REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

APPENDICES

presented to

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges
(WASC) by the University of San Francisco

8 AUGUST 2007

REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

APPENDICES

presented to

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) by the University of San Francisco

Table of Contents

TAB 1

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Update On Recommendations Made in Previous WASC Action Letters

USF hosted a fifth-year visit by a WASC team in November 2002. This visit was a follow-up to a re-affirmation of accreditation visit held in 1997. The Commission letters following both visits made recommendations and comments to the University in four major areas: (a) Assessment; (b) The Learning Community; (c) Planning and Budget; and, (d) The College of Professional Studies. The latest Commission letter (dated March 3, 2003) noted significant changes that the University had made in each of these four areas. Indeed, since the 2002 visit, the University has continued to make significant improvements in each of the four areas. Those advances were documented in our 2005 Proposal for the current re-affirmation of accreditation process and that text is updated here and in the body of the Capacity and Preparatory Review (C&PR) self-study.

Assessment

Increasingly, the University community recognizes that assessment of student learning not only bolsters scholarly excellence but also supports the delivery of rigorous academic programs. Like most higher education institutions, USF is engaged in the development of appropriate and efficient assessment procedures and in the implementation of useful review processes. We have made important progress in the last few years not only in gathering evidence for educational effectiveness and institutional functioning but also in making use of that evidence for program development and evaluation. The C&PR self-study presents details on recent progress in our assessment efforts as well as in program evaluation and that information will not be repeated here.

Some recent developments are allowing us to provide an institutional infrastructure that supports evaluation and assessment projects. Since 2000, the University has benefited from an Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and an Office of Institutional Assessment (OIA). A combined staff of three professionals is charged with the collection, analysis and dissemination of evidence to inform the University's planning, evaluation and assessment efforts. In addition, the above offices are charged with external reporting and with conducting special research projects focusing upon specific initiatives. OIR and OIA have coordinated the preparation of an assessment plan that maps out the University's evaluation and assessment activities (see Attachment number 22). The OIA website now includes the results of our institution-wide surveys as well as pertinent interpretations of the results www.usfca.edu/assessment. In addition, the OIR website includes information on student persistence, gender and ethnic diversity among faculty and staff, and other indicators of progress in attaining USF's strategic initiatives www.usfca.edu/oir.

During AY 2005-2006, the University formalized the existence of the University Assessment Steering Committee that includes faculty and staff and is charged with the oversight of all large-scale assessment and evaluation activities. The Committee oversees the application and interpretation of large-scale projects such as the NSSE, BCSSE, SSI, EBI (residence halls) as well as general satisfaction surveys conducted by various offices. The Committee also has been involved in drafting the alumni survey that was used in spring 2007 and is currently working on a new version of the graduating student survey and an assessment plan for service learning. This plan contemplates a number of steps including the development of learning outcomes (finalized during spring 2007) and the use of the Core Assessment Matrix (CAM) by faculty teaching service learning courses during the spring 2007 semester. In this CAM, faculty are asked to reflect on how each learning outcome was measured and what changes (if any) they will introduce to the course in order to help students achieve the expected learning outcomes. Also part of the plan for assessing service learning are surveys of students reflecting on their learning experiences as well as a survey of those community agencies that provided the learning opportunity for our students.

The College of Arts and Sciences has recognized the need to support faculty and staff in assessment efforts and appointed in 2006 an Associate Dean for Program Review and Assessment. This individual coordinates all academic program reviews in the College and

supports faculty in developing appropriate student learning assessment procedures. He also participates in University-wide assessment and evaluation efforts and supports some of the activities coordinated by the Office of Institutional Assessment.

USF has endeavored to develop procedures that guarantee the dissemination of assessment information as well as its use in program development and modification. As mentioned above, the OIR and OIA are engaged in developing timely and user-friendly approaches to the dissemination of assessment information to all stakeholders. For example, we have joined NSSE's pilot effort to develop a simple approach to disseminating basic information about the annual surveys. We are also improving the design and content of the websites for both offices in order to serve as an easy-to-use depository of institutional data.

As mentioned in the C&PR self-study, faculty and staff have been involved in the last two to three years in the development and refining of learning outcomes for the institution and for the various academic programs and courses. We now have institutional learning outcomes that are directly related to the University's Mission, academic programs have defined and in some cases, revised learning outcomes for students to achieve as a result of their involvement in the program. The Core Curriculum and the two graduation requirements (Service Learning and Cultural Diversity) also have explicit learning outcomes. This important first step of developing learning outcomes has allowed us to move intentionally to their assessment. The process has been slow but it has promoted important dialogues within and across programs.

Our assessment and evaluation efforts also have supported programmatic change. Periodic and comprehensive program reviews have helped us to redefine learning outcomes, modify curricula and requirements, and to identify areas of faculty growth. During AY 2006-2007 the University conducted 7 academic program reviews and 10 are scheduled for AY 07-08. A total of 7 service unit reviews were conducted during AY 06-07 and 12 different ones are scheduled for AY 07-08. These reviews have produced important changes. For example, after their program review, the Department of Theology and Religious Studies revised their learning outcomes, started to develop more Core Curriculum courses, initiated a review of the graduate program, developed a concerted mentorship program for recently hired faculty, developed departmental sub-committees, and began long term planning around the curriculum. The Physics Department began an astronomy program also as a result of their program review. Furthermore, following the results of the program review, new faculty assignments have been made in Mathematics, Exercise and Sport Science, History and in other programs. Staff additions or workload reassignments also have been the result of program reviews at various academic programs. Furthermore, periodic analyses of curriculum at the departmental level are common in a number of programs and these discussions are held in settings as diverse as annual retreats or monthly departmental meetings or motivated by the results of program reviews. These analyses have resulted in the redefinition of learning outcomes, modifications to course sequencing, development of new courses, and other changes that enhance student learning.

Comprehensive reviews of institutional data are now more common and emphasis is being placed on their implications. For example, as detailed in the C&PR self-study, an analysis of student persistence rates led to the creation of a task force to identify strategies that can be implemented in order to improve our retention and graduation rates. Results from NSSE and our Graduating Student Survey on student satisfaction with advising has led to the development of new initiatives to improve academic advising as well as the funding of two new staff lines (College of Arts and Sciences and School of Business and Management). Another example of the impact of recent University-wide assessment efforts is the re-envisioning of New Student Orientation to more properly transmit the University's Mission and to communicate the expectations of high levels of academic engagement and performance. This effort was motivated in part by reviewing evaluation surveys and student satisfaction inventories.

As mentioned in the C&PR self-study, the activities noted above are noteworthy in the development of a culture of evidence at USF. We also are aware of the fact that more and improved assessment efforts need to be developed in a number of areas. Of particular significance (as noted in the C&PR self-study) is the development of comparable program review processes for academic programs as well as for our service units. Also important is the development of learning outcomes for our student support service units so that we can better demonstrate their important role in providing an integrated learning experience to our students. As is true for many institutions, we also need to develop procedures for the direct assessment of student learning across all programs. We have a number of indirect measures (e.g., NSSE, Alumni Survey) and some programs require integrative projects or capstone courses, but we are still lacking direct evidence of student learning across a number of programs.

Learning Community

Central to the University's identity as a learning community is the recognition that student learning takes place not only in the classroom but also in other parts of the campus, in the city and even outside the country. We realize that in order to "educate minds and hearts to change the world" we need to engage all of the University's offices in sharing information about their goals and expected learning outcomes.

As mentioned in the C&PR self-study, the University has engaged in an analysis of what is implied in our goal of providing an integrated (or seamless) learning environment to our students. The discussions have been fruitful in showing the ways in which various offices contribute to student learning and in supporting the central academic activities. Certain structural changes have helped promote the exchange of ideas across divisions and offices. This effort began after a thorough analysis of our student life services and offices that led to the creation of a new Vice Presidency for University Life. This analysis provided us with a framework for developing special activities in which faculty and student development personnel share in the educational enterprise and in enhancing student learning. While this integration is a "work in progress" as could be expected from such a dramatic culture change, we have achieved important landmarks at different levels. At the administrative level, the Vice President for University Life reports to the Provost and participates in meetings of the Provost Council where she interacts every two weeks with all of the deans. The Director of Campus Ministry participates in meetings of the Provost Council and the Dean of Students meets with administrators as part of the Council of Associate Deans.

A newly created Office of Living-Learning Communities (LLCs) supports academic programs and coordinates University Life staff members who participate in our LLCs. The Erasmus Community, an upper-division LLC, was redesigned to concentrate on social justice topics and students' personal involvement in effecting change. During AY 2006-2007 for example, the program analyzed modern slavery from social, political, economic and ethical perspectives and developed initiatives designed to end modern human slavery. Among these projects are the self-identification of churches and universities as modern abolitionist institutions and the promotion of individuals volunteering their earnings toward ending slavery through the "Free to … [play], [work], or [study]" campaign. In addition, students traveled to Cambodia during summer 2007 to interview and work with individuals subjected to modern slavery. USF also offers other LLCs including the Martín-Baró Scholars Program, a socially-responsible multicultural learning community, and the Esther Madriz Diversity Scholars community that is dedicated to an analysis of transborder issues in the United States. Both of these communities received recent external recognition. The Esther Madriz community received an award from the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) as a "Promising Practice in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Collaboration." The Martín-Baró community has been chosen as a case example for the forthcoming book on civic engagement in the first year of college to be published by The National Resource Center for the First year Experience. An analysis of Martín-Baró scholars showed that when compared with other freshman students, Martín-Baró students obtain a higher freshman GPA; take a greater number of units, on average; show higher one-year retention rates; and occupy a high number of leadership positions.

Programmatically, the contributions of the Division of University Life to student learning are further recognized by their participation as partners in strategic planning initiatives such as the re-envisioning of residential learning communities, the analysis of student attrition, student leadership development and training, and diversity initiatives. The Division of University Life also has participated in training sessions directed at designing and assessing learning outcomes for their different programs and offices. Furthermore, the Division has adopted cultural competency as the focus of programming for AY 2006-2007 that manifested itself in the development of new targeted programs, enhancement of student training and the promotion of dialogue and collaboration across cultures. Indeed, data from the EBI among students living in residence halls show that resident advisors (RAs) are perceived as promoting tolerance of others (81%) and being appreciative of ethnic diversity (85%).

As mentioned in various sections of the documents related to the C&PR, the assessment of the effectiveness of the various strategies has begun and these somewhat tentative initial steps are producing important results. For example, the assessment of the Martín-Baró Scholars Program has given us impetus for developing or re-shaping other LLCs including a new Freshman community center on environmental concerns that is scheduled to begin fall of 2007. The evaluation of our New Student Orientation led to the development of an improved program during fall 2006 and its continued improvement and re-design for fall 2007.

Support for learning through student interactions has been an important guide in the renovation and construction of new facilities. The Geschke Learning Center includes a number of small rooms that support group study and discussions. The same types of rooms have been built when sections of the Lone Mountain building were renovated as well as in the construction of the addition to the building for the Business and Management School. The new building for the Arts, the Humanities and the Social Sciences (Kalmanovitz Hall) will also include spaces appropriate for small group interactions. Renovations to food facilities (e.g. Wolf and Kettle, Crossroads) also have been designed with the goals of providing spaces that support small group discussions and group projects.

The intellectual life of the University has continued to grow as the results of specific efforts on the part of students, faculty and staff. Lectures, performances, conferences, film screenings, art exhibits and other activities are now common on campus many of them with well known and respected participants. As noted in the C&PR self-study, USF is the home to five scholarly journals (*Asia Pacific Perspectives, Journal of Asia Business Studies, Maritime Law Journal of the University of San Francisco, Peace Review, University of San Francisco Law Review*), and faculty serve as reviewers of journal articles and book proposals as well as serving on editorial boards and grant review panels. Our faculty also receives continually increasing external support for research and teaching. Our on-campus art gallery presents shows highlighting the contributions of local and international artists, faculty and students. Our Presentation Theater and the newly designed Studio Theater serve as venues for musical and stage performances that include presentations by students who are part of our Performing Arts and Social Justice Program as well as by the College Players. Founded in 1863, the College Players is the oldest campus theater company west of the Mississippi.

Additionally, every year, the University sponsors the Quinn Symposium on Catholic Social Teaching and our Justice Lecture Series. The latter has brought to campus 12 recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize, including Bishop Desmond Tutu, Elie Wiesel, Rigoberta Menchú, Adolfo Pérez-Esquivel, Oscar Arias Sánchez, Shirin Ebadi, and the Dalai Lama. Our Fromm Institute for Lifelong Learning, a not-for-credit institute that provides educational opportunities to retired individuals, provides important opportunities for our students to interact with a wide range of senior scholars as they share classrooms and various campus services.

The University has been committed to providing opportunities for students to learn through service as a reflection of its Jesuit Catholic traditions. In the last few years, we have funded an Office of Service Learning and Community Action and implemented a service learning graduation requirement for all undergraduates. Faculty and students are involved in a variety of community engagement and service learning opportunities (as detailed in the C&PR self-study) that have produced the Carnegie classification of USF as a "Community Engaged" university (one of 77 selected in 2007). The University also has recently created two centers that support our learning community while reflecting our Mission: the Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good and the Joan and Ralph Lane Center for Catholic Studies and Social Thought. These two centers together with the Center for the Pacific Rim sponsor educational opportunities for students, faculty, staff and the general community and support the University's goal of "educating minds and hearts to change the world."

Another important aspect of the development of a "Learning Community" at USF is the use of institutional data and the results of program review and assessment to improve the University. Examples of the use of data and assessment or evaluation results have been cited in the C&PR self-study and in this document and together they demonstrate that we have begun to develop a culture of evidence at USF. Assessment is valued by increasing numbers of faculty and staff and conversations about learning outcomes and goals are more common than before. Data and assessment results are being discussed and used more frequently whether in program planning or when making budget requests. We are becoming a more comprehensive learning community, a changing community modified by the learning that takes place across the campus and among all of our stakeholders.

College of Professional Studies

The last action letter from the Commission noted the significant changes in the College of Professional Studies (CPS) that had taken place since the 1997 visit. These improvements and changes have been solidified since the 2002 visit and faculty and students in CPS are becoming more integrated into the rest of the University. As examples, we cite the dean's participation in all University activities, planning and decision making processes; the recruitment, retention and tenure of faculty at CPS who are scholars, outstanding teach-

ers and active members of the University community; the development of courses for the CPS Core Curriculum that fulfill the same learning outcomes as those for traditional-age undergraduates; and, cooperative research and scholarly activities across colleges and schools (e.g., conferences, workshops). Our regional campuses (where a number of CPS programs are delivered) are functional, modern structures with appropriate support services including information technology, library and other learning resources as well as support staff. Other important changes in CPS include the involvement of full-time faculty in programs delivered at our regional campuses; changes in scheduling to better conform to the University's Calendar; as well as CPS faculty involvement in a variety of University-wide committees and activities, including membership in the committees working on this WASC Re-affirmation of Accreditation process.

As is true for many similar programs throughout the nation, enrollments at CPS have decreased in the recent past. In the meantime, faculty members have developed new academic programs to attract different populations of students and some curricular changes have been implemented. During AY 2006-2007, the University began a discussion of the current structure of CPS. These discussions and plans are now headed by a newly appointed Acting Dean. At the same time, we are seeing an increased number of applicants and the University is initiating non-credit certificate programming serving the professional community.

Planning

As mentioned in our Proposal for the current re-affirmation of accreditation process, the University has continued to implement a transparent, effective and integrative planning process that aligns academic, financial and facilities planning in support of the University's Mission. There are a number of recent examples that support this assertion. In 2001 the University community became engaged in the drafting and ultimate adoption of the new Vision, Mission and Values statement. All stakeholders of the University (alumni, students, faculty, staff, and administrators) participated in discussions of the various drafts of the statement as well as in shaping its general content.

Another example of our institution-wide integrative planning process is the setting of short- and longer-term planning priorities and their alignment with the allocation of financial resources through the budget process. Every year, the members of the Leadership Team review the University's long-term Strategic Priorities and modify them as the circumstances require. Also every year, deans and vice presidents are asked to review and revise their goals for their area of responsibility in terms of their alignment with the University's Mission, their significance in advancing student learning and institutional welfare, and their relationships to other areas or divisions. The University began in 2006 a process of analysis and review of nine specific Planning Priorities that impact the financial and general structure of the University. These priorities include enrollment targets, the analysis of the role of our regional campuses and of our involvement in Asia, the investigation of outsourcing, fees and possible use of incentives, the development of the new Master Plan and the review of specific business processes. Each topic has been assigned a lead person(s) along with a defined timeline for action. Actions taken are summarized in a document that was presented to the Board of Trustees at its March 2007 meeting.

The development of the University's annual budget is another example of our recent efforts at developing a transparent and efficient planning process. This complex activity is coordinated by the Associate Provost for Budget, Planning and Review and involves thorough review by faculty and administrators of enrollment data, cost analyses and other financial indicators. Deans and vice presidents are involved in discussing the plans for the budget and the process moves to the Cabinet and the President before it is submitted to the Board of Trustees. Information on the process and supporting documents are openly available through a website: www.usfca.edu/planning_budget/budget. The process has been highlighted by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities as an example in budgetary transparency that allows faculty, students and staff to review new programs and budget proposals before they are discussed by the University's leadership.

The approval process of new academic programs is another example of open and thorough planning that involves the faculty who develop the program, a College/ School Curriculum Committee (that includes faculty and staff), and a review by the sponsoring school/college dean as well as by the Provost and members of the Provost Council (which includes all of the deans) and the Leadership Team. As mentioned in this document and in the C&PR self-study, we now conduct periodic program reviews for academic and service units which also include a financial review of revenue and expenses associated with the program. These reviews have helped improve our

programs and plan for the future of the institution.

The University has achieved significant milestones in developing a responsive and transparent action oriented planning culture and process that guide the allocation of human and fiscal resources with program and service unit reviews assessing the outcomes of this effort. An important result of this process has been our willingness to revise procedures and conduct periodic evaluations in order to better meet institutional needs and enhance the participation of relevant parties. Likewise, we are engaged in a discussion of how short- and medium-term plans fit within the long-term Strategic Initiatives that are part of our Vision, Mission and Values statement. At the same time, the University has identified "best practices" in a variety of areas ranging from the outsourcing of certain services to the development of an integrated ("One Stop") registrar and bursar facility. Nevertheless, we still have some areas that need improvement and further development. The use of institutional data in planning is at times sporadic although there are excellent examples of the incorporation of data in the planning process such as financial analyses and budgeting, class scheduling and room utilization, prioritizing of new budget items, identification of new IT services, etc. We have begun some benchmarking both in terms of institutional performance (e.g., financial performance), workload (e.g., the Delaware Study) as well as assessment (e.g., the use of the NSSE) but we still need to develop an agile process for the selection of some benchmarks and lists of comparator institutions. In summary, we have moved rather quickly toward creating a culture of evidence in our planning efforts which with continued refinement, will help sustain our momentum.

