

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM  
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

To

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

October 29-31, 2007

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION

Team Roster

Frank Lazarus, Chair  
Cherron Hoppes, Co-Chair  
Julia Barchitta  
Nathaniel Dickmeyer  
Henry Ward

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution according to Commission Standards and the Core Commitment for Institutional Capacity and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

Table of Contents

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT..... 3  
DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION AND VISIT ..... 3  
QUALITY OF THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REPORT AND ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROPOSAL  
..... 4  
RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS COMMISSION ISSUES ..... 6

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE  
STANDARDS..... 8  
STANDARD 1: DEFINING INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES AND ENSURING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES8  
Institutional Purposes..... 8  
The Special Theme on Diversity of Faculty and Staff..... 9  
STANDARD 2: ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES THROUGH CORE FUNCTIONS ..... 11  
Teaching and Learning ..... 11  
Scholarship and Creativity of Faculty..... 12  
Support for Student Learning..... 13  
Living and Learning Communities ..... 14  
Service Learning ..... 16  
Academic Advising..... 18  
Special Initiative on Retention and Persistence to Graduation..... 18  
STANDARD 3: DEVELOPING AND APPLYING RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES  
TO ENSURE STABILITY ..... 21  
Faculty and Staff..... 21  
Library and Media Resources ..... 23  
Fiscal, IT, and Physical Resources ..... 24  
Leadership and Decision-Making ..... 26  
STANDARD 4: CREATING AN ORGANIZATION COMMITTED TO LEARNING AND IMPROVEMENT. 26  
Planning ..... 26  
Commitment to Learning and Improvement – Assessment..... 28

SECTION III – MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 33

SECTION IV - PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT  
AND REVIEW ..... 35

ADDENDUM FOR DOCTOR OF NURSING PRACTICE DEGREE..... 37

## **SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

### **DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION AND VISIT**

Founded in 1855 by the Society of Jesus (Jesuits), the University of San Francisco is a non-profit, Catholic university with its main campus located in San Francisco, California. Today, USF enrolls more than 8,000 students in six schools and colleges at six locations including San Francisco, Los Angeles, Cupertino, San Ramon, Santa Rosa, and Sacramento. In addition, USF students can participate in exchange programs with a number of other institutions located worldwide. Programs and schools at the University of San Francisco are also accredited by the American Bar Association (ABA), the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, (AACSB), the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), and the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE).

The University of San Francisco enjoys a long history with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Activity in the last ten years includes reaffirmation of accreditation in 1998 with a fifth-year visit in 2002 and numerous substantive change activities. Those requests focused on international delivery of master's degree programs in Budapest, China, Bangkok, Manila, and Spain. In 2003, the Substantive Change Committee of WASC approved a systems review proposal to allow implementation of master's degrees at domestic and international off-site locations without seeking prior review. That agreement is in place until January 2008.

This team visited the University of San Francisco on October 29 – 31, 2007, in response to the Capacity and Preparatory Review for reaffirmation of accreditation. In addition to the main campus in San Francisco, members of the review team also visited College of Professional Studies and Schools of Education and Arts and Sciences programs in Los Angeles, Cupertino and San Ramon.

The self-study report prepared by the institution provided information regarding USF's commitment to institutional capacity connected to the four standards and the effort for "building a premier Jesuit Catholic, urban university with a global perspective." The topics that USF has chosen for extensive analysis in its CPR include assessment, student persistence, an integrated learning environment and a diverse faculty and staff. In addition to the review of those issues, the team used the Commission letter dated March 3, 2003, to frame its inquiry.

#### **QUALITY OF THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REPORT AND ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROPOSAL**

The University of San Francisco's Capacity and Preparatory Report (CPR) is a thorough, comprehensive, well-written, and presented document. With its Appendices and Attachments, the CPR provides a substantial view of the status of the University as it reviews its capacities and prepares to engage in its Educational Effectiveness Review process for accreditation. It includes the required University stipulations and data sets. The Academic Liaison Officer (ALO) was able to provide the team members almost instant access to a large and varied number of additional documents that it believed necessary to supply the data needed to make its evaluation and draw well-informed conclusions.

The substantial amount of information provided and the supplemental documents sent upon the team's request constitute a convincing demonstration that the University of San Francisco is close to establishing the "culture of evidence" that the WASC standards hold up as the prerequisite context for positive accreditation action. The team's conversations with faculty from across the University and especially with the administrative staff—both academic and in supporting areas—confirmed our observations that the University has built the capacity in terms of personnel, expertise, systems, business processes, and resolute will to gather the information needed to provide substantiation for its evaluative judgments about student learning and

operational programs. Most of the data available is in documentary form and a great deal of it is readily available on the University's web site. A number of individuals the team interviewed, including a prominent trustee of the University, commented that they were impressed by the degree to which the University administration has been transparent in disclosing to its constituents and to the public at large so much information about the "vital statistics" of the institution (CFR 1.9). The members of the team were equally impressed.

The CPR also displays an admirable amount of integrity in the tone it sets for evaluating and reporting its status with respect to fulfilling the standards and the CFRs. Institutional claims are modest and restrained, but reveal a University confident and secure in its identity and its capacity to demonstrate its quality. There is a frank, forthright identification and acceptance of areas in need of improvement. If there is an area of weakness, it is that the report could have been strengthened by brief descriptions of what improvements are planned and a timetable for their implementation.

The report is congruent with the Institutional Accreditation Proposal that the WASC Commission approved in June 2005; it responds positively to the recommendations for improvement of the CPR report received in WASC's letter of June 30, 2005, and it presents evidence of institutional capacity in most of the areas the proposal indicated would be foci for the institution as it conducted its own work for the capacity and preparatory review. These areas include the creation of a culture of evidence at USF, the integration of the Vision, Mission, and Values Statement in the CPR, special attention to assessment and program review, the creation of an integrated learning experience, and attention to the special initiatives in diversity and service learning. With respect to the adequacy of student support services, however, the Proposal perhaps promises a bit more than the CPR indicates has been delivered. Where, for example, the

assessment of the community service learning program is addressed, the University's performance has been quite good. However, with respect to advising and the initiative on retention and persistence to graduation, the CPR does not demonstrate (and on-campus interviews confirm) that the University's performance lacks even some basic processes of data gathering (cf. *infra*, p.17-18 and CFR 4.3).

