

# University of San Francisco

## Interim Report

**Name of Institution:** University of San Francisco

**Person Submitting the Report:** Deborah Panter, ALO and Associate Vice Provost for Educational Effectiveness

**Report Submission Date:** November 1, 2023

### 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.*

Preparation of the University of San Francisco's (USF) Interim Report began after the reaffirmation of WSCUC accreditation review team read out its draft commendations and recommendations at the exit meeting on October 10, 2018. USF's reaffirmation of accreditation steering committee met and put into place a process to create action plans to address each of the six draft recommendations, which were adopted as issues to respond to by the WSCUC Commission in its Action Letter of March 4, 2019. The steering committee assigned point persons for each action plan. The action plans that were created provided road maps for initial steps to address these issues and were posted on USF's [WSCUC Reaffirmation of Accreditation page](#) for the campus community and public to see and monitor progress. See [Attachment Report Prep.1: Action Plans](#). Since these plans were created, they have been updated, furthered, and discussed at regular meetings of USF leadership, school-wide and relevant units, faculty groups, staff groups, and the board of trustees.

The documentation of progress on the action plans in the Interim Report was an ongoing collaborative process over two academic years. Former Provost Chinyere Oparah, current Interim Provost Eileen Fung, and former Senior Vice Provost Shirley McGuire provided overall leadership. Associate Vice Provost for Educational Effectiveness and Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) Deborah Panter coordinated the assignments for the initial draft of the Interim Report and pulled the sections together. In fall 2022 a timeline was set and leads were assigned to draft responses to each recommendation as follows:

1. Develop Strategic Goals and Objectives: Provost Chinyere Oparah and Vice Provost of Global Education, Immersions and Strategic Initiatives Anastasia Vrachnos
2. Develop Formal Deliberative Body Independent of Faculty Policy Boards: Vice Provost of Equity, Inclusion, and Faculty Excellence Sheila Smith McKoy

3. Issues Facing the School of Law: School of Law Dean Susan Freiwald
4. Build Expertise in Program Review and Assessment: Senior Vice Provost of Academic Innovation, Inclusive Excellence, and Institutional Effectiveness Shirley McGuire and Associate Vice Provost for Educational Effectiveness Deborah Panter
5. Develop Channels of Communication: Vice President of Marketing Communications Ellen Ryder and Associate Vice President, Marketing Anneliese Mauch
6. Improve Methods of Surveying Alumni: Associate Vice President, Annual Giving & Operations Chantel Smith, Senior Director of Alumni Engagement Taryn Moore, Associate Director Development Services Janice Lee, Director, Data & Integrations Nick Recchia and Senior Director Career Services Center Alex Hochman

In spring 2023 the leads drafted sections of the report which responded to the issues identified by the WSCUC Commission.

Drafts of the Report were reviewed in fall 2023 by the president (Fr. Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J.), the interim provost (Eileen Fung), the President's Cabinet and the Council of Deans. The members of both groups were provided three weeks for independent reviews of the Interim Report in its entirety. They provided feedback as individuals. This version of the Report incorporates the feedback provided by these 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 addresses the six issues identified in the March 4, 2019 Commission Action Letter, as follows:

1. Develop and articulate strategic goals and objectives to guide initiatives and resource development that align with the University mission and a vision of the future. (CFRs 3.7, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)
2. Develop a formal deliberative body, independent of the Faculty Association Policy Boards, to establish shared governance that will improve lines of communication and ensure participatory decision-making. (CFRs 2.4, 3.10, 4.5, 4.6)
3. Address pressing issues facing the Law School, including permanent leadership, admissions profile, improvement in the bar passage rate, fiscal stability, and the placement of graduates. (CFRs 1.6, 2.1, 2.6, 2.10-2.14, 4.4, 4.5)
4. Build expertise in program review and planning at the department and program level, and support professional development for the assessment of learning outcomes in both curricular and co-curricular programs. (CFRs 3.3, 4.4)
5. Develop formal, timely, and informative channels of communication that allow for advice and dialogue across the campus prior to major decisions and implementation. (CFRs 3.7, 4.2, 4.3)
6. Improve methods of systematically surveying alumni in order to create a fuller picture of the impact of a USF education. (CFR 4.1)

## **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 (USF) is a Jesuit Catholic urban university pursuing academic excellence and social justice while building a diverse community in San Francisco. Founded in a one-room schoolhouse in 1855, USF is the oldest institution of higher education in San Francisco and the 10th oldest Jesuit University in the nation. Its founding is interwoven with the establishment of the Jesuit Order in California, European immigration to the Western United States, and population growth as a result of the California Gold Rush. Today USF is an independent, private, nonprofit institution of higher education governed by a 41-member board of trustees, all but seven of whom are lay persons. It is one of 27 institutions in the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU). Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J., USF's 28th president, was renewed by the board of trustees for a second five-year term as of December 2022 and Provost Eileen Chia-Ching Fung has started her first year as interim provost. The president and the provost are supported by 29 members of the leadership team, including 11 members of the President's Cabinet.

The [Mission and Values Statement](#), re-articulated after a year of communal discernment and approved by the board of trustees on September 24, 2021, reflects the Jesuit origins of the university, and is the foundation for all of its divisions, schools, college, and programs. The mission articulates core values that embrace educational excellence, a commitment to local and global social justice, academic freedom, reasoned discourse, learning as a social and humanizing enterprise, and diversity of cultural, religious and ethnic experiences and traditions as essential for quality education. Central to the mission is the preparation of people to shape a multicultural world with generosity, compassion, and justice. This mission permeates all aspects of the institution, including student learning and success, co-curricular activities, enrollment management, curriculum design, faculty development, alumni relations, publications, and a host of other institutional features.

The university currently has four schools and one college: The School of Law (SOL), the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the School of Management (SOM), the School of Education (SOE), and the School of Nursing and Health Professions (SONHP). First accredited in 1949, WSCUC reaffirmed USF's accreditation for ten years in 2019. Fifty-four programs within USF's four professional schools are also accredited by 11 different professional accrediting bodies. USF is classified as a Doctoral/Moderate Research and Community- Engaged Institution by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In the fall 2023 semester, USF enrolled 9,212 students, including 5,697 undergraduates, 3,434 graduate students, and 81 visiting students.

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 eight additional locations, including three Northern California sites (Sacramento, San Jose, and Santa Rosa), a Southern California campus in Orange County, a location in downtown San Francisco at 101 Howard Street, and in three Kaiser hospitals throughout the Bay Area. As of fall 2023, USF had nine fully online programs (Bachelor of Arts in Management, Enterprise Master of Business Administration, Master of Public Administration, Master of Public Health, Master of Arts in Public Leadership, Doctor of Nursing Practice, RN-MS Nursing, LLM Taxation and Master of Legal Studies in Taxation). Some of USF's graduate programs include online and hybrid courses. The institution also offers students a multitude of international opportunities, such as study abroad programs and immersions that enrich the learning experience and fulfill the university's mission.

As of fall 2023, there were 135 undergraduate and graduate degree programs and certificate programs. Undergraduate students fulfill a 44-unit Core Curriculum and three graduation requirements in Community Engaged-Learning, Cultural Diversity, and Foreign Language – areas linked to the mission’s emphasis on community engagement, diversity, and global perspective. All students who are candidates for a bachelor’s degree must satisfactorily complete at least 44 unit hours at USF. Additionally, all students must satisfactorily complete their last 30 unit hours at USF except Degree Completion students who must complete a minimum of 30 unit hours at USF.

USF has a long history of contributing to the common good. In 2006, USF received the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification in both possible categories: Curricular Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships. USF was among only 62 schools that received this honor during the first year it was granted. This classification was renewed by the Carnegie Foundation in 2015 for ten years. As is noted above, Community-Engaged Learning courses are required of all USF undergraduates, and the institution has consistently evidenced its contributions to the common good. With the goal of fashioning a more humane and just world, USF’s Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good educates leaders committed to lives of ethical public service by implementing academically rigorous programs, cultivating authentic community partnerships, and creating transformational experiences. The Center has developed strong partnerships with local neighborhood organizations in the Western Addition, the African American neighborhood bordering campus, that have resulted in a rich student learning environment that achieves community-identified outcomes supporting children, youth, and families.

## 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 4, 2019 WSCUC Commission Action Letter required USF to respond to the six issues identified below with an update on progress in this Interim Report:

### **1. Develop and articulate strategic goals and objectives to guide initiatives and resource development that align with the University mission and a vision of the future. (CFRs 3.7, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)**

#### **Description of Issue**

In its fall 2018 report, the WSCUC review team for Reaffirmation of Accreditation cited the need to better integrate key projects into long-term planning efforts, to foster more public and consultative discussion of shorter-range strategic goals, and to clarify how “these efforts align resource allocations, strategic planning, and mission” (Team Report, p. 32). Similarly, in its action letter reaffirming accreditation for 10 years, the WSCUC Commission identified strategic planning as an issue and stated that USF should provide an update as its work to “develop and articulate strategic goals and objectives to guide initiatives and resource development that aligns with the University mission and a vision of the future.” USF has made significant progress in developing and implementing its 2027 Strategic Plan (SP), as detailed below.

#### **Timeline of Actions Taken to Address Strategic Planning** (see [Attachment 1.1: Strategic Plan Groups Glossary](#))

<b>Fall 2020-Fall 2021</b>	Development of community led Strategic Plan
<b>Fall 2020</b>	Launch of USF Strategic Plan Website
<b>October 2020</b>	Establish plan and schedule for community listening sessions
<b>March-May 2021</b>	Activate strategic plan working groups to develop action plan proposals and receive recommendations from working groups
<b>September-October 2021</b>	Targeted group updates and dialogue from Council of Deans, Provost’s Circle, Cabinet, Council of Associate Deans, School/College level structures, GSS, ASUSF, USFFA, PTFA executive board, University Space Committee, and incorporate additional feedback from all stakeholders
<b>December 2021</b>	Endorsement of Strategic Plan by USF Board of Trustees

<b>April 2022</b>	<p>Launch of SP Implementation Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish Task Forces in Enrollment and Student Retention</li> <li>• Establish Strategic Plan Advisory Council (SPAC) as a widely representative body to coordinate implementation, track progress and communicate updates to the community</li> <li>• 7 working groups created by strategic plan area</li> </ul>
<b>Fall 2022</b>	Implementation of Working Groups formed for each goal
<b>August 2022</b>	Working group member training in Antiracism, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
<b>September 2022</b>	Launch of implementation website, monthly forums, town halls
<b>October 2022</b>	Working group assembled toolkit and resources to support implementation
<b>Fall 2022-May 2023</b>	A series of regular monthly forums, called community conversations, were convened by the working groups in each SP goal to give the community an opportunity to hear how each group is approaching its charge, share its progress, and invite broader participation
<b>January-February 2023</b>	Outreach via “roadshow” to update and engage key groups, including the Alumni Board of Directors, Staff Council, Black Community Council, Office of Marketing Communications, College Council, Council of Deans, Council of Associate Deans, and the Mission Council
<b>May 2023</b>	Reports of working groups submitted to SP Advisory Council
<b>June 2023</b>	SP Advisory Council submits recommendations to USF leadership
<b>June-August 2023</b>	President’s Cabinet review of recommendations from 7 working groups
<b>August-September 2023</b>	Report out to the USF community of priorities
<b>September 2023</b>	Continue implementation and track progress

**Next Steps**

<b>August-November 2023</b>	Create Dashboard of Key Implementation Priorities and Key Performance Indicators
<b>Fall 2023</b>	Seek grants and philanthropic support for key short-term priorities
<b>December 2023</b>	Report to Board of Trustees on progress

<b>January-February 2024</b>	Ensure SP priorities are reflected in <a href="#">Institutional Master Plan</a> <sup>1</sup>
<b>Ongoing through 2027</b>	Monthly dashboard updates Semiannual meeting of SP Advisory Council SP Advisory Council reports out to community and Board of Trustees semiannually Integrate select SP priorities into upcoming USF Capital Campaign

**Description of Actions Taken to Address Issues Raised in WSCUC’s Recommendations**

The University of San Francisco (USF) undertook a year-long strategic planning process in fall 2020 to develop and articulate strategic goals and objectives, culminating in the board of trustees’ endorsement of a community-driven strategic plan in December 2021. See [Attachment 1.2: Strategic Plan](#). Developing a participatory, community-led strategic plan in the midst of a global health pandemic, a national racial reckoning, and a time of transition in the Provost’s Office required significant investment from the USF community at a time that was already challenging for USF and for higher education in general. The decision to engage in a community-driven strategic plan, reflecting the president’s desire to include the voice of the USF community in shaping the university’s future, generated an inspiring level of community engagement and participation in conceptualizing and implementing the vision for USF’s future.

