University

of

San Francisco

San Francisco, CA 94117

Fifth year self-study report in preparation for a site visit on November 13-15, 2002

Table of Contents

I. Statement on report preparation

The self-study report for the University of San Francisco was a collaborative effort. The initial draft was prepared by the Provost's Office with contributions from various offices of the University. That draft and subsequent drafts were reviewed and revised by the President's Leadership Team and other interested faculty, staff members, and students.

Preparation for this special visit and the accompanying self-study report began immediately after the December 1997 WASC comprehensive team visit with the decision to collect information about assessment and evaluation activities at the institution on a regular basis. Examples of this annual reporting can be found in the team resource room.

The report preparation began with the convocation of the WASC Assessment Committee in November 2001. That committee, composed of faculty, staff and administrators, oversaw the collection of the information necessary to prepare the relevant sections of this self-study report. The final report has been shared with that committee for their comments. The committee included a representative from each school and college, the University Life division, Institutional Research Office, Academic Services, and the Provost's Office.

II. Descriptive background and History

General Description

The University of San Francisco (USF) is situated on a fifty-one acre campus in the western part of San Francisco near Golden Gate Park. The Rev. Stephen A. Privett, S.J. is President. USF offers undergraduate and graduate programs through the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Nursing, the School of Business and Management, the School of Education, the School of Law, and the College of Professional Studies. Our students come from all areas of the United States and over seventy countries.

In Spring 2002, a total of 7394 students were enrolled, divided as follows:

	Fulltime	Part-time	total
Undergraduate	3305	171	3476
Graduate	1321	541	1862
Law	540	105	645
Special	51	159	210
CPS undergraduate	689	n/a	689
CPS graduate	502	n/a	502
Grand total	6408	986	7384

Source: Spring 2002 Census report

Mission, Vision and Values statement

Vision

The University of San Francisco will be internationally recognized as a premier Jesuit Catholic, urban University with a global perspective that educates leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world.

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.

Core Values

The University's core values include a belief in and a commitment to advancing:

- the Jesuit Catholic tradition that views faith and reason as complementary resources in the search for truth and authentic human development, and that welcomes persons of all faiths or no religious beliefs as fully contributing partners to the University;

- the freedom and the responsibility to pursue truth and follow evidence to its conclusion;

- learning as a humanizing, social activity rather than a competitive exercise;

- a common good that transcends the interests of particular individuals or groups; and reasoned discourse rather than coercion as the norm for decision making;

- diversity of perspectives, experiences and traditions as essential components of a quality education in our global context;

- excellence as the standard for teaching, scholarship, creative expression and service to the University community;

- social responsibility in fulfilling the University's mission to create, communicate and apply knowledge to a world shared by all people and held in trust for future generations;

- the moral dimension of every significant human choice: taking seriously how and who we choose to be in the world;

- the full, integral development of each person and all persons, with the belief that no individual or group may rightfully prosper at the expense of others;

- a culture of service that respects and promotes the dignity of every person.

Strategic Initiatives

The following initiatives are key to the University's achieving recognition as a premier Jesuit Catholic urban University.

1. Recruit and retain a diverse faculty of outstanding teachers and scholars and a diverse, highly qualified, service-oriented staff committed to advancing the University's mission and its core values.

2. Enroll, support and graduate a diverse student body, which demonstrates high academic achievement, strong leadership capability, concern for others and a sense of responsibility for the weak and the vulnerable.

3. Provide an attractive campus environment and the resources necessary to promote learning throughout the University:

- Technology solutions to enhance learning and improve service;

- Facilities to support outstanding educational programs;

- Learning resources that improve the curriculum and support scholarship.

History

The University of San Francisco was founded by the Jesuit Fathers in October 1855 under the name Saint Ignatius Academy. It was San Francisco's first institution of higher education and was initially situated in the downtown area of San Francisco. The Academy opened its doors as a "Jesuit college for the youth of the city" under the guidance of Father Anthony Maraschi, S.J., founder and first president. In April of 1859, the State of California issued a charter under the title of "Saint Ignatius College," empowering the College to confer degrees "with such literary honors as are granted by any university in the United States." The curriculum included courses in Greek, Spanish, Latin, English, French, Algebra

and Arithmetic. In 1862, a new building was constructed for the College on Market Street between Fourth and Fifth Street in downtown San Francisco.

The first bachelor of arts degree was conferred in 1863, and the first master's degree in 1867. A new building on a site on Van Ness Avenue was constructed in 1880. The earthquake and fire of 1906 destroyed the College's facilities, but the College carried on in temporary quarters at Hayes and Schrader Streets until a new campus was developed in the 1920's at the current location at Fulton and Parker Avenues.

In 1926, what had been the Department of Letters, Science and Philosophy officially became the College of Arts and Sciences to reflect the changes taking place within the College, including an increase in the number of elective courses offered to students.

In 1930, on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee, and at the request of civic, professional and industrial leaders of San Francisco, the name was changed to the University of San Francisco. This title better reflected the growing size and complexity of the educational institution and the organization of distinct colleges and schools within the University's structure. In 1964, the University became coeducational in all divisions. The University is incorporated as a California nonprofit public benefit corporation without members.

In 1978, the University acquired the assets of the former Lone Mountain College for Women. University administration, including the Office of the President, Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Office of the Vice President for Planning and budget, and Office of the Vice President for University Advancement relocated to the Rossi Wing of Lone Mountain in August 1997. The Lone Mountain residence halls are filled with freshman and sophomore undergraduate students. The Pacific Wing is home to classrooms, some academic program offices, and faculty offices.

In 1991, USF purchased the Presentation High School building and completed extensive renovation of classrooms for use by undergraduate and graduate students. Another major remodeling project was completed in 1996 and enabled the School of Education to relocate there.

In 2000, the University signed a long-term lease for the former Lincoln University building at the corner of Masonic and Turk Streets. It became the new home of the College of Professional Studies in July 2001.

The Dorraine Zeif Law Library was completed in July 2000. The School of Business and Management is conducting a campaign to raise money to renovate and construct additional classrooms at its current site.

USF retains its rich Catholic heritage although its students and faculty are from all religious backgrounds. The University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national or ethnic origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation or handicap. The University is an equal opportunity employer and is committed to an active Nondiscrimination Program within the institution.

College of Arts and Sciences
(*http://www.usfca.edu/online/colleges/as.html*)

In 1931, the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science were established as major divisions of the University. In 1982, the name was changed to reflect the incorporated status of both Colleges into one -- the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. It is now known as the College of Arts and Sciences.

The College offers the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Fine Arts degrees in over twenty academic disciplines (see catalog).

Graduate education is also an important component of the College, and USF offers the Master of Arts degree in the following areas: Asia Pacific Liberal Studies, Economics, Sports Management, Theology, and the MFA in Writing. The Master of Science degree is awarded in Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, and Environmental Management.

The College offers international programs and off-campus courses in Manila, the Philippines; San Salvador, El Salvador, and Tijuana and Puebla, Mexico for qualified and interested students. Students can also experience a study abroad option for one or two semesters in the "USF in Budapest" program, a joint venture with Peter Pazmany Catholic University (PPKE). Those who remain for two semesters fulfill the requirements for the European Studies Certificate. USF also offers its Master of Science in Environmental Management (MSEM) in Budapest, Thailand, the Philippines and Spain.

School of Law *(http://www.usfca.edu/law/)*

The USF School of Law was established in 1912 with classes held in the Grant Building on Market Street. Matt I. Sullivan, who later became Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court, was the School's first Dean. In 1917, the School moved its classes to Hayes and Shrader Streets, the temporary quarters for USF following the earthquake and fire of 1906. In 1927, the School of Law relocated to the current USF campus. The school now occupies a site across Fulton Street including Kendrick Hall, built in 1962 and expanded in 1982, and the Zief Law Library, completed in 2001. The Moot Court Room was relocated and redesigned in 1987, and is currently undergoing additional renovations.

