutually beneficial partnerships in the P-12 education system, business and industry, and government. An exemplar demonstrating ASU’s involvement within the community can be seen through “ASU Community Connect,” which serves as a conduit for students, faculty, and staff to engage in a myriad of opportunities within the local community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Ph.D. programs</th>
<th>survey-based rank(S)</th>
<th>regression-based rank (R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAU peer universities with comparable rankings</td>
<td>AAU peer universities with comparable rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial engineering</td>
<td>University of California at Berkeley,</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purdue University, Pennsylvania State University,</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials science and</td>
<td>John Hopkins University,</td>
<td>University of Minnesota,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University,</td>
<td>University of Michigan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Minnesota,</td>
<td>University of California at San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of North Carolina,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mathematics</td>
<td>Brandeis University,</td>
<td>John Hopkins University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Iowa,</td>
<td>USC, University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanical engineering</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University,</td>
<td>University of Southern California,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCLA, University of Iowa</td>
<td>University of Iowa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molecular and cellular</td>
<td>Tulane University,</td>
<td>Tulane University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biology</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physics</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University,</td>
<td>University of Iowa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>University of Missouri,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political science</td>
<td>Rutgers University,</td>
<td>University of Florida,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychology</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin,</td>
<td>University of California at Santa Barbara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan State University,</td>
<td>SUNY Stony Brook,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY Stony Brook</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public affairs</td>
<td>Ohio State University,</td>
<td>Harvard University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spanish</td>
<td>University of California at Berkeley,</td>
<td>Michigan State University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>SUNY Stony Brook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-3 continued
as well as connecting the community to ASU.\textsuperscript{39} ASU Community Connect offers resources, data, announcements, and connections in whatever area an individual might be interested in exploring: volunteer opportunities, lectures and events, outreach, etc.

The outcomes of ASU’s community outreach efforts are numerous, but a brief sample provides an indication of their impact and depth of embeddedness:

- ASU’s “contribution to the public good” placed it among the top 100 schools in Washington Monthly magazine’s 2012 national universities rankings. ASU placed 45\textsuperscript{th} in the rankings, up from the 2011 ranking of 132\textsuperscript{nd}. Universities throughout the country were rated based on their contribution to the public good in three categories: social mobility through recruiting and graduating low-income students; research that produces cutting-edge scholarship and doctoral graduates; and service that encourages students to give back to their country.\textsuperscript{39}

- Arizona State University was recognized in 2009 on the Magrath Award Honor Roll for The American Dream Academy, a program that offers instructional courses to parents. The American Dream Academy is a non-profit entrepreneurial unit within ASU’s Center for Community Development and Civil Rights. The Academy plays the innovative role of connecting the parents of marginalized, at-risk students to a major metropolitan research university that is involved in their communities and is in close proximity to their homes. Through its affiliation with the university, the program helps parent participants visualize and pursue the long-term goal of having their children acquire college degrees.

- Changemaker Central is a student-driven initiative that empowers students to apply their education, expertise, and passion for positive social progress and life-long civic engagement. The group tackles local and global challenges through collaboration, innovation, and diverse approaches to problem-solving.\textsuperscript{40} One of Changemaker Central’s pivotal projects is the 10,000 Solutions Project,\textsuperscript{41} an evolving experiment that leverages the power of collaborative wisdom to create a solutions bank. The 10,000 Solutions Project aims to see what can be accomplished when passionate people join a community that works together to build upon each other’s innovative ideas and create change.

- The 100 Cities Project, based in the Global Institute for Sustainability, brings policymakers and researchers together to apply urban remote sensing approaches to the problems of urbanization, the environment, and sustainability.\textsuperscript{42} Initiated in 1996, this research project is ongoing and driven by the needs of the community – locally and globally. Through this project, researchers seek to create meaningful partnerships with cities internationally. Among their goals are to develop models to understand urban development trajectories, and to develop an international network of urban data providers that can make urban sensing products and processes available to cities for planning and policymaking, and to disseminate and archive data and research.

Additional initiatives undertaken to strengthen and serve the communities around the region are many, including, for example, the Center for the Future of Arizona, the Decision Theater at ASU, Venture Catalyst at ASU SkySong, the Phoenix Urban Research Laboratory, and the Math and Science Teacher Initiative.

Another measure associated with Goal 4 called for ASU to undertake applied research in the critical and timely area of sustainability. ASU established the Global Institute of Sustainability (GIOS) as the hub of Arizona State University’s sustainability initiatives.\textsuperscript{43} Bootstrapped by the significant private contributions noted earlier, the Institute advances the design of innovative solutions to research, education, and business practices for an urbanizing world. ASU’s School of Sustainability, the first of its kind in the U.S., offers transdisciplinary degree programs focused on finding practical solutions to environmental, economic, and social challenges through education, research, business practices, and global transformation.

With more than half of the world’s population living in cities, GIOS operates on the premise that the key to global sustainability is making cities sustainable. The Institute places special emphasis on urban environments in research and education, particularly focusing on Greater Phoenix as an urban laboratory where solutions to water, energy, transportation, and livability are largely applicable to other rapidly urbanizing areas around the world. The Institute has identified the grand challenges of sustainability, advanced knowledge for applied practical solutions, created new tools for decision-making, and built global partnerships. Research at the school also helps prioritize and direct ASU’s own efforts towards sustainable practices.

The remaining measure for Goal 4 requires the institution to provide an objective and ongoing monitoring role for the region’s progress. ASU’s Morrison Institute for Public Policy developed the Arizona Indicators Project in 2007, a project that continues today.\textsuperscript{44} The project began in ASU’s Office of the President with the support of a number of community
partners and with the mission to guide and inform the development of the region by providing reliable data on 11 key indicators for the region: economy, public finance, education, innovation, sustainability, culture, health, human services, criminal justice, transportation, and demographics. Public servants throughout Arizona – city managers, legislators, and others – have benefited from the extensive and reliable reports generated by the project.

With the efforts described above, as well as those discussed below for component 1.D, ASU has met all the measures associated with the goal of enhancing ASU’s local impact and social embeddedness. Not content with that achievement, the institution continues to vigorously pursue and advance ASU’s activities in these areas.

To avoid repetition and improve readability, subcomponents 2 and 3 of this component are discussed together.

2. ASU's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.

3. ASU's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.

As noted above, the evidence for the final two subcomponents of this component for Criterion 1 also address components and subcomponents of Criterion 3 and Criterion 5 (in particular, components 3.A and 5.C).

With respect to subcomponent 2, the academic programs, services, and enrollment profile are monitored for consistency both with the foundational documents, as well as the responsibilities to the public interests vouchsafed to the institution by ABOR, as described in the discussions related to components 1.D, 2.C, and 5.B. With respect to subcomponent 3, the tremendous progress described above towards the ASU Goals Statement would have been impossible without strategic alignment of all the institution’s resources, particularly given the great financial stresses ASU experienced while undergoing a major enrollment growth period. The alignment of the strategic planning and budget priorities over the past decade with respect to both the foundational documents and the goals of the 2020 Vision statement are discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

summary for component 1-A: summing up ASU's progress toward becoming the New American University

Measured by the clear and ambitious metrics identified for the four goals stated in the ASU Goals Statement, ASU has advanced rapidly during the past decade toward becoming a model of the New American University, an innovative and transformative institution. (As noted earlier, the 2020 Vision Goals closely outline the ASU Goals Statement, so the review above also provides an indication of how ASU is advancing toward those goals.)

The self-assessment above, predicated in part by President Crow’s charge to the Self-Study Steering Committee, has documented areas where further progress is required. The open-ended nature of some of the measures provides a template for ongoing activity in the decade to come. (This will be seen more clearly in the discussion on page 49, where a description is provided of new goals as ASU moves forward.) Though not addressed directly in this assessment, the goals provided by the Enterprise Metrics also provide clear direction for the path forward to 2020. More to the point of the accreditation process, this overview has underscored how thoroughly the foundational documents have guided the institution towards transforming itself into a university that exemplifies the values espoused in those documents.

The centrality of education in ASU’s Mission Statement has led to the progress described above during a decade when tremendous financial stresses were placed on the university. As noted in the Background section, about 15 percent of ASU’s FY2013 all-funds budget comes through state appropriations. That percentage has steadily declined from about 37 percent at the time of the last site visit. As detailed in the Background section, ASU responded to this shift by increasing tuition revenue, targeted cost reductions focused on administrative and academic efficiency, and utilizing temporary sources of revenue. To achieve the level of performance described above with respect to the ambitious goals set over the past decade, ASU’s budgetary priorities had to be clearly aligned with and supportive of the mission of the university, as described further in Chapter 5.

B. the mission of Arizona State University is articulated publicly

The transformation of ASU into a New American University and its guiding mission have been articulated through publicly available and published documents, through the university’s website, and through other formats, including significant media coverage. This section will clearly illustrate how the mission has been publicly defined and will further demonstrate that these documents clearly explain the university’s emphasis, and the nature, scope, and intended recipients of its higher education programs.
1. ASU clearly articulates its mission through public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.

In 2002, a formal document created by President Michael Crow and entitled “A New American University: The New Gold Standard” was published as a means to communicate the mission, goals, aspirations, implementation strategies, intended constituents, and priorities for the institution as it began its transformation into the New American University. This document served, and continues to serve, as a public resource defining and guiding ASU. Since its original publication, the document has evolved to include updated iterations, PowerPoint presentations, videos, and a dedicated website encouraging exploration of ASU’s foundational documents.

The “New American University” website provides an in-depth look at the university’s Mission Statement and Design Aspirations, while providing additional resources to interested visitors worldwide.

The ASU Mission and Vision Statements, Core Values, and Design Aspirations are posted and presented prominently throughout the institution. The statements are readily accessible through the university’s website with links provided on the home page. Those documents are also displayed in campus facilities and in community venues, and they are available through a multitude of electronic media. Buses and shuttles used for transportation between campuses use “wrapped” banners to highlight elements of the mission statements. Billboards around the greater Phoenix area as well as the region present ASU’s standards while inviting readers to learn more. Finally, signage promoting the Design Aspirations is on display across the institution in buildings, hallways, offices, and elsewhere.

As social media has become a common method of information communication, ASU now conveys the institution’s mission and goals through a variety of electronic channels. ASU’s main webpage provides direct links to ‘MyASU,’ the ASU Mobile app, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, foursquare, ASU on iTunes U, and ‘ASU Alert.’ Each of these tools offers opportunities to connect with internal and external constituents around the globe, and to publicly promote ASU’s design aspirations using modern technology.

2. ASU’s foundational documents are current and explain the extent of the institution’s emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.

Arizona State University clearly articulates its commitment to, and emphasis on, high quality instruction at the undergraduate and graduate levels, research, scholarship, application of research, creative works, clinical services, public service, economic development, and cultural purposes through its website, other publicly circulated documents, and through a variety of formats and venues. ASU’s most current Five-Year Strategic Plan (FY2013-2017) includes the foundational documents and the ASU Goals Statement that articulate ASU’s mission and how it is to be accomplished. Published in January 2012, this document builds on the previous strategic plan (FY2008-2012) by incorporating institutional successes over the past decade. This document is available for viewing or for download from ASU’s website as well as from the ABOR website. Data from ASU’s past five years of performance (2007 through 2012) also is depicted in reference to goals for the future five years (2013 through 2017), including links to the Enterprise Metrics, in updates required by ABOR. The Goals Statement on the inside cover of this report has provided internal metrics for ASU during most of the period since the last accreditation review. A new set of internal metrics, consistent with the 2020 Vision goals and Enterprise metrics, have been developed for moving toward 2020 and incorporated into a new Goals Statement for 2020. Those metrics are discussed previously on page 49.

3. ASU’s foundational documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

As the largest of three public research universities in Arizona, ASU’s foundational documents underscore its dedication to serving all the people of Arizona. ASU’s Mission Statement and Core Values articulate a new approach to measuring the success of a higher education institution by simultaneously (1) pursuing excellence at the highest levels of achievement in scholarly and creative endeavor while (2) providing access to all students in Arizona capable of college-level work, and (3) also assessing itself by how it impacts the communities it serves. These foundational documents continue to place great expectations on ASU from the people of Arizona. As a result, in addition to providing evidence that ASU satisfies the expectations of the Higher Learning Commission with respect to the Criteria for Accreditation, the Self-Study process at ASU and this Self-Study Report have served to provide a “report card” for the people of Arizona on the success that ASU has had in meeting the expectations generated by its foundational documents.

summary for component 1-B

As illustrated by the numerous examples provided above, and throughout this document, ASU articulates its Mission, Vision, Goals, and Core Values through a variety of approaches to faculty, staff, and students, and to the public. Many more examples could be cited, but the evidence provided clearly demonstrates...
that the content of the foundational documents of ASU are articulated transparently and published in ways that reach the various constituencies served by ASU in Arizona, the region, and the global community.

The task of building a university “measured not by who we exclude, but rather by who we include” has served as a polestar for ASU during the past decade. ASU realizes this ideal in many ways, not the least of which is a steadfast commitment to building a university environment that not only reflects diversity in numbers but embraces diversity as a core value of the institution.

Although diversity has always been an important tenet of ASU, the transformation to a model of the New American University increasingly sharpened the focus on diversity. In 2006, Executive Vice President and University Provost Elizabeth D. Phillips appointed a Diversity Council with representation from across the university to lay out a diversity plan that would encapsulate the many programs currently in place and provide a strategic framework for future activity. The resulting document, “Building Blocks for Success through People, Programming, and Policies,” became the framework through which ASU has progressed since that time. The Plan lays out strategies by which ASU can continue to educate and implement programs and policies that foster an inclusive educational environment. The Plan also created an Office of Equity and Inclusion in the Office of Human Resources that works with students, faculty, and programs to reinforce strong principles and practices.

According to ASU’s Diversity Plan, diversity is defined in terms of representation and inclusion. Representation reflects the extent to which our students, staff, faculty, and administrators proportionately reflect the regional and national populations served by our public institution. Inclusion encompasses empowerment and voice among all members of the university community in the areas of scholarship, teaching, learning, and governance. We recognize that race/ethnicity and gender historically have been markers of diversity in institutions of higher education; we further believe that diversity includes additional categories such as socioeconomic background, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, veteran status, nationality, and intellectual perspective.” The sections that follow will demonstrate how diversity is exemplified throughout the institution by its students, faculty, and staff, and by academic programs and co-curricular initiatives.

1. ASU embraces and addresses its role in a multicultural society.

a talented and diverse student body

ASU is committed to enhancing the representation of students from diverse cultures and backgrounds, and also has a long history of creating and supporting academic programs and organizations that support learning and living in a diverse community. As noted earlier, an overview of ASU’s 2012 student profile reveals the following facts: 50 percent of ASU’s undergraduate and 51 percent of graduate students are female; 32.5 percent or 23,877 are students of color (35.1 percent undergraduate, 21.5 percent graduate); international graduate student enrollment is at 20.1 percent, and undergraduate is at 3.9 percent. This growth in diversity represents a significant change over the last decade (Figures 1-5 and 1-6). Reiterating the analysis above to underscore the progress made, in 2003, 22 percent of the student body represented ethnic/racial minority groups; today that percentage has grown to 33 percent. That minority students accounted for over 70 percent of the growth in total ASU student enrollment between 2003 and 2012 demonstrates the results of the University’s extraordinary commitment to fully addressing the diversity of the State of Arizona and the nation.

The Hispanic population constitutes Arizona’s largest and fastest-growing minority population component. Similarly, the single largest component of ASU’s minority enrollment growth is in Hispanic students. The number of Hispanic students has grown from 6,649 (11.6 percent of total) to 12,880 (17.6 percent of total), a 93.7 percent increase (from Fall 2003 to Fall 2012). The number of American Indian students remained stable at 1,184 (2 percent of total). The number of African-American students grew from 2,005 (3.5 percent of total students) to

Arizona State University's commitment to inclusivity is central to its mission as a New American University and is evident throughout its diverse and talented community. 

President Michael M. Crow
3,491 (4.8 percent of total), a 74.1 percent increase. Finally, the number of Asian students grew from 2,757 (4.8 percent of total) to 4,108 (5.6 percent of total), a 49.0 percent increase.

Student persistence and graduation rates constitute another way to measure the success of ASU’s commitment to minority students. ASU’s first-time, full-time freshman persistence rates have increased from 77 percent for the 2002 cohort to 83.5 percent for the 2010 cohort. The persistence rates of ASU’s minority first-time, full-time freshman are similarly strong, and ASU continues to put in place systems to facilitate retention (Figure 1-7). These strategies will be discussed more fully in Chapter 3.

ASU statistics on degree production also highlight the university’s general success in helping ensure that minority students are not only recruited to ASU but
that they also complete their degrees. As Figure 1-8 indicates, the number of degrees awarded to minorities has continued to increase dramatically over time. The percentage increase in the degree productivity of ASU's minority student population is not only keeping pace with the non-minority and international student populations, but also is moving forward at a faster rate. The success of ASU's efforts at promoting multiculturalism and diversity through its Core Value of Access has attracted national attention. The Condition of Latinos in Education: Fact Book 2008, published by Excelencia in Education, ranked ASU 24th among the top 25 colleges and universities enrolling Latinos during the 2006-2007 academic year. The university also was ranked 24th for awarding bachelor’s degrees to Latinos and 17th for awarding engineering bachelor’s degrees to Latinos during the same period. ASU consistently ranks high in the number of degrees awarded to underrepresented minorities according to 2012 data from the National Center for Education Statistics, published in Diverse: Issues in Higher Education magazine. In mathematics, ASU ranks first in the nation for doctoral degrees awarded to Hispanics for the second year in a row, and third in the nation for number of degrees awarded to Asian Americans in business. The number of Native Americans awarded master’s degrees in social sciences ranked second in the nation. For Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians and total minorities awarded baccalaureate degrees, ASU ranked in the top five in architecture, law, communication and journalism, education, engineering, interdisciplinary programs, and others. In all, 107 of ASU’s programs ranked in the top 20 in the nation for graduating ethnic minorities, including 25 programs that ranked in the top five.

According to the most recent data available, when compared to other peer institutions in the Association of American Universities. ASU ranks quite favorably in the production of degrees for various constituency populations at all levels. Table 1-4 displays the national ranking of ASU in degree production for AY2010-2011 among those institutions for various student ethnic and racial groups. Of this group of leading public and private research universities in the United States and Canada, ASU ranks first in bachelor’s degree production for Hispanics and Native Americans and first in master’s degree production for Native Americans. ASU is in the top five for master’s degree production for Hispanics as well as for both professional practice and research doctoral degrees for Native Americans. The university also ranks in the top 10 for production of doctoral-research degrees for Hispanics. Significantly, ASU ranks in the top 40 percent of these 63 leading public and private research universities in minority degree production in all categories other than professional doctoral degrees for African American and Asian Americans.
diversity of faculty and staff

Fair and equal hiring practices enable the body of faculty and staff employees at ASU to reflect the diversity of Arizona and its student body. ASU has made important commitments to increase the diversity of its faculty and staff and to provide programs to help minority employees be successful.

ASU achieved gains in the ethnic diversity of its faculty and staff during the past decade. Although the percentage of minority employees, as a percentage of total ASU employees, remained solid at 25 percent from FY2003 to FY2011, the number of Hispanic employees grew from 937 to 1,131, a 20.7 percent increase. The number of Asians employed by ASU grew from 455 to 715, a 57.1 percent increase. The number of ASU African-American employees grew from 300 to 333, an 11 percent increase.

Diversity in the tenured and tenure-track faculty ranks also reflects ASU’s commitment to a diverse workforce. Women make up 35 percent of the professoriate, and ethnic/racial minorities make up 28 percent of the professoriate. Of the minority faculty, Hispanics make up 38 percent, Asian Americans compose 44 percent, and African Americans make up 11 percent.

In summary, ASU is seen to embrace diversity and inclusion in its foundational documents, and has put the ideals of those documents into its practices.

2. ASU’s processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

The success noted above in enhancing the diversity of ASU’s faculty, staff, and students provides a measure of how effective ASU’s programs, processes, and activities have been at addressing the needs of all groups. Reviewing those programs, processes, and activities provides a sketch of how that effectiveness has been achieved.

diversity-focused academic and co-curricular student programs

ASU provides a comprehensive set of academic programs and co-curricula to meet the needs and interests of a diverse student population. ASU’s commitment to educating a diverse student body includes a related commitment to offering programs and places for these students to grow. As discussed more fully in Chapter 3, ASU has over 380 undergraduate and graduate degree programs that specifically focus on diversity-related areas of study, such as a B.A. in African and African American Studies, a Ph.D. in Transborder Studies, a B.A. in Religious Studies, a Ph.D. in Gender Studies, an undergraduate certificate in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies, and a graduate certificate in Immigration Studies.

student activities and programs

ASU supports a host of programs that serve students from a range of backgrounds. Exemplars include:

- The Disability Resource Center (DRC) establishes eligibility, determines accommodations, and offers services for qualified students with disabilities. The center serves as an information hub and support center for ASU students, with offices on all four campuses.

- The Special Advisor to the President for American Indian Affairs coordinates outreach efforts to the state’s 22 Indian tribes, promotes Native American student recruitment and retention, and helps coordinate and assist Indian-related programs on and off campus. The current leader, Ms. Diane Humetewa of the Hopi Nation in Arizona, received her bachelor’s degree in 1987 and her law degree in 1993 from ASU.

- Student and Cultural Engagement seeks to provide all students, including multicultural, biracial, and multiracial students, access to services designed to assist them in their pursuit for academic success. All students are encouraged to become involved in the traditions of our university. Each campus has multiple opportunities and offices working together to support student involvement in campus life.

- The Pat Tillman Veterans Center, a 3,340 square-foot facility located in the lower level of the Memorial Union on the Tempe campus, provides a single point of contact for ASU veterans and their dependents, bringing together academic and student support services to promote a smooth transition from the military and provide assistance for veterans’ benefits, deployments, information, and referrals. The Center also provides a place where veterans can gather for study groups and social activities.

- The LGBTQA Services (where the acronym connotes Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender, Queer and Questioning Students and their Allies) works to sustain an environment of respect, compassion, and equity for all, and to foster an inclusive and affirming academic and campus environment for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning students.
This list only touches the surface of how the institution works to welcome and empower students from all backgrounds and orientations. In total, the ASU Student Organization Resource Center website lists 70 student groups addressing cultural, ethnic, or international student interests, six student groups identified as serving the needs of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community, 52 student religious or faith groups, and many others.53

**minority faculty and staff programs and activities**

Minority faculty members and staff employees have a variety of resources to support their professional growth and development. Examples include:

- The Chicano Latino Faculty and Staff Association (CLFSA) was founded in the fall of 1970. CLFSA’s mission is to enhance the welfare of all residents of Arizona and to promote the education and advancement of the Chicano/Latino community.60
- Formed in 1994, the organization Ubiquity serves ASU staff and faculty concerned with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender issues.61
- University Career Women provides opportunities for professional and personal development and advances the status of, and improves the environment for, women at ASU.62

**service to ASU’s diverse external communities**

In addition to the various activities and organizations described above for ASU faculty, staff, and students, ASU also is committed to providing services that support the diverse external communities that look to it to promote issues critical to their well-being.

- The Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law provides legal services to minority communities. For example, the Indian Legal Clinic provides free legal services to Arizona Indian tribes and Indians, as well as training on such issues to law students.64 The Immigration Clinic at the law school provides free legal services on immigration issues.65 The Indian Legal Program of the Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law conducts a Native American Law School Admission Program to help prepare Native American college students for the law school admission’s process.66 Students meet with law school admission staff to discuss the personal statement, the LSAT admission exam, grades, and resumes.
- ASU’s Office of Public Affairs annually holds a Tribal Government Leadership Forum to bring together outstanding, respected leaders who share their experience, stories, and wisdom with new and current generations of tribal government leaders.
- The Chicano Research Collection in the ASU library, established in 1970, responds to the academic needs of both Chicano students and faculty in higher education. The collection obtains works by and about Mexican-Americans in the United States, placing those materials in a separate library collection as a central resource for ASU faculty and students. The collection also is available as a major resource for the communities served by the university.
- Upward Bound is a federally funded, college-preparatory program that serves high school students who are low-income and/or who will be the first in their families to earn four-year college degrees.66 Upward Bound’s mission at ASU includes assisting students with graduating high school, entering college, and earning baccalaureate degrees. A parallel Veterans Upward Bound Program is designed to meet the needs of veterans for improving their academic skills in English, reading, math, and computer literacy. The program offers free instruction, assists with financial aid and scholarship applications, and directs veterans to Veterans Administration services.67

**summary for component 1-C**

Consonant with its foundational documents, ASU has demonstrated commitment to diversity in all aspects of university life and recognition of the critical importance of diversity in the region it serves. By offering a welcoming and empowering learning environment over the past decade, ASU has substantially increased the diversity profile of its students. Moreover, these students are highly engaged and are demonstrating strong success in academic performance and degree completion. The institution has also advanced the diversity of its faculty and staff. These strides are the result of intentional efforts to reflect the multicultural society that ASU serves. It is noted here that these strides have taken place despite changes in state and federal laws that have the potential to influence ASU’s diversity. For example state laws related to the status of undocumented immigrants, federal laws that have prohibited students who lack legal immigration status from receiving any federally-funded student financial assistance, and Proposition 300 adopted by the people of the State of Arizona, created even greater barriers for such students to pursue higher education at ASU.68 Despite these laws, and because the university works continually to provide a respectful and supportive educational environment, ASU continues to grow and thrive as a highly diverse community supportive of its students, faculty, and staff.
Beginning in 2002, the extensive transformation of ASU into a New American University has been guided by a foundational model of creating “an egalitarian institution committed to academic excellence, inclusiveness for a broad demographic, and maximum societal impact.” In the following section, evidence will confirm ASU’s commitment to the public good through its quality educational programs, its engagement with external constituencies and communities, and the central role its educational responsibilities play in the execution of the institution’s not-for-profit mission.

1. ASU’s actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role ASU serves the public, not solely itself, and thus entails a public obligation.

Arizona State University is committed through its actions and decisions to serving the public good, and this goal takes primacy over other concerns. As one of only three state universities in one of the fastest growing states in the country, ASU provides regular public access to high quality educational, cultural, and informative opportunities through seminars, workshops, and exhibitions, to name a few, to the external community. Examples of such opportunities:

- **ASSET (Arizona School Services through Educational Technology)** is part of Eight/KAET, ASU’s public television station. ASSET serves as an educational liaison to students, educators, parents, and the community, by providing innovative educational technologies that enrich lives through quality programming, outreach efforts, and services that educate, inform, and inspire.

- A seminar series in the W. P. Carey School of Business’ Department of Finance brings together students, faculty, and industry professionals on a regular basis to offer participants a chance to learn about state-of-the-art research, an opportunity to discuss ideas, and a chance to provide feedback regarding all things financial. These seminars are free and open to the public.

- The ASU Art Museum serves as a laboratory for thinking about and enjoying art in innovative ways. Named “the single most impressive venue for contemporary art in Arizona” by *Art in America* magazine, the museum is an integral part of ASU’s Herberger Institute of Design and the Arts. Open to the public, it serves a diverse community of artists and audiences through innovative, interdisciplinary, educational, and contemprarily relevant programming.

Beyond these types of outreach activities, ASU demonstrates its commitment to the public good through a variety of exceptional educational opportunities open to the community, including lectures discussing recent discoveries in science and technology, workshops and seminars in humanities research, and exhibits promoting artistic and creative design. These events bridge the ASU community to the larger local, state, national, and global communities. The public has the opportunity to enrich its understanding of the world while discovering resources offered by a university the caliber of ASU. Examples of some of these opportunities are:

- The ASU Origins Project is a transdisciplinary initiative that explores the most fundamental questions: who we are and where we came from. Each year, the Origins Project hosts international workshops gathering the world’s top researchers from a variety of fields to consider and raise the profile of origins-related issues. The project also hosts events for the public that bring outstanding scientists and public intellectuals – such as Stephen Hawking, Richard Dawkins, Craig Ventor, Steven Weinberg, and Frank Wilczek – to present their ideas, views, and work at the frontiers of science to overflow crowds.

- ASU’s School of Music, within the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts, hosts a variety of public concerts throughout the year that bring visitors from across the region to campus. The annual Contemporary Music Series aims to present the highest quality performances of experimental music in the Phoenix metropolitan area and incorporates public lectures and discussions along with musical concerts. Its Lyric Opera Theatre presents four or more productions, both musical and operas, each academic year.

ASU has a physical presence not only within the metropolitan area surrounding its campuses but also around the state and the globe. Arizona sites and programs outside of the physical campuses serve residents in communities all over the state, including:

- Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College offers 33 different site programs around the state. The signature component of the iTeachAZ
professional teacher preparation program is the Senior Year Residency, where teacher candidates spend a full-year student teaching in a partner school district. The iTeachAZ sites range from the far northeast corner of the state on the Navajo Reservation to sites on the Mexican/American border to the south, as well as throughout Maricopa County.

• The Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law responds to society’s needs by embedding faculty and law students in the community. The College offers 10 fully-staffed clinics throughout the state that serve people who would not otherwise be able to retain legal representation.

• ASU Colleges at Lake Havasu City is an example of an external constituency (the Lake Havasu City community) joining forces with ASU to address the need for higher educational opportunities in rural parts of Arizona. ASU Colleges at Lake Havasu City began offering courses for high-demand academic programs in Fall 2012 to students within the Lake Havasu City area at a lower tuition rate than other ASU campuses ($6,000 versus $9,720 for in-state students per year) but with the same high academic quality ASU’s other campuses provide.

• The ASU Washington Center, located on Dupont Circle in Washington, D.C., serves as a resource and a venue for high-level exchanges between national policy makers, opinion leaders, and ASU students, faculty, and staff. It represents ASU’s vision for maximizing innovative partnerships with governmental and public agencies, private-sector organizations, and non-government entities as part of a focused effort to address the most pressing challenges related to education, health, economic development, the environment, social justice, and many others.

• Arizona State University’s SkySong exists to make an economic impact in the local, state and international markets by driving economic development and global enterprise. Specifically, ASU SkySong helps grow the economy by launching and accelerating new companies and promoting use-inspired research, in collaboration with local communities, state government, and business partners.

2. ASU’s educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests. As a public university whose operations are completely overseen by a governing board, ASU’s primary responsibilities are directly devoted to the educational programs it delivers. The centrality of educational responsibilities is seen in the mission statement for ABOR:

The Arizona Board of Regents is committed to ensuring access for qualified residents of Arizona to undergraduate and graduate institutions; promoting the discovery, application, and dissemination of new knowledge; extending the benefits of university activities to Arizona’s citizens outside the university; and maximizing the benefits derived from the state’s investment in education.

The centrality of that educational responsibility outlined in ABOR’s mission statement pervades ASU’s foundational documents, academic programs, research and creative activities, and strategic planning, as shown by the evidence presented throughout this Self-Study Report.

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

community outreach

Consonant with the Design Aspiration of being socially embedded in the communities it serves through mutually beneficial partnerships, ASU has hundreds of community outreach programs in over 170 locations, as shown in Figure 1-9. Over 700 outreach opportunities are offered by over 120 different units within ASU. Some of the outreach performed by ASU faculty and students include K-12 schools, advisory boards of non-profit and for-profit businesses, health care facilities and hospitals, Native American organizations and governments, family organizations, and more.

ASU’s outreach efforts impact the region in many ways, including education, the economy, human rights, sustainability, technology, quality of life, and others. The efforts occur through, for example, the Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law’s Advocacy Program Against Domestic Violence, the Consumer Advocacy Protection Program, and the Indian Legal Clinic. Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College provides a Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST), Family Science Nights, and the Herberger Young Scholars Academy Camps. The College of Technology and Innovation provides High Altitude Chamber Trainings and Academies for Elementary and High School Students, and also runs an Advanced Technical Training Center. All these outreach efforts and institutes serve ASU’s constituents in the community.
As mentioned, ASU also serves the community through participation on advisory boards and non-profit boards of directors, extended learning and community education programs, speakers' bureaus, and centers and institutes. Examples of some ASU initiated community centers include the Center for Community Development and Civil Rights, Nurse-Managed Health Centers, and the Lodestar Center for Philanthropy and Non-Profit Innovation.

The university also operates a number of research centers that examine issues and policies important to the ASU community and beyond. Some of these centers include:

- The Center for Indian Education serves as a research and resource center in the field of American Indian, Alaskan Native, and indigenous education and related fields at local, state, national, and international levels. The center also provides research-related services to indigenous nations and to the ASU community of students, staff, and faculty.⁷⁶

- The Hispanic Research Center performs basic and applied research on a broad range of topics related to Hispanic populations, disseminates research findings to the academic community and the public, engages in creative activities and makes them available generally, and provides public service in areas of importance to Hispanics.⁷⁷

- The Center for Urban Innovation is the focal point for research on urban affairs in the School of Public Affairs and the College of Public Programs, improving the quality of life in neighborhoods, cities, and urban regions by promoting innovation in governance, policy, and management.⁸⁰

- The Decision Center for a Desert City was established in 2004 by the National Science Foundation to advance scientific understanding of environmental decision-making under conditions of uncertainty. "DCDC II," launched in 2010, is poised to expand its already extensive research agenda, further engage the policy community, and forge stronger ties between knowledge and action. This second phase will lead to fundamental knowledge about decision-making from three interdisciplinary perspectives: climatic uncertainties, urban-system dynamics, and adaptation decisions.
In addition to the centers and institutes that serve ASU’s constituents, ASU also has a strong relationship with community colleges throughout the state. In recent years, ASU has streamlined the pathways for community college students to transfer to ASU, as noted earlier. These pathways allow advisors and students to understand course equivalencies and to chart a path for students to easily transition from the community colleges to ASU.

Since most of its graduates remain in Arizona, ASU understands that alumni engagement is a significant indicator of institutional quality and is a powerful tool to engage the institution’s constituencies. In 2005, the Alumni Association conducted a major assessment of alumni demographics and interests. In response to that assessment, the Alumni Association undertook a number of initiatives that have positively affected the programs, budget, and number of dues-paying members of the association.81

- The Arizona State Young Alumni (ASYA) program was launched in 2010 with the intention of engaging alumni under the age of 35. This program offers a number of social, career, and community service programming events. ASYA now has affiliates in Chicago, Houston, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and New York City, as well as in Arizona.

- In addition to ASYA, the Alumni Association has strengthened its chapter and club network. There are now 86 chapters, clubs, and international connections (an increase of 6 percent since 2011 and 133 percent from 2003) in a number of geographic locations throughout the United States as well as in 18 around the globe.

- The Alumni Association increased circulation of ASU Magazine to 327,431 (up 6 percent from FY2011). Since 2007 the magazine has received 50 writing, design, and overall excellence awards.

**ASU is responsive to its communities and constituencies**

To encourage one-to-one engagement with the people it serves, ASU encourages student, staff, and faculty community involvement through service clubs, organizations, and student internships. Faculty and staff are strongly encouraged to engage with community boards, associations, and commissions in self-selected areas of expertise or interest. From local chambers of commerce to the East Valley Partnership, and the West Valley Arts Council to Valley Leadership, ASU faculty and staff serve as representatives on over 50 community boards and commissions from across the metropolitan Phoenix area. For students, University Service Learning offers classes that give academic credit for working in a variety of areas of involvement in the community. Service learning empowers student interns to respond to community needs in such areas as: agriculture, business, health care, legal aid, teaching, and more, as discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

Many of the over one thousand student organizations across all four campuses serve the local communities and also address global issues. As but one example, the Association for India’s Development—ASU Chapter, includes a body of volunteers drawn from the ASU student population, including volunteers working with grassroots organizations in India in areas such as women’s empowerment, stewardship of natural resources, and health promotion.82

ASU’s service to local communities is far-reaching and profound. For instance, “Camp Sparky,” an organization of ASU students who volunteer with at-risk youth in the greater Phoenix area, inspires fifth-graders to love learning and have confidence in their future success.83 Through unique learning experiences, students are encouraged to pursue higher education. In addition, Camp Sparky members develop commitment, awareness, leadership, and a sense of community. Another example, the ASU chapter of the international organization Habitat for Humanity, is committed to serving the local community. The primary mission of the student organization is to raise funds to build houses, to volunteer to build houses, and to educate the community about the persistent lack of quality affordable housing. These two organizations and many others provide opportunities for ASU students and faculty to become involved in and make a positive impact on the community.

Outstanding service by faculty members and staff employees is recognized with the President’s Medal for Social Embeddedness, which acknowledges those who have worked in departmental, interdepartmental, or transdisciplinary teams demonstrating excellence in embedding ASU in the social and cultural fabric of surrounding communities. A recent example of a recipient of the President’s Medal is the Community Action Research Experiences (CARE) Program, which builds community capacity through collaborations between student researchers from diverse disciplines, faculty researchers and non-profit community organizations. Their work addresses questions that help these community organizations increase their effectiveness. In the past three cohorts (2009, 2010, 2011) alone, 33 action research projects (representing over 6,000 hours of student researcher investment) were completed for 24 community agencies which provided services to thousands of individuals and families across Maricopa County. Students developed skills in action research, community engagement, and leadership, while community agencies increased their evidence-based practice and effectiveness.

This community service is also highly visible and recognized at the national and international levels.
ASU has received recognitions and awards for its achievements in connecting with communities and serving their needs. A few of those listed here:

- ASU was honored with the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll in 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2012, the highest federal recognition a university can receive for commitment to volunteering, service learning, and civic engagement. In 2010, ASU made the Honor Roll with Distinction, as more than 15,000 students engaged in 400,000 hours of community service.

- ASU’s commitment to higher education as an agent for positive social transformation earned the university a coveted place in the Change maker Campus Consortium by Ashoka, a global non-profit network of more than 2,500 social entrepreneurs. With this award, announced in September 2010, ASU joined an elite group of institutions noted for social entrepreneurship, including Babson College, The New School, Tulane University, and Duke University.”

- In 2010, ASU launched the Community Changemaker Competition as part of the ASU Innovation Challenge. Five student teams were awarded $2000 each to develop projects that address local needs in partnership with organizations including The Improviders Association, Stand Up for Kids, and the National Auto Body Council.”

- In 2010, ASU launched the Sanford Inspire Program (SIP) as part of a five-year, $18.85 million investment from entrepreneur and philanthropist T. Denny Sanford. ASU, in partnership with Teach for America, made major substantive changes to the way ASU recruits, selects, and prepares future K-12 teachers.” By 2012, ASU became among the top 20 large universities in the country contributing the greatest numbers of new graduates to Teach for America’s 2012 teaching corps.”

- Internships within the community serve as a benefit to both ASU students as well as the organizations within the community in which they serve their internships. On average, 56 percent of all students participate in an ASU-affiliated internship during their academic career.

- Since 2003, ASU has supported United Way with an annual faculty and staff campaign. Held each fall, ASU strives to raise funds that support and ultimately address and solve the complex issues facing Arizonans.

In 2011, ASU ranked number two in its category for overall giving and number one in Leadership givers ($1,000+). In 2012, ASU raised over $670,000 during the campaign. This annual drive gives faculty and staff an opportunity to support community needs in an enthusiastic and spirited manner.

intercollegiate athletics

Due to their huge popularity, intercollegiate sports provide numerous connections between ASU and the communities it serves. Arizona State University is a member of the PAC-12 athletic conference, one of the leading intercollegiate athletic conferences in the nation. ASU has over 450 student athletes performing in 21 sports, listed in Table 1-5. Tens of thousands of fans from all the teams of the conference interact throughout the region to watch their students vie in events covered by national media. ASU has prospered during the past decade in the PAC-12 and has been recognized nationally as having one of the leading college athletics programs. In 2008, ASU was named the top athletics program in the U.S. by Sports Illustrated.

Beyond the competition arena, ASU intercollegiate Athletics makes a concerted effort to connect ASU athletes as representatives to the community through outreach efforts, such as:

- “Sun Devils Serve”: ASU’s student-athletes and Intercollegiate Athletics’ staff engage in several community service projects.” Sun Devils Serve has hosted events to provide disadvantaged children with hats, blankets and gloves, as well as holiday meals to needy families.

- “Sun Devil Club”: For a ten-dollar membership fee, Sun Devil Club members attend special events, learn about the latest Sun Devil Athletics’ news, and support ASU Athletics.
This organization is directed and supported by the community, and it provides another strong connection for the public to engage with ASU."

- “Sparky’s Kids to College” exposes kids from around Arizona to a college experience – attending an athletic event. The goal is to introduce kids to college, particularly children who may not have other opportunities for exposure to higher education and all that it has to offer."

**ASU provides community access to unique resources**

ASU has an extensive library system that contains a number of resources available to the public. The libraries’ mission statement expresses ASU’s commitment to access, both within the ASU community and the public, to its virtual and physical environments."

There are accessible facilities on all four campuses, and although the libraries are open to the public during their operating hours, an expanded array of online resources are also available. Additionally, ASU has specialized libraries in law, music, and science/engineering.

ASU boasts 35 publicly-available museum and gallery collections.

Examples of the museums and galleries include the Arizona Historical Foundation, Bill and Judy Schaefer Sports Hall of Fame, Deer Valley Rock Art Center, Old Main, Kerr Cultural Center, For Our Eyes Public Art Community Outreach Gallery, the Nelson Fine Arts Center, and the Memorial Union Art Collection to name a few.

Gammage Auditorium, an architectural landmark and home for the arts, calls ASU home but is a community gem. ASU Gammage is among the largest university-based presenters of performing arts in the world, connecting communities through artistic excellence and educational outreach. The venue is an historic hall designed by internationally renowned architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, and offers world class cultural events open to the public and ASU community alike.

Finally, each of ASU’s campuses provides a recreation facility open to students, faculty, staff, and the surrounding communities. With intramural sports, exercise facilities, fitness and wellness programming, and social activities, the campus recreation centers provide fitness and health-beneficial activities to community members.

**summary for component 1-D**

ASU’s Mission Statement demands that the institution must assume “major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and health and well-being of the community.” As the only public university in the country’s fifth-largest metropolitan area in one of the most diverse states in the nation, ASU’s commitment to serving the public good is exemplified by the educational, cultural, and informational resources and activities it makes available to the communities it serves. This commitment – embodied in countless activities of ASU’s faculty, staff, and students—has been widely and publicly recognized through numerous honors and awards for community engagement and service, as well as for the value placed on ASU by the communities it serves.

**going forward – ASU goals for 2020**

Many of the goals in the ASU Goals Statement were set with 2012 as the year of achievement, and this chapter has provided an assessment of the progress towards those goals. Looking ahead, new and ambitious goals for even higher levels of performance have been identified as ASU continues to strive toward being a model of the New American University. While the university’s Mission and Core Values remain the same, the new goals ASU Goals for 2020 directly build on the accomplishments of the 2012 goals and mesh with the ABOR 2020 Vision targets and Enterprise Metrics.

The ASU Goals for 2020 are:

**goal 1: become a global center for interdisciplinary research, discovery, and development**

- become a leading center for interdisciplinary science and technology discovery and development
- become a leading center for discovery and scholarship in the social sciences, arts and humanities
- enhance research competitiveness to more than $700 million in annual research expenditures by 2020
- augment regional economic competitiveness through research and discovery and value-added programs

**goal 2: access and quality for all**

- expand university access to match Arizona diversification and growth
- improve freshmen persistence to 88.5 percent
- enhance university graduation rate to 67.5 percent as soon as possible
• develop ASU culture that represents a commitment to quality and community outreach

• enroll 100,000 online education and distance students

• enhance linkages with community colleges so as to expand baccalaureate degree production to national leader

• enhance student development and individual student learning to national leader

**goal 3: establish national standing in academic quality and impact of colleges and schools in every field**

• attain national standing in academic quality for each college and school

• attain national standing in the value added to our graduates in each college and school

• become the leading university academically (faculty, discovery, research, creativity) in at least one program subject within each school or college

**goal 4: enhance local impact and social embeddedness**

• enhance linkage to local and regional social and community development groups

• establish/develop/enhance linkages and partnerships with local, regional and national NGO’s, governments and public agencies, and private sector firms with a focus on community development

• undertake applied sustainability research that impacts the social, environmental and economic evolution of the southwest

• provide an objective and ongoing monitoring role for the region’s progress

In the near future, metrics for these new goals will be refined, but these updated goals already show that ASU is not content to maintain the status quo or to rest on its achievements. Rather, consistent with its Mission and Vision Statements, the university continues to advance its reputation for excellence, to continue increasing access for Arizona’s diverse and growing population, and to further enhance the positive impact of the institution on the communities it serves.

**summary for chapter 1: mission**

The evidence and arguments assembled above demonstrate that ASU has met and exceeded expectations for Criterion One, “Mission.”

As part of its transformation into a New American University, ASU adopted a new Mission and Vision Statements, a set of Core Values, and a list of Design Aspirations to direct the transformation. These foundational documents have guided all strategic planning undertaken during the past decade since their adoption. The mission of ASU is clear and publicly articulated, centering on educational excellence, access, and impact. During the past 10 years, ASU has made great progress toward the goals and aspirations that are part of its stated mission to provide a high quality, accessible education, to increase student diversity and the number of degrees granted, to enhance research capabilities, and to significantly and meaningfully engage in the economic, social, and cultural fabric of the communities it serves.

Furthermore, assessed by the transparent and publicly-articulated measures provided in its Goals Statement, ASU has established itself as a model for the New American University. Moving forward, ASU has established a new set of ambitious goals – targeted for completion in 2020 – that build on the success achieved in meeting the ASU Goals Statement. The success over the past decade in achieving the goals set for 2012 bodes well for achieving these new targets.

**strengths**

• ASU has clear, publicly articulated mission documents that permeate the culture of the university and inform its strategic goals and actions.

• ASU has made great progress toward the goals of access and quality for all, becoming a national comprehensive university, establishing national standing for its programs, and enhancing its local impact and social embeddedness.

• ASU has increased diversity in the university to more closely reflect the demographics of Arizona in its faculty, staff, and student populations.

• ASU has engaged in service to its communities, the state of Arizona, the nation, and the world especially through mutually beneficial partnerships.
ASU’s success at strategic planning and progress toward achieving the targets spelled out in the ASU Goals Statement bode well for accomplishing its newly-developed 2020 goals.

challenge

Arizona’s economy, public perception, and culture of inclusivity suffered repercussions from the enactment of several state laws dealing with contentious immigration issues (e.g., Proposition 300 and SB 1070). ASU remains committed to increasing diversity of its student body and has initiated actions to affirm its commitment to admitting and enrolling qualified students.
ASU Community Connect: http://community.asu.edu/index.php
Changemaker Central at ASU: http://changemaker.asu.edu/
Web site for 10,000 Solutions Experiment at ASU: http://10000solutions.org/
Global Institute of Sustainability: http://sustainability.asu.edu/index.php
Arizona Indicators Project: http://arizonaindicators.org/
A New American University PowerPoint Presentation from 2009: http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu/docs/New_American_University_Feb09.ppt
Videos presenting A New American University – Rise to the Challenge: http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu/blog/category/videos/
Dedicated website for A New American University: http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu/
“A New American University”: http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu/
ASU’s home page: http://www.asu.edu/
A copy of the five-year strategic plan for ASU (FY2012-2016) is located at the ABOR website: http://uoia.asu.edu/sites/default/files/StrategicPlans/ASU2010StrategicPlan010111.pdf and a summary of the major goals of the plan can be found at this link http://president.asu.edu/about/asuvision
ASU’s Diversity Plan: http://diversity.asu.edu/asudiversityplan
ASU Club and Organization Search tool: http://asu.orgsync.com/search
Chicano/Latino Faculty & Staff Association: http://www.asu.edu/clfsa
Ubiquity – ASU’s Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and transgender Faculty and Staff Organization: http://www.asu.edu/assn/ub
University Career Women: http://www.asu.edu/ucw
Indian Legal Clinic: http://www.law.asu.edu/Ilc/IndianLegalClinic.aspx
ASU Indian Legal Program: http://law.asu.edu/Default.aspx?alias=law.asu.edu/ILP
TRIO Upward Bound: https://students.asu.edu/trio/ub,
TRIO Veterans Upward Bound: https://students.asu.edu/trio/vub
EiiHt Educational Outreach at ASU: http://asset.asu.edu
W. P. Carey School of Business, Department of Finance Seminar Series: http://wpcarey.asu.edu/finance/news-events/seminar-series.cfm
ASU Art Museums: http://asuartmuseum.asu.edu/
TeachAZ program at ASU: http://education.asu.edu/content/teachaz
More information about the Clinical Programs of the Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law can be found at: http://law.asu.edu/clinics
The Colleges@ASU in Lake Havasu City: https://havasu.asu.edu/
ASU Community Connect: http://community.asu.edu/index.php
ASU Center for Indian Education: http://center-for-indian-education.asu.edu/
ASU Hispanic Research Center (HRC): http://www.asu.edu/clas/hrc/
The Urban Innovation Center at ASU: http://urbaninnovation.asu.edu/
ASU Alumni Association: http://alumni.asu.edu/
Association for India’s Development: Tempe Chapter: http://tempe.aidindia.org/cms/
ASU Camp Sparky: http://campsparkey.club.asu.edu/
ASU named Changemaker Campus for commitment to positive social transformation: https://asunews.asu.edu/20100825_ashoka
ASU’s Innovation Challenge: http://innovationchallenge.asu.edu/about
Sanford Education Project: http://education.asu.edu/content/sanford-inspire-program
ASU News on Teach for America Ranking: https://asunews.asu.edu/20120910_tfa_recruits
ASU Sun Devil Club: http://sundevilclub.com/
ASU Sparky’s Kids to College Program: http://www.thesundevils.com/genre/skctc.html
Information about ASU’s libraries can be found at: http://lib.asu.edu/
Information about ASU’s museums, galleries, and collections, including news and events, operating hours, and locations can be found at http://museums.asu.edu.
ASU’s Gammage Auditorium: http://www.asugammage.com/
chapter 2
criterion two. integrity: ethical and responsible conduct
Arizona State University fulfills its mission ethically and responsibly.

Resources provided to Arizona State University by students, donors, foundations, the State of Arizona, and the nation are invested in the institution with the understanding that ASU will exercise responsible stewardship of those resources and use those resources ethically for the public good. To that end, ASU has established procedures and practices to ensure open decision-making and ethical behavior by its leaders, faculty, staff, and students in keeping with the expectations for a community of scholars. These guiding principles and practices are very visible, publicly accessible, and thoroughly integrated into the operations of the institution so that they continuously serve as the basis for the maintenance of a culture that values fairness, honesty, inclusion, and transparency in all activities and areas of the university.

In a 2007 letter to the University Council, President Michael Crow emphasized the University’s commitment to ethical and responsible behavior:

> Arizona State University is committed to observing the highest standards of ethical behavior so that Arizona’s citizens may have confidence in the integrity of ASU… It is expected that each ASU employee will carry out his or her responsibilities with honesty and integrity and will act in compliance with applicable university policies and governmental laws, rules, and regulations.

The foundations of ethical behavior are built on the basic principle that individuals should treat each other with respect. Within a community of scholars, mutual respect is essential for promoting learning, protecting the free exchange of ideas, and enhancing the soundness of conclusions and outcomes that are reached. In interactions with outside individuals and entities, mutual respect inspires greater confidence that the university is working in pursuit of the public good, and that no member or group within the university seeks to improperly profit by taking advantage of the trust implicit in the relationship. Furthermore, safeguarding the welfare of the members of the community by providing a welcoming, safe, and sustainable environment is imperative for the community to thrive. At ASU, this mutual respect is expected regardless of an individual’s race, color, religion, national origin, citizenship status, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, disability, or veteran status.

ASU has developed a large and integrated system of policies and processes that create, advance, and enforce a publicly transparent atmosphere of mutual respect, both within the institution and among those with whom the institution interacts. These policies have been approved by the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) as part of its oversight of the institution (see section C below). Groups of university policies that are closely related to each other have been compiled into openly available policy manuals that address aspects of all functions of the institution; these policy manuals are listed in Table 2-1. These manuals are maintained by the University Policy Manuals Group within the Office of the General Counsel; all manuals may be accessed online by anyone. For public records purposes, University Archives maintains printed versions of the manuals available for public inspection and responds to requests for those printed materials from the public. In accordance with standard usage at ASU, a specific university policy will be referenced in this Self-Study Report by the three-letter acronym shown in Table 2-1, then by the specific policy number within that chapter (e.g., ACD 204-01). In addition to their presence on the web, these policies are communicated to students, faculty, and staff through various modes, such as orientations, training programs, and short courses. As a direct result of these communication efforts, knowledge of the existence of these policies is pervasive in the institution.

Processes that assure compliance, sanction breaches of policies, and provide for the redress of grievances are also built into these policies. Many breaches of policy may be dealt with at the unit supervisor level,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>title</th>
<th>acronym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic affairs</td>
<td>ACD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital programs management group</td>
<td>CPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental health and safety</td>
<td>EHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities management</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial services</td>
<td>FIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>ICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property control system</td>
<td>PCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police department</td>
<td>PDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking and transit services</td>
<td>PTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchasing and business services</td>
<td>PUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research and sponsored projects</td>
<td>RSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff personnel</td>
<td>SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student services manual</td>
<td>SSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but the severity of the infraction dictates how the infraction is handled. To assist in handling employee grievances, the university also provides the University Ombudspersons program to assist in the informal resolution of problems.

Additionally, the Office of Equity and Inclusion assists units and individuals in addressing diversity issues that arise, as well as providing consultation and training.