**Creating a Consultative, Broadly Participatory Strategic Plan**

The process of developing USF’s strategic plan was envisioned as an opportunity to foster a culture of trust and ensure community-wide participation in creating USF’s future. During the 2020-21 academic year, a strategic planning core committee was assembled to lead the creation of a strategic plan. The co-chairs of this core committee were appointed by USF’s president and provost. The co-chairs were then charged with assembling the core committee through recommendations from the college, school and unit leaders who have knowledge of people with area expertise and planning experience. Subsequently, four working groups were created, composed of over 60 community stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community partners). The plan was informed by broad, representative input from students, faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, and community partners whose insights were gathered via surveys, multiple listening sessions, and small focus-group sized discussions. Each working group focused on specific priority areas and developed action plans containing objectives and supporting actions. University stakeholders provided feedback again in October 2021 that was specific to the vision and the resulting goals and actions before the plan was submitted to the president and the board of trustees.

The resulting strategic plan, USF 2027, articulated a vision for USF as deeply engaged in transformative social and environmental justice, responding to the multiple crises of today, including responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and national racial reckoning, and advancing a more just, sustainable future. As importantly, the process of creating the strategic plan served to build trust and stakeholder buy-in by engaging the USF community in participatory and broadly representative ways. The strategic planning process increased communication about USF’s direction and priorities, emphasized the need for increased transparency, and established mechanisms of shared accountability – key principles with the

---

<sup>1</sup> All post-secondary educational institutions in the City and County of San Francisco must file a current Institutional Master Plan ("IMP") with the San Francisco Planning Department. The IMP describes existing and anticipated institutional campus development, traffic circulation patterns, and parking in and around the institution for the next ten years and analyzes the anticipated impact of proposed development on the surrounding neighborhoods.



intended cumulative effect of building understanding and confidence in the university’s direction and future.

**Key Elements of The Strategic Plan: USF 2027:**

A fundamental principle of the strategic plan, in keeping with USF’s Jesuit tradition, is the belief that the university’s success and long-term thriving depends on the institution’s ability to advance both *cura personalis* — holistic care for USF’s people — and *cura apostolica* — care for USF’s shared mission and vision. Accordingly, USF 2027 identified five guiding values and three integrated and underlying themes considered vital to ensuring a thriving future for the university. See [Attachment 1.3: Guiding Values and Strategic Priorities](#).

These guiding values and strategic priorities served as the basis of forming six specific strategic goals, each with objectives and actions critical to implementing the strategic plan. These goals, summarized in the visual below, are further outlined on the [USF strategic plan website](#).



The six goals — revitalizing USF’s educational offerings, extending the impact of faculty research and creative work, bolstering student engagement and belonging, enhancing USF’s visibility and reputation, enhancing equity and work satisfaction for faculty, librarians and staff, and improving upon shared governance — were identified by the USF community as the essential pillars for fulfilling the vision, as stated in the strategic plan, of “being the leading Jesuit university for diversity, inclusiveness, academic excellence, and innovation, distinguished by our experiential and civically-engaged education; our caring, equitable, and global community; and our contributions to social and environmental justice.”

**Actions Taken: Planning and Resource Allocation in a Changing Landscape**

The USF 2027 Strategic Plan was written as a living document, intended to be revised and adapted as needs and conditions evolve over its five-year lifespan. Indeed, the global, national, and regional backdrop in which USF operates has seen significant shifts in the past two years: macroeconomic trends such as increasing costs due to inflation, ongoing effects from the COVID-19 pandemic, an enrollment cliff that has resulted in declining numbers of students, a change in the perception of desirability of San

Francisco as a destination, and a broader national conversation about the value of a residential, liberal arts education have impacted enrollments and profoundly affected USF's operating environment. The university has been through several rounds of fiscal austerity measures in recent years and so its ability to invest in medium and long-term initiatives, however compelling, has had to be balanced with a keen focus on the short-term strategic imperatives at hand in enrollments and in student retention.

The changing landscape and headwinds of the past several years necessitated strategic plan implementation that allowed for tackling short-term imperatives while also continuing to plan for medium and long-term success and thriving. Immediate actions involved assembling integrated, collaborative, quick-action task forces to address building back enrollments and improving student retention. An Integrated Strategic Enrollment Plan (ISEP) was developed, outlining a wide-range of creative and actionable interventions for undergraduate and graduate enrollments. In addition, a Student Success, Retention and Equity Task Force (SSRE), co-chaired by representatives from Academic Affairs and Student Life, worked collaboratively to strengthen structures that will help retain undergraduate students, bolster advising, enhance student success and persistence, and increase students' sense of belonging. The SSRE developed a data-informed approach to identify majors and demographic groups that persist at lower rates and create targeted interventions to increase retention. Progress reports for enrollment and retention initiatives are tracked via an active dashboard and provided to leadership and the board of trustees on a regular basis. See [Attachment 1.4: ISEP Phase 2 Progress Tracking Table](#).

Strategic planning implementation also focused on developing strategic initiatives for the university's medium and long-term success and thriving. Continuing the community-driven and broadly participatory spirit of strategic planning was critical to cultivating trust and engagement. The Strategic Plan Advisory Council (SPAC), a broadly representative group charged with implementing the initial year of the strategic plan, was formed in spring 2022. See [Attachment 1.5: Strategic Planning Advisory Council](#). The SPAC convened [seven working groups](#), which represented the goals and values of the USF 2027 strategic plan and comprised roughly 140 members of the USF community, including faculty, staff, librarians, senior administrators, students, and alumni. These working groups were charged with operationalizing and prioritizing the recommendations, generating ways of tracking progress, and gauging success. These groups engaged more than 300 additional community members to consult and participate in community forums, small groups, and add their voices to the chorus of ideas for USF's future. Frequent updates, general and focused outreach to community groups, and a series of community conversations were critical to ensuring opportunities for community participation and awareness of the strategic planning priorities.

In addition, the Strategic Plan Advisory Council worked closely with working group co-chairs to integrate strategic planning with other important long-term planning processes, such as the Mission Priority Examen, Comprehensive Capital Campaign, Institutional Master Plan, Latinx Excellence and Belonging Initiative, Indigenous Engagement and the One Earth/Laudato Si Initiative.

### **Shared Accountability**

Accountability is a critical aspect of planning. Clearly identifying stakeholders and responsible parties is an essential aspect of the planning process. The following specific actions were outlined to advance and monitor progress on the plan's implementation:

- The Office of the Provost ensures regular communication on progress and updates, and on continuity of strategic planning as a transparent institutional practice.
- A widely representative Strategic Plan Advisory Council was established to guide and manage the implementation of the strategic plan.

- The vice presidents will ensure that objectives and goals relevant to their specific areas are advanced, and provide quarterly progress reports to the president.
- The board of trustees will review the plan and receive updates on progress annually.
- Objectives and actions will be refined and updated in a transparent manner and with input from campus stakeholders, including through regular public forums with each of the working groups, providing the community an opportunity to hear how each group is approaching its charge, sharing its progress, and inviting broader participation.

### Key Indicators of Progress to Date

- Development of a well-articulated, bold strategic plan endorsed by board of trustees
- Community-driven, participatory spirit of strategic plan
  - 300+ USF faculty, staff, students, community partners, administrators and alumni involved over the past two years in developing in strategic planning
  - Process that created trust, buy-in and ownership among stakeholders
- Establishment of broadly representative Advisory Council to guide implementation
- Significantly increased communications, including regular updates from the provost and leadership, [monthly conversations](#) hosted by each working group, website updates, strategic plan featured at town halls and key university events (e.g., Convocation, Celebrate USF which is the equivalent to an Alumni Day), and a Slack channel
- Increased transparency—all [materials, resources, and reports published](#) via website and updated regularly
- Align with key USF principles
  - Equity: All working group members participated in Antiracism, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion training
  - Commitment to Jesuit values of *cura personalis* and *cura apostolica*
- Regular reports to board of trustees
- Progress on short-term imperatives (enrollment and retention)
- Dashboard currently under construction to track continued progress against Key Performance Indicators (see [Attachment 1.6: Draft SP Implementation Dashboard](#)) to be posted fall 2023

### Upcoming Actions

As discussed above, SPAC working groups generated a collection of over 50 recommendations for actions that USF might take in order to accomplish the goals of its strategic plan. Of course, in a resource-constrained environment, the university must be selective about which of these recommendations to implement. Currently, the president, provost and cabinet are reviewing the recommendations with the objective of identifying “quick wins” that can be implemented easily and will have significant positive institutional impact, and “strategic objectives,” which will require significant additional planning and resource allocation, but are essential to delivering on the goals of the plan and ensuring USF’s success.

In the 2023-24 academic year, USF will assemble a set of highly-focused task forces to implement each of these strategic objectives, with the expectation that these task forces will retain the philosophy of transparency, inclusion and accountability that it has developed so far. USF will also retain the SPAC as an oversight body; in addition to monitoring the progress of the implementation task forces, the council will continue to integrate leadership and stakeholder priorities, communicate progress about the plan to the USF community via the implementation dashboard, and ensure that the institution is making consistent and measurable progress towards its strategic objectives. In summer 2024, the university will once again examine progress to date, evaluate the effectiveness of the planning process itself, and make modifications necessary to ensure success over the remaining years of the plan.

**2. Develop a formal deliberative body, independent of the Faculty Association Policy Boards, to establish shared governance that will improve lines of communication and ensure participatory decision-making. (CFRs 2.4, 3.10, 4.5, 4.6)**

**Description of Issue**

In the action letter for the University of San Francisco (USF), the WSCUC Commission identified shared governance as an issue and recommended that the university develop “a formal deliberative body, independent of the Faculty Association Policy Boards, to establish shared governance that will improve lines of communication and ensure participatory decision-making” and also help the administration to establish “partners in the faculty” (Team Report, p. 20). USF recognizes the importance of creating a university-wide deliberative body that includes a more formalized shared governance structure to support the forward movement of the university and will also serve as a structure to communicate more effectively with the faculty. The university has made progress on this recommendation by strengthening existing areas where faculty already partner with administration, but major structural change takes time and was slowed by the pandemic. The timeline and details described in this section include USF’s immediate work revising existing structures to improve communication and shared high-level decision-making across university stakeholders and USF’s process for long-term change that will create a more robust shared governance structure.

**Progress on Shared Leadership and Decision-Making Structures**

The [Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee \(JUCC\)](#) was formally “rebooted” in spring 2022 to strengthen shared decision-making and communication university-wide in relation to major curriculum changes. After a year-long process the JUCC Workgroup redefined the scope, procedures, and membership of the JUCC. The new JUCC reviews and advises the provost on curriculum proposals, policies, and processes that affect more than one college or school, as well as university-wide policy proposals and processes that have implications for the structure or delivery of curriculum. It previously consisted of full-time faculty and administrators and now includes part-time faculty, librarians, staff, and students. The faculty and librarian membership is outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement for the USF Faculty Association (USFFA). See [Attachment 2.1: USFFA Collective Bargaining Agreement](#). They are elected members and comprise the majority of the committee. The faculty co-chair of the JUCC is elected by the faculty and librarians and serves alongside an administrative staff co-chair.

The [University Budget Advisory Council \(UBAC\)](#) was established in fall 2019, and is composed of five appointed members from the administration, five elected representatives from faculty and librarians, five elected members of staff, and three appointed student representatives. UBAC’s annual agenda of planning and delivery of recommendations is closely aligned with the university’s budget and planning process. All council members are expected to be educated on and familiar with the university’s operating and capital budgets, and to share information with their departments and divisions as part of their role. With the understanding of how resources are allocated at the university, as well as how those allocations comport with the university’s mission and values, UBAC provides formal advice to the president, provost, and cabinet on budget proposals, adjustments to student tuition and fees, and other important decisions related to the university operating budget, making them one of the existing shared governance deliberative bodies.

In addition to these university-wide structures, USF has many formal joint faculty/librarian-administrative committees, including school-level curriculum committees, and school-level, library and university-wide tenure and promotion committees. The committees, processes, policies, and timelines are outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the USFFA and the university. See [Attachment 2.1: USFFA Collective Bargaining Agreement](#). The law school faculty has a separate union which exercises academic leadership and oversight of the curriculum through its own standing

committees and task forces. See [Attachment 2.2: 2023-24 SOL Committee List](#). Section 5, below, on “Channels of Communication” describes other ways that USF has strengthened shared decision-making and faculty/librarian partnering with university administration.

