REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To: The University of San Francisco

Campus Visit

October 7-10, 2018

Team Roster
William Covino, Chair
President, California State University, Los Angeles

Jackie R. Donath, Assistant Chair
Professor Emerita, Department of Humanities and Religious Studies
California State University, Sacramento

Thomas Fleming
Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
Loyola Marymount University

Dennis Jacobs
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Santa Clara University

Tracy Poon Tambascia
Professor, Clinical Education
Rossier School of Education
University of Southern California

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. **Description of the Institution and Reaccreditation Process**

The University of San Francisco is the oldest institution of higher learning in San Francisco, and the 10th oldest Jesuit University in the nation. Founded in 1855, it is an urban university which describes itself as "pursuing academic excellence and social justice while building a diverse community in San Francisco." (*University of San Francisco Institutional Report*, March 8, 2018, p. 1.) The main, "Hilltop," campus is located on 55 acres near Golden Gate Park in San Francisco. In addition to the main campus, the University offers classes and programs at 11 additional locations: four in Northern California (Sacramento, San Jose, Santa Rosa and Pleasanton) and a Southern California campus in Orange County. The University also has locations in downtown San Francisco, including 101 Howard, at the San Francisco Presidio and in select Kaiser hospitals and Andersen Accounting offices. As of spring 2018, USF had six fully-online programs (Masters of Arts in Public Leadership, Master in Public Health, Doctor of Nursing Practice, RN-MS Nursing, LLM Taxation, and Master of Legal Studies in Taxation.) Twenty–six programs in the University's four graduate schools are accredited by nine 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 2006, the University was granted the Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Classification, in both categories: Curricular Engagement and Outreach and Partnerships, which was renewed for ten years by the Foundation in 2015. Additionally, in 2015, for the eighth consecutive year, USF was named to the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll by the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The University has seen significant growth in its enrollments since its last WASC accreditation in 2009, when it was granted a nine-year reaccreditation. In the fall of 2018, the University had a

total enrollment of 10723 students, a slight reduction from 2017's enrollment of 11,080. Fall 2018 enrollments included 6662 undergraduates (with the incoming first-year student enrollment reaching 1542, the second highest first-year enrollment in University of San Francisco history); 3979 graduate students (with an enrollment of 1161 first-year graduate students, 10% lower than 2017 and the lowest enrollment of first-year graduate students since 2014); 506 law students, and 79 "visiting" students.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

On December 18, 2017, the WSCUC appointed a review team to conduct the OSR, followed by a campus visit in 2018. Members of the team were: chair, William Covino, President of California State University, Los Angeles; assistant chair, Jackie R. Donath, Professor Emerita, Department of Humanities and Religious Studies, California State University, Sacramento; Thomas Fleming, Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Loyola Marymount University; Dennis Jacobs, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Santa Clara University, and Tracy Poon Tambascia, Professor, Clinical Education, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California. Richard Osborn, Vice President, WSCUC served as the Institutional Liaison.

On March 8, 2018, the University of San Francisco submitted its institutional report and supplemental materials. The team reviewed these materials and completed worksheets in preparation for an initial review. President Covino led a conference call during which the team discussed a consolidated worksheet and discussed issues and evidence it wished to take up during the Offsite Review (OSR.) The team met at the WASC offices in Alameda, California, on May 9 and 10, 2018 to conduct the OSR and to prepare Lines of Inquiry (LOI) for the campus visit scheduled for October 7-10, 2018. During a teleconference with the University of San Francisco, at the conclusion of the team meeting, President Covino confirmed that the team

recommended proceeding with the campus visit, reviewed the Lines of Inquiry with the

University president and campus accreditation team, and discussed the next steps. WSCUC

Liaison Richard Osborn submitted the Lines of Inquiry to the campus and the assistant chair

submitted requests for additional information needed by the team to prepare for the visit. The

team reviewed the additional materials provided by the University and held a pre-visit

conference call on September 14, 2018.

In preparation for the campus accreditation visit (AV) the team convened on Sunday,

October 7 to discuss the organization of the visit and some goals for the on-site conversations.

The accreditation visit began at 8am on Monday, October 8 and the team met with a wide

variety of campus stakeholders, including the University president and leadership team, faculty,

staff, students, and members of the Board of Trustees. Visit Liaison, Richard Osborn was also

present for the on-site visit, joined by Jamienne Studley, President of WSCUC, who observed the

team visit.

The team ended the visit on Wednesday, October 10, 2018 with a formal presentation of its

commendations and recommendations to the campus community.

C. **Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and**

   Supporting Evidence.

Following its review of the *Institutional Report*, the team concluded that the University of San

Francisco had prepared a report that was concise, well organized, and forthright, clearly

identifying areas where the institution was doing well and others where it was in the process of

improvement. The report was honest about challenges and its preparation had included broad

representation from the campus community. It also conveyed a strong campus-wide

commitment to the University's mission and community engagement, as well as a commitment

to place students at the center of the institution's educational and organizational initiatives. The

team agreed that the University of San Francisco had provided sufficient evidence for its actions, decision-making, and claims, while also recognizing the need to improve data gathering and analysis. The report clearly and seriously addressed the Criteria for Review (CFRs), as well as concerns from previous reviews and developments in on-going issues related to internal processes.

SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission Actions

The University's responses to the 2009 report have been substantive, thorough, and engaged. The University is to be commended for its candor and clarity in disclosing both achievements and challenges in the report and during the visit. Candor regarding challenges is represented at a number of points in the *Institutional Report*, in statements such as "the collection of assessment data is still inconsistent throughout the university, "and "communication, transparency, consistency, complaint management, and accountability can still be improved" (*USF Institutional Report*, pp. 33, 34). Such candor bolsters the University's conclusion that "it has been open and honest with WSCUC, and the University has been timely and consistent in its responses to all accreditation requests, policies, and procedures" (CFR 1.6.) *The Institutional Report* is, at all points, forthcoming and accurate (CFR 1.8.)

Recommendations in Theme 1 of the 2009 team report, focused on the broadening of an assessment culture, urged the development of a broader range of methods of measuring student learning, called for assessment of the core curriculum, and improved student awareness of learning outcomes. A significant delay in the broader development of the assessment of academic outcomes resulted from the discovery in 2014 that the assessment plan that the institution had put in place was unsustainable. A decentralized assessment plan is currently in place, supported by new administrative positions and the assignment of accountability at the

College and School level. Therefore, the broadening of an active and effective assessment culture recommended in 2009 is still an emerging, but earnest, process.

The elaboration of multiple measures with an emphasis on direct measures of student learning, called for in 2009, is in process, and is most fully evident in the College of Arts and Sciences. Some assessment programs in that College (see, for instance, Communication Studies) appear to still be relying, to some extent, on indirect outcomes that involve, for instance, self-reporting by students. At the same time, portfolios and capstone projects are being employed in growing numbers, especially in the College of Arts and Sciences (CFRs 2.3-2.5.)

The assessment of the core curriculum has been revised and was implemented recently, indicated by the submission of an initial assessment of two areas, Philosophy and Natural/Lab Sciences. Gaps in student learning are indicated in both areas, and the consequent deliberative process by the faculty will no doubt lead to revision. The assessment process in these instances appears to be sluggish, and the timeline from assessment to implementation of warranted changes is unclear. The integration of curricular and co-curricular learning outcomes, called for in 2009, is part of the program review of co-curricular programs, several of which have recently developed program learning outcomes. Student awareness of learning outcomes was cited as a concern. The 2018 *Institutional Report i*ndicates that outcomes are now on all syllabi, but does not supply additional evidence that student awareness has improved.

Theme 2 of the 2009 team report contained recommendations focused on the impact of faculty workload on particular groups, and the impact of economic diversity on student progress and opportunity. The team report indicated that full-time faculty, women faculty, and faculty of color may have been unduly burdened by advising and student support. The institution has responded with an increase in the numbers of faculty in all of these categories, and concludes in the *Institutional Report* that the perceived burden has lessened.

The institution cites strong retention and graduation rates across the student population, as well as strong participation in service learning courses, in response to the 2009 recommendation that the institution look at the impact of economic diversity on student progress.

