MEMORANDUM

TO: Catherine Horiuchi
             School of Management
             University of San Francisco

CC: Jennifer E. Turpin, Ph.D.
             Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
             University of San Francisco

FROM: Rex L. Facer II, Chair
             Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation,
             National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration

DATE: August 2, 2012

SUBJECT: NASPAA Accreditation Review

On behalf of the Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation (COPRA), I am pleased to inform you that the Commission found your Master of Public Administration program to be in conformity with NASPAA Standards, subject to the monitoring provisions outlined below. Your program is accredited for a period of seven years and will be included on the Annual Roster of Accredited Programs.

The Commission will monitor your progress annually on the following specific standard(s): 2.1/3.1, 3.3 and 5.1. The Commission asks that you report your progress on these particular standard(s) explicitly each year in your annual report and that you provide the information or data related to the standards that the Commission has noted below.

Standard 2.1 Administrative Capacity/ Standard 3.1 Faculty Qualifications
Standard 2.1 states "The program will have an administrative infrastructure appropriate for its mission, goals and objectives in all delivery modalities employed." The Self Study Instructions at 2.2.3 ask that the program provide information regarding how the program defines "substantial determining influence" in the program and any qualifying comments regarding faculty governance.
Standard 3.1 states, "The program's faculty members will be academically or professionally qualified to pursue the program's mission."
The Self Study Instructions state, "NASPAA accepts as prima facie evidence that students are being taught by qualified faculty who are engaged in the Program where:
     - at least 50% of the courses are taught by full time faculty (employed by the institution)
     - at least 50% of the courses delivering required competencies are taught by qualified nucleus faculty members employed by the institution."

The Interim Report states, "The Self Study describes substantial restructuring of the governance surrounding the program over the past several years, and an ongoing initiative to replicate the MPA program in a fully online mode of delivery. While the Self Study indicates that program autonomy is high in all areas, the Commission seeks further elaboration of how substantial self-determining influence is assured under the new structure for the current and online MPA programs. Are the programs curricular, administrative and student affairs governed by the nucleus faculty? How are these provisions assured in the new school structure and in the creation and delivery of the online program?"

The Site Visit Report states, "The SVT examined faculty distribution on each of the five MPA locations of the USF program and found that in several locations the full-time faculty (FTF) devoted to these locations fall below the 50% standard set by NASPAA. While the entire program is in conformance in regard to this standard, the program seems to not meet the standard in several locations. Program leadership responses to the SVT on this matter was that there might be some data error in the information provided, or that some off-campus cohorts came to the main campus for classes. Nevertheless, the SVT is concerned about how the MPA program is meeting the needs of all students in all locations. The offices for program support personnel, including computer support; audiovisual support, career placement, alumni services, financial aid, and advisement are all located on the main San Francisco campus. In addition, there are plans to move the entire School of Management to a new downtown location on Howard Street - away from the main campus. This change will also require a comprehensive review of how student services are distributed and, as much as possible, to replicate the experience of the on-ground MPA program. The University is making a significant investment to pilot the on-line delivery of the MPA program. …From discussions with the SVT, the School's approach to the on-line MPA is generally supportive yet skeptical using a wait and see approach."

The Commission requests the program provide updated information regarding the distribution of faculty for each of its locations/modalities.

Standard 3.3 Research, Scholarship and Service
Standard 3.3 states "Program faculty members will produce scholarship and engage in professional and community service activities outside of the university appropriate to the program's mission, stage of their careers, and the expectations of their university."

The Interim Report states, "The Commission seeks further information about how research and service expectations are linked to the mission. In particular how does the program define, measures and assure "complementary research" and "transforming learning into acts of consequence to serve our communities, especially the most vulnerable among us" with respect to the standards for faculty performance."

The Site Visit Report states, "The SVT was provided with faculty folders listed professional accomplishments to validate reports in both the program SSR and the response to the interim report." "When asked how the MPA program help faculty to pursue complementary research and service as per the information in the SSR, the SVT was informed that there were really no mechanisms in place to do so. However, given this void, the Associate Dean did suggest that perhaps the School and thus the MPA program could develop a formal policy for complementary research that relates to the program, School and University's mission."

It remains unclear how the faculty actions are determined to provide "complementary research" and "transforming learning into acts of consequence to serve our community, especially the most vulnerable among us." The Commission requests the program provide updated information on how its research and service expectations are linked to the mission of the program.

Standard 5.1 Universal Required Competencies
Standard 5.1 states "As the basis for its curriculum, the program will adopt a set of required competencies related to its mission and to public service values. The required competencies will include five domains: the ability
- to lead and manage in public governance;
- to participate in and contribute to the public policy process
- to analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems and make decisions;
- to articulate and apply a public service perspective;
- to communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry."

The Site Visit Report states, "Systematic Use of Data to Inform the Program- While it is clear that there are a number of efforts in place to assist the program and that are on-going, it seems evident that while the program has lots of data and a considerable amount of assessment, most of the information is used informally. Improvement in assessment clarity, while difficult, will assist the program. Specifically, the SVT was challenged to see how program goals, program competencies and program learning outcomes were usefully integrated to inform the program. While the program is faced with numerous assessment requirements, clarity in terms of mission achievement is recommended."

The Commission requests the program provide updated information on how it is developing more formal (systematic) assessment feedback procedures that will result in tangible programmatic improvement. The program should include information regarding how data collected from its competencies assessment is informing programmatic improvement.

Over time, the Commission expects that its understanding of the Standards and the expectations of what it means to be in compliance will advance and evolve, as programs (and COPRA) become more familiar with the competencies-based approach to accreditation. The Commission will expect accredited programs to continue to develop their competency measures and use of

assessment tools, and that this maturation should be evident in the program's annual maintenance reports.

Please note that the Commission will review each of your annual reports to determine ongoing conformity with NASPAA Standards, including progress in the areas noted above. Your annual reports and COPRA's actions in response to your reports will become a permanent part of your record for your next accreditation review. COPRA's acceptance of the program's annual reports is contingent on receiving satisfactory responses on the issues noted. If the program does not submit the information requested regarding the monitored standards in annual reports, the Commission may require the program to re-enter the accreditation cycle with an updated Self Study Report. Monitoring provisions remain in effect and must be addressed each year until the program is notified by COPRA that the provisions have been removed. We look forward to receiving your annual report by September 15, 2012. If you have any questions, please contact me via telephone (801.422.9321) or email at (rfacer@byu.edu). You may direct questions about next year's annual report to COPRA at copra@naspaa.org.