The School of Law offers a wide-ranging program of both full-time and part-time instruction leading to the Juris Doctor degree. It also offers a J.D./M.B.A. degree in collaboration with the School of Business and Management. The intellectually demanding curriculum prepares the student to be an effective participant in the legal profession, whether as a practicing attorney, member of the judiciary, or other public official. It is also well-suited as preparation for careers in government, business, and legal education. In 1996, a Master of Laws (LL.M.) Curriculum was added, allowing foreign lawyers to earn an LL.M. in Comparative Law and International Transactions. In 2002, the school began the LL.M. in Intellectual Property and Technology Law major.

As a member of the Association of American Law Schools, the School of Law maintains high standards relating to entrance requirements, faculty, library, and curriculum. It is accredited by the American Bar Association, and graduates are eligible to take bar examinations in all jurisdictions of the United States.

The University of San Francisco's Dorraine Zief Law Library, completed in July 2000, accommodates a current collection of nearly 300,000 volume equivalency [projected building lifespan shelving capacity for over 600,000 volume equivalency]. The facility makes provision for new spaces and services, such as a multi-station Electronic Resources Desk; three computer and multimedia training rooms, a grand Reading Room, a Gallery-Lounge area, six individual and eight group study rooms and a Special Collections/Boardroom space. Seating is provided in a mix of workstation, carrel, table, and casual seating with over 500 simultaneous active network connections. The building is fully wired to meet the technological needs of the 21st century. A total of $18.6 million was raised to

fund the cost of construction through law school revenue allocation, foundation donors and alumni and friend donations.

School of Business and Management (SOBAM) (*http://www.usfca.edu/sobam*)

The business program was founded in 1924 as a four-year evening certificate program. The Bachelor of Science degree was first awarded in 1935. In 1947, the School of Business Administration became a separate academic division. The School of Business has been accredited nationally since 1953 by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (now AACSB International). In 1974, the name was changed to the McLaren College of Business when the program became headquartered in McLaren Center. In 1981, the MBA program was accredited by AACSB. In 1990, the name was changed to the McLaren School of Business and was updated in 2000 to the School of Business and Management.

The School of Business and Management offers the Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration, and two graduate programs: Master of Business Administration (MBA), and the Professional MBA for Executives (EPMBA). The undergraduate program allows students to major in Accounting, Business Administration, Finance, Hospitality Management, International Business, or Marketing. The Master of Business Administration program allows students to specialize in finance, international business, management, marketing, telecommunications, or telecommunications management and policy. SOBAM also offers a joint JD/MBA program in cooperation with the School of Law, which is a comprehensive, full-time, four-year program leading to the degrees of Juris Doctor and Master of Business Administration and an MBA/MSN joint degree program with the School of Nursing.

A campaign is currently underway to raise approximately $18 million to totally renovate the McLaren building and add an additional 26,000 square feet of classroom space to that building.

School of Education (*http://www.soe.usfca.edu*)

USF founded the Department of Education in 1948. From its inception, the Department had a highly regarded teacher preparation program. The Department also offered several master's degree programs.

In 1972, the University Board of Trustees established the School of Education. In 1975, the first doctoral students were admitted to study for the newly-approved Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree.

The School of Education offers the Master of Arts, Master of Arts in Teaching, and Doctor of Education degree. Other programs include a BA/MAT Dual Degree Program in collaboration with the College of Arts and Sciences.

The School offers certificate, masters and doctoral programs in six major areas:
> * Counseling Psychology (MA only)
> * Learning and Instruction
> * International and Multicultural Education
> * Organization and Leadership
> * Catholic School Leadership
> * Teacher Education (M.A.T. with credential)

School of Nursing (*http://www.usfca.edu/nursing*)

The University of San Francisco School of Nursing began in the 1940's as a cooperative effort with the Sisters of Mercy so that Registered Nurses from nearby St. Mary's Hospital could earn their baccalaureate degrees. The four-year program was formally established in 1954, and accredited by the National League for Nursing when the first class graduated in 1958. Classes were held in Harney Science Center and administrative and faculty offices were in St. Mary's Hospital until Cowell Hall was built in 1969. The School began offering a Master of Science degree program in Nursing in 1984.

The School currently offers the following degree programs:
- Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)
- Associate Degree in Nursing to BSN Completion program
- Master's of Science in Nursing (MSN)
- MSN/MBA
- MSN/MPA
- MEO

The Master of Science in Nursing prepares graduates for maximum career mobility with a focus in Advanced Practice (Family Nurse Practitioner [FNP], Adult Nurse Practitioner [ANP], and Clinical Nurse Specialist) or Clinical Systems Management. Students in the Advance Practice programs are eligible for Method I certification as a FNP or ANP (with a valid California RN license)

upon graduation from the program. The Master's Entry Option Program is open to students who have a non-nurse baccalaureate degree or higher.

The School of Nursing has also joined forces with the School of Business and Management to offer a unique joint degree in Business and Nursing: The Master of Science in Nursing/Master of Business Administration degree (MSN/MBA). Nursing has also initiated a joint program with the College of Professional studies leading to a MSN/MPA (Master of Public Administration).

The Post Master's Family Nurse Practitioner Certificate Program was developed to provide an advance practitioner option for individuals who already have a Masters degree in nursing. It is open to candidates whose nursing master's degree is in any clinical area of practice.

College of Professional Studies
(*http://www.usfca.edu/acadserv/catalog/catalog_web.htm*)

The College of Professional Studies (CPS) began in 1975 as the Office of Special Programs. The name was changed to the School of Continuing Education in 1979 when the first Dean was appointed. In 1981, the name was changed to the College of Professional Studies.

The structure of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs has been designed to meet the unique educational needs of a working adult population. The typical College of Professional Studies student is a working adult who is pursuing a USF degree to enhance professional skills, promotional opportunities, or career changes and to prepare for graduate or professional school.

The CPS Experiential Learning Center offers CPS students the opportunity to petition for academic credit for learning acquired outside the traditional classroom through rigorous faculty evaluation of an experiential learning portfolio. This portfolio includes the student's curriculum vitae, transcripts, autobiography, degree plan and essays which demonstrate college-level learning achieved outside a traditional educational setting. The purpose of a portfolio essay is to demonstrate that the student has achieved college-level knowledge and skills in a given academic area through his or her experience in a non-academic context. The competence criteria are described in the Portfolio and Degree Planning Handbook, which is required reading in the writing course. With more than 13,000 experiential learning portfolios evaluated in the last

twenty years, CPS administers one of the nation's largest and best programs for the evaluation of experiential learning.

CPS now offers academic programs on the main USF campus and at regional campuses in San Ramon, Santa Rosa, Cupertino, Sacramento and Oakland.

The College of Professional Studies awards undergraduate and graduate degrees in the areas of organizational studies, information systems, and public management.

- Bachelor of Public Administration
- Bachelor of Public Administration with an emphasis in Law Enforcement Leadership
- Bachelor of Public Administration with an emphasis in Nonprofit Administration
- Bachelor of Science in Applied Economics
- Bachelor of Science in Information Systems
- Bachelor of Science in Organizational Behavior
- Master of Human Resources and Organization Development
- Master of Nonprofit Administration
- Master of Public Administration
- Master of Public Administration in Health Services Administration
- Master of Science in Information Systems

Academic Services

Gleeson Library *(http://www.usfca.edu/library/)*

The Gleeson Library/Geschke Learning Resource Center houses the University's central collection of print and electronic resources. Its holdings have now passed the 1.6 million mark. The periodicals and circulating books, including U.S. Government documents, are on open shelves for easy browsing. The Law Library, with holdings of more than 300,000 volumes, supports the students and faculty of the School of Law in their educational research and scholarship, while also providing access to legal information needed by the entire University community.

Professionally staffed libraries in each of the Regional Campuses complete the resources which support the academic various programs. These sites are linked electronically to the University Library catalog and to an array of bibliographic databases.

Ignacio (the online catalog, circulation, and interlibrary loan system) and the *Reference Database Network* are easily accessible from remote locations or within each library. There are a variety of spaces throughout the Gleeson/Geschke building - including a Disability - Related Services Room - for quiet study, open group study, and reserved group study. Ports and outlets for laptops are on every floor, along with two areas with lab-style computers for word processing and other general applications. Librarians and staff in the Reference and Research Services Department assist with all aspects of research. A state- of- the - art electronic classroom allows for collaborative, interactive classroom instruction in research methods.