TAB 2

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
WASC/ACSCU Summary Data

Institution	President/CEO	Year Founded	Date Submitted
University of San Francisco	Stephen A. Privett, S.J.	1855	8/01/2007

Calendar Plan

Semester	Quarter	Trimester	Other

Approved Degree-Granting Levels

Associate	Bachelors	Masters	Research Doctorate	Professional Doctorate	Other

Sponsorship and Control

Independent	Independent, with affiliation: Roman Catholic (Jesuit Order)	Religiously affiliated	California State University	University of California	University of Hawaii
Public	Proprietary				

For Undergraduate Programs:

Last Reported IPEDS Data for Enrollment by Ethnicity and Gender. Use IPEDS definitions for students.
IPEDS data reported as of October 15, 2006

Table 1

ENROLLMENT BY CATEGORY	TOTAL FTE OF STU-DENTS*	TOTAL HEAD-COUNT OF STUDENTS	NON-RESIDENT ALIEN HEAD-COUNT	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC HEADCOUNT	AM. INDIAN/ ALASKA NATIVE HEADCOUNT	ASIAN / PACIFIC ISLANDER HEADCOUNT	HISPANIC/ LATINO HEADCOUNT	WHITE/NON-HISPANIC HEADCOUNT	ETHNICITY UNKNOWN HEADCOUNT	TOTAL MALE HEADCOUNT	TOTAL FEMALE HEADCOUNT
UNDERGRADUATE	5,148	5,245	322	285	55	1,229	714	2,015	625	1,858	3,387
NON-DEGREE	71	139	33	5	1	15	12	24	49	74	65
TOTAL	5,219	5,384	355	290	56	1,244	726	2,039	674	1,932	3,452

* If institution has used a formula other than FTE = FT + (PT/3), please indicate how calculated FTE._____

IPEDS Data for 6-Year Cohort Graduation Rate, Last 3 Years, by Ethnicity and Gender:

PLEASE INDICATE IF THE DATA PROVIDED IN TABLES BELOW IS FOR:

☐ Freshmen only (use Table 2) ☒ Freshmen and transfer students combined (use Tables 2 and 3)

Table 2

FRESHMAN COHORT YEAR (ENTERING FALL)	OVERALL GRADUATION PERCENTAGE	NON-RESIDENT ALIEN %	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC %	AM INDIAN/ ALASKA NATIVE %	ASIAN / PACIFIC ISLANDER %	HISPANIC/ LATINO %	WHITE/NON-HISPANIC %	ETHNICITY UNKNOWN %	MALE %	FEMALE %
1998	65.9%	77.1%	52.0%	25.0%	72.6%	64.9%	60.6%	71.4%	64.7%	66.5%
1999	66.5%	57.8%	65.7%	40.0%	72.8%	61.4%	64.0%	76.5%	61.5%	69.1%
2000	65.0%	66.1%	69.2%	0.0%	74.6%	61.5%	61.0%	64.2%	61.1%	66.8%
3-YEAR AVERAGE:	65.8%	67.1%	62.8%	22.2%	73.3%	62.4%	62.0%	69.9%	62.3%	67.5%

If institution tracks freshman and transfer graduation rates separately please provide last 3 years data
for 6-Year cohort *transfer* graduation rate by ethnicity and gender:

Table 3

TRANSFER COHORT YEAR (ENTERING FALL)	OVERALL GRADUATION PERCENTAGE	NON-RESIDENT ALIEN %	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC %	AM INDIAN/ ALASKA NATIVE %	ASIAN / PACIFIC ISLANDER %	HISPANIC/ LATINO %	WHITE/NON-HISPANIC %	ETHNICITY UNKNOWN %	MALE %	FEMALE %
1998	65.0%	61.8%	46.7%	83.3%	66.3%	55.3%	71.1%	52.6%	61.5%	67.4%
1999	67.8%	59.7%	55.6%	100.0%	68.6%	82.1%	68.0%	64.9%	62.2%	72.5%
2000	63.7%	58.8%	55.6%	50.0%	59.3%	77.1%	64.0%	67.9%	62.4%	64.6%
3-YEAR AVERAGE:	65.4%	60.0%	52.4%	75.0%	64.8%	70.9%	67.7%	62.6%	62.0%	67.9%

For Graduate Programs:

Last Reported IPEDS Data for Enrollment in each program level by Ethnicity and Gender. Use IPEDS definitions for students. IPEDS data reported as of October 15, 2006

Table 4

ENROLLMENT BY CATEGORY	TOTAL FTE OF STUDENTS*	TOTAL HEADCOUNT OF STUDENTS	NON-RESIDENT ALIEN HEADCOUNT	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC HEADCOUNT	AM INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE HEADCOUNT	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER HEADCOUNT	HISPANIC/LATINO HEADCOUNT	WHITE/NON-HISPANIC HEADCOUNT	ETHNICITY UNKNOWN HEADCOUNT	TOTAL MALE HEADCOUNT	TOTAL FEMALE HEADCOUNT
MASTERS	1,408	1,539	300	75	7	227	104	637	189	723	816
RESEARCH DOCTORATE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PROFESSIONAL (MASTERS & DOCTORATE)	1,322*	1,626*	65	110	10	226	198	750	267	576	1,050
TOTAL	2,730	3,165	365	185	17	453	302	1,387	456	1,299	1,866

* Includes Masters and Doctorate in School of Education, L.L.M. and J.D. in School of Law

IPEDS Data for Cohort Graduation Rate, Last 3 Years, by Ethnicity and Gender:

Table 5

COHORT YEAR	GRADUATION PERCENTAGE (ALL PROGRAMS)	NON-RESIDENT ALIEN %	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC %	AM INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE %	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER %	HISPANIC/LATINO %	WHITE/NON-HISPANIC %	ETHNICITY UNKNOWN %	MALE %	FEMALE %
1998	74.5%	81.2%	75.4%	87.5%	74.0%	64.9%	73.7%	78.2%	74.3%	74.6%
1999	72.6%	73.5%	64.3%	83.3%	75.6%	61.4%	73.1%	81.3%	73.3%	72.0%
2000	78.1%	78.8%	68.8%	86.7%	79.3%	76.8%	78.1%	83.4%	79.1%	77.4%
3-YEAR AVERAGE:	75.1%	77.4%	68.6%	86.2%	76.3%	67.0%	75.0%	80.8%	75.6%	74.7%

Current Faculty:

Total FTE of faculty: 539.3 as of Nov 1, 2006

Full-time faculty headcount:	367	% Non-Caucasian (21.0%)	% Male (55.3%)	% Female (44.7%)
Part-time faculty headcount:	517	% Non Caucasian (15.4%)	% Male (44.3%)	% Female (55.7%)
FTE Student: FTE Faculty Ratio:	15:1			

Finances:

A. Annual Tuition Rate:

Undergraduate Resident Tuition:	$28,420/year	Undergraduate Non-Resident Tuition:	$28,420/year
Graduate Resident Tuition:	$17,370/year (average)	Graduate Non-Resident Tuition:	$17,370/year (average) .

B. Total Annual Operating Budget: $215,502,348 (FY06)

C. Percentage from tuition and fees: 86.35% (FY06)

D. Operating deficit(s) for past 3 years: $0 (FY06); $0 (FY05); $0 (FY04)

E. Current Accumulated Deficit: $0

F. Endowment: $190,117,000 (as of May 31, 2006)

Governing Board:

A. Size: 44   **B. Meetings a year: 4**

Off Campus Locations:

A. Number: 4 Regional Campuses and 4 Program Sites   **B. Total Enrollment:** 853 (Fall 2006 Census Date)

Distance Education Programs (50% or more of program/degree requirements are offered via any technology-mediated delivery system):

A. Number: 0   **B. Total Enrollment:** 0

TAB 3

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Required Elements to Support the Capacity & Preparatory Review

Table of Contents

TABLE 1.1: Admission Activity by Level

THESE DATA ARE FOR:	✖ FALL TERMS ONLY*	FULL YEAR (ANNUALIZED)			
	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
Freshmen					
NUMBER OF APPLICANTS	3,590	4,634	5,338	6,090	7,105
Number of applicants admitted	2,960 (82.5%)	3,798 (82.0%)	3,961 (74.2%)	4,376 (71.9%)	5,132 (72.2%)
Number of admitted freshmen actually enrolled	844 (28.5%)	921 (24.2%)	933 (23.6%)	934 (21.3%)	1,079 (21.0%)
Transfer	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
NUMBER OF APPLICANTS WITH COMPLETE CREDENTIALS FOR ADMISSION WITH ADVANCED STANDING (TRANSFER)	916	998	1,167	1,222	1,228
Number of applicants admitted	720 (78.6%)	800 (80.2%)	821 (70.4%)	851 (69.6%)	788 (64.2%)
Number of admitted transfers actually enrolled	349 (48.5%)	359 (44.9%)	383 (46.7%)	398 (46.8%)	400 (32.6%)
Masters	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
NUMBER OF APPLICANTS WITH COMPLETE CREDENTIALS FOR ADMISSION TO MASTER'S PROGRAMS	2,169	2,572	2,613	2,475	2,659
Number of applicants admitted to Master's programs	1,581 (72.9%)	1,853 (72.0%)	1,557 (59.6%)	1,523 (61.5%)	1,670 (62.8%)
Number of admitted actually enrolled in Master's programs	919 (58.1%)	925 (49.9%)	811 (52.1%)	791 (51.9%)	870 (52.1%)
Doctoral	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
NUMBER OF APPLICANTS WITH COMPLETE CREDENTIALS FOR ADMISSION TO DOCTORAL PROGRAMS	108	71	97	98	113
Number of applicants admitted to Doctoral programs	76 (70.4%)	42 (59.2%)	72 (74.2%)	56 (57.1%)	71 (62.8%)
Number of admitted actually enrolled in Doctoral programs	42 (55.3%)	30 (71.4%)	46 (63.9%)	39 (69.6%)	41 (57.7%)
Law	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
NUMBER OF APPLICANTS WITH COMPLETE CREDENTIALS FOR ADMISSION TO LAW PROGRAMS	3,107	3,726	4,581	4,154	3,468
Number of applicants admitted to law programs	1,011 (32.5%)	978 (26.2%)	1,122 (24.5%)	1,265 (30.5%)	1,124 (32.4%)
Number of admitted actually enrolled in law programs	248 (24.5%)	271 (27.7%)	257 (22.9%)	259 (20.5%)	235 (20.9%)

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

** The percentages are calculated as follows: The number of applicants admitted (e.g., 2,960 in 2002) is divided by the total number of applicants (e.g., 3,590 in 2002) to produce the acceptance rate (82.5% in 2002). Then the number of students actually enrolled (e.g., 844 in 2002) is divided by the total number of applicants admitted (e.g., 2,960 in 2002) to produce the yield rate (28.5% in 2002).

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 1.2: Preparation/Selectivity Levels of Entering Students

THESE DATA ARE FOR: ✖ FALL TERMS ONLY* FULL YEAR (ANNUALIZED)

New Freshmen

	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006		
	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH
SAT SCORES FOR ENTERING FRESHMEN															
Verbal	535	480	590	538	480	590	552	510	620	561	510	610	552	500	600
Quantitative	544	490	600	551	490	610	558	500	620	564	520	610	558	508	610
ACT SCORES FOR ENTERING FRESHMEN															
Composite	23	20	25	23	20	25	23	21	26	24	21	26	24	22	26
Mathematics	22	19	25	23	19	26	23	19	26	23	20	26	24	21	26
English	23	20	26	23	20	26	24	20	27	24	21	27	24	21	27
HIGH SCHOOL GPA	3.30			3.31			3.43			3.47			3.47		
PERCENT REQUIRING REMEDIATION	Not Available			Not Available			Not Available			Not Available			Not Available		

Entering Graduate Students

	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006		
	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH	MEAN SCORE	PERCENTILE 25TH	75TH
GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION *(for total Graduate School excluding professional schools)*															
Verbal	455	360	550	471	390	540	476	390	550	488	400	560	459	368	540
Quantitative	584	470	720	583	490	698	582	470	692	595	513	700	608	530	720
Analytical	566	470	660	571	490	670	570	490	685	571	460	640	512	405	635
OTHER TESTS USED FOR ADMISSION OR PLACEMENT															
GMAT Total	530	470	580	526	475	565	526	460	570	562	510	610	544	490	593
LSAT	156*	154	158	158*	156	160	159*	157	162	159*	156	161	159*	156	161

* Median LSAT

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 1.3: Admission by Gender

THESE DATA ARE FOR: ✖ FALL TERMS ONLY* FULL YEAR (ANNUALIZED)

New Freshmen

	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
TOTAL APPLICANTS	**3,590**	**4,634**	**5,338**	**6,090**	**7,105**
Male	1,118 (31.1%)	1,518 (32.8%)	1,772 (33.2%)	1,975 (32.4%)	2,436 (34.3%)
Female	2,472 (68.9%)	3,116 (67.2%)	3,566 (66.8%)	4,115 (67.6%)	4,669 (65.7%)
TOTAL ADMITS	**2,960 (82.5%)**	**3,798 (82.0%)**	**3,961 (74.2%)**	**4,376 (71.9%)**	**5,132 (72.2%)**
Male	856 (76.6%)	1,149 (75.7%)	1,297 (73.2%)	1,368 (69.3%)	1,693 (69.5%)
Female	2,104 (85.1%)	2,649 (85.0%)	2,664 (74.7%)	3,008 (73.1%)	3,439 (73.7%)
TOTAL ENROLLED	**844 (28.5%)**	**921 (24.2%)**	**933 (23.6%)**	**934 (21.3%)**	**1,079 (21.0%)**
Male	261 (30.5%)	284 (24.7%)	317 (24.4%)	269 (19.7%)	343 (20.3%)
Female	583 (27.7%)	637 (24.0%)	616 (23.1%)	665 (22.1%)	736 (21.4%)

Undergrad. Transfers

	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
TOTAL APPLICANTS	**916**	**998**	**1,167**	**1,222**	**1,228**
Male	379 (41.4%)	370 (37.1%)	445 (38.1%)	401 (32.8%)	461 (37.5%)
Female	537 (58.6%)	628 (62.9%)	722 (61.9%)	821 (67.2%)	767 (62.5%)
TOTAL ADMITS	**720 (78.6%)**	**800 (80.2%)**	**821 (70.4%)**	**851 (69.6%)**	**788 (64.2%)**
Male	294 (77.6%)	296 (80.0%)	332 (74.6%)	318 (79.3%)	342 (74.2%)
Female	426 (79.3%)	504 (80.3%)	489 (67.7%)	533 (64.9%)	446 (58.1%)
TOTAL ENROLLED	**349 (48.5%)**	**359 (44.9%)**	**383 (46.7%)**	**398 (46.8%)**	**400 (50.8%)**
Male	150 (51%)	136 (45.9%)	171 (51.5%)	159 (50.0%)	184 (53.8%)
Female	199 (46.7%)	223 (44.2%)	212 (43.4%)	239 (44.8%)	216 (48.4%)

TABLE 1.3: Admission by Gender (continued)

THESE DATA ARE FOR: ✗ FALL TERMS ONLY*   FULL YEAR (ANNUALIZED)

Graduate Students	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
TOTAL APPLICANTS*	**2,299**	**2,626**	**2,703**	**2,574**	**2,700**
Male	895 (38.9%)	997 (38.0%)	990 (36.6%)	1,010 (39.2%)	1,055 (39.1%)
Female	1,404 (61.1%)	1,628 (62.0%)	1,706 (63.1%)	1,561 (60.6%)	1,645 (60.9%)
TOTAL ADMITS**	**1,625 (70.7%)**	**1,880 (71.6%)**	**1,627 (60.2%)**	**1,585 (61.6%)**	**1,679 (62.2%)**
Male	641 (71.6%)	739 (74.1%)	659 (66.6%)	620 (61.4%)	649 (61.5%)
Female	984 (70.1%)	1,140 (70.0%)	966 (56.6%)	963 (61.7%)	1,030 (62.6%)
TOTAL ENROLLED	**979 (60.2%)**	**955 (50.8%)**	**857 (52.7%)**	**830 (52.4%)**	**864 (51.5%)**
Male	365 (56.9%)	356 (48.2%)	339 (51.4%)	332 (53.5%)	336 (51.8%)
Female	614 (62.4%)	599 (52.5%)	518 (53.6%)	498 (51.7%)	528 (51.3%)

Law Students	2002 N (%)**	2003 N (%)**	2004 N (%)**	2005 N (%)**	2006 N (%)**
TOTAL APPLICANTS	**3,107**	**3,726**	**4,581**	**4,154**	**3,468**
Male	1,442 (46.4%)	1,748 (46.9%)	2,146 (46.8%)	1,925 (46.3%)	1,575 (45.4%)
Female	1,665 (53.6%)	1,978 (53.1%)	2,435 (53.2%)	2,229 (53.7%)	1,893 (54.6%)
TOTAL ADMITS	**1,011 (32.5%)**	**978 (26.2%)**	**1,122 (24.5%)**	**1,265 (30.5%)**	**1,124 (32.4%)**
Male	472 (32.7%)	450 (25.7%)	532 (24.8%)	585 (30.4%)	542 (34.4%)
Female	539 (32.4%)	528 (26.7%)	590 (24.2%)	680 (30.5%)	582 (30.7%)
TOTAL ENROLLED	**248 (24.5%)**	**271 (27.7%)**	**257 (22.9%)**	**259 (20.5%)**	**235 (20.9%)**
Male	118 (25.0%)	138 (30.7%)	137 (25.8%)	114 (19.5%)	119 (22.0%)
Female	130 (24.1%)	133 (25.2%)	120 (20.3%)	145 (21.3%)	116 (19.9%)

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

** The percentages are calculated as follows: The number of applicants admitted is divided by the total number of applicants to produce the acceptance rate.
Then the number of students actually enrolled is divided by the total number of applicants admitted to produce the yield rate.

*** Between 2002 and 2005 a total of 19 applicants didn't report their gender

**** Between 2003 and 2005 a total of 5 admits didn't report their gender

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 1.4: Admission by Race/Ethnicity (New Freshmen)

THESE DATA ARE FOR: ✖ **FALL TERMS ONLY***   **FULL YEAR (ANNUALIZED)**

	AFRICAN AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	INTERNATIONAL	LATINO/HISPANIC	MULTIETHNIC	OTHER	UNIDENTIFIED	WHITE	NATIVE HAWAIIAN/ PACIFIC ISLANDER
2002 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	181	13	634	232	438	142	124	160	1,525	141
Total Admits	128 (70.7%)	10 (76.9%)	527 (83.1%)	137 (59.1%)	364 (83.1%)	119 (83.8%)	105 (84.7%)	128 (80%)	1,322 (86.7%)	120 (85.1%)
Total Enrolled	47 (36.7%)	3 (30%)	179 (34%)	42 (30.7%)	120 (33%)	36 (30.3%)	38 (36.2%)	29 (22.7%)	304 (23%)	46 (38.3%)
2003 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	289	23	833	362	567	152	194	172	1,887	155
Total Admits	196 (67.8%)	18 (78.3%)	728 (87.4%)	215 (59.4%)	458 (80.8%)	120 (78.9%)	158 (81.4%)	128 (74.4%)	1,648 (87.3%)	129 (83.2%)
Total Enrolled	53 (27%)	1 (5.6%)	181 (24.9%)	64 (29.8%)	128 (27.9%)	31 (25.8%)	39 (24.7%)	23 (18%)	356 (21.6%)	45 (34.9%)
2004 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	300	31	1,094	336	690	165	94	284	2,226	118
Total Admits	198 (66%)	24 (77.4%)	819 (74.9%)	171 (50.9%)	496 (71.9%)	127 (77%)	68 (72.3%)	218 (76.8%)	1,754 (78.8%)	86 (72.9%)
Total Enrolled	54 (27.3%)	5 (20.8%)	219 (26.7%)	41 (24%)	127 (25.6%)	42 (33.1%)	19 (27.9%)	34 (15.6%)	361 (20.6%)	31 (36%)
2005 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	294	50	1,215	395	765	153	90	458	2,566	104
Total Admits	186 (63.3%)	34 (68%)	889 (73.2%)	203 (51.4%)	517 (67.6%)	102 (66.7%)	70 (77.8%)	329 (71.8%)	1,978 (77.1%)	68 (65.4%)
Total Enrolled	50 (26.9%)	14 (41.2%)	193 (21.7%)	39 (19.2%)	129 (25%)	28 (27.5%)	15 (21.4%)	66 (20.1%)	389 (19.7%)	11 (16.2%)
2006 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	332	69	1,330	465	876	256	116	656	2,883	122
Total Admits	187 (56.3%)	53 (76.8%)	956 (71.9%)	264 (56.8%)	591 (67.5%)	180 (70.3%)	79 (68.1%)	505 (77%)	2,247 (77.9%)	70 (57.4%)
Total Enrolled	41 (21.9%)	13 (24.5%)	231 (24.2%)	55 (20.8%)	147 (24.9%)	50 (27.8%)	18 (22.8%)	82 (16.2%)	420 (18.7%)	22 (31.4%)

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

** The percentages are calculated as follows: The number of applicants admitted is divided by the total number of applicants to produce the acceptance rate. Then the number of students actually enrolled is divided by the total number of applicants admitted to produce the yield rate.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 1.4: Admission by Race/Ethnicity (Undergraduate Transfers) *

THESE DATA ARE FOR:	✖ FALL TERMS ONLY*			FULL YEAR (ANNUALIZED)						
	AFRICAN AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	INTERNATIONAL	LATINO/HISPANIC	MULTIETHNIC	OTHER	UNIDENTIFIED	WHITE	NATIVE HAWAIIAN/ PACIFIC ISLANDER
2002 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	50	14	136	120	92	28	32	64	363	17
Total Admits	35 (70.0%)	10 (71.4%)	97 (71.3%)	85 (70.8%)	75 (81.5%)	23 (82.1%)	24 (75.0%)	50 (78.1%)	310 (85.4%)	11 (64.7%)
Total Enrolled	17 (48.6%)	5 (50.0%)	49 (50.5%)	44 (51.8%)	43 (57.3%)	16 (69.6%)	12 (50.0%)	23 (46.0%)	137 (44.2%)	3 (27.3%)
2003 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	52	2	155	112	90	55	41	42	406	43
Total Admits	38 (73.1%)	2 (100.0%)	121 (78.1%)	60 (53.6%)	79 (87.8%)	46 (83.6%)	31 (75.6%)	38 (90.5%)	353 (86.9%)	32 (74.4%)
Total Enrolled	11 (28.9%)	1 (50.0%)	67 (55.4%)	29 (48.3%)	39 (49.4%)	17 (37.0%)	11 (35.5%)	13 (34.2%)	150 (42.5%)	21 (65.6%)
2004 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	64	11	226	144	111	49	18	81	450	13
Total Admits	35 (54.7%)	9 (81.8%)	134 (59.3%)	75 (52.1%)	80 (72.1%)	39 (79.6%)	12 (66.7%)	64 (79.0%)	366 (81.3%)	7 (53.8%)
Total Enrolled	21 (60.0%)	3 (33.3%)	60 (44.8%)	34 (45.3%)	44 (55.0%)	19 (48.7%)	4 (33.3%)	23 (35.9%)	174 (47.5%)	1 (14.3%)
2005 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	64	6	238	126	105	74	13	85	487	24
Total Admits	41 (64.1%)	5 (83.3%)	139 (58.4%)	75 (59.5%)	75 (71.4%)	55 (74.3%)	11 (84.6%)	55 (64.7%)	380 (78.0%)	15 (62.5%)
Total Enrolled	17 (41.5%)	1 (20.0%)	63 (45.3%)	34 (45.3%)	33 (44.0%)	28 (50.9%)	7 (63.6%)	20 (36.4%)	187 (49.2%)	8 (53.3%)
2006 N(%)*										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	64	9	219	122	118	73	12	80	513	18
Total Admits	38 (59.4%)	4 (44.4%)	110 (50.2%)	69 (56.6%)	85 (72.0%)	43 (58.9%)	8 (66.7%)	49 (61.3%)	371 (72.3%)	11 (61.1%)
Total Enrolled	22 (57.9%)	1 (25.0%)	67 (60.9%)	45 (65.2%)	37 (43.5%)	25 (58.1%)	3 (37.5%)	20 (40.8%)	175 (47.2%)	5 (45.5%)

* Traditional Undergraduate Transfer Students Only   ** As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

*** The percentages are calculated as follows: The number of applicants admitted is divided by the total number of applicants to produce the acceptance rate. Then the number of students actually enrolled is divided by the total number of applicants admitted to produce the yield rate.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
TABLE 1.4: Admission by Race/Ethnicity (Graduate Students)

THESE DATA ARE FOR: ✖ FALL TERMS ONLY* FULL YEAR (ANNUALIZED)