University policies are continuously reviewed and updated to ensure consistency with applicable laws and best practices in higher education. An illustrative sample of policies related to mutual respect and a safe work environment is provided in Table 2-2: examples there include policies related to promoting academic freedom and shared governance, as well as prohibitions related to conflicts of interest and nepotism. As will be discussed in this chapter, these policies have been observed and implemented with integrity, and they have led to improvements in the quality and security of the workplace for all employees. For example, the progress of the institution in its pursuit of greater diversity and a welcoming environment over the past decade discussed in the previous chapter has been promoted as a direct result of many of the policies like those in Table 2-2.

As detailed in subsequent sections, the policies and processes in place at ASU include mechanisms for addressing grievances and concerns. Independent of those processes, the ASU Hotline provides members of the ASU community and of the public a means to report concerns about safety and about any suspicion of non-compliance with laws, regulations, and policies applicable to ASU. To protect confidentiality, a third-party vendor provides the ability to report incidents by either telephone or online. The service preserves anonymity, is available at any time and any day of the year, and is available in most languages. When the vendor is contacted, notification is made to University Audit and Advisory Services (UAAS), which then assigns an appropriate investigator. If the vendor determines that the contact concerns an emergency, the ASU Police Department is contacted immediately. After the investigation is completed, UAAS reviews the investigation report to determine what action is required to resolve and/or close the incident. Approximately 24 incidents in FY2012 were handled by the ASU Hotline, most of which have involved employee-relations issues (6), policy matters (4), and a variety of other issues like harassment, wage issues, and privacy violations. These incidents uniformly have been referred to the appropriate supervisor and were then closed when properly addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>policy area</th>
<th>examples of asu policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-discrimination, anti-harassment, and non-retaliation</td>
<td>ACD 401, SSM 304-03, SSM 304-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflicts of interest</td>
<td>ACD 204-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nepotism</td>
<td>ACD 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared governance</td>
<td>ACD 111, ACD 112, ACD 114, ACD 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic freedom</td>
<td>ACD 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethical conduct of business relationships</td>
<td>PUR 211, SSM 501-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty and academic professional ethics</td>
<td>ACD 200 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe work environment</td>
<td>In addition to those provided in the Environmental Health and Safety Manual (EHS), ACD 126 (background checks), ACD 809 (fire safety), FAC 204 (fleet safety), ICA 407 (pregnant student-athletes), PDP 203-03 (sexual assault), PUR 211 (contractors), RSP 207 (scientific diving), SPP 814 (workplace violence), SSM 104-02 (disruptive individuals), SSM 104-04 (sexual assault)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug-free campus</td>
<td>ACD 119, ACD 122, ICA 405 (student athletes), PCS 216 (property control), PDP 202-03 (alcohol sales, services), RSP 103 (principal investigators on sponsored projects), RSP 213-02 (certification of drug-free workplace), SPP 321 (vehicle operation, repair), SSM 106-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smoking</td>
<td>ACD 804, SSM 801-01, FAC 204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2 Examples of Policies Related to Promoting a Culture of Mutual Respect and Accountability, as well as a Safe Working Environment.
The following discussions and evidence demonstrate that ASU meets the expectations of the HLC with respect to the criterion for “Ethical and Responsible Conduct,” using the components for that criterion. Evidence presented includes descriptions and usages of the policy documents listed in Table 2-1, policies from ABOR, and other applicable state and federal laws. As an integrated system, these policies provide assurance to the public that ASU monitors its activities in ways that preserve its integrity and that, when such occasions arise, missteps or failures are addressed appropriately. By providing data on how well these protocols have worked, the evidence given here will show that these procedures have established a strong system of fair and ethical practices that have provided the foundation of a culture of responsible conduct and mutual respect within the community of scholars at ASU.

A. Arizona State University establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions.

ASU’s financial functions are conducted ethically and responsibly.

Arizona State University adheres to an integrated system of financial policies, procedures, and best practices based on Arizona statutes, ABOR policies, and industry standards to ensure the safeguarding of assets and the accuracy of financial reporting. The system relies on employees throughout the organization who are vetted and screened during recruitment and who receive ongoing training and support while employed. Additionally, financial processes and transactions are regularly audited by internal and external professional staff, and the University actively addresses and resolves noted weaknesses. The entire system is monitored and regularly updated in response to changing standards and specific incidents.

This comprehensive set of policies, procedures, and best practices establishes a framework for ethical and professional behavior in all areas of the organization. These policies are documented in the Financial Services Manual (denoted as FIN, as noted in Table 2-1)\(^1\). This set of policies addresses all financial functions at ASU dealing with accounting services, student business services, treasury services, accounts payable, and tax compliance and reporting.

Established policies make certain that individuals purchasing or otherwise using funds within the institution do so ethically, responsibly, and in keeping with best practices in higher education. ASU policies also demand similarly ethical behavior from those entities with which the university does business. The Purchasing and Business Services Manual (PUR) establishes ASU policy for the acquisition of goods and services and the university’s relationships with suppliers. The manual contains a section (PUR 100) that explicitly addresses ethical behavior of employees in business relationships, consistent with the best practices identified by the National Association of Educational Procurement. For example, these policies address relations with the public (PUR 101), provide a Code of Ethics for those engaged in the acquisition process (PUR 102), address conflict of interest (PUR 103), and prohibit garnering improper benefit from the person’s employment with the institution (PUR 104, PUR 105, PUR 108).

The Purchasing and Business Services Manual also codifies who has the authority to sign contracts (PUR 202), what purchases are prohibited (PUR 203), “green” purchasing standards (PUR 210), and the values-based standard for business relationships with suppliers (PUR 211). (Of note in the latter policy is that, because of ASU’s commitments to sustainability and mutual respect, ASU considers suppliers that do not share ASU’s goals of sustainability and social justice as ethically-challenged.) The Purchasing and Business Services Manual also contains the requirements for justifying sole source transactions (PUR 303-02), guidance on the preparation of specifications and response evaluation criteria (PUR 303-03), purchasing card policies (PUR 304-04), public competitive solicitation requirements (Sections 305 and 306), the justification required to waive competition (PUR 306-02), the purchase of live animals (PUR 401-01), the purchase of hazardous materials (PUR 401-02), and the purchase of radioactive materials (PUR 401-03). The Manual also has policies on information provided to suppliers (PUR 501-01), the university’s diversity business program (PUR 503-01), requirements for handling federal awards or subcontracts in excess of $550,000 (PUR 503-02), and contacts with vendors (PUR 504).

A system of policies and controls also provides ethical and responsible stewardship of the capital resources of the institution. Provisions on how that capital property is to be purchased, controlled, inventoried, transferred, and sold are fully addressed in the Property Control System Manual (PCS)\(^2\). Practices that have been codified within that control system include policies on accepting property donations to the university (PCS 206), requirements for protecting personally owned equipment (PCS 214), use of the university’s surplus property program (PCS 1000), trade-in of equipment (PCS 1006), return of equipment loaned to the university (PCS 1007), and the sale of university
property to a retiring or exiting employee (PCS 1009). Arizona Board of Regents Policy 5-303 specifies that disciplinary action is required for those individuals involved in the “theft or misappropriation of property or of services on the university campus or at a university sponsored activity; known possession of stolen property on the university campus or at a university-sponsored activity.”

Those who contract to deliver services to ASU are required to follow both institutional policies and applicable state laws. The Office of the General Counsel provides guidance on requirements necessary for compliance with Arizona law. Every contract must include statements adhering to non-discrimination, conflict of interest, arbitration, record-keeping, and agreement with conditions regarding any failure by the State Legislature to appropriate funds. Additionally, ASU requires contracts to include its provisions for dispute resolution, legal worker requirements, and prohibited business operations. Where appropriate, additional conditions are applied to contracts dealing with confidentiality, indemnification, trademark usage, and compliance with restrictions on weapons and explosives.

Knowledge of these policies and controls is communicated through appropriate training programs for employees, both at hiring as well as in continuous training designed to update skills and expand their knowledge base. University employees in financial positions receive ongoing training and professional development opportunities within the institution and through attendance at professional conferences and workshops. In-house training opportunities related to financial management include such topics as financial controls, cash handling, financial system transactions and reconciliations, use of the financial data warehouse, payroll processing and reconciliation, and travel policies and processes. Further guidance related to internal controls is available in the form of detailed design questionnaires units may use to craft new processes as the need arises.

Additionally, the senior business officers from all academic and administrative organizations meet regularly to provide an opportunity to discuss financial controls and related processes. Information regarding financial certification, financial controls, cash handling, and purchasing cards is available online and certification must be achieved by the employee prior to receiving access to these systems; the same website also provides examples of desk manuals for positions with financial responsibilities. Training on the university’s Code of Ethical Business Conduct Program is provided through the university’s Office of Research Integrity and Assurance by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative. This training is specifically for employees who affect or could affect the outcome of a contract.

Professional and standard setting organizations, including National Association of College and University Business Officers, Governmental Accounting Standards Board, Association of Government Accountants, Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the American Institute of CPAs, serve as an important source of guidance with policies, procedures, and best practices based on generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), government auditing standards, legislation, and industry standards related to management’s responsibility to maintain an adequate system of internal controls.

Since the quality of performance of this system is directly related to the integrity of the persons responsible for undertaking the actions governed by these policies, individuals are hired for finance-related positions based on established job descriptions and qualifications. Discussion of the specifics of the hiring process is provided in the section below on ethical and responsible conduct in personnel functions. Positions are advertised to recruit a pool of qualified applicants, and applicants are vetted through interviews, references, and background checks. Finalists in positions with responsibility for financial transactions are required to complete a background check that includes fingerprinting.

This system of continuous training has developed a well-qualified cadre of professionals within the institution. For example:

- Many staff members in the Financial Services department hold advanced degrees, are Certified Public Accountants, or are Certified Governmental Financial Managers. Both professional designations are evidence of technical expertise, adherence to ethical standards, and ongoing professional education.

- Purchasing staff members belong to a number of national professional associations, including playing leadership roles in those organizations. These associations include the National Association of Educational Procurement, the Institute for Supply Management, the National Institute of Governmental Procurement, the National Association of Purchasing Card Professionals, and the National Property Management Association. Purchasing staff members attend meetings of these professional associations and remain connected via their respective internet list servers.
The university has had only three directors of purchasing in its entire history; all three were elected President of the National Association of Educational Procurement at some point in their careers. The current director of purchasing is a founding member of the Leadership Group, an organization acknowledged as comprised of and recognized by their peers as the 35 most innovative procurement professionals in the nation.

At ASU, accountability is the responsibility of any employee who authorizes or conducts a transaction, enters or approves data into the financial system, reconciles accounts or works on budgets, or reports on financial data. To assess the status of the University's financial and internal control responsibilities in ASU’s decentralized environment, a comprehensive certification form has been developed to support executive management’s assurances made to the University’s external auditors. The certification is mandatory for all financial administrators in dean's or vice president's offices. It replaces the cash attestation and supplemental disclosure requirements from prior years. Deans, vice presidents, and senior business officers certify compliance with policies and procedures in general and to key policies specifically, and they report all known instances of fraud, violations of Arizona or federal laws and regulations, as well as internal control deficiencies. This statement is an important tool for raising awareness and emphasizing the importance of financial controls, and it may well be adopted as a standard best practice in higher education.

The institution’s financial controls environment is regularly subjected to outside review and audit. The State of Arizona’s Office of the Auditor General (OAG) annually audits ASU’s financial statements and the university’s compliance with Circular A-133. Internal audits are conducted by the University Audit and Advisory Services department and the Arizona Board of Regents internal audit staff. The Director of the University Audit and Advisory Services department and the Board’s Chief Audit Executive report functionally to the Board of Regent’s Audit Committee and meet regularly with the committee to present internal audit reports and to develop audit plans. Additionally, the university maintains a Financial Controls unit within the Financial Services department to perform financial reviews, to assist departments with process improvement, to investigate financial improprieties, and to facilitate education.

A set of ASU policies (ACD 123, SPP 801) provide guidance as to how breaches of expectations are addressed; sanctions can range from an informal reprimand up to and including dismissal from the institution and criminal prosecution. In assessing how well these processes are working, a number of observations provide evidence that these policies and controls are effective at ensuring ethical and responsible behavior. For example:

Since 1989, Office of Naval Research (ONR) Contractor Procurement System Reviews of ASU procurement functions have resulted in no negative findings or actions against the institution. The annual Property Control System Analyses by OAG have resulted in no negative findings or actions against the institution.

As noted above, OAG annually audits ASU’s financial report in accordance with accepted auditing standards. (All ASU annual financial reports since FY1998 are available online.) Additionally, the OAG audits the compliance of the State of Arizona with the U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133; ASU is included in the A-133 audit. From FY2002 through FY2007, the statewide audit identified no issues specifically related to any ASU operations. The A-133 reports from FY2008 to FY2010 expressed concerns with payroll processing, most often at the department/unit level, following the implementation of a new human resources and payroll system, PeopleSoft, in July 2007. The initial rollout of the complex system, and the extended period of training needed to bring units up to speed with that system, resulted in payroll errors. ASU implemented recommendations in those audits and has continued to review and refine policies and training to improve the accuracy and accountability of the payroll system at all levels, significantly improving the error-free rate. As reported in the most recent A-133 report (for FY2011), ASU complied in all respects with applicable compliance requirements for major federal programs included in the scope of the audit. The A-133 report indicates prior year recommendations have been fully corrected, which is evidence of ASU’s successful resolution of the previously reported payroll processing deficiencies. The report includes a single new recommendation to strengthen review of Title IV adjustments required when a student withdraws from classes, which ASU has taken corrective action to resolve.

The Purchasing Card program is reviewed by both the Purchasing Card Administration Office and by the Financial Controls division of ASU.
Financial Services. Since the program began in 1996, almost $350 million has been spent through more than a million transactions. Fraudulent transactions are rare, and when identified, the involved employees are terminated and recommended for prosecution, while steps are taken to recover the loss.

- JP Morgan, the purchasing card issuer for the three Arizona universities, considers the three university purchasing card control programs to be exemplars for higher education.

In summary, the robust system of policies and controls and the high level of integrity required for those individuals implementing the processes have made certain, and ensure for the future, that ASU’s financial functions are conducted ethically and responsibly.

**ASU's academic functions are conducted ethically and responsibly.**

The central role of faculty members and academic professionals in creating a culture of mutual respect within a community of scholars has led to the articulation of policies which define expectations for ethical and responsible conduct for them. (Chapter 3 discusses the array of academic programs offered at ASU and how those programs are delivered.) The policies for faculty and academic professionals are provided in the Academic Affairs Manual (ACD), in particular in chapter 200 of ACD. These policies include specific protections for academic freedom (ACD 201) and a clear delineation of academic responsibilities (ACD 202).

A system of policies related to professional ethics, including a Code of Ethics (ACD 204-01) and Standards for Professional Conduct (ACD 204-02), sets forth expectations of faculty members regarding ethical and responsible conduct of academic functions. The Code of Ethics presents a list of responsibilities for teaching, interactions with students, and the conduct of research and scholarly work, as well as broader responsibilities to the university, colleagues, and the community. Explicit statements of ethical standards and types of unacceptable conduct are given for each of those areas of responsibility. For example, ethical standards in the area of responsible conduct with teaching and students include expectations “to encourage the free pursuit of learning by students,” “to demonstrate respect for students as individuals,” and “to adhere to one’s proper role as intellectual guide and counselor.” Examples of unacceptable practice under the same area include evaluation of student work by criteria not directly reflective of course performance, misuse of one’s position of power, and discrimination against a student. In total, twenty-five ethical standards are promulgated by the code, and twenty-nine types of unacceptable conduct are explicitly proscribed.

Additional policies place restrictions on royalties from instructional materials and other materials sold (ACD 204-04, ACD 204-05) and on gifts and gratuities (ACD 204-06); define and prohibit acting upon conflicts of interest (ACD 204-08); and (as provided by ABOR Policy 6-914) provide protection from reprisal for “whistle blowing.” Inappropriate activity related to lobbying or promoting a partisan political view is addressed, as well (ACD 205). The institution’s Amorous Relationships policy (ACD 402) bars faculty members from being involved in any way with grading, transfer, or evaluative functions for students with whom they have amorous relationships.

Further discussion of academic freedom and the ethical and responsible conduct related to research and scholarly activity is presented below in the evidence presented for Criterion Two components 2.D and 2.E. In advance of that discussion, note here that sanctions for breaches of all policies related to academic and research functions range from informal reprimand and admonishment up to termination of employment. The number of sanctions is small, averaging a few per year, reflecting both the serious consideration and observance given to these codes of conduct by faculty and academic professionals.

In summary, ASU takes seriously the requirement within a community of scholars to maintain a culture of ethical and responsible professionalism in the performance of its academic functions. The academic personnel within the institution conscientiously observe policies that secure the culture, and breaches are punished on those rare occasions when they occur.

**ASU's personnel functions are conducted ethically and responsibly.**

The Office of Human Resources (OHR) is responsible for recruitment, retention, and development of the workforce at ASU, as well as administration services responsible for payroll, compensation, benefits, and well-being for employees. For academic personnel (faculty members, academic professionals), recruitment and retention activity in OHR is supplemented by processes carried out within the Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost. All personnel functions are carried out in compliance with local, state, and federal laws in a manner consistent with best practices in higher education.
The Staff Personnel (SPP) and Academic Affairs (ACD) manuals contain the policies that direct how personnel-related functions are performed and that ensure those functions are carried out transparently, ethically, and responsibly. For employees in positions within the financial, procurement, and business services areas, the discussion in this section supplements the information provided above in the discussion of ethical and responsible conduct in the financial functions of the institution.

ASU promotes equal opportunity through affirmative action in employment and educational programs and activities. Discrimination is prohibited on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, citizenship, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, and qualified veteran status. Equal employment opportunity includes, but is not limited to, recruitment, hiring, promotion, termination, compensation, benefits, transfers, university-sponsored training, education, tuition assistance, and social and recreational programs. ASU's Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) within OHR supports and fosters a culture of inclusiveness by promoting and assisting with equal opportunity and diversity initiatives, providing leadership and hiring officials with clear and accessible employment data and timely consultation. OEI conducts training, as well as rigorous review of employment related-processes and policies. An annually prepared Affirmative Action Plan identifies areas of special attention for near-term hiring plans. OEI also investigates complaints regarding discrimination, and recommends institutional action to the appropriate university officials.

**hiring**

At ASU employees are classified into the following categories (note that some overlap is possible): (1) leadership/administrative: vice presidents, deans, academic unit heads, and other positions identified by ABOR; (2) academic staff: academic professionals (including those with administrative appointments); faculty (including adjunct faculty, professors of practice, clinical faculty, faculty associates, faculty research associates; and tenure/tenure-track assistant, associate, and full professors; faculty with administrative appointments; and postdoctoral fellows); (3) non-academic staff: classified staff and service professionals; and (4) student workers.

For transparency to the public and to inform those seeking employment, specified hiring processes at ASU are publicly available online and govern all positions within the institution; these policies are defined in SPP 201-01 and ACD 505-06. Those policies require the establishment of search committees for administrative positions and most faculty positions; other searches require the unit hiring official to be designated as responsible for following hiring policies and processes. The established job title descriptions at ASU, along with any applicable salary constraints, are posted and publicly available online. Searches committees are expected for most faculty positions, regardless of the tenure eligibility of the position, and for classified staff and service professional recruitments. The essential job functions for the position must be determined before a position is opened for recruitment; for classified staff positions, the job requirements should map onto one of the established classified staff categories. All job announcements must be submitted to OHR for review, editing, and approval.

An OHR-approved advertising plan for the position must be implemented when the job is posted; in addition to other venues stated in the advertising plan, all positions are posted on the OHR website using the Talent Acquisition Management system. A job posting advertisement must include a statement noting ASU’s compliance with Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action requirements. All applicants must meet the minimum advertised job requirements for the position in order to be interviewed. When a candidate is selected, OHR must approve the offer of employment, which is not made until any required background checks are made (SPP 201-08 or ACD 126). Waivers of the recruitment guidelines (except for those on grants or contracts) are granted only in exceptional circumstances and are only granted with approval by OHR.

**ethical and responsible conduct after hiring**

Once employed, ASU provides an open and publicly published set of policies that demand equitable and fair treatment for all employees. In general, academic personnel are guided by policies provided in the Academic Affairs Manual (ACD), while the Staff Personnel Manual (SPP) provides guidance for non-academic personnel; where policies are identical, cross references are provided in the manuals. Supplemental to the job responsibilities established at hire, conditions of employment and annual notifications of appointment are provided to each employee based on a set of policies (administrative staff – SPP 302, academic administrators – ACD 504, service professionals – SPP 320, faculty – ACD 501/ABOR Policy 6-201, postdoctoral scholars – ACD 502/ABOR Policy 6-310, academic professionals – ACD 503/ABOR Policy 6-301, and classified staff – SPP 300). Compensation for classified staff personnel is governed by policies within SPP 400, while the same issues for faculty and academic professionals are governed by ACD 511-01. Codes of conduct and
professional expectations are also provided in ACD and SPP manuals for faculty, staff, and administrators.

Performance review and promotion processes for classified staff and service professionals are governed by processes in SPP 209, while the same processes for faculty members and academic professionals are governed by ACD 506 and ACD 507, respectively. Additional detail on the processes related to evaluation of faculty members is provided in the following chapter.

In those cases where the performance review of an employee in a particular year identifies areas where performance is unsatisfactory, policies require the establishment of an individualized performance improvement plan to help guide the employee back to a satisfactory level of performance (SPP 809 for non-academic personnel; ACD 507-09 for academic professionals; ACD 506-11 for faculty, which also references a document that details the post-tenure review process for faculty). 39 Those policies provide guidelines for the pursuit of grievances related to those plans and actions. Failure to achieve satisfactory performance through the individualized performance improvement plan can result in dismissal from the institution.

Grievance processes are available to assist in dispute resolution for classified staff (SPP 900) and faculty and academic professionals (ACD 509); these processes include the opportunity to seek mediation through the University Ombudspersons Committee. For faculty members, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, a standing committee of the University Senate, is charged with investigating allegations of infringements upon the academic freedom or tenure of faculty members. 39 As noted above, discrimination complaints are investigated by the Office of Equity and Inclusion, which recommends institutional action based on its findings. Personnel records for non-academic personnel are maintained by OHR and are retained for five years after an employee’s separation date (SPP 1101). Personnel records for academic personnel are permanently maintained in the Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost (ACD 811).

As required by federal and state laws, ASU observes all provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act, participates in the Workers’ Compensation program, and complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (as amended in 2008) (ACD 405).

Employee health, retirement, and life insurance programs are provided to employees of the university through the Arizona Department of Administration. In most cases, employees may choose the most appropriate package from a set of options.

In assessing the practice and performance of this body of personnel policies and processes, many examples of evidence follow. For example, with respect to diversity and non-discrimination,

- The U.S. Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) inspects affirmative action and equal employment opportunity programs to enforce federal laws. ASU underwent a pre-award compliance review following notification on December 20, 2010. The OFCCP closely reviewed the university’s current Affirmative Action Plan (FY2011), data on employment activity (applicants, hires, promotion, and terminations), and annualized compensation data (wages and salaries) by race and gender. On July 20, 2011, OFCCP notified ASU that based on their review pre-award EEO clearance had been approved. The results of this third-party inspection provide strong evidence that ASU’s policies and processes related to personnel activity are administered ethically, responsibly, uniformly, and fairly with respect to the race and gender of its employees.

- With respect to diversity, the previous chapter described the progress made over the past decade in increasing the diversity of the workforce at ASU, even during a period of great economic stress. As of FY2012, ASU has moved from fiscal year to calendar year reporting with respect to its Affirmative Action Plan evaluation, development, and placement goals process. The Affirmative Action Plan, mentioned in the OFCCP review just above, analyzed hiring performance to evaluate progress towards a level of diversity matching the availability of minority individuals and women with appropriate talents. 20 Of the 93 job groups identified in the report, only eight job groups had minority representations (for specific minority groups or overall) that were below availability at a statistically significant level: academic associates, agricultural and related workers, development-related professionals, directors, and faculty in business, education, public programs, and social sciences. Only five of the 93 groups had representation by females that were below availability at a statistically significant level: other IT specialists, and faculty in the American English and Culture Program, Biodesign research, honors, and law.

- As evidence of the successful policy regarding non-discrimination (ACD 401), ASU has established a culture where discrimination is not tolerated. Statistics from the Office of Equity and Inclusion show that, over the four-year period of FY2008 to FY2012, the average numbers of discrimination complaints made
observations: these personnel policies includes the following
Evidence with respect to the general performance of these personnel policies includes the following observations:

- The number of personnel actions appealed through grievance actions provides an indirect measure of the ethical observance of the personnel policies and processes, as well as a measure of how often such actions are felt necessary by a grievant. In FY2012, only three grievances were filed through the process outlined in SPP 901 for staff, one of which was ineligible because it was submitted during a probationary period.

- With respect to grievances related to faculty members during AY2011-2012, 11 cases were filed with the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT); only three of those cases reached the hearing stage. These relatively small numbers suggest that the performance expectations are clear and understood, that the evaluation processes are fairly applied, and that policy breaches leading to inappropriate personnel actions are comparatively rare. The Personal Improvement Plan provision of the post-tenure review process typically has been pursued by fewer than 8 persons each year with a 10-year average (FY2003-FY2012) of 3.5.

- When involuntary terminations are necessary, grievance policies are provided for classified employees in policy SPP 809, which includes a right to a pre-termination hearing. In FY2012, a total of 17 pre-termination hearings were held; in no case did the evidence presented at hearing result in reversal of a termination decision. This statistic provides evidence that substantiates the conclusion that the personnel policies regarding involuntary termination of classified staff are administered fairly and transparently.

ASU's auxiliary functions are conducted ethically and responsibly.

The HLC's glossary for the Criteria for Accreditation provides a definition for auxiliary services:

[A]uxiliary denotes activities and services related to but not intrinsic to educational functions: dining services, student housing, faculty or staff housing, intercollegiate athletics, student stores, a Public Radio station, etc. In many institutions, auxiliary simultaneously denotes a segregated budget and dedicated revenues.

This definition is similar to ASU's definition of "auxiliary unit" in the Facilities Management Manual (FAC), under FAC 004: "An operation that derives a substantial portion of its budget from revenues generated from providing goods and/or services to the university community and/or the general public." Using this similarity, in this subsection the ASU auxiliary units are examined with respect to the expectations of ethical and responsible conduct. At ASU, these auxiliary units are the Sun Devil Campus Stores (the campus bookstores), student health services, student housing, parking and transit services, food services, the Memorial Union, the television and radio stations, intercollegiate athletics (including facilities such as Wells Fargo Arena and Sun Devil Stadium), and some activities conducted within the ASU Public Events office (including Gammage Auditorium). For functions not outsourced, the business, financial, and personnel functions of the auxiliary units are carried out within the system of policies developed by
the institution. In all cases, those employed by ASU in auxiliary units are bound by the same policies that are applicable to employees working in other areas, including the codes of ethical and responsible conduct mentioned above. Financial and business transactions are carried out in compliance with the policies in the Financial Services, the Property Control System, and the Purchasing and Business Services Manuals (FIN, PCS, and PUR, respectively). When functions and services are outsourced, contracts with those operating the auxiliary units must follow the same contract guidelines described earlier. Academic personnel associated with auxiliary units are bound by the same set of academic policies as those in other areas. Supervision and responsibility for all auxiliary units is provided by senior administration officials, as noted below.

Some of these auxiliary units have additional policies specific to their unique set of activities, and in some cases, specific manuals contain sets of policies particularly relevant to the activities of a specific auxiliary unit, such as Intercollegiate Athletics (which must adhere to additional policies provided in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics Manual, ICA), the police department (PDP), and Parking and Transit Services (PTS). In some cases, auxiliary units also interact with outside agencies which provide review and compliance certification with respect to the standards and expectations promulgated by those agencies.

university bookstores

Under the supervision of the Associate Vice President for University Business Services, Sun Devil Campus Stores operates on all ASU campuses and has an online presence. In 2011, ASU outsourced the operation of the Sun Devil Campus Stores to Follett Higher Education Group (FHEG). FHEG observes the Fair Labor Association’s Vendor Labor Code to improve and protect working conditions for products sold through Sun Devil Campus Stores, including those that prohibit the use of child or sweatshop labor to make products sold in Sun Devil Campus Stores.27 The stores also partner with Collegiate Licensing Company to make sure that ASU-branded products are marketed consistent with the highest ethical standards. FHEG also offers a textbook rental system through Sun Devil Campus Stores, a program that saves ASU students over $2 million per year compared with the former purchase system, based on the most recent textbook report to the Arizona Board of Regents.

student health services

ASU Health Services (ASUHS), under the supervision of the Vice President for Educational Outreach and Student Services, provides a range of health-related services for students on the Tempe, Polytechnic, and West campuses of ASU.28 Students on ASU’s Downtown Phoenix campus receive a range of health-related services from the College of Nursing and Health Innovation’s nurse practitioner-led health center. The offering of medical services is tightly governed by federal and state laws, state and county health department regulations, as well as applicable institutional policies for business, financial, personnel, and student activities. ASUHS is fully accredited by the Accreditation Association for Ambulatory Health Care, which reviews centers on a three-year review cycle; in 2008, ASUHS received an honorable mention for the “Innovations in Quality Improvement Award”.29 To monitor and improve service delivery, ASU Health Services also participates in the American College Health Association’s Patient Satisfaction Survey and Clinical Benchmarking Survey. Periodic reviews conducted by ASU UAAS and by the State Auditor General have not identified any concerns in the operations of ASUHS.

university housing

Under the supervision of the Vice President for Educational Outreach and Student Services, ASU University Housing (ASUUH) provides student living spaces in compliance with state and federal laws and in compliance with university policies governing financial, personnel, and student activities.30 ASUUH participates in a number of higher education organizations which, in addition to providing development and training opportunities, serve as exchanges for best practices in higher education; these include the National Association of College Auxiliary Services, National Association for Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, the Association of College and University Housing Officers – International, the National Association of College and University Business Officers, and the Western Association of College and University Business Officers. Periodic reviews conducted by UAAS and by the State Auditor General have not identified any concerns in the operations of ASUUH.

parking and transit operations

Operation of vehicles on any of the ASU campuses is governed by federal and state laws, as well as by ASU policies. Under the supervision of the Associate Vice President for University Business Services, ASU Parking and Transit Services (ASUPTS) coordinates the activities associated with the transportation needs for university personnel and students. ASUPTS balances competing parking and transit needs on all campuses and ensures the most effective use of available parking spaces on all property owned or
managed by ASU. The Arizona Board of Regents intends that ASUPTS be financially self-supporting through the receipt of fees from those who park at any of the ASU campuses. In addition to the standard institutional policies for financial, personnel, and purchasing activities, actions of ASUPTS are governed by the Parking and Transit Services Manual (PTS). Periodic reviews conducted by UAAS and by the State Auditor General have not identified any concerns in the operations of ASUPTS.

food services

Dining and retail food services at nearly 200 eating establishments on the ASU campuses are provided through a seven-year contract awarded to ARAMARK Higher Education in 2007. The Vice President for Educational Outreach and Student Services is responsible for the supervision of the terms of that agreement. The outsourcing contract award was based on a comprehensive proprietary interview and selection process developed by ASU faculty members. Currently, ARAMARK provides dining and retail food services to over 600 institutions in North America. In addition to following local, county, state, and federal laws and adhering to contractual provisions required of vendors at ASU, ARAMARK Higher Education utilizes a Code of Social Responsibility to guarantee that its operations reflect and promote values consonant with ASU’s values, including employee diversity and sustainability. Sanitation inspections for the dining locations are discussed in the next subsection; it is noted there that, in the most recent fiscal year reported (FY2012), there were no instances of food-borne illnesses at Arizona State University.

memorial union

Under the supervision of the Vice President for Educational Outreach and Student Services, the Memorial Union serves as a central meeting and conference venue for the university, and at various times of the year, for organizations and businesses external to ASU. Staff employees of the Memorial Union are subject to the same ABOR and ASU policies and procedures used elsewhere in the institution and those employees are responsible for seeing that the operations of the facility are conducted consistent with federal and state laws and Arizona Department of Administration policies. Desk manuals provide guidance for the ethical and responsible conduct of their operations.

Memorial Union staff members participate in a number of higher education organizations that provide professional development and training opportunities on best practices, including the National Association of College Auxiliary Services, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education (NASPA), the National Association of College and University Business Officers, and the Western Association of College and University Business Officers. ASU Financial Services conducts periodic reviews of financial reconciliation processes, purchasing card transactions, and other financial processes, and provides feedback to improve error-free operations and to enhance security. Periodic reviews conducted by UAAS and by the OAG have identified no material weaknesses in those operations.

radio and television stations

ASU operates both a television, and in partnership with Rio Salado College – one of the Maricopa County Community College District institutions – a radio station; both are licensed as non-commercial educational broadcast stations. The institution’s television station is called Eight, and is also known as KAET to its more than 1 million viewers each week; the radio station is known as KBAQ. Both stations are primarily self-supporting (KAET is completely so), obtaining financial resources through donations and grants. The operating license for the television station is held by ABOR for ASU, while the operating license for KBAQ is held by MCCCD. As an ASU department, operations and activities of KAET are subject to the ABOR and ASU policies and procedures, as well as to applicable federal and state laws (including those covering broadcasting). In addition to meeting financial and accounting compliance expectations for the organizations (such as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting) who provide grant funding, KAET also undergoes an annual audit performed by Clifton Gunderson LLP; those audits have not identified any standing issues. Similarly, KBAQ meets financial and accounting compliance expectations for the organizations (such as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting) who provide grant funding. KBAQ also undergoes an annual audit performed by LarsonAllen LLP; those audits have not identified any standing issues.

intercollegiate athletics

As the governing body of ASU, ABOR provides written policies regarding the athletics programs of the public universities in the State of Arizona, as set forth in the ABOR Policy Manual, which includes policies on athletic financial aid (ABOR Policy 4-305), general provisions for athletics (Policy 5-209), and the appointments of coaches and directors (Policy 6-1001). Under the general policies and directives of ABOR, the President of ASU has ultimate responsibility and final authority for the conduct of the Sun Devil Athletics program and the actions of any board in control of that program. The President administers this responsibility primarily through the appointment and supervision of the Vice President for University Athletics. This oversight includes both the activities associated with the athletic teams as well as the operation of the major sporting venues, Wells Fargo Arena and Sun Devil Stadium.
As a member of the PAC-12 intercollegiate athletic conference, ASU is committed to the institutional control of its intercollegiate athletics program. As noted in the Statement of Philosophy of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA 102), ASU regards the student-athlete primarily as a student, with academic qualifications, individual rights, personal interests, and aspirations similar to those of all students. ASU is committed to the principles of amateurism, gender and ethnic diversity, nondiscrimination, ethical conduct, good sportsmanship, and fair play in all aspects of its intercollegiate athletics program. The university is also committed to the self-regulation of all aspects of the intercollegiate athletics program according to internal rules that are at least as stringent as those imposed by official regulatory bodies. These internal controls are intended to achieve full compliance with external regulations and to ensure that the Sun Devil Athletics is operated in a manner consistent with the university's mission and goals.

The Vice President for University Athletics reports directly to the Office of the President and is a member of the University Management Team. All budgetary procedures and actions must be processed through the President’s Office, with the supervision of the University Fiscal Planning and Analysis Office. The Sun Devil Faculty Athletics (SDFA) Board advises the President on all activities and aspects of the athletics program. As representatives of the faculty, student, administrative, and alumni constituent groups, whose interests are reflected in its membership, the SDFA Board, through its advisory role, has the responsibility to review Sun Devil Athletics to ensure that they are conducted in a manner consistent with the goals of the university and ICA 102. The SDFA Board concentrates its attention primarily on those matters that relate to the welfare of student athletes, the academic standards and policies for those who participate in intercollegiate athletics, and the university’s obligation to comply with the requirements of the PAC-12 and NCAA. Additionally, the SDFA Board is authorized by the University President to review any aspect of the intercollegiate athletics program.

The Faculty Athletics Representative is an ASU faculty member appointed by the President to represent the institution and its faculty in the institution’s relations with the NCAA and PAC-12 conference. This faculty representative monitors issues related to academic integrity, institutional control, student-athlete welfare, and proper administration of ASU’s intercollegiate athletics programs, investigates alleged violations of NCAA rules, and verifies student athlete eligibility.

The NCAA certifies the conformance of Division I intercollegiate athletic programs to its principles and practices. Member institutions complete a self-study at least once every 10 years. In order to complete the certification process, the institution submits a self-study to the NCAA and completes a review of these primary components: governance and commitment to rules compliance, academic integrity, gender/diversity issues, and student-athlete well-being. The Division I Committee on Athletics Certification preliminarily reviews an institution’s certification materials and provides a list of issues identified during the evaluation. Then, the university hosts a visit by peer reviewers who file a report regarding the institution’s resolution of those issues before a final certification decision is rendered. ASU received certification status by the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification in March 2012, which denotes that the institution operates its athletics program in compliance with operating principles adopted by the Division I membership.

Gammage auditorium

The Office of the Vice President for Public Affairs is responsible for the supervision of ASU Gammage Auditorium, which is among the largest university-based presenters of performing arts in the world. The ASU personnel, purchasing, and business policies and practices described above are incorporated in the operations of the venue to ensure safe, ethical, and responsible conduct of its activities. Several departments on campus also guide and advise ASU Gammage on procedures, as well as review and audit its transactions (e.g., Public Affairs, Financial Services, Purchasing, and Human Resources). Operational units within ASU Gammage have developed additional sets of standard operating procedures or desk manuals that help ensure that proper processes are followed, with continual review to determine if refinements or changes in training are needed. The financial operations are audited by UAAS, which has not identified any issues.

ASU provides a safe working environment with an unmatched emphasis on sustainability.

Workplace safety is specifically addressed by the activities of the Environmental Health and Safety Services (EH&SS), with policies documented in the Environmental Health and Safety Manual (EHS), including policies that enforce compliance with local, state, and federal laws.36 Policy statements cover occupational health and safety, fire safety, and environmental affairs. Employee familiarity with these policies is achieved through a training program administered by EH&SS that includes annual refresher courses for
policies are being observed. For example: laws. Inspections provide evidence that these issues, and ensure compliance with applicable promote greater awareness of health and safety.

Annual inspections help identify problem areas, involving more than 17,000 participants. Additional web-based training classes enrolled more than five thousand persons.

To assist personnel in understanding and implementing best practices related to health and safety, EH&SS provides over sixty different training courses. During CY2011, more than 900 training classes were conducted, involving more than 17,000 participants. Additional web-based training classes enrolled more than five thousand persons.

Annual inspections help identify problem areas, promote greater awareness of health and safety issues, and ensure compliance with applicable laws. Inspections provide evidence that these policies are being observed. For example:

- Over 700 separate inspections of the nearly 200 eating establishments at ASU during FY2011 identified only one case of food-borne illness; none resulted in a compliance process or required hearing. FY2012 reflected no food-borne illnesses for nearly 200 eating establishments after nearly 600 inspections. The FY2011 inspections of bathing places identified six enforcement actions at the Towers Building Pool/Spa (525 S. Forest Avenue) due to 0 ppm chlorine or excessive chlorine. FY2012 reflected 89 inspections and nine enforcement actions of bathing houses. The nine enforcement actions were as follows: Towers Pool & Spa with seven closures due to no chlorine or too much chlorine and one closure each for Sonora Pool and Cholla Pool related to algae and turbidity and algae-green pool.

- Targeted inspections of building areas on campus identify unsafe conditions and provide instructions for remediation. For example, ASU's Fire Marshall Office conducted 3,762 inspections for FY2011; 539 of the inspections were follow-up inspections. ASU's Occupational Safety Office conducted 382 chemical/laboratory safety inspections in ASU laboratory spaces for CY2011. ASU's Radiation Safety Office conducted 2,214 radioactive material laboratory inspections for CY2011. (Biosafety-related inspections and training are discussed under Criterion component 2.E.)

- EH&SS uses a set of metrics that, through quarter-to-quarter comparisons, provide continuous insight into safety- and health-related conditions in campus facilities. The 21 metrics include, annual building inspections completed, response time for handling hazardous materials, volume of radioactive waste handled, and number of property loss claims filed.

- A set of more general measures that provide evidence that the policies that have been put in place are yielding a safe work environment are the OSHA measures All Injury and Illness Rate (AIIR) and the “Days Away from work; Restricted, or Transferred” (DART) rate. The Bureau of Labor Statistics provides averages for various employment sectors; the averages most comparable to ASU are those for the “Educational Services” sector. In 2010, the OSHA Educational Services average for AIIR and DART were 2.6 and 1.1, respectively. The values for those measures at ASU in CY2011 were 0.84 and 0.53, respectively, representing rates more than a factor of three and more than a factor of two lower than the OSHA sector averages. These measures indicate that the health and safety policies and processes at ASU are yielding a workplace considerably safer and healthier than average.

In cases where safety systems have been found to be deficient, lessons learned are quickly incorporated into improvements in those systems. For example, a major fire grew from a small blaze in the Memorial Union in November 2007, resulting in considerable property damage. Due to training provided to its occupants, the Memorial Union was evacuated quickly and with no injuries. The knowledge gained through studying that fire and the subsequent response resulted in improved emergency evacuation plans for all ASU buildings, and among other improvements, enhanced fire safety systems in the Memorial Union. An example of the impact of those improvements was seen in April 2011 when the new fire detection and sprinkler systems installed in the Memorial Union as part of those upgrades quickly detected and extinguished a small blaze in April 2011, similar in size to that which led to the November 2007 fire, resulting this time in only minor water damage.

Ethical and responsible conduct by an institution of higher education also demands stewardship of the physical environment in which the institution is placed. In a world supporting a growing population of more than 7 billion people, academic institutions are acting unethically and irresponsibly if they do not place sustainability high in their list of priorities for action.

The Global Institute of Sustainability (GIOS) serves as the hub of ASU’s sustainability efforts and the energetic pursuit of sustainable practices at ASU are encapsulated in the Institute’s prospectus,
Progress toward sustainability will require the reconceptualization and reorganization of our ossified knowledge enterprises. Our universities will need to drive innovation at the same time we forge closer ties to the private sector and government alike. To realize the potential of this moment will require both a focused collective commitment and the realization that sustainability, like democracy, is not a problem to be solved but rather a challenge that requires constant vigilance.

President Michael M. Crow, from “Overcoming Stone Age Logic,” Issues in Science and Technology, December 2008

“Sustainability at ASU,” which is excerpted and summarized here,29, 30 ASU’s guiding principles for promoting sustainability are to involve the entire institution, to treat the scientific and social contexts of sustainability issues equally, to span boundaries, to engage decision-makers, to accept risk, and to lead by example. The four cornerstones of ASU’s strategy for engaging sustainability are education, research, business practices, and global partnerships. The Institute places special emphasis on urban environments in research and education, particularly focusing on Greater Phoenix as an urban laboratory where solutions to water, energy, transportation, and livability are largely applicable to other rapidly urbanizing areas around the world. ASU’s business practices reflect the commitment to sustainability, including efforts to reach carbon neutrality and zero water/solid waste in its operations. As part of the extensive set of efforts to reach these ambitious goals, as of October 31, 2012 ASU has installed 15.3 megawatts of solar electricity generation on all campuses and the ASU Research Park.31 This level of electricity generation represents about 30 percent of the total peak energy usage of ASU.

With an additional 5.5 megawatts in process, ASU will reach over 20 megawatts by July 2013. The new goal is 25 megawatts by 2020. Longer range goals include complete mitigation of energy emissions by 2025, complete mitigation of waste, agriculture, and refrigerant emissions by 2025, and complete mitigation of transportation emissions by 2035.

In summary, ASU pursues processes that result in a safe working environment for its employees and provides close monitoring, frequent inspection, and rapid redress of problems related to safety concerns. Recognizing the ethical demands of environmental and resource stewardship, ASU also plays a world-leadership role in advancing sustainability as a priority for institutions of higher learning. In many cases, these practices and programs are exemplars for other institutions, and all are consistent with fair and ethical responsibility towards its employees, the surrounding communities, and the world.

summary for component 2.A

ASU’s large and integrated system of policies and processes, covering all aspects of the institution’s operations, ensures that ethical and responsible conduct in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions are the norm. These approaches safeguard a welcoming, secure, healthy, safe, and sustainable work environment for students, faculty members, and staff employees, as well as visitors to the campus. The institution’s functions are carried out in a manner in keeping with higher education best practices, and in many instances, ASU is an exemplar for those best practices. A variety of direct and indirect observations of outcomes of ASU’s activities strongly support that conclusion.

While the evidence supports the conclusion that ASU has policies that are successful, maintaining such a large body of policies while guaranteeing compliance with changing laws and external agency expectations remains challenging, both in terms of updating the policies and communicating those changes to members of the ASU community. In part, the size and complexity of the institution have driven the development of elaborate and extensive sets of policies in every area of university operations. Additional complexity arises when ABOR policies are also superimposed onto operations; confusion can arise as new state and federal laws and realities require policy changes. The necessary presence of sets of processes and procedures that differ between academic and non-academic personnel in some areas also can lead to confusion. To obtain a working knowledge of this system of policies can take considerable time, and ASU continues to explore new ways to more clearly communicate these to members of the ASU community.
As described in the following chapter, ASU offers a broad spectrum of degrees and certificates in keeping with ASU’s Mission and Goals Statements, the expectations of ABOR’s “2020 Vision” (discussed in the previous chapter), and its role as a major player in the economy of Arizona as a public university. Enrollment in these programs on the four physical campuses of ASU and in ASU Online now exceeds 73,000 students. To fully inform members of the general public about these programs and those responsible for them, ASU uses a variety of methods to fully disclose information about these educational opportunities, their costs, and those responsible for their delivery.

Prospective undergraduate students and their parents are guided through the application process by a special website devoted to them. The website provides information and links to gather more detail on application steps, requirements, and timelines; information on academic programs; information on individual campuses; and instructions for scheduling a visit to ASU. A similar website provides a portal for prospective graduate students.

All policies related to the transfer of academic credit to ASU from other institutions are fully disclosed to the public through a dedicated website for transfer students, which may be reached directly from the ASU’s main webpage. This special transfer student website provides a web-based interface that is interactively customized by the student to provide guidance on admission requirements and transfer policies based on the circumstances specific to that individual (e.g., type of institution from which the student is transferring, whether that institution is inside Arizona, etc.).

Each academic program (degree or certificate) has specific documented curriculum requirements, which are fully detailed in the ASU Academic Catalog, available online in interactive web pages and (for archival purposes) also available as a downloadable PDF file. The specific processes associated with how those program requirements are developed are outlined in the following chapter. University, College, and Graduate College academic policies are also documented at the ASU Academic Catalog website. The Academic Program portal provides a common entry point for learning about both graduate and undergraduate programs, as well as minor and certificate programs.

Policies governing tuition have been established by ABOR (see section C of this chapter) and by ASU, and these policies are fully and publicly disclosed on the ASU website. ABOR governs and conducts the process that sets tuition and fee rates for the public universities in Arizona. Base tuition rates are established for each of the public universities as set forth in ABOR Policy 4-101, which notes that the Arizona Constitution requires that “instruction furnished be as nearly free as possible.” Tuition and fee schedules are published and archived online at the ASU Tuition website. To assist parents and students in planning for tuition and fee costs, ASU provides an online web application (a “tuition calculator”) that provides an estimate of total tuition and fee costs for a specific academic year and term based on residency, year of admission, academic program, campus, and college. As required by ABOR Policy 4-104, a master list of tuition fees is maintained by ASU.

ASU discloses the names, credentials, and academic unit tenure home of its tenure-eligible faculty with a list on the ASU Catalog website. With this information in hand, interested individuals may use the online directory application to obtain further information about a particular faculty member’s teaching assignments, a current curriculum vita, as well as other information about the faculty member’s activities; having obtained the home academic unit, the interested person may also look further for information on the particular academic unit home page. The same web-based directory application provides contact information for all other ASU employees, including work site, telephone number, and e-mail address.

Arizona State University discloses prominently and explicitly the accreditation status of its academic programs with the Higher Learning Commission and other accrediting agencies on a number of university websites. ASU’s accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission is denoted by its Mark of Affiliation on the ASU Academic Programs portal website and linked on the key pages devoted to the ASU Academic Catalog; the relationship is also published in the archived catalog and is detailed on the ASU University Accreditation Office website. These strategically located descriptions provide current and prospective students, as well as members of the general public, accurate, timely, and detailed information about the accreditation status of ASU’s academic programs. As an institution, ASU is only accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. Some individual academic programs are also additionally and specifically
accredited by appropriate national professional agencies; those accreditations are fully disclosed to the public on the University Accreditation Office website and on the websites for the individual programs, as well as listed in Chapter 3.

**summary for component 2.B**

As the discussion above has indicated, ASU uses a variety of methods to fully, transparently, and publicly disclose and communicate to all members of the public – especially including prospective students and their parents – complete information about its academic programs, requirements, costs, faculty, staff, institutional control and leadership, and accreditation relationships so that students and others may make fully-informed decisions and assessments of those programs.

**C. the governing board of Arizona State University is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.**

ABOR is the governing board for the state’s three public universities, Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, and the University of Arizona. The Board is established by both a specific reference in the Arizona Constitution (Article 11, section 5) and by definition as a body corporate in Title 15, Chapter 13, Article 2, section 15-1625 of the Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.), “Arizona Board of Regents” (de-noted A.R.S. 15-1625). Explicitly stated within A.R.S. 15-1625 is that “[t]he Board has jurisdiction and control over the universities,” where “universities” are identified in A.R.S. 15-1601.A as Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, and the University of Arizona. The statute A.R.S. 15-1621, “Members; appointment, terms, oath, immunity,” provides that the Board consists of 10 members (called “Regents”) appointed by the Governor of Arizona with consent of the Senate of the State of Arizona, including two student members. Additionally, the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction serve as ex-officio members of the Board, with voice but no vote, each serving while they hold office. Terms for appointed Regents (excluding student members) are eight years in length. The chair of the Arizona Faculties Council, the coordinating body of the faculty governments of the three universities, is also present at meetings with voice but no vote. 

To avoid repetition and improve readability, subcomponents 1 and 2 of this component are discussed together.

1. **ABOR’s deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance ASU.**

2. **ABOR reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of ASU’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.**

As described more fully in chapter 1 and in the discussion of planning and shared governance in Chapter 5, the priorities of the Board focus tightly on advancing the capabilities and performance of the institutions to meet the needs of the people of Arizona. These are encapsulated in the mission and vision statements for ABOR. The ABOR mission statement, published on the ABOR website, speaks to the Board’s attention to the needs of the internal and external constituents of the Arizona University System:

The Arizona Board of Regents is committed to ensuring access for qualified residents of Arizona to undergraduate and graduate institutions; promoting the discovery, application, and dissemination of new knowledge; extending the benefits of university activities to Arizona’s citizens outside the university; and maximizing the benefits derived from the state’s investment in education.

The ABOR vision statement underscores the centrality of the institutions of higher education to the public good:

The Arizona Board of Regents seeks to provide leadership and a unifying voice on key higher education issues and to influence public policy through advocacy and initiatives founded upon evidence-based research. Synergies from a unified higher education system will provide access and the highest quality education to Arizona’s citizens.

The Arizona public universities provide bachelor’s level and higher public education, advance human knowledge through scholarly research and creative expression, and serve key roles as major partners in statewide economic development and community advancement.

3. **ABOR preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of ASU.**

To protect the freedom of Regents to act in the best interests of the State of Arizona and the institutions of the Arizona University System, A.R.S. 15-1621 provides that Regents are immune from personal
liability with respect to actions taken in performance in good faith within the scope of authority of the Board. The general administrative powers of the Board are provided in A.R.S. 15-1626, which define a broad array of responsibilities delegated by the State of Arizona to the Board. Regents are officers and employees of the State of Arizona. To preserve their independence of the Board from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution, the Regents are subject to state laws regarding the ethical and responsible discharge of their duties as officers of the State of Arizona, including laws related to conflicts of interest and prohibitions on gratuities or rewards; breaches of those laws are generally felonies under Arizona law, subject to criminal penalties upon conviction. 48, 49, 50 Provided its actions taken are consistent with state and federal laws, the Board is thus completely autonomous in carrying out its control over the institutions of the Arizona University System, and independent from undue influence by donors and elected officials.

4. ABOR delegates day-to-day management of ASU to the administration and expects faculty to oversee academic matters.

By policy, ABOR delegates the day-to-day management of the institution to the University President for each of the institutions in the Arizona University System. The Board exercises authority to appoint, employ, dismiss, and determine compensation for the presidents under A.R.S. 15-1626; the specific ABOR policy for appointment of the President is ABOR Policy 6-1102. 51 The responsibilities of the President of Arizona State University are summarized in the ABOR-approved ASU policy ACD 102, where the position of President is identified as the chief executive officer and chief budget officer for the institution; as spelled out in that policy, day-to-day management of the institution is delegated to the President or to those to whom the President has delegated specific responsibilities. 52 The President is given the power to appoint persons to all positions within the institution and approves all faculty and staff changes, subject to ABOR policies and practices.

Provision for faculty responsibility in shared governance and academic and educational matters is specifically provided for in state law by A.R.S. 15-1601.B:

Subject to the responsibilities and powers of the board and the university presidents, the faculty members of the universities, through their elected faculty representatives, shall share responsibility for academic and educational activities and matters related to faculty personnel. The faculty members of each university, through their elected faculty representatives, shall participate in the governance of their respective universities and shall actively participate in the development of university policy.