The Donohue Rare Book Room, renowned for its special collections of rare books and fine press printing, and the Thatcher Art Gallery, with its changing exhibits, enhance the aesthetic and intellectual environment of the University.

Information Technology Services (*http://www.usfca.edu/its*)

Students are given a wide variety of opportunities to learn about and use computers at USF. A number of micro-computer labs provide students access to both Macintosh and Windows computers for use in pursuit of their studies. These computers allow students to use a variety of software applications including word processing, database and spreadsheet programs from a number of major software publishers. The computer labs are also part of a University-wide network for which connections are available in every residence hall room. USF initiated a new campus portal, *USFconnect*, in Fall 2002. A Unix workstation environment is available to mathematics and science students.

A computing Help Desk is open Monday through Friday during normal business to assist faculty and staff with any problems they may encounter while using University owned computers for their course work. In the computer labs, student Lab Consultants are available to assist students with any problems they encounter using lab machines.

ITS provides technical support to the University community via walk-in, phone-in or e-mail, as well as by appointment.

Administrative systems are used by faculty and staff to obtain access to the Student Information System, Human Resource Management, Financial Records, Alumni Development System, and electronic mail. Computer Labs allow

students access to commonly used software applications, high-speed laser printers, and to store personal data in individual user directories. A user account is required for E-mail and Internet access, and to use the computer labs on campus.

The University provides members of the community the facilities to connect to the Internet from home with Remote Access Services. Students, faculty and staff can dial-in to the USF modem bank to browse the Internet and check e-mail. A Remote Access CD-Rom and instructions on connecting to the Internet from home can be obtained at the ITS Help Desk office located in Harney 222.

The Department of Instructional Media provides portable computers and other instructional media equipment that can be reserved by instructors to be used in classroom demonstrations. Portable computers can be reserved by instructors by visiting the Instructional Media department in Cowell Hall, Room G4. In the summer of 2002, ten classrooms were upgraded to a level B smart classroom (a Multimedia Presentation Classroom [instructor front, lecture-style seating] includes: lectern with media-switching control panel, PC and/or Macintosh computer including built-in CD-RW and DVD combo-player; laptop connection; overhead-mounted LCD projector; enhanced speakers with volume control; document camera; screen; whiteboard; VCR with direct screen projection; adjustable lighting control; remote control for computer and LCD projector; television; and Internet access). Additional information about this renovation is available at http://www.usfca.edu/fac-staff/bansavich/smartclassroom/ .This brings the total number of "smart" classrooms to 19-three in the CIT lab and an additional six in Harney, Cowell Hall, Lone Mountain and McLaren.

Information about all of the USF computer labs, including system capabilities, hours of operation, and a campus map of locations are available through printed brochures and the ITS homepage at http://www.usfca.edu/its .

The Center for Instruction and Technology (CIT) (http://www.usfca.edu/cit/) is a teaching and research facility that began as a joint project of the School of Education and USF Information Technology Services. It is a teaching, learning, and research facility designed to provide all USF faculty, staff, and students with access to the tools for the successful integration of technology into today's classrooms. The CIT provides training in current desktop and multimedia applications, demonstrations and workshops on the latest technology solutions for higher education, and supports the Masters of Arts in Educational Technology (MET) program within the School of Education.

The Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good

In 1994, the USF Office of Community Service and Service Learning was created to coordinate and support the many efforts of USF students, faculty, staff and alumni in serving the greater community of which they are a part. In Fall 2002, the Service Learning component of the Office became part of the new Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good. Under the direction of Richard Spohn, the Center will "provide USF students and faculty with experiences that offer perspective on and motivation for rigorous academic work on pressing issues." The community service functions of the OCSSL have moved to University Ministry department.

The new Center was created to match the needs and capabilities of the local community with the knowledge, resources and commitment of the University in order to form a mutually beneficial partnership. The Center will help students explore the complex interconnections between knowledge, practice, and social responsibility through community service and service learning opportunities. The staff will provide individual and group consultation about community service activities and opportunities using their comprehensive online database and a library of resources about community service and service learning. The Center will be an important resource for faculty and students in fulfilling the graduation requirement for service learning coursework described by the new Core Curriculum.

Academic Support Services

The Academic Support Services office provides assistance to students with learning disabilities, physical disabilities and students in academic difficulty. It also assists the University in ADA compliance. Academic Support Services staff members can help students develop better study habits or resolve academic problems. This office also coordinates new student orientation programs.

Academic Support for Student Athletes

A wide range of academic support is offered for those students who represent the University on intercollegiate athletic teams. The goal is to provide encouragement and support for student athletes so that they may take full advantage of the educational opportunities at USF. Planning for a degree, eligibility monitoring, confidential personal counseling or referral, and planning

for sports-related careers are some of the services offered by the Assistant Director of Athletics-Academic Support.

College Success Course

The College Success Courses are one-credit interdisciplinary courses open to new students. 'Success Strategies", the first course in the sequence, addresses self-awareness, time management, memory, test preparation, test anxiety, campus resources, reading techniques, problem solving, and note-taking. The other College Success Courses are "Critical Thinking" and "Career and Major Exploration". In each of these courses students are encouraged to relate information presented in the course to their own strengths and weaknesses as students.

The Learning and Writing Center

The Learning Center provides individual and group tutoring for USF students and assists students interested in forming study groups. In addition, it holds workshops in study skills and other areas. It also coordinates the America Reads Program, the Pre-Professional Health Advising Program, the Foreword program (in cooperation with Multicultural Student Services and Admissions), and Supplemental Instruction. The Learning Center houses print, video and computer learning resources. Staff members in the Learning Center also work with students individually to solve academic challenges. The Writing Center's employs Expository Writing faculty members to work with students to help them improve their writing skills. Staff members provide feedback on students' writing and can tailor a program of instruction to meet individual needs.

Disability Related Services

The Coordinator of Disability Related Services helps to create University-wide awareness of disability and accessibility by providing the following support services;

- Liaison with faculty and staff for students with physical disabilities medical conditions to assist them with accommodations for study
- Advocacy of measures to increase the accessibility of campus facilities and programs
- Counseling and problem solving
- Promotion of awareness and personal advocacy
- Library of relevant books, periodicals, and assistive devices

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, USF makes reasonable accommodations for those individuals with disabilities. USF is an institutional member of the Association of Higher Education and disability.

Contacts with DRS are private and confidential. DRS currently serves approximately 250 students with documented disabilities.

University Life: student services

USF has restructured the former Student Affairs Division. It is now the University Life Division, includes University Ministry, and reports to the Provost.

University Ministry

The Office of University Ministry attends to the pastoral needs of the University community by providing a variety of liturgical, reflective, and educational opportunities. Campus ministry sponsors weekday and Sunday Mass, individual and communal opportunities to celebrate the sacrament of Reconciliation (confession), and interfaith prayer services. The department hired a Protestant chaplain in fall 2002 to assist with faith-related activities.   Campus Ministry recognizes the diversity of religious backgrounds represented at the University and welcomes those of any faith (or no religious faith) to participate in its many activities, which include:

- Retreat weekends in the Sierra foothills, which encourage reflection upon selected themes in prayer, discussion, and silence.
- Social justice education (e.g., lectures, community events, Hunger Banquet) including community-based volunteer activities
- Sacramental preparation opportunities for those who would like to join the Catholic Church or for Catholics who want to celebrate Reconciliation (confession), first communion, or Confirmation. Marriage preparation is also available.
- Counseling and programming are provided by 15 resident ministers who live in the residence halls
- Small groups which meet for discussion, reflection, and education in the areas of scripture, prayer, and faith sharing as well as provide support for former Catholics, the divorced, and the grieving.

Residence Life

The Office of Residence Life at USF oversees six traditional-style residence halls as well as apartment-style living arrangements. A variety of living options are available to accommodate the diverse students who attend USF. For example, residents can live on specialty floors such as the Phelan Multicultural Community, the Erasmus Project Floor, the Martín Báro Scholars community, the Global Living Community or the St. Ignatius Institute Wing.