	AFRICAN AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	INTERNATIONAL	LATINO/HISPANIC	MULTIETHNIC	OTHER	UNIDENTIFIED	WHITE	NATIVE HAWAIIAN/ PACIFIC ISLANDER
2002 N(%)										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	115	11	242	676	158	17	53	161	851	15
Total Admits	77 (67.0%)	6 (54.5%)	181 (74.8%)	405 (59.9%)	114 (72.2%)	13 (76.5%)	37 (69.8%)	126 (78.3%)	656 (77.1%)	10 (66.7%)
Total Enrolled	63 (81.8%)	5 (83.3%)	111 (61.3%)	172 (42.5%)	87 (76.3%)	10 (76.9%)	28 (75.7%)	91 (72.2%)	406 (61.9%)	6 (60.0%)
2003 N(%)										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	143	13	308	634	179	24	189	48	1,067	21
Total Admits	93 (65.0%)	9 (69.2%)	225 (73.1%)	419 (66.1%)	129 (72.1%)	18 (75.0%)	137 (72.5%)	42 (87.5%)	791 (74.1%)	17 (81.0%)
Total Enrolled	61 (65.6%)	4 (44.4%)	118 (52.4%)	122 (29.1%)	76 (58.9%)	11 (61.1%)	88 (64.2%)	25 (59.5%)	441 (55.8%)	9 (52.9%)
2004 N(%)										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	128	15	338	551	187	33	200	108	1,121	22
Total Admits	65 (50.8%)	6 (40.0%)	171 (50.6%)	347 (63.0%)	123 (65.8%)	25 (75.8%)	129 (64.5%)	66 (61.1%)	679 (60.6%)	16 (72.7%)
Total Enrolled	42 (64.6%)	2 (33.3%)	100 (58.5%)	95 (27.4%)	89 (72.4%)	12 (48.0%)	72 (55.8%)	37 (56.1%)	396 (58.3%)	12 (75.0%)
2005 N(%)										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	141	11	275	628	179	11	216	53	1,028	32
Total Admits	67 (47.5%)	5 (45.5%)	173 (62.9%)	366 (58.3%)	118 (65.9%)	9 (81.8%)	128 (59.3%)	42 (79.2%)	660 (64.2%)	17 (53.1%)
Total Enrolled	33 (49.3%)	2 (40.0%)	114 (65.9%)	119 (32.5%)	64 (54.2%)	4 (44.4%)	80 (62.5%)	24 (57.1%)	379 (57.4%)	11 (64.7%)
2006 N(%)										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	132	11	297	819	191	10	241	9	946	44
Total Admits	76 (57.6%)	7 (63.6%)	186 (62.6%)	470 (57.4%)	125 (65.4%)	6 (60.0%)	142 (58.9%)	5 (55.6%)	633 (66.9%)	29 (65.9%)
Total Enrolled	52 (68.4%)	3 (42.9%)	104 (55.9%)	170 (36.2%)	79 (63.2%)	1 (16.7%)	88 (62.0%)	4 (80.0%)	346 (54.7%)	17 (58.6%)

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

** The percentages are calculated as follows: The number of applicants admitted is divided by the total number of applicants to produce the acceptance rate. Then the number of students actually enrolled is divided by the total number of applicants admitted to produce the yield rate.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 1.4: Admission by Race/Ethnicity (Law Students)

THESE DATA ARE FOR: ✖ FALL TERMS ONLY* FULL YEAR (ANNUALIZED)

	AFRICAN AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	ASIAN AMERICAN	INTERNATIONAL	LATINO/HISPANIC	MULTIETHNIC	OTHER	UNIDENTIFIED	WHITE	NATIVE HAWAIIAN/ PACIFIC ISLANDER
2002 N(%)**										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	145	25	590	54	281	87	202	126	1,596	1
Total Admits	39 (26.9%)	4 (16%)	157 (26.6%)	6 (11.1%)	62 (22.1%)	26 (29.9%)	49 (24.3%)	41 (32.5%)	627 (39.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Total Enrolled	12 (30.8%)	0 (0.0%)	32 (20.4%)	2 (33.3%)	16 (25.8%)	6 (23.1%)	8 (16.3%)	4 (9.8%)	168 (26.8%)	0 (0.0%)
2003 N(%)**										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	153	23	718	39	322	88	275	408	1,695	5
Total Admits	47 (30.7%)	8 (34.8%)	174 (24.2%)	3 (7.7%)	62 (19.3%)	23 (26.1%)	65 (23.6%)	94 (23.0%)	501 (29.6%)	1 (20.0%)
Total Enrolled	18 (38.3%)	2 (25.0%)	40 (23.0%)	0 (0.0%)	21 (33.9%)	3 (13.0%)	9 (13.8%)	39 (41.5%)	138 (27.5%)	1 (100.0%)
2004 N(%)**										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	205	23	808	79	348	113	304	660	1,954	87
Total Admits	54 (26.3%)	3 (13.0%)	188 (23.3%)	5 (6.3%)	75 (21.6%)	30 (26.5%)	56 (18.4%)	170 (25.8%)	523 (26.8%)	18 (20.7%)
Total Enrolled	15 (27.8%)	1 (33.3%)	48 (25.5%)	0 (0.0%)	22 (29.3%)	7 (23.3%)	11 (19.6%)	30 (17.6%)	115 (22.0%)	8 (44.4%)
2005 N(%)**										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	171	22	728	99	346	136	285	614	1,693	60
Total Admits	54 (31.6%)	5 (22.7%)	183 (25.1%)	15 (15.2%)	98 (28.3%)	53 (39.0%)	62 (21.8%)	223 (36.3%)	554 (32.7%)	18 (30.0%)
Total Enrolled	7 (13.0%)	1 (20.0%)	36 (19.7%)	3 (20.0%)	20 (20.4%)	10 (18.9%)	17 (27.4%)	45 (20.2%)	119 (21.5%)	1 (5.6%)
2006 N(%)**										
TOTAL APPLICANTS	162	20	578	63	323	111	220	351	1,593	47
Total Admits	48 (29.6%)	4 (20.0%)	183 (31.7%)	13 (20.6%)	91 (28.2%)	37 (33.3%)	50 (22.7%)	146 (41.6%)	542 (34.0%)	10 (21.3%)
Total Enrolled	18 (37.5%)	1 (25.0%)	37 (20.2%)	1 (7.7%)	20 (22.0%)	7 (18.9%)	9 (18.0%)	31 (21.2%)	108 (19.9%)	3 (30.0%)

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

** The percentages are calculated as follows: The number of applicants admitted is divided by the total number of applicants to produce the acceptance rate. Then the number of students actually enrolled is divided by the total number of applicants admitted to produce the yield rate.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 2.1: Headcount Enrollment by Degree Objective

	2002 N(%)	2003 N(%)	2004 N(%)	2005 N(%)	2006 N(%)
Total Enrollment*	**7,951**	**8,139**	**8,274**	**8,447**	**8,568**
Less than 2-Year Awards	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Associate Degrees	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Bachelors Degrees	4,494 (56.5%)	4,574 (56.2%)	4,841 (58.5%)	5,012 (59.3%)	5,242 (61.2%)
Masters Degrees	2,305 (29%)	2,426 (29.8%)	2,252 (27.2%)	2,132 (25.2%)	2,138 (25%)
Doctoral Degrees	287 (3.6%)	250 (3.1%)	262 (3.2%)	264 (3.1%)	266 (3.1%)
First Professional (Law Degrees)	701 (8.8%)	733 (9%)	741 (9%)	759 (9%)	715 (8.3%)
Special/Non-Degree	164 (2.1%)	156 (1.9%)	178 (2.2%)	280 (3.3%)	207 (2.4%)

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 2.2: Headcount Enrollment by Gender

		2002 N(%)	2003 N(%)	2004 N(%)	2005 N(%)	2006 N(%)
Total Enrollment*	Male	2980 (37.5%)	3014 (37.0%)	3148 (38.0%)	3229 (38.2%)	3,245 (37.9%)
	Female	4971 (62.5%)	5125 (63.0%)	5126 (62.0%)	5218 (61.8%)	5,323 (62.1%)
Lower Division	Male	660 (33.7%)	674 (33.2%)	736 (35.0%)	730 (33.5%)	767 (33.9%)
	Female	1298 (66.3%)	1358 (66.8%)	1367 (65.0%)	1446 (66.5%)	1,496 (66.1%)
Upper Division	Male	971 (38.3%)	924 (36.3%)	1019 (37.2%)	1068 (37.6%)	1,090 (36.6%)
	Female	1565 (61.7%)	1618 (63.7%)	1719 (62.8%)	1768 (62.3%)	1,889 (63.4%)
Graduate*	Male	1289 (39.1%)	1353 (39.7%)	1328 (40.8%)	1296 (41.1%)	1,280 (41%)
	Female	2004 (60.9%)	2056 (60.3%)	1927 (59.2%)	1859 (58.9%)	1,839 (59%)
Non-Degree	Male	60 (36.6%)	63 (40.4%)	65 (36.5%)	135 (48.2%)	108 (52.2%)
	Female	104 (63.4%)	93 (59.6%)	113 (63.5%)	145 (51.8%)	99 (47.8%)

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

** Includes Doctoral Students in School of Education and School of Law Students

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 2.3: Headcount Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity*

	ASIAN	AFRICAN AMERICAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	NATIVE HAWAII/ PACIFIC ISLANDER	MULTI-ETHNIC	OTHER	INTERNA-TIONAL	UNSPECIFIED	WHITE
2002										
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	**1386 (17.4%)**	**435 (5.5%)**	**808 (10.2%)**	**43 (0.5%)**	**207 (2.6%)**	**168 (2.1%)**	**193 (2.4%)**	**790 (9.9%)**	**532 (6.7%)**	**3,389 (42.6%)**
Lower Division	404	106	258	11	88	76	74	136	61	744
Upper Division	546	135	305	12	103	61	50	176	156	992
Graduate**	420	189	236	19	15	27	64	462	271	1590
Special	16	5	9	1	1	4	5	16	44	63
2003										
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	**1369 (16.8%)**	**472 (5.8%)**	**888 (10.9%)**	**36 (0.4%)**	**244 (3.0%)**	**213 (2.6%)**	**322 (4.0%)**	**688 (8.5%)**	**426 (5.2%)**	**3,481 (42.8%)**
Lower Division	410	113	279	4	117	86	83	139	56	745
Upper Division	526	130	321	15	105	83	72	169	116	1005
Graduate**	416	224	278	15	20	42	163	361	210	1680
Special	17	5	10	2	2	2	4	19	44	51
2004										
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	**1428 (17.3%)**	**479 (5.8%)**	**951 (11.5%)**	**31 (0.4%)**	**242 (2.9%)**	**250 (3.0%)**	**357 (4.3%)**	**635 (7.7%)**	**414 (5.0%)**	**3,487 (42.1%)**
Lower Division	446	131	289	7	88	89	56	138	69	790
Upper Division	564	144	366	13	112	112	91	164	111	1061
Graduate**	400	198	288	11	37	45	206	302	187	1581
Special	18	6	8	0	5	4	4	31	47	55
2005										
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	**1457 (17.2%)**	**449 (5.3%)**	**976 (11.6%)**	**48 (0.6%)**	**209 (2.5%)**	**263 (3.1%)**	**355 (4.2%)**	**591 (7.0%)**	**527 (6.2%)**	**3,572 (42.3%)**
Lower Division	455	123	287	20	54	96	39	130	107	865
Upper Division	554	147	390	19	117	120	86	162	140	1101
Graduate**	423	156	279	8	36	44	227	266	200	1516
Special	25	23	20	1	2	3	3	33	80	90

Table 2.3: Headcount Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity*

2006	ASIAN	AFRICAN AMERICAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	NATIVE HAWAII/ PACIFIC ISLANDER	MULTI-ETHNIC	OTHER	INTERNA- TIONAL	UNSPECIFIED	WHITE
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	**1,510 (17.6%)**	**479 (5.6%)**	**993 (11.6%)**	**54 (0.6%)**	**196 (2.3%)**	**272 (3.2%)**	**364 (4.2%)**	**743 (8.7%)**	**500 (5.8%)**	**3,457 (40.3%)**
Lower Division	469	110	315	26	40	107	39	124	153	880
Upper Division	618	178	379	15	109	127	68	199	138	1,148
Graduate**	405	184	282	12	46	35	254	361	154	1,386
Special	18	7	17	1	1	3	3	59	55	43

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

** Includes Doctoral Students in School of Education and School of Law Students

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 2.4: Students Receiving Financial Aid*

Undergraduate Students	2002 N(%)	2003 N(%)	2004 N(%)	2005 N(%)	2006 N(%)
TOTAL HEADCOUNT	**4,602**	**4,700**	**4,975**	**5,248**	**5,404**
Total Receiving Some Form of Financial Aid or Assistance	3,202 (69.6%)	3,462 (73.7%)	3,534 (71.0%)	3,666 (69.9%)	3,501 (64.8%)
Total Receiving Federal Pell Grant Support	1,002 (21.8%)	1,126 (24.0%)	1,162 (23.4%)	1,089 (20.7%)	1,035 (19.2%)
Graduate Students	2002 N(%)	2003 N(%)	2004 N(%)	2005 N(%)	2006 N(%)
TOTAL HEADCOUNT	**3,349**	**3,439**	**3,299**	**3,199**	**3,164**
Total Receiving Some Form of Financial Aid or Assistance	2,285 (68.2%)	2,367 (68.8%)	2,559 (77.6%)	2,543 (79.5%)	2,098 (66.3%)

* As of Census Date (mid-September each Fall semester)

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
All Degrees					
Bachelors	1111	1189	1164	1153	1155
Masters	976	860	1046	897	974
Doctoral	236	240	253	239	284
First Professional (Law)	196	205	224	214	250
Architecture					
Bachelors		1	6	6	5
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Art History / Arts Management					
Bachelors			2	1	12
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Art Education					
Bachelors			1	4	4
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Asia Pacific Studies					
Bachelors					
Masters	6	5	20	3	14
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Communication					
Bachelors	37	13	8	1	
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Communication Studies					
Bachelors	9	24	50	56	43
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Economics					
Bachelors	9	16	12	7	19
Masters	11	11	4	7	4
Doctoral					
First Professio.nal					
Economics 4+1					
Bachelors		1	4	2	2
Masters			3	2	
Doctoral					
First Professional					
English					
Bachelors	26	36	39	31	34
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Environmental Studies					
Bachelors		2	6	6	6
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Exercise and Sport Science					
Bachelors	15	14	16	10	13
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Fashion Design					
Bachelors	4	4	8	7	1
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Fine Arts					
Bachelors			3	7	18
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
French					
Bachelors	3	2	1	2	
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Graphic Design					
Bachelors	5	7	9	13	24
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
History					
Bachelors	25	21	36	27	31
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Illustration					
Bachelors		2	1	5	1
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Industrial Design					
Bachelors			1	3	1
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Interior Architecture					
Bachelors	3	2		1	
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Interior Design					
Bachelors		3		5	1
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
International and Development Economics					
Bachelors					
Masters			2	13	15
Doctoral					
First Professional					
International and Development Economics (4+1)					
Bachelors			1	2	
Masters			1		1
Doctoral					
First Professional					
International Studies					
Bachelors					3
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Japanese					
Bachelors				1	1
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Latin American Studies					
Bachelors		1	2	1	5
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Media Studies					
Bachelors	17	28	23	33	39
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Painting					
Bachelors	1				
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Painting/Drawing					
Bachelors	3	4			1
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Performing Arts and Social Justice					
Bachelors	1	4	3	11	10
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Philosophy					
Bachelors	14	14	14	16	12
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Politics					
Bachelors	30	35	50	67	55
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Psych. Services					
Bachelors	15	4	9		1
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Psychology					
Bachelors	68	67	63	79	91
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Sociology					
Bachelors	22	33	28	27	39
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Spanish					
Bachelors	8	5	2	7	5
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Sport Management					
Bachelors					
Masters	67	75	118	93	86
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Theology					
Bachelors	4	2	2		
Masters	13	12	23	4	35
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Theology and Religious Studies					
Bachelors			3	4	5
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
BA Visual Arts					
Bachelors	4	7	9		
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Writing (MFA)					
Bachelors					
Masters	25	10	20	29	39
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Biology					
Bachelors	38	33	49	40	41
Masters	2			2	1
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Chemistry					
Bachelors	7	15	9	12	9
Masters	1	4	4	5	3
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Computer Science					
Bachelors	19	19	11	12	6
Masters	9	6	15	11	7
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Computer Science 4+1					
Bachelors				2	2
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Environmental Science and Management					
Bachelors	2	4	6	7	4
Masters	27	16	54	45	35
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Exercise and Sport Science (PTP)					
Bachelors	13	13	8	16	15
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Financial Analysis					
Bachelors					
Masters				9	22
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Internet Engineering					
Bachelors					
Masters					4
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Internet Engineering 4+1					
Bachelors					
Masters					3
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Math					
Bachelors	7	10	8	5	8
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Physics					
Bachelors	3	3	3	5	1
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Accounting					
Bachelors	37	33	32	43	39
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Business Administration					
Bachelors	61	84	83	62	56
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Entrepreneurship					
Bachelors					3
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Executive MBA					
Bachelors					
Masters	25	13			
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Finance					
Bachelors	51	58	59	49	52
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Hospitality Industry Management					
Bachelors	12	15	13	16	22
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
International Business					
Bachelors	48	41	34	39	27
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Management					
Bachelors				1	2
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Marketing					
Bachelors	39	57	43	56	42
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
MBA					
Bachelors					
Masters	201	187	207	148	184
Doctoral					
First Professional					
E/Professional MBA					
Bachelors					
Masters	29	39	35	24	13
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Exec. Mg Dis. Svcs					
Bachelors					
Masters	1			1	
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Nursing					
Bachelors	75	58	47	72	94
Masters	20	25	22	33	40
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Catholic School Leadership					
Bachelors					
Masters	4	8	6	5	5
Doctoral		2	4	1	3
First Professional					
Catholic School Teaching					
Bachelors					
Masters	2		1	3	2
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Counseling/Ed Psych					
Bachelors					
Masters	75	91	56	105	134
Doctoral	9	6	2	1	4
First Professional					
Education					
Bachelors					
Masters	31	63	82	68	94
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Educational Technology					
Bachelors					
Masters	19	9	9	12	5
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
International/Multicultural					
Bachelors					
Masters	4	4	4	3	3
Doctoral	16	15	13	16	12
First Professional					
Learning & Instruction (C&I)					
Bachelors					
Masters	12	3	12	16	16
Doctoral	13	7	5	4	7
First Professional					
Multicultural Literature					
Bachelors					
Masters	1	6	5	1	3
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Organization & Leadership					
Bachelors					
Masters	11	4	14	9	6
Doctoral	19	19	18	18	24
First Professional					
Private School Administration					
Bachelors					
Masters	15	6	2	6	3
Doctoral	5	7	5	3	3
First Professional					
Teaching Reading					
Bachelors					
Masters				7	17
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Teacher Education					
Bachelors					
Masters		43			
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
TESL					
Bachelors					
Masters	12		22	19	16
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Applied Economics					
Bachelors	31	37	44	38	50
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
General Studies					
Bachelors		1			
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Health Services Administration					
Bachelors					
Masters	42	40	4	11	3
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Human Relations and Organization Development					
Bachelors					
Masters	212	75	74	92	67
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Information Systems					
Bachelors	161	190	144	85	65
Masters	40	55	108	70	54
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Law Enforcement Leadership					
Bachelors				14	14
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					

TABLE 3.1: Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Non-Profit Management					
Bachelors					
Masters	16	17	26	8	17
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Organizational Behavior					
Bachelors	137	128	120	90	98
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Public Administration					
Bachelors	47	38	39	47	23
Masters	21	11	75	15	4
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Law (First Professional)					
JD	174	184	206	196	231
LLM	22	21	18	18	19

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 3.2: Cohort Graduation and Retention and Transfer Rates*

THESE DATA ARE FOR: ✖ FALL ENTERING COHORTS ANNUALIZED COHORTS

First-Time Freshmen	SIZE OF COHORT	1ST YEAR RETENTION RATE (FALL TO FALL) (%)	6-YEAR GRADUATION RATE (%)	STILL ENROLLED AT 6 YEARS (%)	TRANFER OUT RATE (%)
Cohort: 1998	645	84.3%	65.9%	3.1%	Not Available
Cohort: 1999	763	82.6%	66.5%	3.3%	Not Available
Cohort: 2000	760	81.6%	65.0%	3.8%	Not Available
Cohort: 2001	845	81.5%			
Cohort: 2002	842	86.1%			
Cohort: 2003	920	88.8%			
Cohort: 2004	932	85.8%			
Cohort: 2005	934	84.0%			

Transfer Students	SIZE OF COHORT	1ST YEAR RETENTION RATE (FALL TO FALL) (%)	6-YEAR GRADUATION RATE (%)	STILL ENROLLED AT 6 YEARS (%)	TRANFER OUT RATE (%)
Cohort: 1998	321	84.1%	65.0%	0%	Not Available
Cohort: 1999	307	79.5%	67.8%	1.3%	Not Available
Cohort: 2000	357	74.8%	63.7%	1.4%	Not Available
Cohort: 2001	339	83.3%			
Cohort: 2002	332	85.9%			
Cohort: 2003	335	81.5%			
Cohort: 2004	370	86.2%			
Cohort: 2005	378	84.9%			

* As of IPEDS date (mid-October of each Fall semester).