Theme 3 recommendations focused on fuller faculty participation in the assessment of international programs, improvement in the diversity of students participating in study abroad programs, the benchmarking of international program accomplishments, and the improvement of external reviewers of co-curricular programs. The Provost created, and recently led an unsuccessful search for, the position of Vice Provost for Global and Experiential Education, who will lead work related to these recommendations, along with a Faculty Advisory Board for Internationalization, and the Workgroup on the International Student Experience. In the meantime, the Center for Global Education has participated in international benchmarking initiatives, and concluded that USF students exceeded the achievements of comparison institutions in key areas (CFR 2.6.)

Recommendations on Student Retention focused on the assessments delivered to the University from the Committee on Retention, and the support of USF 101 for first year students. The institution indicated that assessment plans for committee recommendations are in progress, and that the pilot results for USF 101 are promising and the program is expanding. The projected impact of USF 101 on retention was demonstrated in materials received after the *Institutional Report* had been submitted, and they support expansion.

In 2010, WSCUC cited two areas for additional attention: a revised 3-year comprehensive assessment plan, and evidence of an increase in full-time faculty, notably faculty from underrepresented groups. In its 2014 interim report, the University presented a new decentralized assessment plan, which is detailed throughout the current report (CFR 2.7.) The number and diversity of full-time faculty has also improved. The overall number increased by

nearly 28% (with a 41% increase in female faculty), with a 10.5% increase in African American faculty, a 74% increase in Hispanic faculty, and a 61.9% increase in Asian American faculty. The percentage of sections taught by full-time faculty increased from 50.4% in fall 2014 to 54.6% in fall 2017.

B. **Component 2: Review under the WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives The University has a clearly defined purpose and has intentionally aligned its educational objectives with its mission. This alignment is clearly documented in the materials prepared for the visiting team and in discussions with University personnel and the Board of Trustees (CFRs 1.1, 1.2.) USF engaged in very open conversations with the visiting team and provided the team with all of the documentation that was requested. The team's review of the documents evidenced a very complete and forthright evaluation of where the University is, and the internal reviews provided the University with future objectives that it needs to accomplish as it goes forward (CFR 1.6.)

The University's students are very diverse, which is a point of mission-based pride that it celebrates. It is committed to educating economically disadvantaged students as is evidenced by the number of Pell-eligible students enrolled at the University of San Francisco and its high first year undergraduate domestic discount rate of 48.5%. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions The *Institutional Report* focused on the issue of rigor within educational programs; the breadth and depth of the curriculum; differentiated standards for undergraduate and graduate work; stated learning

outcomes and regular program review processes; and timely completion for all students, including those who transfer into the University (CFRs 2.1.-2.2.) In all of these areas, USF faculty and staff noted that while some elements of the reviewed items were done well, there could be improvement, and plans are underway to strengthen key areas (CFR 2.7.)

Standard 2 was reviewed by a University committee of engaged faculty and student life administrators, and closely examined Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1 — 2.7), Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8, 2.9) and Student Learning and Success (CFRs 2.10 — 2.14.) Preliminary reflective comments included the need to help the campus community understand the data decision-making process used by University leadership, and the need to clarify academic advising roles of faculty and staff advisors (CFR 2.12.) The comments and evidence of the institution's review for Standard 2 reflect a thoughtful and fairly critical evaluation of what the campus feels is done well, and what remains to be completed. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability The University's Cabinet serves as the operating budget committee and makes its recommendations to the President for his final determination on the budget to be presented to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The University's administrative management appears to be the only cohort that is not under a collective bargaining agreement. The tenured, term and adjunct faculty are members of collective bargaining units. The unions have boards, which interact with the administration on a wide variety of topics; however, USF does not have an Academic Senate, which concerns the team, as this lack undermines the faculty's ability to exercise effective academic leadership (CFR 3.10.)

See below (Component 7) for a detailed discussion of Standard 3 and the team's finding of University's lack of compliance with CFR 3.10. Aside from this issue, the team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning and Improvement The team reviewed the written materials provided by the University, studied various reports that the University had posted on its website, and met with the Assessment Committee and key academic leaders during the site visit. The University has adopted a number of quality assurance practices (program review, assessment of student learning outcomes, real-time dashboards of institutional data, etc.), and the senior administration, deans, department chairs, program directors, and trustees use the results of such studies to guide institutional planning and implement improvements (CFR4.1, 4.2) The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard.

Nonetheless, the team has identified a number of ways in which the University can improve its practices around assessment and program review:

- The University's practice of Academic Program Review would benefit from greater attention to the assessment of student learning outcomes, so that measurable program improvements could be monitored over time;

- Faculty buy-in to assessment is not universal, and the self-study concedes that "a full culture of assessment has not yet been achieved." The University should introduce professional development opportunities for faculty and staff engaged in the assessment of learning outcomes in both curricular and co-curricular programs;

- The University has implemented systematic and robust assessments of student learning across the core curriculum, but the University has yet to introduce any changes to address shortcomings in measured learning outcomes;

- The University would benefit from improved methods in systematically surveying alumni in order to create a fuller picture of the impact of a USF education.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators The IEEI was complete and organized among College and Arts and Sciences, School of Education, School of Management, School of Nursing and Health Professions, and School of Law. Programs in each school or college identified key assessments in the form of exams, assignments, surveys, or other means of evaluating program learning outcomes for students completing the respective programs. The process and use of data were also noted for each, along with dates for each academic program review (CFR 2.7.) The chart was comprehensive and the systems for program review were well developed. However, some of the methods described such as syllabus review, are typically not viewed as effective means for evaluating student learning (CFR 2.6.)

Professional programs with additional accreditation or licensure requirements were more specific in their response to evaluation of educational effectiveness indicators. Some programs in the College of Arts and Sciences will need to further refine their approaches and identify more effective means of learning or program outcome assessments (CFR 2.3, 2.4.)

Compliance with Federal Requirements See Appendices

C. **Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees**

It very clear that the University of San Francisco, as a whole, believes the meaning of its degrees, both undergraduate and graduate, rests in the institution's core mission:

> A USF degree calls on more than 500 years of Jesuit tradition and unites academic excellence with social justice. The outcomes achieved by students are far more than what they learn and are able to do as a result of their degrees; the outcomes also determine who they become as people. The university community understands the

> unique educational experiences offered by USF, and the themes of social responsibility and justice are apparent and guide all its activities (*University of San Francisco Institutional Report,* p.27.)

The University community referenced here certainly includes faculty, staff, students and alumni of the main campus, other locations (Off-Campus Site Reviews, Appendix, p. 39) and distance education program faculty and staff (Distance Education Review, Appendix, p. 49.)

The *Institutional Report* identified the foundational nature and persistent relevance of the University's sense of the meaning of its degrees to the life of the institution and its educational efforts by referencing the *USF 2028 Planning Document*, adopted in 2008 to guide institutional strategic planning over two decades. That document offered an articulate, focused, and detailed description of the values of a USF education in the context of the University's mission and Jesuit foundation (CFRs 2.2- 2.2b:)

> In this tradition, education aims at fully developing every dimension of a person's humanity---intellectual, moral, social, religious and aesthetic---so that our graduates, in addition to mastering the requisite body of knowledge, think clearly, analyze critically, communicate effectively, evidence a disciplined sensitivity to human suffering, construct lives of purpose and meaning and work effectively with persons of varying background and cultures for the common good (*USF 2028 Planning Document*, p.1.)

USF has undertaken a number of initiatives to support and evaluate the effectiveness of this vision of education. In the process of doing the self-study for the *Institutional Report*, the University held focus groups and retreats with community members. One interesting outcome of those conversations was that while undergraduate programs, in general, seemed clearly aligned with the mission, graduate programs were seen as less mission-aligned. New ILOs explicitly linked to the mission were developed for undergraduate programs and were formally adopted in 2014, reducing their number from 20 to 7. Similarly mission-linked ILOs are being developed for graduate education, though a formal timeline has not been developed.

Additionally, the recently revised program review process includes explicit reference to the mission and requires departments and programs to specifically speak to the issue of mission alignment. External consultants have consistently commented positively on this issue in their reports. NSSE data confirms that students feel they have grown in mission-relevant ways.

