USF
UNIVERSITY of SAN FRANCISCO

REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW
SELF-STUDY

presented to

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

8 AUGUST 2007

USF
UNIVERSITY of SAN FRANCISCO

VISION, MISSION *and* VALUES
of the University of San Francisco

Approved by the Board of Trustees September 11, 2001

VISION

The University of San Francisco will be internationally recognized as a premier Jesuit Catholic, urban University with a global perspective that educates leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world.

MISSION

The core mission of the University is to promote learning in the Jesuit Catholic tradition. The University offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional students the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals, and the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for others.

The University will distinguish itself as a diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice. The University will draw from the cultural, intellectual, and economic resources of the San Francisco Bay Area and its location on the Pacific Rim to enrich and strengthen its educational programs.

CORE VALUES

The University's core values include a belief in and a commitment to:

{ 1 } the Jesuit Catholic tradition that views faith and reason as complementary resources in the search for truth and authentic human development, and that welcomes persons of all faiths or no religious beliefs as fully contributing partners to the University

{ 2 } the freedom and the responsibility to pursue truth and follow evidence to its conclusion

{ 3 } learning as a humanizing, social activity rather than a competitive exercise

{ 4 } a common good that transcends the interests of particular individuals or groups; and reasoned discourse rather than coercion as the norm for decision making

{ 5 } diversity of perspectives, experiences, and traditions as essential components of a quality education in our global context

{ 6 } excellence as the standard for teaching, scholarship, creative expression, and service

{ 7 } social responsibility in fulfilling the University's mission to create, communicate and apply knowledge to a world shared by all people and held in trust for future generations

{ 8 } the moral dimension of every significant human choice: taking seriously how and who we choose to be in the world

{ 9 } the full, integral development of each person and all persons, with the belief that no individual or group may rightfully prosper at the expense of others

{ 10 } a culture of service that respects and promotes the dignity of every person.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

The following initiatives are key to the University's achieving recognition as a premier Jesuit Catholic urban University.

{ 1 } Recruit and retain a diverse faculty of outstanding teachers and scholars and a diverse, highly-qualified, service-oriented staff committed to advancing the University's mission and its core values.

{ 2 } Enroll, support and graduate a diverse student body, which demonstrates high academic achievement, strong leadership capability, concern for others, and a sense of responsibility for the weak and the vulnerable.

{ 3 } Provide an attractive campus environment and the resources necessary to promote learning throughout the University:

- Technology solutions to enhance learning and improve service
- Learning resources that improve the curriculum and support scholarship
- Facilities to support outstanding educational programs

{ 4 } Continue to strengthen the University's financial base to support its educational mission.

REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW
SELF-STUDY

presented to

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

Table of Contents

SELF-STUDY
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW **8 AUGUST 2007**

INTRODUCTION

The University of San Francisco's *Vision, Mission and Values* statement proclaims that it will be "internationally recognized as a premier Jesuit Catholic, urban university with a global perspective that educates leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world." Since its founding in 1855, USF has benefited from a 467 year-old tradition of Jesuit education that guides its planning process and informs its actions. Our history as San Francisco's first university, our tradition as a Jesuit Catholic institution, and our *Vision, Mission and Values* statement (referred to as *Mission* in the rest of this document) have been the foundations upon which we built the planning of the WASC reaffirmation of accreditation process. *(CFR 1.1)*

Since early 2004 when we began preparations for our WASC reaffirmation of accreditation, the University community has been engaged in a process of analysis, planning, and change that has moved us closer to realizing our *Mission*. The process has served as a stimulus to a community already energized by a diverse student body, creative and dedicated faculty and staff, and visionary administrators. These past few years have seen an increase in the number and overall level of preparation of the students we serve, the addition of new academic programs, and the continued hiring of excellent teacher scholars and staff. We have significantly improved our planning process, our ability to budget for mission, and the assessment of student learning. Concurrent with these changes, we have made significant additions and improvements to our physical plant, completed a successful capital campaign, begun to re-envision the nature of co-curricular offerings, and added to a creative and energetic leadership. Nevertheless, we have not completed our tasks and much still needs to be accomplished as we become that university defined by our *Mission*—a university that is enriched by our Jesuit Catholic tradition, that both draws upon and contributes to our city, and educates future leaders with the global perspective required to create a more just world. *(CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)*

As we said in our *Proposal* to WASC, our goal for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (C&PR) is: "to assess our accomplishments, build our knowledge base and direct us in making choices that support our *Mission* rather than simply meet accreditation requirements." Thus we begin this document with a discussion of the Jesuit tradition that guides our institutional values and practices before proceeding to an analysis of how well we meet our goal of being a university that "educates minds and hearts to change the world."

Our Jesuit Tradition

Our 151 years of history and our current *Mission* statement can be understood best within the context of the Jesuit Catholic tradition of education, the basis of which can be traced to the writings of St. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits), and his followers. *(CFR 1.1)* Key characteristics of a Jesuit education can be summarized as follows:

- **STRIVING FOR THE MAGIS.** Seeking the *Magis* (the more, the greater) is more than just striving for excellence since it also asks individuals to strive for "the further still." It challenges students to study for "more" than grades, and the University to hold itself to standards "more" substantive than college rankings.
- **PROMOTING CRITICAL INQUIRY.** Education within a Jesuit perspective must include questioning and exploring what is observed and reflecting on what is experienced and learned. That reflection process must always include an analysis of the ethical dimensions of what is done and learned.

- **PROVIDING CURA PERSONALIS.** This core value of Jesuit education asks faculty, staff and administrators to place the individual at the center of an institution's concerns and efforts.
- **PURSUING A LIFELONG LIBERAL EDUCATION THAT IS SENSITIVE AND ADAPTABLE TO DIVERSITY.** Central to Jesuit education is the intention expressed by St. Ignatius to create schools and ministries that reflect the needs and aspirations of the time and place. This adaptability has been shown in Jesuits being welcomed in the imperial Chinese courts, in 16TH century India and Japan, and currently in developing countries where their ministries reflect a preferential option for the poor. Throughout history, Jesuit schools have welcomed students of all religious traditions and those with no denominational affiliation as full partners in the educational enterprise.
- **INSTILLING LEADERSHIP IN SERVICE.** Also central to a Jesuit education is the importance given to exposing students to the voices of the underserved, the disadvantaged, and the poor as well as to making it possible for students to serve others and to learn from those service experiences. This principle is often expressed by statements such as educating "men and women for and with others."
- **PROMOTING JUSTICE.** This encompassing principle of Jesuit education affirms that in educating for justice, we challenge students to use their talents and skills in order to create a better world for all and for generations to come.

For more than four centuries, these ideas and learning principles have played a central role in supporting the goal of educating the whole person (mind, spirit and heart). That goal shapes what we teach, how we educate, how we organize our University, and more importantly, what we expect of USF's students, faculty, alumni and staff. Indeed, our *Mission* challenges us to become a Jesuit Catholic learning community that is committed to educating leaders who will make a difference and who will promote justice wherever they live and however they serve. This approach to education has been summarized by one of our trustees, Fr. Dean Brackley, S.J., as follows: "We want to help students understand texts of all kinds and the world in which they live, and, as part of that, to grow in moral sensitivity and practical reasoning and judgment. For us, this latter half is not a complementary 'pastoral' add-on to academics, but an integral dimension of academic excellence." *(CFR 1.6)*

Institutional Context

The University of San Francisco was founded on October 15, 1855, in a one-room schoolhouse named Saint Ignatius Academy. By 1859, enrollment had grown to 65 students and the name was changed to Saint Ignatius College. The first Bachelor of Arts degree was conferred in 1863 and the first Master's degree in 1867. In 1927, the University moved to its current location near Golden Gate Park and in 1930, its name was changed to the University of San Francisco. In 1964, USF began admitting women as students to all academic programs, although women had been enrolling in selected evening programs and in the School of Law as early as 1927 and in the School of Nursing since 1954.

Today the University of San Francisco enrolls more than 8,500 students in its six schools and colleges: The College of Arts and Sciences; the School of Business and Management; the School of Education; the School of Law; the School of Nursing; and the College of Professional Studies. Classes are offered at the main 55-acre San Francisco campus, at four Northern California regional campuses, in Southern California, and at select international sites.

Ultimate responsibility for university governance rests with the Board of Trustees. There are presently 13 Jesuits on the 44-member Board of Trustees, including two ex-officio members (the University's President and the Rector of the USF Jesuit community). Mr. Claudio Chiuchiarelli is Chair of the Board of Trustees and Mr. Charles Smith is Vice Chair. *(CFR 3.9)*

The President of the University, Fr. Stephen A. Privett, S.J., is the Chief Executive Officer of the University. The President's Cabinet includes the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Associate Provost for Planning, Budget and Review; the vice presidents for Administration, Business and Finance, Information Technology, International Relations, University Advancement, and University Life; and, the General Counsel. The University's Leadership Team includes all of the members of the President's Cabinet plus two additional Associate Provosts; the six deans of the schools and colleges; the Dean of Gleeson Library/Geschke Center; and,

the Rector of the Jesuit community. *(CFR 3.10)* These executive officers meet weekly (Cabinet) or monthly (Leadership Team) and are charged with developing policy and planning and assessing programs and activities.

The faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business and Management, the School of Education, the School of Nursing, and librarians are represented by the USF Faculty Association which was certified by the National Labor Relations Board in 1975. Part-time faculty members are represented by the USF Part-Time Faculty Association, and in the School of Law, faculty members are represented by the Associated Law Professors of the University of San Francisco. Faculty members in the College of Professional Studies are not unionized.

In addition to WASC's accreditation, specific programs at USF are accredited by the AACSB International, the American Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Chemical Society, the California Board of Registered Nursing, the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, the State Bar of California, and the State Commission on Teacher Credentialing. *(CFR 2.7)*

SECTION ONE
USF: Committed to Institutional Capacity

This first section of our *Capacity and Preparatory Review* (C&PR) summarizes the evidence we have accumulated on how we meet the expectations included in the various WASC Criteria for Review (CFRs). Evidence summarized in this document is included in the *Attachments* section and is referenced in the text by numbers within bolded square brackets. The *Appendix* includes additional information and required data tables. This self-study summarizes discussions and analyses of evidence over the past four years with the involvement of students, faculty, staff, alumni, trustees and administrators. In those discussions we have analyze how USF aligns resources and institutional structures to achieve its educational objectives.