Based on this statute and subject to the Board policy on academic degree program planning and implementation, faculty members oversee academic matters as discussed in the following chapter, including the development of curricula and course content, the awarding of grades, and academic program review. 53

summary for component 2.C

The deliberations of the Arizona Board of Regents reflect priorities that serve to preserve, promote, and enhance all institutions within the Arizona University System, including Arizona State University. By virtue of its state-established set of responsibilities, ABOR must review and consider the reasonable and relevant interests of the internal and external constituencies for the Arizona University System during its decision-making deliberations; the centrality of these interests to its decisions are reflected in the direction given to the universities discussed in Chapters 1 and 5. By state statutes (including the provision of criminal penalties for breaking those statutes), the Board is protected from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution. Through establishment of specific and published policy (ACD 102), ABOR has delegated day-to-day management of the institution to the University President. State statute and Board policy communicate the expectation that the faculty provides oversight to academic matters. These observations demonstrate that the Arizona Board of Regents, the governing body of Arizona State University, is autonomous in making decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure the Board’s integrity.

D. Arizona State University is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Because freedom of expression and freedom of inquiry are fundamental rights for all individuals within a community of scholars, Arizona State University protects the responsible exercise of these rights by students, faculty members, and staff employees.

A commitment to protect the responsible exercise of free speech and academic freedom is found in ABOR Policy 5-303, and sets forth for university employees and campus visitors a set of prohibited types of conduct, which includes “[i]ntentionally
and substantially interfering with the freedom of expression of others on the university campus or at a university-sponsored activity.\textsuperscript{144}

The same commitment to protecting these rights is restated in the ABOR-approved Academic Affairs policy ACD 102, which opines that “[a]cademic freedom is the right of every faculty member, academic professional, and other employees and students while engaged in teaching and/or research.”\textsuperscript{185} The policy states that academic freedom includes freedom in research and the publication of results, freedom in teaching to discuss a field of competence without restrictions on content and method, freedom as a private citizen to speak out on public issues, and freedom to be judged by one’s colleagues in matters of promotion, tenure, or continuing appointment. The same policy directs that “[t]he pursuit and communication of knowledge at ASU are to be free from restrictions and include respect for the right of all to search for truth and knowledge without obstruction or restraint, the right of all to attempt to persuade by reasoned argument or peaceful processes, and the right of all to form judgments based on full and free exploration, exposition, and discussion.” In the same vein, the faculty and academic professional Code of Ethics requires academic personnel to encourage the free pursuit of learning by students and to protect student academic freedom, and proscribes retaliatory actions by any academic personnel toward that student based on the content of that speech or for any arbitrary or personal reason.

Finally, as articulated in the ASU Policy Statement Supporting Diversity and Free Speech,

\begin{quote}
[ASU] is committed to maintaining hospitable educational, residential, and working environments that permit students and employees to pursue their goals without substantial interference from harassment. Additionally, diversity of views, cultures, and experiences is critical to the academic mission of higher education. Such diversity enriches the intellectual lives of all, and it increases the capacity of a university to serve the educational needs of its community. \\
ASU is also strongly committed to academic freedom and free speech. Respect for these rights requires that it tolerate expressions of opinion that differ from its own or that it may find abhorrent.\textsuperscript{146}
\end{quote}

The Policy Statement Supporting Diversity and Free Speech also establishes a Committee for Campus Inclusion (now present on each campus), whose mission is to “(1) create and maintain a civil and just campus environment that values diversity, (2) promote respect for all individuals regardless of their status, (3) protect free speech and academic freedom, and (4) promote the pursuit of individual goals without interference from discriminatory harassment.” As an advisory committee to the President, composed of faculty and staff, the responsibilities of the Committee for Campus Inclusion include monitoring freedom of expression.

As part of the faculty governance structure, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) specifically acts to ensure freedom of expression in teaching and research. For example, CAFT is charged with investigating allegations of infringements upon the academic freedom or tenure of faculty members.\textsuperscript{187} The committee reports its findings to the University Senate and makes recommendations to the President in cases of, for example, discrimination and threats to academic freedom. The small number of cases brought to the committee support the conclusion that the policies in place provide a successful shield for academic freedom.

\section*{summary for component 2.D}

ASU’s policies clearly state the commitment of ASU to freedom of expression and academic freedom, and evidence noted supports the conclusion that these policies are monitored and working.

\section*{E. Arizona State University ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.}

As discussed in the next chapter, the magnitude of scholarly activity undertaken at ASU is enormous by any measure. The range of inquiry granted by the principle of academic freedom for inquiry is broad, but that freedom is also constrained by the requirement that the work be carried out responsibly. In this context, responsible conduct encompasses regard for the ethical treatment of subjects, the protection of the rights and safety of others and the environment, accurate and unbiased reporting of results, compliance with applicable state and federal laws (including those governing conflicts of interest), and if funded by a sponsor, specific constraints and expectations placed upon the funds and activities by the sponsor.

All ASU employees are responsible for complying with university and ABOR internal control policies in the practice of their research activities. ABOR Policies 5-301 through 5-308 define the conduct expected and the sanctions provided if those policies are not followed. For further guidance, ASU communicates to researchers the expectations and responsibilities required to maintain standards of integrity through the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics Manual.
To avoid repetition and improve readability, subcomponents 2 and 3 of this component are discussed together.

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

The detailed framework for ethical and responsible conduct of research at ASU, whether funded by an external source or unfunded, is established in the policies assembled in the Research and Sponsored Projects Manual (RSP). To make certain that research at ASU is conducted according to these policies ethically and honestly, the institution has established the Office for Research and Sponsored Programs Administration (ORSPA), which is directly responsible for oversight in areas of research integrity. To make certain that funded research is conducted in full compliance with federal and state laws, as well as with expectations of the sponsoring agency, the Office for Research and Sponsored Programs Administration (ORSPA) is responsible for verifying and certifying compliance of the institution's activities to sponsors.

ORSPA enacts processes to scrutinize research proposals for activity where ethical and safety concerns might arise with respect to human subjects, biosafety, and general research activity; existing policies address how breaches of these policies are to be handled. Parts of the review processes are carried out through a series of boards and committees that provide expert review of proposals where concerns might arise. These groups include the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), and the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC). Additionally, as discussed further below, many health- and safety-related issues also are monitored by EH&SS through inspections to ensure that the workplace and conduct of research activities are kept fully compliant with federal and state regulations; EH&SS also conducts training to ensure the pursuit of safe practices.

Investigators who conduct research involving human subjects must complete online training offered through the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI). During FY2012, 3,380 researchers took the online CITI training module, and 50 outreach sessions were given to faculty, staff, and students covering the IRB. ORSPA also initiated individual outreach by staff through daily consultation with researchers.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB), established by RSP 201-01, guards the rights and safety of the human subjects of research projects in a manner consistent with the ethical principles set forth by the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research and other organizations. In addition, ASU has negotiated federal-wide assurance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), National Institutes of Health, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, so that ASU research practices comply with federal regulations in research involving human subjects, regardless of the project's source of funding.

To continually ensure responsible conduct, post-approval monitoring is performed through a variety of mechanisms, including review of adverse events and protocol modifications, annual review of all active studies in the expedited and full board criteria, and by performing outreach to user departments. Examples of post-approval monitoring activities include:

- Staff members supporting the IRB perform for-cause and not-for-cause audits of principal investigators (PI). When continuing non-compliance is identified, staff members representing the IRB and the committee chair meet with investigators to assist with record-keeping and IRB compliance. Specially designed educational outreach sessions for the PI and/or research group may be required when remedial training is deemed necessary by the IRB.

- Random audits are performed during the annual review process as a post-approval monitoring tool, where, researchers may be asked for redacted copies of the consent forms used.

- Post-approval monitoring is also performed when a federal audit is called. During the
Arizona State University supports the responsible study and humane care and treatment of laboratory animals in research for the purpose of advancing knowledge and education. Researchers have a responsibility for the ethical involvement of animals in research that complies with or exceeds all applicable laws and regulations, and they are held accountable to the highest standards of professionalism. Currently, critical advances in human health and conservation of nature depend, at least in part, on the study of whole, living organisms. Although there currently is no complete alternative to animal research, alternatives to the use of live animals continue to be developed, significantly reducing the number of live animals used in research at ASU. The university is committed to making further progress toward alternative methods, and individuals involved in this venue of scientific research are among those best-prepared and most-motivated to discover new methods.

All personnel - including faculty, research associates, students, laboratory technicians, and teaching assistants - who care for and/or use animals in research or teaching are certified through the Laboratory Animal Training Association Program. In fiscal year 2012, 764 individual researchers took the online training modules for responsible animal care and use.

At ASU, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) receives and reviews protocols or amendments for animal use. IACUC activities follow the policies and processes given in the ASU IACUC Policies and Procedures Manual. The committee consists of not less than five members of varying professional and personal backgrounds, including at least one veterinarian, one practicing scientist experienced in research involving animals, one member whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas, and one individual who is not affiliated with the institution in any way other than as a member of the IACUC and is not an immediate family member of anyone affiliated with ASU. All protocols are reviewed and discussed by the committee at a convened meeting. In addition to the IACUC members, representatives from EH&SS, Health Services, and the Office of General Counsel may participate to provide guidance and input.

Once a protocol is granted approval, the approved activities are monitored in several ways. All active protocols receive continuing review on an annual basis. Additional post-approval monitoring activities include IACUC semi-annual inspections of laboratories, frequent visual post-approval monitoring by the Department of Animal Care and Technology staff and university veterinarians, as well as annual United States Department of Agriculture inspections and tri-annual accreditation by the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International.

ASU ensures the safe, ethical, and responsible conduct of research using recombinant DNA and infectious agents.

Any research conducted at the institution involving recombinant DNA (rDNA) or the use of infectious agents must be registered with the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC). Such research must be consistent with the policies provided in the Department of Environmental Health & Safety Biosafety Manual, which also specifies the process by which proposed research activity is scrutinized by the IBC. The IBC consists of at least five voting members who, collectively, have experience and expertise in rDNA technology, have the capability to assess the safety of rDNA research, and can identify any potential risks to public health or the environment. At least two members are unaffiliated with the ASU (apart from their membership on the committee) and represent the interests of the surrounding community with respect to public health and protection of the environment. The Biological Safety Officer is also a voting member of the IBC. The IBC reviews each proposed project and certifies whether the procedures, project, personnel, training, and facilities are adequate and in compliance with federal guidelines.

To document these activities, disclosure forms are required annually for research involving rDNA or the use of infectious agents. Required forms or proposed modifications are reviewed by the IBC, who may also use outside experts in the review process as needed. Disclosures and major modifications undergo such a thorough review during the pre-review process that it is rare to have a disclosure disapproved. By the time...
they are finished with the pre-review process, the investigators have a thorough understanding of the standards to be met in order to gain IBC approval.

Post-approval monitoring of research conducted with infectious agents or rDNA is accomplished through a number of activities. An annual review report submission requires confirmation of appropriate training and records any upcoming changes to the disclosure such as location, procedures, and materials.

To ensure and improve the safe conduct of rDNA research, EH&SS performs biosafety inspections of laboratories performing research with biological materials on regular intervals, conducts interviews with researchers regarding the protocol-directed work, and provides training courses. In CY2011, the number of Biosafety Level 1, 2, and 3 laboratories subject to these inspections by EH&SS were 151, 243, and 5, respectively, in support of the research activity of groups led by 69 Principal Investigators. Table 2-3 provides a list of biosafety-related training courses provided and the number of participants in those programs in CY2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>training course</th>
<th>participants (CY2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animal biosafety training</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial biosafety &amp; bloodborne pathogens training</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refresher biosafety &amp; bloodborne pathogens training</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bloodborne pathogens training for asu health services</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH recombinant DNA guidelines training</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

table 2-3 Biosafety-related training courses provided by EH&SS personnel during CY2011, and the number of participants in each of those classes.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention uses its Select Agent Program to oversee entities that possess, use, or transfer select agents and toxins that cause disease in humans. Since 2005, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, through their Select Agent Program, have conducted five full inspections of biosafety and security practices and procedures at ASU. No major findings arose from those inspections, providing strong evidence that ASU’s policies, monitoring, and enforcement practices for biosafety have resulted in a safe and secure workplace for researchers and have protected the public.

**ASU researchers avoid conflicts of interest in their research efforts.**

Research activity often can provide a venue where conflicts of interest may arise. As noted above, all employees of the institution are responsible for compliance with university and ABOR policies, federal law, and state statutes regarding conflicts of interest. While most of the external funding for research at ASU comes from federal sources, members of the university are increasingly engaged with private industry and are building complex relationships with private companies. Federal regulations and university policies require researchers to disclose significant financial (RSP 206) or business interests (ACD 204-08) that arise, due to their relationship to research or other scholarly activities, that could give rise to a real or perceived conflict of interest. Disclosures of financial interest are required prior to the submission of a proposal to certify that financial conflicts of interest will be satisfactorily managed, reduced, or eliminated prior to the expenditure of any funds awarded.

All researchers who have a pending proposal or active award through the ASU ORSPA are required by federal law to complete an annual conflict of interest questionnaire to determine if they have any outside financial interests that could potentially conflict with their responsibilities at ASU; if the questionnaire reveals a conflict of interest, a conflict of interest disclosure form is required. The disclosure provides additional information to the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance (ORIA) who then determines whether there is a conflict to manage, reduce, or eliminate. In addition to the Conflict of Interest Annual Questionnaire, disclosures are submitted to ORIA based on employee self-disclosure, certification of a conflict on proposal processing forms, or a disclosure through Arizona Technology Enterprises, the group managing intellectual property for ASU.

Conflict of interest disclosures receive close review upon submission, by several levels within the institution including by the unit director, ORIA staff, and the ORIA director. If a disclosure requires management, the project coordinator and Director of ORIA work together to develop a plan, as needed, to manage the conflict. After the management plan has been put in place, it is reviewed annually to confirm that the project is in compliance with the plan. Deficiencies or deviations are reported to the committee at the next scheduled meeting. Additionally, a conflict of interest disclosure is requested annually from the employee to determine if there are any changes (financial, position in company, family members, etc.) in their relationship with the funding entity.

In 2012, in partnership with other administrative units, ORIA developed and instituted a Code of Business Conduct and Ethics Program governing the ethical conduct expected of all ASU employees engaged in research. The program includes the ASU Code of Business Conduct.
Conduct and Ethics Manual, summarizing the various policies and departmental function areas that oversee the ethical conduct policies to be followed. The program also includes a training curriculum, provided through CITI, as an online training resource. The training is available to all individuals interested in the ethical conduct policies and procedures, but by federal directive, is required training for individuals involved in federal contracting above the $5 million dollar threshold. In addition to project personnel, individuals involved with federal contracting in ORIA, the ORSPA, Financial Services, the OHR, and Purchasing and Business Services have been required to undergo this training. In FY2012, 212 individuals took the online training through the institution’s posted modules.

**ASU deals firmly with research misconduct.**

As an institution devoted to the creation of new knowledge through research and scholarship, ASU is committed to maintaining the integrity fundamental to these activities through the responsible and ethical conduct of its faculty, staff, and students. To this end, the institution has an established policy (RSP 210) and provides a summary of procedures for dealing with alleged misconduct on the ORIA website.\(^72\)\(^,\)\(^73\)

All employees or individuals associated with ASU are required to report (confidentially, if desired) observed, suspected, or apparent misconduct in research. The report can be made directly to the Research Integrity Officer (RIO), by telephoning ORIA, or through the ASU Hotline. If an individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of research misconduct, the RIO or ORIA may be contacted for an informal, confidential discussion to help clarify the assessment. If the circumstances described by the individual do not meet the definition of research misconduct, the individual will be referred to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving any problem.

The policies, controls, and sanctions described above for research misconduct demonstrate the degree of seriousness with which ASU approaches issues related to the ethical and responsible conduct of research. In addition to investigation by individuals, the various boards responsible for research conduct also provide monitoring. For example, the IRB provides an important avenue for scrutinizing the conduct of research. If the IRB finds that a faculty member has not complied with rules and procedures regarding proper conduct of scholarly activity, the IRB can develop a corrective action plan and impose a moratorium on the faculty member’s ability to act as a sole principal investigator. The IRB Chair may also refer a file to an academic administrator for review to determine if additional administrative disciplinary action is warranted in a given case.

In addition to the statistics reported above, the strength and success of this system of monitoring and controls can be assessed in part by the statistics below. In FY2011 and FY2012, the Misconduct in Research Subcommittee (MIRS) was convened on three occasions to investigate allegations of research misconduct. In one case, the subcommittee’s investigation did not substantiate that research misconduct had occurred. In two cases, the respective MIRS panels did conclude that research misconduct had occurred. MIRS identified remedial actions related to research activity and also referred their reports to academic administrators for determination of additional administrative action as necessary. This small number of cases supports the argument that the system of policies and controls set in place by ASU has resulted in a culture that promotes ethical and responsible scholarly activity and also addresses instances of misconduct.

**ASU trains students and faculty in the ethical conduct of research.**

The National Science Foundation (NSF) began mandating training in the responsible conduct of research for undergraduates, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers as part of the America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act. Independent of that mandate, ASU affirms the importance of the knowledge enhancement of novice researchers and experienced investigators regarding the ethical conduct of research and has begun implementing these training requirements for researchers regardless of sponsor.\(^74\) ORIA, which oversees institutional compliance with the NSF mandate, provides online training to undergraduate and graduate students, provides seminars and colloquia on ethics, and offers continuing education opportunities led by experienced principal investigators. In FY2012 nine workshops were offered; over one hundred post-doctoral researchers attended those workshops.

2. **ASU offers students guidance in the ethical use of information resources.**

3. **ASU has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.**

The central role of faculty members and academic professionals in creating a culture of mutual respect within a community of scholars has led to the articulation of policies defining expectations for ethical and responsible conduct. The policies for faculty and academic professionals are provided in the Academic Affairs Manual (ACD), in particular in chapter 200 of ACD.\(^75\) These policies protect academic freedom (ACD 201), delineate academic responsibilities (ACD 202), and provide a system of policies related to professional ethics, including a Code of Ethics (ACD 204-
obligations, the hearing processes, and the sanctions the Student Academic Integrity Policy lists student honesty. to providing guidance about avoiding academic dishonesty, and plagiarism.” The institution’s Amorous Relationships policy (ACD 402) bars faculty members from being involved in any way with grading, transfer, or evaluative functions for students with whom they have amorous relationships. Sanctions for breaches of these policies range from informal reprimand up to termination of employment.

Students are similarly obligated to act with academic integrity and honesty while enrolled. The Student Code of Conduct (SSM 104-01) includes expectations of academic conduct, and in turn, directly references the ABOR Student Code of Conduct; the first item under prohibited conduct (section F) forbids “[a]ll forms of student academic dishonesty, including but not limited to, cheating, fabrication, facilitating academic dishonesty, and plagiarism.” Within ASU, the Student Academic Integrity Policy lists student obligations, the hearing processes, and the sanctions related to breaches of academic integrity.” In addition, any student who accesses the information resources at ASU is advised in the proper and ethical use of those resources under the Computer, Internet, and Electronic Communications Policy (ACD 125), the Misuse of University Assets Policy (ACD 123), Code of Ethics (ACD 204-01), and the ABOR Intellectual Property Policy (ABOR 6-908). Students who are concerned about the proper use of information are referred to the published library guide on copyright basics and academic integrity.

Responsibility for the communication, enforcement, and education about academic integrity expectations and policies is shared by the administration, faculty, and staff. The Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost maintains a website devoted to providing guidance about avoiding academic dishonesty.” The same website also provides resources for faculty and teaching assistants to help them address issues of academic dishonesty.

Each college takes responsibility for its own review process to handle suspected violations of academic integrity, and each college posts on its web page a statement of commitment to academic integrity, the expectations for undergraduate and graduate behavior, and how this policy is enforced within the structure of the college.

Sanctions for breaches of academic integrity can range from assigning a failing grade on an individual assignment in which dishonesty has been found by the instructor of the course, through assignment of an “XE” grade (failure for academic dishonesty) for the course(s) in which the infraction occurred, up to and including dismissed from ASU and degree revocation. The XE grade represents a profound penalty for a student, with potentially serious consequences for the student’s academic reputation for the remainder of the student’s professional life. The XE grade is recorded on the student’s official and unofficial transcripts with the notation “failure due to academic dishonesty”; this notation carries such a stigma that it is likely all grades on the transcript will appear suspect. No student with an XE grade on his or her transcript may represent ASU in any extracurricular activity or run for or hold office in any recognized student organization. Generally, the XE grade remains on the transcript permanently if it was assigned for an act of academic dishonesty requiring significant premeditation; if significant premeditation appears absent, processes exist to remove that mark at some future date based upon additional review.

If a student is working on a federally-funded research project, violations of the Student Academic Integrity Policy may also be considered instances of misconduct in research, including data fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, and other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the academic community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research. A student who violates both ASU’s Misconduct in Research Policy and the Student Academic Integrity Policy will be reviewed by both the college and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Knowledge Enterprise Development. Each independently makes determinations concerning violations and appropriate sanctions.

Indirect evidence of the effectiveness of these processes can be found by looking at the number of infractions dealt with by the various processes noted above. No statistics are kept for sanctions less severe than the assignment of an XE grade. With respect to the XE sanction, during the period from 2003-2012, 185 ASU students received the grade of XE (158 undergraduate and 27 graduate students), a level that suggests both students and faculty regard this penalty with appropriate seriousness. Degree revocation, arguably even more severe in consequences than the XE, occurs much less frequently; a total of three degrees (including undergraduate and graduate level degrees) have been revoked since 2003. These statistics support the conclusion that the importance of academic integrity is communicated effectively to students, and that breaches of academic integrity, though comparatively rare, are dealt with in a serious and appropriate manner when uncovered.
summary for component 2.E

The policies and processes that have been developed at ASU to engender a culture of honest, ethical, and responsible behavior in academic functions, as well as a system of sanctions, have ensured that ASU’s faculty, staff, and students acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

summary for criterion two — integrity: ethical and responsible conduct

ASU has established an integrated system of procedures and practices that ensure ethical and responsible behavior by its leaders, faculty, staff, and students in fulfilling the institution’s mission. This set of mechanisms, checks, balances, and sanctions serves as the basis for the maintenance of an institutional culture that values fairness, honesty, inclusion, and transparency in all activities and areas of the university. These guidelines are very visible, publicly accessible, and thoroughly integrated into the operations of the institution. They are also consistent with best practices in higher education, and in several cases, are recognized in higher education as exemplars. Evidence, including statistics regarding policy breaches, shows that these policies and procedures are consistently observed by the institution and that the rare breaches that occur are dealt with appropriately.

strengths

- ASU’s dedication to observing the highest standards for ethical and responsible conduct have resulted in a culture with a high expectation for integrity within the institution.

- The elaborate system of policies in place to ensure ethical and responsible conduct at ASU has been and is continually honed and refined within the crucible provided by day-to-day operations of one of the largest universities in the nation.

- Knowledge of the existence of institutional policies is pervasive throughout the institution, and those policies consistently guide the operations in an ethical and responsible manner.

- ASU’s policies are cognizant of and consistent with the best practices in higher education and, in some cases, serve as exemplars for other institutions of higher education.

- Hiring practices are fair and ethical, and the practices adopted have helped increase the diversity of faculty, staff, and students.

- Training is readily available for key policies and procedures, and those in positions of trust are required to have appropriate training, skills, and credentials.

- Review of statistics regarding policy breaches, and sanctions related to those breaches, demonstrate that the policy structure at ASU is robustly fulfilling the purpose of providing a safe, sustainable, and welcoming workplace for faculty, staff, and students where high standards of integrity are the norm.

changes

- The size and complexity of the institution require extensive sets of policies in every area of university operations. An additional complexity arises when the governing body policies are also overlaid on operations. Obtaining a working knowledge of all those policies can take considerable time.

- The presence of differing policies for academic and non-academic personnel in some areas can lead to confusion; ongoing discussions explore whether and how those policies might be made more similar or identical.

- Maintenance of such a large body of policies while guaranteeing compliance with changing laws and external agency expectations remains a challenge, both in terms of updating the policies and communicating those changes to members of the ASU community.
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chapter 3

criterion three. teaching and learning: quality, resources, and support
Arizona State University provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

In a New American University, every faculty member, staff employee, and student is expected to be both a committed teacher and an enthusiastic learner. Thus, as a model of the New American University, teaching and learning are ASU’s central functions at the core of its mission. As seen in Chapter 1, nearly all the goals and metrics for the institution directly link to the view of ASU as a broad educational enterprise serving Arizona, the region, and the globe. ASU realizes this model by crafting an academic environment guided by its eight Design Aspirations.

This chapter provides evidence demonstrating that Arizona State University offers high quality academic programs, regardless of the mode of delivery, and takes full responsibility for the quality of those offerings. Additionally, the evidence will show that the university has taken steps to ensure that the quality of its offerings remains high, even during a period of rapid growth. The faculty-led academic program development processes are described; those processes ensure that a superior quality academic program portfolio is maintained through the programs, curricula, and coursework offered for students. As academic personnel are singularly responsible for the delivery of these programs, an explanation is given of the processes that provide systematic evaluation of the performance of faculty members and staff employees. To provide the richest possible learning environment, ASU provides a large palette of co-curricular and student development activities; the material below will demonstrate how ASU integrates academic training with co-curricular learning and development opportunities outside the classroom to provide the New American University experience.

A. the degree programs of Arizona State University are appropriate to higher education.

To serve one of the largest student enrollments in higher education in the United States, ASU employs innovative approaches that provide effective, strong, and fully appropriate degree programs for all its students. These approaches have also furthered fulfillment of ASU’s Core Values of providing Excellence, Access, and Impact in a higher education setting.

This section provides evidence demonstrating that ASU degree programs at all levels are appropriate, illustrating how ASU provides outstanding opportunities to a large and diverse student population. To ensure academic offerings remain of superior quality and remain appropriate for an institution of higher learning, ASU maintains rigorous and comprehensive review and approval processes, has established differentiated learning goals, and utilizes multiple modes of delivery facilitating multi-campus experiences. Those processes are described herein.

1. ASU’s courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

ASU has a comprehensive set of review and approval processes that ensures the currency and soundness of courses, minors, certificates, concentrations, and degree programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels. These processes include internal curricular review processes, as well as formal external academic program reviews every seven years, as discussed in the following chapter. In addition, programs that receive specialized accreditation undergo regular curricular reviews during their respective accreditation assessments, which are also described in the next chapter. Since the responsibility for all courses and academic programs reside within ASU academic units, the review and approval processes are applied consistently across all campuses and delivery formats (face-to-face, hybrid, and distance delivery/online programs). This consistency of process helps ensure that the required levels of student performance, across courses and programs, are consistent and appropriate to the academic program and degree awarded.

Detailed curricular reviews are conducted at the introduction of new academic programs and at regular intervals within the academic units. The ASU approval process matrix for academic proposals maintained by the Provost’s Office lists the required review actions for all curricular-related initiatives, including the development of new courses, degrees, minors, concentrations, and certificates. All curricular proposals (new degrees, concentrations, minors, certificates, and courses) are developed by the faculty at the academic department or school level.1
The initial reviews of the proposals for these academic actions occur within the academic unit and the college. Upon approval by the college dean, proposals are forwarded to the University Provost’s Office for dissemination to appropriate university review bodies. These entities include the University Graduate Council (as appropriate), the Curriculum Academic Programs Committee (CAPC, a sub-committee of the University Senate), and finally the University Senate. All academic program proposals are reviewed and recommended to the Provost for approval. Once they receive approval by the Provost, those proposals that establish new degree programs are reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) of the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR). Once appropriate approval is granted, the Provost’s Office notifies units that their academic action(s) can be implemented. Ensuring the appropriateness of course and program content (i.e., undergraduate and graduate levels) is the responsibility of each review body, beginning at the department level and finalized by the Provost. The specific approval processes for courses and new curricular programs (e.g., degrees, concentrations, certificates, and minors) are described below.

**course approval and review processes**

New course proposals, at both undergraduate and graduate levels, originate and are designed by faculty members within an academic unit. Those proposals undergo initial review and approval within the academic unit. All new course proposals must include a syllabus that provides the course objectives, student learning outcomes, and assessment strategies for those objectives and outcomes. Any prerequisite and co-requisite course requirements must be identified, and the grading system and reading assignments must be described. For consistency, course proposals, as well as all actions related to course modifications or deletions, are submitted electronically through Curriculum ChangeMaker.

Once unit-level approval is granted, a course proposal moves to the college/school curriculum committees for review. Each college/school has a specific and thorough internal review process that includes assessing the impact of the proposal on other academic units. After approval by the respective dean, the course proposal is forwarded to the Provost’s Office for subsequent review by the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; this review scrutinizes the proposal for appropriate content, learning outcomes, and related materials. Graduate courses are reviewed by the Office of the Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Graduate College Dean. Courses not meeting undergraduate or graduate expectations (i.e., appropriateness of level of content, currency, quality, or grading metrics) are sent back to the college and academic unit for clarification and revision before any further consideration is granted. When a course proposal is ready for

university-level review, the Provost’s Office forwards it to CAPC of the University Senate for posting and review. Once the Senate has reviewed and approved the course proposal, the Provost’s Office notifies the respective college/school regarding its readiness for implementation.

**review and approval of degrees, certificates, minors, and concentrations**

All academic degree programs, regardless of mode of delivery, go through ASU and ABOR review and approval processes to ensure their currency, quality, and relevance. Each fall semester, the Provost initiates the academic planning process. Each academic dean, in consultation with the chairs/directors of the academic units, submits a template describing all proposed new degrees, concentrations, minors, and certificates for the ensuing year. Changes to existing degree titles, program disestablishments, creation of new organizations, organizational changes and disestablishments, and other related academic initiatives are also included in this plan. A university master academic plan is developed, reviewed, and finalized by the Provost, and then is submitted to ABOR’s AAC for final review and approval. Once the AAC approves the Academic Plan, the Provost notifies the appropriate deans that their programs may begin preparing proposals for internal university review of new programs and academic actions approved by the AAC. (Concentrations, minors, and certificates are not forwarded to the AAC.) Once reviewed and approved by the Provost, these initiatives begin the internal university review process described below.

Units submitting new degree proposals must complete a template with the new program’s purpose and justification, student learning outcomes and assessment strategies, a curricular map (e.g., core courses, electives), syllabi, list of qualified faculty, and resource requirements. Similar templates exist that guide the development of concentrations, certificates, and minors. Proposals must first undergo thorough review within the respective department/school and then subsequent rigorous review by the college curricular committee(s) and the dean.

Upon approval by the dean, proposals are submitted electronically to the Provost’s Office. These curricular actions are then forwarded to the appropriate university-level committees for subsequent review by the University Graduate Council (as applicable), CAPC, and finally the University Senate. At each level, a substantive review of the proposed program is completed to ensure quality and to avoid redundancy with other programs. At any step in the approval process, programs can be tabled and/or returned to the academic unit for further clarification and/or revision. Once a proposed program successfully moves through each approval level, the Provost’s
Office notifies the academic unit that it may implement the program.

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

Arizona State University takes great pride in the quality of its academic programs across all levels. Statistics on the number of programs offered within the current academic portfolio for the university are provided in Table 3-1. A complete listing of ASU degrees is publicly available through a dedicated page on the ASU website; the same page also provides information about HLC accreditation of these programs, and provides a link to the University Accreditation Office website for further program accreditation information, including any specialized accreditation for that program.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bachelor's degrees</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master's degrees</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional doctorates</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. degrees</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergraduate certificates</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate certificates</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-1: Number of academic programs at each level offered by ASU in Fall 2012.

The learning goals for coursework at different academic levels are well-articulated and appropriately differentiated. Within degree programs, ASU has separate sets of courses for bachelor’s degree students (with levels denoted 100, 200, 300, and 400) and graduate students (500 level and above). The first digit of the course number denotes academic level (e.g., the “1” in Physics 122 denotes freshman level). At the undergraduate level, 100 and 200 level courses typically are focused on general education and introductory courses, while those at the 300 and 400 levels are designed for advanced study by majors in the academic degree programs. At the graduate level, courses are restricted to 500 level and above. Undergraduate certificates include courses in the 100 through 400 level ranges, while graduate certificates primarily consist of courses at the 500 level and above. Under some circumstances, ABOR guidelines allow qualified advanced undergraduates to take 500 level courses. Courses at the 600 level and above, however, are limited to graduate students (e.g., master’s and doctoral), and 700 level courses are restricted to doctoral students.

As noted above, proposals for new courses and new degree programs must provide learning outcomes and assessment strategies in their documentation. The review process at each approval level includes determination of whether student learning goals for proposed courses and programs are appropriately differentiated across 100 through 400 levels for undergraduates and 500 level and above for graduate courses. Assessment strategies are reviewed for appropriateness and feasibility.

ASU has 49 accelerated bachelor’s/master’s programs that allow academically advanced undergraduate students in good academic standing to simultaneously pursue a bachelor’s and master’s degree. An academic unit that wishes to establish an accelerated program must submit a proposal to the Graduate College Dean that describes the program and its rationale and stipulates program admission criteria, the specific requirements for each degree, the standards for monitoring student progress toward degree completion, and the standards for benchmarking the quality of the program over time. This process helps ensure that students in these special programs have transparent paths to successful completion of the requirements for both degrees.

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

As “One University in Many Places,” ASU has a cohesive and comprehensive system of program development, evaluation, and delivery. Programs at the four campuses can have unique academic niches, but academic units and programs are integrated into one university with one comprehensive mission. The unified and explicit review processes described above maintain programmatic consistency in content and requirements across all modes of delivery and locations. Face-to-face and online programs are developed, approved, and evaluated using a consistent set of university processes. As described above, all courses are developed at the academic unit level and subject to approval by the college or school, by CAPC, and by the University Provost.

The latest technologies and best practices for assessment are incorporated into online courses. To ensure rigor across online as well as classroom courses, ASU is an institutional subscriber to the Quality Matters (QM) program that serves as a national benchmark for online course design. QM is a faculty-centered, peer-review process that uses a rubric designed to certify the quality of online courses. The nationally recognized QM process is based on the research literature and higher education best practices for online teaching and learning. ASU’s online course designers also recognize and follow...
guidelines provided in the HLC “Best Practices for Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs” since those guidelines were published. Course designers work with faculty content experts to develop online courses that engage students and professors in the same constructive and meaningful ways as those students and professors who are learning and teaching in a classroom on any of ASU’s campuses.

ASU offers 28 undergraduate degree programs, 24 graduate degree programs, and eight certificate programs completely online. Examples of the fully online, high interest programs facilitated by ASU Online include the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies (School of Letters and Sciences), the Bachelor of Science in Communication (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences), the Bachelor of Applied Science in Internet and Web Development (College of Technology and Innovation), the Bachelor of Science in Criminology and Criminal Justice (College of Public Programs), the Master of Science in Global Technology and Development (School of Letters and Sciences), the Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction (Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College), and the Master of Science in Healthcare Innovation (College of Nursing and Health Innovation).

Additionally, since the last comprehensive site visit, many new internet course offerings have been developed at ASU to supplement degree programs delivered in the traditional face-to-face format. Increasingly, ASU students have added internet courses to their degree programs at various points in their academic careers; during Fall 2012, over 32,000 ASU students took an internet course.

Special efforts are devoted to ensure the academic quality and robustness of online learning. Learning outcomes in online courses are specifically and intentionally embedded into the design of the courses. Those learning outcomes are the same as the outcomes expected for the same course in the face-to-face setting; in other words, faculty members set the expectations for all courses, regardless of mode of delivery. The outstanding overall quality of ASU Online offerings were recognized in 2012 by the award of the Pearson Higher Education Product of the Year, marking the first time in the award’s history that a service-based educational partnership received the Product of the Year Award rather than a piece of educational content, such as a textbook or software.

learning outcome expectations wherever and however those courses are offered. As noted above, these processes have enabled the institution to expand and improve the programs it offers.

B. Arizona State University demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational program.

ASU supports a wide range of intellectual and lifelong learning skills that enhance student success at every level of education; an overview of the general education program is provided here to show how those skills are developed at the institution. This section also illustrates how the institution’s attention to its Core Values is demonstrated through general studies initiatives, articulation and collaboration with community college partners, and promotion of social embeddedness, global engagement, and diversity.

1. ASU’s general education program is appropriate to its mission, educational offerings, and degree levels.

The previous chapters have shown how all activities at ASU share the same commitment to the university’s Core Values of Excellence, Access, and Impact, and how those activities make use of the Design Aspirations to develop approaches to realize those Core Values while at the same time transforming the institution. This commitment is also reflected in the design and provision of the institution’s academic portfolio, including its general education program. Consistent with the Design Aspirations, the university’s general education program supports intellectual and cultural diversity, embraces social embeddedness and global engagement, and utilizes education as an enabler of societal transformation. Direct results of this commitment to ASU’s Core Values and Design Aspirations are reflected in student achievement outcomes, the accomplishments of ASU graduates, as well as in important contributions to the public good and to the economic, social, and cultural vitality of the communities in which the university is embedded.

University General Studies Curriculum

At the undergraduate level, ASU’s general education requirements are delivered via a General Studies Curriculum consistently administered across campuses, delivery methods, and degree programs.

summary for component 3.A

Through the careful and extensive multi-level review processes described above, ASU safeguards the quality of its academic portfolio, assures the currency of its offerings, and provides rigorous
The General Studies Curriculum emphasizes the philosophy that a baccalaureate education should prepare students for constructive and satisfying personal, social, and civic lives, in addition to depth of knowledge in a particular academic or professional discipline. To this end, the university requires all students to complete a set of General Studies Requirements that complement the undergraduate major by helping them 1) gain mastery of critical learning skills, 2) investigate the traditional branches of knowledge, and 3) develop the broad perspective that frees one to appreciate diversity and change across time, culture, and national boundaries. The specific General Studies Requirements are described more fully below.9

General studies courses are regularly reviewed and approved by the General Studies Council, a faculty decision-making body tasked with the continuing implementation and development of the comprehensive university-wide General Studies Program.10 The council is advisory to the Executive Vice President and University Provost, and its members and meeting times are published on the ASU Provost’s website.

partnerships and articulation with community colleges

The Academic Program Articulation Steering Committee (APASC) is the statewide coordinating body of the statewide articulation and transfer system within Arizona.11 APASC provides oversight of curricular alignment among Arizona’s public secondary and post-secondary educational institutions. APASC also helps ensure that students are appropriately prepared and have the support services required to pursue the completion of post-secondary certificate and degree programs. A major goal of APASC is to assist with increasing the number of Arizona students who successfully complete a baccalaureate degree. APASC reports to the Joint Council of Presidents, which is comprised of Arizona’s university and community college chief executive officers.

Within ASU, the Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost manages community college partnerships through the combined efforts of the units of Undergraduate Education (curriculum and advising), Academic Partnerships, and Enrollment Management in collaboration with the colleges. Each of the units has particular responsibilities to ensure that community college partners and students have greater opportunities and access to the university, including implementation of APASC policies, facilitation of faculty involvement in statewide discipline-specific Articulation Task Forces, determination of course equivalencies, development of articulation agreements, cultivation of relationships with community colleges, design of transfer pathways, and direct support for students pursuing those pathways.

A selection of highlights from recent years includes:

- As described in Chapter 1, the Maricopa to ASU Pathways Program (MAPP) prescribes specific courses a student must take at the community college to smoothly transfer to ASU.12 MAPP also identifies any other special requirements necessary for admission to a particular major. Unlike previous transfer programs, each MAPP pathway embeds the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) requirements within a full associate’s degree, as well as the lower-division requirements for the desired ASU bachelor’s degree. MAPPs are available for approximately 125 majors. Because specific incentives have been attached to the completion of a pathway (e.g., guaranteed admission, cost and time efficiencies, reduced tuition, and access to university advisors and pre-enrollment services), these programs have become popular quickly, with thousands of students signing up each academic year. As of November 2012, approximately 11,200 students have entered this pipeline since the program’s inception in Fall 2009. By Spring 2012, MAPP and the similar Transfer Admission Guarantee program, developed and implemented with the nine other public community college districts in the state, had 2,000 students enrolled at ASU.

- A data collection and transfer technology system has been implemented with all community college districts, whereby pathway program students have their directory information electronically submitted to ASU, allowing staff in Undergraduate Admissions and the academic units to cultivate relationships with and provide support for these potential transfer students.

- The Kresge Foundation provided $1 million to expand the successful eAdvisor approach (discussed below) for transfer students. Tools such as dashboards displaying transfer pipeline data and a web portal (MyASU for pathway students) are already available. A transfer student progress-tracking tool will be launched soon.

- A new model for delivery of bachelor’s degrees in collaboration with Eastern Arizona College (EAC) is being implemented during Fall 2012. Eventually, six ASU degrees will be available on-site at EAC’s main campus in Thatcher, Arizona.
Additional efforts to be responsive to the needs of out-of-state community college transfer students are under development, including: creation of a new transfer equivalency process that will provide a quick analysis of how a student’s previous credits will transfer and apply into ASU programs; on-site visits with dozens of community colleges in California, Washington, Colorado, and Texas; transfer of completed lower-division general studies requirements from regionally accredited colleges and universities; and involvement in the Western Undergraduate Exchange program.

In addition to all these initiatives, the three state universities and all community colleges in Arizona cooperate in a system called Shared Unique Numbers (SUN), providing Arizona community college students planning university transfers with an easier way to locate and enroll in courses with direct equivalency. The new SUN course numbering system clearly identifies courses that directly transfer among Arizona’s public community colleges and the three state universities. The SUN System was launched January 2011 and included 82 of the most commonly transferred courses statewide for its introductory year. SUN courses are labeled as such in university and community college catalogs, schedules, and websites, enabling students to quickly identify and locate transferable courses. SUN courses are but a small subset of the multitude of college courses that transfer among Arizona’s colleges and universities, and may be found in the searchable Course Equivalency Guide on AZTransfer.com.

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

As presented in the previous paragraphs, the university articulates its general education program via the General Studies Requirements, which are met by courses in five core and three awareness areas. Consistent with best practices in higher education, components of the program ensure that baccalaureate graduates are trained broadly in the skills necessary to excel in their careers; including development of skills in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information, while conducting investigations through multiple modes of inquiry and creative work. These broad learning skills consist of literacy, critical inquiry, and mathematical reasoning competencies, including the integration of computer literacy into mathematical competency.

For breadth of training and to provide competence in the multiple ways in which humans solve problems, ASU’s core areas also incorporate instruction in the natural and social sciences, history, fine arts, and the humanities. To develop graduates with the ability to participate in a constantly changing global community in the 21st century, the General Studies Curriculum also includes coursework in global awareness, cultural diversity, and history. Courses approved for meeting the General Studies Requirements have been specifically reviewed for compatibility with the aims of the requirement. To further undergird and unify these elements, these requirements are also oriented by the guidance provided through ASU’s foundational documents – the Mission, Vision, Goals, Core Values, and Design Aspirations statements.

Details of the General Studies Requirements are provided here to offer some insight into how this philosophy and orientation inform those requirements.

**General Studies Core Areas:**

- Literacy and Critical Inquiry courses involving the gathering, interpretation, and evaluation of evidence; critical skills pervading university study programs and everyday life. Two courses beyond freshman-level English are required. Most lower-level courses are devoted to the further development of critical skills in reading, writing, listening, speaking, or analysis of discourse. Upper-division courses are usually in a particular discipline and fully integrate writing and critical thinking as means of learning and demonstrating mastery of content.

- Mathematics and Computer/Statistics/Quantitative Applications courses ensure that students develop fundamental skills in mathematics and core mathematical principles and can use mathematical analyses in their chosen fields (i.e., they can apply quantitative problem solving to real-world contexts); and that students gain skills in applying computer applications and understanding how computers make mathematical analysis more powerful and efficient. Four courses must be taken from a list of suitable options.
Natural Sciences courses ensure that students are scientifically knowledgeable. Students must take at least one laboratory course that includes a substantial introduction to the fundamental behavior of matter and energy in physical and/or biological systems. Courses satisfying this requirement emphasize knowledge and application of the scientific method, the potential for uncertainty in scientific inquiry, and the criticality of mathematics and quantitative reasoning in science. Generally, two courses are required.

Humanities, Fine Arts, and Design courses are concerned with the study of the textual and artistic traditions of diverse cultures, including traditions in literature, philosophy, religion, ethics, history, and aesthetics to explore the range of human thought and its application to the past and present human environment. Humanities, Fine Arts, and Design courses encourage students to investigate their own personal philosophies or beliefs and to understand better their own social experience.

Social and Behavioral Sciences courses emphasize social scientific theories and principles, the methods used to acquire knowledge about cultural or social events and processes, and the impact of social scientific understanding on the world. This focus acknowledges social scientists’ observations about human behavior and how their unique perspectives on human events make an important contribution to civic dialogue.

A total of 15 credits are required in the combination of Humanities, Fine Arts and Design and in Social and Behavioral Sciences.

**awareness areas:**

In addition to the core requirements of the curriculum described above, students must complete courses that satisfy three awareness areas. Courses that are listed for both a core area and one or more awareness areas may satisfy requirements concurrently, up to a maximum of two awareness area(s) listed for a given course. The three awareness areas include:

- Cultural Diversity in the United States coursework promotes awareness and appreciation of cultural diversity within the contemporary United States through the study of the cultural, social, or scientific contributions of women and minority groups, examination of their experiences, or exploration of interactions between and among cultural groups.

- Global Awareness courses include in-depth studies of culture-specific elements of a region of the world, country, or culture group; courses with an emphasis on non-U.S. areas; or courses that examine non-U.S. centered cultural inter-relationships of global scope, such as the global interdependence produced by problems of world ecology, multinational corporations, and migration. Contemporary non-English language courses that have a significant cultural component are also applicable.

- Historical Awareness courses are historical in method and content, where “history” designates a sequence of past events or a narrative whose intent or effect is to represent such a sequence. The requirement also presumes that these are human events and that history includes all that has been felt, thought, imagined, said, and done by human beings.

The General Studies Requirement and its functions in undergraduate education are clearly articulated in the ASU Academic Catalog. Course requirements are also reviewed and communicated to students directly via the academic unit advising offices.

Undergraduates in all academic units must meet the General Studies Requirements for graduation with an ASU baccalaureate degree. The web-based Degree Audit Report System (DARS) provides an institutional progress check-up that matches a student’s completed courses with the requirements of a particular academic degree program, and also it is used as the checkout tool for graduation. Since DARS is easily accessible, students can regularly review their DARS reports to ensure that all requirements have been completed.

3. every degree program offered by ASU engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptive to changing environments.

As noted in the preceding section, the foundations for building students’ skills in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information, as well as mastering different modes of inquiry and creative work and adapting to a continuously changing set of global challenges, are provided to every degree student through the ASU General Education Curriculum. Similarly, transfer students receiving the Arizona General Education Certificate receive instruction on
those skills in the courses for that certificate. Most notable in this regard are the requirements associated with the core areas of the General Studies program for undergraduate degree students. For example, the required literacy and critical thinking courses help students to sustain and extend their ability to reason critically and communicate clearly through language. Additionally, the required natural science courses allow students to understand the concepts, principles, and vocabulary of scientific inquiry through the collection, analysis, and discussion of data.

Going beyond those foundations, ASU has in place a multitude of institutional initiatives that go beyond the General Studies Curriculum to provide graduate and undergraduate students with expanded opportunities to enhance their intellectual knowledge, skills, and competencies. ASU broadens and hones the foundational competencies obtained by undergraduate and graduate students by (1) providing expanded research and critical inquiry opportunities, (2) offering a host of interdisciplinary academic programs that prepare students to ask different types of questions and help them cultivate the skills to explore, (3) supplying students with a wide range of service-learning/internship programs that allow students to infuse their learning with "real-world" applications, and (4) giving access to a host of global student exchange opportunities to expand their intellectual vision. Further development of mastery in these skills occurs explicitly in classroom research courses and advanced quantitative skills courses required for most majors, as well as capstone experiences, honors thesis requirements, and independent research courses.

In addition to these enhancements, all graduate academic programs contain one or more culminating experiences in which the student is expected to demonstrate mastery of the various modes of inquiry, communication, and creative work appropriate for that discipline; these experiences also serve to assess the student's capacity to analyze and synthesize what they have learned. Culminating experiences are selected as appropriate for the particular degree program; examples include written and oral comprehensive examinations, portfolios, applied projects, theses, and dissertations. These intensive assessment experiences are intentionally designed to provide a rigorous, individualized, and focused assessment of the student's mastery of the subject by faculty members admitted to the graduate faculty for that particular program. Furthermore, the intense and in-depth review of both students and programs that is provided in these culminating experiences by the thorough scrutiny of experts in those fields of study also serves to maintain and enhance the high quality, currency, and appropriateness of the courses of study provided for each graduate program.

**beyond the classroom: modes of inquiry and creative work**

Education at ASU extends beyond the formal classroom to opportunities in research, capstone projects, and internships for the purpose of addressing the changing needs of our global environment.

The university provides a dedicated web page, “uResearch,” to help students identify research projects that specifically involve undergraduate students. As a large, multi-campus, research-intensive institution, most academic units offer some form of research experience to enrich the educational experience for students, and many of these are collected at that web site. More detail is provided in the discussion under component 3.E. Three college-level examples of such opportunities are described here to illustrate how the education students receive at ASU includes opportunities to go beyond the aptitude provided by the General Education Curriculum to further deepen their skills in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptive to changing environments:

- **Barrett, The Honors College**, a selective, residential college that recruits academically outstanding undergraduates from across the nation, fosters an intellectually and socially vibrant environment. Named “Best Honors College” in the nation (2005) by Reader’s Digest, this residential community has more National Merit Scholars than MIT, Duke, Brown, Stanford, or the University of California-Berkeley. Honors College students benefit from a $12-million-dollar endowment used exclusively to support honors students and their projects. Each student in the Honors College must complete an honors thesis under the direct supervision of a faculty member that provides the student with opportunities to enhance intellectual and research skills on particular topics of interest.

- **Another example of a unit-based research opportunity exists in the School of Life Sciences’ Undergraduate Research program (SOLUR),** which places about 100 students each year in life science research laboratories. SOLUR students learn about and contribute to research by working closely with faculty and other mentors in on-going investigations. The SOLUR program supports students’ experiences by providing information about available projects and mentors; funds for salary, supplies, and travel for research; a seminar to learn about the research enterprise and interact with other SOLUR participants; and an annual poster.
symposium to gain experience in communicating the results of research.

- Similar to the SOLUR program, the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Science’s NCUIRE (New College Undergraduate Inquiry and Research Experiences) program provides stipends to enrolled New College undergraduates while they work on a faculty member’s research project. The NCUIRE experience develops the student’s ability to apply research tools and information to solve real world problems, delving far more deeply into the most intriguing topics covered in their coursework.

interdisciplinary programs

One of ASU’s many ways of expanding intellectual inquiry, inspiring creative thinking, and facilitating cutting edge inquiry skills comes through its interdisciplinary degree programs. Such academic programs advance ASU’s Design Aspiration of intellectual fusion through the creation and implementation of interdisciplinary degree programs and certificates that enhance a student’s ability to ask probing questions different from those often manifested in single discipline programs. A list of intentionally interdisciplinary degree programs is provided in Table 3-2. Among the many examples provided in that Table, the following sample gives insight into the breadth of these offerings:

- Exemplars of this interdisciplinary focus are the new B.A., B.S., M.A., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees in Sustainability. The School of Sustainability gathers faculty with expertise from across the university to build interdisciplinary degree programs that prepare students to address critical issues of local, national, and global importance. The undergraduate and graduate programs prepare students to understand, explore, and analyze sustainability in the context of real-world problems; exploring the interaction of environmental, economic, and social systems.

- ASU also offers a Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies degree program composed of the university General Education Requirement, a set of four core courses in interdisciplinary inquiry, and two approved minors or concentrations. Approximately 1,885 students are enrolled in the program, including 293 who are enrolled in an ASU Online version that focuses on organizational studies.

undergraduate degree programs

- African & African American Studies (B.A.)
- Asian Pacific American Studies (B.A.)
- Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies (B.I.S.)
- Digital Culture (Interdisciplinary Arts & Performance or Technological Entrepreneurship) (B.A.)
- Earth & Environmental Studies (B.A.)
- Ethnicity, Race, First Nations Studies (B.A.)
- Exercise & Wellness (Health Promotion) (B.S.)
- Global Studies (B.A.)
- International Letters & Cultures (Classics) (B.A.)
- Nonprofit Leadership & Management (B.S.)
- Public Service & Public Policy (B.S.)
- Religion & Applied Ethics Studies (B.A.)
- Social & Behavioral Sciences (B.S.)
- Sustainability (B.S. & B.A.)
- Theatre (Design & Production) (B.A.)
- Urban & Metropolitan Studies (B.A. & B.S.)
- Women & Gender Studies (B.A. & B.S.)

graduate degree programs

- Anthropology (Complex Adaptive Systems Science) (Ph.D.)
- Media Arts and Sciences (Ph.D.)
- Biology (Biology and Society) (Ph.D.)
- Environmental Social Science (Urbanism) (Ph.D.)
- Gender Studies (Graduate Certificate & Ph.D.)
- Global Health (Urbanism or Complex Adaptive Systems Science) (Ph.D.)
- Healthcare and Healing Environments (M.S.D.)
- Human & Social Dimensions of Science & Technology (Ph.D.)
- Materials Science and Engineering (Ph.D.)
- Music (Interdisciplinary Digital Media & Performance) (M.M. & D.M.A.)
- Nanoscience (P.S.M. & Ph.D.)
- Philosophy (History & Philosophy of Science) (MA & Ph.D.)
- Physical Activity, Nutrition, and Wellness (Ph.D.)
- Simulation, Modeling and Applied Cognitive Science (Ph.D.)
- Sustainability (MA, M.S. & Ph.D.)