While the *Institutional Report* celebrated the strength and centrality of its mission to life and in the USF community, it also acknowledged the still nascent nature of its ability to assess the quality of the degrees it confers (CFR2.1.) While the institution reports that there is consensus among the stakeholders that the University will know "its degrees have quality if students are achieving outcomes and competencies at expected levels," the mechanisms and structures to define, articulate, and assess "expected levels" of achievement at graduation are still emerging *(University of San Francisco Institutional Report,* p.31.) As a first step, programs and colleges have begun to map their program learning outcomes (PLOs) to the University's Core Graduation Competencies and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs.) Thus far, the undergraduate majors in the School of Management and the School of Nursing and Health Professions have completed the process and the College of Arts and Sciences has made significant progress in this effort (CFR 2.3.)

A similar effort, taking advantage of the self-study required for reaccreditation, was undertaken in fall 2015 to review the currency and soundness of the Core Curriculum. A Core Assessment Working Group (CAWG) was formed, with representation from the disciplinary groups that form the Core. With guidance from an external consulting firm, the Committee considered the processes and procedures in place since its last revision in 2002 and developed a timeline for assessing the Core. The first assessments of Core Areas D1 (Philosophy) and B2 (Natural or Lab Science) were the first to be assessed in summer 2017 (CFR 2.4.) The results of

those assessments are discussed in Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning core

competencies, and standards of performance at graduation.

A final concern related to a holistic understanding of the degrees offered by USF is the

matter of integrity. The University has defined degree integrity as follows:

> USF degrees have integrity when the curriculum is aligned at all levels, including within
> the degree and with learning outcomes at various stages of the degree. Moreover, a
> degree has integrity if it delivers what is expected by stakeholders, both internal and
> external *(University of San Francisco Institutional Report*, p. 33.)

The University of San Francisco has been working in a focused and developmental way to

improve the mission alignment of both its undergraduate and graduate degrees. The University

also seems to be developing its awareness of the need to define, assess and adjust its

expectations for student performance at various stages of degree attainment. Given the

primacy of its mission and interest in serving underserved populations, both in its student body

and larger culture, USF must at once expand and focus its efforts to ensure that all its

stakeholders can be confident in the meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees it awards.

There is a potential challenge inherent in meeting the metrics of graduation rates, retention,

and time to degree and the foundations of mission and quality on which the University has

built its educational programs. The team felt that the dimensions identified by the institutional

report section of MQID and the conversations in which it participated on campus are a good

first step to portraying the uniqueness of a University of San Francisco educational experience,

but felt that further work should be done to arrive at a more coherent definition of the

meaning of a USF education at all degree levels (CFR 2.2.)

D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, standards of

performance at graduation

The focus of faculty work on teaching was evident during the accreditation visit. Long-term full-time and part-time faculty spoke convincingly of their dedication to teaching and the importance of student learning. Several commented on their decision to work at USF particularly since teaching and students were prioritized (CFR 2.8) with statements, like "This is not an R1 university that focuses on big government grants" (CFR 2.9.) A "learning centered culture" was present and visible on campus (CFR 4.3.)

The Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) was noted many times, especially by the co-director, who is a full time, term faculty member. Several faculty talked about initiatives from CTE that brought faculty together to improve pedagogy and practice. The *Institutional Report* noted that CTE also provides training and support for faculty who wish to develop skills and competencies for online teaching (CFR 3.3.)

Program Learning Outcomes The *Institutional Report* noted that all programs had learning outcomes (CFR 2.3, 2.4.) The new system of decentralized assessment coordinators and faculty has generated energy and focus around evaluation activities. Many faculty who participated in the accreditation visit reported honestly that while not all faculty are "on board," many more now understand the benefit of using assessment to better understand what their students are learning and how to improve their teaching. While the IEEI noted that each program not only had identified LOs, but also key assessments, the reality appears to be that this area is under-developed and will require more work. At several points during the accreditation visit, when asked how faculty or program leaders would know if they met learning goals and outcomes, there was silence, or an example of an interim assessment – or a course evaluation – was offered.

While noteworthy, it appears that much of the assessment activity is examining interim learning goals or outcomes (for example, a particular concept in one course); examining

current needs (the Student Success Survey); or that the process identifying or framing outcomes is conflated with the idea of assessing whether those outcomes are met. Others point to alumni surveys to provide evidence of meeting program outcomes. It is likely that a number of different approaches will be needed to assess program outcomes. Professional schools are at an advantage in this area as professional accreditation and licensure or exam requirements may have helped focus not on the desired learning outcomes, but may also serve as a means of assessing it (CFR 4.1.)

Time-to-completion data is gathered and evaluated for all online and on campus programs, disaggregated by race, gender and other demographic information. USF's overall graduation rates are strong (77% for 2011 cohort) and has managed to close the graduation gap found on many campuses for minority student populations. USF's undergraduate Latinx population graduates at a higher rate than White students, but more work needs to be done in improving international students' six-year graduation rates, which is far lower than the average at 68%, and African American students, at 72%. Overall, USF's six-year graduation rates, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, are well above the average for four-year, private non-profit institutions, but the University's commitment to equity may prompt a closer examination to close the achievement gap for minority student groups (CFR 2.10.)

Undergraduate Core Competencies The *Institutional Report* noted that the five core competencies (information literacy, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, oral communication, written communication) were assessed across the three schools that serve undergraduate students. The response rate for information literacy was small, with a very low response rate. The samples for quantitative reasoning were more substantial, and critical thinking, oral communication, and written communication evaluations were more robust as well. The review process for these last three core competencies was labor-intensive, and it is

not clear how the University will institutionalize or routinize future assessments of core competencies beyond this "pilot." Future evaluations will need to include larger samples. In addition, there needs to be focused discussion on how to address identified deficiencies uncovered by the evaluations, specifically the weaker evaluations found for oral communication in the three areas of CAS and the School of Management (CFR 2.2a.)

E. **Component 5: Student Success, Student learning, retention, graduation**

The *Institutional Report'*s examination of Scholarship and Creative Activity was fairly brief, with some exploration of how service, research and other practitioner-focused activity adds to the educational experience of USF students. Team meetings with full time and part time faculty, particularly those in professional programs, indicated the importance and value of connections between industry and curricular relevance. Faculty also talked about student involvement in their research projects, internships, and other ways in which their service or research activity benefitted student learning (CFR 2.8.)

Discussion of student learning and success in the *Institutional Report* focused on the value placed on data in decision-making, and how some segments of the University may not be clear on the value of data (CFR 4.3.) In addition, the *Institutional Report* noted the importance of student services, such as advisement through CASA, disability services, or the bias response team, to helping USF students feel supported and for a strong campus climate (CFR 2.13.) The few students who attended the open forum expressed few concerns and issues, and noted they generally felt safe and supported. Graduate student engagement and student services, outside of school-based supports, may be an area of need, which was expressed by students at the open forum (CFR 2.11.) The report also noted the need for better support for transfer students, a point that was reiterated by transfer students at the student open forum.

 Resources for transfer students continue to evolve, and are benefiting from a newly-formed

Transfer Student Advisory Committee, which may be responding, in part, to a 2017 student

government resolution calling for advisors who are aware of transfer student needs (CFR 2.14.)

Emerging initiatives in this connection include a transfer-specific summer orientation, a

transfer-specific USF 101 course, a web page focused on transfer student resources, and a

student club for transfer students (Transfernation.)

 Information about student support services is comprehensive and accessible on the web.

This includes information on service learning, healthcare, psychological counseling, housing and

residential life, tutorial centers, employment, career services, intercultural life, disability

services, undocumented student resources, veteran's affairs, and financial aid. A PDF version of

the *Student Athlete Handbook* is available online, last updated for 2015-16. The University,

through Student Life, staffs a Center for Academic and Student Achievement, and assigns each

student a success coach who provides comprehensive advice, guidance and academic

probation support.

 The Student Life administrators who participated in the accreditation visit meetings were

clearly committed to student success, and alignment of student development leadership with

the mission and values of the University (CFR 2.13.) However, fully developed assessment

practices for student life programs and outcomes appear to be at an early stage, with more

work and conversation needed for outcomes assessment. Student Life leaders are committed

to this work, and have already completed many departmental program reviews. These

programs align with the work of curricular programs through their work in CASA and

Residential Life, but Student Life assessments will benefit from not only evaluation of co-

curricular outcomes, but also a plan for using assessed data for longer term strategic planning

and improvement (CFRs 2.11, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4.)

