

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Interim Report

Name of Institution: University of San Francisco

Person Submitting the Report: Gerardo Marín, ALO & Senior Vice Provost

Report Submission Date: October 30, 2014

Statement on Report Preparation

Briefly describe in narrative form the process of report preparation, providing the names and titles of those involved. Because of the focused nature of an Interim Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of all institutional constituencies is not normally required. Faculty, administrative staff, and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the report. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the governing board, should review the report before it is submitted to WSCUC, and such reviews should be indicated in this statement.

Our preparation of this Interim Report was an ongoing process during the last two academic years as we compiled all evidence to analyze, report, review and discuss each of the components. As has been our approach to preparing accreditation documents for WSCUC and other professional associations, we made sure that the process was a learning experience for the University community and not just the filing of a compliance report. The complexity of the self-reflection process and its impact on institutional evolution is not completely reflected in this Report due to its space limitations. Nevertheless, we submit this Interim Report having benefitted from our discussions, analyses and reflections knowing that we have developed, strengthened, and implemented assessment strategies that make us a better learning community.

A number of individuals were involved in preparing parts of the Report as well as in reviewing various drafts. Gerardo Marín, Senior Vice Provost and ALO to WSCUC, coordinated the compilation of evidence and preparation of the Report. The Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support (OAAS) played a key role in data collection and analysis, evidence gathering, and interpretation. This process was facilitated by members of the OAAS team: Claribel Torres-Lugo, William Murry, and Alan Ziajka and it benefited greatly from extensive contributions on the part of the following individuals: Theodore Lydon (Director of Institutional Research), Shirley McGuire (Associate Dean for Faculty Scholarship and Academic Effectiveness), Linda Ng (Manager of Administrative Operations), and Linda Wong-Lee (Associate Director, Center for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness-CIPE).

Sections of the Report were reviewed and checked for accuracy by individuals affiliated with the Center for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (CIPE), The Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support (OAAS), Shirley McGuire (College of Arts and Sciences), Susan Prion (School of Nursing and Health Professions), and Jason Lyons (School of Management).

Two faculty and staff committees played a key role in the preparation of the Report: The WSCUC Steering Committee and the Institutional Assessment Committee. The Institutional Assessment Committee is composed of: Gerardo Marín (Senior Vice Provost); Claribel Torres-Lugo (Director of Assessment); William Murry (Director of Indirect Assessment); Luis Enrique Bazán (Associate Director for Global Social Justice); Shawn Calhoun (Associate Dean, Gleeson Library); Corey Cook (Associate Professor of Politics and Director, L. T. McCarthy Center for Public Service); Catherine Horiuchi (Associate Professor of Management); Patricia Lynch (Associate Dean of Nursing); Jason Lyons (Director of Assessment of Learning, School of Management); Shirley McGuire (Associate Dean for Faculty Scholarship and Academic Effectiveness, College of Arts and Sciences); Tom Merrell (Assistant

Dean, Student Disability Services); Matthew Mitchell (Professor of Education); Star Moore (Director of Community-Based Learning); Susan Prion (Associate Professor of Nursing); Christopher Thomas (Associate Dean for Strategy, Assessment and Impact, School of Education); and, Linda Wong (Assistant Director, Center for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning - CIPE).

The WSCUC Steering Committee includes: Gerardo Marín; Claribel Torres Lugo; Alan Ziajka; Linda Wong-Lee; Joshua Paul Davis (Associate Dean of Law); Christopher Thomas; Jason Lyons; Shirley McGuire; Susan Prion (Associate Professor of Nursing); Theodore Lydon (Director of Institutional Research); and, William Murry.

Drafts of the Report were reviewed by the President (Fr. Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J.), the Provost (Jennifer Turpin), the deans (Marcelo Camperi from Arts and Sciences, Elizabeth Davis from Management, Judy Karshmer from Nursing and Health Professions, Kevin Kumashiro from Education, John Trasviña from Law), and the Provost Council (Provost, vice provosts, deans, associate vice provosts, Director of University Ministry). In addition, a digital draft was made available to the whole University community (students, faculty, staff, administrators) for their review. This version of the Report incorporates in as much as possible the feedback provided by these diverse stakeholders.

List of Topics Addressed in this Report

Please list the topics identified in the action letter(s) and that are addressed in this report.

This Interim Report includes our response to two issues identified by the Commission: Assessment of student learning and faculty growth and diversity. In addition, WSCUC has asked us to provide an updated Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (last version was submitted in July 2014 as part of our voluntary Mid-Cycle reporting), samples of curriculum maps, and a table on faculty statistics. We have included curriculum maps from a variety of programs and these do not conform to one single style. Nevertheless, they will provide the readers with an understanding of how we analyze our curricula. The table on faculty diversity complements the data discussed as part of the Report by indicating faculty ranks.

Institutional Context

Very briefly describe the institution's background; mission; history, including the founding date and year first accredited; geographic locations; and other pertinent information so that the Interim Report Committee panel has the context to understand the issues discussed in the report.

The University of San Francisco began in 1855 as a one-room schoolhouse named St. Ignatius Academy, located on Market Street in San Francisco. Its founding is interwoven with the establishment of the Jesuit Order of Catholic priests in California, European immigration to the western United States, and the population growth of California and San Francisco as a result of the California Gold Rush. On October 15, 1855, the school opened its doors to its first class. Three students showed up, a number that gradually grew to 65 by 1858. In 1859, Anthony Maraschi, S.J., the founding president, incorporated the institution under California state law, obtained a charter to issue college degrees, formed a board of trustees, and renamed the institution St. Ignatius College. Student enrollment, composed largely of first- and second-generation Irish immigrants, increased to 457 by 1862. Throughout the next two decades, Italians also came to the United States increasing the population of San Francisco and expanding the enrollment of St. Ignatius College to 650 students by 1880. In addition to the Irish and the Italians, large numbers of

Germans and French came to San Francisco in the last decades of the nineteenth century further adding to the European diversity of the institution by the turn of the century. By 1900, students with Latino surnames also began to appear on the enrollment lists of the school.

Growth in the number of students and rising property taxes prompted St. Ignatius College to move in 1880 to the corner of Hayes Street and Van Ness Avenue, the current location of the Louise M. Davies Symphony Hall. The institution occupied a full city block and was described as having “scientific laboratories and departments” as “thoroughly equipped as money can make them” and a library that contained “the cream of knowledge on all necessary subjects.”

