



UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

University Ministry

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY RESPONSE

Co-Curricular Program Review

University Ministry

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Tamara Liddell, Seattle University

Kevin O'Brien, SJ, Jesuit School of Theology at Santa Clara University

CAMPUS VISIT:

March 26-28, 2017

SUBMITTED BY:

Julie Dowd, Director, University Ministry

In consultation with University Ministry staff members Ali Balfantz, Kique Bazan, Don Crean, Emily Czarnik-Neimeyer, Donal Godfrey, SJ, Paul McWilliams and Wilita Sanguma

University Ministry completed an External Program Review and visit on March 26-28, 2017. The visiting team met with students, UM staff, resident ministers, colleagues in Student Life, the department of theology and religious studies, co-chairs of the University Council for Jesuit Mission, development and alumni office, and diversity and inclusion office. The committee submitted a very positive report highlighting the collaborative nature of UM's work, and the positive relationships we have with students, faculty and staff across campus. No "red flags" were raised. The report focused on two main areas of opportunity, and some concrete suggestions in certain areas. The two main areas of opportunity identified were the need for greater clarification on the role of the Mission Council vis a vis University Ministry, and need for clarification on the role of resident ministers in the halls and the UM office.

The University Ministry (UM) staff members reviewed and discussed the External Review Report at a staff planning retreat on May 22, 2017. The following is a summary of the UM team response to the external review committee's report and recommendations.

- 1. How did the external review committee rate the overall quality of the department- excellent, very good, good, adequate, or poor? How does the department compare with well-established/recognized programs nationally? Please provide a brief rationale for the external review committee's rating.**

The UM external review committee did not present a rating per se, but cited several points of commendation including leadership, a productive and collaborative relationship between UM and other departments on campus, a welcoming and inclusive spirit, strong staff and faculty programming, and strong strategic planning functions. The review committee stated in their report that during their visit they “discerned no red flags, no glaring need to immediate change, no moment of crisis or grave concern. To the contrary, UM is staffed by generous, talented professionals, who are supported by a wide cohort of people committed to the students and the Jesuit and Catholic mission of USF.” (*External Review Report*, 2).

2. What are the most important general issues that emerged from the external review process?

The committee focused their report on two areas of principle concern: 1) the relationship between University Ministry and the Mission, and 2) the Resident Ministry program.

1) The Relationship between University Ministry and Mission

The report emphasizes a need for greater clarity between the roles and functions of University Ministry and the Mission Council. The report states many people on campus confuse our office with the mission office, and see us as responsible for carrying and promoting the mission of USF by default. While several members of our staff are equipped to do the work of mission and identity promotion successfully, we don’t have the authority or the mandate of the university to approach the work systematically and strategically. At the same time, the members of the Mission Council do have the authority and mandate to integrate the mission throughout the university, but lack the necessary recognition and accountability. The UM staff agree that the lines of responsibility, authority and accountability need to be untangled and defined so that the mission of the USF is consistently communicated, deepened and enlivened across all segments of the University.

The specific recommendations presented at the conclusion of this section, such as appointing a chief mission officer, fall under the purview of the president and the Mission Council. This report has been shared with the co-chairs of the Mission Council for their consideration.

The report recommends that we create a separate Center for Ignatian Spirituality. The UM staff is not inclined to do this as centers can often become marginalized from the central operations of the University. By remaining in University Ministry, faculty and staff spirituality remains a central UM program area, and allows us to introduce Ignatian spirituality to faculty and staff who will hopefully introduce UM to their students as well. We believe that it is valuable for our office to serve *both* students *and* faculty/staff. This diversity of populations and stakeholder groups fosters a healthy and collaborative atmosphere that better enables us to meet our goals of serving the entire USF community.

We can clarify on our website what we mean by “Center for Ignatian Spirituality” so that it isn’t confusing to online visitors. We believe that “Center for Ignatian Spirituality” serves as a

descriptive subtitle of University Ministry, rather than a separate set of activities deserving of a center unto itself.