TABLE 4.1: Faculty Composition

Full-Time Faculty	2001 N (%)	2002 N (%)	2003 N(%)	2004 N (%)	2005 N(%)	2006 N (%)
	310	326	345	344	348	367
MALE	185 (59.7%)	191 (58.6%)	202 (58.6%)	205 (59.6%)	199 (57.2%)	203 (55.3%)
FEMALE	125 (40.3%)	135 (41.4%)	143 (41.4%)	139 (40.4%)	149 (42.8%)	164 (44.7%)
White, Non-Hispanic	246 (79.4%)	265 (81.3%)	275 (79.7%)	274 (79.7%)	269 (77.3%)	278 (75.7%)
Black, Non-Hispanic	13 (4.2%)	13 (4.0%)	14 (4.1%)	15 (4.4%)	18 (5.2%)	19 (5.2%)
American Indian / Alaskan Native	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Asian / Pacific Islander	20 (6.5%)	27 (8.3%)	21 (6.1%)	24 (7.0%)	26 (7.5%)	33 (9.0%)
Hispanic	23 (7.4%)	17 (5.2%)	23 (6.7%)	20 (5.8%)	24 (6.9%)	24 (6.5%)
Other/ Unspecified	8 (2.6%)	4 (1.2%)	12 (3.5%)	11 (3.2%)	11 (3.2%)	12 (3.3%)

Part-Time Faculty	2001 N (%)	2002 N (%)	2003 N(%)	2004 N (%)	2005 N(%)	2006 N (%)
	361	360	422	472	513	517
MALE	207 (57.3%)	184 (51.1%)	213 (50.5%)	235 (49.8%)	241 (47.0%)	229 (44.3%)
FEMALE	154 (42.7%)	176 (48.9%)	209 (49.5%)	237 (50.2%)	272 (53.0%)	288 (55.7%)
White, Non-Hispanic	178 (49.3%)	170 (47.2%)	200 (47.4%)	277 (58.7%)	254 (49.5%)	326 (63.1%)
Black, Non-Hispanic	6 (1.7%)	7 (1.9%)	13 (3.1%)	14 (3.0%)	12 (2.3%)	12 (2.3%)
American Indian / Alaskan Native	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.7%)	3 (0.6%)	4 (0.8%)	3 (0.6%)
Asian / Pacific Islander	17 (4.7%)	19 (5.3%)	35 (8.3%)	36 (7.6%)	37 (7.2%)	42 (8.1%)
Hispanic	10 (2.8%)	12 (3.3%)	12 (2.8%)	13 (2.8%)	19 (3.7%)	23 (4.4%)
Other/ Unspecified	150 (41.6%)	151 (41.9%)	159 (37.7%)	129 (27.3%)	187 (36.5%)	111 (21.5%)

* As of November 1 of each year

TABLE 4.2: Faculty Headcount by Department/Program

	2002 N (%)	2003 N (%)	2004 N (%)	2005 N (%)	2006 N (%)
Total Faculty					
FULL-TIME	326 (47.5%)	345 (45.0%)	344 (42.2%)	348 (40.4%)	367 (41.5%)
PART-TIME	360 (52.5%)	422 (55.0%)	472 (57.8%)	513 (59.6%)	517 (58.5%)
Communications					
Full-Time	19 (32.8%)	21 (27.6%)	9 (39.1%)	7 (35.0%)	7 (41.2%)
Part-Time	39 (67.2%)	55 (72.4%)	14 (60.9%)	13 (65.0%)	10 (58.8%)
Economics					
Full-Time	8 (72.7%)	11 (73.3%)	8 (61.5%)	10 (50.0%)	11 (55.0%)
Part-Time	3 (27.3%)	4 (26.7%)	5 (38.5%)	10 (50.0%)	9 (45.0%)
English					
Full-Time	9 (75.0%)	6 (75.0%)	8 (66.7%)	8 (61.5%)	9 (69.2%)
Part-Time	3 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)	4 (33.3%)	5 (38.5%)	4 (30.8%)
Exercise and Sports					
Full-Time	5 (38.5%)	4 (22.2%)	6 (24.0%)	7 (43.8%)	7 (33.3%)
Part-Time	8 (61.5%)	14 (77.8%)	19 (76.0%)	9 (56.3%)	14 (66.7%)
Visual and Performing Arts					
Full-Time	12 (37.5%)	14 (34.1%)	15 (29.4%)	16 (26.2%)	N/A (N/A%)
Part-Time	20 (62.5%)	27 (65.9%)	36 (70.6%)	45 (73.8%)	N/A (N/A%)
Visual Arts					
Full-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	9 (50.0%)
Part-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	9 (50.0%)
Performing Arts					
Full-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	7 (17.9%)
Part-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	32 (82.1%)
History					
Full-Time	8 (50.0%)	10 (55.6%)	10 (62.5%)	9 (60.0%)	10 (71.4%)
Part-Time	8 (50.0%)	8 (44.4%)	6 (37.5%)	6 (40.0%)	4 (28.6%)
Philosophy					
Full-Time	8 (57.1%)	10 (55.6%)	10 (45.5%)	10 (41.7%)	10 (50.0%)
Part-Time	6 (42.9%)	8 (44.4%)	12 (54.5%)	14 (58.3%)	10 (50.0%)
Politics					
Full-Time	10 (100.0%)	10 (83.3%)	9 (69.2%)	10 (76.9%)	12 (85.7%)
Part-Time	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)	4 (30.8%)	3 (23.1%)	2 (14.3%)
Psychology					
Full-Time	11 (84.6%)	10 (62.5%)	11 (61.1%)	12 (66.7%)	12 (48.0%)
Part-Time	2 (15.4%)	6 (37.5%)	7 (38.9%)	6 (33.3%)	13 (52.0%)
Sociology					
Full-Time	6 (75.0%)	9 (81.8%)	8 (72.7%)	9 (69.2%)	9 (60.0%)
Part-Time	2 (25.0%)	2 (18.2%)	3 (27.3%)	4 (30.8%)	6 (40.0%)

Table 4.2: Faculty Headcount by Department/Program

	2002 N (%)	2003 N (%)	2004 N (%)	2005 N (%)	2006 N (%)
Biology					
Full-Time	12 (85.7%)	11 (84.6%)	11 (73.3%)	12 (85.7%)	12 (85.7%)
Part-Time	2 (14.3%)	2 (15.4%)	4 (26.7%)	2 (14.3%)	2 (14.3%)
Chemistry					
Full-Time	9 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)	9 (90.0%)	8 (88.9%)	8 (88.9%)
Part-Time	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)
Computer Science					
Full-Time	8 (66.7%)	9 (81.8%)	10 (62.5%)	7 (63.6%)	9 (64.3%)
Part-Time	4 (33.3%)	2 (18.2%)	6 (37.5%)	4 (36.4%)	5 (35.7%)
Environmental Science					
Full-Time	6 (85.7%)	9 (90.0%)	7 (58.3%)	9 (50.0%)	8 (57.1%)
Part-Time	1 (14.3%)	1 (10.0%)	5 (41.7%)	9 (50.0%)	6 (42.9%)
Mathematics					
Full-Time	8 (61.5%)	7 (77.8%)	9 (69.2%)	9 (64.3%)	10 (58.8%)
Part-Time	5 (38.5%)	2 (22.2%)	4 (30.8%)	5 (35.7%)	7 (41.2%)
Physics					
Full-Time	5 (83.3%)	6 (85.7%)	5 (83.3%)	5 (100.0%)	5 (71.4%)
Part-Time	1 (16.7%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)
Theology and Religion					
Full-Time	11 (78.6%)	11 (68.8%)	9 (81.8%)	10 (62.5%)	11 (68.8%)
Part-Time	3 (21.4%)	5 (31.3%)	2 (18.2%)	6 (37.5%)	5 (31.3%)
Modern and Classical Languages					
Full-Time	12 (48.0%)	14 (46.7%)	14 (43.8%)	12 (35.3%)	14 (38.9%)
Part-Time	13 (52.0%)	16 (53.3%)	18 (56.3%)	22 (64.7%)	22 (61.1%)
Sports and Fitness Management					
Full-Time	2 (28.6%)	2 (20.0%)	2 (40.0%)	2 (11.8%)	3 (75.0%)
Part-Time	5 (71.4%)	8 (80.0%)	3 (60.0%)	15 (88.2%)	1 (25.0%)
Architecture					
Full-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	1 (50.0%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)
Part-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	1 (50.0%)	5 (83.3%)	4 (66.7%)
Composition and Rethorics					
Full-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	12 (32.4%)	9 (20.9%)	12 (25.0%)
Part-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	25 (67.6%)	34 (79.1%)	36 (75.0%)
Intensive English					
Full-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	3 (30.0%)	3 (33.3%)	3 (27.3%)
Part-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	7 (70.0%)	6 (66.7%)	8 (72.7%)
Media Studies					
Full-Time	8 (80.0%)	8 (100.0%)	7 (63.6%)	7 (70.0%)	9 (50.0%)
Part-Time	2 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (36.4%)	3 (30.0%)	9 (50.0%)

Table 4.2: Faculty Headcount by Department/Program

	2002 N (%)	2003 N (%)	2004 N (%)	2005 N (%)	2006 N (%)
Master of Fine Arts in Writing					
Full-Time	3 (23.1%)	3 (20.0%)	3 (27.3%)	3 (27.3%)	3 (30.0%)
Part-Time	10 (76.9%)	12 (80.0%)	8 (72.7%)	8 (72.7%)	7 (70.0%)
Asia Pacific					
Full-Time	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Part-Time	3 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (100.0%)	4 (100.0%)	3 (100.0%)
Business					
Full-Time	46 (63.0%)	47 (61.8%)	46 (64.8%)	46 (62.2%)	48 (60.0%)
Part-Time	27 (37.0%)	29 (38.2%)	25 (35.2%)	28 (37.8%)	32 (40.0%)
Counseling Psychology					
Full-Time	5 (26.3%)	6 (27.3%)	7 (19.4%)	7 (23.3%)	7 (20.6%)
Part-Time	14 (73.7%)	16 (72.7%)	29 (80.6%)	23 (76.7%)	27 (79.4%)
International and Multicultural Education					
Full-Time	10 (66.7%)	4 (44.4%)	4 (50.0%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (66.7%)
Part-Time	5 (33.3%)	5 (55.6%)	4 (50.0%)	7 (87.5%)	3 (33.3%)
Catholic Leadership					
Full-Time	3 (42.9%)	2 (40.0%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (75.0%)	N/A (N/A%)
Part-Time	4 (57.1%)	3 (60.0%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (25.0%)	N/A (N/A%)
Learning and Instruction					
Full-Time	8 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	6 (85.7%)	6 (75.0%)
Part-Time	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (25.0%)
Organization and Leadership					
Full-Time	3 (42.9%)	5 (55.6%)	4 (57.1%)	4 (57.1%)	6 (60.0%)
Part-Time	4 (57.1%)	4 (44.4%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	4 (40.0%)
Teacher Education					
Full-Time	5 (17.2%)	12 (26.1%)	9 (19.6%)	12 (28.6%)	9 (25.7%)
Part-Time	24 (82.8%)	34 (73.9%)	37 (80.4%)	30 (71.4%)	26 (74.3%)
Educational Technology					
Full-Time	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Part-Time	3 (100.0%)	3 (100.0%)	3 (100.0%)	3 (100.0%)	3 (100.0%)
Nursing					
Full-Time	18 (51.4%)	19 (48.7%)	21 (38.9%)	27 (40.9%)	25 (32.9%)
Part-Time	17 (48.6%)	20 (51.3%)	33 (61.1%)	39 (59.1%)	51 (67.1%)
Applied Economics					
Full-Time	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (33.3%)
Part-Time	4 (66.7%)	4 (66.7%)	4 (66.7%)	6 (75.0%)	4 (66.7%)
Human Resources and Organizational Development					
Full-Time	3 (18.8%)	3 (18.8%)	3 (20.0%)	3 (30.0%)	3 (18.8%)
Part-Time	13 (81.3%)	13 (81.3%)	12 (80.0%)	7 (70.0%)	13 (81.3%)

Table 4.2: Faculty Headcount by Department/Program

	2002 N (%)	2003 N (%)	2004 N (%)	2005 N (%)	2006 N (%)
Information Systems					
Full-Time	5 (18.5%)	6 (27.3%)	5 (25%)	2 (9.1%)	3 (15.8%)
Part-Time	22 (81.5%)	16 (72.7%)	15 (75%)	20 (90.9%)	16 (84.2%)
Organizational Behavior					
Full-Time	4 (21.1%)	3 (15.0%)	2 (11.8%)	2 (15.4%)	1 (5.0%)
Part-Time	15 (78.9%)	17 (85.0%)	15 (88.2%)	11 (84.6%)	19 (95.0%)
Non-Profit Management/ Public Administration					
Full-Time	3 (11.5%)	3 (10.7%)	3 (9.1%)	3 (9.7%)	3 (8.3%)
Part-Time	23 (88.5%)	25 (89.3%)	30 (90.9%)	28 (90.3%)	33 (91.7%)
CPS Interdisciplinary Studies					
Full-Time	2 (18.2%)	3 (17.6%)	3 (12.0%)	3 (10.0%)	N/A (N/A%)
Part-Time	9 (81.8%)	14 (82.4%)	22 (88.0%)	27 (90.0%)	N/A (N/A%)
Ethics and Writing					
Full-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	3 (30.0%)
Part-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	7 (70.0%)
Project Management					
Full-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	1 (25.0%)
Part-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	3 (75.0%)
Information Security and Assurance					
Full-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	0 (0.0%)
Part-Time	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	N/A (N/A%)	1 (100.0%)
Law					
Full-Time	29 (48.3%)	30 (45.5%)	30 (52.6%)	32 (50.8%)	32 (48.5%)
Part-Time	31 (51.7%)	36 (54.5%)	27 (47.4%)	31 (49.2%)	34 (51.5%)
Other (SI, Yuchengco, Interdisciplinary, Latin America Studies)					
Full-Time	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Part-Time	5 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	7 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 4.3: Staff by Gender and Ethnicity

Full-Time	2002* N (%)	2003* N(%)	2004* N (%)	2005* N(%)	2006* N (%)
	647	677	697	703	713
MALE	286 (44.2%)	300 (44.3%)	300 (43.0%)	299 (42.5%)	310 (43.5%)
FEMALE	361 (55.8%)	377 (55.7%)	397 (57.0%)	404 (57.5%)	403 (56.5%)
White, Non-Hispanic	433 (66.9%)	464 (68.5%)	444 (63.7%)	447 (63.6%)	444 (62.3%)
Black, Non-Hispanic	42 (6.5%)	41 (6.1%)	44 (6.3%)	45 (6.4%)	49 (6.9%)
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.3%)	2 (0.3%)	2 (0.3%)
Asian / Pacific Islander	127 (19.6%)	118 (17.4%)	145 (20.8%)	143 (20.3%)	150 (21.0%)
Hispanic	44 (6.8%)	44 (6.5%)	53 (7.6%)	57 (8.1%)	53 (7.4%)
Other/ Unspecified	0 (0.0%)	9 (1.3%)	9 (1.3%)	9 (1.3%)	15 (2.1%)

Part-Time	2002* N (%)	2003* N(%)	2004* N (%)	2005* N(%)	2006* N (%)
	228	225	211	216	208
MALE	110 (48.2%)	101 (44.9%)	85 (40.3%)	104 (48.1%)	92 (44.2%)
FEMALE	118 (51.8%)	124 (55.1%)	126 (59.7%)	112 (51.9%)	116 (55.8%)
White, Non-Hispanic	87 (38.2%)	51 (22.7%)	51 (24.2%)	59 (27.3%)	84 (40.4%)
Black, Non-Hispanic	8 (3.5%)	5 (2.2%)	4 (1.9%)	6 (2.8%)	9 (4.3%)
American Indian / Alaskan Native	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Asian / Pacific Islander	56 (24.6%)	45 (20.0%)	54 (25.6%)	52 (24.1%)	49 (23.6%)
Hispanic	19 (8.3%)	16 (7.1%)	17 (8.1%)	15 (6.9%)	17 (8.2%)
Other/ Unspecified	58 (25.4%)	108 (48.0%)	85 (40.3%)	84 (38.9%)	49 (23.6%)

* As of November 1 of each year

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 4.4: Full-Time Faculty/Staff Departures Over the Last 5 Years

Table 4.4.A: All Full-Time Faculty*

CATEGORY	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Continuing Faculty	262	84.8%	272	83.4%	283	82.0%	293	85.2%	302	86.8%
New Hires	27	8.7%	31	9.5%	38	11.0%	22	6.4%	27	7.8%
Non-Continuing	17	5.5%	11	3.4%	8	2.3%	17	4.9%	4	1.1%
Retired	2	0.6%	4	1.2%	9	2.6%	6	1.7%	8	2.3%
Moved to Administration	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	3	0.9%	5	1.5%	1	0.3%
Departed during the same academics year as hired	1	0.3%	6	1.8%	4	1.2%	1	0.3%	6	1.7%
TOTAL FACULTY	309	100%	326	100%	345	100%	344	100%	348	100%

* As of November 1 of each year

Table 4.4.B: Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty*

CATEGORY	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Continuing Faculty	249	90.5%	250	88.3%	251	86.9%	255	90.4%	260	91.2%
New Hires	16	5.8%	18	6.4%	23	8.0%	11	3.9%	13	4.6%
Non-Continuing	8	2.9%	8	2.8%	4	1.4%	6	2.1%	2	0.7%
Retired	2	0.7%	4	1.4%	9	3.1%	6	2.1%	8	2.8%
Moved to Administration	0	0.0%	2	0.7%	2	0.7%	4	1.4%	1	0.4%
Departed during the same academics year as hired	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
TOTAL FACULTY	275	100%	283	100%	289	100%	282	100%	285	100%

* As of November 1 of each year

Table 4.4: Full-Time Faculty/Staff Departures Over the Last 5 Years (continued)

Table 4.4.C: Term Faculty*

CATEGORY	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Continuing Faculty	13	38.2%	22	51.2%	32	57.1%	38	61.3%	42	66.7%
New Hires	11	32.4%	13	30.2%	15	26.8%	11	17.7%	14	22.2%
Non-Continuing	9	26.5%	3	7.0%	4	7.1%	11	17.7%	2	3.2%
Moved to Administration	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%
Departed during the same academics year as hired	1	2.9%	5	11.6%	4	7.1%	1	1.6%	5	7.9%
TOTAL FACULTY	34	100%	43	100%	56	100%	62	100%	63	100%

* As of November 1 of each year

Table 4.4.D: Full-Time Staff*

CATEGORY	2001-02		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number Continuing in this period	531	82.8%	557	82.3%	572	82.1%	568	80.8%	546	76.6%
Number of New Hires in this Period	62	9.7%	77	11.4%	71	10.2%	81	11.5%	93	13.0%
Number of Retirements in this Period	1	0.2%	2	0.3%	1	0.1%	2	0.3%	2	0.3%
Number of Departures in this Period	47	7.3%	41	6.1%	53	7.6%	52	7.4%	72	10.1%
TOTAL NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED IN THIS PERIOD	641	100.0%	677	100.0%	697	100.0%	703	100.0%	713	100.0%

* As of November 1 of each year

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 5.1: Information and Computing Resources

Libraries	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
TOTAL LIBRARY COLLECTIONS	**1,743,816**	**1,778,054**	**1,810,703**	**1,842,378**	**1,867,331**
Books	656,529 (37.6%)	668,199 (37.6%)	681,395 (37.6%)	695,862 (37.8%)	709,993 (38%)
Periodicals	125,336 (7.2%)	128,000 (7.2%)	130,250 (7.2%)	132,316 (7.2%)	134,273 (7.2%)
Electronic Resources	3,419 (0.7%)	13,069 (0.7%)	13,209 (0.7%)	23,953 (1.3%)	28,723 (1.5%)
eBooks	2,656	12,246	12,246	23,354	27,633
eJournals	361	361	410	440	920
Reference Database	122	122	160	159	170
Miscellaneous Electronics Resources	280	340	393	N/A	N/A
Audiovisual Materials	1,377 (0.1%)	1,303 (0.1%)	1,399 (0.1%)	2,747 (0.1%)	2,781 (0.1%)
Audiocassettes	334	445	445	445	445
Videos	1,043	858	954	1,169	1,167
CDs	N/A	N/A	N/A	121	900
DVDs	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,012	269
Government Documents	241,642 (13.3%)	239,921 (13.5%)	241,599 (13.3%)	244,421 (13.3%)	248,119 (13.3%)
Microform Units	713,454 (40.9%)	725,478 (40.8%)	740,650 (40.9%)	740,863 (40.2%)	741,178 (39.7%)
Maps	2,059 (0.1%)	2,084 (0.1%)	2,201 (0.1%)	2,216 (0.1%)	2,264 (0.1%)
TOTAL $ SPENT ON LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS	**$1,687,751**	**$1,739,940**	**$1,826,892**	**$1,672,069**	**$1,784,792**

Computing & Information Systems	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Number of Computer-Equipped Classrooms*	18	30	51	59	63
Total Number of Computer Workstations Available to Students**	N/A	602	658	644	655
Total Number of Workstations Available to Faculty/Staff***	N/A	2,755	2,983	3,068	3,165
Networked	N/A	2,755	2,983	3,068	3,165
Not Networked	N/A	0	0	0	0
TOTAL BOOK (INVENTORY) VALUE OF COMPUTING AND INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT	**$4,283,617**	**$4,379,408**	**$4,650,152**	**$4,364,453**	**$4,264,254**

* Number includes classrooms with fixed computer projection equipment only. Labs not included. Classrooms where portable equipment may be brought in not included.