The history of St. Ignatius College on Van Ness Avenue came to an abrupt end on April 18, 1906. On the morning of that day, an earthquake followed by several days of fires, brought St. Ignatius Church and College, and most of San Francisco, to almost complete ruin. The city and the institution, however, quickly rebuilt from the devastation. In September 1906, St. Ignatius Church and College reopened in temporary quarters on the southwest corner of Hayes and Shrader streets, currently the site of one of the buildings of St. Mary’s Medical Center. In 1927, St. Ignatius College moved to its current location and into its new Liberal Arts Building, the present Kalmanovitz Hall, near the corner of Fulton and Parker Streets. Three years later, St. Ignatius College changed its name to the University of San Francisco.

Today the University of San Francisco is an independent, private, nonprofit institution of higher education governed by a 41-member Board of Trustees. It is one of 28 Jesuit Catholic colleges and universities in the United States. USF currently has four schools and one college: the School of Law, founded in 1912; the College of Arts and Sciences, organized in 1925; the School of Management, which began in 1925 as the College of Commerce and Finance and was merged with the College of Professional Studies in 2009; the School of Education, which started as the Department of Education in 1947 and was upgraded to a school in 1972; and the School of Nursing and Health Professions, which began as the Department of Nursing in 1948 and became a School of Nursing in 1954 and in 2011 became the School of Nursing and Health Professions by adding programs in public health, clinical psychology, health informatics, health simulation, and behavioral health.

For 159 years, the University of San Francisco has served the citizens of San Francisco and enriched the lives of thousands of people from around the world. The institution has graduated students who went on to become leaders in government, education, business, journalism, sports, and the legal and health professions. Among its alumni, the university counts three former San Francisco mayors, numerous city officials, a former United States Senator, one current and three former California Supreme Court Justices, a former California Lieutenant Governor, two Pulitzer Prize winners, three Olympic medalists, several professional athletes, and the former president of Peru. USF has over 103,000 alumni living in all 50 states, 6 United States territories, and 129 countries. Three hundred thirty-eight of USF’s alumni have joined the Peace Corps since that agency was established in 1961, placing USF in the top twenty five among institutions of comparable size regarding the average annual placement number of Peace Corps volunteers.

The University of San Francisco is accredited by the WASC Senior College and University Commission, an accreditation first granted in 1950 by the Western College Association (WCA), the antecedent of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). In 2010, WASC reaffirmed USF’s accreditation for 9 years. USF is also accredited by several professional accrediting bodies, including, but not limited

to, the American Bar Association (ABA), which first accredited USF's School of Law in 1935; the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, which initially accredited USF's Department of Education (now the School of Education) in 1948; AACSB International–The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, which first accredited USF's College of Business Administration (now the School of Management) in 1953; the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE), which first accredited USF's Nursing programs in 2003, following its first accreditation by the National League for Nursing in 1958; the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), which accredited the Public Administration Program in 2012; and the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), which accredited the Master of Public Health in 2014.

USF is classified as a Doctoral/Research Institution by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Under the Carnegie Foundation classification system, USF is characterized as balancing arts, sciences, and the professions at the undergraduate level; as doctoral/professional dominant at the graduate level; with the majority of its students being undergraduates; as selective, with a high level of transfer-in students; and as a medium-sized, four-year, and primarily residential institution. In 2006, USF received the Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement classification in both possible categories: curriculum engagement and outreach and partnerships. USF was among only 62 schools that received this honor during the first year it was granted. In 2013, for the seventh straight year, and for the third time "with distinction," USF was named to the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll by the Corporation for National and Community Service. This honor highlights USF students' exemplary service on issues ranging from poverty and homelessness, to environmental justice. Honorees are chosen on the basis of the scope and impact of service projects, percentage of students participating in service activities, and the extent to which the school offers academic service-learning courses. At USF, service-learning courses are required of all undergraduates.

As of September 5, 2014 (Census Date), the University of San Francisco enrolled 10,701 students (up from 10,130 in fall 2013), including 6,745 undergraduate students, 3,247 graduate students, 557 law students, and 152 special/non-degree students. USF's student body (37% male) represents diverse ethnic, religious, social, and economic backgrounds, 84 foreign countries, and 55 states and territories of the U.S. Among the fall 2014 student population, 21.0% were Asian, 5.6% African American, 18% Latino, 0.8% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 1.3% Native American, and 16.2% international. Within USF's traditional undergraduate student population in the fall of 2014, 33% grew up in a home where English was not their first language, 33% were the first in their family to enroll in college, and 53% were awarded federal financial aid, including 26% who received Pell Grants. By any measure, USF is one of the most diverse universities in the nation. USF was listed as a Tier One National University in the 2015 *U.S. News & World Report*, was ranked in 8th place in undergraduate student ethnic diversity, 6th for success in graduating low-income (Pell Grant) students, and 9th for the percentage of international students.

Central to the Mission of the University of San Francisco is the preparation of men and women to shape a multicultural world with generosity, compassion, and justice. The institution's most recent Vision, Mission, and Values Statement (Attachment 01), approved by the Board of Trustees on September 11, 2001 (CFR 1.1), captures the essence of this commitment in its opening paragraph: "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." This mission permeates all aspects of the institution, including student learning and faculty development, curriculum

design, program and degree offerings, alumni relations, publications, and a host of other institutional features.

The main USF campus occupies 55 acres near Golden Gate Park in San Francisco. In addition to this Hilltop Campus, the university offers classes at four Northern California branch campuses (Sacramento, San Jose, Santa Rosa, and Pleasanton) at a Southern California branch campus, and at locations in downtown San Francisco and at the San Francisco Presidio as well as online. The institution also offers students a multitude of international opportunities, study-abroad programs, and immersion experiences that enrich the learning community and fulfill the university's Mission.

Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

This main section of the report should address the issues identified by the Commission in its action letter(s) as topics for the Interim Report. Each topic identified in the Commission's action letter should be addressed. The team report (on which the action letter is based) may provide additional context and background for the institution's understanding of issues.

Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes. Responses should be no longer than five pages per issue

The March 3, 2010 letter from the Commission asked the University to submit an Interim Report in 2014 addressing two specific issues: (a) Revision, completion, and documentation of the three-year comprehensive assessment plan; and, (b) Increase in full-time faculty and faculty from underrepresented groups. Both of these issues are addressed below.

ASSESSMENT

The University of San Francisco values properly assessing and documenting student learning in courses, programs, and in co-curricular activities (CFR 2.6 & 2.11). As is true of many other institutions, our approach to assessment of student learning has evolved in response to changes in the field of higher education and to faculty and staff identifying approaches that best fit their needs to improve the assessment process and student learning.