Table 3-2 Examples of ASU Interdisciplinary Degree Programs, Fall 2012.
- The School of Earth and Space Exploration offers interdisciplinary degree programs that combine the intellectual disciplines of geology, astrophysics, and engineering. The undergraduate and graduate minors, degrees, concentrations, and certificates in this program offer students an integrated education across earth sciences, planetary sciences, astrophysics, and engineering. Graduates are prepared for key roles in earth resources and exploration, environmental and geologic engineering, space research and industry, and water and environmental use policy.

Programs at ASU do not have to be explicitly interdisciplinary to offer opportunities to students for expanding their knowledge beyond a single field of inquiry. As one popular example, students can earn a B.A. in Business by combining the core courses in business, both lower- and upper-division, with one of ten concentrations outside business. Concentrations are available in communication, global leadership, global politics, legal studies, public policy, statistics, sustainability, technology, tourism management, and urban policy.

Another example of ASU’s commitment to providing graduate and undergraduate students with expanded intellectual opportunities to explore new types of questions is through the academic collaborations that have been built with medical clinical partners, including the Barrow Neurological Institute (BNI) and the Mayo Clinic. In the BNI example, ASU has a collaborative Ph.D. program in which students’ doctoral committees are composed of faculty members from both ASU and BNI, and the students engage in cutting edge clinical research in neuroscience.  

ASU’s partnership with the Mayo Clinic provides opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to engage in a wide range of educational collaborations. Examples include:

- Students in nursing may complete their Bachelor of Science in Nursing on the Mayo campus. This opportunity not only prepares students in the very type of environment within which they will work, but Mayo employs most of these students after graduation.

- The “Mayo Physicians of Tomorrow” program, hosted at the Mayo Medical School in Rochester, Minnesota, provides opportunities for selected Barrett Honors College pre-medical students to participate in a summer, two-week experiential learning program at the medical school. Shadowing physicians and other caregivers, lectures, hands-on activities, social events, and interaction with Mayo medical students provide ASU students with an extraordinary opportunity to explore the world of medicine and medical care.

- Five dual degree programs have been developed: the M.D./M.B.A., the M.D./M.S. in Biomedical Engineering, the M.D./M.S. in Biomedical Informatics, the M.D./Masters of Mass Communication, and the M.D./J.D. These programs enhance the medical training of Mayo medical students and provide them with expanded intellectual competencies.

**beyond the classroom: internships and professional experiences**

ASU’s academic programs are designed to yield professionals able to meet the challenges of the 21st century. To accomplish this, ASU is committed to the integration of applied experiences led by practicing professionals into the traditional classroom-delivered curricula. More than 50 programs distributed across ASU’s colleges mandate or strongly encourage student participation in internships, externships, or practicum experiences. This practice provides opportunities for the vast majority of our students to participate in real-world experiences that will enable them to be more competitive in the workforce.

Internships are an integral part of many professional degree and certificate programs at ASU. For example, the W. P. Carey School of Business actively engages leading local and national companies to provide internships in its nationally ranked undergraduate, M.B.A., and master’s programs. Field experiences in Arizona’s school districts allow Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College students to develop the skills required of teachers while experiencing a diversity of philosophies, strategies, and settings. Students from the College of Nursing and Health Innovation, Department of Speech and Hearing Science, and the School of Social Work complete their practical experiences with trained healthcare professionals in Arizona and across the United States.

Applied experiences are no less important or far-reaching for ASU’s undergraduate students. As an example, programs offered by the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts, the School of Sustainability, and the School of Human Evolution and Social Change place students in domestic and international internships each semester. Students develop the critical skills needed to address complex problems that play out at the level of local communities as well as on the global stage. In another example, the School of Politics and Global Studies’ Capital Scholars program develops future leaders by providing students with hands-on training in the public policymaking process in Washington, D.C. Further, ASU has been recognized by non-profit organizations, such as The Washington Center, for its efforts in expanding student participation in internships in Washington, D.C. and abroad. A similar type of program within the state of Arizona is the Legislative and Government Internship Program. Over the past 40 years, ASU has sent undergraduate and graduate
students to the legislature to serve as interns during the legislative session. Over the years, the program has grown to include placements at the Arizona Supreme Court, the governor’s office, and other state agencies. Many of the students who participate in this program have gone on to work in federal, state, or local government.

The opportunities to participate in internship programs at ASU are vast. As mentioned in Chapter 1, The Wall Street Journal ranked ASU fifth in 2010 on its list of the top universities favored by employers for job recruiting, according to a survey of those employers. Among the items highlighted as significant in The Wall Street Journal investigation was the high availability of internship opportunities provided at ASU thorough the work of faculty members and academic units.

in the classroom and beyond: global engagement.

In pursuit of ASU’s Design Aspiration of engaging globally, ASU continues to grow a multicultural community of students and scholars who address local and global challenges and collaborate to create solutions. Over the past decade, ASU has expanded its portfolio of international degree programs.

At the graduate level, examples include the W. P. Carey School of Business M.B.A. programs that include strong international partnerships. The W. P. Carey School of Business has a longstanding Executive M.B.A. program offered in China, for instance, delivered in conjunction with the Shanghai National Accounting Institute. In addition, ASU has developed several 3+2 programs with international partners that provide graduate degree opportunities for students completing the majority of their undergraduate degree at their home institution and their master’s degree at ASU.

At the undergraduate level, the ASU Study Abroad Office administers more than 300 study abroad programs in over 60 countries around the world. Students can study during the summer term, fall and spring semesters, or for a full academic year. Participating students can expand upon a current course of study, focus on learning a foreign language, fulfill major course requirements, or experiment with various elective requirements. Three distinct types of study abroad programs are available to ASU students: (1) Exchange Programs (participants pay ASU tuition while taking courses at a foreign institution alongside host country students), (2) Faculty-Directed Programs (students pay a program fee, including tuition to take ASU faculty-led courses with other ASU students, primarily offered during the summer term), and (3) Partnership Programs (students pay a special program fee, including tuition to attend special programs at partner institutions with students from host countries and fellow American students). The faculty-led summer study abroad programs are the most popular, comprising approximately 55 percent of the total student participants in study abroad programs. Since 2003 the Institute of International Education has ranked ASU as one of the top 35 schools in the nation for the total numbers of students studying abroad each year. During AY2010-2011 and the Summer 2011 semester, a total of 1,574 ASU students studied abroad. The most popular locations for study were the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, France, and Japan.

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

ASU emphasizes recognition of diversity both explicitly in its curriculum and implicitly in its academic culture and environment, as discussed in previous chapters. As noted above, the General Studies Curriculum explicitly includes requirements in Cultural, Global, and Historical Awareness.

In addition, ASU’s multiple academic units offer curricula and degree programs specifically focused on diversity at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Examples of such academic units and programs include the School of Transborder Studies; Ethnicity and First Nations Studies; American Studies; Women and Gender Studies; African and African American Studies; American Indian Studies; and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Studies. In addition, ASU has a multitude of undergraduate and graduate degrees, certificates, concentrations, and minors that are focused on diversity, including ethnic, global, gender, and religious areas of study. Table 3-3 lists diversity-focused degree programs for undergraduate and graduate students, while Table 3-4 lists diversity-focused undergraduate and graduate certificate programs.

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

As noted in Chapter 1, excellence in research is essential to meeting the goals and measures for the institution enumerated in the ASU Goals Statement and ABOR’s Enterprise Metrics. That discussion provided evidence that research and scholarly activity have grown enormously over the past decade; research expenditures provide a direct measure of
the quality and impact of the research performed due to the common presence of peer-review and competition for those funds. As one of the very few research universities without a medical school classified as “Very High Research Activity,” The Chronicle of Higher Education noted that ASU achieved the second largest increase in ranking (up 30 positions) among the top 100 universities based on federally funded research expenditures in the National Science Foundation’s 2010 survey. In that same survey, ASU ranked in the top 20 in research expenditures among institutions without a medical school, and also in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic and Global Diversity</th>
<th>Religious Diversity</th>
<th>Gender Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African &amp; African American Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>Anthropology, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Women and Gender Studies, B.A., B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Studies, B.S.</td>
<td>Asian Languages/Civilizations (Chinese or Japanese), M.A.</td>
<td>Religious Studies, MA/Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>East Asian Languages and Civilizations, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Gender Studies, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>English as a Second Language, MA</td>
<td>Women's Health Nurse Practitioner, D.N.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific American Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>Environmental Social Science (Urbanism), Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity, Race, First Nations Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>Ethnomusicology, MA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>Global Health, MA, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health, B.A.</td>
<td>Law – Tribal Policy, LL.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Letters &amp; Cultures, B.A.</td>
<td>Law, and Government, LL.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability, B.A., B.S.</td>
<td>Law – US Law and Global Legal Practice, LL.M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transborder Chicana/o &amp; Latina/o Studies, B.A.</td>
<td>Social Justice and Human Rights, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (Global Leadership), B.A.</td>
<td>Sustainability, MA, M.S, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transborder Studies, M.A.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Studies-Cultural Resource Revitalization and Sustainability, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Studies-Indigenous Rights and Social Justice, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Studies-Tribal Leadership and Governance, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Studies-Visual and Oral Culture, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management in China/Corporate, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Technology and Development, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable Tourism, MAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Studies, MA/Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Studies, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-3 diversity-focused undergraduate and graduate degree programs at ASU, Fall 2012.
During FY2011, the university’s total research expenditures reached a record $355 million, an increase of almost 190 percent from $123 million in FY2002. During FY2012 ASU sought more than $1.24 billion in proposals and received over $315 million in awards.

Two notable grants awarded to ASU faculty and academic programs serve as examples of the breadth of intellectual activity often present in a single award:

- ASU’s Engineering Research Center (ERC) for Quantum Energy and Sustainable Solar Technologies (QESST) has established interdisciplinary research and education programs to address a significant energy challenge – how to realize a large-scale, sustainable, domestic energy source by developing advanced solar photovoltaic (PV) technologies, and by providing the foundation for new industries through innovation. Since its inception, QESST has attracted more than 40 solar energy companies that span the industrial spectrum from basic materials, semiconductor manufacturing, and photovoltaic production to energy system installation firms and utilities.

- The Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College was awarded $43.4 million, over five years, for a Teacher Incentive Fund Evaluation Project from the U.S. Department of Education. The Arizona Ready-for-Rigor Project, led by ASU in collaboration with the Arizona Department of Education and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, is a statewide network of schools in partner districts serving high-need students. This coalition has implemented a performance-based compensation system in historically struggling schools for the purpose of increasing student achievement, retaining highly effective educators, and fostering exemplary school culture in the highest-need communities across Arizona.

### Undergraduate Certificates

- African and African American Studies
- Arabic Studies
- Asian Studies
- East Asian Studies
- Ethnic Studies
- Korean Studies
- Latin American Studies
- Medieval and Renaissance Studies
- Russian and East European Studies
- Southeast Asian Studies
- Spanish for the Professions

### Graduate Certificates

- African Studies
- Asian Studies
- Global Sustainability Leadership
- International Health for Healthcare Professionals
- Immigration Studies
- Indian Law Certificate
- Latino Cultural Competency in Social Work
- Linguistics
- Sustainable Tourism

### Ethnic and Global Diversity

- African and African American Studies
- Arabic Studies
- Asian Studies
- East Asian Studies
- Ethnic Studies
- Korean Studies
- Latin American Studies
- Medieval and Renaissance Studies
- Russian and East European Studies
- Southeast Asian Studies
- Spanish for the Professions

### Religious Diversity

- Islamic Studies
- Jewish Studies

### Gender Diversity

- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender
- Women and Gender Studies

**Table 3-4 Diversity-focused Certificate Programs at ASU, Fall 2012.**
Forefront research and scholarly activity are expectations for all graduate degree programs. Beyond those expectations, several ASU graduate programs are funded by the National Science Foundation through the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program, a training initiative for U.S. Ph.D. scientists and engineers that expands knowledge of specified disciplines with training in interdisciplinary fields. The goal of the IGERT program is to introduce Ph.D. students with diverse backgrounds to interdisciplinary training, and to prepare them for the increasingly multidisciplinary nature of scientific research. Current IGERT research at ASU includes (but is not limited to) the following programs: Urban Ecology 2; Alliance for Person-centered Accessible Technologies, and Adaptations in Form and Function; and Solar Utilization Network.

summary for component 3.B

The General Education Requirement, a keystone for all academic programs at ASU, provides undergraduate students with a strong foundation for success in their educational careers at ASU as well as for continued learning after they matriculate. As will be discussed further in Chapter 4, the aims of this requirement are clearly articulated and assessed at multiple levels, including at the institutional level. The requirement includes study that develops critical thinking skills and furthers understanding of the cultural and human diversity of human society, while also enhancing students’ knowledge of the sciences and the humanities, preparing them for life as productive and contributing citizens in a 21st century world. These courses empower students to contribute to the development of new knowledge and the production of new creative works, both during their studies at ASU and after graduation.

C. Arizona State University has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services

ASU is dedicated to building an institution that supports and demands performance at the highest level by its faculty, staff, academic programs, research, and student services. ASU faculty members and staff employees are recruited, hired, and retained using the ethical and responsible processes discussed in the previous chapter. The performance review, promotion, and (for faculty members) tenure processes are carefully specified to require that each individual remains knowledgeable of the current state of their areas of responsibility. To ensure that currency, the university provides a spectrum of professional development opportunities that enhance the knowledge, skills, and capabilities of its faculty and staff.

The subcomponents of this component of Criterion 3 will be addressed in turn in this section, with subcomponents 3 and 4 addressed together.

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

ASU takes pride in an accomplished faculty, composed of scholars from across the intellectual spectrum, many of whom are recognized as among the best in their respective fields. In Fall 2011, ASU employed 2,865 faculty members, corresponding to a student to faculty ratio of 23:1. Table 3-5 shows that, from 2003 to 2008, ASU continually increased the number of faculty members to accommodate increasing student enrollment. During the recent challenging economic period, ASU experienced only a modest decrease in the number of faculty members; most of the decline was due to retirements. As noted in the Background section, navigating those economic stresses without damage to the quality or reputation of its academic portfolio has been accomplished in part by actions taken by the faculty, including the development of innovative approaches to teaching, collaboration, and interdisciplinary engagement; also important has been a steadfast commitment to hiring new faculty members only those scholars with the ability to become or who are among the best scholars in their fields (as described below). As discussed elsewhere, retention and six-year graduation rates (as mentioned in Chapters 1 and 4) also improved substantially during that period, and funded research grew markedly. These measures of productivity in instruction and discovery by the faculty have never been higher in the institution’s history.

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

The foundation of quality for any university’s academic programs relies on the recruitment and retention of world-class scholars to deliver those programs. ASU ensures high-quality instruction in its courses by only hiring faculty and instructors with appropriate educational qualifications, as discussed in the next subsection. Table 3-6 displays the percentages for the highest degree earned by ASU faculty members in Fall 2011; in that tally, nearly four out of...
every five faculty members held doctorates, and more than nineteen out of every twenty held at least one graduate degree.

As described earlier under the first component of this Criterion, oversight of the curriculum is provided directly by faculty members, with full participation by faculty members in all processes and stages related to curriculum, program, and course development, beginning at the level of the academic unit and proceeding through the university-level approval by CAPC. Faculty members also participate fully in the assessment of academic program performance and student learning, as described in detail in the next chapter. The extensive involvement of tenure-track and tenured faculty in the oversight and assessment activities ensures continuity and enhancement of the standards of excellence expected for ASU’s academic programs.

According to the HLC, an accredited institution must notify the Commission before collaborating in or outsourcing certain aspects of an educational program through an agreement with another party or parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>2,862</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>2,991</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-5 Total number of faculty members at ASU, Fall 2003 to Fall 2011

ASU does not offer dual credit or consortial programs.

The faculty hiring process

Meeting the ambitious goals set for a New American University demands careful and continuous recruitment and hiring of capable and promising scholars who can advance ASU towards those targets. All faculty hiring originates from a traditional academic unit and must adhere to the ethical and responsible hiring procedures discussed in Chapter 2. The specific hiring process for faculty members was developed with input from the University Senate through a shared-governance process that included feedback from representatives of all academic units and is consistent with ABOR policies.

The hiring process ensures fair and ethical recruitment practices for hiring the most qualified applicants consistent with ASU’s Core Values and Mission. All full-time, tenure-eligible faculty, continuing-status-eligible faculty, and academic professional positions must be advertised nationally, while non-tenure-eligible faculty or year-to-year academic professionals may be advertised nationally, regionally, or locally, depending on which type of recruitment assures affirmative efforts to recruit a diverse applicant pool. Positions sought are those that have been identified within the hiring plan for the academic unit; those unit-hiring plans are developed to specifically advance the Core Values of Excellence, Access, and Impact for that academic unit and to enable progress towards the goals established for the institution as the New American University.

To conduct the search for a position, each academic unit hiring authority (the unit director or chair) is responsible for organizing a search committee (consisting of two or more people) with at least half the committee drawn from the faculty of the academic unit hiring. Training on effective search practices and diversity recruitment is provided. Typically, the search committee carefully reviews and winnows the pool of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>highest degree earned</th>
<th>percentage of faculty</th>
<th>total number of faculty members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>2,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or Terminal Master’s*</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first professional (e.g., Law)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Master’s</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other**</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-6 Highest degree earned by ASU faculty members, Fall 2011 to Fall 2011

* Master of Accountancy, Master of Architecture, Master of Fine Arts, Master of Landscape Architecture II, Master of Professional Accounting, Master of Teaching English as a Second Language, Master in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, and other terminal masters’ degrees (3 holders).

**Qualification based on licensure and/or extensive professional experience

An agreement is classified as contractual if all parties are not accredited by a U.S. Department of Education-recognized accreditor to offer the program in question. ASU has HLC-approved contractual arrangements with Academic Partnerships, LLC, and with Pearson eCollege. The purpose of these contractual arrangements is to supplement ASU’s infrastructure with additional enhancement that will enable strong enrollment growth in online programs. Faculty members within ASU academic units are solely and entirely responsible for the content of the academic programs, including all course content. ASU academic units review and verify the academic credentials for instructors, perform the recruitment and hiring of those individuals, and coordinate all course activities by the instructor(s), faculty/facilitators, and staff. There is no change to the existing process used with campus based, face-to-face programs when hiring faculty members to teach online courses. Thus ASU is able to ensure that every instructor is appropriately qualified for the course taught.
applicants for the position and selects finalists for interview; the interview list then must be approved by the dean and the Executive Vice President and University Provost. When all interviews have been completed, recommendations for hiring (including strengths and weaknesses) are provided by the search committee to the hiring authority. In selecting the person to be hired, all tenure, tenure-eligible, and multi-year appointments must be approved by the hiring authority within the academic unit, the appropriate dean, and the Executive Vice President and University Provost. This extensive multi-level review ensures that those hired are capable of meeting the expectations of excellence for faculty members that are required to provide effective high-quality academic programs and to carry out forefront research and creative activity.

In addition to hiring into tenured and tenure-eligible positions, fixed-term appointments can be made for a specified period of time; such appointments do not lead to consideration for tenure. Renewal beyond the term of appointment is conditional upon satisfactory job performance, availability of funds, needs of the academic unit and the university, and approval of the college dean.

To avoid repetition and improve readability, subcomponents 3 and 4 of this component are discussed together.

3. ASU’s instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.

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

Essential to the maintenance of high quality academic programs is the process of continual assessment and improvement of the performance of faculty members. Faculty members at ASU are called upon and accountable to be excellent teachers, researchers, and university citizens who aspire to the highest levels of performance. The various assessments of faculty performance conducted at ASU provide feedback to the faculty member about all aspects of performance, give confirmation and recognition for meritorious and outstanding performance, and help identify and address areas where performance can be improved or is unsatisfactory.

Four types of assessments of faculty performance are performed at ASU: student evaluation of instruction in each course, annual performance reviews for all faculty members, and (for tenure-track and tenured faculty members), promotion/tenure reviews and post-tenure reviews.

Student evaluations of instruction

ASU recognizes that student assessments of instructor performance are a valuable source of information concerning the quality of instruction received, and ABOR and university policies require provisions for those assessments. In particular, ABOR Policy 6-211, “Evaluation of Faculty,” requires that “a systematic assessment of student opinion shall constitute one, but not the only, component of [teaching] evaluation.” University policy ACD 304-09 “Evaluation of Teaching” also requires that every instructor in every class every semester administers an academic-unit approved course evaluation. To ensure a confidential assessment that protects students, by policy these evaluations must be administered by someone other than the instructor, and results from those evaluations are reported to the instructor until after final grades have been entered for all students.

ASU colleges and academic units are responsible for the administration of student evaluations of courses and instructors every semester. Over the last ten years, the university has undergone a transition from a traditional paper-pencil course evaluation system to one that is almost entirely online.

Compliance with the ABOR and ASU requirement for student evaluation of instruction is demanded through inclusion and consideration of those evaluation results in the faculty performance assessments made through the annual performance evaluation of faculty (discussed in the following paragraphs) and promotion and tenure reviews (discussed below). These performance assessments all consider the results obtained by student evaluations, but also rely on data and assessments about teaching performance provided through portfolios, syllabi, and peer evaluations of teaching performance.

Annual performance reviews

As described in Chapter 2, ASU and ABOR policies require faculty members to undergo annual performance reviews. These policies provide ongoing assessment of performance and encourage faculty members to perform at levels beyond merely satisfactory; the results are also considered for salary adjustments based on performance. The review covers the previous 36-month period, with emphasis on the current year.

As described in ACD 506-10, annual review processes for faculty members appointed at 50 percent FTE or greater are conducted at the academic unit
level by unit personnel committees, who provide a recommended performance rating to the director/chair of the unit.\textsuperscript{39} The evaluation is based on written criteria developed by academic units; the criteria and review procedures must have been previously approved by the appropriate dean and the Executive Vice President and University Provost. Assessment of teaching performance must include consideration of the systematic assessment of student opinion about the faculty member’s performance, as noted above. The performance criteria communicate expectations for levels of performance in research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service to all faculty members in that academic unit. The academic unit chair/director considers the recommendation from the unit committee, and after consulting the unit performance criteria, provides the resulting assessment for that year.

The results of the review are communicated to the faculty member in writing by the academic unit chair or director. The results can be appealed to the next higher administrative official, though some units also have internal appeals consideration processes. Grievances regarding discrimination are handled through the process described in Chapter 2.

**promotion and tenure reviews**

Faculty excellence is one of the primary determinants of the quality of any university. Thus, tenure and promotion decisions are among the most important activities a university undertakes. The processes used to assess faculty performance for tenure and promotion at ASU are governed by policies ACD 506-04 and ACD 506-05 respectively.\textsuperscript{39, 40, 43, 44} Tenure is a property right authorized by ABOR, and, through ABOR’s delegation of authority, tenure is granted by the President to individual faculty members based on a thorough review process. At ASU, an individual faculty member’s tenure is located in a specific academic unit. Faculty appointments with tenure are those with a legitimate claim of entitlement to continued employment unless the tenured faculty member retires, resigns, or is dismissed or released in accord with ACD 501, the Conditions of Faculty Service.\textsuperscript{44} To be effective, these policies must be administered ethically and responsibly; evidence provided in Chapter 2 established that the processes used for ASU’s decisions are both ethical and responsible.

The promotion and tenure processes provide a series of in-depth reviews at multiple levels within the institution: the academic unit personnel committee, academic unit chair/director, college personnel committee, supervising dean, university tenure and promotion committee, Executive Vice President and University Provost, and the President. Smaller units, however, may conduct fewer levels of review. A candidate for tenure prepares a portfolio of materials documenting performance in research, teaching (including a tabulation of student evaluation of instruction ratings compared with academic unit norms), and service since appointment (or since last tenure or promotion personnel action). Guidance for assembling the portfolio is provided, but that preparation is solely the responsibility of the faculty member.\textsuperscript{42}

The review criteria for the unit, approved by the appropriate dean and the Executive Vice President/Provost of the University based on established guidelines (ACD 506-04; ABOR 6-201), are used at each level of review to determine if the performance during the probationary period has been sufficient for promotion or tenure, and if the candidate shows continued promise for further achievement.\textsuperscript{39, 45, 46, 47}

A set of external reviewers for the portfolio is determined for each candidate; those reviewers are established scholars with deep knowledge of the candidate’s field with no professional or personal ties to the candidate. Those reviewers provide confidential assessments of the candidate’s accomplishments and promise based on the review criteria for the unit. These expert assessments are provided for consideration by each level of review.

Recommendations at each level of review are passed to the subsequent stages for further review; the final decision is made by the University President. Each level involves an independent recommendation that is informed by the results of the deliberation from preceding levels of review. In those cases where a faculty member believes denial of tenure was in violation of ASU policy, the faculty member may file a grievance in accord with ACD 509-02, the same grievance process used for all faculty personnel actions.\textsuperscript{44}

When needed, an expedited review process exists for both tenure and promotion, spelled out in the same policy documents that describe the usual process for those actions.

**post-tenure reviews**

When identified in the annual performance review described above, unsatisfactory performance for tenured faculty members is addressed through the post-tenure review process in accord with guidance provided by the Provost’s office.\textsuperscript{44, 45} A series of individualized annual improvement plans are implemented for a period not exceeding three annual review cycles until the performance returns to satisfactory levels. These plans specifically detail the elements of unsatisfactory performance, provide written targets and criteria for achieving and assessing satisfactory performance, and identify deadlines for when those targets are to be achieved. Should appropriate progress toward those targets as measured by the specific criteria not be met, the dean may exercise the option to initiate the dismissal for cause process.
review for faculty serving on dissertation committees

Through the Graduate Faculty Initiative, qualified faculty engage in graduate education and mentoring opportunities across the university. This initiative allows doctoral programs to expand their Ph.D. faculty membership beyond a single academic unit and to broaden their educational experiences by including Ph.D. faculty with appropriate research and mentoring expertise from other programs, colleges, schools, and campuses. Prior to serving as chair on dissertation committees, faculty must meet specific endorsement criteria created by each program, as well as the following general criteria:

- **Research, Scholarly, and Creative Achievements:** demonstrate currency and an on-going record of expertise in research, scholarly, and creative achievements in the related discipline.

- **Graduate Education and Mentoring:** individuals should have the expertise and capability for, or have been involved in, teaching graduate courses, serving as a research mentor, advising Ph.D. students, and serving on Ph.D. student committees.

professional development

ASU also offers a variety of professional development opportunities to enhance the knowledge bases and skill sets for faculty and staff members. A sample of these programs is listed in Table 3-7; these options include:

- Academic units may provide funds for tenured and tenure-track faculty members to travel to meetings and conferences for communicating results of their scholarly work, as well as for professional development and continuing education.

- **Academic units also provide ongoing support to maintain excellence in curriculum and methods of instruction.**

- **Webinars and workshops are offered by ASU Online for faculty who use technology in their classrooms, covering topics such as the use of media, managing student groups and discussion boards, applying the Quality Matters Rubric (described above for online courses), using Learning Studio, electronic grade books, and academic integrity.**

- **As discussed in Chapter 2, the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, in collaboration with other offices, provides workshops on such topics as the use of human subjects, research administration, lab/biosafety, animal care, and responsible conduct in research.**

- **The Research Strategy Group (RSG) in ASU’s Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development (OKED) provides support for faculty in the development of select large-scale, complex, multi-disciplinary research proposals. RSG staff assist faculty with identification and assessment (analysis of opportunities, agencies, and ASU assets), pre-proposal preparation (assemble teams, conduct risk assessment, assess competition, and confirm stakeholder commitments), proposal development (creation of proposal management sites, editorial assistance, procurement of letters of support, and Red Team Review), and post-submission activities (preparation for site visits, compilation of lessons learned, and repurpose of declined proposals). The Office of Research Operations also offers a variety of online training videos on such topics as identifying funding sources, developing research collaborations, meeting agency proposal expectations, writing proposals, developing research budgets, and submitting proposals through ASU’s processes.**

using technology to enhance instructor effectiveness

As the demands within teaching and learning environments continue to change, a key set of support resources are those devoted to continual improvement of the capabilities of teachers within those environments through instructor development.

A considerable amount of instructor development occurs in mentor relationships within academic units at the department or college level. To help broaden these relationships through a network spanning the campus, ASU will utilize current technologies to bring together an innovative social platform within an education framework during the 2012-2013 academic year.
year. This network will be a community-driven virtual space where university teachers can connect to ask questions, find training and mentorship, and collaborate to devise creative instructional and curricular solutions. A single, global resource for this information replaces mass messaging and distributed, fragmented information sources to promote clarity and consistency in curriculum and instruction.

As ASU considers the future of digital learning and teaching, the goal remains to enhance the experience for both faculty and students, whether they are working in online courses, hybrid courses, or even face-to-face courses. The Provost's Committee on Excellence in Digital Teaching and Learning focuses on potential future initiatives and meets regularly to discuss in depth ASU's opportunities and positions. The committee acts as a vetting team for what is currently being done and what should be introduced.

5. ASU instructors are accessible for student inquiry

The majority of instruction at ASU is classroom-based with direct contact hours between faculty, instructors, and students. In addition, ASU policy requires faculty members to hold office hours (with those hours publicly posted) for further student contact, ensuring students have access to faculty, instructors, and teaching assistants. This policy applies to both graduate and undergraduate instruction.

ASU’s classroom-based courses also incorporate online technology to extend (but not replace) the connection between faculty and students and to engage students in further inquiry. Among many of the technological enhancements employed, ASU classes use both Blackboard and Learning Studio learning management systems to provide accessibility via additional course content, announcements, assessments, discussion boards, and online virtual office hours. One exemplary approach, called Adaptive Learning, is being used to improve the developmental math sequence taken by freshmen. This technology-based approach adapts and personalizes math instruction according to student responses. To promote the adoption of these new approaches to facilitate instructor-student interaction for online classes, best practices for incorporating those new technologies are shared through a number of venues, including the Provost's Committee on Excellence in Digital Teaching and Learning, which focuses on current and potential future initiatives.

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

The extensive assistance provided to students by ASU student support staff members (discussed in the next component of this Criterion) is a critical link in achieving progress towards the ASU Goal “Access and Quality for All” reviewed in Chapter 1. ASU is diligent in hiring sufficient numbers of top-quality student support personnel, and also takes great pride and responsibility in furthering their professional development in the New American University model.

The recruiting and hiring processes for staff personnel, which ensure those staff members are appropriately qualified for their roles, were described in Chapter 2. After hire, ASU fosters a climate that encourages and rewards ongoing growth and professional development by individual staff members. In 1996, ASU enacted a policy ensuring that each member of the ASU staff is allowed up to 16 hours of leave time annually to support continuous learning in work-related or university-sponsored development opportunities. ASU student support staff members can secure release time for professional development endeavors such as workshops, conferences, seminars, webinars, and meetings of university professional organizations.

While there are thousands of development opportunities available outside of the university setting, ASU also has an outstanding network of opportunities available to staff members on campus. The ASU Learning Management System (LMS) is an online and searchable database providing hundreds of classes on wellness and safety topics, as well as training on ASU specific software systems and university processes. The ASU University Technology Office training system offers a wide range of courses including Adobe technologies, podcasting, MS Office, and Blackboard. ASU’s Office of Human Resources offers the Leadership in the New American University series, including the Supervisor Development and Mastering Leadership programs that provide an opportunity for ASU leaders to capitalize on their leadership strengths and competencies.

Student support staff members participate in extensive specialized ongoing professional development and training throughout the year. Examples of professional development activities include retreats and in-service training sessions focusing on skill development and knowledge acquisition; team discussions of current topics and professional articles; internal newsletters, webpages, and wikis; participation in professional associations, webinars, and conferences at the state, regional, and national levels; and attendance at university level meetings, service on committees, and contribution to special projects.

ASU’s student workers also receive intensive skill-based training focusing on content and processes specific to their positions, as well as the development of strong customer service and communication skills. For example, student peer tutors are required to maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.00 and successfully complete training certified by the College Reading and Learning Association. Supplemental Instruction leaders receive extensive training in facilitation strategies.
ASU staff members are also further supported in their professional development through the tuition discount program. Established by ASU and ABOR policies, this program allows all ASU staff members (50 percent FTE or higher) to take up to 9 credit hours each semester for a small fee. The tuition discount program provides employees a low-cost, high-quality professional development option. In Fall 2012 there were over 700 staff members enrolled in a total of 4,207 credit hours, and 134 faculty members enrolled in nearly 700 credit hours.

### Summary for Component 3.C

As the foundation for establishing excellence in its academic programs, ASU recruits, hires, evaluates, and develops the instructors and student support personnel needed to carry out its instructional mission.

The institution ensures that all instructors are properly trained, qualified, and credentialed. To monitor and improve their performance, every instructor in every course is evaluated by student evaluations, and academic units also gather other data to assess and improve teaching performance. The outcomes of these teaching assessments are used in annual performance reviews and, for tenure-track faculty members, to determine whether or not tenure will be awarded. ASU tenure-track and tenured faculty also play dominant roles in the oversight of academic programs as well as in the assessment of student learning, providing continuity in the expectations of excellence for the institution’s academic programs.

To buttress the efforts of these instructors, ASU also recruits, hires, evaluates, and develops a staff to support the academic programs. This staff is appropriate in size and training for the students enrolled in its academic programs. Working cooperatively, the faculty and student support personnel have enabled ASU to secure and enhance the quality of its academic offerings and to improve the delivery efficiency and educational effectiveness of its degree programs.

### D. Arizona State University provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

As one of the Design Aspirations, enabling student success is an institutional imperative: ASU is committed to success of each unique student. The success of ASU’s academic programs in terms of student learning can be judged in part by the improvements seen in student retention, persistence, and graduation rates shown in Chapter 1, by the achievements of its graduates, and by the regard in which those programs are held.

To reach those levels of outstanding performance, ASU provides a wide variety of programs and services in support of student learning and effective teaching for all its academic offerings. They are summarized in this section. Evidence provided in this section demonstrates that ASU strongly and successfully supports student learning and effective teaching through a broad spectrum of dedicated and effective services provided to enrolled students, and further advances student success through other resources provided for students and instructors.

#### 1. ASU provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.

The student body at ASU includes students from a wide spectrum of cultures, backgrounds, and age groups. To meet the needs of its diverse student population, ASU utilizes a wealth of student support services within an infrastructure that provides access to a variety of services designed to accommodate its students. Although several of these programs have been discussed elsewhere in this Self-Study Report, examples of programs that focus on the needs of special groups within the student body include:

- **Adult Learner Resources** provides a place for students beginning or returning to school (25 years of age or older) to receive assistance in obtaining an undergraduate degree. Scholarship information, FAQ’s, and a website hosting services for adult learners are available through this program.

- **The Disability Resource Center**, with offices located on all campuses, is the central location for establishing eligibility and obtaining services and accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. Services include a wide range of supporting activities, including testing accommodations, note-taking services, alternative format services, on-campus transportation (via golf carts), interpreting services, and equipment loan/check-out opportunities.

- **Freshmen living in the residence halls** experience the residential college experience, which is designed to contribute to the academic and personal development of every resident. First year students live in a community with others from their college and have access to faculty and staff outside of class, as well experiences, programs, and support services designed to encourage growth, development, and persistence to graduation. In Fall 2012, ASU introduced Student Success Centers in the residential colleges that provide drop-in academic and career advising, tutoring and academic skill development, and programming focused on personal skill development and community development. The residential
colleges utilize Peer Mentors and Community Assistants who work closely with the students living in the college’s residential communities. A primary role for the Peer Mentors and Community Assistants is to get to know the students who reside on their floor (there is one Peer Mentor and one Community Assistant for approximately 50 undergraduates) and to act as both a resource and a support mechanism throughout their students’ first year at ASU. Mentoring responsibilities include connecting and creating a sense of community with and among their residents, facilitating the knowledge and use of academic and other support resources available, and serving as a model of student success.

- Each college also offers specialized residential programs tailored to the academic program(s) in which students are enrolled. For instance, Barrett, The Honors College prides itself on the interdisciplinary nature of its residence halls where highly motivated students live and engage with students from a wide variety of majors across campuses. A few special freshmen communities within Barrett create strong links between the living and learning experiences for students who have similar interests, backgrounds, and goals. Each of these communities has a staff advisor and a student paraprofessional leader committed to student growth and development through group living. Barrett freshmen from the School of Sustainability, the W. P. Carey School of Business, the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering, and the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts participate in these special communities while also benefiting from college-wide programming that takes place in all Barrett residence halls.

- Graduate Student Resources encompasses diversity, recruitment and retention, financial support, and other student support initiatives specifically for the graduate student population. Preparing Future Faculty (mentioned in chapter 1) and Strategies for Success are two programs the Graduate College provides in support of their students. Strategies for Success provides tools for graduate students from the first semester of study through graduation and beyond. Professional development tools are offered via podcasts, videos, and workshops, and promote graduate students’ well-being during their academic careers.

- Career Services are provided on each of the four campuses through non-academic and academic units that enable students to receive comparable career development support across discipline and location.

- ASU Counseling Services works to support the academic mission of the university by providing mental health consultation and outreach services that facilitate the student learning experience, as well as student persistence and progress toward graduation. Centers are located at all four campuses and are open to all students regardless of their college affiliation or academic level. Counseling centers provide students with priority service in an effort to promote a healthy, safe, and positive campus environment.

- The Center for Off-Campus and Commuter Student Services addresses the many complexities commuter students face.

- The Pat Tillman Veterans Center is a student resource for veterans and their dependents. The Center is located on the Tempe campus and brings together academic and student support services in a single point of contact to promote a smooth transition from the military to an academic setting. ASU was ranked sixth nationally by the Military Times Edge in their 2011 survey of best colleges for veterans. Additionally, ASU was selected to participate in a pilot program sponsored by the Veteran Administration called VetSuccess on Campus. Two VA staff members located in the center assist veterans with services, such as vocational testing, career counseling, and readjustment counseling, to promote successful completion of their educational and employment goals. ASU was named a “Military Friendly School for 2013” by G.I. Jobs magazine for the fourth consecutive year, honoring the top 15 percent of colleges, universities and trade schools that are leaders in providing educational support benefits and paths to success to military veterans.

- ASU’s University Bridge (formerly Summer Bridge) was a very successful high school-to-ASU transition program for entering at-risk students administered by the staff of University Academic Success Programs. From the period of 2006-2010, the average retention rate for the academically at-risk participants was 89
First-year student-athletes spend a minimum of four hours in the athlete learning center each week to promote time for studying, building organizational skills, and achieving academic self-sufficiency. After the first year, student-athletes can ‘graduate’ from the study program by demonstrating competency as a student (generally, achievement of a 2.50 grade point average or above). Academic mentors and tutoring services are available to those student-athletes seeking enrichment opportunities.

The Sun Devil Life Skill Development program affords student-athletes an opportunity to participate in meaningful life skill development programs during their academic tenure: life skills speakers provide interactive sessions on topics of interest; community service engagement experiences are available (every student athlete participates in at least one community service project); career development, resume writing, and interviewing workshops are offered along with networking opportunities; and lessons in etiquette are available.

The Office of Student Athlete Development’s model for assessing student-athlete’s ‘risk factors’ looks at both objective (e.g., standardized test scores, and GPA) and subjective (e.g., first-generation college student, and personal history) information in assessing student athlete college preparedness. This assessment leads to the application of appropriate support for the individual student-athlete. The success of this model led to the adoption of the approach by the NCAA as part of its Graduation Risk Overview model.

These approaches have brought about steady improvement in academic performance by ASU student-athletes and have been continually enhanced since the last accreditation review, as displayed in figure 4-3 on page 4-21. By 2012, the Graduation Success Rate (GSR) for ASU student-athletes reached 80 percent, an all-time high for ASU. The GSR is based on student-athletes who entered college as freshmen in 2001-2004 and allows for the removal of those individuals from the cohort who left ASU in good academic standing prior to completing their eligibility. The 2012 GSR placed ASU’s performance in the top five of the PAC-12 Conference. ASU’s women’s GSR rate reached 94 percent, second in the PAC-12 only to Stanford University. Four ASU teams lead the Pac-12 Conference with a four-year GSR of 100 percent: women’s golf, women’s swimming and diving, women’s tennis, and women’s volleyball. The men’s golf team (86 percent) and the men’s swimming and diving teams (84 percent) had the highest GSR of men’s ASU teams, ranking sixth and fourth in the conference, respectively.

This close-up look at one program focused on a particular segment of the student population demonstrates the devotion to student success present throughout ASU’s academic operations.

### other examples

ASU also offers programs designed specifically to provide multicultural mentoring opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students. For example,
“Shades” is an exemplary interdisciplinary assembly of undergraduate and graduate scholars that spans disciplines, promotes professional development, and encourages networking within the ASU community. Shades mentors coach underrepresented students as they prepare to be future scientists, educators, designers, artists, clinicians, and practitioners. To emphasize the value ASU places on student mentoring, faculty with exceptional mentoring records also are honored through a number of programs at the unit, college, and university level.

2. ASU provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students, and uses a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are prepared.

Consistent with the Design Aspiration of “enabling student success,” ASU takes responsibility for assisting students in making the transition to college success by addressing their academic needs upon entry. Students come with a spectrum of competencies and levels of academic preparation. Efforts are made to smooth the transition to university-level academic performance expectations, and to properly place students within academic programs to ensure their success.

To ensure that students enter academic programs at the appropriate level, ASU provides placement examinations in foreign languages, mathematics, and English composition. The institution also recognizes appropriate transfer credit and considers advanced course placement based on College Level Exam Placement scores, advanced placement courses taken, and dual-enrollment credit courses. English placement for every incoming freshman student is based on the student’s ACT or SAT verbal scores, or by the score obtained on the English placement examination (ACCUPLACER) offered through University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness Testing and Scanning Services. Math placement for every incoming freshman student is based on the score a student obtains on the ALEKS online examination; the examination is taken prior to a student’s entry orientation program. Online language placement testing for all students is available in French, German, and Spanish; these diagnostic tests provide a recommended course level for the language.

Upon entering ASU, all freshmen are required to take a freshmen seminar course, such as ASU 101. These courses, taught in course sections with small numbers of students (typically 20 or fewer), allow students to engage each other in a much smaller environment than a typical class. College-specific examples of ASU 101-type courses include WPC 101 in the W. P. Carey School of Business and the ASU 101 course in the Herberger Institute of Design and the Arts. Each college puts its own imprint on their offerings of this course, engaging students in the college and majors as quickly as possible. In addition, each freshmen seminar also delivers common knowledge and skills to help freshmen adapt to ASU, including instruction on academic integrity and its importance in the life of a scholar, the value of engaging in research activities, time management skills, engagement activities, and study and teamwork skills. First offered in 2007, ASU 101 has undergone continuous evolution to help maximize student success, and is now regarded as a key to early engagement of freshmen into college life at ASU.

As noted earlier, a central component in meeting ASU’s responsibility for enabling student success is the provision of Student Success Centers administered by the University Academic Success Programs. These centers offer free academic support services for all enrolled students, including tutoring, writing support, structured study groups, success courses, and study lounges. Small group, in-person tutoring is available in the Student Success Centers on a walk-in basis and reinforces concepts introduced by course instructors and helps students develop learning strategies. Student Success Centers tutors help students, for example, to review key course concepts, learn new methods of taking notes and reading textbooks, formulate questions about course material for their professors to address, and develop new study strategies. Online tutoring programs are also available for writing, mathematics, business, science, and select general studies courses. Online review sessions are offered weekly and prior to exams.

Launched in Fall 2011, Writer’s Studio offers students technology-rich experiences in first-year composition. Through online courses, students craft multimodal projects (e.g., written words, images, audio recordings, and video recordings) and digital portfolios to demonstrate how they have met nationally developed writing learning outcomes, as well as habits of mind that promote success. Instruction is also multimodal, with students engaging with course material and activities available in online textbook, podcasts, short videos, and discussion boards.107 108 Although course sections scale to meet enrollment demands, students work in small online writing communities to share their work with classmates, who in turn use rubrics to guide responses to peers’ drafts. Students also benefit from feedback offered by instructional assistants (advanced undergraduate students planning careers in teaching), writing center tutors, tutors provided by the publisher, and course faculty. When a student has demonstrated proficiency in all learning outcomes for the course, the student has completed the course.

Supplemental Instruction brings students together in structured study sessions to discuss concepts, compare notes, and share strategies. Supplemental Instruction is designed to increase “time on task” and help students process course content by integrating how to learn with what to learn. Peer facilitators who have successfully completed the class lead the study sessions. Supplemental Instruction Leaders attend all class sessions to keep up with course content and hold three or more study groups each week. In the next chapter, under component 4.C, specific information about the impact of Supplemental Instruction on student success is presented.
Usage of academic support services in the ASU Student Success Centers has grown tremendously over the past few years. In AY2011-2012, there were 132,661 tutoring visits to Student Success Centers across all ASU campuses and online, a 36 percent increase compared to AY2010-2011 (97,500 visits). During AY2011-12, 49,756 tutoring visits (38 percent of all visits) were for math assistance, while the writing centers experienced 11,777 visits (9 percent of total visits). Online tutoring has seen the most dramatic increase in visits, with 8,018 visits in AY2011-2012, a nearly five-fold increase compared to AY2010-2011 (1,342 visits); science tutoring comprised nearly half those visits.

The results from tutoring are clear. Students who seek and receive tutoring perform consistently better than those who do not. Our research has indicated that the initial math course is particularly important to retention and subsequent graduation. Figure 3-1 below provides data on the efficacy of math tutoring.

![Figure 3-1: Effect of Tutoring on Course Passage Rates for Introductory Math Courses 2011-2012.](image)

### 3. ASU Provides Academic Advising Suited to Its Programs and the Needs of Our Students.

**Academic Advisors and Student Success**

Throughout the university, teams of academic advisors promote student success at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The university uses a distributed model of advising wherein each college determines how best to serve their students through advising services. In some colleges, such as the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts and University College, all advising is centralized in order to maximize efficiencies and maintain consistency throughout the unit. In other units, such as the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, direct advising services are provided in the schools and departments with coordination provided by the Office of the Dean. Other colleges, such as the W. P. Carey School of Business, employ a mixed model with primary services provided by a central office and specialized services offered within the academic major.

All transfer students have access to a dedicated transfer specialist within the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. Transfer specialists support the student transitioning to the university in a comprehensive manner. In collaboration with multiple academic units across the university, the transfer specialists provide the student information on efficient and effective options for transfer, including the utilization of Pathways programs (such as the Maricopa-ASU Partnership Program and the Transfer Admission Guarantee described in Chapter 1 and above under subcomponent 3.B.1) with Arizona community colleges. Additionally, academic advisors embedded in programmatic units are willing to meet with and help transfer students outline course sequences, as well as provide an understanding of progress toward degree completion at the university. Transfer specialists regularly visit community colleges to help transfer students understand options regarding their progress plan to obtain a degree from ASU, serving a vital role as the liaison between potential ASU students and the university.

Across the university, 240 staff members have academic advising as a primary responsibility. The most frequent job title is Academic Success Specialist, followed by Academic Success Coordinator, Coordinator, and Assistant Director of Academic Services. Regardless of title, the job descriptions identify the advisor as a key contributor to increased student retention and graduation university-wide. They support students to make timely progress toward a degree through a range of in-person and online academic counseling and support strategies. Within this context, each hiring unit refines the description to include any supervisory responsibilities, data capabilities, or specialized services for online students.

Each student at the university has, at minimum, one academic advisor or member of an advising team assigned to that student. The name of the advisor is available to the student on the MyASU site. In some units, particularly at the graduate level, the students have both a professional academic advisor, as well as a faculty advisor who provide discipline-specific information about both the subject matter and career options. Students in Barrett, The Honors College have three advisors: one advisor within the student's academic major, a staff advisor in Barrett, and a Faculty Honors Advisor with whom the student can discuss questions or issues related to his or her academic interests.

Though advising is distributed throughout the university, the staff members engaged in academic advising coordinate their efforts and pursue professional development through the Council of Academic Advisors. Monthly meetings and electronic distribution lists enable members to share best practices, policy updates, and advances in advising technologies. Members of the Council also work together to define practice and focus on desired outcomes. Toward this end, the Council has crafted a mission statement for academic advising at the university:
The mission of academic advising at Arizona State University is to further the teaching mission of the University by providing quality, accessible advising to all students. Academic advisors help students successfully transition to the University and make progress towards their educational goals and graduation. Advisors are part of the educational process, providing academic information and guidance to help students understand curricula, policies, and procedures. Academic advising is a collaborative teaching relationship among academic advisors, students, faculty, and the University community. Working with advisors, students identify academic and career goals, create and implement plans, and assume responsibility for their education.

Advisors work with faculty and administrators in their academic units to facilitate student success. For first-year students, advisor responsibilities include introduction to the norms, customs and procedures of university life; selection of the appropriate academic major; learning how to access resources such as tutoring, supplemental instruction, and services provided by the writing centers; and learning how to remain on track to graduation. The advisors help transfer students with course equivalencies, block transfer policies and procedures; and options for degree completion. For advanced undergraduate students, advisors assist students with degree checks and verification of degree requirements, internships, and graduation audits.

Graduate students within an academic unit have unique needs, and the advising staff assists students with admission and registration processes, committee formation, formatting for theses and dissertations, and policies and procedures set forth by the Graduate College. Advising needs are determined by the colleges for both graduate and undergraduate students, and the distributed model allows each college the necessary flexibility to ensure the success of their students.

These teams of advisors and their activities have contributed greatly to the advance in student success measures of retention, persistence, and graduation. Overall, according to survey data, students are satisfied with the advising they receive at ASU. During the 2011-2012 academic year, 92 percent of freshman and 84 percent of seniors were satisfied or very satisfied with advising in their major field of study. In a Fall 2011 survey of sophomores and juniors, nearly 90 percent expressed satisfaction with the advising they received. Approximately 80 percent of graduate and law students, during 2011-2012, assigned positive ratings to advising on degree requirements and course selection. Additionally, 84 percent of graduating seniors were satisfied or very satisfied with advising they received on courses and course requirements. During AY2011-2012, over three-quarters of ASU undergraduates said that advising was available when they needed it “almost always” or “more often than not.”

**Technological Innovation and Student Success: eAdvisor**

Some of the major inefficiencies in higher education are evidenced in the failure of students to progress and complete their academic goals in a timely manner. In an institution as large as ASU, these inefficiencies translate into tens of millions of dollars of lost investment.

ASU has used technology to provide an enhanced and individualized system that provides online advising to supplement traditional person-to-person approaches by taking advantage of the ubiquity of digital tools. This technology has resulted in improved student outcomes. The online advising system “eAdvisor at ASU” was developed by Executive Vice President and University Provost Elizabeth D. Phillips, based on the system she developed in 1996 at the University of Florida; there, the system resulted in a 20 percent increase in the graduation rate.

At ASU, eAdvisor has met with similar success. The four-year graduation rate at ASU for the 2002 and 2003 cohorts held constant at approximately 30 percent. For the cohorts in years 2004 to 2006 the average four-year graduation rate was essentially constant and hovered at slightly less than one-third at 32.8 percent. The introduction of eAdvisor, which included the major maps described below, immediately enhanced these four-year graduation rates. The 2007 cohort was the first class to see the major maps portion of eAdvisor. The four-year graduation rate for the 2007 cohort was 37.0 percent, a 12.8 percent improvement from the average for the three prior cohorts which was 32.8 percent. The 2008 cohort was the first cohort where eAdvisor was fully implemented; that cohort saw the four-year graduation rate rise further, to an estimated 42 percent, an additional 13 percent improvement over the 2007 cohort four-year graduation rate. Overall, compared to the 2006 cohort, the eAdvisor approach improved the four-year graduation rate from 33.5 percent to an estimated 42 percent, for an overall improvement of 25 percent during that time period. Compared with the 2002 cohort, the four-year graduation rate has improved from 30.0 percent to 42 percent for the 2008 cohort, a 39.7 percent improvement in that metric; the bulk of that improvement is attributable to the use of eAdvisor.

Since its adoption and implementation in AY2007-2008, ASU’s eAdvisor system has represented a fundamental shift for student success advising at ASU, firmly placing each student’s path to graduation at the center of all advising activity. Each academic unit has developed a “Major Map” for their academic programs leading to a degree. These Major Maps show students exactly what classes are needed in each academic term of their degree program to stay on track to timely graduation. During the first four terms specific courses, considered diagnostic of student success, are marked as “critical tracking” courses to be completed on a schedule. Student progress
through these critical tracking courses is monitored to ensure students progress through their degree tracks and make the right course choices.

The eAdvisor system has a search engine that allows students to survey possible majors by interests, career options, or particular skills; it superimposes the courses that students have successfully completed over the Major Maps of alternative degree programs. Some key strategies used in the design of eAdvisor include:

1. Taking the guesswork out of earning a degree – the eAdvisor tool helps:
   - Clarify degree expectations.
   - Create an early college connection and build a sense of belonging.
   - Emphasize the sequence of courses, not the hierarchy of requirements.
   - Expose students to critical course work required for the degree early in their academic experience.
   - Identify students who are academically struggling and provide early intervention through academic advisors.
   - Students select a major based on their interests and career goals. The degree search option helps students search for a major by key interest such as an interest in people, rather than expecting students to read through a catalog and figure out what major fits them.
   - Increase student persistence and graduation rates.