Finally, and as also discussed in the section below on “Channels of Communication,” USF has expanded faculty representation on USF’s board of trustees’ committees. Effective fall 2020, the administration changed its longstanding practice of asking deans to nominate a faculty member to serve as the faculty representative to the board and to the committees of the board which are not limited in membership exclusively to trustees by committee charter or university bylaws. Senior leadership worked with USFFA leadership to craft a system of nominations, vetting, and then presentation to the board chairs of committees, as well as the board as a whole, of faculty representatives to the board of trustees. Faculty, and now students, on nomination by the vice president of student life, as constituent representatives have access to the electronic book of their committee at least one week prior to the meetings and participate in the deliberations of the trustees, with the exception of voting and presence at an executive session. See [Attachment 2.3: 2023-24 Board Constituent Representatives](#). These constituent representatives are invited to serve on the four core standing committees (Academic Affairs, Development, Finance, and University Life) and on the five standing committees (Athletics Oversight, Information Technology Strategy, Investment, Physical Facilities and Master Plan, and Strategic Marketing Communications). The president of USFFA attends as a standing guest, receives the electronic board book, and participates in the plenary meetings of the full board, with the same exceptions of voting and attendance at executive sessions. As of fall 2023, the President of Staff Council began serving as a constituent representative to the full board with the same access and participation as the faculty and student representatives and the president of the USFFA.

### **USF’s Process for Long-Term Change in Shared Governance**

Following the October 2018 reaffirmation visit for USF’s accreditation, then Provost Donald Heller met with the USF Faculty Association (USFFA) leadership and members at the end of fall 2018 semester about the review team recommendation. See [Attachment 2.4: Nov. 7, 2018 Policy Board Minutes](#), page 2. The USFFA recognized the need to expand faculty governance. The USFFA president also indicated that the original by-laws of the USFFA outline a structure that is more similar to a faculty senate than a bargaining unit, and that it is both a shared governance body and a faculty union. In addition, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the USFFA and administration includes many examples of faculty participation in shared governance (e.g., tenure and promotion and curriculum committees). Still, the USFFA Policy Board agreed with Provost Heller that a series of discussions between the provost and all three faculty union groups (i.e., USFFA, law school faculty, which includes the law school's tenured and tenure-track faculty and the professional librarians, and part-time faculty) were needed. All concerned agreed that increased participatory decision-making was important for the university, in addition to strengthening USF’s compliance with CFR 3.10.

The provost then held an open forum with faculty and librarians on next steps in academic shared governance at USF. See [Attachment 2.5: VP Forum Invitations](#). Many USFFA participants during the forum reiterated the stance that the union was functioning as a senate. Some participants shared that more faculty/librarian and staff voices were needed in USF’s governance structures. These diverse perspectives demonstrated differing points of view on what a faculty senate is, how a senate differs from a collective bargaining unit, and what the relative roles of these bodies are. Still others expressed frustration with administrators leading discussions about shared governance structures. Provost Heller continued discussions with the USFFA leadership until he stepped down as provost in January 2020. Soon after an interim provost resumed discussions about shared governance, USF was absorbed by a university-wide pivot to remote learning and by other emergency activities during spring 2020 as the global COVID-19 pandemic began.

In fall 2020, USF started a strategic planning process. The 2027 Strategic Plan process was shaped by well over 300 community members who participated in listening sessions and surveys to guide and shape its goals. It was a shared project between faculty, librarians, staff, and administration that ultimately resulted in a strategic plan: a shared governance document that has buy-in from these groups. During that time, the Strategic Plan Core Committee was created to oversee the planning process. Further, the university-wide conversations were supported by quantitative and qualitative data, including from the 2017 Campus Climate Survey and the report from the 2017-2018 Magis Project, an institution-wide planning committee designed to identify and capitalize on strengths and reallocate unused resources (see [Attachment 2.6: Magis Project Webpage](#)), which were then used to create the goals of the Strategic Plan. Goal #6 of the Strategic Plan is “to develop inclusive and participatory shared governance structures” and directly relates to the WSCUC recommendation to create a formal, deliberative body, independent of the USF Faculty Association.

The Strategic Plan Advisory Council (SPAC), which was formed to oversee the implementation of the strategic plan, tasked a working group, Strategic Plan Working Group 6 (SPWG6), with crafting recommendations to achieve Goal #6 of the plan. Staffed and launched in October of 2022, it was comprised of faculty, librarians, and staff from across the university. The working group was given the charge to “develop inclusive and participatory shared governance structures to harness the creativity, vision, and brilliance of our students, staff, faculty, and librarians.” Co-chaired by the vice provost of equity, inclusion and faculty excellence and the president of the USF Faculty Association, the members also included four full-time and two part-time faculty affiliated with the USF Part-time Faculty Association, librarians (from both the Dorraine Zief Law Library and the main university library, Gleeson Library | Geschke Center) and two staff affiliated with the Office and Professional Employees (OPE) international union. SPWG6 also included staff members who were not union-affiliated including an associate vice provost, an associate dean, and non-union staff, one of whom was a staff council representative appointed to this working group. The liaison from SPAC to this working group was the dean of the university library. A student representative was also invited to join the working group. Beginning in October 2022, the members met periodically throughout the academic year with the goal of understanding the shared governance structures already in operation at the university and gathering additional data that was used to form and frame recommendations for moving forward. Further, since the through line of the university’s strategic plan includes building antiracism, diversity, equity, and inclusion into each of the goals of the plan, the group was tasked with ensuring that all of its work was aligned with this goal. In March 2023, the shared governance working group convened a university-wide forum to gather additional qualitative data to inform the development of the final recommendations. The feedback gathered from this forum included a consensus that USF should continue to build on existing shared governance structures and that stakeholders should be consulted before decisions are made and provide an opportunity for input. The working group also recommended interviewing key leaders at peer institutions in order to understand the shared governance structures at these institutions.

The membership of SPWG6 is an inclusive group of faculty, librarians and staff who represent the university at many key levels. This process was both helped and challenged by factors including, but not limited to, members of the working group continuing to embrace different definitions and expectations of shared governance; disagreement on how to address this issue as identified by the WSCUC Commission; and that the strategic planning process was designed to gather recommendations that may not all come to fruition. However, the review that SPW6 completed resulted in the following recommendations:

- Conduct outreach with peer institutions
- Create a definition of shared governance for USF

- Develop a vision for integration of ADEI principles into shared governance structures
- Build on and recognize existing spaces that provide a voice for faculty, librarians, and staff
- Explore piloting a body that brings together part-time and full-time faculty and librarians to provide input on policies, decisions, and priorities
- Pilot a forum for shared conversations, collaboration, and visioning
- Create opportunities for all members of the university community to be included in spaces for consultation, engagement, and participation prior to decision-making and implementation
- Establish a yearly review of the shared governance implementation process
- Examine and create structural and procedural components and shared practices for this process

Each recommendation, which the SPWG6 co-chairs are accountable for, included action steps and designated specific individuals and offices to achieve the components of each recommendation. See [Attachment 2.7: Recommendations from Strategic Plan Working Group 6 and Executive Summary](#). The implementation process will benefit from the many thoughtful conversations and the data that the working group reviewed to formulate the recommendations. This process was also impacted by some of the concerns that union leadership have about creating a faculty shared governance body, including that the inventory provided to the Shared Governance Working Group did not capture all of the unit-specific bodies (such as the Library Advisory Council) that exist across the campus, and that those bodies, along with the unions, are already engaging in shared governance. While none of these individual bodies or unions meet the American Association of University Professors statement on shared governance, that it support university-wide ". . . faculty involvement in personnel decisions, selection of administrators, preparation of the budget, and determination of educational policies," union leadership held that there would be significant overlap in the roles, responsibilities and functions of a faculty senate and the faculty unions. These concerns, however, stand in contrast to the concerns of a plurality of faculty and librarians, including adjunct faculty who are not represented by the USFFA, who have called for the creation of a separate, formalized and broadly inclusive shared governance body that will work alongside the unions, especially in light of the shared governance bodies that exist for staff (USF Staff Council) and students (Associated Students of the University of San Francisco and Graduate Student Senate).

Lastly, while these recommendations are in the process of being implemented, USF's president and new provost have initiated a joint meeting with the leaders of the full-time, part-time and law faculty unions, as well as the staff council, with the goal of sharing the vision and priorities for the year and creating space for conversation. The first of these meetings occurred in the fall 2023 semester and they will continue throughout the year. Union and council leadership stated that the initial meeting was productive and that it was helpful to listen to the perspectives of other faculty and staff groups.

### **Looking to the Future**

In summary, USF has made continuous and significant progress toward the long-term goal of a more robust shared governance structure and is working to further that progress. It has strengthened existing shared leadership and decision-making structures, including "rebooting" the JUCC and creating the UBAC, both of which are important partners for advice and dialogue with leadership regarding decisions around the curriculum and resource allocation. The recommendation to create a shared governance structure "to improve lines of communication and ensure participatory decision-making," is being addressed as part of the strategic planning process. Developing a shared governance body is a key goal in Strategic Plan 2027 for two primary reasons. First, several of the recommendations of the Magis Project, which were organized around themes, centered on concepts related to governance, including

“Decision Making Processes,” “Internal Communication and Culture,” and “Leadership and Governance.” See the [Magis Project Final Report](#), pages 17-20. Second, the need and desire for greater shared governance and supporting structures was also affirmed in stakeholder input and working group recommendations throughout the development process for the strategic plan. A Strategic Planning Core Committee Working Group recommended using shared governance best practices to launch the process. The Strategic Plan Working Group members were able to engage in deep dialogue about what defines shared governance and to explore some of the shared governance processes and activities that are ongoing at USF. The result to date has been a series of recommendations as to how to proceed. This process was also impacted by the concerns of USFFA leadership that creating a faculty shared governance body could be redundant, when many bodies across the university are already engaging in shared governance. Next steps include considering how different stakeholders see shared governance and understanding the differences in these perspectives so that progress can be made on fully supporting a new body. The final structure will need to respect the needs of multiple groups on campus, and faculty and librarian members of the USFFA in particular, when it comes to the important partnering that needs to take place for true shared governance.



**3. Address pressing issues facing the Law School, including permanent leadership, admissions profile, improvement in the bar passage rate, fiscal stability, and the placement of graduates. (CFRs 1.6, 2.1, 2.6, 2.10-2.14, 4.4, 4.5)**

**Issue - Permanent Leadership**

At the time of the reaffirmation review in fall 2018, Susan Freiwald was Interim Dean of the University of San Francisco's (USF) School of Law (SOL). Freiwald was appointed in 2017 after serving as an associate dean for one year under Dean John D. Trasviña, who had served a five-year term. Other senior leadership positions in transition at that time included the senior director of finance and administration, the assistant dean of student affairs, and the assistant dean (now director) of career services. Those transitions created a period of instability at the law school and a need for the new team to establish itself with the law school's varied constituencies, including the alumni, university leadership, faculty, staff, and student body.

Over the last five years, the law school has achieved leadership stability. Dean Freiwald is serving a five-year contract as of July, 2019 and senior members of her team have been in place for much of that time: assistant dean of student affairs (five years); senior director of administration and finance (four years); associate dean of academic affairs (three years). The strength of the senior leadership team allowed the law school to effectively address the other issues the review team identified.

A clear measure of the leadership team's effectiveness is the law school's fundraising record. The leadership's successful fundraising demonstrates the confidence of the alumni and other donors in management, operation, and future of the school of law. In the five fiscal years preceding the review, the law school fund-raised an average of \$1.5 million per year (excluding bequests) to support scholarships and special programs. In the five years following the review, the law school fund-raised an average of \$3.8 million, including a \$6.1 million gift in fiscal year 2020 to endow the Justice for Animals Chair and program. Additionally, a \$580,000 Cy Pres gift, which when added with another \$500,000 donor gift, will fund a Visiting Professor of Practice in Securities Law. Hundreds of thousands of dollars in other funds have been raised to support the work of the law school's Racial Justice Clinic and its Immigration and Deportation Defense Clinic, as well as the new Blockchain Law for Social Good Center, and many programs and scholarships.

Dean Freiwald will complete her term at the end of the 2023-2024 academic year. The law school is currently searching for a new dean with the help of an experienced search firm. The dean of the School of Nursing and Health Professions, who also holds a JD, chairs the search committee that enjoys broad representation from faculty (tenured, adjunct, and full-time), librarians, staff, alumni, and the student body. The committee held listening sessions in May 2023 to inform the job description, and will provide finalists to the provost before the end of the calendar year. There are several highly qualified applicants in the pool, and the attractiveness of the deanship to applicants is indicative of the success of the current leadership stability.

**Issue - Bar Passage Rate and Employment Rate**

The review team expressed concern about the school of law's bar passage rate, which had fallen below the California mean, and the post-graduate employment rate that was below the law school's peers. Over the years preceding the review, the law school's bar pass rate had dropped, reaching its lowest point on the July 2018 California Bar Exam, when graduates' first-time pass rate fell to 33% (typically, more than 90% of USF's law graduates take the California Bar Exam). The year prior (July 2017), the pass rate had been 54%, but in 2016, the July first-time pass rate was 36%. Prior to those years, the pass rate had gradually come down from the 70's. Low bar pass rates mean low graduate employment rates because most students who fail the summer bar go on to take the next bar exam offered in February.