The campus visit demonstrated that Institutional Learning Outcomes are established and widely understood by University administrators, and by many department and program heads, and are incorporated into the program review process (CFR 1.2.) The process of mapping institutional outcomes onto program outcomes is ongoing, with the accomplishment of this notably represented by the BSN and Management programs, and program progress toward this goal generally available on the "My USF" web page. Academic leadership has noted the importance of program review evolving to an articulation of assessment, program review, and planning, and to become, through those connections, more action-oriented (CFR 2.7.) Two approaches to reaching this goal that were repeatedly voiced during the campus visit included: increased support for department- and program-level development of expertise in assessment; and improvement in the lines of communication between academic leadership to staff and faculty, which the team felt may be improved through a formal deliberative faculty body in regular communication with academic and university leadership about curricular and student success matters; several academic administrators deeply involved in assessment and program review mentioned the lack of a "formal body to reach out to" that would help establish "partners in the faculty."

> RECOMMENDATION: *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.)

At the same time, the connection of mission and values to the curriculum is widely and enthusiastically embraced. Students repeatedly stated that it is the Jesuit mission that brought them to this University. Both administrators and faculty enthusiastically affirmed that mission is in the fabric of the institution, and associated its presence in the curriculum primarily with the service learning course requirement that inculcates an ethic of service to the community.

Notably, an immersion program available to faculty and staff involves travel to other countries

(El Salvador was one example) to learn about the location through oral histories; and an

orientation series for new employees, which stresses vision and values, has been offered four

times a year since 2002. One of the most striking indicators of the widely understood

importance of mission is a two-year orientation to Jesuit education that is offered to new

members of the Board of Trustees, during which, as President Fitzgerald says, they develop a

"felt understanding of mission within their vast diversity."

The institution offers a comprehensive definition of student success as "a shared

expectation that goes beyond academic outcomes and is organized around the following areas:

holistic learning and education, student retention and persistence, attainment of educational

objectives, academic achievement, and student advancement," as well as a widely propagated

"Vision, Mission, and Values" statement that emphasizes the qualities of a successful university

and its students, who experience "academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice" (CFR

2.13.) In addition to the primacy of mission in the implementation of this definition, retention

and graduation rates reflect a commendable commitment to student success and to closing the

achievement gap.

Retention and graduation rates are publicly available on the "My USF" web page, and fully

disaggregated in the *Institutional Report*. Graduation rates have increased significantly since

the last WSCUC visit: six-year rates have moved from 71% to 77%, well above the national

average for comparable universities, and USF ranked in the top 10 for universities with the

same Carnegie classification. The unit redemption rate on the WSCUC Graduation Rate

Dashboard has increased from 83% to 88%. These rates are especially commendable

considering that USF recruits and enrolls a student population that is 30% Pell-eligible. Further,

the University was recognized as second in the nation by the Education Trust in 2017 for

graduating Latino students at a 4.4% higher rate than White students.

Program review policies, plans, and results are also available on the "My USF" page,

along with student learning outcomes, and assessment information for each academic program,

updated on an annual basis. The University program review policy requires that reviews take

place every 5-8 years, and the current cycles and review results are available online. In general,

data on program goals and student learning are fully represented and accessible, while an

emphasis on applying learning assessment to action is still evolving in a number of cases.

A full picture of the impact of a USF education is still evolving. Student success is also

represented in an Alumni Outcomes Survey administered in summer 2017, for the first time in

five years. The response rate was 9%, with positive responses about the attainment of

educational goals and career preparation. There are plans to improve the response rate,

administer the survey annually, and to get more direct evidence of student satisfaction. An

Employment Work Group was convened in 2017 to work on improvements in the alumni

survey process. Some programs also gather data on their graduates during program review,

and yield longer term data than the university alumni survey. The *USF Fact Book* includes

information on student achievement, but the specific sources of this information are unclear.

Graduation rates for Black/African-American students continue to lag behind those of other

groups, though they exceed the national average by 16 percentage points. The University has

responded to these lower graduation rates with a widely appreciated BASE Program (Black

Achievement, Success, and Engagement), which includes a Black Resource Center, a Black Living

Learning Community, Black Student Orientation, and a Black Scholars Program.

F. **Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence**

The *Institutional Report*'s review of Teaching and Learning offered details on a variety of activities and topics, with no single issue standing out. The most important points were related to the assessment of core competencies, the creation of objectives and learning outcomes for graduate programs (CFR 2.2b,) and the role of program review in supporting program improvement and student learning (CFR 2.7.) All of these points were touched in various meetings with the team during the accreditation visit, with deans, associate deans and faculty emphasizing the importance of teaching, the focus on student learning, and offering examples of how the program review process has offered data and insight how to improve both (CFR 3.10.) The program review process had been routinized and was referenced in both the *Institutional Report* and the accreditation visit as a good source of information for faculty and department chairs (CFR 2.7.)

The University has a well-established pattern of conducting academic program reviews (APR.) The majority of programs in the schools of education, law, management, and nursing and health professions maintain professional accreditation and do not undergo the USF program review process. For these programs, the University has developed a series of crosswalks to demonstrate the connection between professional accreditation standards and the WSCUC accreditation standards. The programs in the College of Arts and Sciences are not accredited by professional organizations; therefore, the College relies heavily on APR to evaluate its programs every 5-8 years (CFRs 2.7 and 4.3.) Following each APR, the dean meets with the program's faculty to develop an action plan to respond to recommendations in the APR. Starting a year ago, the dean and program faculty now review progress against the action plan three years after the APR as a mid-term check on how the plan is being implemented and

what challenges or issues may have arisen. The University's record of "closing the loop"

suggests that the most common results of program review have been curricular revision and

increases in program allocations (i.e., faculty lines, space, and/or funds) (CFR 4.7.) The

institution would benefit from requiring that the APR process pay greater attention to the

assessment of student learning outcomes, so that measurable program improvements could be

monitored over time (CFR 2.6.) The team is confident that the University has a robust system of

APR in place with appropriate follow-through (CFR 2.7.)

In 2015, the University restarted its system of program reviews for co-curricular programs,

and approximately 1/3 of the co-curricular units have completed program review to date. (CFR

2.11.) It is still too early to see the impact of the co-curricular program reviews at USF, but like

the APR process, the University would benefit from (a) greater clarity in distinguishing between

goals for student learning and student learning outcomes, and (b) greater attention to the

assessment of student learning outcomes in the co-curricular program review process.

The University is working to make up for lost ground in developing and implementing

systematic and robust assessments of student learning across the core curriculum. Of the

eleven core areas, only two areas (philosophy and natural sciences) have been completely

assessed and reviewed to date. The assessment of student learning outcomes in Philosophy

revealed significant shortcomings in demonstrated competencies. Unfortunately, the

University has not yet had time to introduce any changes to the philosophy curriculum or

pedagogy and to measure whether improvements in learning outcomes could be achieved.

(CFR 4.4.) The University will not complete its assessment of the entire core curriculum until

spring 2020. Hence, this matter should be revisited by WSCUC in a few years.

Over the past four years, the University shifted from a complex centralized model of

conducting assessment to a more distributed model of assessment that relies on faculty

assessment leaders in every school. The professional programs have been guided by the regular practice of meeting their professional accreditation standards, but many other pockets of the University do not have well-developed learning outcomes. Faculty buy-in to assessment is not universal, and the self-study concedes that "a full culture of assessment has not yet been achieved" (CFR 4.3.)

Despite the increasing understanding of the overall use and purpose of assessment, full understanding of the evaluation of learning outcomes, by course or program, appears to be thin. In some programs, "closing the loop statements" are often rather skeletal or boilerplate, and more work may be needed here (CFR 2.7.) In several conversations, when asked for examples of how student learning was assessed, the team was offered examples of interim assessments or needs assessments. Often, the process of collecting data was offered in lieu of an example of how departments or faculty sought to assess learning or outcomes.

> RECOMMENDATION: *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* (CFR 4.4.)

After a five-year break, the University administered a new Alumni Outcomes Survey in summer 2017 to alumni who graduated in 2015 and 2012 (two and five years post-graduation.) With only a 9% response rate across these two cohorts, one cannot generalize the data from this one administration of the Alumni Outcomes Survey. Further improvements in the survey instrument and systematic administration of the survey over several years will improve the University's ability to draw inferences from this critical source of data.