#### **RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS COMMISSION ISSUES**

Finally, the CPR report responds to the recommendations made by the WASC Commission from previous accreditation site visits. The University has made special efforts in the area of assessment of learning outcomes, and the status of the assessment program provides evidence of necessary, but not sufficient, performance in this area. The report establishes that the Commission's concern with strategic planning at USF has been dealt with adequately and that the Commission's most significant recommendations with respect to the College of Professional Studies have been addressed. This report deals in greater detail with USF's performance vis-à-vis the first two of these areas in greater detail further below, and with the third immediately below.

Three members of the WASC team visited off-campus sites that included courses offered by both the College of Professional Studies and the School of Education. Team members attended classes, interviewed the Director of Regional Campuses, faculty, site administrators, and students, and inspected the facilities at the three sites visited. All three team members brought back similar assessments of their visits for the Team's consideration, and those assessments were uniformly positive with respect to the quality of the teaching that was observed, the ability of the faculty we met and interviewed, the comprehensive program of communication and coordination that the College of Professional Studies has developed for

linking these regional campuses with main campus administrators responsible for their general development, and the high quality of the facilities and academic support observed at each site.

The University and the College regularly evaluate the number and quality of courses being offered at the regional campuses, and have been actively managing the offerings at each campus. Courses and programs at the regional campuses are taught primarily in cohort mode, which makes the faculty's work more easily planned and the students' navigation of the program more convenient for them. One team member also audited one question (and spot-checked several others) of the Graduating Student Surveys of students from several regional campuses and noted that this process was identical to the process on the main campus and that the results of the survey were similar for students on the main and regional campuses with respect to the question he audited. Finally, it was the consensus of the team members who visited regional campuses that the university is not sacrificing quantity and revenue for academic quality. In fact, all three team members were impressed with the amount of investment that the university has made in the physical appearance of the facilities, the support materials and technology available to faculty and students, and the number and ability of the site support staff available to assist faculty and students.

The results of our inquiry substantiate our conclusion that the College of Professional Studies has responded positively and effectively to the issues raised by previous accreditation concerns raised by WASC about the College of Professional Studies.

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS**

### **STANDARD 1: DEFINING INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES AND ENSURING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES**

#### **Institutional Purposes**

The University of San Francisco, under new leadership since 2000, has developed an innovative Vision, Mission and Values Statement, which has been exceptionally successful in articulating the University's aspirations for the future, epitomizing its adherence to the character of its Jesuit, Catholic tradition, and establishing the context and many of the themes for the University's proposal for accreditation (CFR 1.1). The Capacity and Preparatory Review submitted to WASC reflects the tone and themes of this new direction and provides the vehicle through which the report aligns with the University's fundamental purposes and objectives (CFR 1.2). The visiting team was truly impressed by the degree to which the members of the USF community, from senior administrative officers, to faculty, staff, and even students, both in the traditional academic programs and at the regional locations, display both familiarity with and comprehension of the mission and can quote it literally.

Concurrent with writing the Vision, Mission and Values Statement, the University revamped the organizational structure and established new processes and standards for consultation, delegation, and implementation of institutional goals. These processes and standards exemplify institutional transparency in dealing with both internal and external constituencies, a characteristic that was mentioned positively by many individuals interviewed by the team and supported by ample evidence of specific documents, including sensitive budgetary and governance documents posted to the University's web site (CFR 1.2; 1.3).



The CPR report provides an abbreviated outline of the Jesuit tradition in education as it affects capacity, integrity, autonomy, and academic freedom. These qualities are central to and essential for the implementation of the University's operations and the report, with its appendices, provides adequate documentary evidence of the University's commitment to upholding and celebrating the historical, legal, and moral standards of this educational philosophy (CFR 1.4; 1.6).

### **The Special Topic on Diversity of Faculty and Staff**

USF articulates the commitment to diversity in the mission, core values and strategic plan (CFR 1.5). A team representative met with numerous constituencies to determine how this commitment manifests itself in the day-to-day operations of the University and whether he could identify a system to assess the effectiveness of the efforts expended thus far.

Students have a great appreciation for the diversity that is USF. Students interviewed felt the university had provided them with the tools and strategies to be successful students (CFR 1.2). They highlighted the living learning communities as a priority to their development as well as mentorship from faculty of color, services from University Life, Multicultural Student Services and their clubs and organizations. Multicultural organizations and activities provide support for students of color and the reflection of the diversity of the student body can be seen mirrored in the faculty ranks as well. This commitment to observable diversity is not as readily apparent in the senior administrative level of the Provost's Council or the President's Cabinet where there is strong gender diversity but limited representation of ethnic diversity. The environment is favorable for those of all sexual orientations with support groups for faculty and staff, advocacy identification to support students, and efforts to be inclusive in the curriculum (CFR 1.4). USF has faced the challenges of discrimination in the residential communities but

shows a real commitment to promote tolerance as an expectation of the campus environment (CFR 1.5). Every constituency the team interviewed shared a genuine concern for the diversity issues that directly impact communities of color and most acknowledged there are some practices in place that monitor their progress. Some stated, however, that there are limited strategies and systems in place to anticipate or to respond effectively to issues that arise.

Students stated that seeing and interacting with faculty and staff of color added significant value to their USF experience. Faculty of color are especially sought out because of the dependence on them by students of color for empathetic advice. These faculty also discussed issues of being over extended and undervalued. The area in which faculty of color appear to need most assistance and development is in preparation for tenure, for, although the expectation to publish exists for all faculty, the challenge is more daunting for faculty of color in view of heightened expectations for service on committees, advising students, and mentoring. Additionally, some faculty believe that tenure committees undervalue many of the types of support faculty of color provide to develop students committed to the mission and vision of this institution. (CFR 3.3; 3.4).