Response/Action Plan:

- Discuss the external review with the president and Mission Council co-chairs for their consideration of how to clarify the role, responsibilities, structures and accountability for mission integration.
- Edit website to reflect that “Center for Ignatian Spirituality” is a descriptor for UM, not a separate center.

2) The Role of Resident Ministers in the Work of University Ministry

The report rightly points out the challenge of managing a large and inherently volunteer staff of resident ministers, each with distinct personalities, work styles, outside professional and academic obligations, areas of expertise, etc. The report has helped us a staff recognize the need to apply volunteer management concepts to leading the RM team. Group supervision and formation is an excellent suggestion.

The report recommends considering “right-sizing” the RM program, as in, reducing the number of resident ministers on staff so that each gets better formation. We have explored reducing the number of RM rooms in exchange for full time staff, but we would need to reduce the RM team by 6 (or 90 hours) in order to acquire the funding for one full-time person. It is not clear that this is a positive move for us. Offering free room and board to a strong cohort of early-career professionals and graduate students who work 15 hours/week remains a cost effective staffing strategy for UM programs.

We agree that we need to better determine core skills common to all programming. We can also improve the quality of program supervision for some RMs. Action steps are as follows:

Response/Action Plan:

- We are re-writing the job description and learning outcomes for the RM program for AY18.
- Each program director will develop learning outcomes for RMs in each program area so that it is clear what each RM should learn and gain from their UM program area that year.
- RM program director will develop clear learning objectives and job responsibilities for the RM work in the hall. These will be developed with the new director of student housing and residential education in the division of Student Life.
- RM program director will develop a clear evaluation tool for each program director to use to evaluate the performance of his/her RM staff.

3. What specific recommendations for improving the department’s quality has the external review committee made to the supervisor?

In addition to the two areas discussed above, the committee made the following specific recommendations to the UM team. The committee's recommendations are indicated by bullet points. The UM staff response is in italics.

- 1) Conduct in-depth survey of Catholic students.

Response/Action Plan:

- We will develop this as a practicum project for a graduate student, or propose that the Catholic student CORE group lead this initiative themselves to tell us what additional support they would like.

- 2) Consider the question: Do traditional Catholics and other religious groups have a voice on campus, e.g. pro-life groups?

Response/Action Plan:

- We do have traditional Catholics and pro-life students involved with University Ministry programs. Many of them have served as student leaders of our Catholic CORE group. If a student club or organization came to us for support for pro-life activities on or off campus, we would be happy to work with them. In the past there have been students interested in pro-life ministry, and who started clubs on campus, who were involved in UM.

- 3) Deepen UM staff development in Ignatian spirituality and pedagogy.

Response/Action Plan:

- UM staff are encouraged to go on one retreat per year, and attend professional development conferences and classes in these areas. This year UM staff attended the AJCU campus ministry conference, LA Religious Ed Congress, Ignatian Family Teach-In for Justice and will attend the AJCU Justice Conference this summer. I have reiterated this commitment to professional development at our annual retreat, and usually include a professional development goal in each person's annual performance appraisal. Conscious consideration is paid to applicants' familiarity with Ignatian spirituality for new positions.
- We are exploring the creation of a program like SEEL (Spiritual Exercises in Everyday Life) with St. Agnes and St. Ignatius parishes.
- We will hold an in-service this year for all UM staff on grief counseling, and will continue this practice more regularly.

- 4) Continue to attend to the spiritual dimension of UM signature programs such as retreats, service and immersion programs. Involve international students.

Response/Action Plan:

- In order to better integrate all of our student learning and formation opportunities, we are launching the I Am Jesuit Educated campaign this year to more clearly define and promote the spiritual dimensions of leadership formation we hope all of our students acquire.

5) Plan for graduate student outreach.

Response/Action Plan:

- This year we piloted a new program for graduate students and branch campuses that involved three “Theology on Tap” styled programs. We consulted with the Graduate Student Senate on these programs. They were sparsely attended, but we expect to meet again with the Graduate Student Senate, and propose continuing this series. Additional programming requires additional funding that we do not have at this time.