> RECOMMENDATION: *Improve methods of systematically surveying alumni in order to*
>
> *create a fuller picture of the impact of a USF education* (CFR 4.1.)

The Center for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (CIPE) has created powerful tools to support an integrated model of evidence-based decision making for the University's leadership, program chairs, and directors. Most notably, the CIPE has developed an insightful series of real-time dashboards within Tableau that gives the user the ability to customize queries and see immediate results (CFR 4.2.) This expanded analytical capability has provided decision makers with data, trend lines, and visualizations to inform strategic decisions about the deployment of resources. This advance represents a "seismic shift" in the University's ability to leverage data for planning and optimal operations.

G. **Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for changing higher ed.**

   Environment

The University of San Francisco is financially stable as indicated by a strong balance sheet, unqualified independent financial audits and a Moody's Rating of A-2. The University has a strong Consolidated Statement of Financial Position (aka Balance Sheet) with investments, cash and cash equivalents of approximately $500 million. It has total net assets of approximately $803 million of which $454 million is unrestricted (CFR 3.4.)

The University has developed budgeting processes which link the budget to its mission and finances. The operating budget is under the primary oversight of the Vice Provost for Institutional Budget, Planning & Analytics. The President's Cabinet serves as the University Budget Committee. The budget, after the President approves it, is presented to the Board of Trustees for their approval. Discussions with the Trustees indicated they were very aware of the University's financial situation and how its financial plans were operating (CFR 3.4.) The University does engage multiple constituencies, including its Board, faculty and staff in reflection and the planning processes based upon data and evidence. It is through those

processes that it is able to develop plans and align its purposes, mission and resources to chart its future direction (CFR 4.6.)

The University has a clear understanding of its financial realities. An example of the understanding is demonstrated through its budget and development (fund raising) processes and efforts. The University develops a current operating budget and a five-year forecast. It also has a capital plan that prioritizes its needs. The most immediate need--student housing--is being addressed by the construction of a 660-bed residential complex. As these plans are being developed, they also appear to be informed by a Capital campaign that is currently in a silent phase (CFR 4.7.)

Despite a basically sound bottom line, and sound practices and processes, the University has identified financial vulnerabilities, due to a variety of factors, which are described below as concerns:

- A high dependence upon student-based revenue is a significant vulnerability. The University of San Francisco is a private university with a high cost of attendance (undergraduate tuition and fees of $42,634 and estimated other expenses of $19,050, for a total of $61,684 per year before financial aid.) The University is dependent upon net tuition and fees and auxiliary revenues associated with the residence and dining fees, to provide approximately 90% or more of the operating budget revenues. (Note: the Consolidated Statement of Activities for the University does not separate operating and non-operating activities, which results in an estimate of the operating budget revenues for calculation purposes.) The endowment payout ($12.956 million of which $6.634 million is for financial aid—approximately 1.6% of gross tuition and fees) and the unrestricted contributions both provide support for approximately 3.8% each of the

operating expenses. (Note: the 2017 NACUBO survey of endowment payouts for 507

private institutions indicates the average percentage of the operating budget funded by

the endowment is 9.6 %.) Financial aid for its first year undergraduate domestic

students is approximately 48.5% for fiscal 2018, which represents an improvement from

fiscal 2017's rate of approximately 52%. The University is able to provide that financial

aid support by having a significant percentage (approximately 15%) of foreign students

who are primarily full pay students. It was stated approximately 50% of the foreign

students were from China, which the University considers as a vulnerability, due to the

concentration of students from a single foreign country. It is addressing this vulnerability

by reducing its dependency (previously significantly above 50%) upon Chinese students

and increasing recruiting in other areas of Asia (e.g. India, Indonesia, Thailand) (CFR 3.4.)

As mentioned above, the University is highly dependent upon student-related tuition,

fees, and auxiliary services associated with residence halls and food services. This lack of

diversification is a concern and one the University is addressing through increasing its

fund raising efforts (CFR 3.4.) Current donor support for financial aid so approximately

$3.577 million, in addition to which, approximately $705,000 is received in government

grants for financial aid (see Note 11 to the *Consolidated Financial Statements*.) Other

than government grants for financial aid, the University's grant revenue is low

(approximately $339,000 for research and $345,000 for other items (*Schedule of*

Expenditures of Federal Awards, pp. 36-37.)

- The availability of affordable housing for students, staff and faculty is another financial

  vulnerability the University has identified. It is addressing the student housing needs by

  the construction of a 606-bed student residential facility. The construction of this $140

  million project began in late July 2018. The University is expecting to finance the project

through the issuance of tax-exempt bonds through CEFA and anticipates the bond

financing will be completed in November 2018. The University provides a home

mortgage financing assistance to certain faculty and staff (CFR 3.4.)

- The University's Law School has experienced a dramatic decline in JD students and an

  ever-increasing need for financial aid to attract students, which is reflective of the

  national trends in legal education over the past five years. Additionally, the Law School

  has seen its students' bar passage rate fall significantly below the California mean and

  its post-graduate employment rate is below its peers. As a result, the USF Law School

  has become unranked by *U.S. News and World Report.* A further consequence of these

  factors has been that the Law School is experiencing operating losses despite having its

  internal contribution requirement for University services decreased. The University Law

  School discussed its financial situation with the Accreditation Committee of the

  American Bar Association and presented its financial plan through FY 2022. Under the

  plan, the deficits will be funded from accumulated Law School reserves and additional

  support from the University. University management has implemented the plan. The

  gross revenues for the Law School approximate 6.2% of the gross revenues of the

  University and the net operating impact is substantially lower. The University appears to

  have the balance sheet strength to support the financial requirements of its law school

  as the financial plan is implemented (CFR 3.4.) Finally, the University recently appointed

  an interim dean for the Law School and the law faculty are introducing changes to the

  curriculum to better prepare its students to take and pass the California Bar

  Examination. However, it is too early to determine if the curriculum changes will

  improve the bar passage and post-graduate employment rates.

RECOMMENDATION: *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, and 4.5.)

- The University of San Francisco has seven collective bargaining units under contract with the University and its bookstore and food provider have additional collective bargaining units for their employees. The University has been unionized since at least the mid-1970s. It was indicated by the administration that labor relations with the unions are considered good. The contract for the full time faculty (tenured) is a six-year contract, which has a guaranteed labor rate escalations in it of 3% per year, for the next two years, and then increasing to 4% per year in subsequent years. The increased rates are not contractually dependent upon the enrollments or other financial considerations. Additionally, it was indicated, by the University's Director of Labor Relations, that a number of the union contracts have clauses in them that will increase the compensation percentage if another bargaining unit receives a greater percentage increase in a particular year than was in the agreement. Thus, it appears that for the contracts that have those clauses, all employees, across the bargaining units, will move upward to the highest agreed-upon rate (CFR 3.10.) The University's operating budget process includes a five year forecast, which includes compensation and benefit information by year for its financial planning process. The other key operating budget drivers (e.g. debt service) are also included in the forecast (CFRs 3.4, 3.7.)

H. **COMPONENT 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes   NA**

I. **COMPONENT 9: Reflection and Plans for the Future**

In its *Institutional Report*, USF is candid about the issues of what it describes as, "internal growth and external demographic, economic, political and demographic factors," which have had a significant effect on the University's efforts to improve its educational efforts. In its reflective essay, USF describes itself as financially sound; engaged with its Master Plan; and developing more nimble enrollment and annual operating budget processes to ensure the institution's alignment with its strategic planning needs and goals. Its primary emphases continue to reflect its commitment to its core mission as a Jesuit institution: to remain student-centered and focus on the development of the whole personhood of its degree holders. As a part of its commitment to the student experience, the University plans to build more housing for students on a portion of the "Hilltop" campus property.

USF also acknowledged that the self-study process revealed a lack of knowledge on the part of the campus community about the processes of strategic planning and financial priorities, which was reinforced several times during campus conversations with faculty and staff. This issue seems to permeate the campus, is often expresses as an administration "failure to live up to the Jesuit mission," especially as new initiatives, such as the development of a School of Engineering and the purchase of the Star Route Farms, and the development of an Honors College move forward. Faculty and staff groups, along with some administrators, noted that 1) the ambitious and complex Magis project, which aims to involve the whole campus in brainstorming improvements in innovation, collaboration, and efficiencies, has not been as transparent, fully communicated and discussed, or clearly articulated as it could be; and 2) that the Campus Climate Survey reveals reveals a degree of weak confidence in administrative

oversight and priorities. The Magis project itself concludes openly that improved communication and dialogue is a campus-wide issue.