The team suggests that USF direct its attention to evaluating the issue of the perception that there is heavy pressure on faculty and staff of color to supply a diverse presence in so many areas of university life and work. The results of such an assessment would either substantiate or mitigate this presumption and could assist the University in recruiting, developing, and retaining faculty of color. The University might also consider employing a qualitative approach to assessing unmet needs of female faculty and staff and faculty and staff of color in order to identify and understand better broad

areas of concern associated with the roles such employees play in constituting a truly diverse learning community.

## **STANDARD 2: ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES THROUGH CORE FUNCTIONS**

### **Teaching and Learning**

The University of San Francisco has provided strong evidence in support of fulfilling Standard 2 in the Self-Study. The Core Curriculum continues to conform to disciplinary and professional standards and content; levels of learning and quality control are overseen by faculty (CFR 2.1; 2.2). All graduation and major requirements are included in the Catalog and online. Syllabi of courses in the Core, majors, service learning courses, capstone courses and living-learning courses demonstrate high expectations of student learning in and out of the classroom (CFR 2.3).

Service Learning is well integrated into the curriculum and is a requirement for graduation that is necessary to fulfill the Mission of developing “leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world.” (Cf. *infra*, p.16-17 for additional information on service learning.)

The team’s review of pertinent documentation indicates that expected student competencies have been uniformly identified for all courses (CFR 2.5; 2.6; 2.7), but there is a lack of uniformity and quality in how those competencies have been assessed and continuously developed. The institution has focused much energy over the past five years in developing student learning outcomes for graduation and for a majority of the institution’s educational programs. Most of the academic departments have made great strides in identifying goals for successfully completing their major course of study as well as levels of achievement throughout the four years of the curriculum. A review of the course outlines revealed that the vast majority of course syllabi have clearly written goals that are assessed every semester and used to improve,

modify and/or change each course to assure that USF students meet the expected learning outcomes.

The professional programs at USF are accredited by national external accrediting agencies and student achievement is measured by licensure examinations and admission to post-graduate schools. The institution has implemented an institutional program review system whereby all academic and co-curricular programs are reviewed in a 5-7 year cycle. After a thorough self-assessment report conducted by the department or program, well qualified peers from other institutions review the report and conduct an on-site visit. Recommendations are presented to the institution for consideration. In the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dean has addressed all of the recommendations in a document entitled “Actions Taken in Response to Academic Program Review Recommendations, 2004-2007”. Each program is listed with the recommendations, action taken, and status clearly delineated (CFR 2.7). Unfortunately, the fact that the institutional program review has not yet been implemented in all academic units, results in some unevenness in obtaining objective verification of the University’s positive efforts at achieving stated course and programmatic goals across the entire academic spectrum.

### **Scholarship and Creativity of Faculty**

There is continued evidence of effective teaching and an increasing production of good scholarship as noted in a list of the publications produced by the faculty throughout the University since 2004. USF provides substantial financial support for faculty development in the form of workshops, research seed monies, conference participation and the development of teaching skills. Recognition is awarded for research, excellence in teaching and innovation in uses of educational technology. Teaching, research, and service are equally important in promotion and tenure decisions (CFR 2.8; 2.9).

## **Support for Student Learning**

The core curriculum and the service-learning objectives have been initially scrutinized by internal constituents in an effort to improve the assessment of student learning. At this point in USF's development of its assessment program, questions of what constitutes measurement and evidence have been documented most frequently with grades as evidence, and subjective assessments most frequently included in results. Surveys, including NSSE and the alumni surveys, have been used to gauge students' feelings about their experience (CFR 2.10). The development of objective rubrics to guide learning assessment is still at an experimental stage, with first attempts occurring in writing assessment.

The university has data indicating improved student success for those participating in living-learning communities. The research did not appear to be sufficiently controlled, however, to eliminate the possibility that self-selection was the primary factor for success. The application of a course assessment matrix designed specifically for service learning to cover an array of courses was more broadly conceived than the conventional assessment indicators mentioned directly above and appears to be effective in focusing faculty on a search for strong and objective definitions of outcomes and methods of determining both success and improved student experience designs (CFR 2.11). The development of additional assessment instruments such as the service learning matrix would strengthen course and program assessment generally across the University.

There have been significant achievements in curricular and co-curricular program development over the past five years including considerably more planning and resource allocation directed by the institution toward improving the seamless integration of those programs. Illustrations of this progress include the addition of a Vice President of University

Life, the establishment of the Office of Living-Learning Communities, and the continuing development of the Office of Service Learning and Community Action, all of which have provided the opportunity for both academic and co-curricular staff to work together in planning, implementing and assessing new programs such as: living-learning communities, new student orientation, supporting service learning, and improving retention efforts.

Another positive improvement is the introduction of “One Stop” service in the Fall of 2005. The Registrar, Bursar and Financial Aid Office are working together to provide seamless services to the students. All three offices have been relocated in a central location for easy access by students and the staff has been cross-trained to assist students seeking assistance from any of these areas (CFR 2.13).

USF supports its view that learning takes place not only in the classroom, but also on the entire campus: in the residence halls, in co-curricular activities, in the city and in the global community. In order to improve integrated learning at USF, several changes were implemented over the past five years to increase the link between the academic program and student life services. The most important change was the development of a new organizational role, a Vice Presidency for University Life. The Vice President reports to the Provost and sits on the President’s Cabinet and the Provost Council that meets every two weeks. In this capacity, the new Vice President has the ability to link the academic programs to the campus life initiatives with the purpose of improving student-learning outcomes and meeting the USF mission of “educating minds and hearts to change the world.”

### **Living and Learning Communities**

Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have collaborated at USF through the development of Living-Learning Communities (LLCs). In 2005, USF established the Office of Living-

Learning Communities which is located in the College of Arts and Sciences and is coordinated by the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Students/Associate Vice President for University Life as well as Living –Learning Community faculty and staff teams from various departments and the Office of Residence Life. Each Living-Learning Community is a unique entity, and the students play a role in the development and sustainability of each learning community. These living-learning communities meet several requirements for graduation. At the successful completion of the academic year, each LLC fulfills at least one core curriculum requirement and the Service-Learning requirement for each participating student.