We have a long history in pioneering program reviews, updating and revising our curricula, promoting embedded assessment, and more recently, emphasizing the need for gathering direct evidence of learning. Together with this evolution, the University has committed increasing financial and staff resources to develop, implement, and support our efforts in assessment. While program reviews (CFR 2.7 & 4.1) and related concurrent accreditation of professional programs have been and continue to be one of our key approaches to assessment, there are a number of other strategies that we have developed, utilized and tested to comprehensively assess learning and guide curricula and program changes (“Closing of the Loop”) in a meaningful way. As such, we promote assessment as an organic process that needs to be transparent (CFR 1.2), evolving, and informed by the evidence gathered in the process regarding its comprehensiveness, effectiveness, and sustainability (including level of faculty support). Likewise, we believe that a comprehensive assessment process needs to include a balanced representation of quantitative and qualitative approaches as well as the use of direct and indirect measures. These multiple approaches provide a more complete “picture” of the student experience and guide us in our commitment to improve the University and sustain our search for fulfilling our Mission. While some individuals in the field dismiss the value of indirect measures of the student experience, we value their contribution to

Page | 5

achieving a more comprehensive overview. Indeed, research in the social and behavioral sciences¹ has shown that self-reflection and self-report (when reliably collected) are a valid representation of an individual's behavior (e.g., smoking behavior, medication intake, use of safety procedures, school attendance).

Program-Specific Assessment Plans. At the time of the last reaffirmation of accreditation, the University was implementing a pilot program of three-year assessment plans for programs that did not undergo concurrent professional accreditation. This program followed an initial effort conducted in 2007 where faculty reported on course assessment projects they were conducting within the Core Curriculum (see "Core Curriculum" at: <http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/USFProgramReviews/>). This initial effort produced a comprehensive view of assessment across the University but was perceived as a burden by faculty and staff given the large number of details that were requested and the difficulty in filing the forms.

In response to the aforementioned shortcomings, a second pilot was begun in 2008-2009. This pilot had as its main objective to support faculty in developing or revising the mission and SLOs for their program and to develop assessments for the achievement of the SLOs. That second pilot program (in process during our last reaffirmation) was particularly successful in motivating the university's faculty and administrators to make the language of assessment part of their everyday interactions. A series of workshops and materials allowed members of the University community to start identifying the benefits of analyzing the student learning process particularly in those programs not undergoing professional accreditation.

One particularly important success of the "Three-Year Assessment Plan" was that faculty developed or reviewed the mission and SLOs for their programs and identified initial assessment approaches. In the process of developing and implementing these three-year assessment plans, faculty realized that some of their initial SLOs were not assessable (mostly because they were framed as general goals or included multiple outcomes) and importantly, that there was a need to identify a few, reachable and assessable SLOs for a given program. The result of that effort is that now all programs have published SLOs (see IEEI Report) and faculty understands the need to report evidence of their achievement. The first two years of the process produced useful reports that supported curriculum improvements and enhancements (see <http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/USFProgramAssessReports/>).

Another result of the first two years of the assessment plan pilot, was the realization that we needed to rationalize the amount of effort being demanded by formalized assessment reporting initiatives. Our Assessment Office at the time developed a comprehensive reporting template that faculty found onerous to complete. Even the payment of stipends was not sufficiently motivating to maintain the timeliness of the reports and to compensate the great amount of faculty effort required during the summer months. Personnel losses in the Assessment Office made it difficult to provide timely feedback to each academic unit on their yearly reports, which was another time-consuming component included in the design of the pilot project. In addition, new faculty members were not receiving the training they needed to contribute to and help sustain a culture of assessment. We developed a program that was "beautiful" in design but did not consider the practicalities of faculty and staff workload, was unable to obtain "intrinsic" buy-in from some of the faculty, and died in a slow process of extinction produced by incomplete planning.

The 2008 economic downturn meant a significant reduction in resources that could have been devoted to pay faculty stipends for performing the three-year assessment plans. In retrospect, the use of stipends and

¹ See for example, Walsh, W. B. (1967). Validity of Self-Report, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 14, 18-23; Brener, N. D. (2003). Assessment of factors affecting the validity of self-reported health-risk behavior among adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 33, 436-457; Pérez-Stable, E.J., Benowitz, N., & Marín, G. (1995). Is cotinine a better measure of cigarette smoking than self-report? *Preventive Medicine*, 24, 171-179.

their disappearance a year or two later was a poorly planned component of the pilot program that directly affected its sustainability. The staff in the Office of Student Learning Assurance (OSLA) remained small (one person) and there were no longer funds available to provide large-scale trainings. In 2009-2010, only 44% of the academic programs submitted yearly reports to the OSLA. Programs were given a year off to revise their plans, but it did not result in an increase in reports in 2011-2012. Despite these disappointing results, the University remained committed to promoting student learning assessment (CFR 2.6) and to identifying processes that were efficient, comprehensive, and sustainable.

At the same time we were receiving strong feedback from faculty and administrators about the important potential of our model for program reviews (see below) as a way of holistically assessing student learning and as motivators for program changes (“Closing of the Loop”). Academic program review has historically been the cornerstone of assessment at the University (CFR 2.7 & 4.1) with programs preparing for the review at least a year in advance and closing the loop for two to three years after the review. The faculty in the programs are, therefore, engaged in curricular review and revision for five out of five to seven of the years between reviews. Historically, important changes have been introduced as a result of program reviews (see Attachment 02 for a summary of changes made in response to program reviews in the College of Arts and Sciences between 2004-2007). Program reviews remain as essential components of our continuous improvement efforts both for individual programs (for copies of reviews see <http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/USFProgramReviews/>) and for school-wide change. For instance, in response to multiple program reviews, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences asked several faculty members to develop a peer advising model that could be used across the College and specially in departments with a large number of majors. An important lesson from those early efforts was the need to develop assessment support structures closer to the faculty rather than relying on a central office that was physically and psychologically removed from the majority of the faculty. In addition, the yearly assessment efforts needed to be more fully integrated into the program review process because our culture of assessment has lived in program reviews for more than 20 years.

An analysis of our experiences as well as those of other institutions suggested that support for program assessment would be more efficient, better integrated, and better received if it was located within each of the schools/College rather than centralized. This led us to appoint Assessment Coordinators in each of the schools/College. The coordinators are usually faculty members who work cooperatively with the institutional *Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support*. The latter office supports the work of the Assessment Coordinators and directs institutional-level assessment and evaluation efforts (e.g., NSSE, SSI, Graduating Student Survey) and serves as a depository of all evidence <http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/>.

During this period of analysis and self-reflection (2012-2013), assessment was added to the portfolios of the associate dean positions and the Center for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (CIPE) was created to consolidate gathering, processing, and dissemination of institutional information and data. A consultant, Amy Driscoll, was hired to work with CIPE, the associate deans, other administrators and faculty in each of the schools. These discussions again corroborated the problems with the three-year assessment plans mentioned above.