In addition, each residence hall offers different character and capacity. Phelan Hall is the largest and houses about 475 students, primarily sophomores. Gillson Hall and Hayes Healy Hall are the two major freshman residences. They accommodates about 370 and 380 residents respectively. Both halls have floors exclusively for men and women, with co-ed floors available only in Phelan Hall. Lone Mountain Hall houses 175 students, primarily juniors. Xavier Hall, formerly the Jesuit residence, is home to 176 sophomores and juniors on single sex floors. Pedro Arrupe hall houses about 100 students in a close knit community about 6 blocks from the campus proper. Loyola Village accommodates about 375 students in apartment-style housing. This unique housing project is home to about 50 faculty and staff members as well.

All residents benefit from a predictable room-and-board cost with all utilities included; educational programs and social activities where students can become involved with their peers as well as faculty and staff of the university; and student leadership opportunities at the floor, hall, and system-wide levels. Programs and activities vary to meet the specific needs of residents in each hall. The apartment-style housing is a good transitional experience between traditional residence hall living and apartment living. Students benefit from predictable room costs with included utilities and begin to experience the responsibility of apartment life.

Peer Resident Advisors and professional Residence Hall Directors are available in each building to assist residents in adjusting to student life, providing a sense of security and helping to create community. Resident Ministers are assigned to each hall and provide support as well as a religious presence. The main desk in each building provides 24-hour security, emergency assistance, and general information about the hall and campus. Lessons of tolerance, understanding, negotiation, citizenship and cooperation are regularly addressed by staff and residents alike.

Multicultural and International Student Services

Multicultural and International Student Services (MCISS), a department of the University Life Division, has two major goals:

> 1. to initiate programs and services that support the development of a multicultural community
> 2. to provide services related to the unique needs of international students.

MCISS works closely with the International Student Association (ISA) and the Freedom Alliance of Culturally Empowered Students (FACES), which represents the interests of international students and students of color, respectively. MCISS also provides mentor programs for undergraduate students of color (PEACE) and international students (VISA). MCISS provides specific immigration-related services for international students. Advising related to cross-cultural adjustments and immigration regulations and requirements is provided for international students and scholars.

Student Health Services

The University of San Francisco Student Health Clinic is part of the Sr. Mary Philippa Memorial Clinic, located at St. Mary's Hospital. Primary care services (those services provided without additional charge) are offered by Nurse Practitioners and include the treatment of acute illness, minor injuries, skin conditions, screening and management of many sexually transmitted diseases, immunization and testing for some communicable diseases, health education classes such as smoking cessation and stress management, nutritional counseling, referrals to specialists or outside services, and annual gynecological exams (PAP) for female students. There is no charge to visit the clinic beyond the basic student health fee, with the exception of the co-payment associated with gynecological exams. Nonprimary care services (e.g., emergency room care, specialist referrals, medication, laboratory tests, x-rays) are the financial responsibility of the student. Specialty clinics are available on an ability-to-pay basis.

The Clinic is open Monday through Friday (except major holidays) from 9-10:30 and 1-2:30 for drop-in visits. Students may schedule an appoint for the 11-11:30 and 3-4:15 times each day. The Clinic is also open on Tuesday evenings during the school year from 5-7pm for drop-in visits.

The Counseling Center

The purpose of the Counseling Center is to assist students in developing greater self-understanding and in resolving problems that may interfere with their ability to function optimally. Common issues brought to counselors include interpersonal relationships, depression, stress, sexual concerns, substance abuse, time management, self-esteem, eating problems, anxiety, and life transitions. After an initial assessment is made, the counselor may recommend individual, couples, or group counseling. When the concern requires longer-term counseling or a more specialized approach, an appropriate referral is made.

The Counseling Center is staffed by licensed psychologists who are experienced in working with student concerns. Doctoral-trained interns and post-doctoral fellows who work under the supervision of the professional staff also provide counseling services to students. Students may receive up to 12 sessions of individual or couples counseling per academic year. Counseling services are provided free of charge to currently enrolled students.

Career Services Center

The Priscilla Scotlan Career Services Center (CSC) provides undergraduate, credential, and graduate students and alumni with counseling in career decision making, occupational exploration, and job search. The CSC resource library houses information on occupations, industries, graduate schools, and employers. Listings for part-and full-time employment, and internships, are available 24 hours a day through the CSC Web site (www.usfca.edu/usf/career/) as well as in the resource library.

Administrative Structure

Ultimate responsibility for university governance rests with the University Board of Trustees. There are presently 11 Jesuits on the 43-member Board of Trustees. The Chairman of the Trustees is Dominic Tarantino (BS '54) and the Vice Chairman is Ms. Maureen Clark (B.S. '70).

The President of the University, Rev. Stephen A. Privett, S.J., is the chief executive officer of the University. His executive officers are:

- Chancellor-Fr. John Lo Schiavo, S.J.
- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs - Dr. James L. Wiser

- Associate Provost and VP for Planning and Budget-Fr. Robert Niehoff, S.J.
- Vice President for Business and Finance-Charles Cross
- Vice President for University Life-Dr. Margaret Higgins
- Vice President for University Advancement-Mr. David MacMillan
- Chief Information Office-Dr. Abe Baggen
- Executive Director of University Ministry-Fr. John Savard, S.J.
- Dean of the School of Law-Jeffrey S. Brand
- Dean of College of Professional Studies-Dr. Larry Brewster
- Interim Dean of the School of Education-Dr. Larry Brewster
- Dean of the University Library- Mr. Tyrone Cannon
- Dean of Academic Services-Dr. B.J. Johnson
- Dean of the School of Nursing-Dr. John Lantz
- Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences-Dr. Stanley Nel
- Dean of the School of Business and Management-Dr. Gary Williams

The Vice Presidents meet with the President weekly as the President's Cabinet. The Deans, the University Life Vice President, and the Planning and Budget Vice President report to the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs and meet together every two weeks at the Provost's Council. The Deans and Vice Presidents meet monthly at the President's Leadership Team.

The immediate past president and Chancellor of the University, Rev. John Lo Schiavo, S.J., assists with University external relations and development.

The University of San Francisco enjoys good working relationships with collective bargaining units representing the following employees:
- Full-time faculty members (University of San Francisco Faculty Association-USFFA) in the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business and Management, School of Nursing, and School of Education
- Part-time faculty members (USFFA-PT faculty) in the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business and Management, School of Nursing, and School of Education
- Represented clerical staff (Office and Professional Employees International Union, Local 3, AFL-CIO)
- Gardeners and laborers (Service Employees Union Local No.1877, AFL-CIO)
- Engineers (International Union of Operating Engineers Stationary Local No. 39, AFL-CIO

- Theatrical/stage employees Local 16

The full-time and part-time faculty members of the Law School and the College of Professional Studies have separate agreements with the University.

Student Governance

The Associated Students of the University of San Francisco (ASUSF) is the primary campus governance organization for traditional undergraduates. ASUSF has three main functions: to represent the official undergraduate student viewpoint, to recommend policies, and to fund activities and services that will meet the needs and interests of its members. All traditional undergraduates are members of the Associated Students.

Every traditional undergraduate pays a $120 per year student activities fee which provides the budget for ASUSF services. There are 19 organizations (funded accounts) that are allocated funding through these fees. These funded accounts usually fall under one of the following categories: they serve as an umbrella organization for a large number of student organizations; they provide a service to the university community through programming or education, they offer students an opportunity to learn valuable skills.

In addition to ASUSF, three of the six USF schools and colleges have a student governance structure: the Graduate Business Association, the Graduate Student Council in the School of Education, and the Student Bar Association in the School of Law.

Accreditations

The University is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). USF voluntarily complies with all WASC standards, policies, guidelines and self-study requirements, and has demonstrated responsiveness to Commission decisions and requests. University administrators provide counsel and advice to the Commission through membership on visiting teams and WASC committees. A summary report is filed annually with the WASC Commission, and any substantive changes involving new programs or new academic sites are promptly reported to WASC.