> Recommendation: *Develop formal, timely and informative channels of communication that allow for advice and dialogue across the campus prior to major decision-making and implementation* (CFRS 3.7, 4.2, 4.3.)

As a number of the most recent projects mentioned above are not specifically a part of the 20-year *USF 2028 Planning Document*, the University could benefit from some more public and consultative discussion of shorter range goals and clarify how these efforts align resource allocations, strategic planning, and mission.

> Recommendation: *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* (CFR 3.7 4.5, 4.6, 4.7.)

The Team wishes to encourage the University of San Francisco to continue on its path of service to its students and the community, while finding ways to deepen the engagement of its excellent faculty and staff in the good work that is underway.

SECTION III: FDININGS, COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations:

- A well-articulated commitment to integrating the University's mission into all aspects of the institution's life and educational efforts;
- Retention and graduation rates that reflect a commitment to student success and to closing the achievement gap;

- Candor and clarity in disclosing both achievements and challenges in the report and during the visit;

- The collaborative spirit and resourcefulness of cross-institutional leadership teams, to address major institutional challenges and opportunities;

- Proactive responses to a range of financial issues facing the institution, including open communication between University leadership and the Board of Trustees;

- The implementation of appropriate technologies to identify and solve problems at the institutional and program level, and to a support student success;

- The commitment to orient and engage new Trustees deeply in the mission of the institution as it pertains to their role;

Recommendations:

- 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 ;)

- 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;)

- 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 :)

- 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;)

- Develop formal, timely and informative channels of communication, that allow for advice and dialogue across the campus prior to major decision-making and implementation (CFRs 3.7, 4.2, 4.3;)

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

SECTION IV: APPENDICES

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Where is the policy located? https://myusf.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/usf_credit_hour_policy_0.pdf
	Comments: USF's policy on the credit hour is consistent with the definition established by the Department of Education.
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Over the past four years, academic departments conducted comprehensive reviews of the credit hour assignments of their courses. New courses are reviewed during their approval stage. The credit hour assignments are also reviewed as part of the periodic curriculum review process.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: The online class search system provides the specific hours during which each course meets per week.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? both
	What degree level(s)? Masters and Doctorate
	What discipline(s)? Nursing, Public Health
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: The course syllabi were comparable in content to the in-class versions of the same course.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 5
	What kinds of courses? Practicum, Internship, Clinical Lab
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors, Masters, and Doctorate
	What discipline(s)? Counseling Psychology, Public Administration, Sports Management, Data Science, Nursing
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: The syllabi provided thorough descriptions of expectations for these courses that were commensurate with the units awarded.
Sample program information (catalog,	How many programs were reviewed? 3
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Undergraduate science, masters in law, clinical psych.

website, or other program materials)	What degree level(s)? B.S., L.L.M., Psy.D.
	What discipline(s)? Chemistry, Law, Counseling Psychology
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: The academic programs were rigorous, current with the discipline, and had requirements consistent with similar programs taught at other institutions.

Review Completed By: Dennis Jacobs

Date: Oct. 9, 2018

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: The institution is compliant with federal guidelines on recruiting domestic students.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? X❑ YES NO
	Comments: The University does provide information on the length of time to degree, and it communicates the annual cost for tuition and other living expenses in the upcoming year. However, the institution does not forecast the cost of attendance in out years, and therefore it doesn't estimate the overall cost of the degree for multi-year degree programs.
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ❑ YES ■ NO
	Comments: Although USF does post the employment rates for recent graduates from certain degree programs (e.g., J.D.), USF does not post the employment rates for USF students graduating from all of its undergraduate and graduate degree programs.

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Dennis Jacobs
Date: Oct. 9, 2018

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? X YES ❑ NO
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/complaint-resolution-procedures
	Comments: All procedures are available on the university website: https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/complaint-resolution-procedures USF encourages the reporting of Bias Incidents, which include disrespectful acts motivated by bias, hate crimes, and micro aggressions: https://myusf.usfca.edu/bias Reports of Sexual Misconduct or Title IX Violations, including, sexual assault, harassment, stalking, domestic violence or other gender based harassment or violence, are made directly to the Title IX Office: https://myusf.usfca.edu/title-ix Reports of alleged violations of the non-academic student conduct code are processed through the Office of Student Conduct, Rights and Responsibilities: https://myusf.usfca.edu/fogcutter/student-conduct Students can appeal grades through the Appeal Process for Change of Course Grade applies to students and both full-time and part-time faculty members in all schools and colleges except the School of Law. Language specific to the USFFA contract is noted as appropriate. Procedural differences for School of Management students and faculty members in Professional Bachelor's and Professional Master's Degree programs are also noted as appropriate. Details on the The Appeal Process for Change of Course Grade can be found on the University website. https://www.usfca.edu/catalog/policies/appeal-process-change-of-course-grade Law Students must appeal to Law School Student Services. Non-academic complaints go directly to USF Student Disabilities Services, Student Enrollment Services for issues related to Billing/Tuition and Financial Aid, and USF Human Resources. Contact information for these and the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education are found on the university Website. https://myusf.usfca.edu/student-life/complaint-resolution-procedures

Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: There are separate procedures based on the type of complaint. The following links provide the procedures for these types of complaints: Student Conduct: https://myusf.usfca.edu/fogcutter/student-conduct Title IX: https://myusf.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/USFSexualMisconduct_2018.pdf Bias Related: https://myusf.usfca.edu/bias/faqs Academic Integrity: https://myusf.usfca.edu/academic-integrity/honor-code
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ☐ NO
	Comments: None
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? X YES ☐ NO If so, where? The Dean of Students keeps records of student complaints regarding conduct, Title IX, Bias Related and Academic Integrity in Maxient.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? X YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: The Dean of Students keeps records of student complaints regarding conduct, Title IX, Bias Related and Academic Integrity in Maxient.
	Comments: None

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Tracy Poon Tambascia
Date: October 10, 2018

TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X☐ YES ☐ NO
	Is the policy publically available? X ☐ YES ☐ NO If so, where? https://www.usfca.edu/admission/undergraduate/transfer/transfer-credit
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? X☐ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--
(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: William Covino
Date: 10/9/2018

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX (2013 Standards)

Institution: **University of San Francisco**

Type of Visit: **Accreditation Team Visit**

Name of reviewer/s: **Thomas O Fleming Jr**

Date/s of review: **September 18, 2018**

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed[1]. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. **Site Name and Address**
   Orange County Campus

   St. Joseph Center

   480 South Batavia Street

   Orange, CA 92868

2. **Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a regional center or off-campus site by WASC)**
   This location has two programs – Sport Management Master's Program and the ME-MS Nursing Program.

   The Sport Management Program began in 1998, and consists of two cohorts (with approximately 35 students in each cohort). It is a two-year program with 5 semesters of instruction. There is one cohort per year and it begins in summer of each year. The program meets on Tuesday evening, and is taught by tenure/tenure track professors from the main campus in San Francisco, and by local adjunct professors. The instruction on Tuesday evening is repeated on Wednesday evening at the USF main campus. The students can transfer between the campuses without any apparent issues. One of the students in the Student session indicated that she was considering changing locations and expected to take next week's class in San Francisco. The curriculum and course design appears to be completely overseen by, and performed at, the San Francisco location.

   The ME-MS Nursing Program began approximately 3 years ago. It is a program that awards a masters' degree in nursing and is designed for students who did not take nursing in undergraduate school nor are they licensed as nurses. This is a cohort program (approximately 26 students per cohort). There are two cohorts per year, starting with the Fall and Winter semesters. The program consists of the completion of 6 semesters in the two-year period. The program has three full- time faculty (non-tenured) who have employment contracts. It also includes numerous adjunct faculty. The faculty are professionals in the nursing profession. The curriculum was developed in San Francisco, with members of the OC location participating by teleconferences. There is some customization of lab experience in order to have present in the

---

[1] See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

OC location the equipment commonly used in Southern California, which may be different in a few instances in Northern California – it is dependent on the hospitals where the students perform they clinical work. The three full time faculty have the following specializations: 1. Fundamentals (theory) and clinical placements; 2. "Med Surge" – surgery & health care; and 3. OB/PED.