These concerns as well as our previous experiences with assessment of student learning and what we have seen and learned at WSCUC’s meetings and workshops, supported our decision to continue developing an organic and practical process of assessment that includes multiple periodic components as described below. We have created a model that is more efficient, comprehensive, transparent, and sustainable that involves faculty, staff, and administrators with periodic reports to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. Other changes have helped us emphasize the central role of student learning assurance to the University. For example, the name of the central supporting agency was changed to Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support (OAAS); responsibility for evaluating, analyzing, and

disseminating direct and indirect measures were assigned to separate individuals at OAAS; the school-based Assessment Coordinators (individuals with terminal degrees) were physically located in the school or college they served and were charged with supporting program assessment efforts including preparation for program reviews and professional accreditation; institutional efforts in assessment (OAAS) were transferred to report to the Senior Vice Provost (who has experience in assessment and is also the ALO to WSCUC); a newly appointed Vice Provost for Budget, Planning and Effectiveness is an expert in Analytics and is reorganizing CIPE to provide analytics services to the institution; and finally, our top academic administrators, our new President (Fr. Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J.) and our Provost (Jennifer Turpin) are fully conversant with the implications and requirements of assessment and accreditation.

Importantly, as a result of these experiences, we have implemented a process for academic programs to report on a yearly basis the results of their assessment efforts and the “Closing of the Loop”. This time we consulted with faculty, staff, and the Assessment Coordinators rather than imposing a format developed by central administration. The process obviously has taken time to materialize but it is being implemented during AY 2014-2015. This new document (Attachment 03) is web-based, facilitates reporting through the use of pull-down menus, requires a minimum of writing, and serves as the basis for the more comprehensive reporting on assessment of the program’s SLOs that is expected in the program reviews. The reports are submitted before the end of the academic year (eliminating the burden of filling out forms while the faculty are on summer break) and is elegant in its simplicity. One other function it serves (through the options in the pull down menus) is as a training instrument by showing faculty the various approaches to assessment that are possible (e.g., capstones, embedded questions, projects, etc.) as well as the types of results that can be analyzed (e.g., curricular changes, modification of graduation requirements, etc.). The Assessment Coordinators in each school/College will analyze the reports and provide feedback to the programs. This process is a more expeditious approach to provide feedback by someone who understands the field and is closer to the faculty. Programs will be asked to include these reports in their upcoming program reviews.

Our Assessment efforts at the time of this Interim Report look different from what the Visiting Team saw in 2009. During this self-evaluation process (as recommended by the Commission), our plans have evolved in complexity and usefulness. Indeed, we are certain that we have developed (and continue to develop) a comprehensive, effective, and sustainable process. Our current approach is based on the larger involvement of faculty and staff in program reviews and the assessment of specific academic programs and activities (e.g., the Core Curriculum, service learning). We have also witnessed significant interest of co-curricular offices to engage in the program review process. By using multiple approaches to assessing student learning we have moved the institution to the level recommended by the Commission’s letter of making evidence-based assessment into a central part of the culture of the institution. As with any culture change process, we have not achieved the end state but we are well on the way to becoming a university that plans and acts based on evidence. As described in Attachment 04, our assessment efforts have produced a number of important programmatic improvements. When the next reaffirmation of accreditation takes place in 2018, we will be able to demonstrate a more mature and organic assessment process. Furthermore, being true to our Jesuit tradition, we continuously reflect and analyze our experiences as a critical step in improving processes and becoming a better institution.

While we are aware of the space limitations that are part of this Interim Report, we feel that our response to the Commission’s question would not be complete unless we briefly describe some of the other components of our current assessment efforts. In order not to tax the patience of our colleague reviewers, we provide short statements describing the components and have used attachments to provide details or examples when appropriate.

Academic Program Reviews. The University began mandatory academic program reviews as far back as *circa* 1993 when the College of Arts and Sciences implemented comprehensive program reviews (CFR

2.7 & 4.1). Since then, all academic programs (excepting those concurrently accredited professional programs) have conducted periodic (every 5-7 years) program reviews (see Attachment 05 for the current schedule of reviews). These program reviews include a thorough self-study, analysis of the curriculum and syllabi, enrollment (including attrition and graduation rates), staffing ratios, etc. Peer reviewers from other institutions are invited to visit the program and provide written feedback and the documents are reviewed by the program faculty, dean, and the Provost with a summary being presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. At the end of the process, the program faculty discuss with the dean an action plan that addresses the issues identified during the program review. A progress report is often discussed in the interim between reviews and a more formal report is then included in the next scheduled program review (see Attachment 06 for program review handbook). The self-study and the summary of the review written by the dean's office is posted on the website of the Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support (<http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/USFProgramReviews/>).

Concurrent Accreditation of Professional Programs. Professional programs externally accredited (e.g., Nursing, Law, Management, Credentialed Education, Public Administration, Public Health, etc.) do not undergo a program review since the processes are very similar and the results of an accreditation review resemble the goals of a program review. We are currently accredited by ABA (Law-2015), CCNE & BRN (Nursing – 2014-2015), CTC (Credentialed Teaching - 2015), AACSB (Business and Management - 2015), NASPAA (Public Administration-2018), and CEPH (Public Health-2019). In addition we will be pursuing APA accreditation for our PsyD program (July 2017).

Concurrent Accreditation of Co-Curricular Programs. We have recently obtained accreditation by the American Psychological Association (APA) for our Counseling and Psychological Services Center (CAPS) demonstrating the high quality of services provided and the optimal learning experiences provided our students and interns.

Co-Curricular Program Reviews. Co-Curricular program reviews began at the University in 2006 (CFR 2.11). The process was temporarily discontinued due to the re-organization of some offices which required time for the new structures to become better established. This re-organization was the product of the University's decision to move the former co-curricular services grouped under "University Life" to a new Student Life Division (SLD) headed by a Vice Provost who reports directly to the Provost and is part of the Academic Affairs Division. Likewise, the former Academic and Enrollment Services Office was re-envisioned into a Strategic Enrollment Management Office headed by an experienced Vice Provost. We now feel that many of these co-curricular entities and services have matured sufficiently to benefit from a comprehensive program review. Attachment 07 includes the schedule of program reviews and Appendix 08 includes the handbook for the review of these co-curricular offices. In the interim, co-curricular offices have developed mission statements and used various approaches (e.g., satisfaction surveys, participation audits) to evaluate the quality of their services. The forthcoming program reviews (01 are being conducted between 2014 and 2015) will allow for a more holistic approach to analyzing how well the various offices support student learning and development. As is true for the academic program reviews, documents related to these co-curricular reviews will be posted online (CFR 1.2).