The Office of Living-Learning Communities is responsible not only for the administration, recruitment of students and assessment of the program but also for the strategic planning and promotion of new LLCs for the future. The assessment of the LLCs is extensive and includes demographics, comparative metrics, and both qualitative and quantitative data collection. The quantitative data includes: National Study of Living Learning Programs (2007), a new instrument specifically targeted at the LLC, and previously employed institutional assessments (e.g., EBI/ACUHO-I, Resident Student Surveys, Student Satisfaction Inventory, National Survey of Student Engagement or NSSE). The qualitative data is obtained from student questionnaires, faculty-staff debriefs, resident advisor and resident minister intern feedback and alumni experiences. All quantitative data was available in the Resource Room (CRF 2.11). USF students completing the National Study of Living Learning Programs reported very positive experiences including: more hands-on learning experiences, more time on political and social activism, ethnic or cross cultural clubs and activities, work study or work on campus, community service, and greater ability in critical thinking and analysis.

There are also other collaborative programs that have been initiated to bring “the two sides of the house” together. These include: faculty members involved in student clubs, supporting students in their personal growth through immersion trips (e.g. Peru), service learning supported through the Office of Service Learning and Community Action (see next section for additional information), redesigning the New Student Orientation in 2005-2006 with the goal of introducing new students to the Jesuit mission of the University, developing high academic and personal expectations, and facilitating new relationships with peers, faculty and staff.

As evidenced by the numerous intentional activities outlined above, USF has shown a consistent plan and much improvement in integrating Academic and Student Affairs to improve student-learning outcomes (CFR 2.11). The team encourages the University to continue to provide administrative support to develop and implement curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities for students and to continue gathering evidence, both qualitative and quantitative, to demonstrate the effectiveness of integrated learning on achieving student-learning outcomes. It is important, however, for those responsible for integrated learning to analyze the data accumulated from these integrated learning experiences in order to make the best informed decisions about future improvements and the possible development of additional Living Learning Communities

### **Service Learning**

Over five years ago, as part of the core curricular changes, USF added Service Learning as a graduation requirement for all undergraduate students. This requirement aligns well with the Jesuit concepts of “*magis*” and “persons for others” and fits into the institutional philosophy. USF faculty are committed to this philosophy and to social justice and offer enough sections each semester to meet student need. The Director of Service Learning and Community Action



has developed a comprehensive faculty development seminar to prepare faculty to develop Service Learning Syllabi, set student learning outcomes and facilitate reflective activities. Student and community partner panels are included in these seminars to emphasize the collaborative nature of these experiences (CFR 2.11).

Enrollment in Service Learning can take place anytime during the student's education, and the requirement can be fulfilled through a Living-Learning community, an internship, capstone course or specified courses in the major. Although the adequacy of service-learning assessment was not particularly well represented in the CPR report, additional documentation was requested and provided. The documentation received, including the Core Assessment Matrix (CAM), detailed seven very clear and measurable student learning outcomes, provided measurement of objective evidence, and included a summary of results and assessment-informed improvements. In addition, DVDs of students working in an immersion program in Peru teaching schoolchildren to use computers, architecture students designing and building a library in Zambia or designing homes in Mexico, and nursing students' reflective journals and public health projects were excellent examples of evidence that service learning is having a very positive impact on USF students. (CFR 2.5).

Data of the positive impact of service learning has been obtained through NSSE , BCSS, and AS. In addition, the director is planning to develop institutional surveys for students and community partners. It is very notable that USF has successfully applied for and received the new Carnegie classification of "Community Engaged Campus."

An external program review of the Office of Service Learning and Community Action would highlight the extensive work and successful outcomes of this program, which could be used for both internal and external purposes.

## **Academic Advising**

Academic advising is one of the services that appears to need improvement at USF (CFR 2.3). Some colleges and schools have a very strong advisement system while others need to improve the way information is transmitted to their students. Students complain of having difficulty meeting with their faculty advisor and refer specifically to the desire to speak with faculty members about career options and direction (*cf.* Student Satisfaction Inventory). The Team learned from campus interviews that early career advising is an expectation of students, but that the Scotland Career Services Center, which reports to University Life, does not have easy access to students, is not directly involved with New Student Orientation and appears to collaborate with academic departments as an exception rather than as accepted practice. The team recommends that the Provost and Vice President for University Life consider a joint effort to respond to this apparent need. (CFR 2.13)

## **Special Initiative on Retention and Persistence to Graduation**

The University has identified a special need to study and address current perceived weaknesses in retaining students from year to year (especially from the first to second undergraduate years) and in supporting student persistence in continuous enrollment through graduation. Current data indicate that 82% of all enrolled undergraduate students return from the conclusion of one academic year to the beginning of the next and that only about 48% of each cohort undergraduate class graduates within the traditional four years (although that number increases to a level comparable to peer schools of approximately 65% after six years). The University is considering establishing a goal of attaining a 90% year-to-year retention rate for all undergraduate students and a four-year graduation rate that approximates its comparative schools (i.e., about 60-65% of the entering cohort within four years) as benchmarks for acceptable retention and persistence rates (CFR 2.10).

At this point in the process of inquiry, it is apparent to the visit team that the University has not yet gathered enough data about retention and persistence, disaggregated sufficiently the data it has collected, or put in place adequate business processes to ensure that appropriate and timely data are being collected to prepare a plan of action that holds promise of improving performance to the levels the institution has established for itself (CFR 4.4; 4.5). There do exist, however, sufficient anecdotal indications of the etiology of the attrition problem to suggest some possible areas of investigation and data collection that might yield helpful suggestions of how to proceed.

With respect to year-to-year retention, there is some evidence (basically raw survey data not scientifically analyzed) from the Graduating Student Survey that suggest that across the academic units and for a number of succeeding years, students have rated advising services as the poorest area of performance among the services evaluated in the survey. The preliminary reflection that has been done on this data indicates that it seems that USF students desire, need, and expect career-oriented advising and counseling at the very beginning of their matriculation at USF in order to satisfy their uncertainty about the usefulness of their chosen area of study, their total uncertainty about an area to study, and/or their anxiety about choosing a career that they believe will be fulfilling to them. The students seem to believe that this counseling should be available from their academic advisers, and they complain that advisers are inaccessible, ill-equipped to discuss career options, or disengaged from the students' need for such service so early in their college careers (CFR 2.10; 2.12; 2.13). It is also apparent from conversations with staff from both academic units and student services that USF has not yet established a comprehensive effort to track students at risk for premature attrition before they decide to leave or to take coordinated and effective action to gather data on attrition from students who have

decided to leave the University (there is an exit interview required of students on financial aid, but it is very basic and misses much potentially helpful data) (CFR 4.4; 4.5).