The American Bar Association (ABA) collects employment statistics as of 10 months out from graduation on March 15. When graduates are preparing for the February Bar Exam, they often do not have the time or opportunity to obtain a full-time, long-term, job that is bar-required or JD-advantaged.

Bringing the bar passage rate up has been the law school's top priority over the past five years. In service of that goal, the law school faculty passed comprehensive curriculum reform in fall 2018 that, among other measures, increased:

- The number of units devoted to required courses on bar topics
- The number of required bar-preparation courses
- The number of units required to graduate

The law school brought on an entirely new Academic and Bar Exam Success (ABES) team during 2019 and 2020, with two full-time highly qualified co-directors, a full-time fellow, a team of graders and tutors, and an intensive program of study during all years of law school, particularly during the post-graduate, pre-bar study period. The ABES Program has evolved each year, adjusting interventions according to both qualitative and extensive quantitative assessment. Interventions include: a required one-unit course for first-year students that focuses on developing self-assessment, learning and study skills; a required two-unit course in the third year that develops students' essay writing and multiple choice-taking skills; subscriptions for all students to multiple-choice practice software for use after graduation and during school, with sample test questions incorporated by professors into their bar-required courses; a post-graduate study program with feedback on a large numbers of graded exam questions and simulated exams; lectures, videos, and tutoring; counseling for students who need to request accommodations, and more. The ABES team also surveys alumni who have worked with the ABES Program after they have taken the bar exam. The feedback is used to revise and update the ABES Program.

The curricular changes, which took four years to phase in (see [Attachment 3.1: SOL Curricular Reforms Timeline](#)), the ABES program innovations and interventions, and the culture of assessment and improvement, have been successful in improving the bar passage performance of the law school's graduates. The first-time pass rates on the California Bar Exam from 2018 through 2022 (July 2023 results are not yet released) are:

- 33% in July 2018 (ABA-accredited law schools (ABA) average: 64%)
- 40% in July 2019 (ABA average: 71%)
- 81% in October 2020 (exam delayed due to COVID19) (ABA average: 84%)
- 66% in July 2021 (ABA average: 80%)
- 61% in July 2022 (ABA average: 75%)

See [Attachment 3.2: CA Bar Exam Statistics July 2018-July 2022](#).

Additionally, the SOL now tracks the bar pass rate of its graduates two years out from graduation, in light of an American Bar Association (ABA) standard based on that rate that requires the two-year pass rate to be 75% or higher (ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools, Standard 316). The law school's improvement on these metrics indicates the school's progress:

- 63% for the class of 2018
- 82% for the class of 2019
- 87% for the class of 2020
- 83% for the class of 2021

See [Attachment 3.3: ABA Bar Passage Reports 2018-2021](#). Note that the SOL will not be reporting the

class of 2021 bar passage statistics until February 2024. The report for the class of 2021 is an internal document that contains the statistics the SOL will be reporting to the ABA.

The law school aims to further improve its bar pass rate and increase the number of students who pass the bar exam on their first attempt. Graduates' performance on their second and third bar attempt matters as well because some of the law school's graduates need the extra time to fully prepare and, having succeeded on their second or third attempt, go on to have successful and rewarding careers. Placing excessive emphasis on raising the first-time pass rate could conflict with the law school's mission to engage in a holistic admissions process that is not unduly focused on performance on multiple choice exams, a skill that some USF law students are weaker on than students at other law schools. That relative weakness does not detract from their ability to practice law well, and the regulatory bodies are currently evaluating whether to change the methodology of the Bar Exam. Relatedly, the ABA-Accredited law school average will be harder to reach in the future than it was previously because three schools that were included in the average in 2018 have since closed or become unaccredited and one more closing seems imminent.

Concerns about bar performance will continue to be addressed by the ABES team, which is supervised by the associate dean. Keeping bar passage a priority by supporting the team with resources, time, and attention will remain a priority for the next SOL dean. The bar pass issue will be fully resolved only when the first-time pass rate on the California Bar Exam is 70% or higher. The class of 2023 took their first-year classes entirely online, which meant that, in addition to lacking the pedagogical advantages of in-person learning, several critical bar-tested topics were tested in open-book format, which is not ideal preparation for the bar exam. Graduates of the class of 2024 will be the first class to have their law school experience not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Over the next few years, the ABES team and SOL leadership will continue to track data, assess and evaluate interventions, with the goal of graduate pass rates at or above 70% for first-time passage, and well above 80% for two-year pass rates.

As discussed earlier, the law school's graduate employment rates have been impacted by lower bar pass rates, with both rates of concern to the review team. The Office of Career Services (OCS) has come through a period of instability, with significant employee turnover and management challenges. The continued turnover in OCS has resolved over the last year, with excellent new leadership by a successful lawyer and adjunct faculty member. The new team has implemented an open-door, team-based approach and dramatically improved the reputation of OCS as a place where students can get dedicated and impactful help on their application materials and job searches from any member of the counseling team. The team has upgraded the office space to make it more welcoming, elevated their social media presence, provided students with Zoom space for interviewing, and refreshed and replenished a professional clothing closet for students in need of interviewing or professional event attire. The new approach has led to a greater use of services and confidence in the office by students and recent graduates. Increasing numbers of current students are finding the jobs they want earlier in the process and the SOL anticipates that the job placement rate will continue to rise over time.

#### 10-month Employment Rate<sup>2</sup> of Law School Graduates:

- 2018 graduates - 75 / 169 = 44.4%
- 2019 graduates - 59 / 119 = 49.6%
- 2020 graduates - 79 / 124 = 63.7%
- 2021 graduates - 74 / 113 = 65.5%

---

<sup>2</sup> The fraction is the number of graduates employed in full-time, long-term jobs that are either bar-passage required or JD-advantaged / the total number of graduates on March 15 following graduation.

- 2022 graduates - 89 / 133 = 66.9%

OCS remains understaffed, with one counselor departing. The director of OCS, the dean and alumni leadership are working together to recruit qualified candidates and be fully staffed by the end of the calendar year. The SOL anticipates the issue identified by the review team will take another year to be fully resolved, as it will include the onboarding and training of new staff in addition to developing relationships and helping ensure student employment that aligns with career trajectory.

#### **Issue - Admissions Profile and Financial Stability**

At the time of the report, the review team was concerned about the decline in JD students and an ever-increasing need for financial aid to attract students. The review team was also concerned that the law school was experiencing operating losses while decreasing its contribution to the university for shared services. All of these issues are budget issues. The decline in JD students reduced the law school's gross revenue, while the increase in financial aid raised operating expenses. Together, those factors reduced the law school's net revenue, which determines how much it can contribute to the university. At the time of the review, the law school was coming through a period where it had significantly underpaid its contracted for contribution of 22%, and there was no financial plan in place to get back to the 18% contribution that had been the working arrangement, without entirely depleting the law school's reserves.

Since the review, the law school negotiated with the university to pay a decreased contribution for three years, but only did so for two of those years. Since then, the law school has provided much greater contributions to the university, contributing 21% in fiscal year 2021, 17% in fiscal year 2022, and the full 22% (to be finalized at the close of books) for the year ending on May 31st. During this current fiscal year, the SOL has agreed to contribute significantly more than the agreed upon amount so that it can help address university enrollment shortfalls. At the same time, the law school has preserved several million dollars in its reserve fund, and has an endowment of \$64 million that is steadily growing. Several endowed funds distribute resources every year that pay for faculty salaries, programs, and scholarships.

The law school has engaged in careful cost-cutting, aided unexpectedly by the decrease in expenses associated with the pandemic, and hiring qualified staff. It has improved its marketing, admissions, and scholarship practices, and, as its bar pass issues were addressed, the need to provide very large, even full, scholarships to attract students has been reduced. The SOL has moved towards a scholarship model that spreads financial aid more evenly and provides for more need-based aid than previously. The law school has used targeted scholarship programs (honors scholars, animal law scholars, criminal law scholars, immigration law scholars) to attract and retain prospects without the need to invest large amounts of revenue. The law school also conducted a thorough review of its restricted income and located some revenue sources that could further reduce tuition-based operating expenses. All of those steps reduced operating costs.

On the revenue side, the law school's programming, marketing, recruiting, and reputation have helped it to gradually build enrollment back, with the most recent entering class showing the largest increase. New JD enrollment reached its highest level since 2016 this year, at 159 first-year students, three transfer students, and one visitor, for a JD enrollment total of 403. See [Attachment 3.4: Law Enrollment 2021-2023](#). Last year's enrollment total was 353 due to a first-year class of 135, and an exceptionally small third-year class that arrived at the law school during the COVID-19 fall of 2020 with just 106 first-year students. The law school is retaining more students compared to previous years, having lost only two of last year's first-year class to transfer out, and six the year before. Enrollment in the graduate-level Tax Program has also increased revenue, with over 140 students enrolled in the spring of 2023.

The law school is financially stable, but will work to improve its position with each JD class enrollment maintaining at 160 or higher, improving bar pass and employment rates, and continued donor support and confidence.

#### **4. Build expertise in program review and planning at the department and program level, and support professional development for the assessment of learning outcomes in both curricular and co-curricular programs. [CFRs 3.3, 4.4]**

##### **Description of Issue**

The University of San Francisco (USF) values assessing student learning at all levels and engages in many evidence-based efforts aimed at helping the institution understand student success and educational effectiveness. However, as the review team noted, it can improve processes, increase expertise, and broaden the culture of assessment by supporting professional development in these areas. USF has implemented a number of new initiatives and programs to respond to this issue identified by the Commission, as discussed with timelines below. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on some of these initiatives is also addressed below.

##### **Annual Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes and Student Achievement Policy**

In fall 2019, the Policy Working Group of the University Assessment Committee (UAC) drafted an Annual Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes and Student Achievement policy for review and approval by the senior vice provost for curricular innovation and inclusive excellence and council of deans. The policy outlined the requirements of annual program learning outcomes assessment for all programs and graduate program alignment with the following three dimensions used in program review: Jesuit Mission Alignment, Academic Rigor, and Professional Relevance. Please see the discussion of the graduate programs "Scorecard" below. The policy documented and made explicit institutional expectations regarding regular assessment of student learning. It requires that all academic and co-curricular programs prepare and submit an updated assessment plan as part of their program review, annually complete and submit an assessment report to their dean, and set forth the required elements to be included in the annual assessment reports for co-curricular, undergraduate, and graduate programs, as well as academic libraries. The long-term goal of the policy is to connect yearly assessments to program review to assist decision-making by faculty and administrative leadership.

The policy was expected to be fully adopted by spring 2020. However, the COVID-19 pandemic required that the policy be amended to account for the realities of assessment during a global pandemic and the move to emergency remote learning. Amending the policy allowed for more flexibility in understanding how USF's students fared in the remote environment so that programs could more rapidly plan and implement change as needed to improve student learning. The UAC discussed the new policy and need for amendment at the August and September 2020 UAC meetings. An amendment was drafted and was approved by the senior vice provost in October 2020.

The amendment expanded assessment strategies to allow academic and co-curricular programs to choose to forgo assessment of specific Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and instead adapt their annual assessment for 2019-20 and 2020-21 to assess program responsiveness to student academic needs during the global pandemic. The policy still required that the assessment report include, at a minimum, a description of the assessment methodology and process, results of assessment findings, and a description of how the results will be used to make changes to the program and improve student learning, but now also required a description of what was assessed in lieu of a PLO. The opportunity to engage in alternative assessment during the pandemic further raised the visibility of the value of assessment by allowing programs to engage in assessment activities that were meaningful and responsive to the needs of students. During the 2019-20 academic year, 78% of graduate programs and 52% of undergraduate programs in the College of Arts & Sciences chose to engage in alternative assessment strategies focused on the pivot to distance learning due to the global pandemic.

The amendment remained in effect until summer 2023 at which time it was removed and the original policy requiring the annual assessment of PLOs was reinstated. See [Attachment 4.1: Annual Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes & Student Achievement Policy](#) and [Attachment 4.2: Annual Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes & Student Achievement Policy Final with Addendum](#).

The development of this new policy followed the implementation of the “Educational Effectiveness Award,” first awarded by the provost’s office in spring 2018. The award recognizes excellence in assessment practices in both academic and co-curricular programs at USF. Any faculty or staff member at USF may nominate an assessment team for this award, and it reflects a reinforced emphasis by the provost’s office on the importance of regular and effective assessment practices. In fall 2019, concurrent with developing the new annual policy on assessment, a second working group of the UAC published its first newsletter, “*In the Loop*,” which features a section on tips and resources that staff or faculty can use in their assessment work and a “Notes from the Field” section where a faculty member, staff member, or campus team highlights their experiences, challenges, and successes in recent assessment. This section typically features one or two recipients of the Educational Effectiveness Award and a discussion of that team’s best practices. The award and discussion of those teams’ use of assessment to improve student learning in the newsletter facilitates and raises the visibility of the assessment cycle and provides opportunity for professional development in assessment of learning outcomes.