6) Desire for more Jesuit presence on campus, regular meeting with UM director and rector.

Response/Action Plan:

- I met with the rector and proposed we meet regularly. He declined my invitation to meet regularly because he’d rather not serve as the conduit between UM and the Jesuit community. Instead he wants to use his time to facilitate collaboration between all of the apostolates represented at Loyola House: St. Ignatius, St. Agnes, and USF.
- In terms of improving involvement of Jesuit priests in University Ministry programs, we agree as a staff that email is an ineffective means of communication. We are proposing that a member of the UM staff meet individually with individual Jesuits periodically to personally invite him to get involved in UM in an area specifically suited to his interests and availability.
- UM staff recognize that the Jesuit priests on campus are a key stakeholder group for us and all UM staff need to think of the Loyola House Jesuit Community in this way.

7) Outreach to Theology and Religious Studies Department.

Response/Action Plan:

- We will send the UM calendar of events and programs to the THRS department with an invitation to share on their syllabi. We will invite ourselves to attend a THRS department meeting once every two years.

8) Outreach to staff.

Response/Action Plan:

- Staff are already included in all of our faculty/staff programming. We were considering launching an Ignatian Staff Forum (modeled on the Ignatian Faculty Forum) next year but do not have the staff to lead it. More outreach and formation on mission for staff may have to come from the Mission Council.

9) Collaborate with St. Agnes and St. Ignatius parishes.

Response/Action Plan:

- We do collaborate on liturgy, music and reconciliation services with St. Ignatius Church. As mentioned above, there is interest in starting a spiritual direction training program among the two parishes with USF.

10) Develop strategy for engaging alumni.

Response/Action Plan:

- We do work collaboratively with our alumni office and have offered retreats and events for them in the past. Immersion trips frequently come up as an interest area. We will continue to develop this area as resources become available. Alumni outreach is one of our priority funding areas for our major gift officers.

11) Hire a chaplain from non-Christian traditions.

Response/Action Plan:

- We agree that this is a need and will look to creating a position as resources become available. This is also listed as a priority funding need on our development prospectus.

12) More orientation for development officers and admissions counselors.

Response/Action Plan:

- UM staff already lead conference calls on mission for development officers, and annual presentations for admissions counselors and ambassadors (tour guides). More can always be done in this area, but we already do a lot for these groups. This raises a question of whether it is solely the responsibility of UM staff to lead orientations and staff trainings on the Jesuit mission of USF, or if this is the role of the Mission Council.

The University Ministry 2016-2019 Strategic Plan fleshes out our action steps in each of our program areas in greater detail. This document is reviewed at least twice per year by the UM staff to determine our progress on meeting defined objectives, and to insert new goals as opportunities arise.

- 4. In the opinion of the external review committee is the department advancing the University's strategic initiatives and the divisional goals and commitments in the programs and services it offers?**

Yes. See the full self-study and committee report.

- 5. Is the department in compliance with professionally accepted standards? What best practices have been adopted and implemented?**

Yes. Best practices include strong partnerships with University departments, effective communication and outreach, collaboration on mission, commitment to diversity and inclusion, and strategic planning and assessment processes.

- 6. Does the department have adequate space, personnel and budget to carry out its programs and services?**

Additional staffing recommendations include a campus minister to serve non-Christian students and additional support in immersions.

- 7. Has the department identified appropriate learning outcomes and implemented assessment strategies to measure progress in this area?**

Yes. See complete self-study.

- 8. What is the timetable for the response to the external review committee's recommendations for program improvement? What can the Vice President's Office do to appropriately respond to the review?**

Some action steps were implemented immediately. Some are focused on the following two years. The UM strategic plan for 2016-2019 will be updated to incorporate the new action steps identified through the self-study.

- 9. What general comments or issues, if any, are crucial to understanding the reviewer's report?**

For additional information, please see the full report.