With respect to persistence to graduation, there are some hypotheses, expressed by administrators in interviews, to suggest why USF students graduate at such a lower rate than students at comparable institutions. One hypothesis suggests that USF students work too many hours per week to be able to enroll regularly in a sufficiently full load of courses (16 credit hours or more) to expect to graduate in the traditional four years. Another hypothesis is that USF students attempt to accumulate too many curricular credentials (majors, minors, concentrations) to facilitate on-time graduation. A third hypothesis alleges that students' behaviors with respect to retention and persistence only mirror contemporary society's tendency to place little value on permanence in any human activity, and the University should not be surprised at a low graduation rate. There is no evidence to support any one or a combination of more than one of these hypotheses that the University has proposed. Neither has the appropriate data yet emerged from USF's research to suggest that some other, as yet undetected, cause is responsible. The University's academic and student service leadership will have to direct continued, focused, and effective attention on the process of gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data on these two problems in order to improve performance in these important areas.

The team recommends, with regard to advising, retention, and persistence to graduation, that USF develop programs to ensure that career related advising is made available to students soon after they arrive, that the University conduct further research on issues related to current student retention rates, and that it develop a comprehensive strategy for reaching its established performance goals. These steps are the minimum necessary to allow USF to construct a specific plan of action for improvement.

### **STANDARD 3: DEVELOPING AND APPLYING RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES TO ENSURE STABILITY**

#### **Faculty and Staff**

The team shared with the University its significant concern over the large number of part-time faculty teaching at USF in relation to full-time faculty, especially in the College of Arts and Sciences. The impact was evident to the team primarily in two areas: the overall number of sections offered by part-time faculty (ca. 42%) and the concern expressed in the self-study and by students and faculty with whom the team had contact about the quality and availability of advising to students (CFR 3.1).

Overall, there are too few full-time faculty to fill the needs of students, according to students with whom the team talked. The problem is apparently exacerbated by the turnover of faculty who find it difficult to maintain a desirable quality of life in an expensive city. The team was concerned that the University did not articulate a strategy or an approach to the problem other than to attempt to generate more revenue to hire additional full-time faculty. The team was unable to comprehend how long it would take the University to turn the problem around, the resources that would be necessary, the priority areas for additional financial resources, or the specific revenue strategies that would be used (CFR 3.5). The team also did not see evidence of other, creative efforts to reduce the percentage of sections taught by part-time faculty and to ameliorate the advising problem, giving the challenge of supporting more full-time faculty.

In conversation with faculty, there was a general appreciation of the efforts and support the university has exhibited. Meetings with full-time faculty indicated that USF is an institution that both supports and celebrates faculty creativity, innovation and development through generous development fund support and other, less tangible, forms of encouragement (CFR 3.4).

USF has institutionalized two programs, the Writing Retreat and the Mentoring Program, that have consistently been touted as effective tools for nourishing and retaining faculty of color particularly, as well as developing the extended cadre of adjunct faculty in the institution. However, some faculty of color explained that USF proudly promotes diversity as a core value and strength of the institution but has given limited support to development of this diversity. Faculty expressed dissatisfaction with some aspects of the hiring process including search committees convened which were provided with insufficient information about the legalities of affirmative action.

The faculty of the University of San Francisco (with the exception of the College of Professional Studies) has been represented by organized labor unions for an extended period of time. During some of that time, there existed what can fairly be described as an adversarial relationship between the unions and management (i.e., the university administration). During this period, the University suffered the loss of time expended in extended grievance procedures, in the loss of potential faculty and administrators who eschewed an institution of higher education with components of organized labor, in the lack of collaborative effort in solving University problems, and in the opportunity loss of failure to agree on priorities for advancing the University. The current situation at USF appears to be very different with respect to labor relations. The current contracts are being honored by both sides without apparent acrimony and without the disabling grievances that so characterized earlier times. There is still some opportunity loss with respect to peer review because of the sharp division between labor and managerial prerogatives and functions at the department level, but the general tenor is positive and the more harmonious relations between labor and management bode well for the adequate representation of the faculty and the continued growth and development of the University.

Meetings with line staff at USF indicate a sense of pride and achievement for their contributions to the mission of the institution. There is a sense of disappointment among some staff members, however, that the “USF 2028” strategy does not include them as a group as fully as it includes the students and faculty (although a typographical error in an early edition of the plan may have caused staff to believe that they were not included in the University’s plans for developing its employees). While faculty of color expressed concern regarding issues such as awareness of the hiring process, the staff, on the other hand, shared experiences of a fine-tuned process surrounding search committees, recruitment and hiring (CFR 3.3). However, a separate issue was raised with respect to the lack of staff of color in upper management. HR is examining ways to retain and promote staff of color by offering broader staff development offerings. (cf. *supra*, p. 9: “Special Theme on Diversity of Faculty and Staff” for additional information about faculty of color.) Activities that include staff in the strategic planning vision of USF will increase their sense of ownership and commitment both to the process and to the institution as it moves forward toward that future.

### **Library and Media Resources**

The visit team notes with approval the University’s efforts to provide its students with adequate library, media, and information technology resources. Although the library’s acquisitions expenditures declined in 2004-05 by 8.5% from the previous year (due to a decrease in interest on endowed funds), the acquisitions line has been almost completely restored in the current budget year. There has been some loss of potential for retrospective collection, but the library responded to the reduction and slow recovery by expanding electronic research resources to compensate, at least partially, for the decline. The team does not believe that this temporary reduction has significantly harmed the library’s capacity to fulfill its mission and serve

adequately the reference, research, and recreational reading needs of students and faculty. There was some concern voiced by Library personnel with the provision of student group-study space in the library, especially since some library space has been converted temporarily to faculty office and classroom needs.