2. Helping students in trouble – ASU is able to identify students in trouble and engage timely intervention by:
   - Reporting to colleges and advisors when students are “off-track.”
   - Prompting email communication to individual students if they are “off-track.”
   - Requiring students to consult their advisors when they are not progressing toward their selected degree (e.g., enrolled in the wrong courses or not achieving a required GPA or grade). Students who are making inadequate progress cannot register until they see an advisor.
   - Providing tools for students to find a degree that may better fit their talents and interests if they are unsuccessful in their chosen major or find they are uninterested in it.
   - Helping enforce academic policies and reinforcing in-person advising.

3. Expanding the role of in-person advising – Having moved much of the advising work related to degree requirements and tracking to the online eAdvisor application, in-person advising services are expanded and focused to help the student to:
   - Explore degree and career choices.
   - Learn about online tools.
   - Identify strengths.
   - Address unique circumstances and student issues.
   - Locate available resources.
   - Understand university policies.

The eAdvisor system has also assisted ASU teams of professional advisors to effectively manage and communicate with large numbers of students during their first four terms. By reporting to colleges and advisors when a student is off track, providing real-time feedback to students through their MyASU portal, and prompting communication to individual students, the system both enforces academic policies and helps personalize targeted, in-person advising sessions. Response to the program by students, parents, and advisors has been very positive. In 2011-12 surveys, nearly all students (90 percent, freshmen; 97 percent, sophomores/juniors; and 92 percent, seniors) expressed satisfaction with the online tools and resources in eAdvisor.

An important by-product of the Major Maps is the input those maps have provided to academic planning and the forecasting of the university's resource needs for specific classes. For students to stay on track to graduation, the necessary classes must be offered when needed, and the Major Maps are an important tool in this planning process. Chairs, directors, and faculty heads use the Major Maps and student enrollment numbers to forecast the number of seats needed for any given course in a particular semester. Academic units are required to offer sufficient seats in all courses needed for students to stay on track.

Problems often arise for students, particularly in their first few years, and ASU has investigated possible causes thoroughly. For example, ASU has learned that students who fail to earn above a 2.0 GPA in their first semester persist at rates below 50 percent and graduate at rates below 25 percent. Therefore, a new support structure was created to address a full array of potential problems. A retention dashboard was designed to alert academic advisors and other key retention staff to early warning indicators of potential student problems. Data relevant to the indicators are continuously collected and input to the dashboard system. Much of the data comes from PeopleSoft,
but other information can come from such individuals as Community Assistants, health counselors, and student financial aid advisors. The dashboard provides the most current available information to staff and academic advisors about students’ GPA, financial difficulties, early warning indicators of poor progress in current courses; it reports failure to pass critical tracking courses; health issues (properly protected for HIPAA security); indicators of social problems; and so forth. Once an indicator is registered in the dashboard, the relevant staff members are expected to respond to the students’ needs whether the matter is academic, social, financial, or health-related in nature. In the first three months of operation, the retention dashboard was the fourth most active dashboard application at ASU, lagging behind only payroll and a few other common dashboards accessed by university members at large. The overall purpose of the retention dashboard is to identify potential student problems and to provide appropriate assistance before problems become insurmountable and a threat to degree completion.

Another support initiative recently developed is an academic refresher program known as Pathways to Academic Student Success. First implemented in Spring 2012, the program helps students placed on probationary status due to a poor semester performance resulting in a GPA fallen below 2.0. Pathways to Academic Student Success is designed to assist students to succeed in their coursework at a standard consistent with levels that promote persistence and graduation. Students placed on academic probation are required to attend and complete elements of the program prior to beginning the next semester. During the next semester they take (or retake) course(s) they failed to pass, and they participate in mandatory Supplemental Instruction sessions. Students also are required to complete a series of success workshops, sign a pledge accepting responsibility for their own success, and complete obligated courses of actions specified by the Pathways to Academic Student Success program. It is expected that students who are confronted directly and early with their lack of success and who are given guidance for academic recovery are much more likely to show positive improvement and retention to degree completion.

Additional assistance related to advising comes in the form of programs for transfer students. Discussed in a previous section in this chapter, the Maricopa to ASU Pathways Program, the Transfer Admission Guarantee, and Shared Unique Numbers approaches are designed to inform students of their progress towards a successful transfer.

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

Teaching and learning is central to all ASU operations. The institution has developed teaching and learning environments equipped with both human and technological support resources required to facilitate learning and discovery.

Library resources

ASU Libraries is a member of the distinguished Association of Research Libraries, the Center for Research Libraries, and the Greater Western Library Alliance, and is considered one of the premiere research libraries in North America. The collection contains over 4.5 million print volumes, 7.7 million microform volumes, and a full array of digital resources. The libraries’ superb digital collection consisting of 81,937 full-text online journals, complemented by 693 online research databases, and 403,504 e-book titles, supports the research and instructional requirements of faculty and students on all campuses. The ASU Libraries is also a depository library for the United States Government and stores an extensive collection of government publications. Other types of materials include cartographic materials, graphic materials, and video and sound recordings.

ASU Libraries provides eight physical library locations. Five libraries are on the Tempe campus: Hayden Library, housing materials in the humanities and social sciences, including business and education; Noble Science and Engineering Library, housing the collections for astronomy, biology, chemistry, engineering, geography, geology, industry standards, maps and aerial photographs, mathematics, medicine, and physics; the Architecture and Environmental Design Library; the Ross-Blakley Law Library; and the Music Library. The Downtown Phoenix campus Library provides access to research resources focusing on support of curriculum taught at the campus, including nursing and health innovation, health and wellness, journalism and mass communications, and public programs. The Polytechnic campus Library houses materials primarily in the areas of aviation and engineering. The Fletcher Library on the West campus supports West campus curriculum and features an extensive media collection.

Librarians with disciplinary expertise provide in-person instruction sessions to students on the library research process and use of library resources. To support online instruction, subject librarians have created online learning modules and LibGuides to assist students in finding and evaluating the best resources for a subject or a specific course, information on citing resources, and information about academic integrity. Students, faculty, and staff have access to subject librarians for individual and group research consultations, as well as to the 24/7 “Ask a Librarian” service via chat and email. In 2011-12 surveys, nearly all students (96 percent graduating seniors; 96 percent graduate and law students) expressed overall satisfaction with the ASU Libraries as well as with the available information resources (96 percent graduating seniors; 96 percent graduate and law students).
computing resources at ASU

University Technology Office (UTO) provides a myriad of computing services to support the instructional and research needs of students, faculty, and staff across all four campuses and digitally beyond. In-person labs, classrooms, and computing sites are supported with a Common Image, providing every student in every UTO location the same software required for course work, with over 250 software package options available. Student email, file space, and online applications are supported through a partnership with Google. In addition, the ASU-developed MyAPPs delivers software to the desktop or via download through ASU’s web site; providing alternative on- or off-campus access to required software resources. Network file space, state of the art applications, ubiquitous wireless access and printing are also provided. Through the use of UTO services, students can access instructor material online to facilitate a blended learning model, ensuring students get what they need, when they need it, and in the way they need it.

Student computing is supported over a wide range of equipment, from personally owned laptops, mobile devices, and desktop computers to university-provided devices. Offering spaces for students to study, collaborate and learn, UTO has developed strategically designed laptop lounges on the physical campuses (with power, wireless and wired capabilities), along with team rooms equipped with video and computer technology, and meeting spaces with large screen displays and video switching capabilities. Partnering with the ASU libraries, there are over 4000 Common Image computers available for student use across the four metropolitan campuses. The university computing facilities are supported with an annual infusion of funds to keep the equipment and resources current.

ASU utilizes specialized digital tools to advance student success by providing timely information on progress and resources. Two examples noted here are “My ASU” and Blackboard Learn.

- My ASU is a custom-built web-based portal for students, faculty, and staff. This portal provides an individualized tool to allow quick access to personalized information and services. This individualization allows ASU to push pertinent messaging and information while facilitating quick access to personalized information such as class schedules for each person. The student portion of My ASU grows with the individual student from the time of application and admission through graduation, providing a familiar and seamless computer interface for the entirety of their academic career at ASU.

For faculty members, My ASU gives easy access to class details, to review class rosters (including photos based on the student ID card photo database), and to post grades.

- Blackboard Learn is the enterprise learning management system (LMS) that is deployed at ASU to support teaching and learning. The LMS facilitates delivery of course content by faculty and provides a platform of learning for students, including features such as tests, grade reports, course content delivery, and discussion boards. Students directly access Blackboard courses through their My ASU portal.

These and other resources continue to have a significant impact on the student experience at ASU. Based on 2012-2012 exit surveys, over 90 percent of seniors, as well as graduate and law students, were satisfied or very satisfied with ASU’s computer labs and resources.

additional resources for enhancing student instruction

As students advance in their studies, special facilities and laboratories at ASU enable and enhance the acquisition of specialized skills and knowledge. A brief look at three such facilities follows:

- The Child Study Laboratory (CSL) was established by the Department of Psychology in 1972. The CSL fulfills an integral role in the university’s three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service. The CSL serves as a model center for the community. Undergraduate and graduate students pursuing various careers serving young children and families experience carefully supervised training opportunities. The CSL children and families participate in various research studies, leading to cutting-edge research findings and new curricula. The laboratory is a model of high-quality education and care for young children, and offers training opportunities and technical assistance for state and local early childhood professionals.

- The Clinical Psychology Center is the setting for in-house practicum training that begins in the second year of the clinical psychology curriculum. The clinic is comprised of a reception area, waiting room, five therapy rooms, a testing room, offices for the Director and Resident Therapists, a student workroom with computer stations, and two observation rooms. The CPC maintains four webcams for recording therapy sessions that can be reviewed during supervision sessions and maintains clinical files. The Center serves members of ASU campuses and the surrounding community. The CPC offers on-site programs in child and adult social skills, depression
prevention for teens, and sleep improvement in addition to individual, couples and family therapy.

- The College of Nursing and Health Innovation hosts Nurse-Managed Healthcare Clinics at three different sites in the Phoenix metropolitan area. The Healthcare Clinics’ staff provides both physical and mental health services. Staff at the clinics includes nurse practitioners, medical doctors, clinical psychologists, and psychiatric nurse practitioners. Students pursuing degrees in nursing, social work, journalism, bioinformatics, and psychology provide hundreds of hours of service in the clinic, and experience mentoring and educational opportunities. The Clinics also serve as sites for faculty practice, research, and clinical trials.

5. ASU provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information sources.

Students learn to efficiently find and effectively use sources of information through courses and through “stand alone” resources as they progress through the General Education Curriculum.

First-year composition courses place considerable emphasis on teaching students how to use research and information sources in writing assignments. Courses are based on a set of learning outcomes recommended by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA). Students are able to understand a writing assignment as a series of tasks, including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing appropriate primary and secondary sources upon the successful completion of first-year composition. They learn to integrate their own ideas with those of others, and practice appropriate means of documenting their work.

The ASU Libraries also provide students a wide variety of resources and assistance in the effective use of research and information sources, including:

- Online learning modules for finding research topics, evaluating resources, using the library catalog and search engines, understanding academic integrity, accessing and using databases, learning how to cite resources used in their assignments, and how to use resources such as Ref Works.
- Tutoring for beginning and advanced library research skills.
- Workshops on exploring information resources for literature reviews.
- Access to subject librarians and the 24/7 “Ask a Librarian” Service via chat and email.

summary for component 3.D

Enabling student success as a Design Aspiration is a key feature of the New American University. Enabling success for each unique student in a large and diverse student body demands a host of effective and efficient student support services.

ASU provides those services in both traditional ways and through innovative usage of technology. A large cadre of professionally trained academic advisors serve special student needs targeted by specific programs and oversight. The university appropriately assesses the backgrounds of entering students and implements processes to help all students become better prepared to perform university-level work. Instruction and advising, delivered through traditional means as well as through innovative uses of technology, such as eAdvisor, My ASU, and Blackboard Learn support student success and retention. The result of these efforts is high-quality academic programs delivered with greater efficiency and oversight, designed to lead to improvements in retention, persistence, and graduation rates.

E. ASU fulfills its claims for an enriched educational environment.

To avoid repetition and present a more readable discussion, the evidence for both subcomponents of this component will be presented together.

1. ASU's co-curricular programs are suited to its mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

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

As a model of the New American University, ASU provides its large and diverse student body a rich educational experience, and ensures that students experience a broadened education both in and outside of the classroom.

Students are immersed in an enriched educational environment and an atmosphere promoting social development and academic and personal success beginning with their on-campus residential experience. Freshmen live on campus during their first year at ASU in an effort to fully expose them in the university experience. Through a special online website, the
“Sun Devil Way”, residential students are encouraged to become active members of the ASU community, while taking full advantage of the plethora of resources available to them on campus. The Sun Devil Way also promotes the civic responsibilities expected of student members of the ASU community. In order to foster learning and dialogue exchange in non-classroom settings, residence halls ensure that students sharing the same major have the opportunity to be in close proximity to one another. Living on campus introduces students to a dynamic environment where study lounges and onsite classes, wireless connectivity and computer stations, academic support services (advising, tutoring, and workshops), mentoring, dining options, and co-curricular programming are commonplace.

Courses and programs such as ASU 101-type and Preparing Future Faculty offer students supplemental opportunities to enrich their educational and future career experiences:

- ASU 101-type courses teach first-year students about ASU’s mission as the New American University, the importance and benefits of an entrepreneurial approach to problem solving, the demands of academic integrity, potential solutions to sustainability challenges, and the importance of social embeddedness. Students examine the concept of academic integrity, the value of engaging in research activities, and learning to think with an interdisciplinary perspective.

- Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) is a nationally recognized professional development program for doctoral and MFA students, as well as post docs, interested in pursuing a faculty position upon graduation or degree completion. Students learn about the roles of faculty (including research/scholarship, teaching, and service) and how faculty roles differ by institution. They also learn an insider’s perspective through insights from current faculty members at ASU and from other institutions.

Services aimed at helping students and alumni find careers using the skills and knowledge gained at ASU are available to all ASU students and alumni on each campus. The Office of Career Services equips students with the necessary tools to explore, plan, and achieve career aspirations. Sun Devil CareerLink is a national, web-based job and internship tool that allows students to post resumes and schedule interviews in one online location. Interested students register for access to the system; jobs posted in the system are targeted to candidates pursuing or who have completed at least a four-year degree. Career Services promotes an online Career Guide which helps students explore and evaluate potential careers, learn about internships, and understand the processes involved with finding and accepting employment; interview skills, appropriate interview attire, writing a resume, interview etiquette, negotiating employment options, etc. A variety of workshops, seminars, and webinars are offered by ASU Career Services to support the future success of students as they prepare for life post-graduation.

Career centers are also located in several of ASU’s colleges. The Engineering Career Center, for example, sponsors career fairs, connects employers with students pursuing jobs and internships, and offers online tools for resume development and preparation for job fairs and interviews. Center staff members lead workshops and provide comprehensive career coaching for students and alumni. The Business Career Center hosts speaker series, workshops, mock interviews, and career fairs. Staff members provide one-on-one career coaching, critique resumes and cover letters, and assist students in exploring a multitude of career and internship options.

To further enrich their educational experience, ASU provides students with an array of opportunities to explore, discover, engage, and experience research by utilizing the extensive resources available at a large public research university. Students interact with faculty researchers with whom they may have limited or no contact during their coursework, and the search tool uResearch can identify research projects or topics of interest already under research at ASU. Through this program, students have the opportunity to work on a wide variety of challenging research projects ranging from global health to next-generation nanoelectronics. Students transform their theoretical knowledge into experiential practice – whether it is developing alternative energy from sunlight or creating their own entrepreneurial ideas to launch a business. The database is searchable by academic unit, research topics, and keywords. uResearch provides students with contact information so they can reach out to faculty researchers and determine options for participating in real on-going research projects at ASU. Independent study, paid and volunteer research positions, and other mentoring opportunities are all available through uResearch.

As one of its Design Aspirations, ASU values entrepreneurship, encouraging the application of research and creative work in innovative ways. ASU students of all majors are taught to use entrepreneurship as a means to solve local and global challenges. Since the last accreditation visit, the institution has developed a distributed model for entrepreneurship, with over a dozen mini-centers housed in disciplines across the university, embedding an entrepreneurial culture within those disciplines. ASU has launched the Sun Devil Entrepreneurship Network, connecting Arizona’s diverse start-up community with energetic and entrepreneurial-minded students. Participating students take part in unique internships based in real-world settings. Students request, and often receive, course credit for their internships.

Social embeddedness, another Design Aspiration, is realized university-wide through interactive and mu-
 quantidade of ASU students. Strengthen, and enhance the college experiences opportunities and organizations work to guide, Together, this large assortment of engagement involvement. Education, support, and opportunities for student to provide religious services, spiritual counseling, organizations at ASU are affiliated with CORA. CORA works their identities. Venues for students to express that important part of faiths, traditions, and beliefs, provide established campus ministries that represent a diverse variety of campus ministries that represent a diverse variety of ASU students. More than 3,000 undergraduate students participate in the 32 fraternities and 24 sororities at ASU. These groups play an active role in supporting student success, developing lifelong friendships, and enhancing the ASU student experience. Fraternity and sorority members reap the benefits of belonging to a growing student community emphasizing academic achievement, service to the community, focus on diversity, leadership development, strong networking opportunities, and a strong connection to ASU traditions.

The Council of Religious Advisors (CORA), comprised of campus ministries that represent a diverse variety of faiths, traditions, and beliefs, provide established venues for students to express that important part of their identities. Most faith-based student organizations at ASU are affiliated with CORA. CORA works to provide religious services, spiritual counseling, education, support, and opportunities for student involvement.

Together, this large assortment of engagement opportunities and organizations work to guide, strengthen, and enhance the college experiences of ASU students.

**summary for component 3.E**

In keeping with its size and complexity, ASU provides its students a vast array of co-curricular activities to broaden students’ backgrounds as a natural part of an enriched educational environment. The college experience offered is enriched through a host of programs that meet the needs of an academically, ethnically, culturally, and economically diverse student body. These programs and opportunities promote personal growth, broadening and strengthening the capabilities of ASU graduates to work with others, understand people from differing backgrounds, and find creative ways to help their communities.

**summary for criterion 3: strengths, challenges, and opportunities**

Since academic programs are at the heart of its mission as a New American University, ASU has a comprehensive and continuing commitment to ensure the quality of academic programs regardless of mode of delivery.

ASU has extensive review and approval processes in place to ensure that quality academic programs are created, offered, and enhanced through faculty-driven initiatives as shown by the evidence provided in this chapter. The institution uses robust processes that guarantee instructors are thoroughly qualified and properly credentialed as detailed in the discussions above. Personnel evaluation processes at ASU assure that the faculty and staff who support the students’ academic journey are appropriately trained and current in their areas of responsibility through continuing professional development. Support programs described here empower a diverse student population to reach their academic goals, and special support is provided for student populations with special needs. Students may choose to participate in arrays of co-curricular programs offered to enrich their university experience. Support efforts by multiple levels of advisors and faculty members play a key role in the success of ASU academic programs and help ASU achieve the numerous distinctions described elsewhere; attracting students from around the world. As will be discussed further in Chapter 5, ASU maintains its high quality offerings even during a period of rapid growth and economic challenge.

**strengths**

- The quality of academic programs – demonstrated by the number of highly-ranked academic programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels – is a testament to the pride and commitment of ASU to deliver high-quality academic programs. Embedded in ASU’s portfolio of academic programs is a comprehensive array of academic degree choices for students to meet every possible point of interest, including degrees in traditional disciplinary areas, in cutting-edge interdisciplinary fields, and programs that prepare students to work in a world of cultural, linguistic, and global diversity.

- A strong structure of student success support systems is in place. ASU has committed significant resources over the past several years to build robust advising, tracking, and
educational delivery technologies to facilitate student success. eAdvisor and the Major Map, for example, have provided undergraduate students and their advisors with real-time insight into degree progress, improving the rate at which students meet their educational goals. Continued investment in information technology resources, such as enhancement of the Blackboard platform, the improvement of MyASU as a communication tool, and the move to electronic processing of student course evaluations are but three other examples of the many systems implemented since the last accreditation visit to enhance student success.

- A multitude of programs and resources provide continued professional development for faculty and staff members. ASU views the professional development of its faculty and staff members as a critical factor in meeting its goals and vision and in advancing the quality of the institution.

- Above all, the successes realized since the last accreditation visit are a testimony to the superior quality of ASU’s faculty and staff. ASU has continued to hire and retain high-quality faculty and staff to help educate and support student growth and development. In addition, since the last accreditation visit, ASU’s faculty members have dramatically increased their research funding, enhancing the institution’s role in knowledge creation and deployment.

challenge and opportunity

A key, ongoing challenge and opportunity is to continue the energetic innovation that has allowed ASU to improve student success with increased diversity at less cost. ASU has made extraordinary strides over the past decade to enhance the quality of programs, students, faculty, and staff. As the New American University, committed to Excellence, Access, and Impact, ASU has forged a path to enroll a large and high-quality student body and to provide strong academic programs to meet the ever-changing face of competencies and skills required of students in the 21st century. This challenge to maintain a spirit of educational innovation will continue to call upon the creativity and resourcefulness of every faculty and staff member to improve the institution through data-driven decisions and innovations.
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chapter 4

criterion four. teaching and learning: evaluation and improvement
ASU demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Over the past decade, Arizona State University has embraced its complex mission of educating future leaders and citizens, cultivating student learning, and promoting quality instruction, while making an unprecedented commitment to university access for all college-ready students in the state of Arizona. This commitment strives “to create a university that is accessible to a broad range of students while becoming an excellent top-tier research university.” This chapter provides evidence demonstrating that ASU exercises full control and responsibility for the quality of its academic programs, the resources that enable those programs, and the services provided to enable student success. That responsibility includes undertaking sound assessment of those programs in order to continuously improve their performance. This chapter also documents how that facet of responsibility is met.

As described in previous chapters, ASU has expanded its student population since its last accreditation review by more than 27 percent, has increased its total research expenditures by more than 150 percent, and has increased the diversity of both students and faculty, demonstrating that the commitment to access and excellence are not mutually exclusive goals. The intellectual redesign of ASU as “One University in Many Places,” with world-class programs distributed among its campuses, has reached maturity. An improved infrastructure has been put in place to better support high-quality teaching and curricular innovation across interconnected campuses with distinct but equal missions with the common mission expectation that academic quality is equally rigorous for all programs.

Curricular innovation and program creation have markedly impacted the university’s knowledge enterprise over the past decade of fast-paced evolution. During this period of rapid change, ASU has remained cognizant that improvement in academic offerings can only be enabled through the efforts of faculty members, degree-granting units, administrators, and the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) to continuously and thoroughly evaluate instruction through the assessment of teaching effectiveness in individual classes, through periodic reviews of each academic program, and through focused assessments of student learning at the institution and program levels.

The current state of instruction at ASU is defined by high-quality instruction delivered by exemplary faculty members using diversified teaching methods in technologically sophisticated classrooms and laboratories. Faculty members form the first layer of a multi-tiered structure of assessment targeted to ongoing innovation and pursuit of excellence. ASU has well-developed, faculty-driven systems for course evaluations and learning assessment, and new technologies for both of these processes have been incorporated into its systems.

At its most fundamental level, curriculum and program development remain firmly in faculty hands, with curricular modifications, review and approval of academic programs and degrees, and program additions and deletions passed through the Committee for Academic Programs and Curriculum and the University Academic Senate. During recent times of fiscal challenge for higher education in Arizona, curricular integrity and tenure track-faculty retention governed extensive program reorganization into more efficient clusters in terms of cost structure but especially knowledge creation. The newly emerging academic units further stimulated transdisciplinary research while responding in proactive ways to the state’s budgetary actions. These reorganizations were forged in dialogue between administration and faculty. Once approved by the University Academic Senate, the reorganizations moved forward to ABOR for subsequent review and final implementation.

Academic programs, designed by faculty to respond to the most pressing issues at local and global levels, have served and trained an increasingly diversified and expanding student population, and have achieved educational excellence without sacrificing enhanced access for the citizens of Arizona. Especially in academic programs, quality matters, so assurance of quality and performance is an essential function and
responsibility in the life of the institution. ABOR policy mandates the review of all academic programs in seven-year cycles to provide information regarding efficient and effective use of state funds, to allow better university and system-wide planning, to reduce program duplication, to evaluate the creation of new programs, and to identify and support “outstanding programs achieving national and international stature.” A large number of colleges and programs also pursue specialized accreditation, both to certify the integrity and quality of those programs, and to maintain the university’s competitive edge in the national and global competition for students and support resources.

As noted in Chapter 1, the progress toward greater student success is measured by the benchmarks identified in the ASU Goals Statement and by ABOR in 2020 Vision; those goals and metrics are provided on the inside front and back covers of the printed version of this document. The goal-directed, data-informed improvement processes at ASU mirror the current HLC emphasis on using appropriate data to measure educational and research excellence, community impact, and enhanced productivity. The ABOR plan, through its Enterprise Metrics, commits the university to expand student enrollment, raise freshman retention rates, improve six-year graduation rates, enable broader access through on-line courses and degree programs, create lower-cost degree options for Arizona citizens outside the Phoenix metropolitan area, and double the size of the university’s research enterprise. ASU’s foundational documents and ABOR’s 2020 Vision have established a framework for ASU to work toward those future goals best realized through “One University in Many Places.”

1. ASU maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

ABOR requires that all academic programs undergo a formal Academic Program Review every seven years. The Office of the Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate College administers these reviews.

Academic Program Review is conducted in an extensive, year-long process during which an academic unit prepares a self-study report addressing the program’s mission and goals, educational objectives, curriculum, and assessment of student learning outcomes; the quality and diversity of the faculty, staff, and students; resources and facilities; and strategic initiatives and future directions. Academic units receive and analyze trend data on a host of metrics to support the analysis of program quality. Unit leadership and faculty nominate external site visitors, including faculty from aspirational peer institutions as well as a community professional (where applicable) to participate in the review. The site visit team reviews a copy of the self-study report and participates in a two-day site visit that includes meetings with university leadership, school/college leadership, faculty, staff, and students. Site visitors subsequently submit a report that addresses the quality of the academic programs, the quality of the faculty, and other related areas, noting strengths and areas for improvement. Site visit reports are shared with the Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost, the academic unit, and the relevant dean’s office for follow-up. The unit director prepares a unit response report that addresses any concerns and recommendations. The self-study document, the site visit report, and the unit response report are considered the permanent record of the review. A summary report, prepared by the university program review officer, is forwarded to ABOR.

When recommended changes are endorsed, faculty members remain actively involved in the final determination of a program’s status. Any recommended establishment or disestablishment of a degree, program, or academic unit moves through the Committee for Academic Programs and Curriculum and the University Senate for approval. These recommendations are forwarded to ABOR for subsequent analysis of programmatic priorities from a statewide perspective. This combination of internal as well as regular external evaluation assures that ASU programs adapt to current demands and developments and provide the most relevant and expert degrees for students.

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

A. ASU demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

The centrality of education to its mission, the trust placed in it as a public university by the people of Arizona, and the expectations laid upon it by the demands of its Mission, Vision, and Goals require that ASU takes full and conscientious responsibility for all its academic programs, wherever and however those programs are offered. This section provides evidence that ASU takes this responsibility seriously at all times, and has done so throughout the period under scrutiny for this review of the accreditation of those programs.

The subcomponents are discussed in turn; for the sake of readability and to avoid repetition, subcomponents 2 and 3 are discussed together.
3. ASU has policies that ensure the quality of the credit it accepts for transfer.

In light of its commitment to students’ access to higher education, ASU accepts credit for traditional courses that have been successfully completed at other regionally-accredited higher education institutions only after appropriate review. The specific applicability of any credit transferred for satisfying requirements in academic programs and for awarding degrees is subject to the approval of the academic unit and college in which the program is housed. Transfer credits undergo review in ASU’s Undergraduate Admissions Office, which maintains a “Transfer to ASU” webpage that describes in great detail the type of credit accepted and not accepted by the university. In general, credit for courses with a grade of C or better can be transferred from accredited institutions. Individual colleges and programs, however, may have specific details regarding the application of credit to degree requirements.

Academic Partnerships, a unit of the Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost, serves as a resource for school districts and community college employees, as well as ASU faculty and staff, regarding student preparation for university success, partnership programs, community college relations and transfer programs, and issues resolution. Academic Partnerships initiates and manages partnerships with community colleges and other institutions, in collaboration with staff in undergraduate admissions, advising, and curriculum.

Like other accredited institutions of higher education, ASU will consider awarding academic credit for prior study that has been assessed by recognized national examining bodies. Credit may be earned through the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), but CLEP examination credit is not given where it duplicates credit previously earned by the student at ASU, nor is it accepted by the university for coursework done elsewhere. CLEP results also are not accepted for the General Studies Requirements in natural science and literacy and critical inquiry. Similarly, students who have taken an advanced placement (AP) course of the CEEB in their secondary school and who have taken an AP Examination of the CEEB may receive university credit. Students who have taken a Defense Activity for Nontraditional Education Support (DANTES) Subject Standardized Test also may receive university credit; credit is awarded for score results at or above the American Council on Education’s recommended score if the subject examination is applicable to a program of study at ASU or may be assigned elective credit.

Students who present an International Baccalaureate Diploma/Certificate may qualify for university credit depending on the level of the examination and the grade received. ASU grants credit for higher-level courses only; however, no credit is awarded for English as a Second Language.

ASU does not accept academic credit for prior experiential learning that is not credited on a transcript from an accredited institution. In those cases where academic credit has been awarded for experiential learning at another accredited institution, those credit hours are reviewed for transfer using the process described above.

4. ASU maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, the rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. ASU assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

The faculty and the individual academic units are the ultimate authority for planning prerequisites and course sequences; determining breadth, depth, and rigor of course content; clarifying expectations for and assessing student learning (knowledge and skills); providing access to resources; and verifying faculty qualifications. Learning objectives and assessment strategies for individual courses are determined solely by faculty members, as described in the previous chapter, while those for programs and degrees are set by the academic units. As described in the previous chapter within the discussion of component 3.A, course proposals are reviewed and approved through a rigorous process governed by faculty members, including reviews by the Committee on Academic Programs and Curriculum, the University Academic Senate, and the Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost. Processes that guarantee the quality of those individuals providing instruction also were discussed in the previous chapter.

5. ASU maintains specialized accreditation as appropriate to its educational purposes.

At ASU, the Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate College serves as the University Accreditation Officer. Representing the President and the Executive Vice President and University Provost, the UAO is charged with the essential functions related to university-wide accreditation activities and with providing guidance and assistance as the process moves forward, leading to successful and productive accreditation visits.

In addition to the Academic Program Reviews described above, the quality of academic programs is reinforced through specialized accreditation reviews.
There are over fifty ASU academic programs with specialized accreditations from such organizations as the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), the American Psychological Association (APA), and the Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). These specialized accreditation reviews, similar to the Academic Program Reviews, provide another form of quality assurance mechanisms that include comprehensive examination of the appropriateness of the program curricula, learning outcomes, and assessment strategies; the quality of the faculty; and the relevance of student program experiences. A list of programs with specialized accreditations is provided to the public on a website maintained by the University Accreditation Office.

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

Academic programs at ASU are assessed through a number of measures. A primary measure of an institution’s success in preparing its students for advanced study or employment remains the performance of those students post-graduation. The University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness (UOE/EE) conducts annual surveys of ASU’s graduating students, recent graduates, and alumni. Approximately 70-75 percent of graduating seniors, graduate students, and law students complete an exit questionnaire (Graduating Senior Report Card or Graduate and Law Student Report Card) when they apply for university graduation. The survey is offered in paper or online format as one step in the application process.

Questions focus on students’ overall experiences at ASU, as well as within their academic major, in general education courses (where applicable), and with a sampling of university programs and services. Students are asked to reflect upon their years at the university and to “grade” their experiences, including preparation for employment and further study. They are also asked a series of questions about post-graduation employment and future education plans. Key item results for academic units are posted in the university’s Academic Program Profile and are shared annually with colleges through academic plan and department reports. Employment data are also shared with career service units at the university and college levels. A detailed account of post-graduation employment data can be found at asu.edu/career/gradstats.

These annual institutional-level surveys provide important, accurate, and useful feedback to inform university decisions about its academic offerings. During the most recent administrations of the exit surveys, for example:

- 85 percent of 2010-2012 graduating seniors reported that ASU prepared them effectively or very effectively for a job in their major, while 89 percent reported that ASU had effectively or very effectively prepared them for graduate or professional study in their field.

- 86 percent of graduate and law students perceived that an ASU education had prepared them effectively or very effectively for a job in their fields, while a slightly larger percentage (90 percent) rated preparation for further study in their field in a similar fashion (2010-2012).

Recent graduates are surveyed by UOE/EE three to six months after graduation from ASU. Questions on the **ASU Recent Graduate Survey** focus primarily on post-graduation employment and educational pursuits. Graduates who also earned certificates or minors are asked additional questions about these academic experiences. Undergraduate and graduate alumni are also sent a questionnaire (Undergraduate Alumni Survey; Graduate Alumni Survey) three years after graduation from ASU. Alumni are asked about their perceptions of ASU, how well ASU prepared them for subsequent employment and education, and their post-graduation activities (employment and further education).

UOE/EE staff work closely with faculty and staff to develop customized survey items for programs that undergo specialized accreditation. For example, the alumni surveys for graduates of the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering include questions that allow collection of data crucial to their ABET accreditation. Data from the recent graduate and alumni surveys are used in academic program assessment, strategic planning and decision making, and official reporting by colleges, departments, and academic units.
Additional confirmatory evidence of how well ASU prepares students for future employment is supplied by the passage rates on national professional licensure tests. For example, 100 percent of graduates of ASU’s Doctor of Audiology (n=31) and Master of Communication Disorders (n=172) programs who took the Praxis exam from 2007 to 2011 received a passing score. During the same period, nearly all examinees who graduated from ASU’s Ph.D. programs in Clinical Psychology (100 percent) and Counseling Psychology (93 percent) programs passed the American Psychological Association licensure exam. The Masters in Counseling students (n=193) had a 98.5 percent passage rate, and 93 percent of Mary Lou Fulton Teacher College graduates who took the Arizona Educator Proficiency Examination (1,295) received a passing score. In 2011, 95 percent of the graduates in the School of Nursing and Health Innovation who sat for a licensure exam (n=36) received a passing score. The Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law’s bar passage rate was 86 percent for first-time test takers in July 2011, the highest rate among the law schools in Arizona. ASU undergraduates passed the 2011 Uniform CPA examination at a rate of ten percentage points above the national average (as compiled by the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy).

Another measure of the quality of the educational programs delivered is provided by the number of ASU students earning prestigious national and international awards and recognition, particularly when those statistics are compared with other institutions of higher learning. Since the last site visit, undergraduate and graduate students have earned major distinctions for their academic achievements at ASU. For example, since the last comprehensive site visit:

- Five ASU students have been named Truman Scholars since FY2003.
- ASU has been consistently ranked in the top 20 of all schools in the production of Fulbright Scholars, with 171 winners of that distinction since academic year 2003-2004.
- In 2012-2013 ASU was tied for 5th place nationally in production of US Fulbright scholars by type of institution.13
- ASU is a top school in the nation in the production of National Security Education Program (NSEP/Boren) grants to study abroad in countries of critical interest to U.S. security, with 81 recipients since AY2003-2004.
- ASU has produced 26 Goldwater Scholars since 2003-2004.

ASU has also been recognized by The Wall Street Journal (2010) as 5th in the United States in “producing graduates with the skills to succeed in the workplace.” ASU was among five universities noted for the well-rounded and talented student body along with their partnerships that result in work-savvy students with a wide array of internship experiences. The Wall Street Journal noted that ASU was identified by a sample of recruiters for its strong ties between employees and professors.

**Summary for Component 4.A**

ASU safeguards the integrity of the academic credit it awards through stringent review standards for curriculum development. Processes that provide for the transfer of prior earned academic work for credit at ASU are in keeping with accepted practices in higher education. To confirm the quality of many of its professional programs, ASU has sought and received specialized accreditation for those programs by recognized national accrediting bodies. Direct and indirect measures of the success of program graduates support the argument that these programs do indeed prepare students as represented to the public. Taken together, this body of evaluative evidence demonstrates that ASU takes responsibility for the quality of its academic programs.

**B. ASU demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.**

Ongoing, robust assessment is conducted for both the university’s curricular and co-curricular learning outcomes. ASU faculty and staff assess student learning, programs, and services at multiple levels: the institution, academic programs, courses, and support units. A variety of tools, mechanisms, and consultation are available to assist faculty and staff in their assessment practices.

The following sections describe ASU’s comprehensive assessment efforts and resources for each subcomponent of this component of Criterion 4.

1. **ASU has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for the assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.**

Arguably the most important evaluative processes an institution can undertake are those designed to
ascertain the performance of academic programs and the entire institution in delivering high-quality academic programs to its students. In taking responsibility for the quality of its academic programs, ASU has committed itself over the past decade to assessing the performance of its academic programs and improving those programs based on quantitative data developed by approaches using the best standards in higher education. Programs have been continually modified and expanded, especially during the past five years.

The quality of learning at ASU is assessed through two primary sets of learning outcomes: a set of institutional learning outcomes that target broad academic skills and a set of learning outcomes specific to each academic program. The methods used to assess performance with those sets of outcomes are discussed here.

**assessment of institutional learning goals**

ASU’s institutional undergraduate learning goals are achieved through the requirements of the General Studies program, outlined in the discussion in the previous chapter under the discussion of component 3.B and described in detail on the website provided by the Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost.¹³ The following undergraduate learning outcomes are assessed at the institutional level at ASU.

- **Critical thinking:** graduates will be able to gather, interpret, and evaluate various forms of evidence.

- **Written communication skills:** graduates will be able to communicate clearly, concisely, and appropriately through written language.

- **Mathematical reasoning:** graduates will be able to solve complex arithmetic and algebraic problems requiring insight or logical reasoning. Furthermore, graduates should be able to interpret graphs in which trends are to be expressed arithmetically or algebraically.

A major assessment of performance on the institutional learning outcomes is conducted through normal assessment processes within the General Studies courses. For further independent as well as external assessment at the institutional level, a proposal funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and funds from an existing grant from the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation provided additional resources to begin using an externally-developed testing instrument, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), to assess ASU’s institutional learning outcomes. The CLA, a value-added, constructed response approach, includes performance and writing tasks that require students to analyze diverse and complex materials and solve realistic problems. Students respond to prompts and are assessed on their abilities to think critically, reason analytically, solve problems, and write clearly. The growth in these learning outcomes for ASU students who participated in a longitudinal study from freshman year to senior year was at about the 69th percentile, well above the median performance when compared to other institutions in the national 2005-2009 reference cohort. Not only was growth relatively high for ASU students, but senior level achievement in all categories of learning matched the other universities in the study even though the average entering SAT/ACT scores of the sample of ASU students were lower than the average students from the other universities in the study due to ASU’s commitment to access. These results indicate that student achievement in the areas of critical thinking and writing, which are student learning objectives set by the university for all students, is quite high.

In Fall 2011, ASU transitioned to the ETS Proficiency Profile, which provides more specific quantitative detail regarding each of the three institutional learning objectives.¹⁴ This additional information will permit more precise analysis and targeting of the teaching and learning improvement efforts as needed. The Fall 2011 Proficiency Profile data will form the new baseline for the next cycle of assessment and improvement of the institutional learning outcomes. The ETS Proficiency Profile is an integrated, multiple choice assessment tool designed to measure the academic skills students develop in college rather than the subject matter taught in specific university general education courses. Items are presented in three disciplinary contexts (social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities) and are arranged in skill blocks to minimize test fatigue that could negatively affect student performance. The results from the “abbreviated” version of the Proficiency Profile test include a total score, as well as three proficiency classifications (proficient, marginal, not proficient) for each of the three skill levels, and reports provide comparative data for an institutionally-defined peer group. There are three levels of skill proficiency (1 to 3, with 3 being the highest level of proficiency) and a description of those levels may be located on the ETS Proficiency Profile website.¹⁵ With this transition to the ETS Proficiency Profile in Fall 2011, ASU launched a four-year longitudinal study to track student learning while enrolled at ASU. The ETS Proficiency Profile instrument was administered to a cohort of incoming freshmen. In the first phase of the study, approximately 5,000 students, enrolled in “ASU 101” courses, completed the 40-minute version of the test. In order to sufficiently represent ASU schools and colleges, ASU 101 sections were proportionally selected based on anticipated senior enrollment at the school/college
level and the expected attrition of students willing to participate in testing during their fourth year. Members of the longitudinal cohort will take the proctored test again in Spring 2013 (end of their sophomore year) and in Spring 2015 (end of their fourth year). Test administration, data analysis, and reporting for Proficiency Profile testing is being managed by UOEEE. ASU’s Disability Resource Center provides all necessary testing accommodations for eligible students.16

Baseline measurements from the Proficiency Profile indicate that approximately 70 percent of the 2011-2012 freshmen cohort entered ASU proficient at the first level for each of the three skill areas (reading/critical thinking, writing, and math). Between 38 percent and 46 percent of the students entered proficient at the second of the three skill levels.

The results of the longitudinal assessment study will be analyzed at the institution, college, and campus levels. A variety of analyses also will be conducted to compare test results at broad disciplinary categories (e.g., engineering/natural science vs. humanities/social science vs. professional schools) and between similar programs on different campuses (e.g., engineering on the Tempe campus vs. general engineering/technology programs on the Polytechnic campus). ASU will also examine overall performance against a self-selected external comparison group, although important testing conditions such as sample selection and types of student incentives vary greatly across institutions. Because testing conditions can have a powerful influence over institutional results, comparisons become challenging when such conditions vary. The preference is to emphasize value-added as the important metric, and the initially large and stratified sample should allow for more reliable comparisons at the college-level during the senior year of testing. Assessment data from this longitudinal study will be used by leadership from ASU’s central administration as well as from the academic colleges, schools, and units to inform decisions on curriculum, instruction, and academic support services.

assessment of academic program learning outcomes

ASU redesigned the process for assessing program-level learning outcomes three years ago and continues to extend its comprehensive system designed to assess and improve student learning. UOEEE personnel provide extensive coaching, support, and a variety of general and discipline-specific resources to assist ASU faculty and college delegates with their assessment processes. The office also manages an integrated system that utilizes STEPS for Assessment (an assessment management platform discussed further under subcomponent 4.B.3). The technology system maintained by UOEEE serves as a means to distribute assessment documents to (and collect them from) academic units, share survey data reports, and archive documentation of assessment practices and outcomes.

For each multi-year cycle of assessment, academic units identify a minimum of two desired learning outcomes, measures, and performance criteria for each of their programs; in most cases, these two outcomes are only a portion of those identified for that academic program. Focusing the assessment cycle on two to four outcomes on average allows intense focus on those selected outcomes that the programs feel are most important. Programs may continue to assess the same outcomes from one cycle to the next, or they may choose to add or rotate outcomes during subsequent cycles. Thus, the learning objectives themselves are subject to review and redesign. Program-level learning outcomes specify what students should know and be able to do when they graduate from ASU. For each learning outcome, departments are asked to identify appropriate measures and performance criteria. Multiple outcome measures are expected, including at least one direct measure of student performance.

Departments may identify one or more additional direct measures for each particular learning outcome, or they may also identify indirect measures. Direct measures include such approaches as portfolios, practical demonstrations, projects, presentations, comprehensive examinations, embedded exam items, class assignments, labs, and case studies. In addition to one or more direct measures, departments may also use one or more indirect measures to assess performance with respect to a learning outcome. Such indirect measures may include survey items (e.g., job placement, further education, and licensure) from ASU exit and alumni surveys administered by UOEEE. Course grades, GPAs, and course completion rates are not accepted as measures of student learning, as those may include consideration of factors not directly attributable to a specific learning outcome. For each measure, departments are asked to identify a performance criterion or level of performance at which faculty can conclude that program graduates possess the knowledge or skill identified in the outcome.

In order to examine the extent to which assessment outcomes and measures are distributed across ASU’s academic disciplines, UOEEE conducted an analysis of the outcomes and measures reported by program faculty for academic majors and certificates during the Fall 2011 semester. This analysis identified thirty-one
outcome keywords, including such knowledge/skill areas as content knowledge, critical thinking, communication skills, teamwork, and sustainability. Included in this list were ASU’s institutional outcomes and seven of ASU’s eight Design Aspirations. (One outcome, Student Success, was not included because it was not considered a potential student learning outcome.) The analysis also identified 21 types of direct measures (e.g., exams, capstone projects, presentations), and six types of indirect measures (e.g., surveys) used by ASU faculty to measure student learning on the reported outcomes. Table 4.1 below shows the outcome and measure keywords used in this analysis. Even a review of only two learning outcomes per program demonstrates that a wealth of primary learning outcomes is being assessed across programs at ASU.

This analysis of program-level learning outcomes was followed by a similar analysis of the ways in which student learning on these outcomes is currently being measured. The clear emphasis on direct measures indicates that faculty base assessment inferences about student learning on students’ actual demonstration of knowledge or skills more often than relying on indirect measures such as surveys, or on inappropriate measures such as grades and course completion.

Analysis of the use of assessment measures for undergraduate and graduate programs also was conducted. This separation brings the relationships among academic level, assessment measure, and academic discipline into focus. Just as the summaries of assessment outcomes provide important information about those learning outcomes ASU faculty consider to be important, these summaries of assessment measures illustrate the specific ways in which our students are expected to exhibit the knowledge and skills they develop throughout their studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>program outcomes</th>
<th>design aspirations</th>
<th>direct measures</th>
<th>indirect measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>leverage our place</td>
<td>artistic creations performances</td>
<td>admission to further education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content knowledge</td>
<td>transform society</td>
<td>capstone experience</td>
<td>alumni surveys/interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creativity</td>
<td>value entrepreneurship</td>
<td>case studies</td>
<td>exit surveys/interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical thinking</td>
<td>conduct use-inspired research</td>
<td>comprehensive exams</td>
<td>job placement data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>fuse intellectual disciplines</td>
<td>exams or quizzes</td>
<td>other surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment</td>
<td>be socially embedded</td>
<td>homework/classwork assignments</td>
<td>self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics</td>
<td>engage globally</td>
<td>internships or practicums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td></td>
<td>licensure/certification exams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td>papers (research, term, creative, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>portfolios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>practical clinical assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>presentations/oral defense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td>publications/presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>thesis/dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1: assessment outcomes and measures for academic programs at ASU, Fall 2012.
The assessment measures for graduate programs show a heavy emphasis on theses, dissertations, publications, and employment, all consistent with expectations of how members of the graduate faculty gauge their students’ achievement.

Undergraduate education programs stress licensure/certification exams and evaluations of student teaching – both major factors in students’ ability to gain employment as classroom teachers.

The fine arts place a heavy emphasis on artistic creations and performances at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, but there is a clear shift from the heavy undergraduate use of exams, papers, and projects to the graduate focus on the development of an artistic portfolio and theses/dissertations that have a heavy concentration on design and performance.

The entire set of program assessment measures in use at ASU goes well beyond traditional multiple-choice exams or term papers. A small sample of the diverse and effective ways in which ASU faculty measure student learning is provided below in Table 4-2.

Although ASU has identified learning outcomes, measures, and performance criteria for nearly all active programs, the unambiguous assessment of student learning for academic minors is problematic (and, in some cases, impossible) for several reasons. With the exception of the B.I.S. degree, a minor is not required for graduation. Thus, students are not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Family &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>identify hallmarks of human development that are indicators of individual well-being.</td>
<td>application of rubric to online thread in which students discuss hallmarks of human development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Health Sciences (Health Policy)</td>
<td>demonstrate an understanding of current controversial and distinctive ethical issues associated with medical and health care.</td>
<td>HSC 320 Applied Medical/Health Care Ethics Assignment: Health Issue Team Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Air Traffic Management</td>
<td>perform as part of an air traffic control team in an air traffic control environment.</td>
<td>peer assessment of students working as a members of an air traffic control team (in class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Information Management</td>
<td>effectively convey and communicate a business transformation strategy.</td>
<td>students will critically analyze and develop an IT transformation plan that (a) articulates the business goals, (b) identifies the functional areas affected, (c) establishes key metrics, and (d) analyzes the potential impact of the IT transformation plan on the company.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2 examples of high-quality learning outcomes assessments in place at ASU, Fall 2012.
required to start a minor or finish one that has been started. Although some minors at ASU require students to declare their intent to complete the minor, most students are largely unidentified as they work towards a minor. Often ASU students who acquire a minor do so only when, while completing a graduation audit, they are informed by the staff member who performs the audits that their transcript reflects sufficient credits in an area to also receive the minor. Usually at no time can students in a specific minor be identified prior to graduation, and rarely is there any course or event in which a common assessment instrument can be required. Because all students are enrolled in a major that will undergo rigorous, annual assessment in addition to the general skills assessment conducted at the university and college levels, and since courses for minors are almost always a subset of those required for the academic major programs, minor programs are not assessed directly.

ASU remains committed to the continued assessment of its certificate programs. The assessment team has worked with faculty who manage certificate programs to develop outcomes and measures that are meaningful to those programs. UOEEE implemented a Recent Graduate survey that targets those graduates who obtain certificates. This survey, focused on gathering information about post-completion employment and further education, is commonly used as an indirect measure for assessing certificate programs.

ASU’s assessment process is highly effective at identifying intended learning outcomes for ASU program graduates, measuring student performance on those outcomes, and using the information to refine curricula and instructional practices to improve student learning.

Although any assessment program can be only as effective as its execution within individual academic units, the success of ASU’s assessment program relies upon the foundation provided within UOEEE. UOEEE consists of staff with extensive academic and professional backgrounds in program evaluation, educational research, measurement, and program assessment. ASU faculty members receive high quality, ongoing consultation from the UOEEE. The team supports ASU faculty in every phase of the assessment cycle by offering workshops, small group or one-on-one consultation, personalized review and feedback of draft assessment submissions, and a variety of customized support options. One of the primary tools used by the team to support ASU faculty has been *The Assessment Handbook: Five Steps to Effective Assessment Planning, Reporting, and Decision Making*. The *Handbook* is a comprehensive, step-by-step workbook that guides readers through the development of an assessment plan, as well as through the data collection, analysis, reporting, and decision making phases of assessment. It also provides actual examples of how ASU departments have used assessment data to learn about and improve student learning. The *Handbook* is available on the UOEEE website.

In addition to the overall assessment support provided by the UOEEE assessment team, the office also supports the specific assessment needs of those schools and departments with specialized accreditation. The assessment team works to remain abreast of the specific assessment requirements of these organizations and offers assessment-related support to units who are preparing for review by specialized accreditors.

UOEEE also conducts a number of surveys of ASU students and graduates. These surveys, beginning with new freshmen, are repeated at key points throughout students’ academic careers, and culminate with the ASU Recent Graduate and Alumni Surveys, administered three months and three years after graduation, respectively.

In summary, assessment reports now being submitted by many ASU units contain concise information about assessment results of their academic programs, the factors to which faculty have attributed these results, and any planned curricular or instructional changes, support activities, or other items that specifically target the improvement of student learning on the stated outcomes. It may be difficult or unlikely, in many cases, to detect measureable differences within the first few years, but faculty are encouraged to monitor changes over time and report back on those as data become available.

### 2. ASU assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular activities.

As stated previously in this chapter, ASU assesses the institutional learning outcomes of critical thinking, written communication skills, and mathematical reasoning through the ongoing assessment processes within the General Studies courses as well as with the ETS Proficiency Profile. Beginning in Fall 2011, ASU started tracking a cohort of 5,000 first year students. The cohort will complete the Proficiency Profile again in Spring 2013 and in Spring 2015. Data from this longitudinal assessment will be used by ASU’s central administration as well as by leadership from the academic colleges, schools, and units to inform decisions on curriculum, instruction, and academic support services. UOEEE coordinates all aspects of this institution-level assessment, including test administration, data analysis, and reporting.

Each academic unit is asked to submit an annual assessment report for each academic program that briefly summarizes the assessment practices (minimum of two learning outcomes, direct/indirect meas-
Cross-references, performance criteria, etc.) and findings for the academic year, the likely factors that contributed to either positive or negative findings, and all follow-up assessment activities planned for the next academic year. These reports are submitted and approved by the college’s assessment delegates using the STEPS online assessment management system, described more fully under the next subcomponent.

The standard assessment planning and reporting templates (available via STEPS) used by each unit consist of a series of questions about student learning, how it is measured, the inferences faculty draw from the data they collect, and how they plan to use the information to improve student learning. During each cycle, faculty members are given the opportunity to report on the observed effectiveness of previous actions taken.

In addition to assessment at the program level, members of the ASU faculty also conduct assessment at the individual class level for virtually all classes. They use a variety of embedded assessment measures to determine the level of achievement of predetermined student learning outcomes, including such measures as quizzes, tests, performances and practical demonstrations, projects, and presentations.

UOEEE also administers annual surveys to current and former students as indirect measures of student learning and the impact of the ASU experience. These surveys include:

- **First Year Student Survey:** during each spring semester, first-year, first-time ASU students receive an online survey including items about their academic expectations, early campus experiences, and needed support services. Students also rate their satisfaction with university programs and services and indicate their plans for the next academic year. The results of the survey are used to support students’ needs and improve programs for first-year students.