For both programs, the administrative and budgetary responsibilities are handled at the main campus. Ashley Sloper is the Associate Director, Sport Management Master's Program and Tracey Allen is the Program Administrator, ME-MS Nursing Program. Both are located on site and handle non-teaching tasks. They are involved with arranging for tutors, classroom items, etc.

The "library" for both programs consists of one bookcase each with a limited number of books on them. The students are connected to the main campus intranet and are able to access the library material remotely.

The building was remodeled prior to the commencement of the nursing program. It is a single building at the St. Joseph's Center, which serves as the USF presence on that location. The facility upkeep is the responsibility of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange, with whom there is a leasing arrangement.

The building is the responsibility of Maureen Lu, who is the Senior Campus Administrator for the Orange County Campus. She has been with USF approximately four years. There are two large classrooms and several smaller classrooms/meeting rooms. When they are not in class, and there is an available classroom, the students use it as a study spaces. The Wi-Fi appears to be new and there did not seem to be any concerns regarding connectivity.

The graduation ceremonies for both programs are held in San Francisco as part of the USF graduation ceremonies.

3. **Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)**
   In the faculty meeting, I met with the three full-time faculty from the Nursing Program and with one of their adjunct faculty. I met with two tenured faculty from the Sport Management Program – they fly down each Tuesday, teach the classes Tuesday evening, and return on Wednesday to USF's main campus to teach the same classes on Wednesday evening. I also met an adjunct faculty member in the Sport Management Program.

   I met with 10 to 12 students, who appeared to be evenly distributed between the two programs.

   I met with Sr. Mary Beth Ingham, Ph.D., on September 13, 2018. She was the representative from the Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange.

   USF prepared a pre-visit summary on this and other "additional locations." No documents were provided during the visit. I was informed that the financially related documents are maintained in San Francisco, and one of the individuals that I am scheduled to meet with on the main campus, is responsible for the financial status of the programs. In terms of the curriculum, etc., the Orange County location appears to be a teaching facility; however, the primary program administration is performed in San Francisco at the main campus.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6)	The Nursing program seems to fit closely to the USF mission in terms of those being served. From the POV of the Sisters of St. Joseph there appears to be an alignment of interests in the Nursing program and it is one that they indicate is very important to them and they may be monitoring it. It was not as clear how the Sport Management Program aligns – it is a long-standing program and its alignment is in the ethics component of the curriculum.	
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	The location is connected to the main campus via the internet. The location is working on enhancing the connection between it and the main campus. It did not appear to be a deep connection.	
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4)	The facilities are new and the classrooms appear to foster a good learning environment. The faculty office locations are very limited. Except for the three full time faculty in the Nursing Program it is a "hoteling" experience for the faculty with a couple of private meeting rooms	Is there a local IT resource, or is it handled remotely?

	where they can interact with their students.	
Student Support Services. *CPR:* What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? *EER:* What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)	These services appear, for the most part, to be provided remotely with some small on- site presence.	Are there any future plans to enhance that area – should be a line item in the program budget, which is maintained at the main campus.
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.3, 4.3)	The full-time Sport Management faculty are from the main campus. The part- time are local. There are 3 full-time faculty for the Nursing Program and they are supplemented part time faculty who are local and are from the medical professions One of the full-time faculty members from Nursing is on the curriculum development committee at USF (note she has been with the program about 2 or 3 weeks and was recently informed about becoming a member of that committee). The faculty are part of the same unions as are present on the main campus.	This area of assessment, etc. should be followed up on at the main campus, which is where this activity appears to take place.
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]	Appears to be done at the main campus.	

Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	Maintained at the main campus. Program directors and faculty indicated there is very few, if any, issues with retention and graduation. Only one or two cohorts have graduated from the Nursing Program, so it is early in the life of that program. Sport Management has been taught at the OC location for approximately 20 years. No concerns were mentioned.	Need this information.
Student Learning. CPR: How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? *EER*: What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)	Sport Management is taught using the exact same materials and full time professors as at the main campus.	Need information – appears to be centralized at the main campus.
Quality Assurance Processes: CPR: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? *EER:* What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)	Sport Management is taught by the same instructors who teach the program at the main campus – should be same metrics.	Should be documented at the main campus.

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: University of San Francisco

Type of Visit: Accreditation Team Visit

Name of reviewer: Jackie R. Donath

Date/s of review: September 11, 2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed[2]. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. **Site Name and Address**
    University of San Francisco, Sacramento location
    1 Capitol Mall
    Sacramento, CA 94814

2. **Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)**
    A Sacramento campus of the University of San Francisco was opened in 1975. It has been in its current location since 2014. This location offers four programs: a Bachelor's of Science in Nursing program that partners with the Veteran's Association (BSN/VANAP); a Master's degree in Public Health (MPH) program; a program in counseling with an emphasis on Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT); and a Single or Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with an MA in Teaching (MAT).
    Enrollment in fall of 2017 was 225 students. For the 2017-2018 academic year,this location's FTE totaled 20.94: full-time faculty FTEs were 3.36, part time faculty FTEs were 14.58, and staff FTEs totaled 3.00

3. **Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)**
    USF prepared a pre-visit report on what it described as "additional locations" which provided historical, program, retention and graduation figures and FTE information. On-site, this reviewer met with the main campus, ALO, the campus director and staff, five program directors and adminstrators, 9 faculty, and 7 students.

---

[2] See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	NA	NA
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	Clear alignment with mission (especially in BSN program.) Faculty, staff and students strongly identify with mission. Site has a director, assistant director with responsibility for recruitment and enrollment, and office manager	More regular IT support was cited as an issue. Site is understood as tenant by 1 Capitol Mall manangement.
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Bi-monthly meetings among faculty at site and main campus. Video feed common with main campus. Graduation at main campus.	Working to bring main campus services to site in person rather than by computer (which is main contact with student services)
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	Instructional facilities for BSN well-stocked and up-to-date with simulation equipment and observational spaces. Other classrooms are open to flexible learning arrangements and well – equipped technologically. There are also spaces available for more casual student-faculty interaction	Main campus provides facility technical oversight. Main campus administrator visits on regular basis.
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided?	Main campus provies periodic technology refreshes for site. Students can electronically access	Issue for students who would lke more main campus resources to be provided in-person and on a regular schedule.

What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	main campus student services and library. 85% retention rate from 1st to second fall (2016-2017) 4-year graduation rate of 65% .	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	More adjunct than full-time FTES and faculty (no indication from students that this affects their contact with instructors.) Instructors convene regularly on main campus to discuss curriculum development and student learning.	Unclear how much enagagement of adjunct faculty in these processes.
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	Parallel with main campus. Collaboration seems strong between main campus and site faculty.	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	Enrollment, 1st-2nd year retention, 4-year graduation rates, FTES, demographic information.	Volatility at some sites—enrollment at Sacramento seems stable.
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Aligned with main campus, professional programs have external accreditation and collect licensing pass rates (BSN,MAT)	Unable to find comparisons of this sort
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	Retention and graduation rates monitored at main campus and site. "Start-stop-continue" reflections on curriculum and programs at site. Attention to alignment with main campus. Site –based strategic planning	

Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: University of San Francisco

Type of Visit: Reaffirmation

Name of reviewer/s: Tracy Poon Tambascia

Date/s of review: October 1-8, 2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs[3] and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

MA in Public Leadership, College of Arts and Sciences

Offered online only; fall 2018

3 starts per year

Enabler: None; managed in-house

Master in Public Administration, School of Management

Online 2012

3 starts per year

Enabler: Pearson Embanet until spring

2019

Master in Public Health, School of Nursing & Health Professions
Online 2015

Doctor of Nursing Practice, School of Nursing & Health Professions

Online fall 2016

2 starts per year

Enabler: None; managed in-house

Master in Nursing for Registered Nurses, School of Nursing & Health Professions

Online 2011

Starts: unclear

Enabler: Previously Pearson Embanet; now managed in-house

LLM Taxation, School of Law

Online 2015

3 starts per year

Enabler: None; managed in-house

MLST, Legal Studies in Taxation, School of Law

Online 2015

3 starts per year

Enabler: None; managed in-house

---

[3] See Distance Education Review Guide to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

The University of San Francisco currently offers seven programs online. All of the programs have on-campus analogs except for the new MA in Public Leadership, which premiered fall 2018 with only an online cohort. The format for the programs is considered hybrid.