### **Fiscal, IT and Physical Resources**

The new president arrived seven years ago, facing a deficit. After examining its competitive pricing position, the university adopted a strategy to gain financial stability by increasing tuition quickly and increasing enrollments in areas most susceptible to gain. This strategy, along with \$175 million from the capital campaign, has allowed the university to balance its budgets and increase its endowment to \$200 million.

Financial indicators gave the team no concern over the current financial stability of the university (CFR 3.5). The rate of tuition discount is at a safe level for an institution with its diversity goals, as are Moody's ratios and the individual measures of the viability index. There were, however, a few areas that indicate careful management will be needed in the future to prevent a movement away from stability. The level of tuition dependence and the decline in coverage of instruction and academic support by tuition (giving students less direct benefit for their money), will make tuition and enrollment increase strategies increasingly more difficult to achieve. The level of institutional debt with respect to assets is high, but the university is carefully managing its debt service burden.

The university deserves commendation for its successful efforts to provide adequate media and information technology services to both the main campus and the remote sites it operates. Planning, installation, and service of the campus computing network demonstrates



attention to end-user access, flexibility in use, and convenience. Media services are very responsive to faculty needs and current pedagogical requirements, and the resources at the remote sites are equal in quality and perhaps even better in quantity than on the main campus. (CFRs 3.6; 3.7) Presently an impressive 96% of major classrooms have been outfitted with updated technology for support of teaching. Faculty development has been provided to increase the use of Blackboard and smart classrooms by faculty.

The university has begun implementation of the SCT Banner administrative software package. Administrators in areas where modules have been implemented so far are encouraged by the improvement in the availability of information and in system capabilities. The Vice President of University Advancement is particularly pleased with the quality of the implementation and the gain in effectiveness that Banner has provided his staff in developing an accurate and responsive development data base.

With respect to physical resources, the team had no serious concerns before its arrival or even after its first day and a half on campus. As the visit continued, however, there were some indications from faculty, staff, and students that there may be some looming concern about overcrowding, as enrollments remain high and strain the capacity of the facilities, as well as of the faculty and staff. The Library staff mentioned the lack of group study space because library space has been temporarily converted to faculty offices. Faculty office spaces are still at a premium, as are classrooms, and programming and community space. There is no crisis, but there is a need to be aware of these needs and to bear them in mind during planning for any possible additional enrollment growth. The academic area is struggling to provide the full-time instructional resources and the advising needs of the current undergraduate population and, if

facilities become overcrowded simultaneously, this combination of problems might precipitate problems that threaten the overall educational effectiveness of the University.

### **Leadership and Decision-Making**

The team's comments in Standard One indicate recognition of the successful efforts of the University's current leadership to articulate and disseminate a new vision and mission for the University that has resonated deeply with constituents at all levels. At the same place in this report, the team acknowledges the efficacy of the openness of the administration to disclosure and accountability in seeking consultation from University constituencies and its transparency in making planning, budgeting, and many other kinds of governance-related documents available for consultation before decisions are made and for comment afterwards (CFRs 1.3; 3.8; 3.10; 3.11). Decision-making appears to proceed from the processes of needs assessment, data gathering, developing options, and consultation to final decision and implementation. The consultative process assures that analysis takes place at a sophisticated level and that rational and well-informed decisions are made.

## **STANDARD 4: CREATING AN ORGANIZATION COMMITTED TO LEARNING AND IMPROVEMENT**

### **Planning**

The University has chosen a system of planning which is oriented toward a priority-based and results-oriented product. The planning process at USF concentrates on decisions, not on documented plans, analyses, forecasts, and goals, as referenced by the Office of Planning, Budget, and Review's "What is Planning at USF?" The emphasis is on producing annual operational plans that provide rich and robust outlines that will guide administrative officers and staff through the major issues and themes that will dominate the expected work of the year. This mode of planning does not exist in a vacuum, but is informed by the University's Vision,

Mission and Values Statement and is divided into a planning framework that includes strategic (i.e., beyond a five-year cycle), tactical (five-year cycle), and operational (one-year cycle) planning horizons. (CFRs 4.1; 4.2;4.3)

The University's strategic initiatives include recruitment and retention of a diverse group of faculty and staff; the recruitment, retention and graduation of a diverse student body dedicated to academic excellence, development of leadership capability, and responsibility for the weak and vulnerable of society; the provision of an attractive and functional campus; and the strengthening of the University's financial base. In addition, the University has recently developed the first draft of a plan entitled "USF 2028," designed to describe the character of the University twenty years out and to answer the question, "What are the most strategically effective steps USF must take to offer an academically excellent education that reflects the Jesuit, Catholic tradition, draws from the resources and opportunities of San Francisco, capitalizes on the diversity of USF, and prepares students to contribute to the common good of the entire global community?" (CFR 4.1)

Tactical planning is best represented in a document entitled, "Planning Priorities: Action Report" which operates on a functional level and includes for 2007-2008 nine areas of university endeavor representing topics as diverse as USF's future role in recruitment in Asia, outsourcing of campus services, non-monetary incentives for excellent performance by staff, and the University master plan. (CFR 4.2)

Operational planning is incorporated in sixteen discrete unit plans in the 2007-2008 strategic planning booklet. The individual goals of the president, the provost, the vice presidents and the deans are all displayed with a statement of each goal, the person responsible for the

fulfillment of the goal and the expected outcomes or measurement necessary to determine success or failure.

The explicit and implicit criticism of USF's planning function in earlier WASC reports and Commission recommendations have been adequately answered by this documentary evidence of the robust character of planning at this institution. There might be some advantage in bringing a fuller integration of the three phases of planning into a single document, but that would only be necessary for the purposes of external considerations. The current modes of planning and their written expression are entirely satisfactory to ensure that the value of strategic planning is realized within the University. The team does suggest that USF consider developing an assessment process that would document the efficacy of the planning process in the University's successful accomplishment of its objectives.

### **Commitment to Learning and Improvement – Assessment**

The University has completed a first pass at the development of student learning objectives for all programs (CRF 4.4). These objectives are available online and vary somewhat in their level of detail and assessment designs. Rhetoric and Composition has, for example, developed rubrics for the assessment of changes in student writing abilities. In the words of the self-study, however, the university "is aware of the need to develop better measures of students' success in meeting program goals." The University has also found it challenging to design learning achievement assessments in order to "use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy" (CFR 4.4). Assessment designs that allow the comparison of processes, curricula and pedagogy have been more fortuitous at this early stage than planned.