- **Persistence Survey:** each fall, UOEEE attempts to contact first-year students from the previous fall who did not return to ASU. The feedback provided by former students, parents, and family members provides the university with valuable information about why students did not return to ASU, their current activities, and whether they plan to return to ASU in the future. These data are used to inform official retention figures for the university.

- **Advising Survey:** in late fall each year, a randomly selected group of sophomores and juniors are surveyed on their experiences with academic advising. The results of this survey are used for official university reporting and to provide the university with valuable information about student satisfaction with advising and suggestions for improvement.

- **Graduating Senior Report Card/Graduate and Law School Report Card:** the UOEEE conducts annual surveys of ASU’s graduating students, recent graduates, and alumni. Approximately 70-75 percent of graduating seniors, graduate students, and law students complete an exit questionnaire (Graduating Senior Report Card or Graduate and Law Student Report Card) when they apply for university graduation. Questions focus on overall experiences at ASU, experiences in their academic major and in general education courses, satisfaction with university services, and post-graduation employment and education plans. Department key item results are posted on the Academic Program Profile and are shared with colleges in academic plan and department reports. Employment data are shared with Career Service units at the university and college levels and are used to inform Career Services’ programs and practices and to cultivate new employment opportunities for seniors and alumni.

- **Recent Graduate Survey:** recent graduates are surveyed 3-6 months after graduation from ASU. Questions focus on post-graduation employment and education pursuits. Graduates who earned certificates or minors are asked additional questions about their academic experiences. These data are used in academic program assessment, planning, and official reporting by colleges, departments, and units across campus. Employment data are shared with career service units at the university and college levels.

- **Undergraduate Alumni Survey/Graduate Alumni Survey:** undergraduate and graduate alumni are sent a survey three years after graduation from ASU. They are asked about their perceptions of ASU, how well ASU prepared them for subsequent employment and education, as well as employment and post-education activities. Data are used in academic program assessment, planning, and official reporting by colleges, departments, and units across campus.

Ongoing assessment is also conducted within ASU’s educational outreach and student service programs. There are three core principles upon which the ASU
co-curricular student experience is built: achievement, engagement, and responsibility. Programs, services, and experiences are designed to support the following:

- **Achievement**: Academic success and personal growth for each student.
- **Engagement**: Intentional and meaningful opportunities for student engagement, involvement, and participation in the broader university community.
- **Responsibility**: Structured experiences that create values-driven decisions, expectation that reinforces personal responsibility, and opportunities to develop an understanding of civic responsibility.

Co-curricular learning outcomes are assessed by Educational Outreach and Student Services (EOSS) using a variety of indirect methods, including surveys, institutional data, participation data, and focus groups. Survey data are used to gauge student satisfaction with university programs and services. Examples include:

- **Connections Survey (UOEEE/EOSS)**: in Fall 2011, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences piloted an early freshmen intervention survey in one of its residence halls. The survey asked students about many aspects of their experience related to their success and their satisfaction with ASU, including engagement in co-curricular activities, health, as well as academic, emotional, and financial stress. Based on student responses, appropriate support staff (Residential Life, Career Services, Financial Aid, departmental advisors, Counseling and Consultation, etc.) responded immediately to every student’s request for information, services, and assistance. This survey is a collaborative effort between UOEEE and EOSS and was expanded to all new freshmen for AY2012-2013.

- **The Educational Benchmarking Inc. Survey, Inc.**: is used to calibrate the performance of University Housing with professional standards used by hundreds of other institutions. Students identify strengths and areas for improvement.

- **The University Health Services Survey**: gauges patient satisfaction. Results are used to improve services provided to students. University Health Services receives national benchmarking data on its performance.

Members of the EOSS staff also track students’ participation in campus programs and their use of services, including intramurals, recreation facilities, select educational and social programs, and career-focused events and programs (e.g., advising and drop-in resumé review). Participation data are analyzed and used to develop a composite of support for successful ASU students.

EOSS maintains several forums for collecting ongoing student feedback, including Student Government Representatives, the Housing Student Advisory Council, the Dining Advisory Council, and the Residence Hall Association. Each forum provides, at a minimum, a monthly point of connection with students regarding key services and programs.

EOSS regularly uses student feedback, program participation, and institutional data to improve services and experiences for students. The three organizing principles of achievement, engagement, and responsibility drive leadership discussion, planning of activities (e.g., dining strategic plan), and prioritization of staff time and effort. Each EOSS department submits quarterly and annual reports to the Senior Vice President for Educational Outreach and Student Services. Reports include reflection on the extent to which programs and services meet the units’ goals and objectives as well as a cost/benefit analysis of program intent and actual impact.

### 3. ASU uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

During each assessment cycle, academic units submit reports describing learning outcomes and related assessment practices, assessment results, the factors to which faculty have attributed these results, and any planned curricular or instructional changes, support activities, or other items that specifically target the improvement of student learning on the stated outcomes. UOEEE staff review all plans and reports on an annual basis and provide extensive, detailed feedback for improving program assessment practices.

Several examples that highlight the effective use of assessment information by ASU faculty are summarized below.

- **The Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering use data to continuously improve advising practices and the quality of tutoring programs, as well as to make modifications in individual courses and their sequencing. For example, faculty in the aerospace program reviewed assessment data from capstone projects and identified weaknesses in students’ written communication skills. As a result, they incorporated additional lab reports into the capstone course. Additional instruction and opportunities for practice were also incorporated into the industrial engineering curriculum to address weaknesses faculty identified in students’ communication skills.**
Follow up assessment in both programs indicated major improvements in students’ learning outcomes related to communication. Based on feedback from employers, computer science faculty implemented a new two-semester capstone sequence.

- Within the College of Health Solutions’ School of Nutrition and Health Promotion, M.S. in Nutrition (Dietetics) program, although students met the research methods outcome, program faculty reported that they had decided to implement interactive teaching strategies in the coming academic year to further improve student learning in this area.

- For the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, School of Chemistry and Biochemistry, B.S. in Biochemistry (Medicinal Chemistry) program faculty provided an in-depth discussion of those factors they believe contributed to a negative finding related to a content knowledge outcome. They were working to revise the required course sequence and prerequisites for the program to ensure that students acquire critical foundational knowledge and skills early in the program. They also made minor adjustments to their assessment processes in response to the findings. Program faculty were quite satisfied with the students’ laboratory skills and provided a detailed description of the program components they believe led to this highly positive result.

- For the College of Nursing and Health Innovation, undergraduate and graduate curricula were developed and implemented to reflect relevant professional standards and guidelines as well as expected individual and aggregate learning outcomes. Courses were mapped against national standards for accreditation, licensing, and/or certification. Ongoing maintenance of these standards was achieved through periodic curricular review (at least every 3 years) and modification. Student progression, retention, and degree completion were closely monitored and assessed for potential proactive interventions to achieve a 90 percent on-time graduation of students. Aggregate outcome performance results were used both as a basis for celebrating excellence as well as for prioritizing, planning, and redirecting in areas where improvement was indicated. Each semester, the B.S.N. program used a national test (NCLEX) to assess students’ knowledge and to compare pass rates to that of national averages and of peer institutions. If students as a whole did not achieve expected rates at each level, faculty reviewed the curriculum and instructional methods and made modifications where appropriate. In addition, students who were below expected levels of achievement were given an individualized remediation plan and additional assignments. The Graduate D.N.P. program also used a national benchmarking company to assess graduates’ competencies and alumni outcomes as well as to collect employer feedback. The rate at which graduates passed their licensing and/or certification exams was also closely monitored, and curriculum was modified as needed.

- New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences. Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies faculty and staff meet annually to discuss unit assessment reports and student survey data. Recent conversations have led to an extensive restructuring of the curriculum based on learning goals and student needs as well as a decision to utilize “Let Me Learn” – an advanced learning evaluation system focused on future career enhancement goals for New College students. Faculty members in the Mathematical and Natural Sciences regularly collected and reviewed assessment data from a variety of sources (e.g., exam results, homework assignments, mandatory assessments, and feedback from faculty, staff, and students). Recent review of assessment data has led to new course development in such areas as Environmental Science, Medical Microbiology, Human Environment, Environmental Disaster, and Optimization as well as to changes in advising practices. Social and Behavioral Sciences faculty members have collected data from writing-intensive courses and faculty/student research opportunities and have fine-tuned the curriculum toward more career-relevant learning. Expansion of research opportunities in Psychology courses has resulted in the deepening and strengthening of students’ methodological understanding, and the examination of dashboard data has led to more proactive advising practices.

In 2011, ASU acquired STEPS for Assessment (STEPS), an online, commercial assessment management system developed by School of Business faculty at California State University, Chico. STEPS supports every phase of the ASU assessment cycle including facilitating the exchange of assessment documents between UOEEE and academic units, and providing a platform for building historical assessment records within and across units to track assessment activities, decisions, changes, and the effectiveness of any changes. At its most basic level, units are able to upload assessment outcomes and measures; UOEEE can disseminate survey results; and UOEEE and academic units can exchange assessment templates, plans, and reports. Beyond these basic functions,
academic units have the freedom to use the varied features offered by STEPS to meet their own assessment needs.

The assessment team also recently partnered with assessment leaders in ASU’s W. P. Carey School of Business to pilot test strategies for making current and archival assessment information readily available to faculty and to AACSB accreditation teams via STEPS. As part of this pilot, the UOEEE assessment team began to populate the school’s program sites with earlier assessment submissions, and W. P. Carey staff loaded assessment artifacts that contain evidence of their assessment practices. The two units then agreed to pilot test various methods by which UOEEE survey data summaries could be made immediately available to program faculty from within STEPS. An efficient means of accessing these summaries through STEPS was devised and targeted for future implementation.

Within academic programs, additional learning outcomes assessment also takes place. As noted in the previous chapter, instruction in the thousands of sections of ASU courses offered every semester is evaluated at the end of the term, and these student evaluations are reviewed at the academic unit and college levels not only to assess instructor performance but also to assess how successful the courses are at promoting learning. These student course evaluations ask students to provide their (subjective) measurements of the learning environment as well as of the quality of learning that takes place in the classroom. These results complement the program- and institution-level assessment activities described above.

**a case study: using assessment to improve introductory mathematics success rates**

To drive home the point that ASU uses outcome results to redesign specific courses, not just programs, a case study of introductory mathematics is described here as an example. In the case of introductory math courses, information gained from assessment of student learning resulted in a direct change in teaching strategies designed to improve both learning outcomes and ultimately student retention and persistence.

Introductory level mathematics has been a continuing challenge for universities across the nation. Mathematical literacy is an expectation of university education, but its importance goes beyond general education skills, as success in math is the single most significant predictor of persistence and graduation. ASU has been proactive on this issue and has experimented with various instructional approaches, including contracting with the community colleges to teach developmental skills classes. Our extensive analysis of student learning in introductory math courses led to the conclusion that far too often students did not perform well in those courses; and even when they did, their pass rates in subsequent math courses were below expectations. A summary of the results is presented in Table 4-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>students enrolled in developmental math</th>
<th>students who earned below a C have a:</th>
<th>students who earned a C or better in have a:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49% retention rate in year one</td>
<td>81% retention rate in year one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% in year two</td>
<td>69% in year two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% six-year graduation rate</td>
<td>50% six-year graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>students enrolled in college algebra</th>
<th>students who earned below a C have a:</th>
<th>students who earned a C or better in have a:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57% retention rate in year one</td>
<td>85% retention rate in year one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42% in year two</td>
<td>75% in year two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% six-year graduation rate</td>
<td>64% six-year graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>students enrolled in calculus</th>
<th>students who earned below a C have a:</th>
<th>students who earned a C or better in have a:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55% retention rate in year one</td>
<td>89% retention rate in year one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% in year two</td>
<td>78% in year two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% six-year graduation rate</td>
<td>75% six-year graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**table 4-3 student performance in developmental math, college algebra, and business calculus.**

The challenges to the university and its diversified student clientele are reflected in these student outcomes. With these experiences in mind, ASU designed a dramatically different approach to the conventional pedagogy for introductory mathematics. In 2011, ASU constructed three introductory courses in partnership with Knewton, a vendor of adaptive learning platform solutions utilizing their state-of-the-art learning management system to address these problems. The main features of the new courses include:

- Fundamental mathematics is taught in a self-paced, digital environment, allowing students to progress as they are ready. At all times in the course, both the student and instructor know the students’ progress (i.e., what the student knows, what the student does not know, and students’ progress towards
completion of the course material). Instructors do everything possible to prevent students from falling behind.

- Success in the courses is based on mastery of subject matter rather than a percentage of grade points. Students are graded on how well they master the course material. To receive a “C,” students have to master 100 percent of all skills at a certain proficiency level. It is no longer possible to pass the course with holes in one’s knowledge.

- Plans are in place to measure progress in all course learning objectives, including overall persistence, passing rates in subsequent math courses, and measureable gains in critical thinking ability. The evaluations will be extensive and will be conducted by experts at ASU including faculty members in the Learning Science Institute.

The approach taken in the introductory math courses can be extended to other courses. As a starting point, ASU is focused on changing the instructional approach utilized in lower division courses in which the predominant pedagogy is the lecture format conducted in large halls. Our data show that a consistent struggle for instructors in such classes is maintenance of student engagement and the inability to monitor student progress on a timely basis. Some students understand the concepts quickly and easily while others struggle. The adaptive approach taken in math permits focused attention on the individual learner, allowing students to progress quickly to the next material for those who are ready and allowing instructors to concentrate on those who have not grasped the material sufficiently to move ahead. Additionally, a non-lecture environment can be created for students to apply the material they have acquired in the digital environment. This can be a lab in the case of sciences (including virtual labs), or discussion sessions in which students provide solutions to current problems, cases, or issues using the knowledge acquired in the digital environment. The applications will appeal to higher learning and communication skills.

Five general studies courses with total enrollments in excess of 15,000 students are in the developmental stage. All courses will use the adaptive learning program from Knewton used currently in the introductory math courses. Students and instructors will know exactly what they have mastered and what they have not at all times. Integrated assessment measures and processes will provide data about students’ preparation at any time during the course. Students will be required to actively engage in course material in the digital environment and in the sessions requiring application of knowledge and skills. The learning objectives are greater mastery of subject matter and ability to think critically in the application of the course content to open-ended cases and situations. Faculty will review and use assessment data to make curricular improvements.

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

The assessment methodologies and processes used by ASU, displayed in part in the discussion above, reflect current best practices in the field. UOEED retains expertise and remains current in assessment practices. UOEED staff members and other experts in the university attend national conferences (including the HLC Annual Meeting and the IUPUI Assessment Institute), participate in listserv discussions and webinars, and review the latest literature. Assessment staff members share new information with ASU leadership, college assessment delegates, assessment practitioners in ASU’s academic units, and with key faculty who support specialized accreditation in their disciplines. This is done through coaching, providing feedback on annual assessment plans and reports, and through the development and deployment of online assessment resources.

Assessment is a core practice for ASU faculty – at both the classroom and program levels. Members of the ASU faculty are actively involved in assessment planning, collection and analysis of assessment data, and in the use of assessment data for curricular decision-making. Individual faculty use assessment data retrieved from student evaluations conducted every semester for every course to enhance their courses and to facilitate individual student learning. Those course evaluations are important input to annual evaluations conducted on every faculty member at the unit level. Learning outcomes assessment is also an integral component of the work done by curricular committees, and it is reflected in course sequences for majors and their resulting major maps. Faculty actively share their successes and the lessons they have learned as part of ongoing program assessment practices. As a result, faculty and units are learning from each other and are integrating new information, tools, and practices into their courses. Since learning outcomes and assessment measures have been identified and units have learned the new systems, faculty and staff are now directing their efforts to refining outcomes and measures and discussing how to use data to further enhance teaching and learning practices. The archival properties of the database that has been constructed makes it easy to review the assessments over time and share information across units. This will deepen the institutional knowledge on learning outcomes among faculty, academic units and central administration. It will drive the efforts for continuous improvement across the institution.
ASU programs use a balance of direct and indirect measures to assess programs and courses, and a longstanding, methodologically sound instrument (ETS Proficiency Profile) is now used for the assessment of ASU’s institutional learning outcomes. A variety of analyses are conducted that provide data about the institution as well as comparisons between colleges, campuses, and broad disciplinary groupings. Assessment data are used by leadership from ASU’s central administration as well as from the academic colleges, schools, and units to inform decisions on curriculum, instruction, and academic support services.

ASU’s assessment system not only reflects best practice; it also drives it. The model developed at ASU is a rigorous one that yields the data and information necessary to drive curricular planning and decision-making, and it is also an efficient model that utilizes minimal resources. This cost-effective approach has proven invaluable during the recent economic crisis.

summary for component 4.B

ASU faculty members have developed student learning goals and assessment practices at the institutional, program, and course levels, demonstrating the serious commitment made by the institution to provide sound, high-quality academic programs to prepare students. As the evidence above confirms, the data obtained from these assessments is continually used to improve the academic programs and courses offered at ASU. Through the work of an office specifically tasked with educational assessment and improvement, the methods implemented and used are consistent with current practices in higher education by staff members who stay abreast of developments in the field of assessment. All this evidence supports the conclusion that ASU is committed to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning in its academic programs and at the institutional level.

C. ASU demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in degree and certificate programs.

As evidenced in the previous discussion on program assessment under component 4.B, ASU is deeply committed to the continual improvement of its academic programs, courses, and support services. A further indicator of program quality—ongoing monitoring of the institution’s retention, persistence, and completion rates for students pursuing degrees and certificates—is common practice at ASU, and this monitoring is data-driven. Every aspect of the persistence challenge is evaluated continuously to find where improved practices can raise retention and completion rates. Programs are constantly evaluated and re-evaluated. When new analysis uncovers areas that require attention, new programs and practices are designed and implemented almost immediately.

The following section describes ASU’s robust system of practices for collection, analysis, and use of retention and persistence data for improvement of its educational operations.

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

As articulated by the Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost:

*The need to develop a successful strategy for increasing student retention is urgent. In proportion with the state’s enormous projected population growth, our student body will expand rapidly over the next decade to 100,000 students. Much of this growth will be in students whose parents have never gone to college and who will come equipped with little knowledge of what is required to succeed at the university. In order to retain and graduate these students, ASU is developing an infrastructure that ensures all students are provided the skills and resources necessary to succeed first in college and then in the workforce.*

The new goals for freshman persistence and the six-year graduation rate provided in the “Going forward—ASU Goals for 2020” section of Chapter 1 are ambitious, calling for those to rise to 90 percent and 75-80 percent, respectively, as well as having a student population that will rise to 100,000. These goals represent significant increases over current persistence and graduation rates, but lie on the current trajectory of improving persistence and graduation rates. The goals are comparable to rates for ASU’s peer institutions, many of which do not have the same commitment to Access.
Through the many tools brought to bear on student success described in Chapter 3, such as eAdvisor and the retention dashboard, and through, for example, the improvements described earlier in introductory-level mathematics courses and the introduction of small freshmen seminar course to improve engagement, the retention of full-time, first-time (FTFT) freshman improved steadily by 6.5 percent from the Fall 2003 cohort through the Fall 2010 cohort (Figure 4-1). This strong improvement in retention rates occurred simultaneously with the increase in student body diversity, as discussed in Chapter 1. Through the use of targeted support programs and practices, ASU remains committed to the continued improvement on these retention rates to achieve the ASU Goals Statement and ABOR Enterprise Metrics benchmarks.

When using eAdvisor and the retention dashboard, colleges are instructed (and rewarded) when their students progress within the university. This requires that academic units intervene in a timely fashion whenever a student displays an inability to progress or displays a lack of interest in their chosen major. Academic units are instructed to find a better fit for the skills and interests of such students among the several hundred degree options available at ASU. Colleges and schools examine year-to-year enrollment data by academic program and degree type and other appropriate subgroups in order to develop strategies for facilitating improved student success. Staff members from academic units and support programs analyze student participation data, specifically the percentage of successful students who engaged in a particular program (e.g., living in a residence hall or participating in University Bridge) or used a specific university service (e.g., tutoring, Supplemental Instruction, or Facebook). These data are used to refine existing programs and services and to develop new approaches.

As noted at many points throughout this document, between 2003 and 2012, the number of students served by ASU increased dramatically (28 percent) from 57,543 to 73,378. At the same time, students being served increasingly have come from a population far less likely to be served by a university less committed to access than ASU. The total number of ASU undergraduate students on Pell grants increased in three years from about 13,300 students in 2008-2009 to over 26,000 in 2011-2012. The continued improvement in the FTFT retention rate occurred while the university’s enrollment rapidly increased and ASU expanded access. Six-year graduation rates have improved to 56.8 percent for the 2006 cohort (from 55.8 percent for the 2002 cohort), and a new benchmark goal of 67.5 percent has been established.

The university is also determined to improve the persistence of minority students in its programs and to continue outreach to underserved constituencies in the region. The persistence rate for minority students in the 2010 FTFT cohort was 83.1 percent, and the six-year graduation rate for minority students in the 2005 FTFT cohort was 49.5 percent. While these rates can be stubborn to improve, these figures represent hard-won improvements since the last accreditation report, when the one-year persistence rate for minority students was 75.1 percent (2002 cohort), and the six-year graduation for minority students was 48.8 percent (2002 cohort).

The size and diversity of the ASU student body necessitates continual innovation to meet the needs of individual students and to attain the benchmarks set forth by ABOR. As noted in the previous discussion, ASU uses best practices in higher education assessment to promptly inform - paving the way for positive innovations.

2. ASU collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs.

The Office of Institutional Analysis calculates ASU’s official student retention, persistence, and completion rates. Enrollment data and responses from the ASU Persistence Survey are used in the production of retention and persistence rates for the overall cohorts, as well as for particular subgroups (gender, ethnicity, minority status, state residency, college/school, etc.). Each fall, UOEPE attempts to contact first-year students (from the previous fall) who did not return to ASU. Feedback provided by former students, parents, and family members provides the university with valuable information about why students did not return to ASU, their current activities, and whether they plan to return to ASU.

Analysis of retention and persistence data is conducted across the university. College-level retention data are provided to deans, and academic units are evaluated and rewarded based on their retention results. In a significant departure from practices at many universities, ASU colleges are held accountable for retention within the university, not merely within their college. The entire retention apparatus at ASU is centered on university-level retention and completion.

As noted at many points throughout this document, between 2003 and 2012, the number of students served by ASU increased dramatically (28 percent) from 57,543 to 73,378. At the same time, students being served increasingly have come from a population far less likely to be served by a university less committed to access than ASU. The total number of ASU undergraduate students on Pell grants increased in three years from about 13,300 students in 2008-2009 to over 26,000 in 2011-2012. The continued improvement in the FTFT retention rate occurred while the university’s enrollment rapidly increased and ASU expanded access. Six-year graduation rates have improved to 56.8 percent for the 2006 cohort (from 55.8 percent for the 2002 cohort), and a new benchmark goal of 67.5 percent has been established.

The university is also determined to improve the persistence of minority students in its programs and to continue outreach to underserved constituencies in the region. The persistence rate for minority students in the 2010 FTFT cohort was 83.1 percent, and the six-year graduation rate for minority students in the 2005 FTFT cohort was 49.5 percent. While these rates can be stubborn to improve, these figures represent hard-won improvements since the last accreditation report, when the one-year persistence rate for minority students was 75.1 percent (2002 cohort), and the six-year graduation for minority students was 48.8 percent (2002 cohort).

The size and diversity of the ASU student body necessitates continual innovation to meet the needs of individual students and to attain the benchmarks set forth by ABOR. As noted in the previous discussion, ASU uses best practices in higher education assessment to promptly inform - paving the way for positive innovations.
ASU uses information on student retention, persistence and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

As noted earlier, every aspect of the retention strategy at ASU is data-driven, and challenges are continuously identified and analyzed for developing solutions. The Office of the Executive Vice President and University Provost spearheads committees populated by college representatives and student support staff. These committees continuously analyze programmatic data as well as other forms of data. Over the past decade, when adequate data and tools were not available, new data sources and tools were developed (e.g., the retention dashboard and eAdvisor). Such tools have become go-to tools for academic advisors and support staff members.

When a retention, persistence, or completion-related problem is detected, prompt availability of data facilitates immediate implementation of remedies. For instance, data indicated in 2011 that problems with scholarship maintenance were eroding persistence. Within a month, policies were changed dramatically to better align with student needs. The same data are used to set goals, direct planning, and inform decisions at the college and departmental levels, and are examined to use the results to improve programs and services that facilitate student success. Academic units are held accountable for improvements in retention and graduation.

No easy or inexpensive methods exist to improve freshmen retention, and ASU has developed and pursued a series of initiatives that have led to improved persistence rates for university students. The multi-layered approach includes eAdvisor, freshmen seminar courses, improved learning support services, better course placement in the freshmen year, innovations by which students communicate and engage each other in college life (e.g., Facebook), and better pedagogy in key classes (using technologically-enhanced instruction and Supplemental Instruction). Each of these initiatives has incrementally improved retention, and ASU will continue to implement new initiatives and improve upon existing ones to continue to improve freshmen retention rates, and new approaches are being developed and applied; for example, the Pathways to Academic Student Success program, described in the discussion related to sub-component 3.D.3, was developed and begun in Spring 2012 because data analysis indicated successful academic recovery was extremely low among first year students following a first year GPA below 2.0.

Bringing new conventional resources to help enhance persistence and completion rates also has improved learning support systems. For example, as noted in Chapter 3, ASU has greatly expanded new tutoring facilities, extended the number and types of courses for which tutoring is available, implemented online tutoring, and extended tutoring into the residence halls for “after-hours” access. As discussed in Chapter 3, this expansion of tutoring resources has paid substantial dividends to the tens of thousands of students who make use of the resource.

As noted earlier, a new freshmen ASU 101-type course was introduced to encourage student engagement in an instructional environment much smaller than the typical classroom. Today, each college puts its own imprint on the course and uses it to engage students in the college and in specific majors as quickly as possible. Each seminar delivers standard material to help freshmen adapt to college, including the concept of academic integrity and its potential impact on their future, the value of engaging in research activities, time management skills, engagement activities, study skills, and working in teams. Additionally, ASU has implemented more proactive placement mechanisms. Enrolling students in the correct introductory course is very important; math placement, in particular, has become more precise using ALEKS as the placement exam. ALEKS is a division of McGraw-Hill that offers student placement exams.

ASU has implemented other coursework innovations for students who need extra support. ASU’s learning support courses are designed to help students overcome early problems. For example, ASU has implemented a highly successful Critical Reading and Thinking course to complement composition courses that better prepares students for large lecture courses. Lack of prerequisite skills for learning in large lecture courses can be a major stumbling block for many students.

Mentioned several times above, another program to improve student success in the so called “gateway courses” is Supplemental Instruction, which is most often used to supplement large, lecture hall classes that many beginning students find difficult. In 2011-2012, participation in Supplemental Instruction for large lecture courses increased to 21,594 visits, or 16 percent of the total Student Success Center visits that year. Data suggest that students who participate in Supplemental Instruction pass the course at significantly higher rates (Figure 4-2). Pass rate data show that, on average, pass rates for students who participated in Supplemental Instruction in supported large lecture courses were 15 percent higher than for non-participants. On average, there was a 0.5 positive
GPA difference for Supplemental Instruction participants in the supported courses with the most tutoring visits. A notable success was in chemistry courses, where there was a 0.72 positive difference in average GPA for Supplemental Instruction participants.

Figure 4-2: Effect of Supplemental Instruction on pass rates in large lecture courses, AY2010-2011.

Not all retention problems result from academic issues. ASU investigations have confirmed that retention problems also exist for students who never assimilate within the university, and this facet of the retention issue is particularly true for non-resident students who withdraw from ASU at much higher rates than in-state students. Furthermore, the retention gap between Arizona students and out-of-state students continues to grow. ASU has created special initiatives in response to the copious data collected regarding assimilation. Orientations and Fall Welcome events have been re-envisioned to stress engagement, spirit, pride, and participation in campus events. Academic colleges are charged with engaging students from the outset in the residence halls and in college communities. Individual academic units are also encouraged to develop internal systems for supporting this crucial student group. In addition to tailored ASU 101 classes, colleges have implemented camps for new freshmen at locations away from campus (e.g., Camp SESE held at Camp Tontoza on the Mogollon Rim for FTFT freshmen in the School of Earth and Space Exploration).

The W. P. Carey School of Business and the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering have actively utilized student camps. Camp Carey is an intensive three-day retreat for incoming W. P. Carey freshmen held in northern Arizona at the beginning of the fall semester. The camp gives students the opportunity to connect with fellow students, faculty, staff, and alumni through a variety of interactive and enjoyable activities. Participants meet the business school dean, create business plans in the Corporate Challenge, and work with fellow students through a Team Challenge course. The three-day experience helps students develop personal networks and make a strong connection with the W. P. Carey School and like-minded students. Students who attended Camp Carey in Fall 2010 were retained at a rate of six and a half percentage points higher than those students who did not attend camp. In the 2011-2012 academic year, the retention rate was five percentage points higher for students who attended Camp Carey than for those students who did not.

The Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering apply the concept of continuous improvement to their retention activities. Within the first two years of implementation, an analysis of Engineering’s signature E2 Camp experience for entering freshmen showed that participants continued to their sophomore year at a rate approximately 10 percentage points higher than non-participants. Other programs that are evaluated for impact on retention include student participation in the Engineering Residential Community, participation in undergraduate research experiences, freshman career exploration events, tutoring services, and many more as outlined in their comprehensive undergraduate student intervention plan. Using demographic and academic factor analysis, Engineering has initiated special programs designed to retain females and underrepresented minorities as well as provide curriculum enrichment for academically underprepared students. Engineering’s freshman retention at the University improved over five percentage points, from 82.6 percent to 87.9 percent during the period of 2005-2009 with a small drop in 2010 to 85.2 percent.

The Cronkite School also holds a large number of engagement activities for its new students as soon as they arrive for classes; and Barrett, The Honors College takes advantage of its residential environment to cultivate cohesion among its students.

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) has been a strong advocate for providing better data and more targeted programs to improve the overall retention rates of their undergraduates. In 2012, the college convened a half-day workshop for academic advisors. During this session, leadership:

- Shared current retention figures by major, student class (freshmen, sophomore, and junior class) retention rates, and market (in-state, out-of-state, and international);
- Critiqued and suggested modifications to the available tools that consolidate student success information (e.g., the retention dashboard and online advisor scheduling tools);
- Reported on departmental best practices in advising (e.g., how advisors are using data, retention tools, and programming to improve student success); and
- Developed a month-to-month advising calendar to help coordinate communication and outreach.
efforts to students across departments and with the services and programs available through the college and the university.

CLAS is also partnering with University Housing in developing a “residential college” model of student success targeting freshman residence halls. The focus is to provide timely and relevant support and programming to address the academic, financial, social, and health/wellness issues facing first-time freshmen.

A Connections Survey, a university-wide survey administered by UOEEE and University Housing to first-year students during their initial month at ASU, allows new students to seek out and receive immediate and personal guidance and support for the problems they may be facing in their transition to ASU. The survey is followed by regular and consistent workshops and in-house programming that allow students to receive help when difficult issues arise.

To further address the assimilation issue, the university has begun to experiment with new ways of communicating with students that allow them to engage in communities of students with common interests. A Facebook application was launched in 2009 that allows students to search for activities that interest them most – students studying fine arts, students from California, students interested in hiking, and so forth – and find other ASU students who share the same interests. The Facebook application is secure, restricted to ASU students, and requires an ASU ID for access. Much interaction occurred using the application during the Fall 2009 implementation, and a five-percentage-point higher fall-to-fall retention rate was observed for those students who used the application compared to those who did not. Differences were not as pronounced during the application’s second or third year of use. Initial data indicated heavy student use early in the semester. As expected, new students used the application most frequently, and as they developed a network of friends and communities, usage declined. This result was precisely the purpose of the application – to get students engaged early in campus life and in activities that interest them.

ASU also strives to improve student retention rates through heightened concentration on appropriate student placement in math and English classes, and through required participation in University Bridge programs for students based on placement scores and a calculated index (CI) that combines the student’s high school GPA and SAT/ACT. Students with scores below a particular threshold on the CI are required to participate in the transition program. The average retention rate for individuals in the University Bridge program during the 2006-2010 time period was 89 percent. Overall, 87 percent of Fall 2011 University Bridge students re-enrolled in Spring 2012.

EOSS uses institutional retention data to inform decisions about the development of student programs and services. Specifically, retention data for residence hall students are analyzed by academic discipline, class level, and residency. Eighty-seven percent of FTFT freshman Arizona residents living in the halls returned for the next fall semester, compared to only 83 percent of Arizona students who lived elsewhere. Similarly, 76 percent of FTFT freshman non-residents living in halls returned, while 71 percent of non-residents living elsewhere came back to ASU for Fall 2011. Those data led ASU to require that all FTFT freshmen live in residence halls, subject to appeal. ASU makes every effort to provide additional financial support to make on-campus residential living affordable for low income families.

Discussed in Chapter 3 as an example of efforts targeting assistance to a particular group of students, Sun Devil Athletics has served as a national trend-setter for boosting the success of student-athletes through continual assessment and improvement of strategies for that population. ASU was the first institution in the United States to acknowledge academic achievement on the athletic uniform by placing the “Scholar Baller®” patch on the football jersey and, later, soccer, softball, and several other sport uniforms. The Scholar Baller® concept is a reward platform bridging sports, education, and personal development for university student-athletes, and strives to inspire collegiate athletes to think beyond sports by maximizing academic opportunities in tandem with their passion for athletics. The success of the measures devoted to student athletes has been assessed using a number of metrics and used to refine the approaches taken. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Graduation Success Rates (GSR) have greatly improved for ASU’s student-athletes over the past seven years, climbing from 69 percent in 2005 to 80 percent in 2012 (using NCAA measures of graduation success); this strong upward trajectory is seen in Figure 4-3. Since 2003, the average GPA for student-athletes also has improved from 2.78 in Spring 2003 to 2.96 in Spring 2012. In 2012,
61 percent of all student-athletes earned Sun Devil Scholar-Athletes honors by earning a GPA equal to or greater than 3.00 (for fall or spring semester), nearly 50 percent of all student-athletes had a cumulative GPA of 3.00 or above, 16 student-athletes completed the year with a 4.00 cumulative GPA, and 88 student-athletes earned their degrees (30 percent graduated with honors). 20

4. ASU’s processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice.

The Office of Institutional Analysis and UOEEE follow strict protocols for the collection, analysis, and reporting of university retention, persistence, and completion data. The units use consistent data definitions, and items on the persistence survey were carefully worded and pilot-tested prior to implementation. Appropriate analytical procedures are strictly followed, and quality control mechanisms are implemented to ensure that calculations and reports are accurate. Data are analyzed for the aggregate as well as for meaningful subgroups. Results are shared with the university community, and administrators use data to drive planning and decision-making.

summary for component 4.C

Consistent with its Design Aspiration of enabling student success, Arizona State University is committed to assisting every student in its diverse student body to reach his or her academic goals. As described above, ASU carefully collects and analyzes data related to student retention, persistence, and completion rates. The data continuously drive proactive programmatic improvements and inform the development of new programs and initiatives. As a result of these improvements, programs, and initiatives, the university has made significant gains in these rates since the time of the last accreditation review. A host of new tools and techniques, such as eAdvisor, have helped improve the number of students who stay on track to reach their academic goals and have directed needed attention to them in a timely manner when missteps have occurred.

summary for criterion 4: teaching and learning: evaluation and improvement

Sustained improvement of academic programs rarely, if ever, happens by chance. The evidence and discussion above shows that ASU has engaged – and continues to engage – in vigorously, seriously, and conscientiously using measures of the performance of its academic programs to proactively enhance its offerings through a cycle of assessment, analysis, and improvement.

As discussed above, ASU has established student learning outcomes at the institutional, academic program, and course levels. In-depth assessments at all of these levels have provided copious amounts of data that have given insight into how well these programs meet their stated learning objectives and where improvements are needed. Data provided above show that this feedback, coupled with new additions over the past decade to the tools used to enhance student success (which also include assessment/improvement processes), has led to substantial progress toward the ambitious, but attainable, goals for student retention, persistence, and graduation; hallmarks of the New American University.

strengths

- ASU has a clearly defined, multi-level assessment system in place to help inform decisions aimed at improving instruction and student success. This robust system incorporates effective assessment strategies, measurement instruments, and web-based technology packages to aid the accomplishment of ASU’s assessment goals. ASU continues to enhance the existing assessment system to provide the resources, tools, and data faculty members need to enhance teaching and learning practices (e.g., expansion of assessment for general education courses and institutional learning outcomes; the systematic review and feedback mechanisms for program assessment plans and reports; and the use of the STEPS assessment management system to archive assessment plans, reports, and college-level data from institutional exit/alumni surveys).

- The University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness, a unit specifically tasked to provide guidance and support for assessment and evaluation activities, maintains focus on the multi-level system that is in place.

- Faculty members actively participate in the process at all levels, providing discipline-specific input to the development of learning outcomes and identification of assessment measures, the implementation of assessment strategies, the analysis and use of assessment data for continuous improvement purposes, and the sharing of successes and lessons learned with their colleagues.

- College assessment delegates serve as liaisons to UOEEE and coordinate participation in all
university assessment activities, serve as resources to faculty, review and provide feedback on assessment strategies and results, and submit and approve all unit assessment plans and reports.

**challenge**

- The nature of assessment at the university level dictates long timelines (a year or more) for the assessment cycle, during which student cohorts change in character and number, vastly complicating the analysis of data obtained.
5 ASU Academic Program Review Policy: http://graduate.asu.edu/faculty_staff/apr
7 ASU evaluation of transfer credit: http://transfer.asu.edu/credits
8 ASU Academic Partnerships: https://provost.asu.edu/ap
9 Specialized Accreditation at ASU: http://accreditation.asu.edu/programs-specialized-accreditation
10 Specialized Accreditation at ASU: http://accreditation.asu.edu/programs-specialized-accreditation
11 ASU Academic Program Profile: http://uoia.asu.edu/academic-program-profile
13 ASU General Studies: https://provost.asu.edu/generalstudies
14 ETS Proficiency Profile: http://www.ets.org/proficiencyprofile/about
15 ETS Proficiency Profile Assessment: (http://www.ets.org/proficiencyprofile/about/content/).
16 ASU Disability Resource Center: http://www.asu.edu/studentaffairs/ed/drc/
17 ASU Provost Betty Phillips statement on student retention: https://provost.asu.edu/Student-Retention
18 ASU Intercollegiate Athletics, Scholar Baller Program: http://scholarballer.org/partner-schools/colleges
19 ASU News, Sun Devil Athletics Reaches 80% Graduation Rate: https://asunews.asu.edu/20121025_gsr_athletics
chapter 5

criterion five. resources, planning, and institutional effectiveness
Arizona State University’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. Arizona State University plans for the future.

Arizona State University continuously plans, acts, evaluates, and improves, folding those enhancements into its plans to reach its goals. ASU’s transformation into a model of the New American University was accomplished over the period since the last accreditation reaffirmation by the Higher Learning Commission. The institution strategically marshaled physical, human, and financial resources to accomplish that feat. ASU carefully prioritized and allocated resources to continue the upward advance towards the goals discussed in Chapter 1, as well as the goals and targets consistent with ASU’s foundational documents and the Arizona Board of Regents’ expectations in ABOR 2020 Vision.

This chapter sketches how resource and planning processes at ASU have been tightly integrated to lead the university over the past decade and into the future to support and enhance ASU’s transformation.

A. Arizona State University’s resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

ASU has worked to ensure that its resources can handle the dramatic growth in its enrollment, program scope, and research activity since the last accreditation visit. Its success in expanding enrollment while improving student outcomes and building its research expenditures, as detailed in the preceding sections and chapters, is evidence that the resource base has been sufficient for ASU to accomplish these outcomes.

With the dramatic changes in the higher education funding landscape during the last three years (discussed in the Background section), ASU has added new capabilities to monitor, forecast, and plan for the long-term strategic use of its resources. The focus of this effort has been the development of an enterprise approach, which expands resources that result from institutional action and performance, rather than to rely entirely on less-controllable external sources, such as state appropriations. This planning approach evolved into ASU’s “Strategic Business Framework,” which forecasts resource needs associated with its goals and outcome metrics, and the means by which ASU can assure that the resources are available. By taking full control and responsibility for its future, ASU can confidently assert that its planning aligns with its aspirational goals to strengthen institutional quality in the coming years.

The context for strategic planning is built on four considerations for ASU as part of the Arizona University System:

1. Constitutional Mandate: The universities in the Arizona University System are established to serve the citizens of Arizona.

2. ABOR Vision 2020: ABOR establishes the goals to achieve the constitutional mandate through the Arizona University System.

3. Enterprise Plan: The Presidents of the universities in the Arizona University System design innovative strategies to achieve the goals.

4. Strategic Business Framework for ASU: ASU utilizes specific strategies from the enterprise plan to achieve its targets.

The key elements of the Strategic Business Framework are (1) to build the student pipeline to lead students to attain university degrees, (2) to maintain cost effectiveness, (3) to secure the resources needed to build quality and performance and to maintain affordability, and (4) improve performance and achieve the ASU internal goals and metrics and the ABOR 2020 Vision metrics.
1. ASU has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

Population growth, increasing diversity, and economic stress (discussed in the Background section) placed increasing demands on the university over the past decade. To cope with those factors while forging ahead in ASU’s transformation requires that the institution be prudent in prioritizing and allocating its resources.

**fiscal resources**

As discussed in the Background section, the levels of state appropriations to higher education in Arizona have been reduced dramatically since 2008, on both a real and a per-student basis. When adjusted for inflation, the state investment in ASU has fallen to levels last seen half-a-century ago. ASU responded to these decreases in state investment with careful planning, the enhancement of alternative revenue streams, and creative cost-saving measures.

One of ASU’s responses to the reduction in state investment was to shore up its resource base through increased tuition. (See Figure 5-1 and the Background section), with concomitant set-asides for increased financial aid. Student financial aid maintains the Core Value of Access and meets the ASU Goal of “Access and Quality for All.”

State appropriation reductions were substantially offset by (1) net tuition rate increases (after financial aid), (2) increases in non-resident tuition, and (3) revenue from rapidly growing ASU Online program enrollment. Thus, even though the institution has seen a 52 percent reduction in per FTE state appropriations since FY2008, the total net available resources from tuition, state funds, and other general revenue sources per FTE student in FY2012 has declined only by 11 percent from FY2008 levels on an inflation-adjusted basis (and only 4 percent in real terms) over that same time frame.

ASU has also made strategic reductions in its spending in response to reduced state appropriations (as discussed in the Background section). Major consolidations of academic units within the university (directly impacting 9 colleges and 47 departments) generated substantial cost savings. This academic reorganization was driven by strategic planning to better align programs with the university’s Mission, Vision, and Core Values Statements (see inside front cover), all while absolutely protecting the quality of academic programs. These realignment and redesign efforts resulted in the downsizing of support staff (as seen in part in Table 5-1), the creation of administrative efficiencies (after 2006-2007 when campuses were brought under a single administrative structure), and a closer eye to developing streamlined institutional processes.
Further cost savings have been made possible through innovative uses of technology to improve student learning outcomes and lower teaching costs. ASU enhanced the student learning environment while simultaneously creating more efficient and cost effective delivery modalities by upgrades to the Blackboard online course content management system, increased support to online course delivery, and deployment of new educational technologies in the classroom. New teaching and learning technology in introductory mathematics, for example, enhanced student learning outcomes while reducing faculty cost-per-student for entry-level math from $233.13/student to $112.27/student, a reduction of more than half the cost.

As part of the America Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009, the institution benefited greatly from federal stimulus funds of $103.2 million. The stimulus funds provided a temporary replacement of lost revenue from FY2009 through FY2011, giving added time to strategically plan and ramp up its additional cost-savings measures and revenue enhancements. Table 5.2 shows a sampling of cost efficiencies realized in non-academic areas.

Consequently, ASU has been able to stabilize its financial status and assure the availability of adequate resources for the future. Evidence for this is seen in the period of adjustment since state investment reductions began in FY2008. ASU has supported a growing student body (up 20.7% in FTE’s from AY 2007-2008 to AY2011-2012), and improved its undergraduate first year retention rates from 77% with the Fall 2006 cohort to 83.5% with the Fall 2010 cohort. Similarly, since 2008, ASU has increased its sponsored research expenditures by $120 million, and added over 3.5 million gross square feet of space.

These outcome improvements, during a period of resource austerity, build upon the very substantial increments in investment in the quality of the
institution during the period prior to FY2008, and the increasing efficiencies that ASU has been able to put in place to handle its growth.

Over the entire period of FY2003 to FY2012:

- ASU’s FTE enrollment rose by 19,500 (39%), a growth nearly as large as the entire Fall 2012 FTE undergraduate enrollment* of Northern Arizona University (20,923).
- ASU’s FTE tenured/tenure-track faculty size grew by 210 faculty members (15%), and its overall FTE faculty count increased by 535 (27%).
- ASU’s overall faculty and staff FTE count rose by 1,060 (27%).
- ASU’s research expenditures increased by over $230 million (150%).
- ASU added a total of over 5.5 million square feet of new space, as detailed below. This includes almost one million square feet of new or renovated modern research laboratory space, 450,000 square feet of technologically-sophisticated teaching space, 800,000 square feet of other academic space, and 6,600 beds of new student residential capacity.
- ASU opened a new campus in downtown Phoenix, with new office and teaching facilities for four of its colleges (Public Programs, Journalism, Nursing and Health Innovation, and Health Solutions).

Moving forward, ASU intends to leverage new efficiencies and revenue streams to continue its current and projected growth trajectory. Some key fiscal strategies to support this growth and maintain existing programs are (1) expanding the enrollment of non-residents and international students, (2) improving ASU Online revenue, (3) controlling costs for education and financial aid, (4) moving tuition rate growth to peer averages, (5) requesting performance-based funding from the state, and (6) enhancing ASU’s market brand to facilitate recruitment. As noted in the Background section, ASU has also secured from the State Legislature additional funding in part to make up for underfunding of the state enrollment formula in prior years; $12 million was provided for FY2013, the first installment of five years of such support to be requested.

**human resources**

The financial and physical resources at ASU support the daily functions of a vibrant and dedicated workforce of faculty, administrators, and professional and classified staff. Each of these groups has demonstrated tremendous adaptability and commitment to ASU’s higher education mission through the challenges of the past decade.

From any perspective within the institution, the economic and growth challenges have been daunting, but particularly so for those in the academic operations areas. ASU has continually taken advantage of a resourceful and creative workforce of academic personnel committed to ASU’s Core Values of Excellence, Access, and Impact. As shown in Table 3.5 in Chapter 3, the number of faculty members increased steadily from 2003 to 2007 with enrollment growth, but fell during the period 2008-2011. The decrease of about 7% in faculty from 2008 to 2011 was compensated by an increased focus on efficiencies, unit consolidations, and improved teaching methods. The discussion in Chapters 3 and 4 provided evidence that, against the backdrop of fiscal challenges, improved teaching and student support methods and efficiencies were successful in generating increased retention rates, higher graduation rates, and advances on other student success metrics during this same time period.

As seen in Figure 5-4, in Fall 2010, ASU had a total FTE enrollment (full-time + one-third part-time) of 60,511 students and an instructional faculty of 2,579 FTE across its campuses. These statistics yield a FTE student/faculty ratio of 23:1, a ratio considerably higher than most of its peer institutions.* Traditionally, lower values for this measure have been interpreted to denote greater attentiveness to student learning and a higher likelihood of improved student learning outcomes. However, with the increased use of technology and growing enrollment in online offerings, interpretations of that measure now must be nuanced to include considerations of improvements in efficiency of course delivery, as well.

Staff members at any university provide a strong contribution to the success of the institution. The workforce of classified staff and service professionals

---

*Figure 5-4: student/faculty ratio compared to peer institutions, Fall 2010.*
also has not been immune from the impact of economic stresses, as shown in Table 5-1. In Fall 2011, ASU had over 6,000 staff members working in areas ranging from admissions and student support to technology, accounting, and administration.

As seen in Figure 5-5, ASU maintains a student-to-staff ratio of 7.3:1, approximately a factor of two higher than the average 3.5:1 for ASU’s ABOR-approved peer-institutions. As in the case of the student/faculty ratio, lower values for this measure traditionally have been interpreted to denote greater responsiveness to student needs and a greater likelihood of student academic success. However, as before, with the increased use of technology and growing enrollment in online offerings, interpretations of that measure now must be nuanced to include considerations of improvements in efficiency of service delivery, as well. Despite the substantially higher student/staff ratio when compared with its peer institutions, ASU has continually provided quality support to all academic units, growing annual enrollment figures and increasing both graduation and retention rates, while experiencing a net 5.8% reduction in staff employees from 2003-2011. In dealing with these reductions, as noted in Chapters 2 and 3, ASU policies and practices have demonstrated an institutional commitment to the recruitment, retention, and development of a qualified and diverse team of classified staff members, service professional, and administrators.

In addition to major cost-savings adjustments in academic operations, substantial efficiencies also were realized in the non-academic support units. Privatization of a number of service functions garnered economies while preserving or improving service levels. For example, Sun Devil Campus Stores, the bookstores for ASU, outsourced services to the Follett Higher Education Group, resulting in a substantial decrease in risk to the university. During that outsourcing process, the stores also instituted a book rental system that saved students over $2 million when compared to the previous system. The evidence demonstrates that ASU has carefully and strategically managed human resources during a period of great financial stress to protect and enhance the quality of its academic offerings and the achievements in forefront scholarly activity, as documented in previous chapters. This has been accomplished while remaining consistent with its Mission, Vision, and Core Values.

**physical and technological infrastructure**

Today, ASU utilizes over 12 million square feet of system-wide building space to support operations for the delivery and support of academic programs and the conduct of research. Since the last accreditation visit (as seen in Figure 5-6), ASU has steadily added new structures to support the advancing mission of the university and to provide the infrastructure needed to support ongoing teaching, research, and student activities.

![Figure 5-6: Physical Inventory of Space for All ASU Campuses, FY2003 through FY2012](image)

Net square footage includes all useable space in the ASU campus buildings and structures, and includes buildings leased by ASU.

The Office of the University Architect (OUA) is responsible for the management of the physical space at ASU. Some of the key areas of OUA activity relate specifically to the ability of ASU to conduct operations wherever and however programs are delivered. The physical space requirements needed for ASU’s academic units are substantial, and those structures are dispersed primarily on four widely-separated physical campus locations. At the time ASU’s accreditation was last reaffirmed, the university had severe infrastructure needs that threatened to hinder its projected rapid growth in student enrollment. ASU worked in concert with local governments, utilities companies, and other stakeholders (as noted in the Preface), to develop the “Comprehensive Development Plan for a New American University.”

The goal of that architectural planning process was to “[t]o build a comprehensive metropolitan research university that embodies an unparalleled combination of academic excellence with a commitment to its...
social, economic, cultural, and environmental setting.” Two examples that exemplify the effectiveness of this plan in achieving ASU’s goals are:

- The Brickyard, shown in Figure 5-7, is a downtown Tempe building with more than 390,000 square feet of mixed-use space. This building expands student services, cultivates program and research excellence, and stimulates a dynamic relationship between the city of Tempe and ASU. In addition to providing additional classroom space, the Brickyard now houses The School of Arts, Media and Engineering (a collaboration between The Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts and the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering), the Decision Theater, the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering Dean’s Office, and several research centers, including Arizona Technology Enterprises, the Center for Cognitive Ubiquitous Computing, and the Partnership for Research in Spatial Modeling. The building participates in the vibrant environment of downtown Tempe, offering a range of courses, opportunities, and services, while connected through its centers to the surrounding economic well-being of the neighborhood and the state.

- In August 2006, ASU opened an entirely new campus in downtown Phoenix to house the College of Nursing and Healthcare Innovation, the College of Public Programs, and University College (see Figure 5-8). The emergence of the Downtown Phoenix campus reflects ASU’s Core Values of Excellence, Access, and Impact. An unprecedented public referendum secured municipal capital funding for the development of this new campus. Relocation to the downtown Phoenix campus positioned these programs to the site best suited to the programmatic need of students and the point of impact in the community—at the vanguard of health care delivery and innovation, adjacent to the seat of federal, state, and civil government, and within the media core of the fifth largest metropolitan city in the country. This new campus initially enrolled 6,000 total students, with more than 3,000 attending on a full-time basis. In 2008 The Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communications, along with KAET (ASU’s television station), completed relocation to close proximity with major media outlets in metropolitan Phoenix. The University Center complex includes modern classrooms, laboratories, offices, and study rooms and provides essential student services through its ASU Bookstore and Information Commons.

Major additions and renovations also were undertaken at the West and Polytechnic campuses, although the infrastructure of the West campus, compared to the Tempe campus, was relatively new and information-technology ready. The original structures at the Polytechnic campus were World-War-II-era military base structures; those buildings were targeted for retrofitting and new classroom and laboratory buildings were erected to serve its envisioned enrollment in 2020 of 10,000 students. One example of this major building development at the Polytechnic campus is the Interdisciplinary Science and Technology Building 3, seen in Figure 5-9, with 34,600 square feet of space dedicated to the laboratory sciences, including applied research in the biological sciences, psychology, health lifestyles, and plant-made pharmaceuticals.