** Number reflects computers in USF Labs

*** Number reflects full USF computer inventory

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 5.2: Physical Resources—Current Year

Physical Space

1. On-Campus	SIZE – NET ASSIGNABLE AREA (IN SQUARE FEET)	NUMBER OF ROOMS	NUMBER OF STATIONS*
a. Classroom	82,429	105	Not Available
b. Class Laboratory	20,040	32	Not Available
c. Special-Class Laboratory	6,008	6	Not Available
d. Individual-Study Laboratory	3,556	4	Not Available
e. Non-Class (Research) Laboratory	13,978	45	Not Available
f. Office	213,885	1,065	Not Available
g. Study (Library)	37,004	51	Not Available
h. Special Use	122,194	74	Not Available
i. General Use	135,154	153	Not Available
j. Support	0	0	Not Available
k. Healthcare	0	0	Not Available
Patient Care Rooms	*0*	*0*	*Not Available*
Other	*0*	*0*	*Not Available*
l. Residential	315,375	1,611	Not Available

1. Other Locations	SIZE – NET ASSIGNABLE AREA (IN SQUARE FEET)	NUMBER OF ROOMS	NUMBER OF STATIONS*
Describe: Supply, Storage, Archives	39,156	126	Not Available

	DOLLARS
3. Total Replacement Cost for Total Physical Plant (or Insured value)	**$496,867,762**

4. Equipment	
a. Book Value	Not Available
b. Replacement Cost (or insured value)	$263,173,185

* Throughout the university, there are 655 computer workstations available to students and 3,068 computer workstations available to faculty/staff.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 5.3: Sources of Revenue

Private Institutions	FY 2002 AMOUNT	%	FY 2003 AMOUNT	%	FY 2004 AMOUNT	%	FY 2005 AMOUNT	%	FY 2006 AMOUNT	%
TUITION AND FEES*	132,256,000	71.2%	145,456,000	72.6%	159,993,000	67.0%	173,080,000	70.3%	187,974,000	66.8%
GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Federal	0		0		0		0		0	
State	0		0		0		0		0	
Local	0		0		0		0		0	
GRANTS AND CONTRACTS	10,618,000	5.7%	10,816,000	5.4%	11,148,000	4.7%	10,285,000	4.2%	8,589,000	3.1%
Unrestricted	10,618,000		10,816,000		11,148,000		10,285,000		8,589,000	
Temporarily Restricted	0		0		0		0		0	
Permanently Restricted	0		0		0		0		0	
CONTRIBUTIONS	26,750,000	14.4%	19,444,000	9.7%	21,078,000	8.8%	15,555,000	6.3%	26,337,000	9.4%
Unrestricted	12,233,000		10,348,000		6,558,000		9,488,000		7,086,000	
Temporarily Restricted	11,440,000		2,169,000		10,416,000		2,630,000		9,292,000	
Permanently Restricted	3,077,000		6,927,000		4,104,000		3,437,000		9,959,000	
INVESTMENT & ENDOWMENT INCOME	4,668,000	2.5%	2,577,000	1.3%	2,666,000	1.1%	3,407,000	1.4%	5,653,000	2.0%
Unrestricted	4,622,000		2,467,000		2,544,000		3,229,000		5,157,000	
Temporarily Restricted	16,000		0		0		0		1,000	
Permanently Restricted	30,000		110,000		122,000		178,000		495,000	
SALES AND SERVICE	20,554,000	11.1%	21,577,000	10.8%	22,320,000	9.3%	23,123,000	9.4%	24,884,000	8.8%
Educational Activities	0		0		0		0		0	
Auxiliary Enterprises	20,554,000		21,577,000		22,320,000		23,123,000		24,884,000	
Hospitals	0		0		0		0		0	
Independent Operations Revenue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER REVENUE	2,457,000		3,119,000		1,600,000		5,209,000		5,137,000	
GAINS (LOSSES) ON INVESTMENTS	(11,581,000)	-6.2%	(2,733,000)	-1.4%	19,989,000	8.4%	15,584,000	6.3%	17,495,000	6.2%
CHANGE IN ACTUARIAL VALUE SPLIT INTEREST AGREEMENT **		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1,610,000	0.7%	(16,000)	-0.0%
CHANGE IN BENEFIT (LIABILITY) UNDER INTEREST RATE SWAP AGREEMENT		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	(1,560,000)	-0.6%	5,483,000	1.9%
TOTAL REVENUES	185,722,000	100.0%	200,256,000	100.0%	238,794,000	100.0%	246,293,000	100.0%	281,536,000	100.0%

* Does not include scholarships and fellowships, per independent auditors' report.   ** Included in Gains (Losses) on Investments' for prior years to 2005

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 5.4: Operating Expenditures

EDUCATION AND GENERAL	FY 2002 AMOUNT	%	FY 2003 AMOUNT	%	FY 2004 AMOUNT	%	FY 2005 AMOUNT	%	FY 2006 AMOUNT	%
Instruction	75,570,000	41.9%	80,168,000	41.2%	88,059,000	41.8%	90,153,000	40.8%	93,270,000	39.4%
Research	854,000	0.5%	889,000	0.5%	1,218,000	0.6%	1,170,000	0.5%	1,024,000	0.4%
Public Service	757,000	0.4%	791,000	0.4%	951,000	0.5%	1,024,000	0.5%	1,290,000	0.5%
Academic Support	16,460,000	9.1%	17,987,000	9.3%	19,042,000	9.1%	24,521,000	11.1%	25,061,000	10.6%
Student Services	14,550,000	8.1%	15,321,000	7.9%	16,375,000	7.8%	18,477,000	8.4%	20,674,000	8.7%
Institutional Support	20,697,000	11.5%	22,167,000	11.4%	25,183,000	12.0%	26,861,000	12.1%	29,622,000	12.5%
Scholarships and fellowships	29,048,000		33,637,000		34,185,000		35,498,000		39,959,000	
Sponsored	*10,919,000*	16.1%	*11,246,000*	17.3%	*9,485,000*	16.2%	*8,204,000*	16.1%	*10,307,000*	16.9%
Unsponsored	*18,129,000*		*22,391,000*		*24,700,000*		*27,294,000*		*29,652,000*	
Operation & Maintenance of Plant*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Auxiliary Enterprises	20,736,000	11.5%	23,077,000	11.9%	23,726,000	11.3%	23,180,000	10.5%	25,385,000	10.7%
Other (specify)	1,791,000	1.0%	313,000	0.2%	1,756,000	0.8%	245,000	0.1%	228,000	0.1%
TOTAL EXPENSES	**180,463,000**	**100.0%**	**194,350,000**	**100.0%**	**210,495,000**	**100.0%**	**221,129,000**	**100.0%**	**236,513,000**	**100.0%**

CHANGE IN NET ASSETS	FY 2002 AMOUNT	%	FY 2003 AMOUNT	%	FY 2004 AMOUNT	%	FY 2005 AMOUNT	%	FY 2006 AMOUNT	%
Unrestricted	7,782,000	148.0%	358,000	6.1%	19,654,000	69.5%	25,289,000	76.3%	31,144,000	72.7%
Temporarily Restricted	(5,111,000)	-97.2%	(61,000)	-1.0%	3,060,000	10.8%	4,087,000	12.3%	895,000	2.1%
Permanently Restricted	2,588,000	49.2%	5,609,000	95.0%	5,585,000	19.7%	3,775,000	11.4%	10,805,000	25.2%

* Operations & Maintenance of Plant Expenditures are included as a fraction in each of the other categories named above.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 5.5: Assets and Liabilities

Assets	FY 2002 AMOUNT	%	FY 2003 AMOUNT	%	FY 2004 AMOUNT	%	FY 2005 AMOUNT	%	FY 2006 AMOUNT	%
Cash	14,157,000	3.5%	12,804,000	2.9%	17,088,000	3.6%	24,096,000	4.7%	22,102,000	3.7%
Accounts Receivable	37,081,000	23.6%	36,508,000	24.6%	42,249,000	25.4%	42,482,000	21.5%	50,160,000	23.2%
Inventories	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Prepaid Expenses	4,366,000	1.1%	10,420,000	2.3%	10,425,000	2.2%	8,592,000	1.7%	9,357,000	1.6%
Notes Receivable	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Investments	157,426,000	38.6%	148,492,000	33.4%	166,642,000	34.9%	197,307,000	38.2%	216,060,000	35.8%
Plant and Land	195,233,000	47.8%	210,413,000	47.3%	224,168,000	46.9%	244,144,000	47.3%	263,949,000	43.7%
Other: Restricted Investments and Benefit under Interest Rate Swap Agreements	0	0.0%	26,592,000	6.0%	17,457,000	3.7%	6,000	0.0%	41,974,000	7.0%
TOTAL ASSETS	408,263,000	100.0%	445,229,000	100.0%	478,029,000	100.0%	516,627,000	100.0%	603,602,000	100.0%

Liabilities	FY 2002 AMOUNT	%	FY 2003 AMOUNT	%	FY 2004 AMOUNT	%	FY 2005 AMOUNT	%	FY 2006 AMOUNT	%
Accounts Payable	18,995,000	13.3%	16,653,000	9.6%	21,524,000	12.1%	25,787,000	14.1%	27,840,000	12.2%
Notes Payable	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Deferred Revenue*	7,916,000	5.6%	9,131,000	5.3%	9,963,000	5.6%	11,288,000	6.2%	8,843,000	3.9%
Government Advances for Students Loans	9,001,000	6.3%	8,696,000	5.0%	9,693,000	5.4%	9,508,000	5.2%	9,649,000	4.2%
Other: Line of Credit	5,500,000	3.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3,502,000	1.9%	234,000	0.1%
Long Term	100,895,000	70.9%	138,887,000	80.1%	136,688,000	76.8%	133,230,000	72.7%	180,880,000	79.5%
Bonds Payable	100,895,000	70.9%	138,887,000	80.1%	136,688,000	76.8%	133,230,000	72.7%	180,880,000	79.5%
Notes Payable**	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pensions Payable	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other (specify)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Deposits Held for Others	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Students Organizations	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL LIABILITIES	142,307,000	100.0%	173,367,000	100.0%	177,868,000	100.0%	183,315,000	100.0%	227,446,000	100.0%

TABLE 5.5: Assets and Liabilities (continued)

Net Assets	FY 2002		FY 2003		FY 2004		FY 2005		FY 2006	
	AMOUNT	%	AMOUNT	%	AMOUNT	%	AMOUNT	%	AMOUNT	%
Unrestricted	168,248,000	63.3%	167,290,000	61.5%	186,944,000	62.3%	212,233,000	63.7%	243,377,000	64.7%
Temporarily Restricted	21,953,000	8.3%	22,892,000	8.4%	25,952,000	8.6%	30,039,000	9.0%	30,934,000	8.2%
Permanently Restricted	75,755,000	28.5%	81,680,000	30.0%	87,265,000	29.1%	91,040,000	27.3%	101,845,000	27.1%
TOTAL NET ASSETS	265,956,000	100.0%	271,862,000	100.0%	300,161,000	100.0%	333,312,000	100.0%	376,156,000	100.0%

* Deferred Tuition was changed to Deferred Revenue

** If Notes Payable exists, they are too small to break them out

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 5.7: Endowment Values and Performance

	MARKET VALUE OF ENDOWMENT [$]	MARKET VALUE OF QUASI-ENDOWMENT* [%]	DIVIDENDS & INTEREST [$]	ENDOWMENT SPENDING [$]	GAINS & TRANFERS [$]	TOTAL ANNUAL RETURN ON INVESTMENTS** [$]
2001–2002	132,462,000	45.91%	3,079,950	7,448,051	3,065,066	-7,196,750
2002–2003	132,662,703	45.68%	2,202,600	7,325,346	8,814,618	-1,307,545
2003–2004	159,219,000	45.98%	2,140,698	5,104,885	9,006,614	19,301,719
2004–2005	170,578,000	49.79%	2,305,893	5,505,222	5,028,813	16,164,180
2005–2006	190,117,000	53.22%	2,883,931	6,516,094	7,397,120	19,972,371

* Created by the university at discretion of the board

** Includes dividends, interest, realized and unrealized gain and losses.

INCLUDE THE INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION OF ENDOWMENT AND QUASI-ENDOWMENT, THE ENDOWMENT POLICY, AND ANY CHANGES MADE TO THE POLICY DURING THE 5-YEAR PERIOD.

The University's endowment consists of assets that are permanently restricted by the donor, with the principal gift kept in perpetuity and the income available to support activities of the University as designated by the donor. The quasi-endowment represents assets that have been designated for specific purposes by action of the Board of Trustees or by management.

Spending distributions are determined annually, and are calculated at 4.5% of the rolling 3-year endowment pool market value as of December 31st. The spending distribution decreased by 0.25% during fiscal 2004, consistent with industry best practices.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 6.1: Key Undergraduate Educational Operations Ratios

Admissions*	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Admit/Apply	2,960/3,590 (82.5%)	3,798/4,634 (82.0%)	3,961/5,338 (74.2%)	4,376/6,090 (71.9%)	5,132/7,105 (72.2%)
Enroll/Admit	844/2,960 (28.5%)	921/3,798 (24.2%)	933/3,961 (23.6%)	934/4,376 (21.3%)	1,079/5,132 (21%)

Retention*	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1st Year Freshman Retention	2002 Cohort 86.1%	2003 Cohort 88.8%	2004 Cohort 85.8%	2005 Cohort 84.0%	
Freshmen 6-year Completion to Graduation	1996 Cohort 66.9%	1997 Cohort 65.4%	1998 Cohort 65.9%	1999 Cohort 66.5%	2000 Cohort 65.0%
Transfer 1st Year Retention	2002 Cohort 85.9%	2003 Cohort 81.5%	2004 Cohort 86.2%	2005 Cohort 84.9%	

Instruction (Undergraduate)	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
FTE Student / FTE Faculty Ratio	15:1	15:1	15:1	15:1	16:1
% Credits Taught by Part-Time Faculty	37.7%	38.8%	43.8%	45.0%	42.2%
% Credits Taught Off-Campus	5.6%	5.3%	5.4%	4.8%	3.3%
% Credits Taught by Distance Education	0.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%
Classes with 1-9 Students**	105	103	100	103	94
Classes with 10-20 Students**	261	279	268	264	239
Classes with 21-35 Students**	187	168	138	156	194
Classes with 36-50 Students**	94	89	147	147	143
Classes with 50+ Students**	29	25	19	23	27
Average Credit Load per Student	15.8	15.7	15.7	15.6	15.6
Average GPA***	3.05	3.06	3.08	3.04	3.05

* As of Fall Census Date, First-Time Freshmen Only

** Data as of end of term. Courses are LEC, only, with level from 1 to 4. Section enrollment counts exclude coop BFA (AA) and JDP (CCA) courses.

*** Cumulative at the end of the fall semester

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 6.2: Key Asset and Maintenance Ratios

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY HEADCOUNT*	**326**	**345**	**344**	**348**	**367**
Faculty 59 and Older	81	92	98	109	106
Faculty ≥ 59 / Total Faculty	24.8%	26.7%	28.5%	31.3%	28.9%
O&M EXPENDITURES ($)	**$21,691,000**	**$23,424,000**	**$28,021,000**	**$31,765,000**	**$35,117,000**
TOTAL E&G EXPENDITURES ($)	**$180,153,000**	**$194,326,000**	**$210,495,000**	**$222,687,000**	**$236,513,000**
O&M / E&G	12.0%	12.1%	13.3%	14.3%	14.8%
TOTAL EQUIPMENT EXPENDITURES	**$6,211,000**	**$7,745,000**	**$5,961,000**	**$3,181,000**	**$18,361,000**
TOTAL BOOK VALUE OF EQUIPMENT ($)**	**$18,653,000**	**$22,046,000**	**$22,114,000**	**$19,330,000**	**$32,018,000**
Expenditures / Book Value	33.3%	35.1%	27.0%	16.5%	57.3%

* As of November 1 of each year

** At end of fiscal year, May 31

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

TABLE 6.3: Key Financial Ratios

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006
RETURN ON NET ASSETS	2.0%	2.2%	10.4%	11.0%	12.9%
Change in Net Assets / Total Net Assets at the beginning of fiscal year					
NET INCOME RATIO	4.1%	0.2%	10.0%	12.4%	14.5%
Change in Unrestricted Net Assets / Total Unrestricted Revenues					
OPERATING INCOME RATIO	1.11	1.04	1.05	1.09	1.09
Operating Income / Total Expenses					
VIABILITY RATIO	0.99	0.93	0.96	0.99	1.04
Expendable Net Assets / Long Term Debt					
INSTRUCTIONAL EXPENSE PER STUDENT	$9,767	$10,362	$11,382	$11,904	$11,602
NET TUITION PER STUDENT	$14,538	$14,824	$16,261	$17,354	$18,411

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SUMMARY TABLE 1: Headcount Enrollment by Level (Fall Term)*

	TOTAL HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT	LOWER DIVISION HEADCOUNT	UPPER DIVISION HEADCOUNT	GRADUATE HEADCOUNT	POST-BACCALAUREATE (NON-GRADUATE) HEADCOUNT	NON-DEGREE HEADCOUNT	TOTAL FTE ENROLLMENT
2002	8,194	1,946	2,623	3,452	47	126	7,545
		23.7%	32.0%	42.1%	0.6%	1.5%	
2003	8,159	2,027	2,560	3,421	20	131	7,554
		24.8%	31.4%	41.9%	0.2%	1.6%	
2004	8,271	2,099	2,743	3,268	36	125	7,602
		25.4%	33.2%	39.5%	0.4%	1.5%	
2005	8,457	2,273	2,848	3,192	24	120	7,819
		26.9%	33.7%	37.7%	0.3%	1.4%	
2006	8,549	2,256	2,989	3,143	22	139	7,950
		26.4%	35.0%	36.8%	0.3%	1.6%	

* As of IPEDS Reporting Date, Mid-October each year

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SUMMARY TABLE 2: Headcount Enrollment by Status and Location (Fall Term)*

	TOTAL HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME	ON-CAMPUS LOCATION	OFF-CAMPUS LOCATION
2002	8,194	7,221	973	6,776	1,418
		88.1%	11.9%	82.7%	17.3%
2003	8,159	7,252	907	7,010	1,149
		88.9%	11.1%	85.9%	14.1%
2004	8,271	7,267	1,004	7,299	972
		87.9%	12.1%	88.2%	11.8%
2005	8,457	7,500	957	7,488	969
		88.7%	11.3%	88.5%	11.5%
2006	8,549	7,650	899	7,696	853
		89.5%	10.5%-	90.0%	10.0%

* As of IPEDS Reporting Date, Mid-October each year

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SUMMARY TABLE 3: Degrees and Certificates Granted by Level (Academic Year)

	TOTAL DEGREES GRANTED	LESS THAN 2-YEAR	ASSOCIATE	BACHELOR	POST-BACCALAUREATE	MASTER	DOCTORATE	LAW
2002	2326			1113		977	62	174
				47.9%		42.0%	2.7%	7.5%
2003	2292			1192		860	56	184
				52.0%		37.5%	2.4%	8.0%
2004	2464			1164	1	1046	47	206
				47.2%	0.0%	42.5%	1.9%	8.4%
2005	2281			1147		895	43	196
				50.3%		39.2%	1.9%	8.6%
2006	2407			1152		971	53	231
				47.9%		40.3%	2.2%	9.6%

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SUMMARY TABLE 4: Faculty by Employment Status*

	TOTAL FACULTY HEADCOUNT	FULL-TIME FACULTY	PART-TIME FACULTY	TOTAL FACULTY FTE
2002	686	326	360	446
2003	767	345	422	485.7
2004	816	344	472	501.3
2005	861	348	513	519
2006	884	367	517	539.3

* As of November 1 of each year

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SUMMARY TABLE 5: Key Financial Ratios

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006
RETURN ON NET ASSETS Change in Net Assets/Total Net Assets at the beginning of fiscal year	2.0%	2.2%	10.4%	11.0%	12.9%
NET INCOME RATIO Change in Unrestricted Net Assets/Total Unrestricted Revenues	4.1%	0.2%	10.0%	12.4%	14.5%
OPERATING INCOME RATIO Operating Income/Total Expenses	1.11	1.04	1.05	1.09	1.09
VIABILITY RATIO Expendable Net Assets/Long Term Debt	0.99	0.93	0.96	0.99	1.04
INSTRUCTIONAL EXPENSE PER STUDENT	$9,767	$10,362	$11,382	$11,904	$11,602
NET TUITION PER STUDENT	$14,538	$14,824	$16,261	$17,354	$18,411

TAB 4

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL:	Yes	Online Catalog				
FOR GENERAL EDUCATION IF AN UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION: • Core Curriculum • Cultural Diversity Graduation Requirement • Service Learning Graduation Requirement	Yes Yes Yes	Catalog & Website [www.usfca.edu/CORE]				
SOBAM B.S.B.A. in Accounting	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Experience Capstone courses	Instructor of record		AY 01-02 (AACSB)
SOBAM B.S.B.A. in Business Administration	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone courses	Instructor of record		AY 01-02 (AACSB)
SOBAM B.S.B.A. in Finance	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Experience Capstone courses	Instructor of record		AY 01-02 (AACSB)
SOBAM B.S.B.A. in Entrepreneurship	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone courses	Instructor of record		
SOBAM B.S.B.A. in Hospitality Industry Management	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Experience Capstone courses	Instructor of record		AY 01-02 (AACSB)
SOBAM B.S.B.A. in International Business	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Experience Capstone courses	Instructor of record		AY 01-02 (AACSB)

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SOBAM B.S.B.A. in Marketing	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Experience Capstone courses	Instructor of record		AY 01-02 (AACSB)
SOBAM B.S.B.A. in Management	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone courses	Instructor of record		
SOBAM Master of Business Administration	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone Courses			AY 01-02 (AACSB)
SOBAM M.B.A.E. in Business Administration	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone Project			AY 01-02 (AACSB) AY 03-04
CPS Bachelor of Science in Applied Economics	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone Course			AY 04-05
CPS Bachelor of Science in American Studies	Yes	Online Catalog				AY 09-10
CPS Bachelor of Public Administration	Yes	Online Catalog	Field project Capstone course	Instructor of record and program directors Instructor of record	Results used to modify program content	AY 04-05

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
CPS Bachelor of Science in Information Systems	Yes	Online Catalog	Community service project	Instructor of record	Feedback to students on project success	AY 06-07
CPS Bachelor of Science in Organizational Behavior and Leadership	Yes	Online Catalog	Pre- and post-program self-assessment of student learning (achievement of learning objectives) and development of skills	Program Director & Associate Director	Data used to refine and update program & course content	AY 03-04
CPS Master of Science in Organization Development	Yes	Online Catalog	Culminating Project course	Instructor of record/Project advisor	Findings used to assess students' achievements and adjust curriculum	AY 06-07
CPS Master of Nonprofit Administration	Yes	Online Catalog	Client Project or Thesis	Project/Thesis Committee	Assess students' achievements	AY 07-08
CPS Master of Science in Project Management	Yes	Online Catalog	Culminating project portfolio course	Instructor of record & Program Director	Findings used to assess students' achievements and adjust curriculum	AY 09-10

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
CPS Master of Science in Information Security	Yes	Online Catalog				AY 09-10
CPS Master of Public Administration	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone course	Instructor of record and program Director	Findings used to assess students' achievements and adjust curriculum	AY 04-05
CPS Master of Science in Information Systems	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone course			AY 06-07
CAS B.A. in Asian Studies	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone project			AY 09-10
CAS Master of Asian Pacific Studies	Yes	Online Catalog				November 1997 AY 09-10
CAS B.S. in Biology	Yes	Online Catalog				April 2007 AY 13-14
CAS M.S. in Biology	Yes	Online Catalog	Thesis	Members of thesis committee	Work is submitted for publication	April 2007 AY 13-14
CAS B.S. in Chemistry	Yes	Online Catalog				March 2005 AY 11-12

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
CAS M.S. in Chemistry	Yes	Online Catalog				March 2005 AY 11–12
CAS B.A. in Communication Studies	Yes	Online Catalog				February 1995 AY 07–08
CAS B.S. in Computer Science	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Team Project			November 1997 AY 07–08
CAS M.S. in Computer Science	Yes	Online Catalog	Master's Project			November 1997 AY 07–08
CAS M.S. In Internet Engineering	Yes	Online Catalog	Master's Project			AY 07–08
CAS Joint B.A./M.A. in Computer Science	Yes	Online Catalog				AY 07–08
CAS Joint M.S. in Computer Science /MBA	Yes	Online Catalog				AY 07–08
CAS B.A. in Economics	Yes	Online Catalog				March 2007 AY 13–14
CAS M.A. in Economics	Yes	Online Catalog	Comprehensive Exam	Two faculty members grade the exam	Student need to pass exam in order to graduate	March 2007 AY 13–14

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
CAS Joint B.A./M.A. in Economics	Yes	Online Catalog				March 2007 AY 13-14
CAS M.A. International and Development Economics	Yes	Online Catalog	Graduate Seminar

Project | Instructor of record.