USF also enjoys accreditation by the AACSB International (undergraduate and graduate programs), the American Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Chemical Society, the California Board of Registered

Nursing, the National League for Nursing, the State Bar of California, the State Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the United States Department of Justice (foreign students).

The National Collegiate Athletic Association certified USF under the procedures adopted by the Division I membership in May 1997.

IV. Institutional summary data form

University of San Francisco
President Stephen Privett, S.J.   13 September 2002

1. Year founded: 1855   2. Calendar plan: semesters plus intersession

3. Degree level offered: Baccalaureate, Masters, Ed.D.

4. Sponsorship and control: Independent

5. Current enrollment (spring 2002)

	headcount	% minority	FTE
A. undergraduate	4165	44.9%[1]	4283.8
B. Graduate (including Law)	3009	27.7%[2]	2701.0
C. non-degree	210	25.2%	114.0
TOTAL	7384	36.9%	7098.8

6. Current faculty (fall 2001):   fulltime: 322   % minority: 21.78%
                                       parttime: 361[3]   % minority: 9.14%[4]

7. Finances
    A. annual tuition rate: <u>undergraduate</u> - $20,190   <u>graduate</u> - $645-800 per unit[5]
    B. Total annual operating budget: $151,306,000
    C. % from tuition and fees: 82.6%
    D. Operating deficit(s) for past 3 years: $0 for each year
    E. Current accumulated deficit: $ 0

8. Governing board:
    A. size: 43 members
    B. Meetings a year: 4

9. Off-campus locations:
    A. number: 12
    B. total enrollment: 1543 (spring 2002 census)

10. Library:
    A. number of volumes: 656,529 books (as of May 31, 2002 inventory)
    B. Number of periodical subscriptions: 3710 (as of May 31, 2002 inventory)

---

[1] Does not include those students who self-selected *other, international* ,or *unspecified*
[2] Does not include those students who self-selected *other, international* ,or *unspecified*
[3] Source: Fall 2001 IPEDS report
[4] Ibid., *note-142 respondents or 39.33% are "unknown" category*
[5] Please see attachment 2 of the 2002 WASC Annual report for a full description of graduate
      tuitions

V. Response to recommendations from the most recent visit

The 1997 Visiting Team report and the 1998 commission letter made recommendations to the University in 4 major areas:

- Assessment
- The learning community
- Planning and budget
- The College of Professional Studies

The institution's response is organized by the specific recommendations.

It is useful to note at the outset of this report that Plan 2005, the thematic structure for the 1997 comprehensive self-study, has been superceded by the planning work of the new University president and his Leadership team. Since the last WASC visit, USF has gained a new President, a new Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, a new Board of Trustees chair and vice chair, a new Vice President for University Life, a new Vice President for Business and Finance, a new Vice President for Planning and Budget, a new Chief Information Officer, a new Dean of the College of Professional Studies, a new interim Dean of the School of Education, a new Dean of the Law School, a new Office of Institutional Research, a new Office of Assessment and Teaching Resources, and a new Office of Sponsored Research. The University also developed and ultimately adopted a new Mission and Vision statement, including several strategic initiatives. Plan 2005 served as an excellent base on which this new group of leaders could begin to address the needs and concerns of the institution. The participatory, collaborative approach of Plan 2005 continues to serve as the standard for decision-making for the University, but the perspectives and strategies for growth have shifted towards the planning and implementation activities described in the remainder of this report.

Assessment is an integral part of the effective functioning of any institution. USF has taken the recommendations of the 1997 visiting team very seriously. We attempt to collect and make use of systematic feedback from a variety of sources and employ a variety of methodologies to improve our services and maximize student learning.

The new institutional mission statement approved in 2001 identifies "excellence as the standard for teaching, scholarship, creative expression and service to the University community" as a core value of the institution. In addition, one of the three strategic initiatives identified in the new mission statement is to "provide an attractive campus environment and the resources necessary to promote learning throughout the University." Chief among these resources are technology solutions to enhance learning and improve service; facilities to support outstanding educational programs; and learning resources that improve the curriculum and support scholarship. USF is deeply committed to its core values and sees its strategic initiatives as the essential means for maximizing student learning. To do so requires a reflective pedagogy which is informed by comprehensive assessment data.

Visiting team recommendation: The University should develop a comprehensive assessment plan to determine the co-curricular needs and satisfaction level of the different cohorts of students comprising the student body - undergraduate resident students, commuting students, adult students at off-campus facilities, and graduate students.

Because of the wonderful diversity of students at USF- undergraduate resident students, commuting students, adult students at off-campus facilities, and graduate students, it is always difficult to develop co-curricular activities that appeal to everyone. The plethora of activities readily available in the San Francisco Bay Area, the number of commuter students, and the significant number of students who work during the semester all have contributed to ongoing concerns about student participation in USF events and activities.

Just as difficult as increasing student participation in events is collecting good assessment data from these disparate student groups about their co-curricular needs and overall level of satisfaction with activities and services. At this time, the best measure of satisfaction is the locally-developed Graduating Student Survey given to all matriculating undergraduate and graduate students (except

Law) at the end of their final semester at USF. Each semester's results reports are available in the Team Resource room. Changes made in response to the survey's results include:

- Students consistently rated ITS support as weak, so significant resources were invested to increase the number of support technicians and extend HELP desk hours. Student ratings of this service have improved dramatically.

- The survey data is analyzed by student level, school and campus enrolled and the responses have been used to substantially modify programs in vital services such as financial aid and orientation.

The Student Activities department within the University Life Division coordinates a wide variety of student activities and events. The professional staff serve as advisors to the approximately 60 student clubs and organizations, many of them culture-focused. These student groups conduct both formal and informal needs assessments in order to provide an interesting mix of programming for their fellow students. A selection of these needs assessment are available in the team room for review.

The SKILL Initiative

University Life professional staff have developed learning outcomes for much of their work with students. Beginning in 1996, the Student Affairs Division (now called University Life) has been reviewing its approach to promoting leadership development. The SKILL program (see definition below) is based on the Social Change Model and sets forth the philosophical direction for the many developmental programs and services offered within the University Life Division. Consistent with the Jesuit, Catholic tradition of USF, these developmental programs and services embody the core values of citizenship, character, civility, consciousness, and responsibility for self and others.

SKILL views leadership development as a critical link between student learning and personal development and helps to build both cognitive <u>and</u> affective skills. SKILL stresses service to others--both on and off campus--as a powerful vehicle for developing leaders. All students, therefore, are considered potential leaders under SKILL. Central to preparing graduates competent to address the challenges of society in the new century, SKILL consists of five general categories of leadership development. The first letter of each component forms the acronym for SKILL:

- Service

- knowledge of self and others
- integrity
- literacy
- linkages

In order to understand its impact on student learning, an assessment component is built into each of the SKILL programs. Student self-reflection about personal changes in knowledge, skills and attitudes are collected to assess the effectiveness of these SKILL programs. Student behaviors (service learning and volunteer activities, leadership opportunities in student government and campus clubs) are also examined to provide feedback and improve SKILL programming.

Visiting Team recommendation:

- *The University needs to develop a comprehensive assessment plan/model, with special attention being given to general education, relating to desired student learning outcomes defined by assessment criteria.*

- *Faculty need to develop a strategy for communicating and demonstrating to students the purpose and expected learning outcomes for the General Education Curriculum that incorporates the transferable skills and intellectual abilities fostered by liberal learning.*

- *The University should clarify the relationship of service learning to the goals of the General Education Curriculum.*

- *The faculty should increase its efforts to focus on domestic racial and ethnic minorities in the General Education curriculum.*

Program review is an important quality assurance and assessment strategy for the University. All ongoing program reviews, program revisions and new program proposals are required to include student learning outcomes and an assessment plan. The template for new program proposals is included on the CD accompanying this self-study report. Examples of departmental and school program reviews are available in the team resource room during the visit.

Every course at USF has clearly defined learning outcomes and most instructors make the link between outcomes and assessment explicit in their syllabus. Multiple examples of course syllabi and program review activities can be found in the team resource room.