Notable examples of improvements on the Tempe campus included the Lattie F. Coor Hall, which houses numerous centers, departments, institutes, and classrooms, and the Biodesign Institute Building A (with 177,661 square feet of mixed-use space). These buildings show the university’s commitment to offer the best possible learning environments in support of cutting-edge research in all areas; both came into use in 2004. Additional examples of infrastructure improvements and additions include those at the ASU Research Park (which now provides space for research activity with over $93 million in expenditures) and ASU SkySong (a collaboration with the City of Scottsdale that has helped launch or accelerate over 50 start-up companies from eleven countries outside the United States).

As progress continues at ASU, a variety of building projects are underway that will continue to support the
increased enrollment projections and the current student body, some of which are displayed in Figure 5-10. At the Polytechnic and West campus locations, new academic villages are being built in partnership with private sector developers to support the concept of immersion education, providing well over 600 new beds for incoming freshman and an additional combined 124,800 square feet.17–18 On the ASU Tempe campus, the W. P. Carey School of Business is constructing a 129,000 square-foot state-of-the-art business school facility that will provide students and faculty with more classroom space, technologically advanced team study rooms, a new career center, outdoor assembly areas, and world-class conference facilities.

Because of the inherent challenges of constructing a large urban campus from scratch near the center of a large city location, ASU continues to actively explore creative options for the addition of classroom space at the Downtown Phoenix campus. Two student housing projects at that campus were completed in 2011 that have provided an additional 1300 beds of on-campus housing for students, and construction is ongoing to complete a new campus recreation center and a student activities center to support students, faculty, and staff.19–20

As evidenced by the trends in the physical space inventory seen in Figure 5-11, ASU has been committed over the past decade to building the physical space needed to provide the academic, research, and support space and buildings required to enable current operations and to allow for substantial long-term growth.

Since the last accreditation review in 2003, a critical component in advancing ASU’s goals and mission has been the infrastructure devoted to information technology. As at all institutions, the demands of a growing, computer-savvy community of scholars require that the university remain current with technology trends, while maintaining reliable and robust services for the delivery of academic programs and meeting the needs of researchers.

ASU’s University Technology Office (UTO) has striven to provide the highest quality technology-based services and systems in a cost-effective manner, to support the University’s mission and goals as they apply to student learning, academic research, engagement, and public service. Led by the Chief Information Officer, UTO deploys a staff of 300 individuals to support ASU’s teaching and research missions, supplemented by over 200 additional staff supporting decentralized IT functions in the colleges and departments. The UTO strategic plan identifies goals in the areas of supporting student success, developing additional infrastructure, improving administrative effectiveness, safeguarding resources through security, advancing academic technology, strongly supporting research computing, and building and enhancing strategic technology alliances.

ASU’s current financial investment in UTO is over $60 million annually, part of a total estimated information technology budget expenditure of $125 million for the University, amounting to over 7% of the university’s budget. UTO was spared the severe budget reductions seen elsewhere in the institution since FY2008 due to the central role that technological infrastructure plays as a critical component in ASU’s ability to advance academic programs and research.

Over the past decade, UTO has focused on ubiquitous classroom mediation, has implemented video conferencing solutions, and has upgraded hardware in classrooms and computing sites. ASU has committed funds for maintaining a four-year classroom technology refresh schedule, while pursuing programs such as using virtual desktops to lower
classroom technology costs. Research computing has improved with the expansion of the central provisioning of processing, storage, software, bandwidth, and expertise. This consolidation of computer, data, network, and storage systems is a widely-recognized approach to help ensure secure and continuous operation of information systems while improving reliability and minimizing cost. Looking to the future, UTO’s infrastructure improvement plan calls for an additional investment of $11 million in the FY2013 budget request.

Beyond its campus expertise, UTO continues to seek out strategic technology alliances, identifying opportunities to replace the direct provisioning of information services with externally provided services operating at larger scales. ASU uses such companies as Google, CenturyLink/Qwest, Blackboard, CedarCrestone, Cisco, Amazon, and NetApp for “context” work, thus allowing UTO to focus on “core” University initiatives. As noted above, ASU’s focus on student retention and graduation rates led to the development and deployment of information systems such as eAdvisor, PeopleSoft ERP, and other key applications. This student-centered IT support thrust includes a renewed focus on academic technology, project portfolios, online learning, and learning management systems for program delivery.

To meet the needs of one of the largest institutions of higher learning in the nation, growing rapidly in terms of both academic and research achievement, the evidence shows that ASU has carefully and strategically managed physical and technological resources on all its physical campuses since the last review of the institution’s accreditation in 2003. As a result of this constant attention to the enhancement of its physical and technological infrastructure, the superior quality of ASU’s academic programs have been and will continue to be enhanced, regardless of how those programs are delivered.

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

As the discussion above has shown in multiple ways, and as subsequent discussion of other subcomponents of this Criterion will continue to underscore, the centrality of ASU’s educational mission pervades its resource and budgeting allocation processes. As a combined workforce with a shared educational mission, over the past decade, ASU faculty, administrators, and staff continually demonstrated their commitment to advancing the quality of ASU’s programs and affirmed their commitment to ASU’s students despite very difficult fiscal times.

Many examples of evidence beyond the discussions that have appeared throughout this document can be cited supporting the centrality of the educational mission at ASU. Perhaps the most striking example of this central, fixed institutional priority came in FY2008, when a substantial, mid-year mandated state budget cut was forced onto ASU. In response, the faculty, staff, and administration undertook an institution-wide furlough program (with enforced unpaid leaves of up to 15 workdays for every employee, regardless of funding source) to ensure adequate financial resources were kept available to meet all academic responsibilities to students through the remainder of that fiscal year. All classes, services, and financial aid for students were maintained unabated throughout that period due to the shared sacrifice of every employee of the institution, a total contribution amounting to about $24 million.

As a non-profit public university, ASU does not return revenue to any superordinate entity.

3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of ASU’s organization, resources, and opportunities.

Discussions throughout this Self-Study Report have established that, since the last accreditation visit, ASU has been steadfastly led by an ambitious and clear set of foundational documents, which have provided realistically achievable goals and targets with publicly stated and transparent quantitative and qualitative measures to assess its forward progress. Embodying ASU’s Mission, Vision, Goals, and Core Values Statements, utilizing the “One University in Many Places” redesign, following the Comprehensive Development Plan, and considering the Arizona Board of Regents 2020 Vision and the Enterprise Metrics guidance, the previous discussions have shown the many ways that goal-directed plans and strategies have guided the institution’s steps to effect its transformation to the New American University.

That these plans indeed are realistic in light of ASU’s organization, resources, and opportunities was evidenced in the discussion in Chapter 1. In that discussion, it was shown that ASU has met most of the targets spelled out in the ASU Goals Statement, is poised to meet the remaining measures, has established new internal goals for the future, and is now moving steadily towards the objectives provided in ABOR’s 2020 Vision and the Enterprise Metrics using the specific tools of the Strategic Business Framework to derive the needed support. All these results demonstrate that, while the goals set are ambitious and challenging, those targets are realistically within reach through concerted and dedicated efforts strategically focused on them.
4. ASU's staff members in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

ASU's hiring and new employee practices for faculty and staff members, discussed at length in Chapter 2, ensure that staff members hired are appropriately qualified for the jobs to which they are assigned and have opportunities to advance their skills. During the hiring process, essential job qualifications for every position are identified, and the required qualifications that ensure applicants can successfully carry out those functions are specified. Only applicants who meet all required qualifications are considered for hire. After hire, ASU requires each faculty and staff member to maintain the qualifications and skills needed to continue performing those jobs. Annual performance reviews ensure that those employees remain current with needed skills and provide avenues for improvement when qualifications fail to maintain the high standards set.

Opportunities provided for continuing professional development and skill development are accompanied with incentives (promotion, reclassification, salary increases, etc.) that encourage staff members to improve their knowledge and skills. As noted in Chapter 2, in the environmental health and safety area alone, for example, over 60 different training courses were offered during CY2012, with more than 900 training classes conducted involving more than 17,000 registrants. Other training activities include, for example, the continuous training provided in fiscal operations to ensure ethical and responsible conduct of the business affairs of the institution, the orientation and training of residence hall assistants in areas like student success, and workshops for student advising. Beyond these training activities directly related to an employee’s job functions, ASU also provides each employee opportunities to further his or her education through taking university courses, whether for a few courses for continuing education, or in pursuit of a degree or certificate, with a provision of tuition benefits.

5. ASU has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expenses.

ASU uses a well-defined, continuously-updated budget development and monitoring process. The overall institutional budget is maintained on a five-year cycle, with a highly detailed focus for the current and upcoming fiscal years. It is also maintained with constant awareness of the resource requirements and likely resource availability for the remaining four years in the cycle.

The budget process is overseen by a Budget Committee, reporting to the President, composed of senior administrators: the Executive Vice President and University Provost, the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, and the Senior Vice President and University Planner. This structure ensures that budget planning is done by those most knowledgeable of the needs of academic units, administrative support functions, and longer-term planning issues. Each of these senior officers is responsible for regular contact with the leaders in their areas (deans, vice presidents, and others) so that they are in a position to identify resource needs and to balance their priorities in meeting ASU’s larger goals.

Annual budgets are established at very detailed levels for all units and functions. The units receive notice of the coming resource allocations as early as possible in the prior fiscal year. The allocations are monitored by both the unit leaders and the central budget office. Reports projecting anticipated changes in budget revenues or expenses are reviewed by an ABOR oversight committee on a quarterly basis.

Several levels of reporting and analysis track revenues and expenditures monthly, both centrally and at the departmental level. These include staff accountants’ independent reviews of individual account activity, reconciliation of expenditure activity in accounting records by college and administrative business officers, and periodic review by accounting staff. Trend analysis and expenditure updates are prepared by the Office of Planning and Budget with input from the colleges and administrative personnel and shared with the Budget Committee along with careful monitoring and approval of payroll activity. Unit leaders and the budget office can prepare ad hoc tailored reports through the MyReports web-based software application, but leaders more frequently use the systematic reports offered by the ASU Advantage web reports, staff accounting reports, MyReports financial reports, and the Strategic Tracking Analysis and Reporting System (STAR) budgeting monitoring reports.

Additional formal budget reporting requirements are imposed by state law and ABOR policies beyond the internal university budget process described here. ABOR has a well-developed set of policies and structures for overseeing the fiscal and resource allocations as well as priorities of the three universities in the Arizona University System. ABOR establishes timetables for standard financial and budget reports, standard formats for reporting, and committees with whom regular meetings are scheduled to review academic policy, financial projections, capital plans, and information technology practices. The Board also requires auditing offices at each of the three universities. Proposed budgets for the coming fiscal year for tuition and state appropriation–derived resources are presented annually for endorsement by the ABOR before their submission to the State’s Office of Planning and Budget for incorporation into the overall State budget proposal.
The formal state budget process begins almost a year before the budget is enacted. State funding is largely provided as lump sum funding, with the use of the funds at the discretion of the university unless a specific activity is separately earmarked in the legislation. At present, only $3 million of state funding (1%) is identified for any specific program, and the university has the full ability to direct state funding appropriately.

In September of the fiscal year preceding enactment of the state budget, ASU submits proposed requests for funding changes to ABOR for approval. Following guidance from the Regents, ASU incorporates the planned changes and submits the budget to the Arizona Governor’s Office of Strategic Planning and Budget on October 1st. In the following January, the Governor of Arizona submits a budget proposal to the Arizona State Legislature. The State Legislature considers the Governor’s budget along with the request made to the Governor by the university system, and legislation is drafted to establish the budget for the following fiscal year. While final budgets are typically legislated in late spring of each year, the Budget Committee often has a reasonable expectation of the level of funding that eventually will be set for ASU. Those changes are refined in the budget planning activities during this period, and they are incorporated into detailed department budgets in time for the start of the new fiscal year in July.

The Budget Committee meets regularly through the year as a group as well as with the President. The committee monitors current-year financial performance and prepares and regularly revisits multi-year enrollment forecasts, multi-year tuition rate and financial aid strategies, state appropriation prospects, cost structures in base programs such as benefits and utilities, and near-term and longer-term academic investment needs. Through this process, current issues are identified and addressed in a timely fashion, longer term needs can be anticipated and planned for, and multi-year strategies for the improvement of the institution can be conceptualized, prioritized, and planned.

**summary for component 5.A**

Since the last accreditation review, ASU has greatly strengthened its physical, human, financial, and technological resource base in order to provide a platform for ASU as a model of a new type of major American research university. The physical plant has been greatly expanded and renovated to power strong academic programs and to facilitate cutting-edge research.

Coupled with this growth in resources has been strong attention to better utilization of those investments. As a result of its close attention to resource efficiency, ASU today takes pride in its cost-effectiveness in providing strong academic programs and in carrying out forefront research. The institution’s robust planning and budget processes have guided the university over the past decade through the greatest period of transformation ASU has ever experienced. Through a decade of economic ups and downs, that guidance has led to sizeable increases in physical, financial, technological, and human resources, all amassed through goal-driven efforts. With careful attention and creativity, large improvements in cost-efficiency have been made without sacrificing or diminishing quality. As a result, when comparisons are made with other comprehensive research universities of ASU’s class and scope, the resources expended per student and per degree awarded have remained at the most efficient and most economical end of the spectrum, as was illustrated in Figure 5-2.

ASU has a large base of new facilities, strong demand for the programs supporting tuition-derived resources, other established and growing revenue streams, and an ongoing commitment to the use of innovative strategies to accomplish more with a constrained resource base demonstrates. Through careful planning and budgeting during the economic downturn, ASU stabilized this resource base such that the university can maintain and strengthen the performance of its programs into the future. This efficiency and resource enhancement has been maintained while simultaneously advancing greatly the size and quality of its educational and research enterprises and making progress towards ambitious but realistic goals. All these indicate that ASU is well-positioned to meet its resource needs to grow and improve program quality and educational outcomes to meet ASU’s Mission and Goals. The evidence presented thus supports the conclusion that, ever-mindful of efficient use of resources, ASU’s fiscal, human, technological, and physical resources, as well as the means by which they are deployed, are sufficient to support and continue to strengthen the institution’s operations, academic program delivery, and research efforts to outstanding levels of performance.
B. ASU’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

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

The discussion in previous chapters has repeatedly provided illustrations of how the governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students share the critical tasks of ensuring the centrality and quality of the educational experience. In this section, details of these various constituencies are provided along with a summary description of how each participates in the shared governance of this institution.

As a public university in Arizona, state law requires that ABOR, the President, and the faculty share governance at ASU. Adopted in 1992, Arizona Revised Statute 15-1601, paragraph B reads:

The universities shall have colleges, schools and departments and give courses of study and academic degrees as the board approves. Subject to the responsibilities and powers of the board and the university presidents, the faculty members of the universities, through their elected faculty representatives, shall share responsibility for academic and educational activities and matters related to faculty personnel. The faculty members of each university, through their elected faculty representatives, shall participate in the governance of their respective universities and shall actively participate in the development of university policy.

At ASU, governance of the institution is a shared responsibility carried out by ABOR, ASU’s administration, and the faculty acting through their representatives. Students and staff employees also provide input through their elected representatives. ASU employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including ABOR, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution’s governance. The administrative, faculty, staff, and student leadership functions are discussed in turn here, with a sketch of how those groups function as part of the collective decision-making process of the institution. ABOR is discussed in the following subcomponent discussion.

ASU administration

As part of the academic redesign during the past decade, the semi-autonomous administrations of the physical campuses have been consolidated into a single administration for all programs and operations. That administration is led by the President, with two additional officers who are appointed by and report directly to the President: (1) the Executive Vice President and University Provost and (2) the Executive Vice President, Treasurer, and Chief Financial Officer.

By ABOR policy, the chief executive officer at ASU is the President. Dr. Michael M. Crow became the 16th president of Arizona State University on July 1, 2002, during the final stages of the last accreditation review process. The President (or his delegates) is responsible for the execution of measures enacted by ABOR regarding the administration of the university, and for the execution of all measures adopted by the faculty or councils of the university, provided such measures are approved by the President. He is an ex-officio member of the university faculty, the University Senate, and faculty committees of schools and colleges, including divisional councils. President Crow is the chief budget officer of the institution and leads the budget and planning processes described above. His responsibilities include guiding the institution’s strategic planning and budgeting processes and appointing and assigning persons to all positions in the university, subject to the policies and practices of the ABOR. The President officially represents the university to ABOR.

The chief academic officer of ASU is the Executive Vice President and University Provost. Dr. Elizabeth D. Phillips assumed that role on July 1, 2006. As ASU’s chief academic officer, she provides leadership to all university campuses and academic programs, fostering excellence in teaching, research, and service to the community. She guides the university toward meeting its mission of providing educational excellence and access, and directs the university efforts in the strategic redesign of its academic mission to achieve the vision embodied in the model of a New American University. The various responsibilities for the academic operations of the institution are delegated to vice provosts reporting to the Executive Vice President and University Provost.

Dr. Morgan R. Olsen became Executive Vice President, Treasurer, and Chief Financial Officer in November 2008. His responsibilities at the University include oversight of all treasury and financial functions, capital projects, real estate, facilities operations, human resources, police, environmental health and safety, and business and auxiliary services at ASU. These operational areas are given oversight by a team of associate vice presidents responsible for groups of these functions.
faculty, staff, and student governance

Academic personnel, staff employees, and graduate and undergraduate students are represented in shared governance by elected bodies.

For academic personnel, ASU policy (ACD 112-01, “Academic Constitution and Bylaws”) outlines and defines the authority by which faculty members and academic professionals of Arizona State University participate in the governance and administration of the university and in the development of university policy. The constitution provides for three organizations – the Academic Assembly, the University Senate, and the University Academic Council.

- The Academic Assembly is composed of all faculty in a tenure-eligible or tenured position; academic professionals with full-time multi-year, probationary, or continuing appointment positions; the President of the university, and the Executive Vice President and University Provost; all full-time faculty with fixed appointments (i.e., instructors, lecturers, senior lecturers, principal lecturers, clinical faculty, research faculty, and professors of practice); and members of the Emeritus College. The Academic Assembly has the power, as provided by state law and subject to the authority of the ABOR and to the limitations provided by the assembly constitution, to propose on all matters of educational policy, faculty grievance, faculty personnel, financial affairs, university support services, and all other matters affecting the faculty and academic professional role in the university, its campuses, research parks, and other facilities. The Academic Assembly normally exercises this power through its representative body, the University Senate.

- The University Senate is the elected representative body of the Academic Assembly, and has power to act for and represent the Academic Assembly in all matters including, but not limited to, academic affairs, personnel matters, faculty-student policies, financial affairs, and university services and facilities, subject to the authority granted to it by ABOR.

- The University Academic Council (UAC) serves as the executive board of the University Senate and is composed of the senate presidents, president-elects, and immediate past presidents of the Downtown Phoenix campus, the Polytechnic campus, the Tempe campus, and the West campus. The University Academic Council supervises the affairs of the University Senate, though the University Academic Council is subject to the orders of the University Senate.

The classified staff employees and service professionals at ASU are represented through the Staff Council organized by campus. Each campus has its own elected board, comprised of a President, Vice President, Treasurer, Parliamentarian, and Past President; as well as Council members and committee members (non-Council members) that participate in Council activities. The Executive Council is comprised of the Staff Council President from each campus, and the Council advises the university President on the working climate for staff employees, as well as making recommendations on improving the employment environment, policies and procedures affecting staff, and the general welfare and equal opportunities for staff members; enhancing internal communication among staff on all campuses, other universities within Arizona, and local communities; and promoting organizational and professional development. Additionally, one of the campus-based Staff Council Presidents serves as the representative for the Executive Council on university-level committees.

Several layers of student governance at the college, campus, and university levels represent undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at Arizona State University. The highest bodies in student governance include:

- An Undergraduate Student Government (USG) on each campus that provides advocacy services and representation for the undergraduate student body. Comprised of both elected and appointed officers, USG leaders work with university administrators on their respective campuses to enhance the student experience at each location in accordance with student priorities. A USG Student Senate, comprised of elected representatives on each campus, supports each USG.

- The Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA), which exists to advocate for and to provide support and services to the graduate and professional student community of Arizona State University. All registered post-baccalaureate students with graduate, professional, or non-degree seeking status are members of GPSA, which has both elected and appointed officers, including one Director representing each of the campuses. The GPSA is supported by the GPSA Assembly, comprised of elected representatives from each of ASU’s colleges. Student leaders of the GPSA routinely meet with senior university administrators (including the Graduate College) to discuss and address matters of import to the graduate and professional student community.
The collective voice of the student body is represented in the Council of Presidents. Comprised of each of the four undergraduate student body presidents (from the Tempe, Downtown Phoenix, West, and Polytechnic campuses) and the Graduate and Professional Student Association President, the Council meets routinely with senior university administrators, including the President to discuss and address student priorities. In addition, the Council hosts various events, including quarterly town halls with the University President. These events provide all students the opportunity to ask questions or share concerns directly with their representative student leaders and university administrators. The Undergraduate Student Government Association and the Graduate Professional Student Association regularly provide feedback, solutions, and options to both the administration and the faculty on items of interest and concern.

A further example of student participation in shared governance is the University Senate Student-Faculty Policy Committee (SFPC). The SFPC serves in a policy-forming and advisory capacity in matters governing student conduct, consistent with the Student Code of Conduct; in matters concerning student organizations; and in all other matters related to students and academic freedom. While this is a faculty committee, there are ex-officio members from both the USG and the GPSA who provide valuable input towards the academic policy process. Similarly, this shared governance philosophy frequently extends down to the academic unit, where student representatives may serve on appropriate department committees and provide their viewpoints.

2. The governing board is knowledgeable about ASU’s financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

ABOR’s governance and oversight roles in higher education in Arizona and its important role in academic program development and approval were detailed in previous chapters. As discussed immediately above, ABOR also plays a key role in the resource allocation deliberations and decisions. As those discussions have indicated, ABOR consideration and approval is required for many key operational decisions and actions, including examples such as university budget submissions to the State Legislature, authorizing new capital spending and new borrowing, fixing tuition and fee rates, creation or dissolution of new academic programs, and the hiring of senior leadership.

The Board regularly discusses longer-term goals and direction for the institution. The Board’s deliberations include shared governance representation, implicit in the inclusion of a Student Regent on the Board as a voting member, as well as the provision of a representative of the faculty governance bodies within Arizona. As noted below, members of the faculty also participate in decision-making processes in their own institutions, so the presence of a faculty representative is an additional safeguard for the representation of faculty views. The full board meets six times per year with these faculty and student representatives in attendance, as well as representatives from the university administration, present and participating in the deliberations. Most business is conducted in public sessions with opportunities for public comment; the meetings are also broadcast on the web. In sum, as noted here and discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, ABOR clearly honors shared governance through its involvement of representatives of faculty, students, and administrators, as well as providing the public an opportunity to participate in deliberations, meeting its oversight, legal, and fiduciary responsibilities.

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

The shared governance processes related to academic requirements were discussed in Chapter 3. Beyond those requirements, the primary consultative links between faculty members, staff members, students, and the administration were discussed above. These consultative links between representatives of the faculty, staff, and students exist to promote shared governance by providing forums for discussion and debate. Evidence for those linkages include:

- The President attends the first and last meetings of the University Senate each semester to report on university issues and concerns, as well as to respond to any questions or concerns of the senators. The Executive Vice President and University Provost, and other Vice Provosts as appropriate, are present at all meetings of the University Senate.
- Student government leaders meet with appropriate vice presidents on a periodic basis.
- The University Staff Council meets with the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer.
- The President holds regularly scheduled Town Hall meetings on each of the four ASU campuses each year, and has open forum.
sessions for groups such as faculty or students. Members of the Budget Committee and other senior leaders attend these sessions.

- The President's Office maintains an active online forum that invites comments from the ASU community, with staff specifically assigned to provide prompt response.

- The President's Office also relies heavily on the University Management Team meetings that bring together all levels of administrative leadership, from directors through vice-presidents, to discuss university initiatives and directions.

- The President's University Council, composed of the university's senior leadership, also meets with the President regularly throughout the year.

- The President and the Executive Vice President and University Provost meet regularly with the academic deans of all schools and colleges to discuss and resolve issues, move forward with shared university initiatives, and communicate about academic-related issues that need resolution. Both leaders also meet with the faculty members of each academic unit from time to time to discuss issues of concern and importance.

All these consultative relationships illustrate the presence of opportunities to share viewpoints and information, to reach informed decisions on all sides, and to carry out decision as honest brokers and fair partners.

A recent example of how such collaborative relationships help shape actions occurred in Spring 2012. The UAC requested and received a meeting with the President, Provost, and other administrative officers to discuss the need for salary adjustments in the wake of the recent financial crisis, which had deferred salary adjustments for several years and involved one-time furloughs. An argument for a 1 percent salary adjustment was advanced by faculty leadership as a way of recognizing the sacrifices that had been willingly made during the financial crisis. While an initial review of the budget indicated little fiscal room existed for such an adjustment, based on these discussions, the President agreed to re-examine the budget nonetheless. A mechanism was subsequently found to offer salary adjustments for as much as 30 percent of the total number of faculty and classified staff members identified as high-performing at the beginning of the FY2012. These increases also targeted matters of retention, salary inversions, and compressions. In this example, the agreement occurred following a meeting requested by the faculty leadership to which the administration responded positively, and illustrates the collaborative and shared governance relationship between faculty and staff representatives and the ASU administration.

**summary for component 5.B**

Shared governance, required by Arizona state law, is a key component of decision-making processes at ASU. As detailed in previous chapters and discussed above, the development of decisions, plans, and policies fully involves representatives of faculty, staff, and students in concert with the administration of the institution and ABOR. The traditions and exercise of shared governance – with decision-making shared and informed through trustworthy relationships among students, faculty, staff, administration, and ABOR – during the past decade of unprecedented institutional change and economic stress has kept the institution focused on moving forward with the transformation of ASU into the New American University. Particularly in challenging times when difficult decisions must be made, the provision of input and voice in how those decisions are made and how those decisions are carried out has helped the institution as a whole maintain morale and momentum.

C. Arizona State University engages in systematic and integrated planning.

*In the interest of a more readable and cohesive presentation, the discussions of ASU’s performance with respect to subcomponents 1 and 3 of component 5.C are combined here into a single discussion. That discussion will then be followed by individual discussions of subcomponents 2, 4, and 5.*

1. **ASU allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.**

ASU’s budget process, described above, ties the planning processes directly with the budget process to meet the institution’s Mission, Vision, and Goals Statements. Those statements, as discussed in Chapter 1, align with the goals and priorities established by ABOR’s Vision 2020 goals.

ASU’s external constituencies include alumni, state policy-makers, local government officials, business groups, and citizens. ASU engages in substantial outreach efforts with all these constituencies. Efforts include a well-organized and active alumni association with chapters throughout the United States and
globally, a staff of full-time legislative liaisons who meet frequently with legislators and state staff, regular meetings by the President and other senior staff with representatives from the municipalities in the region, and membership and active participation in all business advancement and civic organizations. In addition, the President’s Office maintains an active on-line forum that invites comments from outside the university, with staff specifically assigned to provide prompt response. These interactions allow the university to learn of constituent concerns, to reflect those concerns in the budgeting and planning processes, and to seek their assistance in marshaling resources needed to address those concerns. Strategic planning involves the entire institution and includes all functions and areas.

The senior officers responsible for university planning engage in a mission-directed orientation of the resource allocation process within the Budget Committee. The strategic planning framework is refined iteratively and annually as schematically presented in Figure 5-12. The details of this multi-year budgeting framework are presented to ABOR in an annual report, the “Strategic Business Framework.” The report summarizes how the university intends to advance toward the Vision 2020 goals and outcomes, specifies sources and levels of all resources that will be available, identifies investments needed to achieve the goals, and the extent to which the elements relate to one another for the coming year.

Targets for the Strategic Business Framework are those presented in Enterprise Metrics, a set of 35 measures established by ABOR in 2010 in response to the Vision 2020 mandate. The measures are reproduced on the inside back cover of this document. The list of metrics reflects the perspectives of both internal and external constituencies in terms of what is especially important to ABOR and the State of Arizona including:

**Goal #1 Educational Excellence and Access**
- Number of bachelor’s degrees awarded
- Number of master’s degrees awarded
- Cost of attendance as a percentage of Arizona median family income
- Number of Arizona community college transfer students awarded bachelor’s degrees
- Number of Arizona community college students who transfer to a university

**Goal #2 Research Excellence**
- Number of doctoral degrees awarded
- Total research expenditures
- Number of invention disclosures transacted

**Goal #3 Workforce and Community**
- Number of degrees awarded in high demand fields
- Total income and expenditures related to service engagement activities
- Impact of community engagement activities

**Goal #4 Productivity**
- Number of bachelor’s degrees awarded per 100 FTE students
- Total educational expenditures per degree awarded
- Composite Financial Index (CFI)

To achieve progress on these and the other metrics requires full leveraging of every aspect of the institution’s operations. To ensure that the interests of all constituents are reflected in the process, and as a public university that values transparency, ASU embraces the metrics and uses them as a means to fully inform internal and external constituencies about how well ASU measures up and how it intends to improve upon them.

An example illustrating how this information is presented to the public is shown in Figure 5-13, drawn from the Strategic Business Framework. The diagram shows past performance in FY2008 and FY2012 towards key Enterprise Metrics, indicates what those targets are, and shows where the institution intends to be by FY2016 and FY2020. Another mechanism that allows the public to monitor progress towards those metrics is provided by ABOR at the Enterprise Metrics Dashboard; progress towards any of the Enterprise Metrics for any of the Arizona University Systems institutions or the system as a whole can be checked instantly at the ABOR website. This transparency...
forces an extremely high level of public accountability on all phases of budgeting and planning.

2. **ASU links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.**

With an adequate, but constrained, resource base and a commitment to affordable education, ASU’s allocation of new resources and reallocation of existing resources must critically tie to activities and initiatives, such as enhancement of academic programs that will advance ASU toward its mission and priorities. As noted above, for Goals 1 and 2, of Vision 2020 progress on many of the ABOR Enterprise Metrics depends directly on performance of the institution’s academic programs, making the assessment and improvement efforts described in Chapter 4 critical to ASU’s progress towards the goals established in Vision 2020.

ASU has made forecasts for each of the Enterprise Metrics (and additional ASU-established measures) extending to the year 2020. Data resulting from assessment and improvement efforts yields frequent feedback on progress to provide updates to ABOR and facilitate prompt adjustment to the Strategic Business Framework. Implementation of the Strategic Business Framework provides critical data related to all goal areas, such as the success of new entrepreneurial initiatives. Feedback also guides refinements in the budget planning process, to assure direct linkage between academic programs, research progress, institutional planning, and budget planning.

Over the past decade major advances in accommodation of growth in enrollment demand, improvement of retention and graduation rates, substantial expansion of research activities, and improvement in the diversity of both student body and faculty stand as a testament to the effectiveness of the planning efforts. Goals were laid out to achieve and track progress in each of the areas identified above, and were met through the implementation of the Strategic Business Framework. Planning activities at ASU are linked, driven by, and are consistent with the goals and outcomes identified in the Strategic Business Framework; uniting academic program goals, ABOR, and budget planning seamlessly. Required state reports, such as the annual Five-Year Strategic Plan, follow the format and guidelines dictated by statute, but are prepared to be fully consistent with and facilitate internal planning.

As previously noted, the university developed a framework for managing academic quality and productivity within an “Enterprise Model.” The Enterprise Model connects the budget with assessment, evaluation, and planning. For example, each dean works with the Executive Vice President and University Provost to establish enrollment targets each year. Based on the enrollment targets and in order to hire appropriate faculty, the academic units are front-funded. The funding is fixed even though units may exceed their target goals. If after a set period of time units fail to meet their enrollment targets, funding may be forfeited. This model encourages the academic units to forecast enrollments, plan accordingly, and link their budgets with the planning process. The University Faculty Senate, Staff Council, Undergraduate Student Government, and the Graduate and Professional Student Association establish the structure for consultation with internal constituent groups and with ABOR regarding budget and goal planning. The structure is well-established and effective and provides substantial input for planning and budgeting processes. When inputs are judged to be supportive of the mission and goals of ASU, the Budget Committee considers the needs and issues for inclusion in the next year’s budget and in planning longer range resource needs.

4. **ASU plans based on a sound understanding of current capacity.**

ASU works to assure that the resources anticipated will be sufficient to support its existing and planned capacity through its multi-year planning. Multiple-year enrollment projections provide guidance on the expected demand for educational services and facilities. Multiple-year projection of research expenditures, driven by measured and anticipated proposal revenues, provide guidance for laboratory facility planning. Revenue and other resource projections allow budget planning and capital planning outcomes to assign resources to the needs identified, or to flag areas in which resources may be strained to handle
anticipated capacity. In such cases, early decisions can be made to prioritize spending and goals.

Potential fluctuations in areas that can impact resource availability and capacity demand are monitored and modeled through the multi-year strategic and budget planning structure. The Office of Budget and Planning develops multiple enrollment and tuition rate scenarios each year, and these scenarios are reviewed by the Budget Committee. The committee and the President determine which resource scenario is most appropriate to use for near-term and for longer-term planning using information from many sources: demographic, legislative, ABOR liaison, and others. The members of the Budget Committee are briefed frequently to inform their work, for example, by state legislative liaison staff members who work with state legislators daily to understand the dynamics that will impact levels of state support. The committee regularly consults with faculty possessing expertise in economic forecasting to provide an independent view of state resources. National legislative liaison staff, the President, and the Senior Vice President for Knowledge Enterprise Development regularly visit Washington to closely follow the trends in federal financing for programs of greatest importance to ASU: financial aid, student loans, and research funding, etc. As seen above, ASU has successfully navigated the highly changeable and challenging resource environment of the past four years to improve its outcomes and performance, providing strong evidence of the effectiveness of the planning process in place.

5. ASU’s planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

For planning in all areas, ASU endeavors to understand the larger context. Senior leaders are fully cognizant of the trends in their professional arenas and communicate freely with each other to learn about others’ areas. Leaders accomplish this currency through regular participation in national higher education groups, awareness of the literature in their field of expertise, and regular consultation with other experts.

Examples of such emerging factors considered in budget and planning at ASU are given in Table 5-3. ASU faculty and staff members leverage their expertise and networks of contacts to facilitate the process of monitoring trends. As an example, business school faculty members who possess expertise in economic and demographic projections collaborate with the state demographer. This partnership between ASU faculty and the state demographer helps to shape the business schools’ activities and provides the state office with faculty members able to assist in the prediction of enrollment demand and patterns. ASU leaders and faculty members maintain contacts in institutions of higher education and in businesses through regular travel globally to understand new patterns and trends, develop partner relationships, and seek new resources. For instance, the University Design Consortium is a boundary-spanning organization founded by Arizona State University and Sichuan University in China. The consortium challenges public universities around the world to develop innovative strategies to address the complex issues of the 21st century by engaging academic leaders and policy makers to share ideas, generate solutions, and take action to make a difference in society. Finally, ASU employs a Vice Provost for International Initiatives who monitors emerging trends in international education and develops partnerships that leverage and maximize ASU campus resources and intellectual capital.

Monitoring and forecasting of trends in areas that will impact ASU’s performance and productivity are reflected in both the multi-year budget plan and Strategic Business Framework. The rapid emergence of ASU Online as an option for students in many undergraduate and graduate programs is an example of
the anticipation of a new market of student demand and the proven ability of ASU to develop a solution in a timely fashion and at the scale needed. Another example is the anticipatory recognition of demographic trends in the pool of potential in-state Arizona students. Expanded outreach to traditionally underserved groups of students, rapid ramping up of out-of-state recruitment efforts, and development of structures and programs to support substantial growth in international students were made possible through the early identification in the demographic projections of a slowing growth in the student pool. For the next two planning cycles the Strategic Business Framework has built these activities into resource allocations to accomplish performance goals.

summary for component 5.C

ASU has engaged deeply in the process of goal-directed systematic and integrated planning since the last accreditation review to a degree that is likely greater than most institutions of higher education. The Mission, Vision, Goals, and Core Value statements, as well as the Design Aspirations have informed every facet of institution activities. Continuous assessment and improvement, particularly related to advancement of the quality of academic programs has always been central to those goals. Led by clear foundational documents, guidance provided by ABOR, and public and transparent metrics for performance, the resources of the institution over the past decade have been fully aligned with its mission and goals. Those same guideposts determined how adjustments were made when substantial financial rescissions were imposed upon the institution over the past several years.

D. ASU works systematically to improve its performance.

Improvements in ASU performance are directly tied to the evaluative processes that the university has in place. Since the last accreditation review in 2003, ASU has continued to utilize systematic feedback as a precursor to meaningful change and an impetus for faculty, staff, and student innovation. This systemwide commitment to evaluation, feedback, and change has allowed ASU to make consistent and incremental adjustments that have had substantially positive long-term effects on the university. As seen more specifically in this section, ASU has consistently worked towards improving itself in all areas of operation.

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

ASU operates as a “knowledge enterprise”. In the planning processes in place over the past decade, ASU’s academic quality and productivity have been configured as outputs and societal outcomes that emerge from strategic inputs and processes. The desired outputs from this process for academic programs include increased retention and graduation rates, increased success of students in their careers, increased learning outcomes shown by the assessments, and faculty awards. The larger, societal outcomes of a successful higher education enterprise include improved health and well-being of our citizenry; decreased crime rates; increased numbers and quality of professionals in such areas as teaching, engineering, and nursing; and a robust economy.

To realize these outputs and outcomes, the university monitors the quality of the inputs through the admission of qualified students; carefully designed transfer pathways from the community colleges; the recruitment and retention of faculty who are leaders in their fields and committed to excellent teaching; research opportunities for undergraduate students; sufficient and appropriately directed financial aid; programs in cultural competence; and appropriate academic facilities and state-of-the-art learning technologies.

The outputs and outcomes which emerge from these inputs are shaped and guided through strategic processes, and the “knowledge enterprise” approach requires monitoring the effectiveness of key processes. The deans set academic goals with the Executive Vice President and University Provost and forecast the need for resources through enrollment targets. Faculty members are evaluated annually to ensure the quality of performance, and the tenure and promotion processes meet the highest standards of rigor and quality. Students are given the opportunity to evaluate every course they take, and learning outcomes are assessed annually. In the academic programs, professional accreditations occur every five to seven years, and the academic program reviews occur every seven years.

The metrics structure for ABOR oversight and review discussed previously assures that performance results are publically documented and that a feedback loop is established to both ABOR and also the members of the ASU leadership team. As mentioned previously, the Enterprise Metrics serve as the basis for the
ASU operations are driven by data, assessment, and experiential evaluation in its planning and resource allocation activities, and it does so through a number of analysis units. For example, the University Office of Institutional Analysis (UOIA) provides timely and accurate data to meet the needs of all internal and external requestors, utilizing technology for efficient, innovative delivery of data. Examples of commonly used products produced by that office include university enrollment summaries (with data analyzed by multiple variables), the ASU Fact Book (the official public reporting document of basic data about the institution), and the Academic Program Profile (which provides colleges and academic units access to program specific information).

UOIA also maintains ASU’s information in the Common Data Set, a collaborative effort among data providers in the higher education community and publishers such as the College Board, Peterson’s, and U.S. News & World Report to improve the quality and accuracy of information provided to all involved in a student’s transition into higher education, as well as to reduce the reporting burden on data providers. The publicly available data include student enrollment and persistence measures, transfer student data, information about academic offerings, student life facts, information on annual expenses and financial aid, graduation rates, degrees awarded, student demographics, and faculty demographics. These data not only assist ASU in planning but also help institutions across the nation mutually monitor trends and anticipate needed changes in services or offerings.

Data provided by UOIA allows decisions at all levels of the university to be evidence-driven and based on a common set of institutionally-agreed-upon data. They also support partnerships and initiatives focused on the improvement of higher education. Similar analysis units in the Registrar’s office, the Controller’s Office, and Human Resources provide the ability to analyze and forecast trends in those institutional areas, using experience and data to drive institutional effectiveness and efficient use of resources to achieve academic and service goals.

Prime examples of ongoing performance evaluation are those elements of evaluation related to the university’s commitment to learning outcomes in courses as well as curricula, which have been discussed in detail in Chapter 4. But in addition to the academic-related evaluative services, other evaluative processes span the institution. Focusing on one group of such efforts, many examples of those assessment and improvement processes are located in the University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness (UOEEE). In addition to the academic performance monitoring discussed in Chapter 4, UOEEE also collects service level feedback that is used to improve ASU in areas such as advising, retention, career counseling, recruitment, marketing effectiveness, and other key areas that are heavily staff-driven.

Surveys of current and former students are specifically tailored through interactions between the requesting units and UOEEE so that the data obtained are robust indicators that can inform actions based on the results of those surveys. Just as in the case of the academic program improvement cycles discussed in Chapter 4, similar examples of UOEEE assistance to non-academic units include:

- **Survey design and consultation services for** ASU Study Abroad, the Office of University Initiatives, the Graduate and Professional Student Association, Student Success Centers, Educational Outreach and Student Services, the ASU Breastfeeding Committee, and the Offices of Public Affairs (Polytechnic campus; Tempe campus - Facilities Development and Management).

- **Ad hoc data analyses for such units as** the Morrison Institute, the Hispanic Research Center, Student Financial Assistance, Student Success Centers, ASU Libraries, Career Services, Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development, ASU Staff Council, Parking and Transit Services, Office of University Initiatives, University Housing, ASU Memorial Union, Human Resources, Off Campus and Commuter Student Services, Counseling and Consultation, and TRIO Student Support Services.

- **Program evaluation services for faculty-directed sponsored projects funded by such entities as** the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.

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

By continually assessing and improving operations in all areas through data-informed decision-making, ASU has been able to advance on many fronts over the past decade. This culture of assessment and improvement has led ASU to devise and export highly innovative practices in order both to improve its
educational outcomes and to manage through the recent state appropriation reductions. At the same time, ASU also knows that much can be gained by closely examining practices outside the institution. Thus, some implemented innovations at ASU have emerged from within the institution while others have been drawn from successful ventures elsewhere that have been adapted to meet ASU’s needs.

A recap of two examples discussed in previous chapters makes this point. One example of such an innovation is the enrollment and retention management structure “eAdvisor” discussed earlier. The eAdvisor system is an approach to student success that is guided by a set of sound educational principles and supported by a technology-based platform for its deployment. eAdvisor provides the structure that links all the elements for student success—academic major selection, registration for the correct courses, advising, deficiency interventions, and the availability of required courses. As a result, ASU saw improvements in undergraduate first-year retention rates, increasing from 77 percent for the Fall 2006 cohort to 84 percent for the Fall 2010 cohort. This improvement, in turn, has helped improve required course availability to all students and has also led to an increased proportion of students who are on track for timely degree completion (85.1 percent).

Another example of innovation, drawn from examining advances at other institutions, is the introduction of a new structure for teaching in introductory mathematics sequences and in expository writing classes. Using teaching technology, specially-designed learning studio spaces and a new instructor paradigm, students are able to advance through the material at their own pace (often more quickly) and with the assurance that all the required concepts for future success are well understood. Substantial savings in teaching resources have been possible while at the same time improving learning outcomes.

As at most institutions, ASU leadership participates in national meetings to learn of innovations and best practices and to share the approaches developed at ASU that may permit other institutions to enhance their operations. For ASU, however, this information exchange goes beyond simply looking at best practices in higher education institutions. ASU also has looked to harness private sector expertise and cost-effectiveness in a growing number of areas of its operations. Areas in which private sector best practices have been adapted for use at ASU include data processing hosting, information technology help desks, custodial services, bookstore management, solar energy and other utility infrastructure, and telecommunications system management. Decisions about which services can be appropriately provided through partnerships are guided by how well the institution’s goals will be advanced by the choice.

summary for component 5.D

A culture of continuous assessment improvement pervades ASU, from the classroom to the boardroom. The institution has a large array of tools that permit decisions on how best to increase the quality of its operations based on both experience gained within the institution, at other schools, and in the private sector. These improvements have led to greater levels of student success and greater cost-effectiveness in delivering its programs and carrying out its research.

summary for criterion five — resources, planning, and institutional effectiveness

Through the evidence presented throughout this document but particularly in this chapter, Arizona State University has demonstrated a strong system of planning that enables the university not only to support current operations but also to lay the groundwork for future success. Because of its robust planning and budgeting processes and its institutional commitment to the Core Values of Excellence, Access, and Impact, ASU has surmounted economic obstacles and continues to provide the fiscal, physical, human, and technological resource base needed to support its mission to become the New American University. Throughout the period since the last accreditation review, the entire ASU community, through its shared governance and administrative structures, has participated in shaping and affecting the broad and deep transformation of the institution. Through the continuous and systematic use of strategic planning, a continued focus on mission success, the utilization of evaluative processes that provide critical feedback, and the inclusion of constituent feedback, ASU will continue to meet the challenges of the future for a global civilization and to work towards changing the world in a meaningful way for the citizens of the State of Arizona.

strengths

- ASU has a strong resource base for future efforts. Through careful planning and budgeting during the economic downturn, ASU stabilized its resource base such that the university can maintain and strengthen the performance of its programs into the future.
- The strategic planning and budgeting processes at ASU are sound and robust. ASU’s strong resource base today was achieved through difficult decisions during the decade that focused on priorities. The resulting health of the institution has shown that the quality
and effectiveness of the institution’s planning and budget processes have guided the university over the past decade through the greatest period of transformation ASU has ever experienced.

- The traditions and exercise of shared governance – shared among students, faculty, staff, administration, and ABOR – during the past decade of unprecedented institutional change and economic stress have kept the institution focused on moving forward in the transformation of ASU into a New American University.

- ASU is deeply committed to and engaged in goal-directed systematic and integrated planning. The Mission, Vision, Goals, and Core Value statements, as well as the Design Aspirations have informed every facet of the institution’s activities. Led by clear foundational documents, guidance provided by ABOR, and public and transparent metrics for performance, the resources of the institution over the past decade have been kept fully aligned with its mission and goals.

- ASU makes decisions based on data. The institution has a strong commitment to assessment and data collection, and it utilizes this information to make smart decisions in all planning and budgeting operations.

- Faculty, staff, students, and administrators at ASU embrace the concept of innovation and change. The institution’s ability to implement new or altered planning and budgeting requirements is a strength of Arizona State University as challenges arise.

**challenges**

- Dealing with continued economic fluctuations and an uncertain level of higher education investments by the State of Arizona will be an ongoing challenge for the university.

- Developing revenue streams in an increasingly competitive environment will require even more focus and commitment than has been required in previous years.

- Achieving Vision 2020 mandates while maintaining a cost effective tuition structure will be an ongoing challenge for ASU.
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request for continued accreditation
This Self-Study Report, covering a ten-year period of profound and significant institutional transformation, has outlined the tremendous achievements made toward the objectives articulated in the Mission Statement for Arizona State University:

To establish ASU as the model for a New American University, measured not by who we exclude, but rather by who we include; pursuing research and discovery that benefits the public good; assuming major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the community.

Through the Self-Study Process, ASU has assembled for the North Central Association’s Higher Learning Commission definitive evidence, both presented within this report and through the required supplemental materials that have been submitted, demonstrating that the institution fully meets all the Criteria for Accreditation established by the Commission. In brief, this evidence demonstrates that:

- Arizona State University’s mission is clear and articulated publicly, and guides the institution’s operations.
- Arizona State University acts with integrity, and its conduct is ethical and responsible.
- Arizona State University provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.
- Arizona State University demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.
- Arizona State University’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. Arizona State University plans for the future.

After full consideration of this evidence, it is respectfully requested that the accreditation currently granted to Arizona State University by the Higher Learning Commission be reaffirmed.
This appendix provides information for the Higher Learning Commission’s Federal Compliance Program based on expectations for compliance provided by the Commission.¹

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC or Commission) expects that affiliated institutions comply with federal regulations and demonstrate fulfillment through this Federal Compliance program. Under the program, ASU must address the requirements of the program in materials submitted to the Commission before a visit. As an institution participating in HLC’s Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality, the Federal Compliance requirements are addressed as part of the Self-Study Report, using the outline of requirements provided by the Commission’s guidance document as a guide, and are submitted prior to the comprehensive evaluation visit. ASU will also make Federal Compliance information available in the Electronic Resource Room during the visit.

Some of the information presented in this appendix is also reproduced within the chapters and sections of this Self-Study Report for convenience in reading. Conversely, some portions of this Appendix reference material in the chapters providing evidence that ASU meets the Criteria for Accreditation.

I. information on academic programs

credits, program length, and tuition

The completed Worksheet for Use by Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours is available in the Electronic Resource Room.

Policies governing credits, program length, and tuition have been established by the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) and by Arizona State University (ASU). These policies are fully and publicly disclosed on the ABOR and university websites, and the policies specific to items in this section will be indicated in turn.

academic calendar

Arizona State University operates on a semester system with term lengths consistent with standard practices in higher education. The university calendar is published on the ASU Academic Calendar website, which also includes an archive of calendars for prior years and projected calendars for future years.² Fall and Spring semesters within the academic year are 15 weeks in length. For increased scheduling flexibility for students, faculty, and academic units, the academic year calendar also includes two sequential 7.5-week sessions within each semester. The contact hour and work expectations for these sessions is commensurate with the credit hour assignments discussed below.

The nomenclature for the various terms during the academic year is:

- Fall A: first 7.5-week session in Fall Semester
- Fall B: second 7.5-week session in Fall Semester
- Fall C: full Fall Semester (15 weeks)
- Spring A: first 7.5-week session in Spring Semester
- Spring B: second 7.5-week session in Spring Semester
- Spring C: full Spring Semester (15 weeks)

Summer sessions are two sequential six-week sessions delivered during a summer calendar along with an eight-week session running in parallel for portions of the summer.

unit of academic credit

The federal definition of the credit hour states that:

… a credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally-established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

(1) one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time;

or

(2) at least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other activities as established by an institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading toward the award of credit hours.³

The basic unit of academic credit within academic programs at ASU is the credit hour, also referred to
as a “semester hour.” This unit of academic credit is defined by ABOR Policy 2-206, which provides a systematic method for assigning academic credit consistent with both federal law and common practice in institutions of higher learning. All course credit assignments at ASU adhere to this ABOR policy.

In detail, the policy defines a semester hour to include at least 15 contact hours of recitation, lecture, discussion, testing, or evaluation, as well as a minimum 30 hours of student homework. A contact hour is defined as the equivalent of 50 minutes of class time or 60 minutes of independent study work. A minimum of 45 hours of work by each student is required for each semester hour. These definitions are consistent with part (1) of the federal definition for the credit hour noted above.

Semester hour determinations for course delivery format other than traditional lecture, discussion, testing, or evaluation is also specifically addressed in this same ABOR policy, again consistent with both federal law and common practice in institutions of higher learning. In detail, the ABOR policy provides that a credit hour for course delivery formats other than traditional lecture, discussion, testing, or evaluation must observe the following requirements:

- Workshops must involve a minimum of 45 hours for each unit of credit, including a minimum of 15 contact hours, with the balance of the requirement in homework.
- Studios must involve at least 30 contact hours and at least 15 hours of homework for each unit of credit.
- Laboratory courses require a minimum of 45 contact hours per unit of credit.
- Field trips are counted hour-for-hour as laboratory meetings.
- Each unit of internship or practicum must require a minimum of forty-five (45) clock hours of work.
- Music instruction and specialized types of music performance offerings must conform to the requirement for accreditation of the National Association of Schools of Music.
- Off-campus courses, regardless of mode of delivery, may be assigned credit based on competencies or learning outcomes that are acquired through coursework and are equivalent to those of students in a traditional classroom setting. An equivalent of 45 hours of work by each student is required for each unit of credit.

These definitions are consistent with the requirements provided in part (2) of the federal definition of the credit hour provided above.

**course load**

The minimum full-time course load for an undergraduate student is 12 semester hours. The maximum course load for which a student may register is 18 semester hours (with the exception of a 19-hour maximum for students enrolled in the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering and the College of Technology and Innovation). The maximum and minimum course load limits at ASU are consistent with standard practices in higher education. A student wishing to register for more hours than permitted by the maximum course load limit must successfully petition the standards committee of the college in which the student is enrolled and must obtain an approved overload before registration.

The summer session maximum course load limit is seven semester hours for each six-week session or nine credit hours for the eight-week session, and may not exceed a total of 14 semester hours for any combination of summer sessions.

**resident credit**

In specifying program requirements, the term “resident credit” refers to semester hours earned in a course that is offered at ASU in a regular semester, winter session (prior to 2011-2012), intersession, or summer session. Semester hours earned through comprehensive examinations are also included when calculating ASU resident hours. Semester hours earned through independent learning, advanced placement, the College-Level Examination Program, or an International Baccalaureate Diploma/Certificate are excluded when calculating ASU resident hours.

**academic program length**

Academic programs at Arizona State University are comparable in length to similar programs at other accredited institutions of higher education, and they reflect accepted best practices in higher education. Each college and program has specific curriculum requirements, which are provided in the ASU Academic Catalog, available online in interactive web pages and (for archival purposes) also available as a downloadable PDF file. University, college, and Graduate College academic policies also are documented at the ASU Academic Catalog website.