Identification of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). During the last two years, the University has been revising the ILOs for undergraduate education (Attachment 09) in order to limit their number, making sure they can be assessed and mapped against the Mission and WSCUC's Core Competencies (CFR 2.3, 2.4 & 2.2a). Currently, we are developing ILOs for graduate education. These ILOs are useful in program reviews as well as in identifying programs' institutional connectedness. In the development of the ILOs we have involved a large number of stakeholders, including the deans, the Institutional Assessment Committee, and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. In addition, a close-to-final draft has been posted online for additional feedback from students, faculty, and staff.

Core Curriculum Assessment. The University's Core Curriculum (<http://www.usfca.edu/catalog/core/>) is a reflection of our Jesuit tradition and goes beyond most GE requirements in its complexity. The Core Advisory Committee or CAC (<http://www.usfca.edu/college-committees/core-advisory-committee/>) oversees assessment of the Core Curriculum, with the direct involvement of the full-time and adjunct faculty. We provide details here of assessment of the Core as concrete examples of our ongoing activities using a variety of mostly direct measures. Recent efforts at assessing the Core Curriculum began with the four areas closely linked to the University Mission: Written Communication, Public Speaking, Philosophy, and Ethics. The Rhetoric and Language Department conducted pre-and post-course analyses of writing samples over three-years to evaluate direct evidence of students' written communication skills. Rubrics were created for the four learning outcomes for the area: critical analysis of academic discourse, integrating multiple sources, academic research, and style. Double-blind evaluation by at least two instructors of student essays showed the type of progress accomplished as well as areas that needed improvement. Results showed strong progress toward most outcomes after a year of instruction with students becoming more stylistically capable (e.g., minimized errors and awkwardness, engaging more demanding content) across the two-course sequence. Errors in some areas by a significant percentage of students led to closing the loop activities to improve instruction. Students are now required in their first major writing assignment to draw upon source material, more emphasis is being placed on reading non-fiction prose texts, and full-time and adjunct faculty are made clearly aware of the need for emphasis on reading and source-based writing skills.

Public Speaking, a second area of the Core Curriculum that is also related to the Jesuit ideal of *Eloquencia Perfecta*, was assessed by examining videotapes of student speeches. The Rhetoric and Language Department began with revising learning outcomes to emphasize not only oral communication skills, such as crafting thesis-driven speeches and practicing extemporaneous delivery, but also the use of rhetorical concepts and theory as a means of assessing the effectiveness and the ethicality of communication. The Department then analyzed the delivery mode for a random selection of informative and persuasive speeches. Speeches were scored by at least two instructors using a rubric created by the Public Speaking faculty. Results suggested that students were developing efficient skills in delivery, but work was needed in improving their ability to perform extemporaneously. The Department closed the loop by instituting professional development for full-time and adjunct faculty to bring their course material more in line with the learning outcomes and by increasing their submission requirements for our annual "Speaker Showcase" events to identify exceptional speakers that can serve as models for the students.

The third and fourth areas, Philosophy and Ethics, were assessed by the Philosophy Department over a two-year period. Two committees were formed to read and assess a signature assignment from multiple courses across each area. Two instructors scored each written assignment using department-created rubrics. The committees met with full-time and adjunct faculty to review the data and course syllabi. The faculty then created an action plan that included new writing assignments and greater uniformity on essentials in syllabi and teaching. For example, all Core courses in Philosophy and Ethics now require a critical paper. In addition, at least 75% of a major exam must be essay-writing. Faculty also show an assignment connects with the relevant learning outcome. A follow-up assessment a year later showed that the closing the loop activities were effective in increasing the quality of student learning and alignment with the course learning outcomes for the two Core areas.

While these efforts to assess the Core Curriculum have been successful, the Core Advisory Committee (CAC) continued to develop assessment initiatives for the other areas of the Core Curriculum. The University is providing staff support and resources to the CAC from the office of the Dean. The CAC is currently in the process of creating a Core Curriculum Assessment Plan that will focus on "higher-order" competencies that cut across Core areas, instead of a focus on assessing every individual learning outcome within each area (some areas of the Core are served by various departments making area-specific

assessment difficult to coordinate). The goal is to create an assessment plan that is more efficient and emphasizes skills and abilities that prepare students for the 21st Century. The CAC has adopted The Essential Learning Outcomes from the American Association of Colleges and Universities as a guide for the higher-order competences (<https://www.aacu.org/leap/essential-learning-outcomes>) which are in line with the USF Institutional Learning Outcomes. The new approach also emphasizes connections across areas and will allow the University to move toward a model that can assess a Mission-related integrative learning approach (<https://www.aacu.org/resources/integrative-learning>). In advancing this initiative, the committee is engaging in curricular mapping to determine connections across learning outcomes. Faculty working groups will be formed to create rubrics and determine assessment methods. The CAC has also reaffirmed that, as is true with all program reviews and the previous Core evaluations, adjunct faculty and students will continue to be involved in the assessment of the Core Curriculum.

Normed Indirect Measures. The University continues using and analyzing such well known instruments as NSSE, SSI, EBI (Housing), NCLEX (Nursing) and their results are used for assessment and program improvement. Results are reviewed by administrators, trustees and all are made available online (http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/USF_ILO_Results/ (CFR 1.2). The results of these measures have served to develop new strategies to improve student learning (CFR 2.12 & 2.13). One of the most recent results of this “Closing of the Loop” based on the data from indirect measures is the creation of CASA (Center for Academic and Student Achievement). At CASA, students find compassionate academic and personal support that promotes holistic student development (www.usfca.edu/casa). For a number of years we had seen that data in SSI and in NSSE showed that students were reporting not being fully satisfied with the academic advising they received. Furthermore, we wanted to improve our retention and graduation rates even though those rates compared favorably with many of our comparator institutions. CASA developed a series of strategies to implement intrusive advising and to follow student progress and identify early warning signs. CASA staff in collaboration with OAAS use *MapWorks* to identify students at risk (e.g., low grades, high number of absences, low motivation) and to implement a series of strategies to help students succeed.

The text below describes some of the most recent activities utilizing normed indirect measures. These serve as complements to the other assessment strategies we have implemented in the last few years (many of them since the last WASC Visit).

Mapping of NSSE. Given that NSSE samples first-year and graduating students, we have carried out a mapping process of the NSSE results against the institutional ILOs for undergraduates (Attachments 10 & 11) as well as against the five core competencies of WSCUC’s CFR 2.2a (Attachments 12 & 13). Our analysis of the NSSE data in terms of the ILOs was divided into two given that NSSE changed a number of questions in 2013. Attachment 10 shows the 2005-2011 NSSE items that we felt (through an iterative process) were most closely related to each of the ILOs. Attachment 11 shows the NSSE 2014 data in terms of the undergraduate ILOs. In general, the analyses show that Seniors tend to agree more strongly with the various items than First-Year students showing that indeed, the experiences at the University have served to promote growth and development in the expected ILOs. The NSSE 2014 data also show (Attachments 12 and 13) that graduating seniors report having acquired or improved in most of the Core Competencies.