The Core curriculum

In spring, 1998, the Provost authorized the Joint University General Education Curriculum Committee (JUGECC) to recommend revisions in the University's General Education Curriculum (GEC). During the period from 1998-2001, the Committee reviewed the literature on university core curricula and general education programs; identified national trends in the design of general education curricula; examined core and general education programs at similar universities; and gathered information from students and faculty on their perceptions of the strengths and limitations of the current GEC.

The new undergraduate general education curriculum, known as the Core Curriculum, is scheduled for approval by the Board of Trustees at the September 24, 2002 meeting. It was built on a set of shared learning outcomes. They are:

- Students should be able to speak and write effectively.
- Students should be able to express ideas in an articulate and persuasive way.
- Students should be able to understand a mathematical problem and design a solution.
- Students should be exposed to a wide breadth of disciplines, as a foundation for a general liberal arts education.
- Students should understand the process of seeking truth and disseminating knowledge.
- Students should understand historical traditions.
- Students should appreciate and be able to critically evaluate the arts.
- Students should understand the nature of society and the relationships between individuals and groups.
- Students should understand the nature of the physical world, the uses of the scientific method, and the implications of technology.
- Students should comprehend the variations of people's relationship with God and develop respect for the religious beliefs of others.
- Students should understand the moral dimension of every significant human choice, taking seriously how and who we choose to be in the world.
- Students should understand and value cultural and ethnic differences in a multicultural society and globalizing world.
- Students should gain the skills and experiences necessary to link education to service.
- Students should be exposed to opportunities to work for social justice.

The structure of the new Core is:

Area A: Foundations of Communication	
Speaking	*4 units*
Rhetoric and Composition	*4 units*
Area B: Math and Sciences	*8 units*
Area C: Humanities	
Literature	*4 units*
History	*4 units*
Area D: Philosophy and Theology	
Philosophy, Ethics and Theology	*12 units*
Area E: Social Sciences	*4 units*
Area F: Fine and Performing Arts	*4 units*
Integration of Service Learning and Cultural Diversity *	*(see below)*
TOTAL CORE CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS:	***44 units***

*In addition to completing the GEC course requirements, the baccalaureate degree candidate will have completed a minimum of two courses within the GEC or within his/her major that integrate two mission-driven characteristics: Service Learning and Cultural Diversity. These requirements may be met by completing course sections designated as "SL" and "CD". Courses that integrate service learning as well as courses that meet the Cultural Diversity designation are offered across disciplines and schools.

The Cultural Diversity Requirement will be met by courses that promote understanding and appreciation of the richness and diversity of human culture. The Service Learning Requirement will be met by courses that integrate a form of community/public service into the academic undergraduate learning experience.

Specific learning outcomes have also been developed for each of the core areas. Those specific outcomes can be viewed in the "Core curriculum" document on the CD accompanying this report.

Throughout the process of review, revision and different iterations of the Core, several issues emerged indicating the importance of a clear, efficient, equitable and fair implementation process for a new Core Curriculum. The current system of a large committee with transient membership – and consequent problems with attendance, familiarity with committee business, and discipline expertise -- has resulted in inefficient and ineffective deliberations regarding course approval, assessment processes and commitment to the goals of a core curriculum. Additionally, this very centralized committee became politicized, losing credibility from the departmental and school perspectives. There was no "shared ownership" of the curriculum that came out of this committee. Several schools and/or departments felt alienated and disenfranchised by the current committee structure and its deliberations. The intent of this implementation process is to give the curriculum back to the experts of the discipline with fair representation from all schools to ensure commitment by all and integrity of the process.

It has been recommended that the University and the USF Faculty Association dismantle and abolish the current centralized committee (Joint University General Education Core Curriculum or JUGECC) structure, thereby decentralizing the process of creating and revising the Core Curriculum. In place of the JUGECC, the recommendation is for assigned Area Committees for each area, and an overall Core Advisory Board, as follows.

The chairs of each Area Committee make up the Core Advisory Board. In meeting its oversight responsibility, the board assures adherence to the learning goals of the overall Core Curriculum. The board reports jointly to the AVP and the USFFA and then reports back to the Area Committees. The Advisory Board will help to share information among areas and to coordinate recommendations that are made to the Academic Vice-President. The Core Advisory Board will be required to meet at least every semester and will annually review the learning outcomes for the Core Curriculum. Following this review, any proposed recommendations for changes to the learning outcomes will be forwarded to the Provost's office for final review and approval.

Area Committees draft and recommend learning outcomes, recommend courses for approval, assess courses for continued inclusion in the Core, and make recommendations to discipline-faculty for updates and changes to the Core.

- Each Area Committee will recommend the learning outcomes a course must meet in order for that course to be considered as meeting the area requirement of the Core Curriculum. (incorporating prerequisites and placement tests as determined by their respective College).
- Area Committees can make recommendations, to the Core Advisory Board, to change the learning outcomes of an area to ensure that the Area continues to update itself, continuously improving the curriculum in a dynamic fashion. The dynamic nature of the curriculum should be influenced primarily by the discipline itself. The intention of this point is to assure that the Area Committee converses with the faculty in the disciplines and builds consensus around any new changes to the learning outcomes.
- Area Committees will recommend, to the Academic Vice-President, the courses that are approved as part of the Core Curriculum. A majority vote, with a quorum present, is required for all recommendations.
- Area Committees will recommend, to the Advisory Board, assessment mechanisms for each area and will also recommend discontinuation of any

courses that fail to meet the outcomes from the Core Curriculum.

Once the curriculum has been formally approved, the Core Advisory Board and the Area Committees will work with departments to develop a regular system of assessment of the student learning outcomes.

Visiting team recommendations:

- *The university needs to design strategies to help faculty to understand how assessment is an integral and valuable part of the teaching and learning process to improve both the quality and quantity of student learning.*

- *The University needs to design strategies to help faculty to understand that defining, facilitating, and assessing student learning outcomes lies at the heart of the paradigm shift from a teacher-centered to a learner-centered environment.*

In the School of Business and Management, the School of Nursing, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the College of Professional studies, the policy for new curricula and course development states that approval of any course will require demonstration of the learning goals (outcomes) incorporated into the course, as well as the assessment or evaluation process and tools that will be employed to measure those outcomes.

Concurrent with the development of student learning outcomes at the course and program level is the continued support for faculty development in these essential skills. After the 1997 WASC visit, the University created the Office of Assessment and Teaching Resources to develop and deliver the recommended strategies. Faculty workshops at the individual school and college level have addressed the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. The Teaching Academy devotes several hours to this topic in a variety of contexts. A Student Learning Outcome Primer (see CD) was developed for distribution to interested faculty and appropriate University Life staff members to assist their efforts to articulate student learning outcomes.

Numerous new curriculum development and current curricular revision efforts have been aided by this focus on student learning outcomes. For example, the School of Business and Management redefined the goals of the MBA and Executive Professional MBA programs and completely revised the curricula of both programs by articulating the desired learning outcomes of the program and

the individual courses, then redesigning the program to most effectively and efficiently accomplish those learning goals.

Some selected examples of assessment throughout the University include the following:

- In summer 2002, USF commissioned a survey of 3000 alumni. Using the American College Testing Board alumni form, we hope for a response rate of 20-25%. This will provide us with valuable information about the experience and perspectives of our graduates.

- All SOE doctoral students are conditionally admitted. After completion of 12-15 units from a set of core courses identified by each program, student outcomes are reviewed. If appropriate for doctoral-level work, then students are fully admitted into the program. If work falls below doctoral-level expectations, a student may be directed to specific resources (writing center, tutoring, time management training, etc.) and then reviewed again within a semester. Other students who fall below doctoral level work are not admitted into the program and counseled out of the School.

- Every CPS program requires a capstone course that integrates and measures student learning, based on the learning outcomes for each of the courses in the program. The first course and the capstone course are very often taught by full-time faculty in an effort to better measure total student progress, as they exit the program.

- CPS has conducted a series of program-based focus groups, consisting of students and alumni, to assess the effectiveness of the curriculum, delivery model, and instruction. In addition, the dean, associate dean, program directors and associate program directors regularly visit cohorts to assess the curriculum, classroom instruction, and student services.