STANDARD ONE: Institutional Purpose and Educational Objectives

A Mission-Driven Institution

The University's *Mission* guides the curriculum and the co-curriculum; orients planning, budgeting and review; and serves as the University's cornerstone. For example, job openings for faculty and staff clearly indicate the need for candidates to "demonstrate a commitment to work in a culturally diverse environment and to contribute to the mission of the university." Interviews with prospective faculty include a discussion of the University's *Mission* and their understanding of how they can contribute to its fulfillment. Students applying to USF are asked to address the University's *Mission* in their application essay. Orientation programs for new faculty, staff and students include a discussion of the *Mission* and its implications. The importance of USF's *Mission* will be evident throughout this document, and in particular, in our analysis of how the University meets the two central commitments of institutional capacity and educational effectiveness. *(CFR 1.5, 3.2)*

The University's *Mission* serves as an underlying premise for transparent planning and decision-making, assessment and evaluation. For example, the planning and approval process for new academic programs includes consideration of how each program contributes to the University's *Mission*. Planning and budget decisions by the University's administration [1] consider the initiative's contributions to fulfilling our *Mission*. The program review process asks academic programs and service units to explicitly address their alignment with the *Mission*. Annually, faculty, staff and students are recognized for demonstrating scholarly achievement, superiority in service, and for exemplifying "the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for and with others." Furthermore, the University's *Mission* serves as the foundation for the mission statements of the various schools and colleges and for the University's service units. *(CFR 3.8)*

That our students are aware of our *Mission* and its role in the distinctive education they receive is demonstrated by their curricular and co-curricular activities and their stated plans for the future. Large proportions of graduating students indicate that USF has impacted their lives not just in terms of the

knowledge and skills they have acquired but in terms of their worldview and self-understanding. In 2006 for example, more than 78% of graduating students reported that their sense of social justice improved as a result of their USF experiences (a result that is similar to that of previous years). [2] Indeed, USF ranks 11th among medium-size universities in the number of graduates (N=287) who have become Peace Corps volunteers since the Peace Corps was founded in 1961. *(CFR 2.6, 2.11)*

Furthermore, results of a survey conducted in spring 2007 among those alumni who received their undergraduate degree from USF in the last 10 years show that 92.7% felt that USF prepared them well or very well for their first job after graduation. In addition, a large number of alumni reported that USF taught them the skills necessary to meet a number of other aspects of our *Mission* including participating in activities to assist the underserved and marginalized (82.7%), appreciating the needs of others (92.7%), acting ethically in their profession (95.9%), and contributing positively to society (95.2%). [3] *(CFR 4.8)*

Excellence in Educating Leaders

As our basic documents indicate, USF is an institution dedicated to "educating minds and hearts to change the world" and to creating "a diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice." Our academic programs are therefore, developed by faculty who are expert scholars in their fields and who are constantly updating and improving the curriculum and supporting the academic, professional, civic and personal development of our students. *(CFR 3.2)*

Our efforts at providing an excellent academic preparation for our students have been recognized by external indicators and ratings. For example, in October 2006, USF was one of only 99 institutions of higher education, including three other Jesuit schools, to be honored by the Corporation for National and Community Service for inclusion in the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll. In November 2006, USF was designated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a "Community Engagement" institution, one of only 76 schools to receive that designation during 2006. USF was one of only two Jesuit schools chosen for this new category. The Carnegie Foundation noted that USF "demonstrated excellent alignment between mission, culture, leadership, resources and practices that support dynamic and noteworthy community engagement." In addition, in 2006, the *Washington Monthly* described USF as one of 140 universities nationwide that distinguish themselves for being an engine of social mobility, supporting research and promoting an ethic of service. *(CFR 2.7, 4.8)*

The Unrestricted Pursuit of Truth

USF is a Jesuit Catholic university that is legally and financially independent of both the Catholic Church and the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). Nevertheless, the Jesuit tradition and the principles of the Catholic Church are the basis upon which we continue to build our community. As such, the University functions with the primary purpose of educating "leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world," individuals who exhibit academic excellence and who are "men and women for and with others." In pursuing this unconditional pursuit of truth and academic excellence, we welcome the contributions to our *Mission* made by Catholics and by our other Judeo-Christian sisters and brothers as well as by those who do not share a Christian faith and by those who may profess no particular religious beliefs. *(CFR 1.6)*

The freedom to pursue truth is a central value of USF and is manifested in the diversity of curricular and co-curricular offerings as well as in library acquisitions. Indeed, the University's *Mission* explicitly states that one of our Core Values is "the freedom and the responsibility to pursue truth and follow evidence to its conclusion." Furthermore, USF is an institution where values and religious concerns can be freely discussed in the classroom and where faculty and staff do not need to apologize for supporting the search for social justice. In its 151-year history, the University has neither been sanctioned nor warned by any professional or scholarly association regarding its ability to provide an open academic environment. Indeed, when the Western College Association (forerunner of WASC) paid its first official visit to USF in November of 1950, the visiting team noted that the "religious commitment of the institution did not limit freedom of learning or scholarship" and that "there was a considerable adaptation of the content of courses to the needs and problems of students in the modern world."

The faculty controls the planning, delivery and oversight of the curriculum. Curriculum committees, including faculty and administrators, exist in all schools and colleges. The primary objective of the curriculum committees is to oversee the academic quality of proposed curricular offerings including the appropriateness of learning outcomes, course design, number of credits assigned, workload expectations, and other factors. Faculty members are guaranteed academic freedom through specific statements in the various Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) and faculty handbooks. Due process procedures for faculty, staff and students are widely available online and through publications as well as within the various CBAs and faculty handbooks. *(CFR 1.4, 3.11)*

As part of its policies and procedures, the University supports the rights of its students: freedom of expression, association, information dissemination and the use of University facilities that are congruent with their search for truth. Students' explorations for the truth and opportunities for expressing their beliefs range from the commonplace to the idiosyncratic and inspired, including writing for the student newspaper, recording programs and events for the radio stations (KDNZ or KUSF) as well as for USFtv, organizing student groups and events, holding a hunger strike to protest immigration law or signing a graduation pledge to search for sustainability and environmental responsibility in employment. Policies and procedures are available online as well as in student publications such as the *Catalog* and the *Fogcutter*. The offices of the Dean of Students and of the Ombudsperson are available for students to express concerns about their rights or to seek the resolution of disputes regarding freedom of expression or inquiry. The University truthfully represents its goals and the nature of its programs through publications and on its website (www.usfca.edu). *(CFR 1.8, 1.4)*

Institutional Operational Integrity

The University is constantly searching for more effective business practices that allow USF to be a better steward of its resources. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees meets every two months to review key aspects of the University's functioning. The President's Cabinet meets every week to set policy and review progress in planning. A demonstration of our concern for operational integrity is the establishment in 2004 of the Office of Internal Audit and Tax Compliance and the creation of a "whistleblower line." The director of the office reports to the Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees. Annually, the Office selects specific areas to audit because of complaints received, events at other institutions, or procedures or practices that have a potential for abuse. *(CFR 1.3, 3.5)*

Additionally, USF demonstrates integrity in its operations and has developed functional procedures to guarantee such integrity. Policies have been developed for a number of functions including travel and entertainment, and the use of communications equipment and purchasing cards. The University's finances are audited annually by Deloitte & Touche and the University's budget and audit report are reviewed by the Board of Trustees. *(CFR 1.3)*

Strength and Excellence in Our Diversity

The University's *Mission* identifies diversity as one of our key distinctive Core Values in particular, "a belief in and a commitment to advancing … a diversity of perspectives, experiences and traditions as essential components of a quality education in our global context." An additional related institutional value is USF's commitment to advancing "the full, integral development of each person and all persons, with the belief that no individual or group may rightfully prosper at the expense of others." *(CFR 1.5)*

These core values have shaped USF into an institution that fosters diversity as a way to enhance the educational experience, academic excellence, and personal development of our students and all the other members of our learning community. We realize that "diversity" at a university must mean more than gender and ethnic/racial variety. Indeed, we also value diversity in terms of ancestry, nationality, citizenship, religion, religious creed, socio-economic status, physical ability, sexual orientation, marital status, and age. As our President, Fr. Stephen A. Privett, S.J. has said, "this is a University community where students, faculty and staff learn from each other; where diversity is not a political agenda, but the necessary ingredient of a quality education in the 21st century." This diversity can be seen in the composition of our student body, faculty and staff and in significant efforts to diversify the curriculum. For example, all undergraduate students must take a course that analyzes cultural diversity and several majors have discipline-specific diversity requirements. *(CFR 1.5)*

We have chosen to analyze our effectiveness in building a diverse learning environment as one of our themes for the Educational Effectiveness Review. Therefore, in this docu-

ment we will only review our efforts to support diversity through our policies, academic and co-curricular programming and organizational practices. To make the analysis manageable, we will concentrate on three aspects of diversity: gender, ethnicity/race and economic diversity. The second section of this C&PR self-study will analyze in greater detail two issues of particular concern to us: retention and on-time graduation of our students and the recruitment, retention and promotion of minority faculty and staff.

Ethnicity/Race

USF is one of the most ethnically diverse institutions in the country. We are rated 14th in the ethnic diversity of our students among 248 national universities in the 2007 *U.S. News & World Report* and 16th among 361 institutions of higher learning by the 2006 *Princeton Review*. In addition, we are the second most ethnically diverse university among the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities. In fall 2006, 40.9% of our students were ethnic minority or multiethnic. Overall, Asian Americans represent the largest minority group among all USF students (17.6%) and among traditional-age undergraduates (21.5%). [4]

The diversity of the student body has been increasing in the last 15 years with the proportion of white students decreasing from 51.1% of all students in 1991 to 40.3% in 2006. During this 15-year period, we have experienced noticeable increases in the number of African Americans (32.7% increase), Asian Americans (100.8% increase) and Latinos (140.4% increase). [4] These increases in the ethnic composition of our student body reflect not just the increasing diversity of college-bound youth in the western states but also USF's targeted outreach efforts. Between 2002 and 2006, the number of freshman applications received from African Americans increased 83.4%, 110% for Asian Americans, and 100% for Latinos.

Our faculty and staff do not show the same level of ethnic/racial diversity as our student body. Overall, 21% of our full-time faculty identify themselves as a member of an ethnic minority group. Of the part-time faculty who report ethnic background, 15.5% self-identify as members of an ethnic minority group. Among full-time staff, 35.6% self-identify as belonging to one of the major ethnic/racial minority groups. Among our Trustees, 31% are members of an ethnic minority group.

The curriculum also reflects USF's commitment to ethnic/racial diversity. Undergraduate students can pursue one of four ethnicity-oriented minors (African American Studies, Asian American Studies, Chicano/Latino Studies or Ethnic Studies). Also, courses in our regional minors (e.g., African Studies, Asian Studies, European Studies, Latin American Studies) often involve discussions and analyses of ethnicity and race. Approximately 24 undergraduate and 11 graduate courses with significant ethnic/racial content have been offered at least once during the last two academic years. Co-curricular activities also reflect our interest in creating an ethnically diverse learning community. For example, our Multicultural Student Services Office supports 23 clubs centered on ethnicity or culture that are open to all students.

Gender

USF has made great strides in the gender diversification of its student body since 1964 when the first women students were admitted to the traditional undergraduate programs. Indeed, the number of women students at USF has increased by 11% over the last 10 years and in fall 2006, 62.1% of all students were women. [5] The corresponding figure among traditional-age undergraduates was 65.9%. Compared to other Jesuit universities, USF is 3rd in terms of the proportion of women enrolled as students in AY 2005-2006. Gender parity is increasing in other areas of the University including the gender distribution of student athletes and faculty, administrator and staff appointments.

USF has made significant efforts at gender diversification of the faculty. As reported in the 2006 AAUP report on gender equity, 42.8% of the full-time faculty at USF are women compared to 39.1% for all colleges and universities included in that report. This level of gender diversity among the faculty is the product of concerted efforts to diversify candidate pools on the part of the deans and Provost. IPEDS data for 2006 showed that 56.5% of full-time staff are women. The largest proportions of women are found among such job categories as clerical and secretarial (71.0%) and support and service professionals (57.2%). [6] Among our Trustees, 21% are women and this proportion has remained fairly similar over the last four years.

Our efforts to increase gender diversity are also manifested in the curriculum. USF offers undergraduate students the

opportunity to pursue an interdisciplinary minor in Gender and Sexualities Studies. In addition, approximately 25 undergraduate and three graduate courses with a significant level of gender or sexuality content have been offered at least once during the last two academic years.