Advisor and entire faculty | Grade awarded by instructor of record

Grade awarded by advisor | March 2007 AY 13-14 |
CAS M.A. Financial Analysis	Yes	Online Catalog	Comprehensive Exam (CFA)	Professional association	Professional accreditation is granted to those who pass exam	March 2007 AY 13-14
CAS B.A. in English	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior seminar in literature Senior seminar in writing	Instructor of record		September 2001 AY 08-09
CAS B.A. in Environmental Studies	Yes	Online Catalog	Capstone practicum Self-report on achievement of learning outcomes	Instructor of record and members of advisory board	Findings are used to modify curriculum	AY 12-13
CAS B.S. in Environmental Science	Yes	Online Catalog	Research project			April 2006 AY 12-13
CAS M.S. Environmental Management	Yes	Online Catalog	Master's Project			April 2006 AY 12-13

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
CAS B.S. in Exercise and Sport Science	Yes	Online Catalog				April 2005 AY 11-12
CAS M.A. in Sport Management	Yes	Online Catalog	Project			AY 07-08
CAS B.A. in History	Yes	Online Catalog	Seminar in area of emphasis Honors Senior Thesis (optional)	Instructor of record	Demonstrate completion of requirements	April 2005 AY 11-12
CAS B.A. in International Studies	Yes	Online Catalog				AY 09-10
CAS B.A. in Latin American Studies	Yes	Online Catalog				AY 09-10
CAS B.S. in Mathematics	Yes	Online Catalog				April 2004 AY 10-11
CAS B.A. in Media Studies	Yes	Online Catalog				February 1995 AY 07-08
CAS B.A. in French	Yes	Online Catalog				October 1994 AY 09-10
CAS B.A. in Spanish	Yes	Online Catalog				October 1994 AY 09-10
CAS B.A. in Japanese	Yes	Online Catalog				AY 09-10

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
CAS B.A. in Philosophy	Yes	Online Catalog				April 2006 AY 12-13
CAS B.S. in Physics	Yes	Online Catalog				March 2004 AY 10-11
CAS B.A. in Politics	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Honors Thesis (optional)			March 2006 AY 12-13
CAS B.A. in Psychology	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Honors course			March 2004 AY 10-11
CAS B.A. in Sociology	Yes	Online Catalog				April 2006 AY 12-13
CAS B.A. in Theology and Religious Studies	Yes	Online Catalog	Senior Capstone Synthesis Paper	Instructor of record	Department analyzes results and decides on changes to program	April 2004 AY 10-11
CAS M.A. in Theology	Yes	Online Catalog	Comprehensive Seminar	Instructor of record	Department analyzes results and decides on changes to program	April 2004 AY 10-11
CAS B.A. in Visual Arts	Yes	Online Catalog				AY 08-09

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
CAS B.A. in Architecture and Community Design	Yes	Online Catalog	Internship	Instructor of record	Contract and written assignments used in discussions and program updating	AY 08-09
CAS B.A. in Performing Arts and Social Justice	Yes	Online Catalog	Group-Designed Performance			AY 08-09
CAS M.F.A. in Writing	Yes	Online Catalog	Major project	Instructor of record and second reader	Completes graduation requirements	April 2007 AY 13-14
SOL J.D. program	Yes	Catalog (SOL)	Upper Level Research and Writing Project Bar Exam			April 2001 (ABA) AY 06-07
SOL Masters of Law in International Transactions & Comparative Law	No					
SOL Masters of Law in Intellectual Property and Technology Law	No					

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTER-PRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SON B.S.N.	Yes	Catalog	Clinical Capstone Course HESI (comprehensive exam) NCLEX (licensure exam) Public health nurse license			Spring 2003 (CCNE) Spring 2005 (CA BRN) Program review: AY 08-09
SON M.S.N. in Advanced Practice	Yes	Catalog	Comprehensive Exam Clinical Outcome Mastery Advanced Practice Nurse certification			Spring 2003 (CCNE) Spring 2005 (CA BRN) Program review: AY 07-08
SON M.S.N. in Healthcare Systems Management (for the R.N.)	Yes	Catalog	Comprehensive Exam Nursing Practicum & Final Project			Spring 2003 (CCNE) Program review: AY 07-08
SON M.E.O. in Healthcare Systems Management (for the Non-Nurse)	Yes	Catalog	Comprehensive Exam Nursing Practicum & Final Project HESI (comprehensive exam) Public Health Nurse License NCLEX (licensure exam)			Spring 2003 (CCNE) Spring 2000 & 2005 (CA BRN) Program review: AY 08-09

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SON M.S.N. in Clinical Nurse Leader (for the Non-Nurse)	Yes	Catalog	Comprehensive Exam Nursing CNL Internship HESI (comprehensive exam) Public Health License NCLEX (licensure exam)			Spring 2005 & Summer 2006 (CA BRN) Spring 2003 (CCNE) Program review: AY 07-08
SON M.S.N. in Clinical Nurse Leader (for the RN)	Yes	Catalog	Comprehensive Exam Nursing CNL Internship			Spring 2003 (CCNE) Program review: AY 07-08
SON M.S.N. / M.P.A.	Yes	Catalog	Comprehensive Exam Nursing Practicum & Final Project			Spring 2003 (CCNE) Spring 2000 & 2005 (CA BRN)
SON M.S.N. / M.S.I.S.	Yes	Catalog	Comprehensive Exam Nursing Practicum & Final Project			Spring 2003 (CCNE) Spring 2000 & 2005 (CA BRN)

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SOE M.A. in Catholic School Leadership	Yes	Catalog	Culminating Project	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	AY 06–07
SOE M.A. in Catholic School Teaching with emphasis in Religious Education [new title]	Yes	Catalog	Culminating Project	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	AY 06–07
SOE M.A. in Catholic School Teaching	Yes	Catalog	Culminating Project	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	AY 06–07
SOE M.A. in Counseling Psychology	Yes	Catalog	State licensure Supervisor evaluations	Program coordinators	Determines completion of program	AY 06–07
SOE M.A. in Digital Media and Learning [new title]	Yes	Catalog	Culminating Project	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	AY 03–04
SOE M.A. in International and Multicultural Education	Yes	Catalog	Thesis	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	CTC 2002 Program Review: AY 05–06
SOE M.A. in Learning and Instruction	Yes	Catalog	Thesis	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	AY 05–06

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SOE M.A. in Multicultural Literature for Children and Young Adults	Yes	Catalog	Thesis	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	2005
SOE M.A. Organization and Leadership	Yes	Catalog	Master's Field Project	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	AY 03-04
SOE M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language	Yes	Catalog	Thesis	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	2005
SOE M.A. in Teaching	Yes	Catalog	Thesis or Field Project	Instructor of record	Determines completion of program	CTC 2002 Program Review: AY 07-08
SOE M.A. in Teaching Reading	Yes	Catalog	State Licensure Supervisor evaluation	Program Coordinator	Determines completion of program- Recommendation for reading certificate	CTC 2002
SOE Ed.D. in International and Multicultural Education	Yes	Catalog	Dissertation	Dissertation Committee Dissertation defense	Determines completion of program	2005

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SOE Ed.D. Learning and Instruction	Yes	Catalog	Dissertation	Dissertation Committee Dissertation defense	Determines completion of program	2005
SOE Ed.D. in Organization and Leadership	Yes	Catalog	Dissertation	Dissertation Committee Dissertation defense	Determines completion of program	2004
SOE Ed.D. Catholic School Leadership	Yes	Catalog	Dissertation	Dissertation Committee Dissertation defense	Determines completion of program	AY 06-07
SOE Credential Multiple Subjects BCLAD	Yes	Catalog	Teacher Performance Assessment (4 tasks) to meet State expectations CSET (State Subject Competency Tests) RICA (State Reading Instruction Competency Assessment) CBEST (California Basic Educational Skills Test) Supervisor and Master Teacher reports from field practica	Trained calibrated assessors; TPA Coordinator Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents Field Placement Coordinator	Determines completion of program Recommendation for credential	CTC 2002

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTER-PRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SOE Credential in Multiple Subject	Yes	Catalog	Teacher Performance Assessment (4 tasks) to meet State expectations	Trained calibrated assessors; TPA Coordinator		CTC 2002
			CSET (State Subject Competency Tests) RICA (State Reading Instruction Compe-tency Assessment)	Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents	Determines completion of program	
			CBEST (California Basic Educational Skills Test)	Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents	Recommen-dation for credential	
			Supervisor and Master Teacher reports from field practica	Field Place-ment Coordi-nator		

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SOE Credential in Single Subject	Yes	Catalog	Teacher Performance Assessment (4 tasks) to meet State expectations	Trained calibrated assessors; TPA Coordinator		
			CSET (State Subject Competency Tests)	Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents	Determines completion of program	CTC 2002
			CBEST (California Basic Educational Skills Test)	Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents	Recommen-dation for credential	
			Supervisor and Master Teacher reports from field practica	Field Place-ment Coordi-nator		

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SOE Credential Single Subject BCLAD	Yes	Catalog	Teacher Performance Assessment (4 tasks) to meet State expectations CSET (State Subject Competency Tests) CBEST (California Basic Educational Skills Test) Supervisor and Master Teacher eports from field practica	Trained calibrated assessors; TPA Coordinator Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents Field Placement Coordinator	Determines completion of program Recommendation for credential	CTC 2002
SOE Credential in Preliminary Administrative Services	Yes	Catalog	State licensure Supervisor reports from field practica	Program Coordinator	Determines completion of program Recommendation for credential	CTC 2002

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, July 2007

CATEGORY	HAVE FORMAL LEARNING OUTCOMES BEEN DEVELOPED?	WHERE ARE THESE LEARNING OUTCOMES PUBLISHED? (PLEASE SPECIFY)	OTHER THAN GPA, WHAT DATA/EVIDENCE IS USED TO DETERMINE THAT GRADUATES HAVE ACHIEVED THE STATED OUTCOMES FOR THE DEGREE? (E.G., CAPSTONE COURSE, PORTFOLIO REVIEW, LICENSURE EXAMINATION)	WHO INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE? WHAT IS THE PROCESS?	HOW ARE THE FINDINGS USED?	DATE OF LAST/ NEXT PROGRAM REVIEW FOR THIS DEGREE PROGRAM
SOE Credential in Professional Administrative Services	Yes	Catalog	State licensure Supervisor reports from field practica	Program Coordinator	Determines completion of program Recommendation for credential	CTC 2002 Program Review 2006
SOE Credential in Pupil Personnel Services	Yes	Catalog	State licensure Supervisor reports from field practica	Program Coordinator	Determines completion of program Recommendation for credential	CTC 2002
SOE Credential in Special Education (Mild/Moderate Specialist)	Yes	Catalog	Electronic portfolio CSET (State Subject Competency Tests) RICA (State Reading Instruction Competency Assessment) CBEST (California Basic Educational Skills Test) Supervisor reports from field practica	Instructor of record Program faculty Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents Credential Analyst Review of all required CTC documents Field Placement Coordinator	Determines completion of program Recommendation for credential	CTC 2002

TAB 5

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO **SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION (BY AGENCY AND PROGRAM NAME)	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY ("BULLET POINTS") OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM (LICENSURE, BOARD, OR BAR PASS RATES; EMPLOYMENT RATES, ETC.)	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA. INSTITUTION MAY WISH TO LINK CELL TO A GRAPH OR OTHER FORMAT.
AACSB	April 22, 2001	• Continuing to address the salary issue related to cost of living in the Bay Area for both new recruits and continuing faculty. • Encouraging and rewarding scholarship in the critical areas of accounting, as well as decision sciences and information systems. • Clarifying core offerings in the MBA and considering strengthening of the operations component.	Employment rates at 3 months post graduation.	Employment Rates at 3 months post-graduation: 1. Hospitality Mgmt. 2004: 73.4% 2005: 91.7% 2006: 85.0% 2. MBA 2004: N/A 2005: 57.0% 2006: 83.3%

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO **SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) School of Education [unit accreditation]	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit	*Common Standard 8 District Field Supervisors: Each district-employed field experience supervisor is care-fully selected, trained in supervision, oriented in the supervisory role and certified and experienced in either teaching the subject(s) of the class or performing the services authorized by the credential. District supervisors and supervisory activities are appropriately evaluated, recognized, and rewarded by the institution.* Standard Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns	"Although there is evidence the major-ity of district-employed supervisors are evaluated, the team found that this is inconsistent across all programs. The University is aware of this inconsistency and has recently developed hand-book which is intended to support the development of a systematic evaluation process…"	Candidates are asked at the time of exit from the program to provide a range of data, including an evaluation of district-employed supervisors. An average of 97% of candidates completing the programs participate in the exit process [either face to face and/or written forms] and provide information evaluat-ing district-employed field supervisors and clinical field supervisors.

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS/ PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Multiple Subject (Elementary) Credential Program	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit	*Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors* *Element 16(e) Program sponsors and cooperating school administrators enable supervising teachers to complete, as needed, planned professional training to develop their understanding of the developmental progression of beginning teachers; the Teaching Performance Expectations for Preliminary Teaching Credentials; state-adopted academic content standards for students; theory-practice relationships in the program's curriculum; and effective professional communication with students teachers and intern teachers.*	"While there are some grant funded professional development opportunities currently available to interested master teachers, there is no on-going, institutionalized process for providing professional development for the program's cooperating and master teachers."	The Teacher Education program works closely with school districts in which our candidates are placed to collaborate in providing professional development opportunities for district employees serving in the role of cooperating/ master teachers. For example, the TED Placement Coordinator is a member of the San Francisco Unified School District Student Teacher/Intern Advisory Committee (Human Resources). This group meets monthly and makes suggestion to HR and the Office of Teacher Affairs about recruitment, training, and retention of qualified Master Teachers. In addition, cooperating/master teacher are notified of professional develop opportunities (lectures, conferences, etc.) available on the USF campus which are available to them for free or at a reduced rate.

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
		Element 16(f) Individuals selected to provide professional development to supervising teachers (1) are experienced and effective in supervising credential candidates; (2) know and understand current educational theory and practice, the sponsors' expectations for supervising teachers, state-adopted academic content standards and frameworks, and the developmental stages of learning –to-teach; (3) model collegial supervisory practices that foster success among credential candidates; and (4) promote reflective practice. Standard Met with Concerns		

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Single Subject Credential Program	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit	*Standard 8B Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject Candidates* *In the subject to be authorized by the Single Subject Teaching Credential, the professional teacher preparation program provides substantive instruction and supervised practice that effectively prepare each candidate for an SS [Single Subject] Credential to plan and deliver content-specific instruction that is consistent with (1) the state-adopted academic content standards for students and/or curriculum framework in the content area, and (2) the basic principles and primary values of the underlying discipline....* Standard Met with Concerns	"Candidates in areas of Art, Physical Education, Languages Other than English and Business Education are not consistently receiving subject-specific pedagogical knowledge and skills. The program sometimes inappropriately places candidates outside their subject area because it cannot achieve a critical mass of candidates in their specific subject matter area."	A Consortium agreement with other regional colleges/universities provide an opportunity for candidates seeking a credential in one of the identified areas to take subject-specific pedagogical courses at another institution and automatically transfer that course into their USF credential program when an insufficient number of candidates at USF prevents the offering of a subject-specific pedagogical course at our university. Currently the Main Campus Teacher Education Program is limiting the admission of Single Subject candidates to the four main subject content areas – English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science – in part to address this issue and also due to the lack of student teaching placements and qualified cooperating and/or master teachers to serve as mentors in other subject content areas.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO **SCHOOL** OF EDUCATION

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Single Subject Credential Program	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit	*Standard 15 Learning to Teach Through Supervised Field Work* *Element 15(c) During the supervised student teaching or internship, each candidate is supervised in daily teaching for a minimum of one K-12 grading period, including a full-day teaching assignment of at least two weeks, commensurate with the authorization of the recommended credential…..* Standard Met with Concerns	"It is not clear how candidates will complete the required 2 week-full day teaching assignment in the new program. Many candidates in the current program are teaching full-time under an emergency credential and others voluntarily student teach for the full day. The new plan does not explain how all students will meet the full-day requirement in the future."	USF Single Subject candidates spend 1 full academic year student teaching at the same school site. The time they spend in the classroom teaching exceeds requirements for issuing a credential.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO **SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Single Subject Credential Program	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit	*Standard 16: Selection of fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of field Supervisors* *Element 16(e) Program sponsors and cooperating school administrators enable supervising teachers to complete, as needed, planned professional training to develop their understanding of the developmental progression of beginning teachers; the Teaching Performance Expectations for Preliminary Teaching Credentials; state-adopted academic content standards for students; theory-practice relationships in the program's curriculum; and effective professional communication with students teachers and intern teachers.*	"The team found that there is a lack of institutionalized professional development opportunities for cooperating and master teachers. While there are some grant funded professional development opportunities currently available to interested mater teachers, there is no on-going, institutionalized process for providing professional development for the program's cooperating and mater teachers."	The Teacher Education program works closely with school districts in which our candidates are placed to collaborate in providing professional development opportunities for district employees serving in the role of cooperating/master teachers. In addition, cooperating/master teacher are notified of professional develop opportunities (lectures, conferences, TPA Assessor training, etc.) available on the USF campus which are available to them for free or at a reduced rate.

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
		Element 16(f)Individuals selected to provide professional development to supervising teachers (1) are experienced and effective in supervising credential candidates; (2) know and understand current educational theory and practice, the sponsors' expectations for supervising teachers, state-adopted academic content standards and frameworks, and the developmental stages of learning –to–teach; (3) model collegial supervisory practices that foster success among credential candidates; and (4) promote reflective practice. Standard Met with Concerns		

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Multiple Subject (Elementary) and Single Subject Credential Programs	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit: Reading Reviewer Report	Standards Met: No Concerns Noted	Data tracking as indicative of program effectiveness: Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Examination (required of Multiple Subject candidates only)	RICA Examination Results: Candidates for the Education Specialist Credential have a 99% pass rate on the first attempt of the examination over the past three years.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Multiple Subject (Elementary) and Single Subject Credential Programs	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit Senate Bill 2042 Requirement: Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)	Senate Bill 2042 implemented a new credentialing system in California that began in 2002. As part of that bill, passage of a Teaching Performance Assessment was required for recommendation for a credential. The California TPA (developed by ETS for the CTC) was implemented at USF for all candidates admitted to the program as of Fall 2003. The TPA consists of 4 tasks, each scored by trained calibrated assessors on a 4 point rubric. While the CTC requires 15% of TPA submission be double scored, USF is currently double scoring 98% of all submissions.	Passage of the TPA is one of the requirements for USF to recommend a candidate to the CTC for a credential.	In Fall 2004, Task 4 (20 minutes teaching video w/ analysis and reflections) was scored for the first time. The pass rate for first time submissions was 84%.

In Spring 2007 (the sixth group to submit Task 4), the pass rate for first time submissions was 90%. |

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
		Tasks receiving a score of 4 on the first reading are not all double scored, only a random number to confirm calibration. A candidate must score a minimum of a 2 on any task and a total score of 12 is required for passage of the TPA. Content measured (Teaching Performance Expectations or TPEs) in the TPA is embedded in credential courses. At one level the tasks are formative, a means of assisting candidates to develop their skills as teachers. Tasks can be worked on as part of a course requirement but the final submission must the work of the candidate. Candidates who receive a score of 2 or lower on a task are provided with additional mentoring and permitted to submit the task a second time. The assessment is summative in that a final passing score of 12 must be attained as one of the requirements for recommendation for a credential.		