The University's assessment of learning at the course level has been well begun with the core assessment matrix (CAM). The process demonstrates much of the necessary capacity for this area. Faculty follow-up plans appear based on evidence and reflection (CFR 4.6). Standards of evidence are not, however, strongly developed in the CAM process, with too much reliance on grades on one hand and subjective measures on the other. (CFR 4.5). Furthermore, student grades are not sufficiently disaggregated to measure the processes of learning and thus to inform strong recommendations for improvement.

At the program level, the University has developed an institutional academic program review that is characterized by a well-articulated evaluation process that continues to be examined and improved (CFR 4.4). (The current revision of the "Program Review Guidelines" is dated April 2, 2007.) The program review process includes self-studies and external reviews (CFRs 2.7; 4.8), but at the current time has not yet been implemented in all academic units. The emphasis on the development of action recommendations (*cf.* "Conclusions" in Program Review Guidelines booklet) based on these examinations and the Arts and Sciences' dean's follow-up on those recommendations are strengths (CFR 4.6). External reviewers in the most recent assessments have examined program student learning objectives but have been able to give only general reactions because of the scope of their review and, possibly, because of their own lack of experience with in-depth assessment techniques (CFR 2.6).

The process guidelines do not make clear the level of reflection and analysis that actually goes on. For example, the chemistry department report recommended more student involvement in undergraduate research (CFR 2.5)—an excellent idea—but it was not clear that the idea was developed from any particular reflection on evidence. What student needs and learning goals would this practice respond to? How would the success of this idea be assessed?

At this point, most of the program evaluation summaries have a number of recommendations for improving working conditions with implications for student learning, but without a specified direct connection to that outcome. The team agrees, however, that a decentralized approach to assessment design at the department level is best for strengthening faculty commitment to the process, and the team expects an evolving focus toward measuring and improving student learning (CFRs 2.4; 4.5).

Program assessment, as was true of all assessment processes examined, did not present the attentiveness to evidence standards that is expected within an assessment process. Some of the external review teams seemed driven by rumors and reliance on single voices, pushing out of focus the question of what constitutes evidence of student learning (CFR 4.5). While program review, including external reviewer assessment, is explicitly a part of the planning cycle for administrative units, some members of the faculty perceive that these units have been successfully avoiding the task (CFR 4.6). The self-study (p. 20) notes the ongoing challenge of developing a “common framework and procedures for conducting the review and for sharing results.”

The development of a culture of evidence (CFR 4.3) at the University is in its early stages but already reveals a positive character. Student and alumni opinion and satisfaction surveys are regularly conducted at several points in a student’s career and the results made available to the community. Student and alumni reactions are solicited through the surveys on their experience with services and the impact on them of the University’s academic and values clarification efforts. Demographic data of many kinds has been gathered and sometimes disaggregated by interesting and informative categories, but there are some areas, e.g. advising, retention, and persistence to graduation, for which data sets are incomplete, not disaggregated or both (CFR

2.13). The assessment committee has wisely been monitoring and managing the survey burden on students.

The team saw less evidence that the University invested in analyzing and reflecting on data collected in all cases. The recommendations from the retention task force were not clearly derived from the evidence available from the data, for example (CFRs 4.4; 4.6). The data were used primarily to motivate the creation of the Task Force and to search for solutions, certainly a reasonable response to the data. It was not clear to the team, however, if, and if so how, data were used to understand the causes of retention challenges. As an organization at the early stages of the development of a culture of evidence, the university is still engaged in arraying available data and less engaged in inventorying what information might be necessary to improve the quality of decisions and processes (CFR 4.4).

The burden of assessment design is largely decentralized with the Institutional Research function shepherding the broader survey efforts and the Assessment Office supporting departmental efforts to gain faculty confidence in the usefulness of assessment. More resources may be needed to assist the university with the development of standards for assessment. A full understanding of the complete framework of assessment design seems to be missing. Members of the university community could benefit from a better understanding of methods of assessment design that lead to actionable results (CFRs 4.4; 4.6); standards for evidence, analysis and reflection structures; and assessment process improvement cycles (CFR 4.5). In many cases support would have been useful to advance beyond the general indications of broad surveys to better understand causes and specific challenges. Additional resources for Institutional Research and the Assessment Office might enable the development of additional high-quality qualitative

and quantitative research, but the University should consider that some needed professional expertise in evaluation is likely available within the faculty itself.

Several areas within the university were leading in assessment efforts. The development of writing rubrics in Rhetoric and Composition, the focus on specific indicators of student achievement of service learning goals, the core assessment matrix and the survey on the causes and degrees of challenge faced by women faculty and staff were more fully developed vehicles of assessment than were other efforts (CFR 4.4). The university's use of external stakeholders in some assessment processes also deserves positive recognition (CFRs 2.4; 4.1; 4.8).

Such recognition notwithstanding, assessment at USF still appears to be too reliant on subjective responses to data (especially for assessments of student learning objectives) and the university has not developed systems or procedures for acquiring objective, empirically-based evaluations of outcomes, except in areas like nursing, education and law where licensure pass rates provide concrete evidence of program efficacy (CFR 2.7). Where objectives are less amenable to direct testing, the university may wish to follow the lead of Rhetoric and Composition and seek to develop detailed rubrics that allow a more objective evaluation of student progress (CFRs 4.4; 4.5). Student reflections on their learning have also been useful gauges of progress on less quantifiable objectives at other institutions. (See the literature on the use of rubrics within the application of ePortfolios, for example.)

There is substantial evidence that there is not sufficient capacity developed thus far to summarize, analyze, reflect on, and suggest improvements for the assessment activities that have been and are being utilized at this time (CFR 4.3). As spelled out in the self-study (p. 23), assessment "must be made an integral part of the planning and not an after-thought." In efforts to improve advising, for example, the institution may need to strengthen its assessment design and



seek more qualitative data, like that from focus groups, a capacity that appears to be lacking. The team did not see a full system in place to assess and improve advising based on evidence detailing areas of greatest concern (CFR 4.6). The university may also wish to explore additional rubric-based content analysis of student reflections on their learning to expand understanding of the factors that best propel the transformative dimensions of learning.