Socio-Economic Diversity

USF supports the education of low-income students and values the contributions of a socio-economically diverse student body. For AY 2004-2005, approximately 13% of the students who applied for financial aid had family incomes of less than $30,000. This percentage is higher than at the other Jesuit universities in California. Approximately 22.5% of USF undergraduate students received Pell grants during AY 2005-2006, a percentage that is again higher than that of the other California Jesuit universities. Indeed, USF is ranked 8th among the 28 Jesuit universities in the proportion of undergraduate students who received a Pell grant in AY 2005-2006. [7] Maintaining this diversity in our student body is important to USF not just as a reflection of our history as educators of immigrants and of their children and of first generation college students but also because of the important educational benefits of diversity in the quality of our learning community.

Effects of Diversity

This diversity in the curriculum and in the composition of our student body, faculty and staff is reflected in students' reactions as seen in a number of surveys. For the past five years, more than 80% of graduating students reported that individual, ethnic, religious and other differences were valued at the University. Approximately 70% of graduating students in the last five years reported that their appreciation of individual, ethnic and religious differences increased while at USF. [8]

Responses to the NSSE for the last three years consistently show that the experiences of our students in a diverse environment have increased their exposure and understanding of diverse others. And this is reflected in their academic work. For example, among respondents to the 2006 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), 75% of first-year students and 79% of seniors indicated that they often or very often included diverse perspectives in class discussions or in written work. These responses are well above those of the whole NSSE sample in 2006 (60%) as well as those found among respondents from Jesuit universities (66% for first-year students and 69% for seniors). Furthermore, this behavior is found among minority students (74% of first-year students and 82% for seniors) as well as whites (74% of first-year students and 80% of seniors). Moreover, large proportions of first-year students (69%) and seniors (68%) reported that their experiences at the University contributed to their acquisition of knowledge and skills required to understand individuals of diverse ethnic backgrounds. These results are higher than those found for the NSSE sample and for other Jesuit universities. Importantly, our NSSE data show that these effects also are found among white students (67% of first-year and 62% of seniors) and among ethnic minority students (71% of first-year and 76% of seniors). [8]

Data from NSSE also show that USF's institutional emphasis on promoting diversity manifests itself in self-reported interpersonal behaviors. In 2006, approximately 68% of first-year students and 71% of seniors at USF reported having serious conversations with students different from themselves in terms of ethnicity or race. Comparable responses for Jesuit universities were 56% for both first-year students and seniors, and for the entire NSSE sample were 49% and 52%, respectively. Once again these results were found among ethnic minority students (63% of first-year students and 66% of seniors) and among whites (76% of first-year students and 72% of seniors). [8]

Results from our alumni survey show that 92% believed that USF prepared them for working in a multicultural environment as well as to appreciate differences between people (94%). Similarly, large numbers of alumni felt that USF prepared them to relate positively with diversity in terms of race/ethnicity (94%), religion (91%), sexual orientation (87%), political beliefs/values (89%) or socio-economic background (90%). Importantly, 88% of our alumni reported that their experiences at USF helped them to personally and/or professionally advocate for diversity. [9]

STANDARD TWO: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Excellence in Teaching and Learning

USF is characterized in our *Mission* as a "premier Jesuit Catholic, urban university with a global perspective that educates leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world." In carrying out this mission, USF is dedicated to delivering excellent graduate and undergraduate academic programs and co-curricular activities that challenge students to engage the world in which they live and to which they must contribute. Excellence in learning at USF, therefore, goes beyond quality academic programs that match the level of excellence achieved by other institutions and includes striving for the *Magis* and learning *from* and *in* the city of San Francisco, the nation, and the world.

All undergraduate students at USF must fulfill the requirements of a Core Curriculum that reflects our Jesuit tradition of educating the whole person. USF's Core Curriculum includes 44 units (out of 128 units required for graduation) in communication and quantitative skills, literature, history, philosophy, theology or religious studies, social sciences, visual and performing arts, physical sciences, and ethics. In addition, all undergraduate students must take at least one course in each of two areas: Service Learning and Cultural Diversity. Large proportions of USF seniors consistently report on the NSSE that their experiences at USF contributed to acquiring a broad general education, developing writing and speaking skills, developing the ability to think critically, and learning to work effectively with others. NSSE data also show that our students feel that their experiences at USF have contributed to acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills. [10] Furthermore, the 2007 survey of alumni showed that large numbers felt that their experiences at USF helped them develop skills and abilities associated with the outcomes of an excellent general education such as critical thinking and problem solving capabilities (95%), oral and written communication skills (95%), information-seeking abilities (93%), quantitative analysis skills (87%), as well as to think creatively (90%), appreciate the arts (83%), be aware of international issues (80%), and achieve leadership skills (88%). [11] *(CFR 2.1)*

Academic Program Excellence

The fulfillment of the University's *Mission* is based on providing academic programs that excel in their quality and relevance. Our academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary and professional standards in terms of content and length, and undergo periodic review on a five- to seven-year cycle. In a number of occasions these program reviews have produced curricular changes that have improved the program and the academic experiences of our students. External standards and practices are considered when developing new academic programs to ensure they meet or exceed the expectations of scholars in the field and relevant accrediting or licensing agencies. *(CFR 2.1)*

Equally important is our concern with developing academically rigorous programs that reflect our *Mission*. For example, the University recently developed a new Master of Science in Financial Analysis. The program adheres strictly to the standards of the relevant professional certification association (CFA) and includes concerns for ethical behavior and for an understanding on the part of our students of their social responsibilities. The same analysis and concern for reflecting our *Mission* is reflected in recently developed graduate and undergraduate programs in Chicano/Latino Studies, Development Economics, and Nursing, to mention but a few. Faculty members are always involved in overseeing course and program development and approval through their membership in college/school curriculum committees. *(CFR 2.1)*

Syllabi and student feedback show that faculty members clearly articulate academic expectations and challenge students to go beyond rote learning to become critically engaged scholars. For example, among students responding to NSSE in 2006, 61% of seniors and 52% of first-year students reported working harder than they thought they could in order to meet instructor's standards or expectations. These figures are similar to those found among all NSSE respondents and among Jesuit universities. Likewise, USF students report that faculty members challenge them in exams in proportions similar to those found among other NSSE respondents. [12] *(CFR 2.2)*

Results from NSSE surveys also show that students engage in collaborative learning both inside and outside the classroom. In 2006, 61% of seniors and 41% of first-year students

reported working outside of class with other students to prepare assignments. Once again, these figures are similar to those of respondents at Jesuit universities and of the whole NSSE sample. [13] In addition, on the May 2006 Graduating Student Survey (GSS), 94.6% of the respondents agreed that "my instructor took an active interest in my learning" and 92.9% felt that instructors were "reasonably accessible outside of class." Furthermore, data from our teaching evaluations (i.e., SUMMA) show that USF faculty members consistently receive scores that are above national averages. *(CFR 2.2)*

The excellence of the academic experiences of our students can also be seen by how our students challenge themselves to excel in their learning. It is not uncommon for our students, undergraduate as well as graduate, to conduct research and present or publish the results, both with faculty and independently. Business and Management students have repeatedly earned top places in international entrepreneurial business plan competitions. The best work of undergraduates across the disciplines is published in an annual book-length publication, *Writing for a Real World*. During AY 2006-2007, students in Computer Science developed a website to track contributions to political campaigns in San Francisco. These are but a few examples of the active scholarly life at USF, where students continually demonstrate the quality of their academic experiences and engagement with their chosen field of study. While these and other activities enhance our students' scholarly life, they don't necessarily reach all students and are not present in all fields of study. *(CFR 2.9)*

Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities

The student successes mentioned above are the result of the high quality faculty who teach at USF. Over 90% of the full-time faculty have terminal degrees in their respective field and maintain an active scholarly life. For example, during the period 2004-2006, full-time faculty published 79 books in areas as diverse as moral theology, aging, globalization, health care, workplace rights, organizational behavior, business and management and teaching techniques. [14] In addition, faculty published a large number of articles in refereed journals in the disciplines represented among USF's faculty. USF is the home to five scholarly journals 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. Data from our Office of Sponsored Projects (established in 2002), show that in FY 2007 a total of 38 grants were funded for the first time or renewed for combined total funding of $5.5 million of support, an increase of 15.9% over the previous fiscal year. [15] *(CFR 2.8, 3.1)*

The University endeavors to encourage and support the scholarly and creative activities of its faculty. A faculty development fund is provided every year to support scholarly travel, instructional improvements, and to serve as seed money for new research projects. Our on-campus Jesuit Foundation provides small grants for curriculum innovation and research efforts that enhance the Jesuit tradition and identity of USF. The University offers periodic workshops and mentoring opportunities for faculty in order to enhance their scholarship and teaching. During AY 2006-2007, the Office of Sponsored Projects offered workshops on grant writing, and the deans of the various colleges/schools sponsored writing retreats, reading groups, brown bag discussions, colloquia, and visits by distinguished scholars to discuss their latest work. USF is a full member of the Faculty Research Network that offers faculty development workshops during January and June. We have been able to send 23 faculty members in the last three years to these very successful workshops that have impacted curriculum as well as the research agenda of our faculty. *(CFR 3.4)*

Educating the Whole Person

The Jesuit tradition enjoins USF to educate the whole person–mind, body and spirit–leading us to recognize the need to support student learning and development in classroom contexts *and* beyond. For example, USF requires all undergraduate students to participate in service learning courses and encourages them to explore the world beyond the comforts of their own experiences. We challenge students to extend their knowledge and experience by building the structures they have designed, performing the plays they have authored, publishing the works they have written, and practicing what they have learned - through internships, volunteer work, community leadership roles and other opportunities outside the classroom. NSSE data for the last three years show that USF students have participated in community-based projects in greater proportions than other NSSE respondents. In 2006 for example, 39% of USF seniors reported this type of activity, compared to 22% at other Jesuit universities and 17% for the whole NSSE sample. [29] *(CFR 2.2)*

Our efforts to support student learning extend beyond the classroom context, and NSSE data indicate that our

students feel supported academically. For example, in 2006, 75% of seniors and 79% of first-year students indicated that they received academic support from USF. These figures are similar to those of Jesuit institutions and higher than the responses of the whole NSSE sample. In contrast, low proportions of 2006 seniors (33%) and first-year students (49%) indicated that USF emphasized providing the support needed to thrive socially. Relatively small proportions of USF students reported spending time in co-curricular activities. In the 2006 NSSE, 50% of seniors and 39% of first-year students reported spending no time at all in co-curricular activities during a typical week. Corresponding figures at other Jesuit universities were 31% for seniors and 24% for first-year students. *(CFR 2.10)* [16]

USF endeavors to provide both prospective and current students including transfers with all the information necessary to make informed educational choices. Our printed materials are revised every two to three years with new materials being added and their design improved. Information contained in viewbooks, the *Catalog*, and other publications is accurate and current, and the online *Catalog* is regularly updated. Student policies are available in print (*Fogcutter*) and online and they are continually updated. Our website is maintained and updated by the staff of relevant departments and programs. While further changes are necessary to make the website more attractive, user-friendly and informative, a recent analysis by NRCCUA awarded our website's functionality and design an "A" in terms of its ability to meet the needs of prospective students. Our website received a score of 70.05 points out of a possible 100 (national average is 49.57). *(CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.12, 2.14)*

Student support services are available to all students and receive high user satisfaction ratings. Data from our 2006 Graduating Student Survey (GSS), for example, show that 78.6% of graduating students rated library services as excellent or good. Nevertheless, some improvements need to be made in services to graduate students and to those studying at our regional campuses. For example, on the May 2006 GSS, undergraduate students were much more likely than graduate students to give positive ratings to services provided by a school/college dean's office, the registrar's office, career services center, bursar's office, recreational facilities and academic advising. *(CFR 2.3)*

Financial aid plays an important role in our ability to serve and retain students. As a private, tuition-driven institution (86.6% of the annual revenue is produced by tuition and fees), financial aid is critical in our ability to recruit and retain students. During AY 2005-2006, 67.6% of undergraduates and 64.2% of graduate students received some form of financial aid. During that same academic year, the University dedicated $32.2 million to need-based scholarships and grants and $5.7 million to non-need-based aid. Total institutional aid for FY 05-06 was almost $40 million, representing approximately 16.9% of USF's total operating budget. Nevertheless, there is an average unmet aid gap of approximately $3,000 to $4,000 for students who receive aid and USF students carried an average debt load during AY 2005-2006 of $25,788. The need for additional financial aid is central to the University's planning and has been made a special component of our recently completed Capital Campaign through which we have raised nearly $50 million for financial aid endowment.