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Education Specialist Credential – Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II Mild/Moderate NOTE: The Educational Specialist Credential is a 2 year intern program.	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit	Standards Met: No Concerns Noted	"…the team determined that USF has fully met all Level I Educational Specialist Standards." "…the team determined that USF has fully met all Level II Educational Specialist Standards." Data tracking as indicative of program effectiveness: Reaching Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Examination; Program completion and recommendation for credential	RICA Examination Results: Candidates for the Education Specialist Credential have a 99% pass rate on the first attempt of the examination over the past three years. In the past three years 98%-99% of candidates have completed the 2-year program with their cohort and were recommended for the credential.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Pupil Personnel Service Credential/ School Counseling	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit	Standards Met: No Concerns Noted	"…the team found that the program [Pupil Personnel Services Credential] fully met all of the standards." Data tracking as indicative of program effectiveness: Program completion, recommendation for the credential, and hired as school counselor	In the last three years, 100% of candidates completed the program, were recommended for credential and all obtained employment as school counselors.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Preliminary Administrative Services Credential	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit June 15, 2006 document submission to new standards approved	Standards Met: No Concerns Noted	"…the team has determined that the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program fully meets all standards." Data tracking as indicative of program effectiveness: Program completion and recommendation for credential	Credential recommendation requires verification of employment as a school administrator, thus the completion of the credential is an indicator of employment. The three-year trend has held to an average of 75%–80% due to this employment requirement. Some of our candidates do not secure positions immediately upon program completion and are therefore recommended for a certificate of eligibility, rather than the administrative services credential.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential	April 21-24, 2002 Accreditation Visit June 15, 2006 document submission to new standards approved	Standards Met: No Concerns Noted	"…the team has determined that the Professional [Clear] Administrative Services Credential Program fully meets all applicable standards." Data tracking as indicative of program effectiveness: Program completion and recommendation for credential	Credential recommendation requires verification of employment as a school administrator, thus the completion of the credential is an indicator of employment. The three-year trend has held to an average of 75%–80% due to this employment requirement.

NOTE: A new accreditation system is currently being implemented by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) for all programs listed above. Year 1 [in the new 7-year cycle] begins for the USF credential program in 2008-2009. The USF credential programs are currently revising data collection to align with the new accreditation system requirements and to meet requirements for data collection in Year 7 and Year 1 for the initial Biennial Report submission due Fall 2008. Under the new system, Biennial Reports are due in Years 1, 3, and 5. A program Self-Study addressing Program Standards is due in Year 4. A Site Visit is held in Year 6 with a follow-up report and/or site visit in Year 7 based on the Year 6 review.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL OF LAW
Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
American Bar Association (Section on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar	March 2001	Enforcing the class attendance policy Status of tenure in classification clinicians Status of Law Librarian	Bar pass rate of first time takers Entering LSAT scores Entering GPA	See accompanying data
Association of American Law Schools	March 2001	Steps taken to ameliorate effect of presence of military recruiters on campus	See above	See above

USF School of Law Performance Indicators

CATEGORIES	2004	2005	2006
75th Percentile LSAT Enrolled combined #	162 (87.3%)	161 (84.5%)	161 (84.3%)
50th Percentile LSAT Enrolled combined #	159 (79.1%)	159 (78.8%)	159 (78.4%)
25th Percentile LSAT Enrolled combined #	157 (72.6%)	156 (68.4%)	156 (68.2%)
75th Percentile GPA Enrolled combined	3.51	3.57	3.54
50th Percentile GPA Enrolled combined	3.29	3.34	3.28
25th Percentile GPA Enrolled combined	2.95	3.07	3.00
BAR First Time Takers	180	175	200
BAR Passed Among First Time Takers	114	131	147
BAR Pass Rate	63.3%	74.9%	73.5%

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) • BSN • MSN	October 3, 2003 – Accreditation of baccalaureate and master's degree programs for a term of five years, extending until December 31, 2008. Next Visit: April 6-9, 2008	"…there are no compliance concerns with respect to the key enlacements. As is required for all accredited programs, the Board requested that programs submit a continuous improvement progress report at the mid-point of the accreditation terms… deadline for submitting progress repot to CCNE is December 31 2006." The School submitted the Continuous Improvement Progress Report and is awaiting notification of the Board Review.	RN Licensure Rate (NCLEX-RN)	NCLEX-RN Pass Rates • 2001-2002 — 94.5% • 2002-2003 — 93.1% • 2003-2004 — 91% MSN: 100% 2004-2005 — 94.2% MSN: 100% 2005-2006 — 100% MSN: 100% 1/31-3/31, 2007 97.76% MSN: 100%

Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

(1) PROFESSIONAL, SPECIAL, STATE, OR PROGRAMMATIC ACCREDITATIONS CURRENTLY HELD BY INSTITUTION	(2) DATE OF MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION ACTION BY EACH LISTED AGENCY	(3) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FOR CONTINUING INSTITUTIONAL ATTENTION IDENTIFIED IN ACCREDITATION ACTION LETTER OR REPORT	(4) KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AS REQUIRED BY AGENCY OR SELECTED BY PROGRAM	(5) FOR AT LEAST ONE INDICATOR FOR EACH PROGRAM, PROVIDE UP TO 3 YEARS OF TREND DATA.
California Board of Registered Nursing (BRN) • BSN • MSN	September 9, 2005 – Ratification of Minor Curriculum Revision; Continuing Approval for Pre-licensure and Nurse Practitioner Nursing Programs	"Program Evaluation: Summarize discussion and action taken by faculty, the program's administration, or both, upon review of data collected as part of the total program evaluation. Resources: Evaluate the need for additional support staff and physical space if the program stays at its current enrollment or expands further. Continue to evaluate the sufficiency and the availability of resources, library or other, that are essential to students' ability to complete required assignments, meet course objectives, and enhance their learning.	Employment Rates	Graduates of both the undergraduate and graduate programs have been extremely successful in securing employment. New graduates in the San Francisco Bay Area are able to earn an average salary of $85,000 annually. One hundred percent of USF graduates have reported they were able to secure a job if they were searching for one. MSN graduates report 100% employment. However not all MSN graduates are employed in advanced practice roles. Survey results indicate 29% are employed as RNs.

USF School of Nursing NCLEX-RN Pass Rates Compared to CA Schools
http://www.rn.ca.gov/schools/passrates.htm

TAB 6

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards (May 2007)

Rating for Columns in the Worksheet:

	SELF REVIEW RATING		IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME
1	We do this well; area of strength for us	A	High priority
2	Aspects of this need our attention	B	Lower priority
3	This item needs significant development	C	Does not need to be addressed at this time
0	Does not apply or not enough evidence to address		

STANDARD 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with its purposes and character. It has a clear and conscious sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in the higher educational community and its relationship to society at large. Through its purposes and educational objectives, the institution dedicates itself to higher learning, the search for truth, and the dissemination of knowledge. The institution functions with integrity and autonomy.

Institutional Purposes

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines, or are subject to peer review within the framework of generally recognized academic disciplines or areas of practices.	1	C	• University has a Vision, Mission, and Values statement that is known and used in program planning, budget decisions and evaluation. • The University's Mission guides academic and service program development and assessment as well as the Planning, Budget and Review process • Programs are in areas and disciplines that are recognized and reviewed by peers as part of program reviews • All Colleges/Schools have a Mission statement

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives.	The institution has published educational objectives that are consistent with its purposes.	3	A	• Institutional learning outcomes have been developed • Degree programs have identified and published learning outcomes although related assessment procedures need to be developed for various programs. • Academic program review process (5-7 year cycle) is carried out in all schools/colleges and in addition, professional programs undergo periodic accreditation (SOBAM, SON, SOL and credential programs in SOE). • Co-curricular programs and service units also undergo periodic reviews that include performance evaluations and assessment of their support of learning outcomes.
1.3 The institution's leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at all levels that is marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.		1	C	• There is a clearly delineated organizational structure. Administrators (including vice presidents and deans) undergo an annual performance review process. President's performance is reviewed by Trustees and includes wide-ranging feedback. Executive officers undergo periodic 360 reviews. • Administrators, faculty and staff are hired in a structured recruitment process that is characterized by fairness and transparency. • Faculty controls the curriculum and works in an open and transparent fashion through the unions and/or in joint committees and school/college committees and councils. • Faculty's academic plans (ACP) are reviewed by deans on a yearly basis. • Administration meets periodically with faculty and students; there are student representatives in many University-wide committees. • Undergraduate students have a student government structure (ASUSF) and graduate students have a council. • There are two students who sit in the meetings of the Board of Trustees.

Integrity

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
1.4 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and in their writing.	The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state conditions, and ensure these conditions are consistent with academic freedom. Due process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.	1	C	• Academic freedom is guaranteed in the *Vision, Mission and sValues* statements as well as in Collective Bargaining Agreements and faculty and student handbooks. • The University has not received sanctions or warnings from external bodies. • Curriculum planning and delivery and library acquisitions are carried out within the context of complete academic freedom. • Due process procedures are included in above documents and in the *Fogcutter* and Catalog and in program handbooks for students. • Office of Dean of Students and the Ombudsperson guarantee students' freedom of expression.
1.5 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices.	The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WASC Statement on Diversity.	2	A	• *Vision, Mission and Values* statement supports diversity and administration is committed to advancing students, faculty and staff diversity as well as curricular diversity. • USF is recognized as one of the most diverse universities in the country. • There is a diversity graduation requirement for all undergraduate students. • There is a need to address under-represented faculty/student/ staff recruitment and retention. • Further diversification (ethnicity, gender, international) of curriculum is needed in term of US diversity. • Students integrate diverse perspectives into their academic and co-curricular activities.
1.6 Even when supported by or affiliated with political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.	The institution has no history of interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by political, religious, corporate or other external bodies outside the institution's own governance arrangements.	1	C	• USF has no history of interference by external bodies (corporate, religious or political) including the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) or the Roman Catholic Church.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
1.7 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public; demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research and refunds.	The institution has published or readily- available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. and has no history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts.	2	B	• Policies and procedures for students are published in the *Catalog* and in the *Fogcutter* and are available online. • Policies and procedures are periodically reviewed for currency and consistency by special committees or faculty. • University truthfully represents its goals and programs through Catalog and other publications. • Credits assigned to academic work are reviewed by curriculum committees and deans. Transcripts accurately reflect those decisions. • Periodic reviews of academic programs and of service units include external reviewers and are supervised by deans and members of the Leadership Team.
1.8 The institution exhibits integrity in its operations as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.	The institution has published or readily- available grievance procedures for faculty, staff, and students. Its finances are regularly audited by external agencies.	1	C	• Faculty and staff grievance procedures are readily available and published in CBAs and handbooks. • Student grievance procedures are included in student publications (*Catalog, Fogcutter*). • Policies for a variety of business practices (e.g., travel, purchasing) have been developed. • Finances are audited by Deloitte & Touche and budget and audit is approved by Board of Trustees • A Director of Internal Auditing and Tax Compliance reporting to Trustees was appointed in 2004.

STANDARD 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution achieves its institutional purposes and attains its educational objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning. It demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively and that they support one another in the institution's efforts to attain educational effectiveness.

Teaching and Learning

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered.	The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.	1	C	• Content, length, and standards of all academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary and professional standards and are published in the Catalog as well as online. • A 5-7 year cycle of reviews of academic programs and service units has been instituted and the reviews include feedback from external reviewers. • Professional programs are externally accredited
2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits.	Competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the major.	2	A	• Entry-level requirements are clearly specified in recruitment materials and in the Catalog. • Competencies and their assessment have not been uniformly specified for all degree programs (except for the accumulation of credits). • Competencies/learning outcomes have been determined for most majors, the Core Curriculum and the Diversity and Service Learning graduation requirements.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
• Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and a fulfilling life. These programs also ensure the development of core learning abilities and competencies including, but not limited to, college-level written and oral communication; college-level quantitative skills; information literacy; and the habit of critical analysis of data and argument. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster an understanding of diversity; civic responsibility; the ability to work with others; and the capability to engage in lifelong learning.	The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, consisting of a minimum of 45 semester credit hours (or the equivalent), together with significant study in depth in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a major).	2	A	• The Core Curriculum is integrated throughout students' experiences at USF • The Core Curriculum includes defined learning outcomes and supports the development of basic competencies as well as Mission-related goals • The Core Curriculum requires completion of 44 units. There are three Mission-related graduation requirements: (a) A Service Learning course; (b) a Cultural Diversity course; and (c) courses in Theology/Religious Studies and Philosophy. • All baccalaureate students are required to complete the requirements for a major • We lack generalized comprehensive assessments at the program level
• Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in the areas of cultural and aesthetic, social and political, as well as scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons in this society. Finally, students are required to engage in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study as part of their baccalaureate programs		2	A	• Areas of breadth (cultural, aesthetic, social, political, scientific) are included in the Core Curriculum • All baccalaureate programs require fulfilling the requirements for a major • Requirements for the Core Curriculum and for each major are included in the Catalog and online

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
• Graduate programs are consistent with the purpose and character of their institutions; are in keeping with the expectations of their respective disciplines and professions; and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the several levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. Graduate curricula are visibly structured to include active involvement with the literature of the field and ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate high-level professional practice and training experiences. Additionally, admission criteria to graduate programs normally include a baccalaureate degree in an appropriate undergraduate program.	The institution employs at least one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered.	2	B	• All graduate programs meet professional and disciplinary expectations and are labeled appropriately • Graduate programs are structured to engage students with current literature and/or professional practice • At least one full-time faculty member is involved with each of the graduate programs • Certain programs ask students for portfolios, theses or capstone projects that demonstrate integration of knowledge.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
2.3 The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in its academic programs and policies. These include the organization and content of the institution's curricula; admissions and graduation policies; the organization and delivery of advisement; the use of its library and information resources; and (where applicable) experience in the wider learning environment provided by the campus and/or co-curriculum.	The use of information and learning resources beyond textbooks is evidenced in syllabi throughout the undergraduate and graduate curriculum.	2	B	• Program organization and requirements are peer-reviewed and published in Catalog. • Course proposals are reviewed by faculty in school/college curriculum committees. • Co-curricular experiences are available to most students although participation is limited due to students' personal commitments. • There are a wide variety of service learning opportunities coordinated by an Office of Service Learning. • A limited number of Residential Learning communities have been developed. • In general, courses require students to use information that goes beyond textbooks. • IT learning resources are constantly renovated and enlarged. IT resources (including *Blackboard*) and updated facilities (smart classrooms) are widely used • Admission and graduation policies are widely available and known. Library resources continue to expand. • Syllabi generally demonstrate high expectations of student learning. • Students conduct research and present or publish with faculty in peer-reviewed conferences or publications. • Capstone projects demonstrate high levels of student achievement and integration of knowledge. • Student work such as research projects, papers and publications (e.g., *Writing for a Real World*) also demonstrate high levels of student scholarly attainment. • Students tutor peers in gateway courses and in languages. • Significant numbers of students are involved in service learning, volunteer activities and in 'smart activism'.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
2.4 The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution's faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.		3	A	• Learning outcomes and their assessment are required for all newly approved courses in all colleges/schools and are disseminated to most students via syllabi. • Some programs lack assessment procedures for overall program learning outcomes. • Faculty in Curriculum Committees review syllabi and learning outcomes, and recommend approval to deans. • Faculty in programs are expected to define curriculum and learning outcome. • Program Advisory Board members support and guide program development and implementation in selected programs.
2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.		1	C	• Ongoing feedback is provided to students. • Faculty and deans support the development of challenging opportunities for students as well as providing continuous feedback on learning (including feedback on papers, projects, exams). • Service Learning and Cultural Diversity are graduation requirements for undergraduate students • Faculty are engaged in creating innovative learning approaches that involve students in active, reflective learning in the classroom, the laboratory and in field experiences.
2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.		3	B	• Some programs have capstone or end-of-program experiences. • Students are evaluated in terms of program learning outcomes set by faculty and/or credentialing agencies in some programs. • Some programs (e.g., SON, CPS, SOL) survey alumni and employers to establish quality of preparation for work but assessment is not systematic. We lack systematic tracking of alumni.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
2.7 In order to improve currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such reviews.	The institution incorporates in its assessment of educational objectives results with respect to student achievement, including program completion, license examination, and placement rates results.	2	A	• All academic and co-curricular programs are being reviewed in a 5-7 year cycle. Professional programs are accredited by external agencies. • Assessment of comprehensive student achievement is being developed. Evaluation of student achievement is also done through licensure examinations for Nursing and Law, and selected programs in SOE, CPS and CAS. • Student placements in graduate school in health-related and Law programs are tracked.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
2.8 The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovations, and creative activity, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution's purposes and character.		1	C	• The University provides faculty development funds to full-time faculty including conference participation, research seed monies and curriculum innovation. Part-time faculty are supported in development of teaching skills. • Jesuit Foundation provides support for Mission-focused curriculum innovation and research. • Scholarship and curricular innovation are considered as part of tenure and promotion decisions. • Faculty are offered periodic teaching development workshops, meetings analyzing how the Mission is translated into research and teaching. • First year faculty are offered special mentoring and faculty development workshops. • Recognition is awarded for excellence in teaching and innovation in uses of educational technology. • Office of Sponsored Projects supports faculty research interests. • Special activities, such as USF Justice Lecture Series and conferences held on campus, provide a climate of intellectual growth.
2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, and service.		1	C	• Teaching, research, and service are equally important in promotion and tenure decisions in all schools/colleges. • Faculty are recognized for excellence in teaching, research, and service. • Faculty research has impacted students who collaborate as well as in the classroom.

Support for Student Learning

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
2.10 Regardless of mode of program delivery, the institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students and assesses their needs, experiences and levels of satisfaction. This information is used to help shape a learning-centered environment and to actively promote student success.	The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated, and provides opportunity for appeal as needed; and periodic analyses of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and impact of these policies.	1	C	• Grading policies are found in student publications (Catalog, Fogcutter) and faculty is expected to include them in syllabi. • Grade appeal processes are published (Catalog, Fogcutter). • Grades are reviewed by deans (A&S, SOL, SOBAM) and faculty during annual review. • BCSSE and a Graduating Student Survey, as well as NSSE are periodically used and the results are now analyzed by administration and selectively made available to students, faculty and staff.
2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs, and supports student professional and personal development.		2	A	• We are developing an integrated learning environment that requires more planning. There have been significant achievements in this area in terms of designing or reshaping new student orientation, living-learning communities, retention efforts, etc. • Faculty are increasingly more involved in supporting or developing co-curricular activities including new student orientation.
2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements.	Recruiting and admission practices, academic calendars, publications, and advertising are accurate, current, disclosing, and are readily available to support student needs.	2	B	• Publications accurately describe requirements and procedures and are readily available via print, audiovisual modes, and the web. • New student orientation properly describes programs and high academic expectations as well as job opportunities for students. • Certain colleges have designed a special advising manual for faculty. Assessment of the effectiveness of advising is missing.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
2.13 Student support services—including financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, computer labs, and library and information serves—are designed to meet the needs of the specific types of students the institution serves and the curricula it offers.		2	B	• Services meet most needs traditional age undergraduates but are less helpful to graduate students and adult students although improvements are being made. • IT services in support of academic activities including Black-board, smart classrooms and portal system (USFconnect) have improved and are widely used by faculty. • Academic advising is of uneven quality across programs and colleges/schools although there have been improvements in recent years. • Financial aid is insufficient to meet students' needs or meet the aid gap but base-budget increases have been recently made. • Library services are perceived as helpful and appropriate with periodic base-budget increases made. • "One Stop" service was implemented in Fall 2005 to improve services by Registrar, Bursar and Financial Aid. • Approximately 80% of major classrooms have technological support for teaching.
2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students assume an obligation to provide clear and accurate information about transfer requirements, ensure equitable treatment for such students with respect to academic policies, and ensure that such students are not unduly disadvantaged by transfer requirements.		1	C	• Transfer students receive individualized feedback as to their status regarding graduation requirement. • Transfer students receive additional and specialized advising as part of Orientation and throughout school year. • Articulation agreements help prospective transfers plan their academic programs. • NSSE and BCSSE data are available for transfer students to aid in advising them and in the development of special programs to support them.

STANDARD 3. Developing & Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high quality environment for learning.

Faculty and Staff

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
3.1 The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives.		2	A	• The number of full-time faculty has been steadily increasing with base-budget additions. • Professional standards and accrediting expectations for number of full-time faculty are met in SON, SOBAM and SOL. • Diverse and highly trained staff have been recently hired. • Search procedures emphasize qualifications and commitment to furthering University's Mission.
3.2 The institution demonstrates that it employs a faculty with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve its educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever and however delivered.	The institution has an instructional staffing plan that includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty with appropriate background by discipline and degree levels.	3	A	• Qualified professionals are employed to meet our educational objectives. • Faculty of color are under-represented and there is lack of gender balance in some programs. • Faculty reflects appropriate training and excel in their qualifications, as defined by peers and deans. • There is a need to develop a strategic plan for faculty and staff recruitment to match enrollment plans and academic goals as well as potential retirements.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
3.3 Faculty and staff recruitment, workload, in- centive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are system- atic, include appropriate peer review, and, for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.		1	C	• Faculty workload, incentives and evaluation are dictated by CBAs or handbooks. • Faculty evaluation is systematic and includes student evaluation of instruction. • Faculty meet yearly with dean to review progress and plans for academic and scholarly work. • Promotion and tenure decisions are based on teaching, research and service and include an analysis of teaching evaluations and teaching innovation and are based on evaluation of application materials by peers at the college and University level and by external peers as well as by administrators. • Staff recruitment usually involves a complex process with feed- back from peers.
3.4 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purposes.		2	B	• Faculty development funds are available to full- and part-time faculty on a competitive basis. • College-specific faculty development activities are periodically scheduled for both experienced and newly-hired faculty. • Faculty development opportunities include mentoring seminars for new faculty and 4th year sabbatical for tenure-track faculty.

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
3.5 Fiscal and physical resources are effectively aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives, and are sufficiently developed to support and maintain the level and kinds of educational programs offered both now and for the foreseeable future.	The institution has a history of financial stability, appropriate independent audits, and realistic plans to eliminate any accumulated deficits and to build sufficient reserves to sup- port long-term viability.	2	B	• The University continues to be financially stable and to function without deficits and with appropriate external auditing. • The endowment and reserves have recently grown and plans are in place for their continued annual growth. • Deferred maintenance is being addressed by budgeting and there is a need for upgraded and enlarged facilities (classrooms, labs, offices, residence halls). • A new Master Plan for Physical Plant is being developed and a number of construction/ renovation efforts are underway.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
3.6 The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. For on-campus students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kinds to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered. These resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's purposes, and are appropriate, sufficient, and sustainable.		3	A	• On-campus information resources are deemed adequate by external reviewers. • Progress has been made to enhance information resources at regional campuses, but additional improvements may be needed. • Facilities (e.g., classrooms, offices, meeting rooms) are continuously being updated and improved, but there is a need for additional classrooms of varying sizes to accommodate current needs and further student body expansion. • There is a need to increase support for improving library collections although recent additions to the budget have been made.
3.7 The institution's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.		2	B	• Upgrading classroom IT is continuing with approximately 90% being Level One in technology. • The University recently completed a major network upgrade. • A new 2007–2010 IT Plan has been developed. • Faculty and staff training opportunities are offered in new or upgraded software and facilities. • Blackboard is used by a large proportion of faculty. • Student records archives have been digitized. • An investment of $10.2 million is being made for a new ERP system, SCT Banner and migration to the new system has begun. • Additional services (e.g., increased wireless coverage) are needed to meet student and faculty needs. • An information security policy has been developed.