- The School of Nursing gains valuable feedback for curricular revision from the HESI (Health Education Systems Incorporated) computerized test. The test represents a synthesis of the knowledge acquired during the undergraduate pre-licensure nursing program at USF. It provides information about the level of knowledge and indicates what if any additional remediation or corrective intervention is needed to achieve knowledge synthesis. The score the student receives represents a probability of her/his ability to integrate knowledge in all of the areas included on the exit exam. The results of this data collection methodology

provide information to faculty and administration regarding the ability of the senior nursing students to demonstrate synthesis of nursing knowledge. Results of individual and aggregate data analysis helped faculty review course content, testing methodology and clinical application interventions. Additional work was designed for students who did not achieve an 85% probability on the test. NCLEX results that were between 50 and 76 % in 1999 rose to 96-97% for all graduates in 2002. One hundred percent of all students who achieved an 85% on the first testing passed NCLEX the first time; 90% of second time test takers passed NCLEX the first time and 80% of the third time test takers passed NCLEX on the first time. USF Nursing course testing was modified to reflect critical thinking and critical reasoning skills, course objectives and weekly class objectives were redesigned to reflect higher level knowledge acquisition.

- The newest Collection Bargaining Agreement with the full-time faculty includes the following article within the "Professional responsibilities of the Faculty" section: *The parties to this agreement commit to the idea that assessment of student learning outcomes is an important and demonstrable goal of our academic community. To this extent, the University and USFFA agree that Deans and faculty shall engage in regular and consistent efforts, which shall include discussions between Deans and faculty, on the methodologies to assess student learning outcomes. Faculty shall demonstrate how student learning outcomes have been assessed.*

Many other examples of the use of assessment information can be viewed in the Team resource room.

Visiting team recommendation: The University should conduct a campus climate survey to assess, document, and improve the climate and satisfaction of minority students on campus.

In 1998-99, the Multicultural Action Planning committee at USF began a comprehensive evaluation of diversity-related activities on campus. On February 24, 1998, the entire committee participated in a day-long retreat to develop a working definition of "multiculturalism" and "diversity" and identify assessment questions targeted at students, faculty, staff, administrators and alums about these important issues. From this collaborative beginning, several assessment activities were undertaken. A series of interviews were conducted by an outside consultant with University administrators to determine 'best

practices" and frustrations in promoting diversity. The summary report of those interviews is available in the Team Resource room.

A written survey was eventually developed by a graduate student in Education working as a research assistant to one of the committee members. The survey development process, which became this student's dissertation research project, successfully met established psychometric standards for validity and reliability. The results of this survey and the dissertation report are available in the team room for review.

The results of this survey allowed USF to look carefully at the programs and services in place to meet the needs of minority students. Following is a table that depicts freshman-to-sophomore retention, by ethnicity, for the last ten years. The table is constructed from data adapted from a report on USF freshman and transfer student *attrition* and graduation rates issued by academic services in November 2001. Because the USF freshman cohort that began in fall 2001 has not yet returned for the fall 2002 semester, we will not know their retention rate any earlier than census date, September 13, 2002. Thus, the attached table portrays the most current data we have. Some key points:

- Overall freshman-to-sophomore retention rates at USF have declined somewhat over the past ten years, from 84.1 percent for the freshman cohort of 1990 to 82.1 percent for the freshman cohort of 2000.
- The highest freshman-to-sophomore retention rate during the past ten years was 88.2 percent for the fall 1992 cohort.
- For the last two years, freshman-to-sophomore retention rates have been markedly higher for African-American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic students than for white students.
- During the past year, the African-American freshman-to-sophomore retention rate was 96.8 percent, in contrast to 78.1 percent for white students.

Current research shows that average freshmen-to-sophomore retention rates in the nation's colleges and universities have gradually drifted downward over the past 10 years. Among all private institutions, it was 75.1 percent. Thus, USF's freshman-to-sophomore retention rates are seven percentage points higher than the average among all private institutions, and comparable to *selective* private institutions.

Freshman to Sophomore Retention by Ethnicity, Fall 1990-2000 Cohorts

Year		African-American	Asian/Pacific Islander	Hispanic	International Students	Native American	Not Defined	Others	White	All
1990	Beginning cohort N	7	102	21	71	3	16	7	202	429
	% Retention	85.7%	85.3%	85.7%	78.9%	66.7%	87.5%	100%	84.7%	84.1%
1991	Beginning cohort N	12	107	22	72	4	17	16	232	482
	% Retention	75.0%	86.9%	90.9%	77.8%	75.0%	94.1%	81.2%	84.5%	84.2%
1992	Beginning cohort N	17	110	42	71	0	28	13	220	501
	% Retention	100%	89.1%	85.7%	91.5%	N/A	85.7%	100%	85.9%	88.2%
1993	Beginning cohort N	19	159	46	45	2	28	26	211	536
	% Retention	73.7%	91.2%	91.3%	88.9%	100%	89.3%	96.2%	84.4%	87.9%
1994	Beginning cohort N	14	147	53	54	1	23	28	208	528
	% Retention	78.6%	87.8%	79.2%	77.8%	100%	87.0%	96.4%	83.2%	84.3%
1995	Beginning cohort N	22	143	69	63	2	19	52	196	566
	% Retention	90.9%	88.8%	84.1%	81.0%	50.0%	78.9%	86.5%	87.2%	86.2%
1996	Beginning cohort N	22	148	64	62	4	26	78	217	621
	% Retention	90.9%	89.2%	89.1%	82.3%	75.0%	80.2%	85.9%	84.8%	86.2%
1997	Beginning cohort N	21	155	66	57	5	23	68	214	609
	% Retention	81.0%	85.2%	83.3%	78.9%	60.0%	100%	88.2%	84.6%	84.7%
1998	Beginning cohort N	25	205	74	47	8	27	8	251	645
	% Retention	80.0%	86.8%	85.1%	89.4%	100%	92.6%	100%	80.9%	84.8%
1999	Beginning cohort N	35	207	88	47	5	31	20	330	763
	% Retention	88.6%	90.8%	88.6%	74.5%	40.0%	87.1%	90.0%	77.0%	83.0%
2000	Beginning cohort N	31	200	92	58	4	33	31	311	760
	% Retention	96.8%	88.5%	82.6%	84.5%	50.0%	78.8%	67.7%	78.1%	82.1%

Source: Academic Services, November, 2001

The extension literature on college student retention reveals a multitude of successful freshman retention strategies, all of which are employed to varying degrees at USF. These retention strategies include the creation of a sense of belonging and community among freshmen, the development of learning communities for first-year students, the promotion of student involvement in active learning, enrollment in freshman seminars, academic skill development, and high-quality developmental advising and mentoring.

The relatively high retention rate among African-American freshmen during this past year deserves special attention. We believe that this high rate is most likely attributable to the academic, social, and personal support provided to this group of students by the Senior Associate Director, Minority Student Recruitment and Retention in the Admissions Office. National research indicates that various personalized strategies can have a significant impact on attrition rates. We believe that personal attention, often referred to as mentoring in educational literature, should increasingly be extended to other categories of USF students by administrators and faculty. Giving personal attention to students is the *cura personalis* of the Jesuit approach to education, and was a basic principle of education in the *Constitutions* of Saint Ignatius of Loyola. Although various institutional strategies can have a positive impact on retention rates, personalized strategies need to be tried and tested to help our students persist in achieving their educational objectives.

A variety of strategies for faculty diversification at USF have been in place during the last 10 years, many of them brought about by the efforts of a former Provost and Academic Vice-President (Fr. John Clark, S.J.) and the continued support of the current Provost and Academic Vice-President (James L. Wiser). As early as 1990, a group of minority faculty circulated to the deans steps and objectives directed at increasing the representation of minority faculty on campus. A number of those plans were subsequently implemented (e.g., targeted special mailings and advertisement placements, and diversification of search committees).