The start dates of these programs reflects a modest roll-out, with one starting in 2011, one in 2012, three in 2015, one in 2016 and one in 2018. Only two programs contracted with Pearson Embanet to provide learning management system (LMS) development or other support services, and by spring 2019 all seven programs will be largely managed by university staff.

Most of the programs offer two or three starts a year. The launch of the online version of programs resulted in an expected upward growth online, with declines in on campus enrollments in each program except for Master in Nursing for Registered Nurses, which saw a decline in online enrollments after year two.

Enrollment

	2018 online enrollment	2018 on campus enrollment
MA in Public Leadership, College of Arts and Sciences	14	n/a
Master in Public Administration, School of Management	67	50
Master in Public Health, School of Nursing & Health Professions	40	101
Doctor of Nursing Practice, School of Nursing & Health Professions	115	37
Master in Nursing for Registered Nurses, School of Nursing & Health Professions	56	67
LLM Taxation, School of Law	27	6
MLST, Legal Studies in Taxation, School of Law	55	2

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Reports and printed material were reviewed by Tracy Poon Tambascia. Additional questions were addressed during the Accreditation Visit October 8-10, 2018.

Printed materials included:

> USF Distance Education Review (September 2017 and 2018)
>
> USF Online Degree Program Overview, Enrollment, Completion Report
>
> USF Online DNP Overview, Enrollment, and Completion Report

In addition, an archived version of each of the following courses (taught in 2017 and earlier in 2018) were examined in the actual course environment:

Master of Public Health

MPH 621 Epidemiology (Spring 2018)

MPH 636 Public Health Program Planning and Evaluation (Spring 2018)

Doctor of Nurse Practice

DNP NURS 765 Project and Practice Management (Fall 2017)

DNP NURS 754 Policy and Ethical Implications for Healthcare Outcomes (Fall 2017)

RN-MSN

NURS 505 - Community Health Nursing (Spring 2018)

NURS 614 - Healthcare Systems Leadership (Spring 2018)

Master of Public Administration

PA 613 Management and Organization Theory (Spring 2018)

PA 680 Program and Policy Evaluation (Spring 2018)

Tax LLM/MLST (Same courses for both)

Law 515 Legal Principles of Fed Inc Tax (Spring 2018)

Law 516 Real Estate Taxation (Fall 2017)

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	USF mission: *The core mission of the University is to promote learning in the Jesuit Catholic tradition.* *The University offers undergraduate, graduate and professional students the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals, and the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for others.* *The University will distinguish itself as a diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice. The University will draw from the cultural, intellectual and economic resources of the San Francisco Bay Area and its location on the Pacific Rim to enrich and strengthen its educational programs.* The USF mission is sufficiently broad as to encompass the goals of the professionally oriented online programs. In mostly creating online versions of existing on campus programs, the university appeared to be less focused on extending its content expertise than extending its reach geographically. The new MA in Public Leadership, which operates online only, appears to be the only program that is venturing into new territory. One part of the mission, "The University will draw from the cultural, intellectual and economic resources of the San Francisco Bay Area and its location on the Pacific Rim to enrich and strengthen its educational programs" appears to make the university place-based, but that could be interpreted as more about the Bay Area as inspiration rather than location. The university's vision speaks of a "global perspective that educates	

	leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world." Online education offers the university an opportunity to engage with students in a more international context. However, it should be noted that programs in particular fields may be subject to certification or standards in different countries; therefore, programs such as nursing may be nursing may be limited to enrollments from students from the US. This may be a question to explore. The USF Distance Education Review (September 2017 and 2018) indicates that there is a process for new program proposals, including the College Curriculum Committee and then, if approved, the New/Changed Programs (NCAP). The review and approval process include faculty. USF requires a five year budget to be submitted as part of the NCAP process. Consultants will be utilized in the future to determine market needs and to determine viability of more hybrid programs. The Provost has a Student Hybrid Experience committee, which was involved in the Distance Education Review. The Provost and Council of Deans is revising the university's digital education plan. The Magis Project is examining hybrid and online course delivery as part of its Academic Portfolio Working Group.	
Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Students in the online programs pay some student fees and have access to advisors, the career center, and other select services. However, they do not engage in campus events and activities in the same manner as their on campus counterparts. The engagement with faculty, and the network of peers within the cohort, are likely the most substantive engagement online students have with the life of the institution.	
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology	While I cannot compare the rigor of the online courses versus their on campus counterpart, I did find the courses to include a variety of activities, from group assignments to individual work, pre-recorded welcome messages and lectures, and chat boards. Worked/model examples were often provided, along with specific feedback and guidance from instructors to students on how to	

adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	improve their work. Faculty engagement with students and student work appeared to be substantive. There is a Help button for each class that connects students with live chat/support, as well as links to the instructor, the library and other digital resources. In sum, the courses met or exceeded expectations for online course design and interface.	
Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Introductory sessions are often available to students, but this varies by program. The USF online course website lists a number of student and academic services, including counseling, career services, writing support, an disability services. There is also quite a lot of information about which states USF can enroll students, including notes about professional licensure issues by state. Tuition rates, fees and financial aid information are also available on the Online Education webpages.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	The USF Distance Education Review states that orientations and training are available to faculty so they can be trained in online learning management. The School of Nursing and Health Professions (SONHP) SONHP faculty meet twice a month to share best practices for online learning and provide faculty development opportunities. The USF Distance Education Review (September 2017 and 2018) indicates that there is a process for new program proposals, including the College Curriculum Committee and then, if approved, the New/Changed Programs (NCAP). The review and approval process include faculty.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	The USF Distance Education Review (September 2017 and 2018) indicates that there is a process for new program proposals, including the College Curriculum Committee and then, if approved, the New/Changed Programs (NCAP). The review and approval process include faculty. Faculty develop the curriculum. A review of courses online show that the interface for the online courses sampled were coherent, well developed and organized. Courses followed a	

	standard format using Canvas, which was easy to navigate and intuitive.	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	The average and median time to completion for each program, comparing online and on campus, seems to vary. There is no pattern; the time to completion for MLST in Legal Studies is the same for both online and on campus, while students in the online LLM Taxation program finish sooner than their on campus counterparts. Slightly bigger disparities are noted in the Master in Public Administration program, in which the on campus students appear to spend about four months longer completing the degree, and Master in Nursing for RN, in which the online students take four months longer to complete the degree as well. Time to completion for the five programs which have graduated students, disaggregated by race, is more complex. While some programs, such as Master in Public Administration, has a fairly consistent average time to completion rates for students of different races online and on campus, Pacific Islander students in the online program clearly take more time to complete the program (36 months versus about 24-25 months for students in other groups). The same can be said for International students in the Master in Nursing for RN online program (45 months versus about 27-28 months for students in other groups). In LLM Taxation, Latinx students on campus are enrolled longer than other students, on average. While in some cases the numbers may be small, this raises questions about how USF may be monitoring this and identifying potential barriers to completion for particular student groups.	
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	The USF Distance Education Review states that they are in compliance with this, but the report merely says courses are built on learning outcomes. This is not absent, it is merely not known. Overall, programs and departments on campus continue to work on outcomes assessment. Professional programs may be ahead in this process as they are compliant with professional	

	accreditation and standards. As the online curriculum are mostly built using the on campus curriculum, assessment of learning outcomes for online courses may be in a similarly developmental stage.	
Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	Only two programs contracted with Pearson Embanet to provide learning management system (LMS) development or other support services, and by spring 2019 all seven programs will be largely managed by university staff.	
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	The USF Distance Education Review states that they are in compliance with this, but the report merely says courses are built on learning outcomes. This is not absent, it is merely not known. Online programs are subject evaluation under the Academic Program Review process every five years.	*There is no indication of whether student course evaluation analysis contributes to strategies for course improvements; if the institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of the academic and support services provided to students in on-line courses and uses the results for improvement; whether the institution provides examples of student work and student interactions among themselves and with faculty; if it sets appropriate goals for the retention/persistence of students using on-line learning, assesses its achievement of these goals, and uses the results for improvement.*