For a number of years, data from our GSS, and more recently from NSSE, have shown that there is a significant level of student dissatisfaction with aspects of academic advising. Data from the GSS, for example, showed that while there was generalized unhappiness with advising, there were differences across schools/colleges and that students were particularly dissatisfied with career or professional/life choice advising. Results from NSSE demonstrate that students show satisfaction with general academic advising, but tend to report low levels of interactions regarding career plans. The 2006 NSSE showed that 72% of seniors and 74% of first-year students felt that academic advising was good or excellent, proportions that were fairly similar to those of other Jesuit universities. [17] Nevertheless, 23% of seniors and 32% of first-year students reported "never" talking about career plans with a faculty member or adviser. These proportions are higher than the corresponding figures at other Jesuit universities. *(CFR 2.3, 2.13)*

During the last few months, the University has implemented strategies to improve student advising. The College of Arts and Sciences has developed a comprehensive manual and convened training sessions for recently hired faculty. During the fall, 2006 new student orientation, the University piloted a special program- and department-specific component that fully describes program opportunities and requirements and promotes high academic expectations on the part of students. These modules are faculty-driven and received overwhelmingly positive reactions from our incoming students. The

University has funded two additional positions to support the advising of at-risk students and those on academic probation, one in the College of Arts and Sciences and the other in the School of Business and Management. The College of Arts and Sciences has also developed a special intervention program that is required of all students on academic probation. Initial data from this program showed that after one semester of personalized advising, 73% of the students in the program raised their GPA and 40% were removed from probation. Furthermore, faculty as well as staff at the career services center are encouraged to advise students on job and career opportunities, and the School of Business and Management is developing a placement center targeted at MBA graduates. Meeting students' expectations regarding advising continues to be an important challenge that the University needs to address as it strives to provide effective learning support to our students. *(CFR 2.4, 2.5)*

STANDARD THREE: A Sustainable Institution

USF pays careful attention to the responsible stewardship of its human, physical, fiscal, and information resources. Achieving our *Mission* and supporting student learning is made possible by our excellent and dedicated faculty and staff, systematic planning and alignment of investments in physical and information resources, fiscal responsibility, and participatory and transparent decision-making processes.

A Dedicated Highly Qualified Faculty and Staff

A cornerstone of our ability to support student learning in the Jesuit Catholic tradition is our excellent faculty and staff. Hiring decisions for tenure-track appointments at USF are made after thorough nationwide searches that are advertised in national publications and other outlets and that produce, in most cases, large and diverse candidate pools. Some professional staff positions also undergo national searches in order to fill openings. We hire highly qualified individuals who are promising scholars and professionals, well trained in their fields, and who understand their important role in fulfilling the University's *Mission. (CFR 3.2)*

Recent increases in our undergraduate population and, to a lesser extent among selected graduate programs, have required us to increase the number of full-time faculty in order to better serve the educational needs of our students. The University has made a significant investment in the last few years, adding 33 new faculty lines since 2001. For AY 2007-2008, provisions are being made to fund an additional 17 new, full-time faculty lines. Increases in full-time faculty will allow us to improve the learning climate and experiences of our students by increasing the range of expertise within USF's intellectual community as well as the availability of faculty to advise students and to engage them in scholarly activities. This decision to invest more resources in the hiring of full-time faculty will also allow USF to compare favorably with other universities. Indeed, the 2006 AAUP report on faculty showed that USF relies on a relatively large percentage of part-time faculty. In the fall of 2005, for example, 59.6% of our faculty was made up of part-time employees, one of the highest among the 28 Jesuit universities. This is due in part to the increase in undergraduate students during the last few years and the University's desire to maintain relatively small section sizes. For example, there were 3,978 traditional-age undergraduate students at USF in fall 2002 and that group had increased to 4,684 in fall 2005. This growth has produced increases in the number of undergraduate student credit hours (SCHs) taught by part-time faculty. In the fall of 2002, 37.2% of undergraduate SCHs class sections were taught by part-time faculty members compared to 42.2% in the fall of 2006. *(CFR 3.1, 3.2)*

Although we are concerned with the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty, we are proud of the quality of our part-time faculty members, many of whom have taught for us over a number of years. In a majority of cases, part-time faculty are hired as a result of local searches that produce well-trained scholars or professionals who are dedicated to student learning and who understand the University's *Mission***.** The University supports adjunct faculty in their teaching through dedicated faculty development funds for course or pedagogical improvement, training seminars, workshops on pedagogy, periodic review of their classroom performance, and their involvement in curriculum development. Individual schools and colleges have also put in place processes to support part-time faculty, including class visitations, training in pedagogy and assessment, and periodic meetings with dean's office staff and/or program directors. *(CFR 3.4)*

The University maintains a strong commitment to affirmative action and to providing equal employment opportunities to all qualified applicants, and we consider this commitment an important component of building an excellent faculty and professional staff. We have developed a number of procedures to guarantee a diverse pool of candidates, and our job announcements specifically state that we look for individuals who "demonstrate a commitment to work in a culturally diverse environment and to contribute to the mission of the University. USF is an Equal Opportunity Employer dedicated to affirmative action and to excellence through diversity."

In the last few years, we have made significant strides in diversifying the faculty. For example, in AY 2001-2002, 79.4% of full-time faculty members were white non-Hispanic and 40.3% were women. Five years later, during AY 2006-2007, the proportion of white non-Hispanic faculty had decreased to 75.7% and the proportion of full-time women faculty had increased to 44.7%. Among probationary (tenure-track) full-time faculty, the proportion of white non-Hispanics decreased from 68.7% in AY 2001-2002 to 66.7% in AY 2006-2007, and the proportion of women increased from 44.6% in AY 2001-2002 to 56.4% in AY 2006-2007. Significantly, increases in the number of women faculty have taken place across disciplines including the physical sciences. These changes over a relatively short period of time are the result of a commitment on the part of the University to diversify its faculty. Nevertheless, further diversification is needed, both overall, and in specific programs and departments, in order to provide our students with the educational benefits of a diverse learning environment and to prepare them for working in a multicultural and diverse society. Unfortunately, a few of our ethnic minority faculty have been recruited away from USF in the recent past by institutions who can offer access to graduate students, locations with lower costs for housing and overall living expenses, or are minority-serving institutions. [6, 18] *(CFR 1.5)*

Reflecting the increased number of students and the increased mandated demands for reporting and accountability, the number of full-time administrators and staff increased from 647 in the fall of 2002 to 713 in the fall of 2006. Hiring of staff follows established procedures that are coordinated by our Human Resources Office and include open, public searches and the evaluation of qualifications by peers and/or supervisors. Data on staff diversity as reported in the IPEDS protocols show that from 2002 to 2006, the number of female staff members has increased 2.5% and the number of ethnic minority staff members has increased by 18.7%. [6, 19]

The University values the quality of its faculty and has developed procedures to support their development. Faculty evaluation parameters are defined in the various collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) and in the Faculty Handbook for the College of Professional Studies (CPS) and the School of Law. Faculty workload is decided by the dean of each school and college based on parameters set in the CBAs or handbooks and considering the needs of the department or program and the University. All students are asked to fill out a teaching evaluation form at the end of each course session and these evaluations are taken into consideration in making decisions regarding continuation of appointment, promotion and tenure. All full-time faculty, and increasingly part-time faculty as well, meet with a member of the dean's staff to review teaching and scholarly progress in the previous academic year and plans for the future. Promotion and tenure decisions are made based on procedures and standards included in the CBAs or handbooks, and involve peer review of each application by USF committees as well as outside scholars. *(CFR 3.3, 3.4)*

The University annually provides substantial funds for faculty development activities. For FY 2007, USF contributed $861,000 for full-time faculty development and $91,000 for part-time faculty development activities. These funds are allocated on a competitive basis at the college/school level and support various areas of scholarly and/or teaching development. Recently, schools/colleges have been developing more systematic approaches to the assignment of these funds in order to better serve the needs of the faculty and of the University. USF also has implemented creative approaches to sabbaticals. Newly hired tenure-track faculty members are eligible for a 4TH-year sabbatical where they can spend a semester at full pay advancing their research agenda and preparing for tenure. Full-time tenure-track faculty members are eligible for a semester-long sabbatical at full pay or for a full year sabbatical at 75% of salary. *(CFR 3.4)*

Institutional Alignment of Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources

We realize that our success at providing an effective and supportive learning environment for our students depends on aligning our resources to support the University's *Mission*.

Achieving this alignment has been a focus of our recent efforts, particularly during the last seven years, with the development of a more participative, transparent and data-driven decision-making process. For example, we have instituted an open planning, budget and review process. In addition, we have begun the development of updated plans in Information Technology and a new campus Master Plan since the previous ones were completed. These plans have guided construction and remodeling of our facilities and helped us meet the technological needs of students, faculty and staff.

The University continues to be financially stable, operating with a surplus and with appropriate internal and external budgetary controls and oversight. Our financial strength (e.g., balanced budgets, increased endowment, increased reserves) is the result of a responsible planning and review process that involves faculty and administrators and is overseen by the Board of Trustees, external auditors (Deloitte & Touche), the Associate Provost for Budget, Planning and Review and our internal auditor. The University's budget has been balanced for over 25 years, and has seen growing operating surpluses since the year 2000. For the past three years, the cumulative operating surplus has exceeded $6 million which has been invested in improving the institution. The endowment has increased from $38.7 million in May 1991 to over $200 million in May 2007. The University is building a reserve account to buffer unexpected enrollment or cost variations and we expect to reach our goal of this account totaling 1.5% of unrestricted revenue in FY08. Central to our budget planning is a review of new initiatives by members of the Leadership Team who judge each proposal's perceived value and contribution to fulfilling the *Mission* of the University. Revenue proposals (such as tuition and housing rates) are also discussed by members of the Leadership Team. The University's budget, including charges for tuition and housing, is approved annually by the Board of Trustees. *(CFR 3.5)*