Graduating Student Survey. We have developed an institutional exit survey of graduating students (seniors as well as graduate students) that measures students’ perceptions of how well their experiences at USF have allowed them to fulfill the Mission of the University and achieve the ILOs. The data from various years of graduates not only show satisfaction with their experience at USF but also a general feeling that they have been influenced by our Mission and our learning environment (see <http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/UgGSS/> for undergraduate students and

<http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/GrGSS/> for graduate students). Attachment 14 shows the results of recent undergraduate exit surveys mapped against the ILOs (CFR 2.3 & 2.4).

Professional Exams. Some professional programs use the results of an end-of-program professional exam/experience to assess student achievement of program SLOs. Among these are the JD program (Bar passing rate), the CFA Exam for students graduating from the Master in Financial Analysis, the Clinical Nurse Certification Exam, the NCLEX licensing exam for baccalaureate and Master's Entry Nursing students, the TPA for Education students, etc. The results of these exams help us evaluate not only student performance and learning achieved (which in some cases is required for professional practice) but also to compare our programs with those at other institutions. Results are used to improve curricular design. For example, recent CNL exam results for some of our nursing students showed somewhat disappointing results. In response to these relative low passing rates, the School of Nursing and Health Professions implemented a number of strategies to improve the student learning experience including changes in the curriculum to better match the expected competencies in the CNL exam and revision of practical experiences.

Capstone Project/Portfolios. Recently programs have begun to implement the use of a capstone comprehensive assessment project or of a portfolio as a way to measure the achievement of program SLOs. While these recent efforts have been primarily in graduate programs, our experience with these strategies will help us extend its use across the University. Examples include the development of a portfolio in our Master of Public Health and in our Master in Collegiate Athletics. Likewise, our Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) students complete an evidence-based change in practice project and the Master in Migration Studies requires students to produce a professional-level manuscript during their involvement with the program.

Student Evaluation of Teaching. Since Fall 2010 the University has been developing a new process for the assessment of teaching. A Committee (including full-time and adjunct faculty and staff) was charged with reviewing and assessing both in-house and outsourced options for conducting online teaching evaluations, paying particular attention to effectiveness, feasibility, cost, and administrative efficiency. Anticipated to be released for use in the Spring 2015, the Committee created an in-house, fully validated instrument for use as a measure of teaching effectiveness with focus on four related constructs: Instructional Design, Instructional Practices, Student Engagement, and Student Learning. The new instrument will replace the current survey for evaluating instructors that represents a conscious effort to encourage pedagogical improvements through both quantitative and qualitative feedback. A key aspect of the instrument is that it will provide formative and summative evaluation of instruction and short-term feedback to faculty so that courses can be modified and improved before the upcoming semester (see http://www.usfca.edu/Registration/Teaching_Effectiveness_Survey/)

Redefined Mission of Assessment Committee. In Fall 2014, the Institutional Assessment Committee has been asked to redefine its mission to include not only detailed analyses of assessment results (e.g, program reviews, NSSE, etc.) but also to make recommendations to deans and the Provost of areas that according to our assessment results, require attention in order to improve our students' learning experience. In this sense, the approach is changing from a somewhat "passive" strategy of sharing information to a more "proactive" approach of identifying areas that require action. The Committee will have a comprehensive perspective of our assessment efforts and results that will complement the work of the associate deans and of the Assessment Coordinators while working with programs in the specific school or in the College.

As shown in the previous paragraphs, the University has developed in the last few years (and for the most part, since our last reaffirmation visit) a comprehensive iterative assessment strategy. This new approach to assessment incorporates feedback and behavioral measures from students, information from faculty's

analyses and reflection on the learning experience as well as the analysis of information obtained through normed surveys, extant data, and other sources. These multiple sources and strategies help us compile a more complete and nuanced vision of the learning experience at the University. At the same time we strive to use these various informational channels to modify the curriculum, improve the learning experience, better advise students, and fulfill our Mission.

INCREASES IN FULL-TIME FACULTY

Since fall 2008, the University of San Francisco has made significant progress in increasing the number of full-time faculty (Attachment 15). The number of full-time faculty members increased 20.8% from the fall of 2008 to the fall of 2013 (from 380 to 459), with 67% of that increase taking place during the last two years, after the national economy had improved sufficiently to permit more hiring (CFR 3.1). Preliminary figures for fall 2014 (October 10, 2014)² show that there are 474 full-time faculty members, an increase of 24.7% over fall of 2008. The number of full-time female faculty members increased by 26.7% from fall 2008 to fall 2013 (from 176 to 223), while the number of male full-time faculty members increased by 15.7%. Preliminary figures for fall 2014 show that full-time women faculty increased 32.4% from fall 2008 to fall 2014 (from 176 to 233) while the number of men increased by 18.1% in that same period of time. In terms of ethnicity (CFR 1.4), the number of White Non-Hispanic full-time faculty decreased by 4.8% from fall 2008 to fall 2013 (from 289 to 275) and decreased by 9.3% from fall 2008 to fall 2014 (from 289 to 262). From fall 2008 to fall 2013, the number of African American full-time faculty members increased by 20.0%; Hispanic full-time faculty increased by 68.2%; and the number of Asian full-time faculty increased by 41.2%. From fall 2008 to fall 2014, the number of African American faculty increased by 25%, Latino full-time faculty increased by 113.6%, and the number of Asian full-time faculty increased by 55.9%. In September 2014, the University budgeted 20 additional full-time faculty positions from revenue generated by an unexpectedly high yield of entering students. Most of these positions will probably not be filled until fall 2015 given the time required to conduct a national search for faculty but together with the 12 new full-time positions budgeted for AY 2014-2015, the figures demonstrate the University's continued commitment to increase the number and diversity of full-time faculty.

The ratio of full-time to part-time faculty at USF has also improved from 2008 to 2013. In the fall of 2008, there were 380 full-time faculty members at USF and 553 part-time instructors, for a ratio of approximately 3:5. In 2013, there were 459 full-time faculty members and 651 part-time instructors, a ratio of approximately 2:3. By headcount, 40.7% of the instructional staff in 2008 were full-time compared to 41.4% in fall 2013. This modest improvement in the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty has taken place concurrently with the growth in student enrollment, which went from 8,772 students in fall 2008 to 10,130 students in fall 2013. Preliminary data for fall 2014 show that there were 47 full-time faculty members and 715 part-time faculty, a ratio of approximately 2:3. By headcount, 40.7% of the instructional staff in 2008 were full-time compared to 40.5% in fall 2013. This slight reduction in the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty has taken place concurrently with the growth in student enrollment that went from 8,772 students in fall 2008 to 10,701 student in fall 2014 with almost 30% of that growth occurring in the last year.