#### **Graduate Program “Scorecards”**

Since summer 2019, the senior vice provost of curricular innovation and inclusive excellence and her team has used the external reviewer reports from the academic program reviews and professional accreditation visits to score degree-granting graduate programs on three dimensions: 1) alignment with Jesuit mission; 2) academic rigor; and 3) professional relevance. Each dimension was coded as a “strength,” “potential problem,” “serious problem,” or “not mentioned” based on reviewers’ comments on each program. A grid was created for each school and is updated every year. The grid allows leaders to see across multiple programs for school or university level issues that need addressing that will, in turn, further support the programs. The provost and deans discuss the grid for each school. A summary of the university-wide results is reported to the Executive Committee and Academic Affairs Committee of the board of trustees as a key indicator of academic excellence. See [Attachment 4.3: Reports to the Board of Trustees AY 2023/2024](#). Deans use the data from these three measures alongside enrollment and contribution margin data to measure the health of the graduate programs within their school. Departments and programs have traditionally focused on individual action plans created upon the completion of academic program review or reaffirmation of professional accreditation. A drawback to this approach, particularly for graduate programs in quickly changing fields, is that program review and professional reaccreditation occur every five to seven years. As discussed in the previous section on the new assessment policy, the UAC now encourages graduate programs to submit assessment reports that also focus on these three dimensions in order to better align academic program review and assessment, and to provide data for program faculty and deans on a yearly basis. The goal of the new process is to provide consistently actionable data and increase assessment expertise and buy-in for faculty and staff by regularly generating data that drive decisions to improve programs. Furthermore, this process promotes the shared understanding of the meaning of USF degrees and that the degrees are aligned with the Jesuit mission and identity, especially the core values of social justice and diversity, and have quality and integrity.

#### **Updated Academic Program Review Guidelines**

In February 2021, a Program Review Guidelines Working Group of the UAC was created to review and update the program review guidelines.

The working group was charged by the UAC with creating streamlined program review guidelines for both academic and co-curricular programs that are: standardized; flexible to incorporate school/program/unit needs and requirements; in alignment with (Jesuit) ethics/call on the mission; address inclusivity; make room for assessment outside of external parameters such as accreditors, but are also inclusive of accreditor parameters; centered on student learning; reflect ~seven-year schedule; and address the need for all PLOs to be assessed between review cycles. The group aimed to create processes that were not overwhelming but fulfilled the primary goals of 1) building expertise in program review by creating new guidelines and educating faculty and staff on how to do successful program reviews that result in actionable data, and 2) focusing program reviews squarely on improvement in student learning rather than program resources, as the WSCUC review team recommended (Team Report, p. 24).

The working group reviewed the current guidelines, one specifically for academic program review (APR) and one for student life programs, as well as the WSCUC Program Review Resource Guide and determined that the academic program review guidelines should be updated first, followed closely by co-curricular guidelines to be used by all co-curricular programs, including student life programs. During development of the APR guidelines, the group considered how faculty can benefit from the relationship between annual assessment and the APR process, processes that are clear and concise, easy-to-find resources, a “close-the-loop” approach, and action plans that drive curricular changes and improvement in student learning. The group further recognized that the APR process should require formal annual progress reports of the action plan to be submitted concurrently with the annual PLO assessment reports. While this is a significant shift in the APR process, the UAC agreed that this inclusion would 1) greatly increase faculty assessment expertise, by making explicit the intersection of the curricular change process, the annual program learning outcome assessment, and strategic planning and 2) provide timely and meaningful data and evidence to help inform curricular change, university decision-making, as well as support strategic initiatives, by “closing-the-loop” on goals and objectives of the strategic plan. In October 2023, the working group completed a draft of updated APR guidelines, a suggested timelines document, a preparation checklist, a self-study template, an external review report template, and an action plan and progress report template. The draft was sent to the vice provost for student success, inclusive excellence and curricular innovation and the Council of Deans for approval. Once approved, these items will be available on the OAAS website. [See Attachment 4.4: Academic Program Review Guidelines \(Revised 2023\)](#).

### **Assessment Courselet**

To further address the need to build expertise in program review and planning and support professional development for the assessment of learning outcomes, a working group of the UAC began developing an online assessment “courselet” in 2019. The goal was to create a short, engaging and interactive online course in Canvas, USF’s Learning Management System, on the components, process, and use of assessment and the data it generates that would be available on-demand to all faculty and staff. In spring 2019 and fall 2019 the group created and revised course learning objectives, created a delivery schedule with the intention of a full version pilot release in spring 2020, created a working design document, outlining course content, activities and assessments, and began course content development, determining video opportunities, topics, and resources. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the project was put on hold.

In 2023, the UAC working group was reinstated. The group reviewed the original course design and determined that the courselet would be redesigned to focus on the foundations of assessment to include: information on the purpose of assessment, USF’s expectations in regards to assessment, methods for conducting annual assessment of program learning outcomes, and program review. The



working group is in the process of redefining the learning objectives for the courselet to ensure that it meets the needs of a diverse faculty with varying backgrounds and assessment-related knowledge. The goal is to pilot the courselet during the 2023-24 academic year. Those who take the courselet will be asked to participate in a post-completion survey to help the working group determine if any refinements are needed to the content and/or design.

While the courselet will not be required of all faculty, it will be recommended for new faculty, those engaged in assessment related activities, and anyone wanting to learn more about assessment. The UAC will work with the vice provost for student success, inclusive excellence and curricular innovation, the provost's office, and the deans' offices to advertise and promote the courselet.

### **Addressing Bias and Racism in Assessment**

In 2021 the UAC applied for funding to hold a series titled "[Addressing Bias and Racism in Assessment](#)" for faculty and staff professional development. Funding from the Jesuit Foundation Grant and its 6+YOU Initiative enabled the UAC to hire internal experts and facilitators to lead the sessions. As stated in its charge, the UAC at the University of San Francisco "is guided by the ideals that effective and meaningful assessment practices are an integral part of the educational process; should be strategic and systematic; include institutional and programmatic assessment of academic and co-curricular units; and above all, that assessment should be ethical and anti-racist." The Anti-Bias in Assessment Subgroup of the UAC was formed in academic year 2020-21 to fulfill this aspect of the charge, and to address racism and biases that persist in assessment practices at institutions of higher education, and at the University of San Francisco, which have traditionally centered whiteness. The "Addressing Bias and Racism in Assessment" series was established with the following objectives: 1) to raise awareness of the racism and bias that persists in assessment practices at institutions of higher education and at USF; 2) help faculty and staff identify both implicit and explicit bias in assessment; and ultimately 3) drive language and culture shifts around equity in assessment at USF.

In fall 2022 the series was launched, with eight sessions on four topics. The topics were: 1) "Social Conscience and Responsibility: Teaching the Common Good," presented by Jane Bleasdale, Assistant Professor at the School of Education; 2) "Engaging Critical Quantitative Research in our Assessment Practice" presented by Desiree Zerquera, Associate Professor at the School of Education; 3) "Hawaiian Protocols: the Assessment Process at the USF Food Pantry" presented by Kahanu Salavea, Program Assistant in the Office of Community Living; and 4) "Joining the Inner and Outer Work of Addressing Bias and Racism in Assessment" presented by Rhonda V. Magee, Professor at the School of Law. The sessions had more than 150 attendees over the eight sessions, and faculty and staff expressed interest to the UAC in extending the series. All sessions were recorded and are posted on the UAC's webpage so that they can be viewed by faculty and staff. Participants praised the series, particularly the second topic, "Engaging Critical Quantitative Research in our Assessment Practice," and called the series "interesting," "valuable," and "helpful," while requesting interactive sessions with more practical advice and tips for the classroom.

In spring 2023 the UAC applied for and received additional funding from the Jesuit Foundation Grant Initiative to extend the series into fall 2023, with sessions that will include a panel discussion on anti-racist and contract-based grading. The UAC plans to offer an annual professional development opportunity for faculty and staff on anti-racism in assessment moving forward.

### **Celebration of Assessment**

As a means of both celebrating assessment and creating a community of learning centered on university assessment, the Office of Assessment and Accreditation Support and the UAC created the annual

Celebration of Assessment Day, an event for all staff and faculty to commemorate the good assessment work that is being done throughout the institution. On November 8, 2018, USF held its first Celebration of Assessment Day. The program included a series of talks by faculty and staff from the schools, academic, and co-curricular units, to discuss their assessment successes and challenges. The day included presentations on: using student success surveys to develop a more authentic process and better understand USF's students; Assessment 101 presented by the College of Arts & Sciences faculty members; engaging adjunct faculty in assessment; assessment of enduring outcomes for alumni of the McCarthy Center public service programs; assessment of core curriculum; assessment of the core graduation competencies project: processes, results, and next steps; and assessment in the schools and in student life: successes to date, lessons learned, and plans for next steps. See [Attachment 4.5: 2018 Celebration of Assessment Agenda](#).

A post-event survey was sent to confirmed participants and the response rate was 43%. Of the respondents, 79% rated the inaugural Celebration of Assessment Day as "Above Average" or "Excellent." In response to the question "What worked well?" numerous respondents highlighted the opportunity to share assessment practices across campus and having a range of speakers from across the assessment process explaining their work.

On November 12, 2019, USF held its second Celebration of Assessment Day with the theme of "Understanding Student Learning Through Assessment." Participants discussed topics related to assessment, heard assessment success stories from academic programs and student life, and learned about current data on student success. The program included table discussions about the top three challenges associated with assessment; a panel discussion on moving toward authentic assessment; presentations on assessment success stories from the Counseling and Psychological Services office and the Master of Science in Information Systems program; and a presentation on voting as assessment from the McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good. See [Attachment 4.6: 2019 Celebration of Assessment Agenda](#).

A post-event feedback form was provided to all participants to gather qualitative feedback; 30% of attendees completed a form. In response to the question "What worked well?" numerous participants indicated they appreciated the group discussions and presentations/panels and particularly appreciated learning from colleagues about their assessment concerns, efforts, challenges, and successes.

The Celebration of Assessment Day was suspended in 2020, 2021, and 2022 due to the pandemic. Planning is underway to bring the celebration back in the 2023-24 academic year.

### **Additional Steps/Looking to the Future**

Faculty buy-in of assessment and its value in teaching and learning has improved since the last review, as can be seen in the high number of assessment reports regularly submitted and in the quality of the presentations in the Celebration of Assessment Day activities. While still not completely institutionalized, the culture of assessment is strong, particularly in the increasing awareness of the obligation to address historically entrenched inequities in higher education for underserved minorities and assessment's role in these historic injustices. The University Assessment Committee in particular is dedicated to learning about and addressing these inequities, as the group plans to secure funding in order to make "Addressing Bias and Racism in Assessment" a yearly series beyond 2024 to meet faculty interest and enthusiasm. The UAC now sees commitment to racial equity in assessment as part of its charge, and will closely follow the growing canon of research in this area, and continue to present it to the community in an accessible way. Finally, the revised program review guidelines and courselet are designed to continue building and strengthening faculty and staff assessment skills.

## **5. Develop formal, timely, and informative channels of communication that allow for advice and dialogue across the campus prior to major decisions and implementation. (CFRs 3.7, 4.2, 4.3)**

### **Description of Issue**

The University of San Francisco (USF) is committed to prioritizing how faculty, staff, and students contribute to and are informed about decisions at the university. However, as the WSCUC Commission noted, channels of communication that allow for advice and dialogue across campus can be improved and, in some areas, further developed. Under the leadership of the vice president of marketing communications, immediately after the accreditation visit in November 2018, the steering committee for WSCUC reaffirmation, a group composed of faculty, staff, and administrators from the five schools and departments across the university, came together as the Communications Strategy Working Group. This group met from late 2018 through 2019 and reviewed data from campus-wide reports to identify communication deficits, gaps and shortcomings, and established the first steps of an action plan. The results of this first stage informed actions the university took over time to address this important area.

Over the past five years, there have been a number of shifts, improvements, and on-going analysis of how the community engages with leadership and receives information in the course of decision-making. The recovery from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic (2019-22) disrupted or delayed the development of some of these collaborative implementation plans and administrative actions. Still, as the university community has successfully transitioned back to primarily in-person operations, faculty, librarians, staff, and administrators are together assessing how USF communicates critical information via web publishing, digital and physical signage, email communications, and direct interactions with leadership. With lessons learned, USF is intent upon continued analysis, improvement, and timeliness in providing substantive opportunities for campus dialogue prior to university decision-making.