Our first Master Plan for Physical Plant was developed in 1947, and subsequent versions have oriented construction as well as the remodeling of almost all campus buildings. All along, changes to physical plant have been guided by the University's academic needs, with priority given to those projects that receive appropriate funding from bonds, gifts and the capital campaign and that are integral to our ability to serve the University community. While major inroads have been made in solving problems due to deferred maintenance, significant improvements and repairs are still needed. The University recently hired an Assistant Vice President for Facilities Management who is providing direction and clarity to physical space construction and renovation in a transparent manner that involves stakeholders fully. For example, a campus construction bulletin is posted weekly on USFconnect (the campus web portal) to provide updates on changes to physical plant and warn about possible disruptions created by noise, dust or traffic. Planning for space assignments and relocations continues to be a source of concern across campus, given the ill-defined nature of the decision-making process. Classroom remodeling and upgrading is a significant success story. Over 95% of all classrooms have new furnishings and updated technology. At the same time, given our increased enrollment figures, and the growth in certain programs, there is a need for additional classrooms in diverse sizes and configurations as well as social spaces. Furthermore, recent construction and remodeling projects have made it difficult to find enough classrooms at certain times of the week. Our regional campuses (San Ramon, Santa Rosa, Sacramento, Cupertino) are modern and flexible. One of our strategic initiative analyses for AY 2006-2007 is centered on the role and future of our regional campuses. This analysis involves a review of revenue contributions made by each campus, enrollment patterns, plans for new programs, and an analysis of their enrollment potential. A similar analysis conducted approximately two years ago led to the closure of our Oakland regional campus. *(CFR 4.2)*

USF has made a significant investment in information technology. From an unrestricted expense budget of $4.7 million in 2000 (approximately 3.4% of the FY operating base budget), we are now spending well over $11.5 million in hardware, software, licenses and staff (5.0% of the base budget). The last few years have seen classroom technology upgrades, implementation of a three-year replacement cycle for personal computers, enhancement of classroom support software, an investment of over $10.2 million over various years for a new ERP system (SCT Banner), increased wireless coverage, and associated IT staff increases (from 38 staff in 2000 to 62 in 2007). This investment in IT resources and increased staff commitment to service, have produced a significant increase in student satisfaction. For example, the May 2000 Graduating Student Survey showed that 43% of graduating students rated IT services as excellent or good. In comparison, 67% of May 2006 graduates rated IT services as good or excellent. *(CFR 3.6)*

USF has embraced the use of technology to improve teaching and learning. Almost all of our classrooms are networked and a large proportion of courses use course management technology resources (e.g., Blackboard). Furthermore, faculty members are increasingly using student feedback and engagement technology (e.g., clickers), podcasting and other technological resources. For example, Blackboard use increased from 309 course sections in fall 2003 to 586 sections by fall 2006. A substantial number of classrooms, the library and other public social places now have wireless connections to the Internet, and all student rooms in residence halls are networked. Like students all over the country, USF students show reliance on digital methods to complete assignments and to communicate with faculty. NSSE data for 2006 show that a high proportion of first-year students (56% in 2006) and seniors (67%) report using electronic resources to discuss or complete assignments–proportions that are very similar to those of the whole NSSE sample and of students at Jesuit schools. [20] *(CFR 3.7)*

The University's libraries continue to play an extremely important role in supporting our learning community. While limited financial resources and significant cost increases (e.g., subscriptions to periodicals and online databases) have constrained the library's growth and development potential, the University has sought creative ways in which services may continue to improve. The number and quality of online resources (databases, full-text documents, catalog) have grown significantly in the last few years. The University also has increased the library's endowment during FY 07 and made important new base budget increases to support growth and maintenance of library collections and services. For example, during AY 2005-2006, an increased allocation of over $110,000 was made to Gleeson Library/Geschke Center to support acquisitions, and ongoing base budget increases of $100,000 are planned to cover raising subscription costs. Our capital campaign that concluded in 2007 also contributed $4.5 million for library facilities and endowment. Our library also has developed creative new strategies to facilitate the use of information resources, including purchasing alliances with other Jesuit universities, shared access to collections through the Jesuit Passport, and more traditional services, such as interlibrary loans and document search services. Overall, satisfaction with library services is quite high among students and faculty. For example, 78.6% of May 2006 graduating students rated library services as good or excellent. In the 2006 LibQUAL+ survey of our library, respondents were asked to rate general satisfaction with "library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs." On a nine point scale, the mean for undergraduate students was 7.5 while for graduate students the average was 7.4 and for faculty 7.1. [21] *(CFR 3.6)*

Responsive Organizational Structure

USF is organized to encourage participation from all stakeholders and permit transparency in most decision-making processes. Our organizational structure reflects our *Mission* of advancing "a common good that transcends the interests of particular individuals or groups; and reasoned discourse rather than coercion as the norm for decision making" and "a culture of service that respects and promotes the dignity of every person." *(CFR 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)*

As mentioned at the beginning of this document, USF has an independent Board of Trustees that oversees the University's financial and organizational integrity, provides guidance and support for initiatives that further the *Mission*, and appoints and evaluates the President. The President has full-time responsibility to the University and is aided by members of the Leadership Team who have clear lines of responsibility and reporting. [1] All executive officers are highly qualified, full-time employees, with significant experience in academia. Membership on the Leadership Team has been diversified in the last few years; of the 19 members, six are women and four belong to an ethnic minority group. Five of the ten women or ethnic minority members of the Leadership Team were appointed within the last five years. *(CFR 3.9, 3.10)*

Decision-making at USF involves all relevant individuals, and there is a significant effort at increasing involvement and engagement, as well as transparency. The process of building the University's budget, for example, engages all members of the Leadership Team and a faculty budget review committee, and all relevant documents are made available online for review. Major academic decisions involve faculty as well as deans and members of the Provost Council. Faculty actively participate in drafting and reviewing program and course proposals; ensuring the academic quality of the institution; assessing student learning; conducting program reviews; supporting, analyzing and developing initiatives and activities (through membership on committees, councils and task forces); and serving as resource members on committees of the Board of Trustees. As mentioned above, the majority of full- and part-time faculty members are represented by

unions, and there is a friendly, respectful and collegial relationship between the unions and the administration. Staff members participate in the program reviews of their respective units and are engaged in planning and reorganization of their services and units. In addition, staff at the Division of University Life is engaged in supporting the development of student leaders. *(CFR 3.8)*

STANDARD FOUR: Commitment to Learning and Improvement

USF is committed to institutional learning and improvement as a reflection of its *Mission* "to promote learning in the Jesuit Catholic tradition" and to offer "undergraduate, graduate and professional students the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals, and the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for others." Fulfillment of this goal requires that we constantly and objectively assess student learning. Indeed, one of our *Core Values* commits the University to advancing "the freedom and the responsibility to pursue truth and follow evidence to its conclusion" in what we teach, what we research, and what we evaluate and assess. Many issues related to this Standard have already been addressed in previous pages and will not be repeated here.

In the last few years, USF has made major improvements in its planning process. Evidence of these changes is the identification of yearly goals by all vice presidents and deans, development of procedures and structures for budget planning, the financial and performance reviews of service units and academic programs, and the existence of specific development plans. Throughout these efforts, emphasis is placed on transparency and the engagement of relevant stakeholders. For example, not only does the approval of new initiatives that have budgetary implications involve the discussion of the plan by members of the Leadership Team, but the actual proposals are also available online for review by all members of the University community. Faculty and staff are often involved in setting priorities or reviewing the alignment of these priorities with the University's *Mission* through their participation in program reviews, committees, councils, or other specially constructed processes. For example, directors and other staff in the Division of University Life spent the Spring 2007 semester identifying strategic goals in three areas for their division: cultural competence, socially responsible student leadership, and student success. Typically, the development of major documents (e.g., the *Mission* statement, the Physical Plant Master Plan) includes feedback from and discussions among stakeholders and open town hall meetings of the University community. Yearly strategic goals for the University are drafted by the members of the Leadership Team and presented by the President for open discussion. *(CFR 4.1)*

As part of the planning process, the University endeavors to utilize relevant institutional information as well as the experiences of peer institutions. Financial information is used in planning and evaluation, and a variety of indicators are contrasted with external benchmarks and expectations. Academic planning is informed by a well-developed and comprehensive program review process that involves internal information and analysis as well as evaluative feedback from peers at other institutions. Professional schools and programs routinely conduct external accreditation reviews with entities such as AACSB, ABA, the State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education. Peer approval processes are in place in all schools and colleges, and service units have begun periodic program reviews including an analysis of performance against relevant, externally developed criteria (e.g., CAS). Special indicators of effectiveness are gathered by some programs and services (e.g., employer surveys by School of Law, EBI survey in Residence Life). As detailed in Section Two, the University has been collecting student feedback and evaluations for several years through surveys (e.g., NSSE, CIRP, Graduating Student Survey), and where appropriate, those results have been used in planning. For example, data on student perceptions of advising have encouraged the development of new strategies and the strengthening of our current advising procedures. Nevertheless, some institutional data have not been optimally utilized or, at times, communicated to relevant parties. As detailed in the Appendix section of this report, recent efforts on the part of the offices of Institutional Research and of Assessment will make information more easily available. *(CFR 4.3, 4.5)*

Commitment to Continuous Improvement

USF is committed to continuous improvement — striving for the *Magis* — that is part of our Jesuit tradition. Indeed, one of our *Core Values* commits us to advancing "excellence as the standard for teaching, scholarship, creative expression and

service to the University community." As such, the faculty and leadership of the University are committed to improvement through evaluation and assessment. These efforts include measurement of student learning in the classroom, as well as more comprehensive approaches to assessing learning that some programs are beginning to develop and implement. Full-time faculty meet on a yearly basis with their respective dean to review an Academic Career Prospectus (ACP) — a summary of scholarly progress and activities carried out and planned by each faculty member. The program review process and advisory boards in some schools/programs allow us to assess our programs with the participation of a variety of stakeholders and external peers. These and other efforts (detailed in Section Two of this report) are helping us develop a culture of evidence that includes targeted data collection and the improved promulgation of results, as well as an increased perception of the value of assessment as a learning opportunity. We are using more and better information in our planning process and in our reviews of how we are achieving our institutional goals. As are many other institutions, we too are committed to making further advances in developing comprehensive and innovative approaches to the assessment of student learning. *(CFR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7)*

SECTION TWO
Building a Premier Jesuit Catholic, Urban University with a Global Perspective

The reaffirmation of accreditation process has allowed us to identify certain areas where we still need to make improvements in order to become the "premier Jesuit Catholic, urban University with a global perspective" that our *Mission* statement mandates. In the process of preparing for reaffirmation of accreditation, members of the University community had the opportunity to review all of WASC's Criteria for Review (CFRs) and share in drafting our self-review under those standards. The preparation of that document helped us identify four areas where the University community felt improvements were needed in order to continue developing a premier learning environment. Those areas are: (a) assessment; (b) student persistence; (c) development of an integrated learning environment; and, (d) recruitment, retention and promotion of diverse faculty and staff. In the following sections, we briefly describe both the progress made and the challenges we still face. While we have improved in all four areas, significant change is seldom achieved overnight nor even in the two years that have passed since writing the *Proposal* to WASC.

Assessment

USF is committed to developing effective assessment procedures that document the achievements of our students and support the improvement of our academic programs. The assessment of student learning at USF takes place at the course, program and institutional level. In general, course level assessment follows traditional approaches centered on measuring student recall, analysis, integration and/or application of information skills and principles gained as part of the course. Although this is the most frequent type of assessment carried out at the University, we have been developing more comprehensive assessment efforts including course-specific projects (research papers, performances, writing assignments, etc.), the measurement of program learning outcomes, the implementation of capstone projects or portfolios, the institutionalization of comprehensive program reviews, and the use of surveys such as the NSSE, BCSSE, and SSI. [22] These efforts are part of the University's commitment to assessing its effectiveness not only to demonstrate educational accountability, but as a way to support academic improvement. There has been real progress in making the systematic assessment of student learning a central institutional activity, but, as at other universities across the nation, a more sustained effort is still needed.