Among the 84 universities that share our Carnegie classification, USF was tied for the 15th highest percentage of full-time ethnic minority faculty as of 2011, the most recent year available for comparison (see Attachment 16).

² Our IPEDS reporting date for faculty is November 1 therefore we report changes between 2008 and 2013 based on IPEDS and preliminary data for changes between 2008 and 2014.

The deans and faculty at the University of San Francisco have made major efforts at recruiting and retaining full-time underrepresented faculty members, notwithstanding the severe competition from other institutions for hiring them. To recruit underrepresented faculty members, USF's schools and college mandate that:

- Ethnic and gender composition are considered when all faculty search committees are formed.
- All search committees ensure a diverse pool of applicants.
- Faculty positions are usually advertised in at least 12 publications that target diverse academic communities.
- The faculty hiring process is fair and inclusive. All committees are briefed on fair processes.
- Programs within each college recruit faculty through USF's Ethnic Minority Dissertation Fellows (EMDF) program, in which minority scholars are expected to complete their dissertation while teaching one course per semester in the academic program where they are placed. Through this initiative, promising scholars from diverse backgrounds become familiar with the responsibilities of a USF faculty member, and may be offered a tenure-track appointment at the end of their one year fellowship (http://www.usfca.edu/Provost/Diversity/Ethnic_Minority_Dissertation_Fellowship/).

In addition, the various deans have special programs to attract a diverse pool. For example, the School of Management is a member of the "Ph.D. Project" that alerts business and management schools when qualified underrepresented Ph.D. candidates in business fields have finished their dissertations. The School of Law has created a separate unit of its appointments committee ("lateral recruitment subcommittee") to focus exclusively on lateral faculty hiring from other law schools instead of entry-level candidates. This was done in part to more effectively identify potential candidates from underrepresented groups whom the law school has been able to recruit more successfully than minority applicants on the entry-level market.

The Center for Teaching Excellence offers a wide variety of support and resources for new faculty members. New Faculty Teaching Seminars, peer coaching services, regularly-scheduled Teaching Cafes, the Faculty Summer Book Club, Faculty Learning Communities, Open Classrooms, and Focused Conversations are all available to new faculty members. The CTE online "Faculty Lounge" provides rich resources on a variety of topics (<http://www.usfcte.net>) available for review 24/7.

Competition with other institutions for minority faculty retention exists, but to a significantly less degree than at the hiring level because faculty generally want to stay at USF after becoming members of USF's inclusive, supportive, and mission-driven community. USF's schools and the college use the following approaches to retain and support underrepresented faculty members:

- All new faculty members are paired with at least one mentor.
- Ongoing financial awards from the Faculty Development Fund support faculty scholarship, and have been critical for the professional development of many minority faculty members.
- Workshops are held for first-year faculty members that include discussions by second-year faculty and administrators about academic life, workload, and other similarly relevant issues.
- Writing retreats have been developed to specifically support ethnic minority faculty.

In addition, the USF School of Nursing and Health Professions maintains that one way to retain diverse faculty is by placing a premium on working with diverse patient populations where they can apply their scholarship and practice their profession. Therefore, the School of Nursing and Health Professions has a number of academic-practice partnerships with Bay Area non-profits that focus on underrepresented minorities. School of Nursing and Health Professions faculty report that this is a key feature for recruitment and retention. In the School of Management, the dean has encouraged underrepresented faculty to reach out to colleagues in Arts and Sciences and has personally facilitated some of these initial contacts. Moreover, the School of Management has made extensive use of minority faculty writing retreats run by the College of Arts and Sciences, and has regularly underwritten the cost of School of Management faculty to attend that retreat. The School of Education provides a new faculty orientation on

the school's mission, strategic plan, academic culture, teaching, and service expectations, research resources, the ACP process, and faculty development resources. Further, all tenure-track faculty seeking promotion are paired with a mentoring committee. Moreover, the School of Education supports ethnic minority faculty to attend university-wide writing retreats that have been developed to specifically support ethnic minority faculty, and the School of Education has its own writing retreat each semester that further benefits ethnic minority faculty in their scholarship. Finally, the dean of the School of Education holds brown bag discussions with ethnic minority faculty members throughout the academic year.

The Vision, Mission, and Values Statement of the University of San Francisco underscores the importance of recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty members. Among the strategic initiatives listed in that statement is the following: "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." In the final analysis, the university is fulfilling this strategic initiative as it concurrently achieves recognition as a premier Jesuit Catholic urban University.

Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

Instructions: This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred or issues that have arisen at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, addition of major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, unanticipated challenges, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described in the preceding section. This information will help the Interim Report Committee panel gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the actions of the institution discussed in the previous section have taken place.

Since WSCUC's reaffirmation of USF's accreditation in March 2010, the institution has continuously improved its data-gathering processes and structures, added key personnel and programs, and adapted to economic and political factors in the external environment. The nation's financial crisis from 2008 to 2010, the increase in calls for transparency from the various constituencies that USF serves, and a stronger focus by all accreditation agencies on the assessment of student learning, has prompted the University to develop more responsive structures and capitalize on improvements well underway at the time of the last WSCUC visit. Moreover, the significant growth in student enrollment at USF (from a total student enrollment of 9,036 students in the fall of 2009 to 10,701 students in the fall of 2014), accompanied by the demand for innovative and responsive programs to meet the needs of those students, has further underscored USF's goal to make the assessment of student learning a critical part of the planning process for all new programs.

In September 2012, USF changed its approach to institutional data-gathering, analysis, and reporting through a reorganization of staff and functions previously housed in different areas of the University. USF created the Center for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (CIPE), which resides within the Provost's Office and integrates functions previously performed by the Office of Student Learning Assurance, Information and Data Services, Institutional Research, and Planning and Budget (CFR 4.2). CIPE is currently composed of the Office of Institutional Research and Analytics, which develops, organizes, maintains, analyzes, and reports longitudinal institutional data using innovative and dynamic analytic tools; the Office of Planning and Budget, which serves the institution's strategic priorities through budget development, financial analysis, and report dissemination; and the Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support, which contributes critical, timely, and accurate information about students' holistic learning experiences to maintain and improve academic programs, student services, and accreditation reporting. To underscore the importance of the Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support, the Office has a separate reporting line to the University's Senior Vice Provost, who is also the Accreditation Liaison Officer for the University. Drawing on the natural fit of its constituent offices, CIPE creates greater efficiency, synergies, and focus for our myriad data needs. The Center thus serves as a "one-stop" location for USF's data needs. Overall, the primary goal of CIPE is to create an integrated

model of evidence-based decision making to support the University leadership in its commitment to the university's core Mission and strategic priorities.