Transparency, shared decision-making, and clear communication channels are a priority for the university's leadership team, which includes the president, cabinet members, and deans. See [Attachment 5.1: USF Leadership Team](#). USF is committed to receiving and considering feedback and ideas from faculty, staff, and students, and incorporated enhanced opportunities for representation and participation via surveys, feedback forms, and other mechanisms to regularly gather that input.

The following items reflect developments and improvements to communication channels and expansion of shared decision-making processes. For each item, a summary of effectiveness is provided, along with planned next steps.

### **Communication Channels: Information Sharing During the COVID-19 Pandemic**

As USF managed operations during the COVID-19 pandemic, communication around key university priorities, policies, and changes in delivery of remote academic programs became critically important and required near-constant updating and refinement. Community email communication and social media posts became even more important. While regular in-person meetings of working groups and committees were disrupted, the community embraced virtual technology and relied upon digital publication of decisions, documentation of progress, and plans. An aggregated website "USF Together," was launched as a hub for all communication related to university guidelines and protocols. The site also included information on membership and the charge of the working groups established to address COVID-19 matters. See [Attachment 5.2: Archived USF Together](#). Continued communication related to COVID-19 and general campus health and safety is currently posted on myUSF under the purview of Health Promotion Services.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** The “USF Together” web content went live on March 8, 2021 and was updated regularly, at least weekly, until it was archived on July 19, 2023. The content continues to be accessible for reference on the archived site. Views to all USF Together content (including webpages and announcements) total 389,282. Through September 14, 2023 there have been 101,210 views to the USF Together homepage. This represents 26% of all myUSF website traffic, which is significant and indicates both the active use of the resource by the USF community and the value the community placed on it. See [Attachment 5.3: USF Together Website Analytics](#).

**Communication Channels: “Required” Email Communication**

Critical messages to the USF community from the president, provost, and members of the university leadership team are scheduled and delivered through a centralized system managed by the Office of Marketing Communication (OMC). In the USF system, “required” emails mean faculty, librarians, staff, and students cannot opt out of receiving these messages; they are deemed essential reading for all community members. Content ranges from official reports on student enrollment and retention and announcements on tuition and fee increases, to messages from the president on national or international news-breaking stories that impact community members. The centralized system also allows for review and analysis of open rates and click-through data.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** In the spring 2023 semester, OMC tested a simple survey mechanism by which the university sought input on the required emails. The test provided meaningful findings on how the community responded to the content, delivery, timeliness, and importance of each message. The survey also allowed respondents to add comments and suggestions. Analysis showed that the community was eager to read serious/important messages, appreciated transparency by leadership, was impatient with longer emails, and engaged with short, informative video messages. Links within the messages received more click-throughs when accompanied by informative descriptions. In the fall 2023 semester, the same simple survey mechanism was added to all leadership emails. OMC will collect data and findings on an ongoing basis and report back to leadership on an as-needed basis and in an aggregated way at the end of each semester.

**Communication Channels: Action Items by Board of Trustee (and Trustee Committees)**

[Action items](#) that result from meetings of the USF board of trustees are posted by meeting date on the main university website (usfca.edu) and are available to the public.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** Community website traffic to this feature, which includes relatively detailed information, is not robust unless the university explicitly reminds the community that new information has been posted. Beginning in fall 2023, the president’s office plans to incorporate a regular schedule of emails reporting on each quarterly board meeting. A link to the action items will be included in this message, and resulting traffic will be monitored.

**Communication Channels: Access to Meeting Summaries of the President’s Cabinet**

[Summaries](#) of the minutes from meetings of the president’s cabinet are compiled and posted on a regular basis, and are accessible via myUSF, the university’s internally-facing website.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** Timely posting of meeting summaries and minutes has not kept pace with the community’s need to have a regular accounting of cabinet level business and discussion. Among the university’s priorities is to catch up on posting cabinet meeting summaries and implement a rigorous schedule of posting on a monthly basis. USF leadership expects this to be completed by the fall 2023 semester.

### **Communication Channels: President’s Community Meetings**

The president’s community meetings for faculty, librarians, and staff are held at least twice during the academic year. A [Convocation](#) is held at the beginning of the academic year in August and a [Town Hall](#) is scheduled in the spring semester. During the COVID-19 pandemic, that schedule was supplemented with additional meetings. Town Halls were convened virtually to provide critical information regarding health and safety protocols as well as critical financial information. The Convocation is open to the entire community, with students and families joining. As part of the invitation to these events, attendees may submit questions they would like the president to address. Recordings from these presidential meetings are posted online, and the community is alerted to the availability of the posting by an email message from the president. Community members are invited to complete a survey to evaluate the effectiveness of the information shared. Another example of direct communication and interaction with leadership were VP Forums. A series of these listening sessions were held in 2017-2019, and community members were invited to hear from and ask questions of cabinet members. While these sessions have not been hosted for some time, the sessions were well-attended, and the informality of the small group gatherings facilitated the exchange of ideas and information.

**Analysis of Effectiveness and Next Steps:** The president’s Town Hall and Convocation have become a tradition that community members appreciate and look forward to – especially now that technology allows faculty, librarians, and staff to attend either in person or to join remotely. The university is concerned about low attendance by faculty members, and for 2024, plans will be made to better incorporate the faculty’s arrival back on campus into Convocation and into individual department and school meetings. Working with the president and provost (and seeking input from the Staff Council and represented groups of faculty and staff), USF will explore hosting a new series of informal conversations with cabinet members.

### **Communication Channels: Website Redesign**

The most important and most widely-accessed publications of the university are the USF websites, [usfca.edu](#) and [myusf.usfca.edu](#). Both are public-facing websites, but each serves different audiences. The primary audiences of the externally-facing usfca.edu are prospective students and the general public; the university’s internal audience of faculty, staff, and students turn to myUSF for information and news, for getting business done, and to learn more about university initiatives.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** With the comprehensive redesign of usfca.edu from June 2021 to July 2022, it was essential that the USF community be involved in decisions and provide input on the best way to present USF to the public. A working group was assembled and worked for one year in tracking vendor work, testing concepts, and providing feedback. In summer 2023, OMC began working on a series of enhancements to myUSF to improve functionality, and to respond to internal constituents’ feedback and recommendations.

### **Shared Decision-Making: Rebooting of the Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee and Curriculog**

As discussed in the shared governance section above, the Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee (JUCC) was formally “rebooted” in spring 2022 after a year-long process by the JUCC Preparation Workgroup to redefine the scope, procedures, and membership of the JUCC. The JUCC facilitates campus-wide conversations regarding curriculum change and innovation. Agendas and minutes of the JUCC meetings are posted on the JUCC website. JUCC discussions and deliberations are held in an open session so that any member of the campus community may attend.

In addition to the JUCC, curricular recommendations to the provost, and the reasons for them, are documented in USF's curriculum management platform, Curriculog, which further creates visibility and transparency around decisions related to the curriculum.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** The JUCC reports directly to the provost and, as such, has created a formal channel of input and dialog from campus community members to leadership prior to decision-making, increasing visibility and transparency of decision-making related to the university-wide curricular changes. Recent examples of the effectiveness of the JUCC and Curriculog include reviews of program closures, creation of Definitions and Guidelines for Instructional Modalities, and a formal recommendation to the provost to begin a Core Curriculum review and redesign based on a request from the faculty-led Core Advisory Committee.

#### **Shared Decision-Making: University Budget Advisory Council**

As mentioned in the shared governance section above, the University Budget Advisory Council (UBAC) was established in fall 2019, and is composed of appointed members from the administration, elected representatives from staff and faculty, and appointed student representatives. UBAC's annual agenda of planning and delivery of recommendations is closely aligned with the university's budget and planning process. All council members are expected to educate themselves on the university's operating and capital budgets and share information with their departments and divisions, as part of their role in this communication channel. Meeting minutes are posted on the UBAC website.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** The creation and on-going operation of UBAC has been a critical development at USF. The body provides needed transparency to the university's budget and planning process and allows faculty, librarians, and staff to give the administration their perspectives and advice about budgetary matters. In fall 2019, during UBAC's initial formation, more than 650 full-time faculty and staff members at the University of San Francisco voted in the election of the first slate of faculty and staff representatives. The level of interest, participation, and engagement in the establishment of this new council was strong across campus and 29 candidates stepped forward to run for election. In the fall 2021 election, with the process changed so that staff vote for staff seats and faculty have their own elections, nine staff agreed to stand for election for one open staff seat. More than 200 full-time staff members voted in the election. In the next academic year, USF plans to administer a survey to better determine the community's understanding and perception of UBAC.

#### **Shared Decision-Making: Representation on Board of Trustees' Standing Committees**

Faculty and student representation on board of trustees' standing committees is an important and long-standing component of the board's structure. Standing committee campus representatives provide feedback, engage in discussion, and report back to their campus constituency groups. The president of the USFFA offers nominations of faculty to each committee (nominations are generally accepted by the board); the vice president of student life offers nominations of students to serve and these nominations are also generally accepted. Term limits vary depending on the committee. Students typically serve one year (attending three meetings) with an option to be reappointed; faculty serve two years and can be reappointed for four years once they have served a term.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** A trustee mentor is assigned to each student representative to assist with their orientation and support their active participation in the committee work. Both faculty and student representatives are expected to fully participate in committee discussions. In addition to sharing reports of the committee discussions with their peer and constituent groups, they are expected to seek input and feedback from members of the university community.

**Shared Decision-Making: Staff Council**

The [Staff Council](#) was established June 2022, with elected representatives from departments and divisions across the university. The Council is actively engaged in advocating for improved channels of communications at the university and building community. The Council has a strong organizational structure, advocates for itself and its articulated goals, and communicates regularly to the campus via monthly staff council meetings, via email and via its website. The president of the staff council began serving as a constituent representative to the board of trustees in fall 2023.

**Analysis of Effectiveness:** As a relatively new body at USF, there is not yet significant data on the effectiveness of the Council. The Council conducted a survey in October 2023 to understand how it has been successful and where its effectiveness can be improved.

**Shared Decision-Making: Strategic Planning Process**

The strategic planning process at USF has been one of the most critical and community-driven initiatives in the university's history, as discussed above. The development of the 2027 Strategic Plan involved hundreds of faculty, librarians, and staff across the university, and resulted in a host of actions to develop goals, solicit input, and report progress. A dedicated website was created to be the repository of all information, including videos of community forums, membership lists of working groups, resources, and more. In addition to the in-person reporting on the progress of the plan (at every level of the organization – from division and department meetings to briefings at the board of trustees), the website serves as a hub for anyone with questions or for specific information about recommendations.

**Analysis of Effectiveness and Next steps:** As implementation of the plan begins, the strategic plan website is transitioning to a formal presentation of the full plan and a record of how recommendations were implemented. This Strategic Plan Implementation Dashboard will be posted in fall 2023.

## 6. Improve methods of systematically surveying alumni in order to create a fuller picture of the impact of a USF education. (CFR 4.1)

### Description of Issue

The following response serves as a summary of the University of San Francisco's (USF) concentrated effort to address the issue outlined in the WSCUC Commission's action letter regarding improving methods of systematically surveying alumni in order to create a fuller picture of the impact of a USF education. As is true for the many universities that USF benchmarks its data against, alumni response rates continue to decline and the competition for the attention of USF alumni continues to increase. While the university persists in investing in traditional and digital marketing and communications tools to help alleviate this threat, this is an uphill battle as email and traditional marketing response rates decrease.

The university's progress includes efforts to more frequently and comprehensively survey alumni, in addition to the data acquisition, retention, and quality assurance tools and processes the university has implemented or expanded over the last several years to address this issue comprehensively.

### Data Collection, Retention, and Quality Assurance

The university has increased its investment in the three guiding change management principles of people, process and technology to more effectively collect, store, retain and analyze its alumni data. These data paint a fuller picture of this important university constituency, their connection to their alma mater, and their perception of the value of their time and accomplishments at the university.

- **Capacity:** Since the Commission action letter was delivered to the university in 2019, the university has hired new staff to support its data and research within the division of Development. This includes additional staff in the Development Services department, specializing in the management and integration of data for over 300,000 constituent records, in the Advanced Analytics department, specializing in analysis, advanced data models, data visualization, and internal and peer benchmarking analysis. This also includes staff on the Prospect Development & Analytics team, specializing in alumni research and individualized strategy for frontline fundraising performance. In all, four new or repurposed positions have been added between 2020 and 2023. The university provided resources to the collection, management, and analysis of alumni outcome data during a time of budget constraints due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The resource allocation demonstrates university commitment to this issue.
- **Evaluation and Documentation Processes:** The division of Development has also embarked on an extensive process evaluation to ensure that data acquisition, retention, and validation processes are well-documented and shared with stakeholders across the university to increase consistency in data security, data processing, and data sharing. This process has resulted in over 15 cross-departmental business processes and operating procedure documents in the last two years. The division of Development is currently working to compile these into a larger toolkit to share with partners across the university. This documentation project has already seen positive outcomes in the onboarding of new Development employees and partners. In the future, the university seeks to expand the rollout for these business process documents and the larger toolkit and to provide annual training for non-Development university employees who are in regular contact with alumni and/or alumni data to increase outreach and improve the quality of the university's data.
- **Technology:** In the past several years, USF has invested in a number of technology resources that are critical to the university's ability to address this issue. An extensive list of technologies



in use for alumni data collection is available in Item B of the [Attachment 6.1: Additional Details for Alumni Data Collection](#), but for brevity, three technology investments are highlighted below.