Learning Outcomes

The University has devoted considerable effort to articulating a broad spectrum of learning goals and outcomes. During AY 2006-2007, the University community defined institutional learning goals/outcomes that are directly tied to the University's *Mission*. These learning goals/outcomes are shaping our program development and review process and are serving to guide our assessment efforts by helping us to more clearly articulate the qualities that characterize the kind of student we intend to graduate. USF's institutional learning goals/outcomes underwent significant discussion among faculty and administrators during the academic year and were posted online for review by students, faculty and staff. The current version was finalized in December 2006 [23].

Additionally, during the last three years, faculty members in the various academic programs have dedicated significant effort to developing or revising the learning goals/outcomes for their program and the Core Curriculum, as well as for the other undergraduate graduation requirements: courses in (a) Service Learning; and, (b) Cultural Diversity. These efforts have led to comprehensive analyses of educational goals on the part of the faculty. In some cases, faculty members have initiated a review of a program's curriculum based on these discussions of learning outcomes. Currently, all degree programs have learning goals/outcomes that are publicly available in the online *Catalog* as well as in other publications and on college/school websites. Specific learning outcomes are required in all proposals for new courses in the Core Curriculum and the major; nevertheless, they are less frequent among syllabi for long-established courses. We are initiating a process of identifying and separating program learning goals from specific and more directly assessable learning outcomes. Service and support units are now beginning to identify their learning outcomes. While learning outcomes have become part of our academic discourse, their systematic assessment remains "a work in progress" particularly at the program and institutional level.

Course-Level Assessment

Assessment of student learning in specific courses, particularly the evaluation of how well students develop an understanding of certain topics or acquire basic information and skills (formative assessment), has been central to the work of our faculty as they evaluate students' performance. A number of courses, however, go beyond basic knowledge to require integrative or comprehensive demonstrations of student learning such as research projects, performances, and/or presentations that allow students to demonstrate not only what they have learned but also ways of generalizing, integrating and applying that knowledge. For example, in one Environmental Studies course, USF undergraduate students taught community members how to test and monitor potential pollutant sources and health hazards. In another course, students in the Performing Arts and Social Justice program worked with immigrant actors in a Latino theater company, and other students set up a drawing class for homeless individuals through an *Artist as Citizen* visual arts class. In a Nursing course, students worked with Guatemalan midwives on improving delivery techniques. Furthermore, students in the Architecture and Community Design program designed and built a library in Zambia and students in the USF School of Law have traveled to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva to present oral and written arguments on several international human rights issues.

Course level assessment has become particularly important in the Core Curriculum. For the past two years, faculty who teach courses in the Core Curriculum have completed an assessment report entitled the "Core Assessment Matrix" or CAM. In that self-study, faculty members indicate how they measure each of the learning outcomes of specific Core Curriculum areas, what the findings indicate in terms of student learning, and the changes they plan to introduce to the curriculum to better achieve the learning outcomes. Faculty feedback shows a large proportion relying on exams to measure achievement of learning outcomes as well as more comprehensive assessment approaches such as integrative papers, presentations, performances and research projects. Importantly, faculty often report changes made to or planned for the curriculum or the conduct of the class that they feel will improve student learning. [24]

Students, too, have been asked to reflect on the achievement of a course's learning outcomes. During AY 2006-2007, the faculty in the Rhetoric and Composition Program asked students taking introductory courses to report how each of the relevant Core Curriculum learning outcomes was achieved through the course. Student responses indicate a clear understanding of the learning outcomes for their courses as well as the perception that in general, the outcomes were achieved. Students frequently identified specific course activities that contributed to the achievement of the course learning outcomes. Program faculty members are currently analyzing the results of those reports.

Finally, students are asked to reflect on their learning using a standardized teacher and course evaluation instrument (SUMMA). The results of these evaluations are distributed to faculty and deans and become part of the personnel file of each faculty member. The CBAs and Faculty Handbook include specific SUMMA-related performance expectations for faculty applying for promotion and/or tenure. SUMMA results for part-time faculty are evaluated by deans and used for faculty development and reappointment decisions.

During the annual Academic Career Prospectus (ACP) process, full-time faculty members meet individually with their respective dean and review content of syllabi (with performance expectations), course grade distributions, and other indicators of student learning.

Program-Level Assessment

In order to measure the achievement of programmatic learning outcomes beyond the simple accumulation of grades and credits within the discipline, a number of degree programs (see Educational Effectiveness table in the *Appendix*) have developed senior seminars or capstone courses or require a senior project, portfolio, comprehensive exam or internship/practicum, or, in the case of graduate programs, a thesis or dissertation. Several of our professional programs have specific ways of measuring the achievement of program learning outcomes, such as the bar exam in our School of Law, and licensure or credentialing in our schools of Nursing and Education. Nevertheless, we recognize that we still need to enhance this approach to measuring educational effectiveness. Indeed, NSSE data show that our seniors report completing a culminating project in lower proportions (23% in 2006) than seniors at other Jesuit universities (44%) [25].

Moreover, we are aware of the need to develop better measures of students' success in meeting program goals. Part of the difficulty in developing these culminating experiences has been that they put pressures on students' schedules, as well as placing added demands on faculty. Nonetheless, we support these measures and recognize their importance in assessing the academic experience of our students. As a result, faculty members are currently being asked during program reviews to indicate how their program's goals are being measured. We are confident that this is an area where near-term developments will take place as the assessment of programmatic learning becomes more familiar and as methodologies (e.g., electronic portfolios) become better known and easier to implement.

Finally, we have begun some special and program-specific assessment projects to better measure the accomplishment of program learning outcomes. For example, during AY 2006-2007, faculty in the Rhetoric and Composition program collected the first and last written student assignment in a two-semester sequence of introductory rhetoric courses. Changes in student writing ability as indicated by those two papers are currently being evaluated.

Program Reviews

Periodic program reviews are an important component in assessment of programs and provide another important example of the University's continued striving for academic excellence. The components of our academic program reviews have been evolving over time within the College of Arts and Sciences. In addition, all other schools/colleges are implementing a program review process modeled on the one developed by the College of Arts and Sciences. In general, our academic program reviews include (a) a thorough self-study of the program written by the faculty with input from alumni and students; (b) an on-site visit by external reviewers from other institutions; (c) discussions between the dean and the faculty of the reviewers' report and self-study; (d) discussion and formulation of key recommendations in an action plan; (e) implementation of agreed-upon recommendations and follow-up with departments. Members of the Provost Council discuss an executive summary of the external reviewers' report and, in conversation with the Provost, the respective dean produces periodic updates of the progress made on carrying out the recommendations. Academic programs are scheduled [26] to conduct program reviews on a five- to seven-year cycle.

Service or support units also undergo reviews on a cycle similar to that of academic programs. [26] These reviews are a more recent initiative for us and a common template is still under development. The purpose of these reviews is not only to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the functioning and effectiveness of various offices and services but also to identify how they contribute to student learning. We recognize that appropriate and effective service units are essential complements to the learning that takes place in the classroom, the laboratory and the field. Indeed, "educating minds and hearts" also involves learning that takes place in the residence halls and in the commons and through clubs, immersion programs, student leadership opportunities, retreats and volunteer work, in the cafeteria, while registering and paying bills, at the libraries, at the recreation center, and elsewhere. The service unit reviews include on-site visits by external peers who analyze a self-study prepared by the unit's staff.

Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

For four years, USF has been using the NSSE with first-year and senior students and those data have played an important

role in charting institutional effectiveness. NSSE results allow us to see not only how well we compare with other institutions but how we differ in the education we provide our students. In general, our students rate their educational experience at USF in very favorable terms, matching the ratings of students at other institutions. For example, in 2006, 86% of seniors rated their entire educational experience as good or excellent. The corresponding figure for the entire NSSE sample was 85%, and 91% for students at Jesuit universities. Furthermore, 81% of USF's seniors indicated that they would probably attend USF if they could start over again. That result is identical to that of the NSSE sample (81%) and slightly lower than that of respondents of Jesuit universities (83%). [27] Respondents to our alumni survey reported that 93% were satisfied with their academic experiences while at USF, and 95% would recommend USF to others. [28]

As an indicator of how well the University fulfills its *Mission*, we can point to how our students feel that their experiences at the University teach them to go beyond professional or work-related knowledge and skills. For example, 70% of 2006 seniors and 68% of first-year students reported that USF helped them develop a personal code of values and ethics. These results are similar to those of students at Jesuit universities and much higher than for the whole NSSE sample. Furthermore, in 2006, 66% of seniors and 63% of first-year students felt that their experiences at USF helped them gain the skills necessary to contribute to the welfare of their communities. Although these results are similar to those at Jesuit universities they are again much higher than for the whole NSSE sample. These differences have been fairly consistent across multiple years, demonstrating that from our students' perspective USF is achieving its mission of educating the whole person and of training women and men for others. [29] Responses to the 2007 alumni survey (summarized above) also show that USF is helping our students to develop a number of skills and abilities that go beyond those related to a profession or occupation. [3]

An additional indicator of USF's educational effectiveness is the number of graduates who go on to pursue doctoral degrees after receiving their baccalaureate. Data from NORC on research doctorates [30] awarded between 1996 and 2005 in the United States show that USF was the baccalaureate institution of 196 of those doctorates (rank of 55 among 104 doctoral-intensive universities). Among Jesuit universities, USF was the baccalaureate institution with the highest proportion of people of color receiving a research doctorate in 2004 and 2005. Another important indicator of the academic success of our students is the rate of admission into U.S. medical schools. From 1996 to 2006, 169 USF students applied to medical school through the Pre-Professional Health Committee and of those, 107 (63.3%) were admitted. During the same period, 43.0% of applicants to medical school were admitted nationwide. In addition, in 2006, USF students who took the MCAT test scored an average of 9.3 in Verbal Reasoning compared to 9.0 for the national average. Furthermore, our graduates of professional programs pass licensure exams or credentialing processes at very high rates: 73.5% Bar pass rate for 2006 graduates of our School of Law; 99% pass rate on first attempt in the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) for candidates for the Education Specialist Credential over the past three years; 90% first time pass rate on the 2007 Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA); 97.8% pass rate for Nursing licensure (NCLEX-RN) and 100% in the same exam for nurses obtaining their Master in Nursing from USF.

USF has moved decidedly to develop and implement appropriate student learning assessment procedures. Nevertheless, we need to develop more frequent, varied and direct measures of what our students are learning. Our current evaluation and assessment procedures are based largely on indirect or self-reported measures of student learning. Greater emphasis on direct measures and program-specific learning is needed. Furthermore, we need to develop more comprehensive indicators of overall institutional effectiveness. We expect to make significant advances in these areas within the coming year so that we can better address our academic excellence in the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Next Steps

As we review our recent developments in our assessment efforts, we have identified several challenges that we need to address:

- **DEVELOPING LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES.** Our commitment to developing a supportive learning environment requires the identification of learning outcomes we wish to achieve through those activities that take place outside of the classroom.

- **IMPLEMENTING COMPARABLE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESSES.** We still need to develop comparable procedures across schools and colleges for our academic program reviews. Likewise, service units program reviews need to use a common framework and procedures for conducting the review and for sharing results.
- **IMPLEMENTING THE DIRECT ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES.** While we have a number of indirect indicators of institutional effectiveness (NSSE, Alumni Survey), we still need to identify additional direct measures of learning that can be used to assess institutional as well as program learning outcomes.