The culture of evidence at USF needs support to expand to all phases of assessment. The gathering of evidence should not precede an assessment design phase that focuses on decisions faced by the university, evidence quality standards, appropriate analysis and reflection techniques and review of the success of the assessment process itself. Developing this capacity and discipline will require both resolute will and some additional resources.

### **SECTION III – MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The University's assessment systems, although largely in place and expanding to those areas not yet included, reveal several significant deficiencies that need to be addressed. The University's overall assessment program may be characterized in the WASC rubric as "emerging" (as for example in the Core Assessment Matrix and many other areas), although some areas could be described as "developed" (as in the Rhetoric and Writing assessment rubric) and others as "initial" (as in academic advising and persistence to graduation). The most significant issues deal with the appropriate opportunities for analysis of data, processes of reflection and the development of continuous improvement that is suggested by the assessment findings.

In particular, two areas of assessment should be refined. First, the development and use of empirically-based, objective evaluations, especially with respect to the SLO's where there is a

need for comprehensive and consistent use of assessment indicators, benchmarks, and results to suggest and drive the development of continuous improvement policies and procedures. USF should build upon its use of nationally-normed, standardized survey tools to develop additional methods of inquiry, both qualitative and quantitative. Such a strategy will provide greater insight with respect to causes and underlying concerns and will assist in the development of meaningful, value-added strategies for improvement. Documentation and other evidence that articulates the continuous learning process should be included in this effort. Second, there is a need to implement the planned and scheduled expansion of the institutional program review process to include all academic and student-service programs and to integrate those reviews with accreditation reviews for units subject to external, specialized accreditation. There is considerable expertise in the social sciences and among some professional school faculty and the team recommends that USF use this capacity to respond to the challenges of improving its assessment system.

With regard to the faculty of USF, there is an excessive reliance on part-time faculty to teach courses and programs that are central to the fundamental curricular objectives of the undergraduate program. The team questions the adequacy of faculty resources in terms of the institution's reliance on part-time faculty. This situation affects much more than simply classroom learning. It affects advising, committees and other service, accessibility of faculty and opportunities to expand externally funded research, all of which rest in the hands of full-time faculty.

While the University of San Francisco has established an admirable record of promoting and enhancing diversity and cultural competency and it is to be applauded for these achievements, fatigue expressed by some faculty of color must be a constant reminder that they

cannot teach, serve on numerous committees, directly serve students, and participate in the tenure review process without some additional support or recognition for the extended demands on their time and energy. USF is strongly encouraged to continue its current efforts to expand the diversity of the faculty and staff, but also to ensure that it provides the support necessary for current faculty and staff of color to succeed and advance within the University's personnel development system.

The need to continue to improve the advising system at USF is clearly evident, especially as it relates to career outcomes. There is evidence (from the Graduating Student Survey, from interviews with students and administrators, and from differing internal views with respect to the root causes of student attrition) that the weakness in the advising system contributes negatively to the University's efforts in retention and persistence to graduation. The team sees this issue linked to both the size and availability of the full-time faculty (with the attendant danger posed by USF's dependence on a large pool of part-time faculty) and on the need for additional acquisition and analysis of data regarding student attrition and persistence to graduation. The team also recommends that the Deans should reconsider the decision not to provide full-time professional advising, at least in the career development area and aimed especially at freshmen.

#### **SECTION IV - PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT AND REVIEW**

In preparation for the Education Effectiveness Review, the University of San Francisco must move its assessment efforts from the current level on the WASC rubric of "initial" in some areas or "emerging" in others, to "developed" through the use of an articulated cycle of continuous learning and improvement.

USF has successfully conducted the analysis necessary to determine the core questions to which it will respond in addressing its Educational Effectiveness Review and report. Faculty and staff have established a design for its EER which appears to the CPR visit team to be adequate to present the institutional case for educational effectiveness. USF has put in place the resources and systems necessary to conduct the research on the questions to be addressed and has begun to define and categorize the data necessary to provide the evidence which will support the arguments brought forward to demonstrate USF's educational effectiveness.

## **CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW REPORT**

### **ADDENDUM**

#### **DOCTOR OF NURSING PRACTICE DEGREE**

The WASC site visit team for the 2007 Capacity and Preparatory Review for reaccreditation of the University of San Francisco also conducted a site visit for USF's Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree recently approved through the substantive change process by the WASC Commission. The DNP program at USF has just welcomed its first class of students, and WASC team members, Frank Lazarus of the University of Dallas and Julia Barchitta of Wagner University, reviewed documents and interviewed the Dean and faculty of the USF School of Nursing to satisfy the U.S. Department of Education's requirement for a site visit focusing on the DNP program.

The USF DNP program has attracted a large, well-prepared and enthusiastic group of students for its first class. The DNP proposal's budget pro-forma called for admitting 12-14 students per term, but there were twenty-four well-qualified students admitted to the first class, with smaller numbers to be admitted thereafter. The students presented a wide range of clinical backgrounds upon admission, and the School and its faculty seem to have responded positively and creatively to the task of accommodating these varied backgrounds to the distinctive curriculum of the DNP degree. The clinical placements assigned to students appear to mirror well their clinical training and experience and to accommodate their interests in establishing their credentials for direct or indirect practice placement. The Dean has established a plan for transitioning the graduate programs of the School of Nursing to feature the DNP as the first professional degree of choice for nurses, while phasing out the graduate nursing specialties that have been dominant in the profession for the last two decades. When the transition is complete,

the USF School of Nursing will offer a single masters level program in general nursing leadership, and most students (and the faculty resources serving those students) will be centered around the DNP. The reallocation of nursing faculty resources will allow the School to accommodate the new doctoral students without harming the quality of the offerings at the master's and undergraduate levels.

The visit team members are confident that the DNP program at the University of San Francisco is proceeding to full implementation in a fashion that is properly aligned with the format approved by the WASC Commission and is receiving the leadership necessary to ensure academic quality and student service.