- **Salesforce Affinaquest (SFAQ)** - In April 2021, the University of San Francisco transitioned from its dual database systems of managing alumni constituent records in both Salesforce Round Corner and Ellucian Banner to one comprehensive source: Salesforce Affinaquest. One key result of this migration is reduced duplication of data entry, allowing the division of Development to streamline records updates, and mobilize staff time and resources on new data initiatives.
- **NetworkUSF (Powered by PeopleGrove)** - In June 2020, the University of San Francisco contracted with PeopleGrove to launch an exclusive online networking tool for USF alumni, students, faculty and staff. An invitation was sent through the institution email provider (Emma) to all alumni to create an account on the new platform. The registration process for PeopleGrove collects data such as secondary degree, employment, phone and email, interests and hobbies. This data is then migrated between PeopleGrove and the alumni database of record, Salesforce Affinaquest. Prior to fall 2022, this was a manual process but currently a custom-built integration runs nightly to load this data into the database. Beyond data collection, the PeopleGrove platform provides an opportunity for alumni to search an alumni directory, connect individually, and join a group that reflects their identity, location, or interests. The PeopleGrove platform also houses the Alumni Mentorship Program, an annual six-month program that matches alumni with current students for mentorship and career insight.
- **Snowflake (Data Warehouse)** - Following the database migration to SFAQ, Snowflake was selected as a pilot program from USF's Information Technology Services division to implement a data warehouse environment. This technology is paramount to the division's ability to store, organize, update, and analyze alumni data. A map of the current state of the Data Warehouse is available in Item E of [Attachment 6.1](#).

### **Defining and Mobilizing Strategies for Critical Data to Inform Issue**

In order to make strides to address the issue raised by the Commission, the university determined it would be important to focus on the mobilization of strategy and process surrounding four categories of data: Biographical/Contact Information, Student Engagement Data, Brand Awareness and Alumni Satisfaction Metrics, and Employment/Career Outcomes.

- **Biographical and Communication Data** - Most alumni data originate from internal data transfers when students are enrolled and then graduate from the university via a complex integration process between USF's enrollment, academic, and alumni databases. These systems include Slate, Banner, and Salesforce Affinaquest (SFAQ), and data points include biographical data as well as communication data, such as address and email information. As the alumni relationship with the university matures, future biographical and communication updates are done by alumni notifying USF directly or by one of the many data research and validation tools described in Item B of [Attachment 6.1](#). The University of San Francisco is currently contracted with Grenzbach Glier and Associates (GG+A) to collect alumni data and perform an alumni survey using a data append. The alumni data append will focus on collecting accurate email data from living alumni for which the university does not have an active account, and it will allow new emails to be confirmed via an opt-in process. The data append began in February 2023 and concluded in March 2023. GG&A will provide the institution with the results.
- **Student Engagement Data** - Currently, data integrated from the campus database (Banner) to the alumni database (SFAQ) includes foundational student engagement data, such as degree, major, and participation in athletics. For students and alumni participating in the alumni

mentorship program, participation is captured and stored in the alumni database. Future plans are in place to increase the number of datapoints integrating from the student/academic areas of campus to alumni records, such as a current project in place to capture student club information.

- **Brand Awareness and Alumni Satisfaction Metrics** - USF has conducted a brand awareness survey three times in the last ten years. In 2015, USF engaged a third-party partner, Simpson Scarborough, who designed and launched the first brand awareness study; USF then replicated it in 2018; and most recently in 2021. In 2021, the online survey was sent to an alumni and donor population of 73,411 and the university received a 3% response rate, with about 2,200 responses (mostly alumni). The survey audiences also included potential undergraduate and graduate students, hiring partners, academic peers, etc. Additional results are listed in Item C of [Attachment 6.1](#). One of the top takeaways from this survey is that 72% of alumni who responded to the survey feel that USF is part of their identity, a positive reflection of the value the university has in the lives of their alumni. Of those respondents, 86% want to remain connected, showcasing a strong opportunity for the future. The department of Alumni Engagement also launched a comprehensive alumni survey in spring 2023. An overview and timeline are available in Item F of [Attachment 6.1](#).
- **Employment Career Outcomes Data** - There are a number of tools referenced on the technology map found in Item A of [Attachment 6.1](#) that are used to gather employment data, mostly by scraping widely-used public resources, such as LinkedIn. However, the majority of employment data for recent graduates comes through the first destination survey conducted by the Office of Career Services each year, which systematically surveys and gathers employment, salary, and continuing education plans for all undergraduates. The most recent survey timeline, results and benchmarking statistics are available in Item D of [Attachment 6.1](#). To maximize the outcomes collection, in addition to survey responses, the Office of Career Services and the Office of Alumni Engagement collaborate on a manual data scraping process, where they engage staff and student intern resources to research non-respondents online and gather additional responses. This additional step brings the total survey completion rate from 36% to 67%, which helps the university to align with survey competition rates at benchmarking institutions like Chapman University (64%), Seattle University (64%), University of Southern California (65%) and far outpaces completion rates at Santa Clara University (25%). The data from these surveys is then shared with Development to record in the alumni database of record. Graduate schools, particularly the School of Management and the School of Law, conduct similar surveys for graduates of their postsecondary degree programs.

### **Actions to Date - Analysis of Effectiveness**

The University of San Francisco uses a number of metrics to measure the effectiveness of its actions in response to this Commission issue. Although not an exhaustive list, the primary data points the University reviews are as follows:

- **# of Records Cases Closed** - The Records Management team resolved over 2,500 manual biographical data requests this year. This is exclusive of large data integration loads, the thousands of records requiring data validation within those processes.
- **% of Alumni with Active Contact Information** - According to the most recent alumni statistics report (ran annually each summer), the university has 125,651 living alumni. An area of opportunity earlier identified was the low number of emails the University of San Francisco had for alumni that were available to use in mass email communications. Over the course of the last 18 months, a cross-campus task force, led by Development and inclusive of partners in Information Technology Services (ITS) and the Office of Marketing and Communication (OMC) collaborated on a business process and database-to-email system tool integration project that

has resulted in an increase of the percentage of alumni with an email available for outreach from 55% of the university's alumni to nearly 85%. The final stage of this project was completed in May 2023 at which point online alumni interactions will be tracked, stored, and analyzed to inform future strategies and the creation of a comprehensive Alumni Engagement Score.

- **Users Registered in Alumni Hub** - (NetworkUSF powered by PeopleGrove) There are currently nearly 7,000 users in the alumni hub, the vast majority of whom are alumni and students (or future alumni). It is the university's goal to increase the percentage of alumni utilizing this platform over time. USF will monitor growth over the next several years to evaluate effectiveness and adjust strategy as needed to meet milestone user goals.
- **Survey Response Rates** - One of the key metrics for measuring success is to increase response rates to university surveys that gather critical biographical, student outcome, and alumni satisfaction statistics. The "First Destination Survey" has a strong survey completion rate with 36% responding. Alumni survey responses average between 3-5% which is in line with industry trends for response rates of alumni from large public institutions but which falls short of the industry average for faith-based private institutions.

## Looking to the Future

### Areas of Opportunity

- **Engagement Score** - The division of Development is currently finalizing a data analytics project for the creation of an Alumni Engagement Score. This is based on industry best practices and several models from peer institutions, incorporating data from volunteerism, event attendance, communications, giving, and more. To further ensure the university's alumni engagement efforts continue to be data driven, in March 2023, the team presented the Engagement KPI Dashboard to the Trustee Development Committee of the board of trustees and officially set the baseline and milestone goals for alumni engagement over the next several years.
- **Data Sharing Across Campus** - While the data warehouse was a critical step in allowing the division of Development to store, organize, and analyze alumni data, there continues to be areas of improvement needed to ensure that all interactions with alumni are tracked and housed in a central repository, regardless of the source across campus with which the alumnus is interacting. Data storage across campus is largely siloed at this time, and the university will need to invest in resources to support the next several phases of the data warehouse and golden record project (see Item E in [Attachment 6.1.](#)) in order to break down these silos and have a more streamlined process for data sharing across campus.
- **% of Alumni Engaging with University** - As is true for most universities, data and alumni satisfaction analysis is more reliable as alumni are increasingly involved and interacting with the institution (attending an event, making a donation, volunteering, etc.). USF is currently in the leadership planning phase of the next campaign where increasing the percentage of alumni who engage with the university is central to its ultimate goal. Set up is equally important to achieving the revenue fundraising target of the campaign.

### Areas of Concern/Threats

In the last several years, privacy laws have received increased attention, adding complexity to how the university tracks and uses the data it manages and requiring additional tools and resources for USF to manage. The university has selected a United Kingdom based email marketing platform, whose data privacy restrictions are far less flexible due to very strict data privacy laws internationally. This requires the university to require alumni to interact with USF on a regular basis, or lose the ability to communicate with them, which is far stricter than US law requires. The university is exploring alternative email communication tools, but this requires additional financial and staffing resources to manage.

## **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.*

There have been changes in key personnel since the reaffirmation of accreditation visit. As mentioned earlier, former Provost Donald Heller stepped down as provost in January of 2020 after receiving a vote of no confidence from the faculty. He became vice president of operations until he retired in February 2022. The dean of the library, Tyrone Cannon, served as interim provost from January 2020 to July 2021, steering Academic Affairs during the beginning of the pandemic. Interim Provost Cannon was dean for 25 years and well-known within the USF community. After a national search, Provost Chinyere Oparah, the former provost at Mills College, was appointed provost. She served almost two years and stepped down in May 2023. The dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Eileen Fung, is now interim provost. Interim Provost Fung has been a faculty member at USF for over 25 years and has served in USF administration for over 12 years. She created USF's Honor College, secured grant funds for transfer pathways from community colleges, and created new academic programs in all areas of the College. She is a highly-effective and knowledgeable leader. Turnover in the provost position was accompanied by major changes in the Provost Office team and structure, with every vice provost position changing personnel at least once since 2018. The operational budget and related personnel moved from the Provost Office to the Chief Financial Officer Office during spring of 2023. In addition, there were multiple changes at the school level with three out of the five deanships changing personnel, with multiple changes in the School of Management and in the School of Nursing and Health Professions.

Turnover in key leadership positions in Academic Affairs coupled with the COVID-19 pandemic slowed progress on important curricular innovations, such as revisions to the 20-year-old undergraduate core curriculum and graduation requirements, revisions to first-year experiences, and development of new academic programs. Multiple leadership changes also made post-pandemic recovery more difficult as the campus continues to rebuild a sense of belonging in the community. Finally, the turnover in the provost position impacted progress on shared governance, with the faculty union having to develop new relationships with each new leader. Fortunately, there has been significant growth in academic areas in the last year. A core redesign task force was charged by then Provost Oparah with revising the curriculum at the request of the Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee, and Interim Provost Fung has committed to continuing this work. The new strategic plan is leading progress on retention initiatives, such as revising the first-year experience, examining advising practices, and expanding the experiential learning opportunities. The academic deans have been acting on new market research to launch new academic programs, update curricula, and develop new professional certificates.

Like many institutions, USF faces enrollment challenges. These challenges include concerns over the affordability of a USF education and the cost of attendance, coupled with rising debt aversion by students and their families. While San Francisco is a desirable location for many prospective students, there are also concerns about housing (including no guarantee of on-campus housing over four years and the availability and cost of housing off-campus), and safety in the city (including the unhoused population, crime, and a perception of being the epicenter of the opioid epidemic). The challenging relationship between the United States and China has driven once high-levels of Chinese student applicants to much lower numbers. The university has also fielded questions from prospective students about educational outcomes as compared to peer institutions and the perception of a lack of academic

distinctiveness. In response to these challenges, USF continues to take steps to grow its application pool and improve its yield and market position through a number of initiatives including: enhancing social engagement with prospective students; investing in a digital marketing campaign to reach students on new platforms; forging new recruiting partnerships in key international markets; strengthening how USF articulates and communicates the value of its education; launching the Double Dons scholarship for students pursuing a second degree at USF; and offering more competitive scholarships.