Student Persistence

One of our Strategic Goals specifies our commitment to "recruit and graduate a diverse student body of individuals who are academically talented and who embrace and manifest USF's values in their personal and professional lives." For the past few years, the University has been investigating student persistence rates as we analyze how well we fulfill our *Mission* and strive for the *Magis*. Those findings have been the subject of discussions at faculty and staff meetings as well as planning meetings of the Leadership Team and the Provost Council for well over five years. In 2004, a committee of associate deans analyzed institutional data on student attrition. More recently, in the summer of 2006, the President appointed a task force charged with summarizing information on student retention and graduation rates, and with drafting recommendations to improve both rates. The task force issued a report in spring 2007, and the University is currently studying the recommendations contained in that report.

Student persistence at USF compares differently depending on which group we analyze. For example, USF ranks 17th out of 28 Jesuit universities in the one-year retention rate of freshman students. At the same time, our one-year retention rate (84%) is similar to that of selective peer institutions (82%) according to data collected by ACT in 2006. Analyses by the CSRDE show that our two-year retention rate (72%) is similar to that of Doctoral/Research Intensive institutions (71%). Other persistence-related analyses show that, USF has the lowest six-year graduation rate for student athletes among all 19 Jesuit schools in Division I and was 21st out of 28 Jesuit universities in overall six-year graduation rates. Nevertheless, our six-year graduation rate (66%) exceeded both the predicted graduation rate (62%) included in the 2006 analysis conducted by *U.S. News & World Report* and the predicted graduation rate (58%) computed by the *Washington Monthly* that same year. The Education Trust analysis of our six-year graduation rates, places USF as 13th out of 25 institutions considered similar to USF in their characteristics. Regardless of these comparisons, we feel that USF needs to do better in terms of student persistence and we have implemented a number of recent strategies in order to better understand this phenomenon.

Our efforts at better understanding student persistence exemplify the University's dedication to its *Mission* and to becoming an institution that values a culture of evidence. We now perceive student attrition at USF as a complex phenomenon with multiple possible causes that affect students differently and that require a variety of intervention approaches. We realize that USF needs to advance at improving student persistence by following our Jesuit traditions of excellence, of providing *Cura Personalis* to our students and of searching for the *Magis*.

Persistence Rates

In general, our analyses of student persistence rates for traditional-age undergraduates show that attrition varies across years and within entering cohorts with six-year graduation rates being fairly stable for almost a decade. Attrition and graduation rates for 10 different cohorts of USF undergraduates of traditional age shows that there is no clear pattern in one- or two-year attrition rates across the 10 years, and that there is noticeable variation from year-to-year within gender and ethnic groups. On average, approximately 15% of entering freshman and 17% of traditional-age transfers do not return for their second year at USF. Approximately one in four entering freshman students do not return to USF for their Junior year (two-year attrition). One-year attrition rates tend to be higher among men; students majoring in the arts in the College of Arts and Sciences or the School of Business; and among African American, white, and international students. [31] Our analysis of overall graduation rates shows that approximately 35% of entering freshman and 33% of traditional-age transfers do not graduate from USF in six years. African Americans and international students tend to have the lowest six-year graduation rates.

USF's Office of Institutional Research has been conducting in-depth studies of persistence among freshman students who entered the University in fall 2004 and fall 2005. These studies show that there is no single strong predictor of attrition or single reason for students not returning to USF after their freshman year. In addition, the analysis shows that possible high school-related predictor variables (e.g. GPA, SAT scores) do not differentiate between those who continued and those who failed to return. The studies also found that academic performance while at USF seems to affect retention. Non-continuing students are more likely to earn a lower GPA during their freshman year, withdraw from a class after Census Day and/or obtain a grade of D or F in their first and/or second semesters. The study also found that one-year attrition occurs among both the less prepared students and among those who are better prepared and who do well academically at USF.

Improving Student Persistence

A task force appointed by USF's President to analyze retention and graduation rates for undergraduate students made 10 specific recommendations that address four areas: (a) continuing the institution's public commitment to improving students' academic, social and communal experiences; (b) developing additional engaging and challenging academic experiences including the improvement of new student orientation; (c) strengthening academic and career advising; and, (d) improving the quality and effectiveness of student support services. [32]

As suggested in the report of the Retention Task Force, the University community is engaged in discussing and planning approaches for improving persistence. As an example, new student orientation continues to be redesigned so that it meets the goals of increasing engagement and commitment to the institution and to excellence. During fall 2007, the University will pilot a program that offers through block scheduling, some Core Curriculum classes to a cohort of freshman students who share the same residence hall. Subsequent responses to the task force's report should become available during AY 2007-2008.

Next Steps

As we continue to work on improving student persistence, there are various challenges that we need to address. They include

- **IDENTIFYING INSTITUTIONAL GOALS REGARDING PERSISTENCE.** USF needs to identify goals for student persistence including analyzing its implications for enrollment management, financial aid, academic programming, and student support services.
- **UPDATING INFORMATION ON PERSISTENCE FOR ALL STUDENTS.** There is a need for the University to more fully analyze persistence rates and reasons for attrition among student athletes, graduate students as well as among students in the College of Professional Studies.
- **IMPROVING SUPPORTIVE STUDENT SERVICES.** The University needs to continue assessing student satisfaction with all support services and to re-envision them or implement changes that improve timeliness, responsiveness, procedural clarity/transparency and/or willingness to be of service to students and their specific needs.
- **DEVELOPING ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES FOR WELL-PREPARED STUDENTS.** The University needs to develop dedicated academic experiences for well-prepared entering students including special freshman seminar sections, year-long honors seminars, learning communities, and other academic activities that challenge and support the scholarly interests of our best prepared students.
- **PROGRAM EVALUATION AND COORDINATION.** Overall, there is a dearth of effectiveness evaluation of the various strategies that the University has implemented in order to improve the learning experience of students and/or promote retention and on-time graduation. The University needs to assess the effectiveness of these programs in order to make informed decisions regarding their continued existence. Some retention-promoting strategies seem to be planned or implemented with limited consultation or communication across offices. Coordination of efforts may prevent duplication, benefit from possible synergies and support the diffusion of innovations.

Integrated Learning Environment

For the past few years, the University has been trying to define and implement an integrated or "seamless" learning environment. This discussion has been based on a belief that by better integrating or coordinating the different aspects of the student experience, we could further advance the core *Mission* of the University. While some activities have taken place that bring together "the two sides of the house" in a developing climate of collaboration, some would argue that limited progress has been achieved in defining or bringing about an integrated learning environment. What probably would be a consensus is the belief that there is need for more conversations and sharing of ideas and expectations. Furthermore, the argument has been made that what may be required in the development of such a learning environment is coordination of efforts and excellence in performance of professional roles without blurring areas of expertise.

An important initial step in this process involved redefining our student development programs into a new Division of University Life with its vice president reporting to the Provost and participating (together with deans) in meetings of the Provost Council. Furthermore, we have made significant progress in improving the experiences of students through the ongoing redesign of New Student Orientation and the creation of an Office of Living-Learning Communities. Faculty members are becoming increasingly more involved in supporting student clubs and in accompanying students (physically, psychologically and spiritually) in their personal growth through immersion trips and teach-in experiences. Furthermore, learning through service is now supported by an Office of Service Learning and Community Engagement.

For the last five years, the University has been supporting the development and piloting of a small number of residential learning communities (LLCs) in the belief that as integrated living-learning environments, they provide students an experience that reflects our *Mission* and Jesuit tradition. These communities support the academic and personal development of our students and have received a number of external accolades. In addition, evaluation data show that students participating in these LLCs tend to perform better academically and to show better persistence.

The re-imagining of orientation for new students (NSO) is another example of the University's recent efforts to develop integrated learning environments for our students. During AY 2005-2006, NSO was re-designed to meet goals set by the President that would (a) introduce students to USF's Jesuit Catholic educational *Mission*; (b) help students set high academic and personal expectations for themselves; (c) foster student engagement by creating opportunities for new relationships to evolve with other students, faculty and staff; and (d) promote personal commitment to succeed as students and persons. The re-designed NSO, piloted during fall 2006, benefited from significant involvement of faculty members during presentations as well as in previews of academic programs. A summer reading program became more central to NSO through a faculty-led discussion, the inclusion of the book (*Mountains Beyond Mountains*) as a component of most Rhetoric and Composition classes, and a visit to campus by Dr. Paul Farmer, the individual whose life is portrayed in the book. In addition, entering students had the opportunity to engage in a variety of service learning opportunities as part of NSO. An assessment of the effects of the re-imagined NSO showed that students not only felt informed about the University and its policies, but that going through NSO and reading the book helped them set higher academic and personal expectations. In addition, students reported that NSO helped them learn how to relate the University's *Mission* to their personal goals and enhanced their motivation to become engaged with the community. The results of this pilot are being used to continue re-imagining NSO for fall 2007 and to develop additional activities that extend the goals of NSO over the academic year.

There are additional examples of our efforts to develop better supportive learning experiences for our students. These efforts have resulted in better student services (e.g., the development of the One-Stop Office where one staff person can help students with registrar, financial aid and bursar functions); improved advising (e.g., the pilot project in the College of Arts and Sciences for students on probation); and, creative and life-changing learning experiences (e.g., service learning opportunities). Evaluation of these efforts is advancing, and importantly, results are being used to further improve the learning experiences of our students.

Next Steps

The continued development of our incipient integrated learning environment at USF requires that we pay attention to

- **DEFINITION OF A USF INTEGRATED LEARNING ENVIRONMENT.** There is a need for the University to clarify what is meant by the use of the term "Integrated Learning Environment" and its implications in program planning and implementation.
- **IDENTIFICATION OF AREAS WHERE INTEGRATED LEARNING EXPERIENCES CAN EASILY BE DEVELOPED.** We need to identify additional areas where academic personnel and staff professionals can collaborate and demonstrate successes at integrating student learning without necessarily changing their roles or imposing excessive demands on their time.
- **DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT.** As strategies or programs are re-imagined or developed, assessment of student learning must be made an integral part of the planning and not an after-thought.

Diverse Faculty and Staff

Recruitment, retention and promotion of diverse faculty and staff are other areas that we identified as needing further analysis during the *Proposal* preparation stage. This interest is rooted in our *Mission* statement where we distinguish USF as a "diverse, socially responsible learning community" and is predicated on our Strategic Initiatives, which commit the University to "recruit and retain a diverse faculty of outstanding teachers and scholars and a diverse, highly-qualified, service-oriented staff, all committed to advancing the University's mission and its core values."

USF is committed to affirmative action and to equal employment opportunities. At USF, we value the contributions that all individuals make to the fulfillment of our *Mission* regardless of factors such as their ancestry, nationality, religion, religious creed, sex, gender identity, race, socioeconomic status, physical ability, ethnicity, sexual orientation, marital status, and age. The next few sections of this self-study analyze, as mentioned in the *Proposal*, gender and ethnic diversity of our faculty and staff.

Gender Diversity Among Faculty and Staff

In 2006, USF employed 367 full-time and 517 part-time faculty who taught in all six colleges/schools. These numbers represent increases, compared to AY 2001-2002, of 18.4% for full-time faculty and 43.2% for part-time faculty. Data on gender diversity [6] show that the proportion of full-time faculty who are women increased from 40.3% in 2001 to 44.7% in 2006. The proportion of women among part-time faculty also has increased (from 42.7% in 2001 to 55.7% in 2006). Since 2001, the proportion of women within most academic ranks has been increasing with the largest changes occurring among Assistant Professors (47.1% in 2001 versus 53.6% in 2006). USF tenures a large proportion of probationary faculty (74.4% of those hired between 1997 and 2001) and the level of gender diversity at the Assistant Professor level should soon translate into a significant increase at the Associate Professor and Professor levels.