Organizational Structure and Decision-Making Processes

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
3.8 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, and sufficient to support effective decision making.	The institution has an organization chart that clearly depicts positions, associated responsibilities, and lines of authority.	1	C	• Decision-making processes are clear and there is an emphasis on greater involvement (through Leadership Team) and on transparency. • Organizational chart clearly depicts lines of authority • Board of Trustees periodically reviews progress and plans. • College/Program Advisory Boards provide input to the University's plans and activities. • There are a number of joint (faculty-administration) committees (e.g., Assessment, Curriculum, Faculty Development).
3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.		1	C	• An independent Board of Trustees oversees the University's integrity and operations and evaluates the President. • The Board of Trustees analyzes the University's functioning and provides guidance and support for initiatives that further the Mission. • The Director of Internal Auditing and Tax Compliance reports directly to the Board of Trustees.
3.10 The institution has a chief executive whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, together with a cadre of administrators qualified and able to provide effective educational leadership and management at all levels.		1	C	• The President has full-time responsibilities to the institution. • All executive officers are full-time employees and they are highly qualified with significant experience in academia. • New appointments for executive positions are usually made after national searches (except for internal promotions).
3.11 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution's educational purposes and character.		1	C	• Faculty participation in drafting program and course proposals that are reviewed by peers in curriculum committees and approved by deans/Provost. • Program reviews include faculty-written self-study. • Faculty representatives sit on Board of Trustees and make up college/school councils and curriculum committees.

STANDARD 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

The institution conducts sustained, evidence-based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities at different levels of the institution, and to revise institutional purposes, structures, and approaches to teaching, learning, and scholarly work.

Faculty and Staff

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
4.1 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate.	A clear charge to planning bodies with a regular schedule and the existence of an understandable and coherent plan for assessing the attainment of educational objectives must be developed. Evidence of the ways the results of planning and evaluation are linked to decision-making is demonstrable.	2	A	• Development of *Vision, Mission and Values* statement in 2001 involved review by all stakeholders. • Leadership Team chooses Strategic Goals with feedback from community (online as well as in town hall meetings) and reviews the specific plans for each division and college/school. • In some areas, the specific plans are developed through consultation involving faculty and staff. • Physical Plant Master Plan has been openly discussed with University community. • There is a transparent University-wide Planning, Budget and Review process in place with summaries being widely shared. • An Assessment Plan is reviewed by Provost Council every year.
4.2 Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.		1	B	• Budget, Planning, and Review process aligns budget with University priorities, including new program initiatives and program reviews. • All colleges/schools involve faculty in setting priorities through committees or direct consultation. • Staff is involved in alignment and priority-setting for co-curricular and service offices. • Board of Trustees receives an annual report and update on planning process.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
4.3 Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.		3	A	• Graduating Student Survey is widely disseminated but seldom used in decision making. Other institutional data (NSSE, CBSSE, SSI) are not well disseminated or used, but improvements in this area are being planned. • SON use benchmarks (EBI) in program assessment; SOL conducts employment survey. • Financial information is used in planning and evaluation.
4.4 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures, and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.		2	A	• Strong peer curriculum approval processes are in place in each school/college for new courses and learning outcomes are required at that stage. • SOBAM, SOL, SOE, SON conduct periodic specialized external accreditation reviews. • Academic program reviews are periodically conducted and emphasis has been placed on learning outcomes. • New reporting process on program reviews (to Provost Council or Leadership Team) emphasizes action plans for outcomes of program reviews. • University Life Division assesses performance using external benchmarks and standards. • There is little information of longitudinal nature.

Commitment to Learning and Improvement

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
4.5 Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included among the priorities of institutional research function is the identification of indicators and the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution's purposes and educational objectives. Periodic reviews of institutional research and data collection are conducted to develop more effective indicators of performance and to assure the suitability and usefulness of data.	The institution exhibits existence of clear institutional research capacities with appropriate reporting lines and support appropriate to the institution's size and scope. Institutional research or equivalent databases are developed that are sufficient to meet all external reporting needs (e.g. IPEDS), and there are appropriate ways to access or disseminate this information through publications, reports, or widely-accessible databases.	2	B	• IR Office produces most reports for external constituencies, although there is a need to improve internal dissemination. • Reports generated by IR Office are maintained on a website, but some data are not easily accessible. • Student data reports are produced by Academic Services. • Personnel data reports are produced by HR. • There is a need to identify data that would be most useful in producing effective indicators of performance. Online reporting of indicators is being tried out by SOE and SON. • A new webpage is being developed to archive assessment procedures and results. • New ERP will allow timely, relevant and accessible data reporting.
4.6 Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.	The institution has clear, well-established policies and practices for gathering and analyzing information that leads to a culture of evidence and improvement.	2	A	• There is commitment to assessment on the part of the leadership. • In general, faculty takes a role in evaluation of teaching and assessment of effectiveness, particularly during ACP process. • A comprehensive culture of evidence is being developed including better data collection procedures and transparency of results, and perceptions of the value of assessment as a learning opportunity.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	GUIDELINE	SELF-REVIEW RATING	IMPORTANCE TO ADDRESS AT THIS TIME	EVALUATION
4.7 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.		2	B	• Faculty's yearly review (ACP) and other activities promote an individualized and group-referent analysis of teaching and learning. • Structured faculty development opportunities exist in colleges/schools including workshops, special programs, mentoring, instructional technology, teaching-related discussions (SOL). • There is a need to support adjunct faculty with programs such as class visitations. SOL pairs adjunct faculty members with full-time liaisons. • There is a new faculty mentor program for newly hired full-time faculty.
4.8 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of the educational programs.		3	A	• Analysis of educational effectiveness by external stakeholders (including employers) and alumni has usually been sporadic and impressionistic (except SON). • Advisory boards (SOBAM, SON, CPS, SOL) provide useful feedback on curriculum design. • Alumni satisfaction is surveyed in selected program reviews. • ABA advises LLM programs in SOL. • External review process is being implemented in program reviews of University Life Division modeled after academic program review process.

TAB 7

Evidence Reviewed and/or Discussed During Preparation of C&P Review

STANDARD 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

CFR	Evidence
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character.	• Copy of *Vision, Mission and Values* statement • Copy of mission statement for each college/school and service departments • Program review schedule for academic and service units
1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives.	• Institutional learning outcomes • Table on educational effectiveness indicators • Learning outcomes for all programs (online Catalog) • Academic program review schedule and procedures • Last accreditation reports and self-studies for SOBAM, SOL, SON, SOE • Program review results of service units as they support student learning outcomes
1.3 The institution's leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at all levels that is marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.	• Schedule and summaries of 360 reviews of administrators • Log of University-wide committees that include students and faculty • Organizational charts
1.4 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and in their writing.	• University *Vision, Mission and Values* statement • Academic freedom statement in CBAs, faculty handbooks and library collection policy • *Fogcutter* and *Catalog* section on due process policies and description of Ombudsperson office
1.5 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices.	• University *Vision, Mission and Values* statement • Data on student/faculty/staff diversity and copy of recruitment procedures • Data on courses reflecting ethnic or gender diversity • Survey results on diversity (NSSE, EBI, GSS)
1.6 Even when supported by or affiliated with political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.	• University bylaws • Absence of external sanctions for violations of academic freedom or evidence of lack of autonomy

STANDARD 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives (continued)

CFR	Evidence
1.7 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public; demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research and refunds.	• Policies found in *Fogcutter*, *Catalog* and IRBPHS Manual • Academic program review schedule • Executive summaries of academic program reviews, reports and schedules • Procedures or bylaws for selected college/school curriculum committees
1.8 The institution exhibits integrity in its operations as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.	• Faculty grievance procedures (CBAs & CPS Handbook), OPE employee grievance procedures, and student grievance procedures in *Fogcutter* and *Catalog* • Business and Finance policies (travel, PC, etc.) • Deloitte & Touche audit, and Internal audit procedures

STANDARD 2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

CFR	Evidence
2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered.	• Executive summaries of recent academic and service units program reviews, reports and schedules • Accreditation letters for SOBAM, SON, SOL and SOE Credential approval letter
2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits.	• *Catalog* • Core Curriculum learning outcomes and syllabi for Core and courses in majors • Data on SON, SOL, SOE exam/pass results/rates • Report on learning communities • Educational effectiveness indicators table
Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and a fulfilling life. These programs also ensure the development of core learning abilities and competencies including, but not limited to, college-level written and oral communication; college-level quantitative skills; information literacy; and the habit of critical analysis of data and argument. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster an understanding of diversity; civic responsibility; the ability to work with others; and the capability to engage in lifelong learning.	• *Catalog* • Core Curriculum learning outcomes and syllabi for Core and courses in majors • Data on SON, SOL, SOE exam/pass results/rates • Report on learning communities • Educational effectiveness indicators table • NSSE, GSS results
Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in the areas of cultural and aesthetic, social and political, as well as scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons in this society. Finally, students are required to engage in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study as part of their baccalaureate programs.	• *Catalog* • Core Curriculum learning outcomes and syllabi for Core and courses in majors • Report on learning communities • Educational effectiveness indicators table

CFR	Evidence
Graduate programs are consistent with the purpose and character of their institutions; are in keeping with the expectations of their respective disciplines and professions; and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the several levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. Graduate curricula are visibly structured to include active involvement with the literature of the field and ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate high-level professional practice and training experiences. Additionally, admission criteria to graduate programs normally include a baccalaureate degree in an appropriate undergraduate program	• Copies of accreditation reports for professional programs (SOBAM, SON, SOL) • Summaries of program reviews and executive summaries • GSS results
2.3 The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in its academic programs and policies. These include the organization and content of the institution's curricula; admissions and graduation policies; the organization and delivery of advisement; the use of its library and information resources; and (where applicable) experience in the wider learning environment provided by the campus and/or co-curriculum.	• *Catalog* • Sample of syllabi approved by college/school curriculum committees demonstrating high expectations and learning beyond textbooks (e.g., service learning, "Smart Activism," co-curricular activities, learning communities, student research projects, integrative or capstone projects) • Learning opportunities beyond course or classroom (e.g., library services, IT instructional resources, study abroad and immersion programs/opportunities, student produced publications including "Discourse," "Writing for a Real World," "Ignatian," and student written performances) • Capstone projects • NSSE, GSS results
2.4 The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution's faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.	• Select school/colleges curriculum committees bylaws or procedures • Sample syllabi of recently approved courses • WASC table on educational effectiveness indicators
2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.	• Examples of active student learning (e.g., service learning courses, living learning communities, online simulations being used in the classroom, problem-based learning) • Examples of special challenges presented to students (e.g., capstone courses, honors programs, hierarchical curriculum learning outcomes) • Examples of feedback to students on paper and online (e.g., Progress Report (A&S), Academic Improvement Forms (SON) and procedures), • NSSE, GSS and SSI data on student feedback • Summary evaluations of teaching (SUMMA)

STANDARD 2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions (continued)

CFR	Evidence
2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.	• Table on educational effectiveness indicators • Examples of capstone projects • Results of alumni surveys • Data on alumni who receive doctorates
2.7 In order to improve currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such reviews.	• Student placements in graduate school in health-related and Law programs • Executive summaries of program reviews and program review schedule • Examples of student achievement after graduation (e.g., licensure results in Nursing, Bar passing rate in SOL, alumni who receive doctorates)
2.8 The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovations, and creative activity, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution's purposes and character.	• Allocation of faculty development funds • Projects recently funded by Jesuit Foundation • Relevant text from collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) and handbooks • List of teaching development workshops (colleges and CIT) and of first-year faculty workshops (Provost and colleges/schools) • List of activities and presentations related to the effects of the Mission on teaching and research • List of teaching, research, technology, service learning awards and faculty awardees and of awards given by each school/college • Fromm Institute description and programming • List of USF Justice Lecture Series presenters and conferences held on campus or co-sponsored by USF • Report on proposals submitted through Office of Sponsored Projects
2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.	• Text concerning faculty promotion in CBAs and handbooks • List of relevant awards and awardees (teaching, research, University Life) • Examples of how research has impacted teaching and how students have participated in faculty-directed research and service learning
2.10 Regardless of mode of program delivery, the institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students and assesses their needs, experiences and levels of satisfaction. This information is used to help shape a learning-centered environment and to actively promote student success	• Copy of grade appeals process in *Fogcutter* and *Catalog* • NSSE, GSS and SSI data on student satisfaction • Report to Trustees on student experience at USF • Results of health survey and EBI conducted by UL and examples of how data were used to improve student experience

STANDARD 2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions (continued)

CFR	Evidence
2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs, and supports student professional and personal development.	• New student orientation description and assessment • Resident Ministers program description • Description of off-campus and co-curricular programs (e.g., study abroad, service learning, living learning communities, student service organizations, career services center, etc.) • NSSE, GSS and SSI data on participation on co-curricular activities
2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements.	• Copies of Admission Office brochures and advertisements, admissions video and blogs • CAS and SON Advising manuals • Description of departmental orientation sessions for new students • NSSE, GSS results • Assessment of New Student Orientation
2.13 Student support services—including financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, computer labs, and library and information serves—are designed to meet the needs of the specific types of students the institution serves and the curricula it offers.	• Survey of graduating students (GSS) data on satisfaction with support services • Description of CIT services and ITS survey on service satisfaction including a description of new smart classrooms and portal system • Description of changes in CAS advising • information on financial aid awarded and unmet gaps (including Pell eligibility trends) • List of services available through library and results of Library surveys • Description of One Stop and student feedback • NSSE, GSS and SSI data on satisfaction with support services • Summary of student feedback on advising quality and satisfaction
2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students assume an obligation to provide clear and accurate information about transfer requirements, ensure equitable treatment for such students with respect to academic policies, and ensure that such students are not unduly disadvantaged by transfer requirements.	• Admissions publications targeting transfers • Orientation for transfer students • Articulation agreements (descriptions, summaries, and/or full agreements) • NSSE data for transfer students

STANDARD 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

CFR	Evidence
3.1 The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives.	• Data on faculty and staff number and characteristics (including number with terminal degrees) • Faculty/student ratio • Copies of hiring procedures for faculty and staff and suggestions for diversifying candidate pools
3.2 The institution demonstrates that it employs a faculty with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve its educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever and however delivered.	• Data on faculty number and characteristics • Document on suggestions for diversifying candidate pools • Executive summaries of recent academic program reviews • CVs or general descriptions of recently hired faculty • List of recent faculty publications
3.3 Faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and, for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.	• CBAs and faculty handbooks • Copy of blank SUMMA and summary data • Copy of blank ACP • Procedures for staff recruitment
3.4 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purposes.	• Description of faculty development fund allocations • Listing of faculty development activities by school/ college • Orientation for new faculty and list of mentoring monthly lunches • List of special faculty development activities such as writing retreats, mentoring workshops for minority faculty, master teacher seminars (SOBAM), service learning seminars, mentoring workshops for recently hired faculty (CAS), appointment of peer mentors for new faculty (CAS), Western Conversations • List and projects of University-wide faculty development activities in CIT, NYU Summer Seminars, 4th Year Sabbatical • Special projects sponsored by departments or colleges supporting teaching and learning (e.g., Rhetoric 2006 Conference)
3.5. Fiscal and physical resources are effectively aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives, and are sufficiently developed to support and maintain the level and kinds of educational programs offered both now and for the foreseeable future.	• Copy of recent University budgets • Copy of Physical Plant Master Plan • Copy of audited Financial report

STANDARD 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability (continued)

CFR	Evidence
3.6 The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. For on-campus students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kinds to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered. These resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's purposes, and are appropriate, sufficient, and sustainable.	• Results of IT survey and feedback on use of USFconnect • Results of Library surveys • Description of information resources available at regional campuses • Description and number of smart classroom • Report on new ERP • GSS results
3.7 The institution's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.	• IT Master Plan • CIT training schedule • Data on *Blackboard* usage • Progress report on new ERP and Banner • Computer replacement policy • Classroom upgrade schedule/report • GSS results
3.8 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, and sufficient to support effective decision-making.	• Organizational charts • List of advisory boards and membership • Membership of Cabinet , Provost Council and Leadership Team • Description of the Planning, Budget and Review process • List of joint committees with membership
3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.	• Membership of Board of Trustees • Bylaws of Board of Trustees
3.10 The institution has a chief executive whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, together with a cadre of administrators qualified and able to provide effective educational leadership and management at all levels.	• Description of qualifications of members of Leadership Team • Leadership Team retreats in El Salvador and Tijuana
3.11 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution's educational purposes and character.	• Bylaws/procedures of select curriculum committees in each school or college • List of faculty who sit on Trustee committees • List of faculty members in college or school councils

STANDARD 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

CFR	Evidence
4.1 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning processes that assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate.	• Copy of Strategic Goals • Copy of Physical Plant Master Plan • Copy of Assessment Plan • Planning Priorities • "Report Card" to Board of Trustees on status of planning priorities
4.2 Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.	• Document on Planning, Budget and Review procedures • College/school strategic plans • Program review schedule for academic, co-curricular and service units • List of annual goals
4.3 Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.	• Planning process documents • Strategic Plans procedures • Program review schedule
4.4 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures, and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.	• Bylaws/procedures for select school or college curriculum committees • Copies of accreditation reports for SOBAM, SON, SOL, SOE • Schedule of academic, co-curricular and service unit program reviews and executive summaries of recent program reviews
4.5 Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included among the priorities of institutional research function are the identification of indicators and the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution's purposes and educational objectives. Periodic reviews of institutional research and data collection are conducted to develop more effective indicators of performance and to assure the suitability and usefulness of data.	• List of OIR-produced recent reports • Office of Institutional Assessment webpage • Copy of last reports about student enrollment, applications (Academic and Enrollment Services)

STANDARD 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement (continued)

CFR	Evidence
4.6 Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty takes responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and uses the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.	• Copy of blank ACP • CAM instructions for assessment of Core Curriculum • Summary of CAM assessment for Spring 2006 • Summaries of teaching evaluation (SUMMA) • NSSE, GSS results
4.7 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.	• List of faculty development activities in colleges and schools and University-wide including activities sponsored by Provost, CIT • Document on part-time faculty mentorship activities within department (Psychology, Sociology, Communication)
4.8 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of the educational programs.	• List and membership of advisory boards (SOBAM, SON, CPS, SOL) • Results of alumni surveys in program reviews (A&S) • Results of last surveys of alumni

TAB 8

INSTITUTIONAL STIPULATIONS

1. The University of San Francisco is using the review process to demonstrate its fulfillment of the two Core Commitments. We will engage in the process with seriousness and candor, present data that are accurate, and the Institutional Presentation will fairly represent the University.

2. The University of San Francisco has published and made publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission. Such policies will be available for review on request throughout the period of accreditation. Special attention will be paid to the University's policies and recordkeeping regarding complaints and appeals.

3. The University of San Francisco will abide by procedures adopted by the Commission to meet United States Department of Education (USDE) procedural requirements.

4. The University of San Francisco will submit all regularly required data and any data specifically requested by the Commission during the period of accreditation.

5. The University of San Francisco has reviewed its off-campus and distance education degree programs to ensure that they have been approved as required by the WASC Substantive Change process.

Stephen A. Privett, S.J.
President

TAB 9

List of Acronyms Used in Capacity and Preparatory Review

AACSB:	The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International
AAUP:	American Association of University Professors
ABA:	American Bar Association
ACP:	Academic Career Prospectus
ACT:	American College Testing
BCSSE:	Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement
C&PR:	Capacity and Preparatory Review
CAS:	College of Arts and Sciences
CASE:	Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education
CAAS:	Comprehensive Alumni Assessment Survey
CAM:	Core Assessment Matrix
CBAs:	Collective Bargaining Agreements
CFR:	Criteria for Review
CIRP:	Cooperative Institutional Research Program
CPS:	College of Professional Studies
CSRDE:	Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange
EBI:	Educational Benchmarking Inventory
ERP:	Enterprise Resource Planning
GRE:	Graduate Record Examination
GSS:	Graduating Student Survey
HERI:	Higher Education Research Institute Faculty Survey
IPEDS:	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System
IT:	Information Technologies
LIBQUAL:	Library Quality Survey
LLCs:	Living-Learning Communities
LSAT:	Law School Admission Test
LSSE:	Law School Survey of Student Engagement
MCAT:	Medical College Aptitude Test
NCLEX-RN:	Nursing Licensure Exam
NORC:	National Opinion Research Center
NRCCUA:	National Research Center for College & University Admissions
NSO:	New Student Orientation
NSSE:	National Survey of Student Engagement
OIA:	Office of Institutional Assessment
OIR:	Office of Institutional Research

List of Acronyms Used in Capacity and Preparatory Review

PACSW:	President's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women
RICA:	Reading Instruction Competence Assessment
RLC:	Residential Learning Communities/Living-Learning Communities
SAT:	Scholastic Aptitude Test
SOBAM:	School of Business and Management
SOE:	School of Education
SOL:	School of Law
SON:	School of Nursing
SSI:	Student Satisfaction Survey
SUMMA:	Summa Information Systems Faculty Evaluation
TPA:	Teaching Performance Assessment
USFFA:	University of San Francisco Faculty Association
WASC:	Western Association of Schools and Colleges