While impacted by a long response to the pandemic by the City of San Francisco, USF is now in a time of significant data-driven curricular development. The provost and deans spent this past year heavily focused on market research to better understand opportunities, locally and nationally, in the post-pandemic world. The one-person Office of Marketing Research was closed and the funds were used to contract with an external provider for real-time labor market analytics. Deans and their leadership teams continue to review institutional data with market insights to hone their school-level strategic plans. Based on marketing data, the College of Arts and Science (CAS) will be launching a new BS in Neuroscience in fall 2024 and BS in Biotechnology in fall 2025. A new donor-funded center/institute for the arts is in the process of being launched, with an endowed chair position in place and ongoing discussion as to where within the campus the center will be located. CAS will be revamping the graduate programs by: improving scholarship-raising efforts; optimizing discounting; increasing internship and career pathways; restructuring the curricula; reducing melt; and implementing new marketing. The School of Management (SOM) closed two programs and is in the process of closing a third, and the resources have been realigned to strengthen their current programs, including a major redesign in the undergraduate business core curriculum. SOM is pivoting into more multimodal academic programs in response to market research on working professional students and after successfully launching an MBA program tailored to the needs of an industry partner. The School of Nursing and Health Professions (SONHP) launched a BS in Public Health in response to market need and already has 27 students in the program. SONHP faculty are realigning the program learning outcomes for all of their nursing programs with the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) Essentials. The work will further strengthen the SONHP, which has a nationally-ranked MSN program. The School of Education (SOE) has been responding to significant local need for their programs due to the recent closure of two universities with similar missions, Mills College and Holy Names University. Changes in the School of Law are outlined in detail in section three, above. In summary, USF is now in a period of significant academic program growth and realignment.

After a nine month-long process of community discernment, USF examined and revised its mission statement. Members of the University Council for Jesuit Mission met with multiple community groups to reflect upon key elements of USF's Jesuit, Catholic mission alignment and integration, such as Ignatian pedagogy, educating minds and hearts, liberal arts, belonging, and caring for our common home. The working group drafted a new mission statement that centers all of these elements and more in a clear, concise affirmation of USF's values. The statement was approved by the board of trustees on September 24, 2021. During the 2021-22 academic year, USF also underwent a self-study process, called the [Mission Priority Examen](#) (MPE), to be reaffirmed as a Jesuit, Catholic institution. The mission statement revision and practice of communal discernment prepared the community for the MPE. A self-study committee of five USF community members oversaw the MPE process. They solicited feedback through a university-wide survey and partnered with the University Council for Jesuit Mission to facilitate listening sessions with faculty, students, and staff. The self-study committee also met with the deans and Leadership Team to inform the 37-page self-study, which was reviewed by a team of peers from other Jesuit Colleges and Universities. The five-person peer review team met with the USF community during a virtual site visit in February 2022 and created a report recommending the reaffirmation of USF's Jesuit Catholic identity. After a review of the self-study and peer report, Father General Arturo Sosa, SJ

reaffirmed the four mission priorities of USF for the next seven years, which align with the university strategic plan. The first priority is to build capacity and opportunity among faculty, staff, students, and leaders to understand and engage in substantive conversations about Jesuit Catholic identity in the context of higher education. The goal is to share worldviews and visions, both secular and religious, of how USF can embody a faith that does justice and ensures institutional accountability. The next is to develop a transparent, sustainable, university-wide plan to strengthen the Jesuit mission with diversity, equity and inclusion priorities. This must be supported by a well-resourced, visible structure to ensure institutional accountability. USF must also prioritize strengthening the Office of Sustainability so that it promotes cross-disciplinary faculty participation in shaping the curriculum, motivating university-wide engagement, and ensuring institutional accountability in meeting bold, science-driven sustainability goals inspired by *Laudato si*. Lastly, the university must cultivate collaborative structures among USF stakeholders that model *cura personalis*, practice Ignatian discernment, and respect the legitimate autonomy of the several unions that represent subsets of our employees.

And finally, USF welcomed Fr. John Fitzgibbons in February 2023 as chancellor and chief mission officer. The former president of Regis University, Fr. Fitzgibbons is a highly-respected and experienced leader in higher education and Ignatian pedagogy.

## 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.*

The last five years at the University of San Francisco have brought tremendous change, catalyzed by the COVID-19 pandemic, San Francisco city and county regulations, and national trends in higher education. Like many other institutions, USF faced post-pandemic leadership change and enrollment declines. However, the past five years for USF also include significant progress in university assessment practices and engagement, the drafting of an institutional strategic plan, and in measurable action in shared governance, communication, and alumni data collection.

University planning and innovation is now guided by two documents, the USF Strategic Plan 2027 and the Institutional Strategic Enrollment Plan (ISEP), both drafted by administration, faculty, and staff and approved by the board of trustees in 2021 and 2022, respectively. The ISEP outlines a wide-range of creative and actionable interventions for undergraduate and graduate enrollments, and the USF Strategic Plan 2027 is now referenced in major university decision making.

A number of initiatives have supported progress on assessment practices across the university through building expertise and providing professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. The increasing awareness of the obligation to address historically entrenched inequities in higher education for underserved minorities, and assessment's role in these historic injustices, is also propelling progress. A now-yearly series on addressing bias and racism in assessment is meeting the university community's interest and enthusiasm to remedy these historical inequities.

The WSCUC Commission's recommendation that the university establish shared governance by the development of a formal deliberative body, independent of the Faculty Association Policy Boards, is a work in progress for the university. While there was some faculty pushback to the creation of such a formal deliberative body, a newly reformed Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee (JUCC) was convened in 2022 to address university-wide, major curriculum changes. Additionally, in 2019 the University Budget Advisory Council (UBAC) was established as a shared governance deliberative body, and provides formal advice to leadership in regard to the university operating budget. Changes to academic affairs leadership has delayed some progress, but the new and current leadership in academic affairs is committed, and will partner with faculty to design a more formalized shared governance structure. The Strategic Plan will also aid USF in the creation of more structures that include participatory decision making.

While USF manages a changing, post-pandemic higher education climate, the School of Law deftly navigates a shifting and dynamic law landscape. Since 2018, USF's SOL has solidified its leadership, addressed enrollment and bar passage issues, met significant fundraising milestones, and managed its operating budget. The next two years should see the school continue to stabilize.

Channels of communication at USF have grown formally and informally, through strengthening existing structures, posting information regularly, and a reinvigorated website and communications plan. The university has also worked to better collect and store data about our programs, current students, and alumni. This work strengthens both the assessment work at the university, allowing deans to start new academic programs after in-depth market research, and bolsters the work of the alumni and development offices. Mostly importantly, this data collection provides the institution with feedback from our students and alumni about the value of a USF education and degree. The University of San

Francisco remains, above all, a mission-driven and aligned institution, committed to its students and their educational outcomes.



## Attachments and Webpages

### Statement on Report Preparation

#### Attachments

[Report Prep.1: Action Plans](#)

#### Webpages

WSCUC Reaffirmation of Accreditation

[https://myusf.usfca.edu/provost/vice-provost/wscuc/current\\_reaccreditation\\_process](https://myusf.usfca.edu/provost/vice-provost/wscuc/current_reaccreditation_process)

### Institutional Context

#### Webpages

Mission and Values Statement:

[https://www.usfca.edu/who-we-are/reinventing-education/our-mission-and-values?gclid=CjwKCAjw3oqoBhAjEiwA\\_UaLtg7oLwBR\\_2CUxrxPNy2yQnipnQSoJmDIRxwUVctmkYBpLfPU-rrjXoCXsQA\\_VD\\_BwE](https://www.usfca.edu/who-we-are/reinventing-education/our-mission-and-values?gclid=CjwKCAjw3oqoBhAjEiwA_UaLtg7oLwBR_2CUxrxPNy2yQnipnQSoJmDIRxwUVctmkYBpLfPU-rrjXoCXsQA_VD_BwE)

### Recommendation 1

#### Attachments

[1.1: Strategic Plan Groups Glossary](#)

[1.2: Strategic Plan](#)

[1.3: Guiding Values and Strategic Priorities](#)

[1.4: ISEP Phase 2 Progress Tracking Table](#)

[1.5 Strategic Plan Advisory Council](#)

[1.6: Draft SP Implementation Dashboard](#)

#### Webpages

Institutional Master Plan

[https://myusf.usfca.edu/facilities/2018-2019-University-of-San-Francisco-Institutional-Master-Plan-Update?\\_gl=1%2A1rFv0k%2A\\_ga%2ANzk5OTA4OTU1LjE2ODMxNTI1Mjc.%2A\\_ga\\_J3HJ7NQ7GM%2AMTY5ODM2MDkyMS43OC4xLjE2OTgzNjA5NTAuMC4wLjA.%2A\\_fplc%2AJTJGamYxWILLR3YxUjB1RzIIMkMmUmFuSkIXQ1VjNIBmdHI6TIROJTJCMzExTVZob2sybWNZdm5YWUs4MyUyQnFFZyUyQlpRUkMmRmhoblhsWlNGQIuYRmdnempaTnpaRFdZdDVRZEZENXpxa1RTdGpxbVZiTXdZRGnrN3NIEUsyTW9oSSUyRmtuMmclM0QIM0Q](https://myusf.usfca.edu/facilities/2018-2019-University-of-San-Francisco-Institutional-Master-Plan-Update?_gl=1%2A1rFv0k%2A_ga%2ANzk5OTA4OTU1LjE2ODMxNTI1Mjc.%2A_ga_J3HJ7NQ7GM%2AMTY5ODM2MDkyMS43OC4xLjE2OTgzNjA5NTAuMC4wLjA.%2A_fplc%2AJTJGamYxWILLR3YxUjB1RzIIMkMmUmFuSkIXQ1VjNIBmdHI6TIROJTJCMzExTVZob2sybWNZdm5YWUs4MyUyQnFFZyUyQlpRUkMmRmhoblhsWlNGQIuYRmdnempaTnpaRFdZdDVRZEZENXpxa1RTdGpxbVZiTXdZRGnrN3NIEUsyTW9oSSUyRmtuMmclM0QIM0Q)

USF 2027 Strategic Plan Website

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/president/usf-2027-strategic-plan>

Strategic Plan Working Groups

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/president/usf-2027-strategic-plan/working-groups>

Strategic Plan Forums

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/president/usf-2027-strategic-plan/strategic-plan-forums>

Strategic Plan Resources

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/president/usf-2027-strategic-plan/strategic-plan-resources>

## **Recommendation 2**

### Attachments

[2.1: USFFA Collective Bargaining Agreement](#)

[2.2: 2023-24 SOL Committee List](#)

[2.3: 2023-24 Board Constituent Representatives](#)

[2.4: Nov. 7, 2018 Policy Board Minutes](#)

[2.5: VP Forum Invitations](#)

[2.6: Magis Project Webpage](#)

[2.7: Recommendations from Strategic Plan Working Group 6 and Executive Summary](#)

### Webpages

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/provost/svpaa/jucc>

University Budget Advisory Council

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/planning-budget/university-budget-advisory-council>

Magis Project Final Report

[https://myusf.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/documents/Magis%20Project/Magis\\_Project\\_Final\\_Report\\_accessible.pdf](https://myusf.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/documents/Magis%20Project/Magis_Project_Final_Report_accessible.pdf)

## **Recommendation 3**

### Attachments

[3.1: SOL Curricular Reforms Timeline](#)

[3.2: CA Bar Exam Statistics July 2018-July 2022](#)

[3.3: ABA Bar Passage Report 2018- 2021](#)

[3.4: Law Enrollment 2021-2023](#)

## **Recommendation 4**

### Attachments

[4.1: Annual Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes & Student Achievement Policy](#)

[4.2: Annual Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes & Student Achievement Policy Final with Addendum](#)

[4.3: Reports to the Board of Trustees AY 2022-2023](#)

[4.4: Academic Program Review Guidelines \(Revised 2023\)](#)

[4.5: 2018 Celebration of Assessment Agenda](#)

[4.6: 2019 Celebration of Assessment Agenda](#)

### Webpages

UAC Series on Addressing Bias and Racism in Assessment Webpage

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/assessment/uac/series>

## **Recommendation 5**

### Attachments

[5.1: USF Leadership Team](#)

[5.2: Archived USF Together](#)

[5.3: USF Together Website Analytics](#)

### Webpages

Board of Trustees Meeting Action Items

<https://www.usfca.edu/who-we-are/president-leadership/board-trustees/meeting-action-items>

President's Cabinet Meeting Minutes

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/president/committees-commissions/cabinet-meeting-minutes>

University Convocations

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/president/articles-speeches/convocations>

Town Hall Meeting Recording

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/president/town-hall-meetings>

USF Website

<https://www.usfca.edu/>

USF Internal Website

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/>

Staff Council

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/staff-council>

### **Recommendation 6**

#### Attachments

[6.1: Additional Details for Alumni Data Collection](#)

### **Other Changes and Issues**

#### Webpages

Mission Priority Examen Webpage

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/mission-council/mission-priority-examen-2021>