As is true for faculty, the representation of women among our staff has increased noticeably in the last few years. Their contributions to the *Mission* of the University are seen at all job levels including areas where women are often underrepresented such as executive and technical positions. Data on gender distribution among staff [6] show that there has been an increase in the last four years in the representation of women in executive/administrative positions. In 2001, women made up 31.8% of executive/ administrative staff, and that percentage had increased to 49.3% by 2006. This change also has been seen among members of the Leadership Team where the number of women went from one in 2001 to six in 2007. Overall, 2006 data show that women represent a high percentage of clerical/secretarial staff (71.0%) and low percentages of skilled craft staff (25.0%) and service/maintenance staff (18.0%).

The recent AAUP compensation report shows that USF's faculty compares favorably with other institutions in terms of gender representation and salary equity. Data for AY 2005-2006 show that women held 39.1% of full-time faculty positions nationwide, compared to 42.8% at USF. Women held 44.8% of full-time tenure-track positions at the nation's colleges and universities compared to 57.6% at USF. In addition, women's average salary across all faculty ranks nationwide was 80.7% of men's average salary, while at USF, women's average salary across all faculty ranks was 89.3% of men's average salary. As more women achieve top faculty ranks at USF, the salary differential between men and women should decrease even more. Among the nation's 25 Jesuit universities that participated in the AAUP study, USF was in the top third in its percentages of (a) full-time women faculty mem-

bers; (b) women holding tenure-track positions; (c) tenured women faculty members; (d) women at full professor rank; and, (e) women's attainment of salary equity across all faculty ranks.

During AY 2004-2005, USF conducted a survey among its full-time faculty using the questionnaire developed by UCLA's HERI. In general, a large proportion of women (64.4%) felt that promoting gender equity among faculty was a high priority at USF (compared with 54.5% of the men). Women (93.3%) reported in greater proportion than men (82.5%) that their teaching was valued by departmental peers. In general, women tended to report in greater proportions than men that they wanted to instill in students a sense of social responsibility, help students in their emotional development, enhance student appreciation of differences, and prepare students for responsible citizenship. Indeed, a greater proportion of women (93.0%) than men (80.4%) felt that serving as a role model to students was an important personal goal.

Two findings from the HERI survey present significant challenges to the University. Women faculty members reported in higher proportions (37.8%) than men (21.4%) the possibility of leaving academia as well as of leaving USF (44.4% for women vs. 30.4% for men). In subsequent questions, women were less likely (55.6%) than men (68.4%) to indicate that they experienced joy in their work and to report overall job satisfaction (75.0% of women versus 80.7% of men). There were three areas that women reported as sources of stress. One area related to personal responsibilities (e.g., being part of a dual career family, physical health, lack of personal time); another dealt with personal and institutional job performance expectancies (e.g., review process, committee work, publishing demands, self-imposed job expectations). A third aspect was related to the social environment where 42.2% of women reported subtle discrimination (e.g., prejudice, racism, sexism) as a source of stress compared to 21.4% of men.

Unfortunately, we lack recent comprehensive information on the experiences of women who serve in USF staff positions. During AY 2002-2003, the President's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women (PACSW) conducted a survey among faculty and staff of both genders. The survey showed that in general women (as well as men) felt respected by their peers, students and supervisors/administrators. Indeed, the proportion of women agreeing with such statements ranged from a low of 86% for respect from supervisors to a high of 96% for respect from staff and students.

Faculty and staff receive comprehensive benefits packages that include health benefits for legally domiciled adults, commuter checks, child care support and tuition remission. The University endeavors to support the professional development of all its employees through workshops sponsored by the Office of Human Resources. Faculty members are supported by mentors, year-long orientation programs for new faculty, regularly scheduled training workshops, half-year sabbaticals at full-pay or year-long sabbaticals at 75% pay, writing retreats, modifications to the "tenure clock" during childbirth, and a fourth-year sabbatical for tenure-track faculty. In compliance with State of California law, USF has implemented compulsory sexual harassment training for all administrators, managers and faculty. In addition, the University has produced a booklet that provides examples of behaviors that constitute harassment and a description of procedures to be followed in reporting harassment. A significant void in faculty and staff support at the University is the absence of an on-site child care center. Efforts to establish such a facility have been the subject of much planning and targeted fund raising for a number of years, but none of these efforts have been successful.

Ethnic/Racial Diversity Among Faculty and Staff

The University has emphasized the recruitment, retention and promotion of ethnic minority faculty. This effort is based on our commitment to distinguishing USF as "a diverse, socially responsible learning community" and recognition that a diverse faculty and staff are essential components for achieving the excellence that is part of our Jesuit tradition.

An analysis of the composition of our full-time faculty [18] shows that there has been an increase in the ethnic/racial diversity of the full-time faculty in the last 16 years with the percentage of whites changing from 87.9% in 1991 to 75.7% in 2006. Among full-time faculty, the number of faculty of color has increased 37.5% in the last five years, from 56 in 2001 to 77 in 2006, compared to a 13% increase among white non-Hispanic faculty during the same period.

IPEDS data [19] show that the diversity of staff at USF (measured by the proportion of white non-Hispanics) has remained fairly stable during the last five years, except for a decrease of 10 percentage points among technical/parapro-

fessional staff. Overall, the largest percentage of white non-Hispanic staff in 2006 can be found in executive/administrative positions (78.7%) and non-faculty professionals (63.8%) positions. The percentage of whites is lowest in technical/paraprofessional staff (40.0%) and service/maintenance positions (43.8%).

In order to enhance the diversity of our faculty and professional staff, the Provost's Office has asked deans and vice presidents to implement a number of procedures to assure wide dissemination of information on openings and the diversity of candidate pools. These procedures include advertising in minority as well as general publications; direct mailings to doctorate-producing institutions and minority sections of professional associations, and appointment of diverse search committees including members from outside the department/program. In addition, the University currently supports a dissertation completion fellowship program for ethnic minority scholars who may join the faculty after the completion of their fellowship year.

The University has developed a number of strategies to support ethnic minority faculty in their scholarly endeavors. For the past six years, USF has organized writing retreats for minority faculty that are recognized as important instruments for advancing research and writing. The University has implemented grant writing workshops specifically for minority faculty, appointed mentors for newly hired faculty, and facilitated networking and mentoring meetings. Deans and other administrators play an important role in monitoring faculty workload and have worked with ethnic minority faculty to manage their involvement in service activities on- and off-campus in order to protect the time and energy they need to dedicate to teaching and research.

Next Steps

- **DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL EFFECTIVE RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES.** The University needs to develop additional strategies to further diversify faculty and staff particularly among job categories and divisions or programs that have low proportions of women or ethnic minorities.
- **DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT INITIATIVES.** These strategies need to support and help alleviate the extra, and at times conflicting, demands placed on women and minorities by the "culture and gender tax" imposed on them by demands to provide exemplar service to university and community, serve as role models and advisors, and become prototypes of success for future generations.
- **PROVIDE NEEDED ADDITIONAL SUPPORT TO WOMEN AND MINORITY FACULTY AND STAFF.** The University needs to identify ways of providing additional support services to women and minority faculty including the creation of an on-campus child care center. In addition, the compulsory nature of sexual harassment training needs to be better communicated to faculty and staff.

***

As we end this reflection on our community, we realize that the USF of the 21ST century is an institution that has made great progress since its last WASC reaffirmation of accreditation. We see that progress in enhancements to the quality of our academic programs, in the continued growth and development of our gifted faculty and staff, and in the increased educational, personal and civic engagement of our students. We also see an improved physical infrastructure, a stable financial base, a transparent planning, budget and review process, a nascent but active dedication to a culture of evidence and a commitment to fulfilling our *Mission*. Faculty, students, staff, trustees and alumni continually reaffirm their commitment to the search for the *Magis* as the University of San Francisco strives to reach the goal of educating "leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world."

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Preparatory Task Force [2003-2004]

- Michael Bloch, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Brandon Brown, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Robert Burns, EDUCATION
- Greg DeBourgh, NURSING
- Carol Graham, BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT
- Gerardo Marin, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Susan Prion, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Sharon Wagner, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
- Alan Ziajka, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Steering Committee [2004 – 2009]

- Salvador Aceves, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Michael Bloch, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Brandon Brown, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Robert Burns, EDUCATION
- Marcelo Camperi, ARTS AND SCIENCES [2004-2005]
- Jennifer Dever, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Carol Graham, BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT
- Johnnie Johnson Hafernik, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Dan Himmelstein, BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT [2007-]
- Gerardo Marin, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Scott McElwain, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- William Murry, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS [2006 -]
- Susan Prion, NURSING
- Richard Stackman, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES [2007-]
- Andrew Thomson, UNIVERSITY LIFE
- Paulina Van. NURSING [2004-2005]
- Sharon Wagner, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES [2004-2007]
- Alan Ziajka, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Working Groups [2005 – 2009]

- Salvador Aceves, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Mary Grace Almandrez, UNIVERSITY LIFE
- Mary Beth Almeda, ACADEMIC STUDENT SERVICES
- Debbie Benrubi, LIBRARY
- Michael Bloch, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Thomas Bottger, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Brandon Brown, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Robert Burns, EDUCATION
- Norman Caito, ACADEMIC STUDENT SERVICES
- Shawn Calhoun, LIBRARY
- Marcelo Camperi, ARTS AND SCIENCES [2005 – 2006]
- Val Day, ACADEMIC STUDENT SERVICES
- Jennifer Dever, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Michael Duffy, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- James Forcier, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
- William Garner, EDUCATION [2005-2006]
- Carol Graham, BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT
- Johnnie Johnson Hafernik, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Dan Himelstein, BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT
- Evelyn Ho, ARTS AND SCIENCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Working Groups [2005 – 2009] *continued*

- Heather Hoag, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Susan Katz, EDUCATION
- Sherise Kimura, LIBRARY
- Shabnam Koirala-Azad, EDUCATION
- Gerardo Marin, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- Sarah Mart, UNIVERSITY LIFE [2005-2007]
- Scott McElwain, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Tom Merrell, ACADEMIC STUDENT SERVICES
- Mark Meritt, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Matthew Mitchell, EDUCATION
- William Murry, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS [2006 -]
- Julia Orri, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Judy Pace, EDUCATION [2006-]
- Terence Patterson, EDUCATION
- Vincent Pizzuto, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Susan Prion, NURSING
- Christina Sanchez, UNIVERSITY LIFE
- Belinda Sandoval, ACADEMIC STUDENT SERVICES
- Penny Scott, LIBRARY
- Mouwafac Sidaoui, EDUCATION
- Richard Stackman, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
- Sue Stavn, BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT
- Peggy Takahashi, BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT
- Linda Thomas, UNIVERSITY LIFE
- Andrew Thomson, UNIVERSITY LIFE
- Karen Van Leuven, NURSING
- Lisa Wagner, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Sharon Wagner, PROFESSIONAL STUDIES [2005-2007]
- Michael Webber, ARTS AND SCIENCES
- Kathy Woo, LIBRARY
- Alan Ziajka, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Educational Resources Committee [2006 – 2009]

- John Bansavich, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
- Felicia Lee, UNIVERSITY LIFE [2005-2007]
- Lisa Moore, ADVANCEMENT [2005-2006]
- Locke Morrisey, LIBRARY
- Martha Peugh-Wade, HUMAN RESOURCES
- Archie Porter, ACADEMIC SERVICES
- Joseph Sutton, ADVANCEMENT [2006 -]

Editorial Review for Capacity and Preparatory Review Self-Study

- Theodore Matula
- Richard Stackman

Accreditation Liaison Officer

- Gerardo Marin

Made from post-consumer recycled fiber.