In 2011, the Office of Diversity and Community Outreach was created at USF, under the direction of a Vice Provost. The Office seeks to promote an organizational culture that values diversity in all its forms through inclusive dialogue, experiences, and appreciation of diverse populations as a source of student learning, campus unity, and institutional strength. Among the Office's strategic goals are to enrich the diverse urban community through outreach, service, and partnerships. Toward that end, the Office partners with USF departments, offices, and faculty members to engage the university in critical dialogue with the multicultural communities throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. These efforts connect USF to community leaders and programs working in San Francisco's most under-resourced neighborhoods. Through strengthening these community relationships, USF students learn from and engage with groups that have traditionally been marginalized.

Beyond these major organizational changes at the University level, improvements in the program review process at the individual school and college level, and the addition of school and college Assessment Coordinators, have produced a supportive process that can effectively address accreditation issues. Since the last WSCUC visit, the University has added several new graduate and online programs, and this expansion has allowed USF to develop a standardized web-based program development and implementation approval process. For example, all new degree programs and change proposals must include PLOs, curriculum maps, assessment plans, and budget projections. This new process (NCAP) allows us to build a culture of assessment as well as to properly oversee curriculum changes.

To remain current with WSCUC standards and best practices in assessment, representatives of the University and its school and colleges have attended WSCUC's Assessment Leadership Academy and its annual ARC as well as training workshops organized by our professional associations (AACSB, CCNE, NASSPA, CTC). USF has built a strong infrastructure to assess student learning, supported by individuals with a depth and breadth of knowledge of the intersection of assessment of student learning and accreditation.

These changes and staff additions and re-assignments as well as the reorganization of the Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support have occurred in the recent past and we are seeing the results of these institutional commitments in the development and implementation of the comprehensive and innovative multi-pronged assessment strategy described above. The recentness of these changes are not the result of the impending deadline for the Interim Report or the reaffirmation of accreditation in 2018 but rather the results of institutional reflection and maturity and the benefits of synergies produces when high quality staff collaborate in achieving common goals.

In the last two years, the University has hired several key administration leaders, including a new President (Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J.), a new Dean of the School of Law (John Trasviña), a new Dean of the School of Education (Kevin Kumashiro), a new Dean of the School of Management (Elizabeth Davis), and three new Vice Provosts: Jeff Hamrich (Institutional Budget, Planning and Effectiveness), Robert Spatig (Strategic Enrollment Management), and Michael Webber (Academic Affairs), all of whom possess years of experience in higher education, have great appreciation for the importance of continually assessing student learning, and who are dedicated to the University's Mission.

For almost 475 years, Jesuit institutions of higher education have promoted academic excellence, social justice, community engagement, and multicultural sensitivity and respect. Since 1855, the University of San Francisco has steadfastly embraced these core Jesuit values. For the past four years, the University's infrastructure and institutional processes have continuously improved to better assess the degree to which our students have internalized these core Jesuit values and can apply them to the real world. Whether it is

a comprehensive rubric to assess community engagement by our students, a pretest/posttest research design project to directly assess improvement in undergraduates' writing skills, or a survey to indirectly assess alumni commitment to social justice and ethnic diversity, USF is dedicated to the assessment of what it means to have a degree from our Jesuit institution. The University of San Francisco's Vision, Mission, and Values Statement articulates this view when it proudly proclaims to the world that the institution's core values include "excellence as the standard for teaching, scholarship, creative expression and service to the community" coupled with a "responsibility to pursue truth and follow evidence to its conclusion."

We continue to be an active, engaged, reflective and visionary institution that strives to provide the best possible education to our students. Our current motto proclaims "Change the World from Here" and we know that this requires providing required knowledge, honing skills, shaping values and in the end, educating (as the Jesuits proclaim), men and women for and with others.

Concluding Statement

Instructions: Reflect on how the institutional responses to the issues raised by the Commission have had an impact upon the institution, including future steps to be taken.

Since its founding in 1855, the University of San Francisco has been dedicated to making a reality the Jesuit principle of *Magis* – the search for what is better, "continuous improvement" in today's world. Our commitment to accreditation processes (institutional as well as that of professional programs) is centered on our search for improving quality and not just compliance. We frame the preparation of accreditation reports as well as the follow up as ways to receive feedback from our peers and ways of strengthening our uniqueness and our Mission. We see with satisfaction how our students and graduates feel that they are improving in their personal and professional development and how the University has played an important role in shaping these future leaders. We also realize that the evidence we have of our effectiveness needs to keep improving in its quality, validity, and sensitivity. By the same token we are aware of the fact that as our new President has said, we need to make better use of evidence to plan and develop the University.

We have been grateful to the comments of the Visiting Team and of the Commission during our latest reaffirmation and they have helped us to continue the evolution and improvement of the University. As we reflect on the status of the University of San Francisco in 2014 in terms of the Commission's recommendations, we are proud to have developed a more informative, mature, sustainable, and useable multifaceted assessment of the learning process. These multiple evidence sources will help us improve our institution and provide students with the skills, knowledge, and values to better serve society. We look forward to sharing the results of these efforts during our next reaffirmation of accreditation in 2018.

Likewise, we are very proud of reporting the significant commitment the University has made to the funding of full-time faculty positions as suggested by the Commission. The recently hired faculty and administrators have brought their experience and intellectual gifts to continue improving and strengthening our programs in alliance with the dedicated faculty and staff who have been at USF for many decades. Together we are better prepared to address the needs of San Francisco, the State of California, the nation, and the world.

ATTACHMENTS

- 01 Vision, Mission and Values of the University of San Francisco
- 02 Examples of Changes Made to Arts and Sciences Programs after Program Reviews (2004-2007)
- 03 Form to Report Assessment of PLOs and “Closing of the Loop”
- 04 Examples of Changes Implemented as a Result of Assessment Efforts (“Closing of the Loop”)
- 05 Schedule of Academic Program Reviews
- 06 Academic Program Review Handbook
- 07 Schedule of Co-Curricular Program Reviews
- 08 Co-Curricular Program Review Handbook
- 09 Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for Undergraduate
- 10 Mapping of NSSE on undergraduate ILOs (2005-2011)
- 11 Mapping of NSSE on undergraduate ILOs (2014)
- 12 Mapping of NSSE on WSCUC’s Core Competencies (2005-2011)
- 13 Mapping of NSSE on WSCUC’s Core Competencies (2014)
- 14 Exit Data from Undergraduate Students and ILOs
- 15 Data on Faculty Growth
- 16 Faculty Diversity at Institutions with Similar Carnegie Classification as USF