For undergraduate programs, a minimum of 120 semester hours is required for graduation with a baccalaureate degree, with at least 45 semester hours in upper-division courses. Generally, no more than 64 semester hours of lower-division credit from a
community college or two-year college can be applied to a bachelor’s degree, and at least 30 semester hours must be earned in resident credit at ASU. Four specific exceptions to this 64-credit-hour-limit have been granted by the Arizona Board of Regents to special partnership programs with Arizona institutions of higher learning in order to better serve the higher education needs of Arizona without compromising degree quality:

- Up to 75 credit hours of lower-division transfer work from Arizona community colleges for application toward the ASU Bachelor of Science in nursing degree (BSN) for students who have completed the Associate of Applied Science Degree in Nursing from an Arizona community college, who hold an unencumbered Arizona RN license, and are part of unique partnership programs offered through ASU for those students. Of the 120 credits required for this BSN, a minimum of 30 credits must be from ASU, and a minimum of 45 credits must be upper-division. This partnership between ASU and the local community colleges decreases barriers that have historically challenged students who completed the Associate of Science in nursing degree program and obtained an Arizona RN license from completing a BSN.

- Up to 75 lower-division credit hours from Arizona community colleges may be transferred for application toward the ASU Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies degree with a concentration in Organizational Studies. This degree is promoted through community college partnerships statewide to rural communities and working professionals who are seeking a pathway to complete their bachelor’s degrees.

- Up to 75 credit hours can be transferred to the Bachelor of Applied Science degree by students who have completed the Associate of Applied Science at an Arizona community college and up to 15 additional credits in courses that transfer to the universities in mathematics, computer sciences, life sciences, physical sciences, social sciences and humanities, as specified by the universities. AAS programs address the workforce needs of Arizona by providing entry-level education in a variety of technical fields. The BAS degree provides an option for individuals with an AAS degree who need additional education for upward mobility and for the state to address its workforce needs.

- Through a medical/clinical laboratory sciences partnership with Phoenix College (one of the Maricopa County Community Colleges), students may complete 90 credit hours of specified courses at Phoenix College, and transfer those hours into the Bachelor of Applied Science program, with the remaining 30 credit hours of upper-division credit provided through ASU.

No more than 60 semester hours in independent learning courses and/or earned by comprehensive examination (including advanced placement, College-Level Examination Program, DANTES Subject Standardized Test, and International Baccalaureate Diploma/Certificate exams) are accepted for credit toward the baccalaureate degree.⁹

More than one baccalaureate degree may be pursued concurrently only if prior approval is given by the standards committee(s) of the college(s) offering the degrees. Students may receive concurrent degrees only if they meet the minimum requirements for both degrees. A student seeking a second baccalaureate degree must meet the ASU admission criteria for that degree. After conferral of the first degree, a minimum of 30 semester hours in resident credit courses at ASU must be successfully completed to earn the second baccalaureate degree. The student must meet all degree and university requirements of the second degree.

A master’s degree program requires a minimum of 30 semester hours of graduate work approved by a student’s supervisory committee and the Graduate College. All requirements must be completed within six years. A maximum of 9 semester hours earned prior to admission to the degree program may be applied towards the degree.¹⁰

A minimum of 84 credit hours of graduate work is required for the doctoral degree; a total of 12 (and only 12) of these hours must be 799 Dissertation course credits if the student is completing a dissertation.¹¹ No more than 12 semester hours not previously applied toward a degree may be included in a doctoral program. A maximum of 30 credit hours from a previously awarded master’s degree may be included toward a doctoral program with approval of the degree program and the Graduate College dean. A student with an appropriate master’s degree must complete a minimum of 54 semester hours of approved graduate work, including 24 semester hours of dissertation and research after admission to a doctoral program. All program requirements must be completed within 10 years. Any exceptions must be approved by the supervisory committee and the Graduate College dean and ordinarily involves repeating the comprehensive examinations.

tuition and fees

The Arizona Board of Regents governs and conducts the process that establishes tuition and fee rates for
the public universities in Arizona. Base tuition rates are established for each of the public universities as set forth in ABOR Policy 4-101, which notes that the Arizona state constitution requires that “instruction furnished be as nearly free as possible.” In setting base tuition, the policy requires that ABOR must consider factors such as the amount of state support provided to the university system, the availability of student financial aid as outlined in ABOR’s financial aid policies, the median of tuition and mandatory fees charged by the university’s peers, other student fees and charges established by each university, the cost of university attendance, the revenues required to service bonded indebtedness, Arizona’s median family income levels; and evidence of student consultation and feedback.

Beyond the base tuition rates, the process that sets tuition and fees also includes establishing any differential tuition, program fees, class fees (for more than $100), or deposits. ABOR Policy 4-104 governs the procedure for setting and distributing fees, including other fees and charges established by each university. This policy requires that all tuition-setting processes include opportunities for public comment, and spells out how that public comment is obtained. The policy requires that differential tuition and program fee implementation plans must allow access for qualified students who cannot afford the additional costs of the differential tuition or program fee. The implementation scheme must include a financial aid plan with a minimum of 14 percent of the differential tuition revenue set aside for need-based financial aid; these requirements are consonant with ASU’s goals and Core Values related to Access in all programs for all qualified students. New or revised fees and charges are not effective until approved by the Board.

Sections of ABOR Policy 4-104 pertinent to specific charges are:

- Section B.1 governs the setting of differential tuition, which is different from base tuition and applies to an entire college/school or campus. Differential tuition may be higher or lower than the base and may be established at the graduate or undergraduate level. ABOR maintains published guidelines for requesting and modifying differential tuition.

- Section B.3 governs the setting of program fees. Additional costs not normally associated with the delivery of a program are often covered by program fees. Program fees are usually earmarked for payment of specific costs and are retained by the program. ABOR maintains published guidelines for requesting and modifying program fees.

- Section B.4 governs class fees. Class fees cover expenses necessary for successful completion of the class objectives (e.g., group travel costs, expendable materials, admission to off-campus facilities, etc.). ABOR maintains published guidelines for requesting and modifying class fees.

Due to variances in the education-related cost of delivery, differential tuition fees in addition to the standard tuition exist at ASU for some colleges. All undergraduate programs in the W. P. Carey School of Business, the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering, the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts, the College of Nursing and Health Innovation, and the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication are assessed differential tuition fees. Differential tuition is also assessed to graduate programs in the College of Law and the Herberger Institute for the Design and Arts. These differentials were approved by ABOR through proposals that were required to address the quality of the student experience, the issues of access and affordability, the cost of instruction, market pricing, the benefits to the entire University, and any information gathered reflecting student consultation and support about the differential.

Program fees earmarked for payment of specific costs are also in place for many programs. These fees were individually considered and approved by ABOR, and they are based on proposals addressing the issues of access and affordability, the benefits to the entire university, program cost, the increased earning potential of graduates, market pricing, and the desired program quality. Class fees are assessed for some courses to allow the university to cover expenses that are necessary for the successful completion of class objectives. Each class fee request in excess of $100 must be specifically approved by ABOR. Typical expenses covered by class fees include costs associated with off-campus field trips, private instruction, expendable materials, technology costs, selected personnel expenses, and deposits.

Arizona law (A.R.S. § 15-1625) establishes credit hour thresholds for undergraduate students who attend an Arizona public university beyond which an Undergraduate Excess Hours Tuition Surchargen is billed in addition to other tuition and fees. The current threshold is set by the Arizona Legislature at 145 semester hours for baccalaureate degrees. Exemptions are granted for certain situations:

- Undergraduate degree programs that require credit hours above the credit hour threshold.

- Credits earned in pursuit of up to two baccalaureate degrees: The excess hours tuition surcharge is not assessed if (1) student has previously earned a baccalaureate degree and is currently admitted to one undergraduate
II. student complaints

The ASU Design Aspiration, “Enable Student Success,” speaks of the institution’s commitment to the success of each student. Concomitant with this aspiration is the requirement that the university listens carefully, and responds appropriately, to student complaints, concerns, and issues about any aspect of university life and operations. To efficiently handle student concerns, with a student body of over 73,000 students distributed over multiple campuses (including online), multiple points of entry are available for students to pursue resolution.

Most student complaints related to classroom and laboratory coursework are handled promptly, directly, and informally by the instructor of record for the course. Heads of academic units and colleges also are approachable to address student grievances and concerns which are not resolved by the instructor of record. Formal resolution procedures for academic concerns and grievances exist at the college-level to address issues that do not reach resolution through these informal processes.

Student complaints about non-academic matters (such as enrollment, tuition, financial aid, student services, campus police department, and others) are handled through the appropriate administrative office. Summaries of the complaints received, as well as the processes used for achieving resolution of those complaints, are provided in the Electronic Resource Room for each of the offices.

Student complaints related to discrimination, sexual harassment, harassment, and retaliation are addressed by the University Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI). The number of complaints over the past three years handled by the OEI has been about ten cases per year, with most of those related to sexual harassment and discrimination. An investigatory report for each incident is sent to the Executive Vice President and University Provost (and appropriate dean) for complaints against academic personnel or to the appropriate vice president (and the Vice President for Human Resources) for complaints involving non-academic personnel. About half of the complaints are resolved through direct mediation by OEI staff.

Student grievances relating to participation in intercollegiate athletics are initially handled at the sport supervisor level in accordance with university policy ICA 501 for student-athlete grievances. The policy provides a series of steps, leading, if necessary, to final review by the Vice President of University Athletics. This process has been quite efficient at resolving issues, and, since the last accreditation visit, only one grievance has move through the entire process to the Vice President of University Athletics.

The ASU Hotline provides students (as well as other members of the ASU community) a means to report concerns about safety and about non-compliance with laws, regulations, and policies applicable to ASU. To ensure confidentiality, a third-party vendor provides the ability to report incidents either by telephone (1-877-SUN-DEV) or online through the third-party vendor’s online website. The service preserves anonymity, is available at any time on any day of the year, and is available in most languages. When the vendor is contacted, notification is made to University Audit and Advisory Services (UAAS), which then assigns an appropriate investigator. If the vendor determines that the contact regards an emergency,
the ASU Police Department is contacted immediately. After the investigation is completed, UAAS reviews the investigation report to determine what action is required to resolve and/or close the incident. Generally, about sixty incidents per year are handled by ASU Hotline, most of which have involved sanitation and safety issues or discrimination or harassment complaints. More specifically, approximately 24 incidents in FY2012 were handled by ASU Hotline, most of which involved employee relations issues, policy matters and a variety of other issues like harassment, wage issues or privacy violations. Since the service operates to preserve the anonymity of the complainant, the number of these complaints which may have been made by students made through the ASU Hotline is not known, but may be assumed to represent an upper limit on the number of student complaints addressed. These incidents were referred to the appropriate supervisor for addressing, and were then closed.

Since these avenues of complaint resolution are accessible by e-mail, online students can pursue resolution of their concerns and grievances through any of these. Specific contacts for obtaining information and for addressing concerns are gathered on a web page of the ASU Online website. Additionally, as required by federal law, students may contact an office within their state to file a complaint; those offices are provided on the ASU Online website.

Students also may discuss their concerns with student government representatives. Students with concerns or suggestions related to policies regarding student conduct or student academic freedoms may take those concerns to the Student-Faculty Policy Committee, which includes representatives from each campus.

As a final avenue for resolution of student concerns beyond the aforementioned channels is the Ombudspersons Committee, appointed by the Executive Vice President and University Provost. Members serve as impartial fact-finders and problem-solvers. The Ombudspersons Committee acts in accordance with university policy ACD 509-01. Ombudspersons receive formal training in dispute resolution. About ten or so students (and/or parents) each year avail themselves of this avenue for problem resolution, for issues as varied as parking tickets, residential housing, and “political incorrectness.” Summaries of the actions taken by the Ombudsperson Committee during academic years 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 are provided in the Electronic Resource Room. While these numbers no doubt underestimate the number of unresolved student concerns due to lack of pursuit by many students, even a ten-fold underestimation would suggest most problems are dealt with to the satisfaction of students.

III. transfer policies

All policies related to the transfer of academic credit to ASU from other institutions are fully disclosed to the public through a dedicated website for transfer students, which may be reached directly from the main ASU web page. This special transfer student website provides a web-based interface that is interactively customized by the student to provide guidance on admission requirements and transfer policies based on the circumstances specific to that individual (e.g., type of institution from which the student is transferring, whether that institution is inside Arizona, etc.). Particularly important policies related to transfer students are summarized in this section.

The following general standards govern the transfer of credit:

- ASU accepts college-level (not remedial) courses in which a grade of C (where A=4.00) or better was earned from regionally accredited institutions. A maximum of 64 semester hours of credit may be accepted as lower-division credit when transferred from a regionally accredited community, junior or two-year college, with the exception of some special programs.

- Some ASU colleges/schools may choose not to accept credit for courses that are evaluated with nontraditional grading systems (e.g. pass/fail). Acceptable academic credits earned at other institutions that are based on a different unit of credit than the one prescribed by the ABOR definition described above are subject to conversion before being transferred to ASU.

- The ASU college/school in which the undergraduate major is to be earned determines how transfer courses fulfill the degree requirements for the major.

- Grades and honor points earned at other colleges and universities are considered for admission (with the exception for honorably discharged veterans), but an ASU cumulative grade point average (GPA) is based solely upon course work taken at ASU. When Undergraduate Admissions reviews applications for admission from honorably discharged veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States for a minimum of two years, they may not consider any failing grades received at an Arizona university or college before military service commenced.
ASU does not accept credit for transfer for:

- Courses in which a grade below “C-” was earned.
- Credit awarded by postsecondary institutions in the U.S. that lack candidate status or accreditation by a regional accrediting association.
- Credit awarded by postsecondary institutions for life experience.
- Credit awarded by postsecondary institutions for courses taken at non-collegiate institutions (e.g., governmental agencies, corporations, industrial firms, etc.).
- Credit awarded by postsecondary institutions for non-credit courses, workshops, and seminars offered by other post-secondary institutions as part of continuing education programs.

All students who apply for transfer admission to ASU must provide one of the following:

- Official high school transcript with high school graduation date.
- GED with acceptable score of 500 or above.
- Official college transcript with Associate degree posted (including award date).
- Official college transcript with Associate degree in progress posted (including expected award date).

A set of “assured admission standards” transparently simplify most transfer admissions to ASU; these standards are listed on the transfer admission requirements website. Arizona residents who hold an associate degree with a 2.00 cumulative GPA automatically meet the assured admissions criteria. Special cooperative agreements also provide pathways that satisfy the assured admission criteria and facilitate the transfer of credit.

The Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) was developed by public universities and community colleges in Arizona to provide the opportunity for students to earn at local community colleges academic credit that is transferable to Arizona public universities for general education requirements. Students who wish to transfer their AGEC credit to ASU must have an earned cumulative GPA within that program of at least 2.50 (where A=4.00). Those credits satisfy all general education requirements for baccalaureate degrees.

Arizona residents may also secure admission as transfer students by successfully completing an approved “transfer pathway” through an accredited Arizona community college, which provides transfer credit for courses in specific academic programs at ASU. As described above, those pathways include the Maricopa – ASU Pathways Program, Registered Nurse-Bachelor of Science in Nursing Pathway, Transfer Admission Guarantee, and Associate of Applied Science to Bachelor of Applied Science Pathway.) For California students wishing to transfer to ASU, ASU also accepts the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum/California State University General Education patterns.

Students who do not meet the “assured admission” standards may be considered for admission through the individual review process, which inspects all available information about a student’s application. The process carefully considers all aspects of a student’s academic background and accomplishments; this review also ascertains if credit awarded by examination, credit for prior learning, or credit for transfer is acceptable for transfer.

IV. verification of student identity

ASU verifies the identity of students who access course and program content electronically through distance education. An ASURITE (Arizona State University Rational Information Technology Environment) account is the primary secure login and pass code for Arizona State University computing services. Every person at ASU is assigned a unique ASURITE UserID, which is used as long as students and faculty are associated with the University and abide by the appropriate policies and guidelines.

The student’s ASURITE UserID is used to access various services at ASU, including the Pearson LearningStudio and Blackboard Learning Management Systems, which are used to deliver the online courses and programs managed by ASU Online. Course content such as grade books, quizzes, exams, and discussion boards are all contained in these environments. Additional identity verification options are available to instructors for use with quizzes and exams in the Pearson LearningStudio and Blackboard systems:

- Acxiom is an identification platform that utilizes demographic and geographic data in challenge questions with nearly 900 data elements for more than 300 million individuals. Acxiom identity challenge questions can be enabled for a randomly selected group of students prior to taking a quiz or exam. If a student fails an identity check, a report is generated for system administrators and faculty.

- ProctorU is an online proctoring service that allows exam takers to complete their assessments at home while still ensuring the integrity of the
V. Title IV and related responsibilities

1. General program responsibilities

As a model of the New American University, ASU measures itself not by who it excludes, but by who it includes. To provide sufficient financial aid resources that enable a diverse student body to receive a university education, ASU participates in Title IV programs offering financial aid through grants, loans, and work-study programs. The institution employs a skilled and knowledgeable staff that, during the 2011-2012 academic year, administered over $970 million in financial aid for eligible students, and provided information and guidance for students receiving that aid.


The only review since the last HLC accreditation visit by the U.S. Department of Education covering ASU’s administration of programs authorized pursuant to Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended) was summarized in a report issued on May 5, 2010 for the 2008-2009 award year. The review, available in the Electronic Resource Room, included examination of ASU’s policies and procedures regarding institutional and student eligibility, individual student financial aid and academic files, attendance records, student account ledgers, and consumer information requirements. The report noted that 42,245 students (approximately 55 percent of the then-current student enrollment of 76,809) received aid totaling $394.5 million during the 2008-2009 award year.

This thorough review by the U.S. Department of Education identified five findings that required corrective actions. These findings, and ASU’s responses, were:

- ASU incorrectly calculated the amount of funds to be returned to Title IV for two students who had withdrawn. In one instance, a software rounding error resulted in a miscalculation of $24 for the student’s Pell Grant. For the other student, the date of withdrawal was determined incorrectly, resulting in an under-refund of $3,750 in federal aid. The reports were corrected and the funds remitted.

- A recognized high school diploma or equivalent is required for eligibility to receive Title IV funds. High school seniors often are admitted to ASU prior to the granting of a recognized high school diploma or equivalent. To ensure that funds were distributed only to students who had a recognized high school diploma or equivalent, ASU was requested to revise its policies to ensure that no funds are disbursed without confirming the award of a high school diploma or equivalent; ASU complied with that request.

- Three graduate-level certificate programs administered by the State of Arizona were incorrectly identified as being awarded by ASU and thus eligible for Title IV funds administered through ASU. Following the review, ASU modified its policies to ensure that students in those three certificate programs understood that they were ineligible for Title IV funds, and ASU removed these programs from its Eligibility and Certification Approval Report. ASU identified one student who had received funding while ineligible; the Department of Education estimated an actual loss of $1,620.95, which ASU remitted to the Department of Education.

- ASU’s policies permitted qualified disabled students to be eligible to receive full-time status funding for federal loans. However, there is no federal regulatory accommodation of this enrollment status definition for a student with a learning disability or other physical disability. As a result of the review, ASU revised its policies to reflect that no such adjustment be made for students with a learning disability or other physical disability.
Three non-degree programs (Asian-American Studies, American Indian Studies, and the Incite program) were identified as programs that might not prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation. In response to the program review, ASU updated information for all non-degree program descriptions in the institution’s ECAR.

All these matters are considered closed by the U.S. Department of Education. As noted in these responses, ASU continues to review and refine processes to improve the accuracy and accountability of its management of Title IV funds. The findings of this review have led to improvements in the systems used to administer that aid, and the high level of performance for those systems can be qualitatively assessed by comparing the amounts for the misallocations discussed in the findings (less than $5,000) to the total disbursement of $394.5 million in Title IV funds.

The Department of Education has not placed any limitations or taken any suspension or termination actions against ASU. No fines, letters of credit, or heightened monitoring activities are outstanding or in place from the Department of Education.

In the FY2011 A-133 audit, several concerns were expressed that the University’s internal control policies and procedures were not sufficient to ensure that all returns of Title IV monies were calculated correctly and processed within the required time frame. Specifically, auditors noted the following:

- For 1 of 40 students tested for eligibility, the student had withdrawn from the University and received $1,225 in Title IV monies from the Federal Pell Grant Program that had not been earned, but the return of monies was not processed because an incorrect code was entered into the student information system.

- For 1 of 40 students tested for return of Title IV monies, the return of Federal Direct Student Loans processed by the University was understated by $360 as a result of a data entry error.

- For 1 of 40 students tested for return of Title IV monies, the student had unofficially withdrawn during the fall semester and this was determined by the University on December 23, 2010. However, the return of Federal Pell Grant Program monies of $347 was not processed until January 23, 2012, since a counselor did not adjust the student’s award on the student information system, and this issue was not identified until the subsequent fiscal year.

The audit stated the opinion that ASU did not have a control in place to ensure the accuracy of the data entered by accountants responsible for adjusting student awards on the University’s student information system. As a result, it was recommended that the institution should establish policies and procedures requiring an independent review of data entered by employees responsible for processing returns of Title IV monies or other controls, such as system edit checks, to validate the data entered and ensure that returns are processed accurately by the required deadline. ASU responded by implementing the recommendation in the audit, and the audit concluded that The University has fully implemented processes to validate the integrity of data entered and to ensure returns are processed by the required deadline. Through programming changes, the need for manual intervention has been significantly reduced, therefore minimizing the opportunity for clerical errors. Should clerical errors occur, new reports will immediately identify and flag suspect transactions for review by the accounting staff.

In conclusion, ASU meets and/or exceed expectations for general program responsibilities related to Title IV.

2. financial responsibility requirements

The Federal Government requires an annual audit of non-Federal entities expending $500,000 or more in Federal awards. The Office of the Auditor General performs an annual audit of Arizona State University as part of its audit of all State of Arizona A-133 agencies. The results of these audits since FY2002 are posted online for the public.12

- From FY2002 through FY2007, the statewide audit identified no issues specifically related to any ASU operations.

- The A-133 reports from FY2008 to FY2010 expressed concerns with payroll processing, most often at the department/unit level, arising following the implementation of a new human resources and payroll system, PeopleSoft, in July 2007. The initial rollout of the complex system, and the extended period of training needed to bring units up to speed with that system, resulted in payroll errors. ASU implemented recommendations in those audits and has continued to review and refine policies and training to improve the accuracy and accountability of the payroll system at all levels, significantly improving the error-free rate.

- As reported in the most recent A-133 report for FY2011, ASU complied in all material respects with applicable compliance requirements for major federal programs included in the scope of the audit. The A-133 report indicates prior year
recommendations, which were unrelated to Title IV administration, have been fully corrected, evidence of ASU’s successful resolution of the previously reported payroll processing deficiencies. The report included a single new recommendation, noted above, to strengthen review of Title IV adjustments required when a student withdraws from classes. This finding is considered a significant deficiency, which is the less severe of the two finding categories. As indicated in the report and above, ASU has implemented strengthened processes related to Title IV required adjustments and considers this recommendation complete.

The U.S. Department of Education annually calculates financial ratios for each institution participating in the student financial aid programs authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. ASU provides the information that is used to perform these calculations in its annual audited Financial Report. The Department, in turn, uses these ratios to determine whether an institution demonstrates financial responsibility under the regulations.

The Composite Financial Index (CFI) score for ASU has historically exceeded the Commission’s 1.1 threshold for review; the values for that index since the last accreditation review are provided in Table FC-1. The most recent two years scores were 2.7 and 2.3 for FY2011 and FY2012, respectively; the slight decline in FY2012 was primarily due to lower endowment investment returns than in the previous year, consistent with overall market returns. ASU’s decline in CFI scores in FY2008 and FY2009 were due to short-term anomalies: 1) In FY2008 ASU temporarily funded a large construction project that was financed in Fall 2008, reducing expendable net assets as of June 30, 2008; 2) In FY2009 with the economic downturn, the resulting reduction in state contributions, and the decline in endowment market values (which have since recovered much of the decline) impacted ASU’s CFI score.

3. default rates

The student financial aid “cohort default rate” is defined by the U.S. Department of Education as the percentage of a school’s borrowers who (1) enter repayment on certain Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Programs or William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program loans during a particular federal fiscal year (FY), October 1 to September 30 and, (2) default or meet other specified conditions prior to the end of the either the next fiscal year (two-year default rate) or the following year (three-year default rate).

Cohort two-year default rates for the most recent four fiscal years and the three-year default rate for FY2009 under this definition for students receiving aid through ASU are considerably lower than the national average default rates, generally being roughly half the national average, as shown in Table FC-2. These default rates also are compared to those for ASU’s ABOR-approved peer institutions in Table FC-2. The ASU cohort default rates are generally higher than the rates for ASU’s ABOR-approved peer institutions, likely reflecting the greater challenges (both financial and personal) that are faced by ASU’s more economically-diverse student population.

To test this hypothesis, one proxy that may be used for student family income is the percentage of students receiving Pell grants at an institution, since the majority of students receiving Pell grants come from families with lower income, and those students are subject to greater financial and personal stressors that can make achievement of academic goals more difficult. Table FC-2 also presents institutional Pell grant recipient percentages for ASU and the ABOR-approved peers. The correlation between two-year cohort default rates and institutional Pell grant percentage for FY2009 is strong ($r = 0.72$, $r^2 = 0.52$), and even stronger for the three-year default rate ($r = 0.78$, $r^2 = 0.61$), suggesting that greater economic diversity in the student body strongly correlates with higher cohort default rates.

Since ASU’s Pell Grant fraction is the highest of the institutions listed in the table, the somewhat higher cohort default rates are to be expected given the greater economic diversity of the ASU student body. The ASU cohort default rates – which are less than half the national rates – suggest that ASU attendees from lower income families, faced with similar challenges to those in the national sample, are much less likely to default on their federal loans.

ASU’s student financial aid cohort default rates are favorable when compared to national averages, are
consistent with its institutional peers (allowing consideration of the emphasis on Access in ASU’s Core Values), and are consistent with Department of Education expectations for an institution of higher learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cohort year</th>
<th>two-year default rates FY2007</th>
<th>FY2008</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>three-year default rate FY2009 cohort</th>
<th>percentage of students awarded Pell Grants 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASU</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national average*</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>39%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average for ABOR-approved peer institutions</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University (Main campus)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California – Los Angeles</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois (Urbana/Champaign)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland (College Park)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota (Twin Cities)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas (Austin)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington (Seattle)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin (Madison)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State (Columbus)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University (New Brunswick)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table FC-2** Two-year and three-year cohort default rates for students receiving financial aid from ASU, compared with national averages and ASU’s ABOR-approved peer institutions. Also provided is the fraction of students receiving Pell grants during award year 2009-2010. All data shown are taken from the U.S. Department of Education databases.  
*National average provided by the U.S. Department of Education.  

**Private Loans to Students**

To facilitate meeting the Core Value of Access, ASU administers large amounts of financial aid to its students; in FY2010, FY2011, and FY2012, the financial aid funds disbursed through ASU totaled...
$792,661,554, $894,455,119, and $972,153,655, respectively. While much of that aid is awarded through scholarships, grants, and federal loan programs, a student needing additional funding to meet educational costs also may choose to seek private loans. ASU encourages students to exhaust all other possible sources of financial aid first, to look for ways to reduce expenses before deciding on the amount to borrow, to borrow only what is needed, and to compare rates and terms offered by different lenders before borrowing any amount.

ASU abides by the stringent restrictions of the Arizona Student Loan Code of Conduct, which bars the university and all university employees from receiving or soliciting anything of more than nominal value (i.e., valued at more than ten dollars) from any student lending business; employees in the financial aid office are further restricted from having any financial or consulting interest whatsoever in any student loan lender. The same law bans any arrangement under which a student loan lender pays a higher education institution or an affiliated entity or organization a certain sum, fee or percentage calculated in relationship to the volume of loans received by the lender from students of the institution.

Information on student and parent loans is provided on the Student Financial Assistance website. The information provided on that website includes details on the types of federal loans available. In the website section on private loans, students are cautioned that the annual percentage interest rate charged on private loans may vary based on market interest rates, translating to monthly payments that may change over time. In addition, some important differences between federal and private student loans are noted on that website. Students are informed that ASU works with any lender a student chooses and that ASU does not recommend or promote any lender; the choice is entirely up to each student. As noted on the website, “ASU is committed to processing all loans and does not endorse nor accept any incentives, financial or otherwise, from any lenders. ASU adheres to a strict code of conduct that prohibits inducements by private lenders.”

Once a lender approves a private loan for a student, transmissions begin through ELM Resources between the lender and ASU for the lender’s loan approval, and ASU’s review of eligibility, which then leads to ASU disbursing the funds to the student.

To further the Core Value of Access, ASU also administers several small institutional long-term and short-term loan programs, funded primarily from endowments, to enable students to reach their educational goals. The number of students participating in, and the funds provided to students through, those programs are summarized in Table FC-3.

4. campus crime information, athletic participation and financial aid, and related disclosures

4.1 campus crime information

As required by the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crimes Act (“Clery Act”), ASU publishes an annual crime statistics report, which is made available online to the public. The Clery Act requires higher education institutions to give timely warnings of crimes which represent a threat to the safety of students or employees, and to make public their campus security policies. It also requires that crime data is collected, reported, and disseminated to the campus community and is also submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.

The annual ASU Crime Report provides students and their families, as higher education consumers, with accurate, complete, and timely information about safety on campus so that they can make informed decisions. The data provided in ASU’s report meet the disclosure requirements of the Clery Act and go beyond those requirements to further inform and protect members of the university community and the public.

The annual crime statistics report is prepared by the ASU Police Department with assistance from the Office of University Student Initiatives. Statistical information is gathered from reports by campus security authorities and local law enforcement agencies (the police departments of Tempe, Phoenix, Mesa, Scottsdale, and Glendale and the sheriffs’ offices in Maricopa County and Gila County). Separate statistical compilations are provided for each of the four campuses. Licensed counselors are exempted from reporting requirements; campus counselors are encouraged to inform those they counsel to report crimes to the ASU Police Department.

The most common offenses reported involve liquor law and drug law violations referred for disciplinary action. These violations are the result of alleged offenses reported to other responsible university officials, investigated by departments other than the ASU Police Department, and referred for disciplinary action without arrest.

While not required by the Clery Act for public notification, the annual crime report for the university also reports statistics for reports of larceny and theft. By reporting these statistics, the university increases campus and community awareness of such incidents and helps promote a conscious response to the prevention of crime. In addition to the annual statistical reports required by the Clery Act, the ASU Police Department provides access on its website to an online interactive mapping tool that provides the location information provided on that website includes details on the types of federal loans available. In the website section on private loans, students are cautioned that the annual percentage interest rate charged on private loans may vary based on market interest rates, translating to monthly payments that may change over time. In addition, some important differences between federal and private student loans are noted on that website. Students are informed that ASU works with any lender a student chooses and that ASU does not recommend or promote any lender; the choice is entirely up to each student. As noted on the website, “ASU is committed to processing all loans and does not endorse nor accept any incentives, financial or otherwise, from any lenders. ASU adheres to a strict code of conduct that prohibits inducements by private lenders.”

Once a lender approves a private loan for a student, transmissions begin through ELM Resources between the lender and ASU for the lender’s loan approval, and ASU’s review of eligibility, which then leads to ASU disbursing the funds to the student.

To further the Core Value of Access, ASU also administers several small institutional long-term and short-term loan programs, funded primarily from endowments, to enable students to reach their educational goals. The number of students participating in, and the funds provided to students through, those programs are summarized in Table FC-3.
of campus crimes within the past 30 days, including the type of offense committed. This information also increases crime awareness by the campus and community and promotes greater preparedness.

While not required under Title IV or by state law, the ASU Police Department has voluntarily sought and received advanced accreditation status by the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), effective through November 2014, having first been accredited in 1997. To reach accreditation status, law enforcement agencies must comply with 190 specific standards; advanced accreditation may be achieved by police agencies that comply with 480 standards, including 15 new standards specific to campus policing. The new process focuses on agency practices with assessors interacting with approximately half of the 141 department employees and many faculty, staff, and students. Only 55 university and college law enforcement agencies have achieved accreditation by CALEA.

In conclusion, ASU meets and exceeds all disclosure, public safety warnings, and reporting expectations of the Clery Act.

### Athletic Participation and Financial Aid

As required by the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act of 1994, ASU provides information to the public related to the numbers of participating student-athletes in intercollegiate athletic programs offered by the institution, the staff supporting those programs, and the revenues and expenses for those programs.

### Table FCO-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>head count</td>
<td>total offered</td>
<td>total accepted</td>
<td>total disbursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boehm Memorial Loan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Short Term Loan</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>$190,400</td>
<td>$190,400</td>
<td>$189,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buros Short Term Loan</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$80,125</td>
<td>$80,125</td>
<td>$79,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chas &amp; Doris Pearce Short Term Loan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia H. Bichette Short Term Loan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$63,144</td>
<td>$63,144</td>
<td>$63,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL ASU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL Boehm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL Charles C. Bernstein</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL Gammage Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL John W. Allen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wassaja General Short Term Loan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 1081 | $672,081 | $672,081 | $670,481 | 820 | $489,894 | $489,894 | $489,894 | 686 | $420,706 | $420,706 | $420,206 | 288 | $170,446 | $170,446 | $170,446 | 172
with statistics broken down by gender as well as aggregated. This information is made publicly available at the Department of Education website.40 A copy of the most recent data submission to the Department of Education is available in the Electronic Resource Room.

Thus, ASU meets and exceeds all disclosure, public safety warnings, and reporting expectations of the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act of 1994.

5. student right-to-know

Federal laws and responsible practice require that institutions provide to prospective and current students, parents, and members of the public information that permit them to make informed decisions. Institutions managing and dispensing federal financial aid must comply with federal reporting requirements under Title IV and related laws. ASU fully, publicly, and completely complies with all federal requirements associated with Title IV and related laws, in many cases providing data to the public far beyond the minimum expectations dictated by federal law. These disclosures include the following:

- **Title IV responsibilities require that institutions provide data on graduation/completion rates for the student body by gender, ethnicity, receipt of Pell grants, and other data. The most recent available data for ASU are provided to the public through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Educational Statistics.**41

- **The policies and process students follow for withdrawing from courses at ASU are fully disclosed on the university website on a web page specifically devoted to that topic.**42

- **Information for students and parents regarding the cost of attendance, tuition and fees, and refund and return policies are documented online at the university website on web pages specifically devoted to those topics.**43, 44

- **Information on current academic programs is fully and publicly disclosed on the university website, including any necessary prerequisites. GPA restrictions and course requirements are provided on both the university website and catalog application; archived versions of the catalog provide information on programs offered in previous years.**5, 6, 15, 11

- **A list of members of the faculty, and the credentials earned by each of them, is available on the university website.**46 Students, parents, and members of the public may obtain further information about a particular faculty member using the ASU directory web application on the university website or by visiting the website for the academic unit indicated for the faculty member either in the faculty list or web-based directory application.46

- **The accreditation status of academic programs at ASU, including the current accreditation status provided by the HLC and the current information on all specialized accreditations for specific academic programs, are publicly and fully disclosed on the University Accreditation Office website.**47

- **Descriptions of the accommodations, services, and facilities available for meeting the needs of disabled students enrolled at ASU, as well as the policies related to establishment of eligibility for services, are fully and publicly disclosed on the Disabled Resource Center website.**48

- **Information concerning ASU’s Study Abroad programs, including policies related to enrollment, is provided publicly on the website of the Study Abroad Office.**49

Thus, ASU meets and exceeds Title IV expectations with respect to Student’s Right-to-Know.

6. satisfactory academic progress and attendance policies

ASU’s policies regarding satisfactory academic progress (SAP) for each student receiving financial aid are published on the ASU website.50 To remain eligible for federal and state financial aid programs, a student must meet the three standards of the SAP policy:

- **The GPA Standard requires that the student maintain the minimum ASU grade point average indicated in the minimum GPA policies for undergraduate and graduate students.**50, 51

- **The PACE Rate Standard requires that the student passes at least 67 percent of their total attempted ASU credit hours in their current degree level at ASU. The student is assessed by this standard once a year, at the end of the academic year in May.**

- **The Maximum Credit Hour Standard limits the number of attempted credit hours for the student’s particular degree program. For transfer students, all passed credits reported on college transcripts sent to ASU are included in this measurement. The specific limits are provided on the SAP website. Students who have reached 150 attempted credits are sent an e-mail warning of the impending limit on maximum credit hours attempted.**
Students may appeal termination of their financial aid eligibility by the SAP policy. A committee reviews student appeals on a case-by-case basis. Review approval is only granted for extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the student. Inability to master course material is not an extenuating circumstance. All decisions made by this committee are final.

The university attendance policy is explicitly stated on the ASU Academic Policies and Procedures website, as well as published in the archived catalog: “The instructor has full authority to decide whether class attendance is required.”

Hence, ASU meets expectations with respect to satisfactory academic progress standards and attendance policies.

7. contractual relationships

Arizona State University contracts with Academic Partnerships, LLC and Pearson eCollege to deliver and promote portions of its online academic programs. These arrangements are disclosed to HLC in the Annual Information Data Update. These agreements may be inspected by the Evaluation Team in the Electronic Resource Room.

Arizona State University provides sole institutional and academic guidance, evaluation, and oversight for the academic programs managed by the contractual partners. ASU processes all financial aid and performs all administrative services for these programs related to admissions, academic record-keeping, and financial aid, and is responsible for review and verification of credentials, appointment and coordination of course instructors, faculty/facilitators, and associated staff. ASU exercises sole responsibility for course instruction, content and curricula, and is solely responsible for granting academic credit and degrees associated with these programs.

8. consortial relationships

Arizona State University has no consortial relationships for outsourcing delivery or content of any academic programs.

VI. required information for students and the public

Throughout this Appendix, the online location of disclosures regarding tuition, academic programs, academic policies, and other information needed by the public to determine the cost of attendance and policies related to attendance have been provided. In particular, course catalogs covering all academic offerings are publicly available online, and catalogs from previous years are also archived, as discussed in Section 1 above. The Student Code of Conduct (SSM 104-01 and ABOR Policy 5-308) is also available online, as is the Student Services Manual.

VII. advertising and recruitment materials and other public information

As noted above, current and prospective students are kept abreast of academic program requirements and costs through the ASU web site.

ASU publicly and explicitly indicates the accreditation status of its academic programs with the HLC and other accrediting agencies on the university website. Of particular importance, ASU’s accreditation by the HLC is prominently displayed on the ASU Academic Programs entry portal (with a link that takes the browser to the HLC website information page for ASU), is published in the archived catalogs, and is further discussed on the ASU University Accreditation Office website. These strategically located descriptions provide current and prospective students, as well as members of the general public, with accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information about ASU’s accreditation status.

VIII. review of student outcome data

ASU extensively collects information about student outcomes; the discussion in Chapter 4 demonstrates that ASU collects information about student outcomes through approaches consistent with best practices in higher education and uses that information to plan and improve its academic programs.

IX. relationship with other accrediting agencies and state regulatory bodies

ASU, as an institution, is only accredited by the HLC. Some individual academic programs are also additionally and specifically accredited by appropriate national professional agencies; those accreditations are fully disclosed to the public on the university accreditation website. The summaries of the most recent report from professional accrediting bodies is provided in the Electronic Resource Room.
X. public notification of comprehensive evaluation visit and third-party comment

Beginning in December 2012, public notices following the format prescribed by the Higher Learning Commission were provided to ensure all constituencies (students, parents, alumni, taxpayers, donors, community groups, local businesses, and so on) were aware of the purpose of the site visit, the dates of the visit, and the current accreditation status of ASU. An invitation to send public comments directly to HLC (with a deadline of February 25, 2013, one month before the site visit) was provided with that announcement. The announcement was provided using email, the student newspaper, the three largest newspapers in Arizona, ASU social media sites, and the ASU HLC 2013 website.
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1. student demography headcounts

a. undergraduate enrollments by class levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>10,373</td>
<td>9,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>11,619</td>
<td>11,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>15,729</td>
<td>16,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>18,511</td>
<td>19,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b.1 - degree-seeking undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,184</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>3,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>3,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>10,038</td>
<td>10,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34,956</td>
<td>35,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,818</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>1,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>4,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17,429</td>
<td>17,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,602</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,366</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>1,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>5,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17,527</td>
<td>17,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b.2 - nondegree-seeking undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### c.1 - degree-seeking graduate/professional students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,027</td>
<td>13,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,651</td>
<td>7,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>6,353</td>
<td>6,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>3,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>6,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4,143</td>
<td>4,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c.2 - nondegree-seeking graduate/professional students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>851</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>504</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/AK Native</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Am.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### d. age range of undergraduate students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 and under</td>
<td>45,694</td>
<td>46,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and older</td>
<td>10,868</td>
<td>12,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>56,562</td>
<td>58,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e. credit-seeking on-site students by residency status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>51,029</td>
<td>51,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>15,555</td>
<td>16,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US Resident</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>4,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70,440</td>
<td>72,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Student Recruitment and Admissions

#### a. Applications, Acceptances, and Matriculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Acceptances</th>
<th>Matriculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>35,449</td>
<td>25,795</td>
<td>9,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>37,225</td>
<td>26,425</td>
<td>9,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Transfer</td>
<td>15,679</td>
<td>9,634</td>
<td>6,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>17,830</td>
<td>10,943</td>
<td>6,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>15,522</td>
<td>8,237</td>
<td>4,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>15,327</td>
<td>8,069</td>
<td>4,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2474</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b.1 - Required Standardized Test Score Means for Applied, Admitted, and Enrolled First-Time Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SAT (combined)</th>
<th>ACT (composite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b.2 - Required Standardized Test Score Means for Applied, Admitted, and Enrolled Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GRE Verbal</th>
<th>GRE Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>497</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. financial assistance for students

#### a. number of students enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled (degree-seeking)</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>56,232</td>
<td>13,027</td>
<td>58,184</td>
<td>13,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>56,184</td>
<td>13,039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number applied for financial assistance</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>38,661</td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>41,836</td>
<td>6,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent applied for financial assistance</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b. students receiving any type of financial assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number receiving:</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any type of financial assistance</td>
<td>45,003</td>
<td>10,338</td>
<td>47,788</td>
<td>10,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>27,693</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>30,816</td>
<td>5,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-Study</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/grants</td>
<td>36,736</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>38,572</td>
<td>2,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-based merit-based Scholarships</td>
<td>13,524</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>15,331</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of total enrollment receiving:</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any type of financial assistance</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-Study</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/grants</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-based merit-based Scholarships</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Tuition Discount Rate (TDR)\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total institutional financial aid (I)</td>
<td>$188,685,730</td>
<td>$202,883,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments of tuition expected (P)</td>
<td>$684,529,017</td>
<td>$835,153,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Discount Rate I/(I+P)</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Reflects students with a valid Federal Application for Federal Student Aid on file; does not include students who received aid not requiring a FAFSA (including but not limited to scholarships, waivers, fellowships, assistantships, on-campus employment, and athletic aid).

\(^2\)Includes students who received aid not requiring a FAFSA (including but not limited to scholarships, waivers, fellowships, assistantships, on-campus employment, athletic aid).

\(^3\)Excludes parent plus loans

\(^4\)Includes academic based merit based Institutional funded scholarships

\(^5\)Limited to Institutional funded scholarships

\(^6\)Values taken from the annual ABOR Financial Aid report and based on full year
4. student retention and program productivity

a. first-time, full-time entering undergraduates - one-year persistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>Returning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,127</td>
<td>6,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native /Pacific Islander</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,032</td>
<td>4,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the new IPEDS reporting categories for ethnicity.

b. degrees awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 2009-10</th>
<th>AY 2010-11*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacc</td>
<td>Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native /Pacific Islander</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8,127</td>
<td>2,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,810</td>
<td>4,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the new IPEDS reporting categories for ethnicity.

c. degrees awarded by program (CIP code)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>AY 2009-10</th>
<th>AY 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacc</td>
<td>Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Natural Resources</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture/Engineering/Engineering Tech</td>
<td>4, 14, 15</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Physical Science</td>
<td>26, 40, 41</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Communication Tech/Fine Arts</td>
<td>9, 10, 50</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Library Science</td>
<td>13, 21, 25</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>5, 16, 23, 24, 30, 38, 39, 54</td>
<td>1,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Computer Science</td>
<td>11, 27</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Technology/Protective Services</td>
<td>29, 43</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services/Consumer Services/Fitness</td>
<td>12, 19, 31</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Social Sciences &amp; Services</td>
<td>42, 44, 45</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades/Production/Transportation Health</td>
<td>46, 47, 48, 49</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,810</td>
<td>4,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. faculty demography

### a. headcount by highest degree earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Professional</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>253</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. headcount by race/ethnicity, gender, rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native /Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>253</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>253</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-Track</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured*</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes research/visiting faculty, instructors, lecturers, faculty associates, and scholars.
6. availability of instructional resources and information technology

a. provide an account of the technology resources dedicated to supporting student learning (library sites, residence hall hookups, internet cafes, etc.) and explain how you monitor the level of their usage.

Arizona State University's University Technology Office (UTO) provides the highest quality technology based services and systems, in a cost-effective manner, to support the University's mission and goals as they apply to student learning, academic research and engagement in public service. ASU measures IT services and offerings through bandwidth, polling, population ratios and specific technology analytics designated from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NBS/NIST). The following is a breakdown of the technology infrastructure and services provided centrally by UTO. (Note that a substantial number of resources are provided by individual schools and departments, which are not included in these numbers).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT offering</th>
<th>IT metric</th>
<th>current measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASU LMS &amp; Online Services</td>
<td>% Time that ASU’s computer systems are operational (My ASU, Blackboard, PeopleSoft, Advantage, email) *Past six months</td>
<td>99.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Storage Space</td>
<td># TB of computer storage provided by centralized University storage infrastructure</td>
<td>8.2PB/10PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Campus wireless coverage</td>
<td>% Campus with centrally provided wireless connectivity</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubiquitous classroom mediation</td>
<td>7600 courses taught in Blackboard. ASU Online Courses Using Pearson Learning Studio</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Natural Resources</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture/Engineering/Engineering Tech</td>
<td>4, 14, 15</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Physical Science</td>
<td>26, 40, 41</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Communication Tech/Fine Arts</td>
<td>9, 10, 50</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Library Science</td>
<td>13, 21, 25</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>5, 16, 23, 24, 30, 38, 39, 54</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Computer Science</td>
<td>11, 27</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Technology/Protective Services</td>
<td>29, 43</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services/Consumer Services/Fitness</td>
<td>12, 19, 31</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Social Sciences &amp; Services</td>
<td>42, 44, 45</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades/Production/Transportation Health</td>
<td>46, 47, 48, 49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT offering</td>
<td>IT metric</td>
<td>current measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Classrooms equipped with computer projection and audio equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research computing that supports sponsored research</td>
<td># Researchers using ASU's High Performance Computing system</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># TB of centralized storage space used by ASU researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td>234TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Research projects hosted on ASU's High Performance Computing system</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included in these enterprise wide service offerings, ASU offers several IT resources campus wide. The following is a list of the IT services provided across all campuses:

- There are a total of 4,287 Desktops in non-department, centrally managed, student centers that include:
  - 11 Public and Library Computing Sites
    - Dual Computing Platforms (Mac and Windows)
    - ‘Common’ computing image with a standard set of applications available across all campuses
    - Comprehensive set of software available locally and via Citrix
    - VDI/thin-image workstation environments for quick-use computing
    - Multifunction Devices for printing, scanning, and copying
    - Dedicated 1:1 Laptop Space with Power and Wireless Connectivity
    - Team focused areas with large displays designed for collaboration
    - Workstation usage monitored by LabStats; Laptop users by hourly counts; Keyserver statistics are used to measure utilization of launched applications
  - 8 Residential Housing Computing sites (Mac and Windows)
  - 498 University Classrooms (centrally managed)
    - Mediated at the Instructor level with audio, video, an instructor’s computer, laptop connectivity, and control
    - Mediation available at the student level with one computer for each student or every two students to enable sharing and collaboration
    - Student Response System integration (TurningPoint clickers) in select lecture halls
    - Video conferencing capabilities in select locations
    - Support for student organization events
  - 7 Adaptive Learning Studios
    - Self-paced, computer-based learning for Math and English students.
    - 1:1 instructor assistance available
    - 509 courses offered in Fall 2012
    - 4 Knewton Math labs served 4,702 students in Fall 2012
  - 4 Technology Studios
    - Hardware and software assistance for student laptops and mobile devices
    - Instructional workshops
  - 4 Disability Resource Centers
    - Hardware and software support for workstations
    - Configuration of accessibility hardware (Braille embosser)
The ASU Libraries (7 libraries across 4 campuses) support student learning by providing 601 desk top computers to assist in discovery and research. We use a software package call Lab Stats that allows us to track their usage. Wireless and network connectivity is provided by UTO.

Over the last two years, we have had an increase in students bringing their own devices into the library (laptops, tablets, smartphones). In addition to wireless coverage within all the libraries (provided by UTO), we have created spaces to accommodate the remote user, provided remote printing, increased our electrical outlets, and have provided Help Desk assistance.

Improvement, maintenance, and enhancement are an ongoing effort of ASU’s University Technology Office. Data collection, analysis, and reporting of the utilization and performance is continuous.

### 7. financial information

**a. actual unrestricted revenues (millions of dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>566.3</td>
<td>639.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Local Appropriations (if applicable)</td>
<td>395.4</td>
<td>395.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and Annuity Income</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>136.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,197.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. actual unrestricted expense (millions of dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional/Departmental/Library</td>
<td>660.2</td>
<td>691.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>135.1</td>
<td>142.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>175.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,108.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,158.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Frequently Used Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABOR</td>
<td>Arizona Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGEC</td>
<td>Arizona General Education Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Academic Progress Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUHS</td>
<td>ASU Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUPTS</td>
<td>ASU Parking and Transit Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASUUH</td>
<td>ASU University Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPC</td>
<td>Curriculum Academic Programs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Disability Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH&amp;SS</td>
<td>Environmental Health and Safety Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSS</td>
<td>Educational Outreach and Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHES</td>
<td>Follett Higher Education Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTFT</td>
<td>Full-time, first-time freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIOS</td>
<td>Global Institute of Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPSA</td>
<td>Graduate and Professional Student Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLC</td>
<td>Higher Learning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACUC</td>
<td>Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBC</td>
<td>Institutional Biosafety Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPP</td>
<td>Maricopa to ASU Partnership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCD</td>
<td>Maricopa County Community Colleges District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRS</td>
<td>Misconduct Research Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFCCP</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEI</td>
<td>Office of Equity and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHR</td>
<td>Office of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKED</td>
<td>Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIA</td>
<td>Office of Research Integrity and Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORSPA</td>
<td>Office of Research and Sponsored Project Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUA</td>
<td>Office of the University Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDFA</td>
<td>Sun Devil Faculty Athletics Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPC</td>
<td>Student-Faculty Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Staff Personnel Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPS</td>
<td>Standard Assessment Plan and Reporting templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>Transfer Admission Guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAAS</td>
<td>University Audit and Advisory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>University Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOEED</td>
<td>University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOIA</td>
<td>University Office of Institutional Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTO</td>
<td>University Technology Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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abor 2020 vision enterprise metrics

**goal 1: educational excellence**
- Number of bachelor’s degrees awarded
- Number of Master’s degrees awarded
- Number of Arizona community college students who transfer to a university
- Number of Arizona community college transfer students awarded bachelor’s degrees
- Educational quality as reported in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) or ETS Proficiency Profile
- Cost of attendance as a percentage of Arizona median family income
- 6-year graduation rate
- Freshman retention rate
- Undergraduate enrollment
- Total enrollment
- Four year graduation rate of Arizona community college transfers
- College going rate (from K-12)

**goal 2: research excellence**
- Total research expenditures
- Number of doctoral degrees awarded
- Number of invention disclosures transacted
- Number of patents issued
- Intellectual property income

**goal 3: workforce and community**
- Impact of community engagement activities
- Total expenditures related to service and engagement activities
- Number of degrees awarded in high demand fields
- Diversity of graduates
- New companies started
- Milken Institute state science and technology ranking
- Adults with bachelor’s degrees in Arizona

**goal 4: productivity**
- Number of bachelor’s degrees awarded per 100 FTE students
- Composite Financial Index (CFI)
- Tuition at average of peer institutions
- Online degrees and certificates
- Employment of graduates who stay in Arizona
- Education and related expenses per degree
- College, online, and other enrollment
abor 2020 vision goals

**goal 1: educational excellence and impact**
“To be nationally competitive in the percentage of Arizona’s citizens with a high-quality Bachelor’s degree by providing affordable access through a well-coordinated and aligned system.”

**goal 2: research excellence**
“To increase the research capabilities and performance of the Arizona University System to a level of competitive prominence with peer rankings of top American research universities.”

**goal 3: workforce and community**
“To utilize research, economic development, community engagement, and service contributions of the universities to create and disseminate knowledge to strengthen Arizona’s economy and improve Arizona’s quality of life.”

**goal 4: productivity**
“To maximize the use of existing resources so that the system can produce greater numbers of degrees and with greater efficiency of resources per degree without sacrificing quality.”
asu excellence

excellent students

Over 600 National Merit Scholars
Over 300 National Hispanic Scholars
Among the top 10 producers of Fulbright Scholars

excellent faculty

3 Nobel laureates
12 National Academy of Sciences members
9 National Academy of Engineering members
6 Pulitzer Prize awardees
11 American Academy of Arts and Sciences members
25 Guggenheim Fellows
66 American Academy of Arts and Sciences Fellows
86 Early Career Awardees (NSF, DOE, Army)
114 Fulbright American Scholar awards

excellent programs

ASU's business programs in the top
10 percent of all business programs in the nation.

ASU's undergraduate engineering programs in the top
10 percent of all undergraduate engineering programs in the nation.

Rated in the top 25 percent in the nation:
  Education
  Public affairs
  Design and arts