Before Fr. Clark's arrival at USF and since the closing of the original Ethnic Studies program in the 70s, there were a few ethnic minority faculty hired but not as the result of specific efforts at faculty diversification. The 1989 Higher Education Staff Information (EEO-6) report indicated that 91% of the full-time faculty were non-Hispanic Whites. By 1991, when the Irvine Minority Scholars program was proposed to the James Irvine Foundation, 88% of the full-time

faculty at USF was white, and at the end of two funding cycles of the Irvine Scholars program, 75% of USF's full-time faculty are non-Hispanic white (see table below).

Diversity of USF Faculty in 1991 and 2000 Compared to State Diversity

	California 2000	Full-time Faculty 1991	Full-time Faculty 2000
African Americans	7.5%	N=10 (4%)	N=12 (4%)
Asian Americans	12.2%	N=11 (5%)	N=20 (6%)
Latinos	31.6%	N=7 (3%)	N=19 (6%)
Native Americans	0.9%	N=0	N=0
Non-Hispanic Whites	49.9%	N=203 (88%)	N=242 (75%)
Unspecified *			N=29 (9%)
Total		231	322

SOURCES: November 8, 1991 and November 8, 2000 Human Resources database.
* In 1991, individuals who did not specify ethnicity were considered "Non-Hispanic Whites"

Another significant change related to the campus climate survey is the new cultural diversity graduation requirement described earlier in this report with the Core Curriculum. The Cultural Diversity Requirement will be met by courses that promote understanding and appreciation of the richness and diversity of human culture and fulfill the Core learning outcome "students should understand and value cultural and ethnic differences in a multicultural society and globalizing world."

This student survey will be repeated during academic year 2002-2003 as part of the evaluation plan for the Irvine Diversity grant received by the University. A multi-departmental group is planning the distribution, administration and analysis of the survey results.

Soon after the conclusion of the 1997 visit, the University began an extended discussion about what it meant to become a learning community. These discussions were held at the department, division and administrative levels. After extensive review of the literature and meta-analysis of successful learning community attributes, USF settled on a working definition of *learning community* that has helped guide our subsequent efforts.

Working definition:
A creative and vibrant environment in which all members of the USF community (faculty, student, friend, alumni and staff member) are encouraged and supported in accomplishing their learning goals

Structural components of successful learning communities:
1. Clearly-defined learning goals
2. Comprehensive and regular feedback about accomplishment of learning goals
3. Simultaneous teaching/learning responsibilities
   Each member of the community role models life-long learning behaviors (attending conferences, writing and reading professional articles, sharing with colleagues) and teaching behaviors (professional instruction, groups work, sharing in class)
4. Enabling each unique learner
   Intentional consideration of each learner's strengths and weaknesses and designing remedial and enrichment activities to maximize the potential for learning achievement (*e.g. remedial classes, using the Learning and Writing center, working with a mentor, becoming a mentor/tutor, working as a research assistant*)

This "working definition" has allowed each individual department and division to maximize their growth towards a more effective learning community while providing a strong infrastructure for that development. Explicit learning goals linked to relevant assessment activities become the starting point for productive efforts at multidisciplinary learning communities at USF.

WASC Commission recommendation: The development of a personnel evaluation process that rewards the transition to learning-centered approaches?

Visiting team recommendation: The University needs to clarify the relative merits of effective teaching and traditional scholarship in its "reward" system in order to make clear to faculty whether their time and energy required to implement a learning culture will be rewarded.

As noted previously, the newest Collection Bargaining Agreement with the full-time faculty includes the following article within the "Professional responsibilities of the Faculty" section:

> The parties to this agreement commit to the idea that assessment of student learning outcomes is an important and demonstrable goal of our academic community. To this extent, the University and USFFA agree that Deans and faculty shall engage in regular and consistent efforts, which shall include discussions between Deans and faculty, on the methodologies to assess student learning outcomes. Faculty shall demonstrate how student learning outcomes have been assessed.

Faculty approaching promotion and tenure now have the option of a "pretenure" sabbatical to assist them in preparing their materials and completing necessary activities to enhance their portfolios. This sabbatical can be taken for 1 semester at 100% salary or 2 semesters (an academic year) at 75% salary.

In 2000, the University piloted a new student evaluation of faculty effectiveness instrument. During the last round of negotiations between the University and Faculty Association, both parties agreed to form a joint committee to investigate alternatives to the current student evaluation system, the IDEA survey. Once formed, the joint committee responded to what they believed were widespread concerns about the IDEA instrument. They examined numerous instruments, proposals and related evaluation methodologies used at other colleges and universities. They asked for faculty input and made all data, correspondence, and related evaluation instruments available to faculty at the Reserve Desk of the Library or at the Project's website (http://www.usfca.edu/acadserv/ideareport.html).

The University of San Francisco adopted the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction System, published by Kansas State University, in 1994. Since its adoption, faculty members have voiced concerns about the instruments. In addition, administrative concerns have been raised about the impossibility of

predicting when the results will be returned, and the unwillingness of the developers to respond to the concerns of specific institutions, such as USF.

The committee initially met and discussed possible strategies for reviewing potential teaching evaluation instruments. They then identified five instruments that would meet the following minimum criteria:

1. Standardized objective system with a large database that would allow for comparative purposes (e.g. promotion and tenure, within and across departments and schools/colleges)
2. Reliable, valid and defensible instrument

    The following instruments were chosen for detailed evaluation:
    - IDEA
    - Student Instructional Report II (SIR II)
    - Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ)
    - College Classroom Environment Scales
    - Student Opinion of Instruction (SUMMA)

Each instrument was evaluated by committee members against the following criteria:

1. Information about how much students learned in the course included
2. Information about what faculty need to do to be more effective in the course included
3. Responses provide information about what pedagogy or teaching methodologies were effective and ineffective
4. Timely feedback to faculty possible
5. Minimal need for faculty background information input
6. Cost effective
7. Reasonable administration time for instrument
8. Ease and comprehensibility of survey questions
9. Easy to understand results report
10. Alternative strategies for evaluation of varying pedagogical approaches possible (e.g. lab, clinicals, seminars)
11. Information about student satisfaction with the course/instructor included

Based on the detailed evaluation of the instruments, the College Classroom Environment Scales was disqualified because it did not fulfill the overall purpose of a desired evaluation instrument. Of the remaining four evaluation systems, the committee recommended the Student Opinion of Instruction (SUMMA) evaluation instrument for trial usage because they felt that it had

more promise of meeting the criteria and fulfilling the objectives the Committee has established as necessary and desirable than the other instruments examined.

- It is a standardized system providing comparative data within and across departments and schools or colleges.
- It appears likely to provide reliable, valid and defensible data, and information about how much students learned in any given course and what faculty need to do to teach the course more effectively.
- It seems to be sensitive to the evaluation of various pedagogical approaches [e.g. lab, clinical, seminar].
- The survey's questions are easy to understand and would take an acceptable time to administer, without the need for excessive faculty background information.
- SUMMA is likely to give more timely and more intelligible feedback to faculty than IDEA, and is comparable in administrative costs.

After discussion and approval of these recommendations by the AVPC and the USFFA Policy Board, the committee's report and a copy of the SUMMA instrument was sent to each member of the USF faculty. The committee then recommended a pilot use of the form during the Fall 2000 semester. After time to review the results, a final decision about adoption of the instrument was made by simple majority vote of the USFFA faculty during the Spring 2001 semester. The SUMMA form, providing rich and easily accessible data for faculty using a variety of pedagogical approaches, was adopted for University-wide use in Fall 2001.

WASC Commission recommendation: Extend the learning community planning beyond the classroom into the entire University environment, especially the co-curricular.

The recent Planning Action Task Force recommendations included the following:

> The Student Affairs and Academic Affairs divisions should be integrated into a single organizational structure with the Provost as chief administrator.
>
> The rationale for this recommendation is consistent with the fundamental mission of the University—the education of the whole person. The PATF believes that a structure with Academic Affairs and Student Affairs as a single unit will improve coordination of services and insure that resources are consistently focused to promote student life and learning. Within a single division faculty would be challenged to more fully

engage the education of the whole person; staff responsible for providing services that support and enhance the learning environment would be able to participate more fully in the educational enterprise. Such a new division could better identify, create, and support curricular and co-curricular activities which promote leadership for service in the Ignatian tradition, and enrich the lives of students, faculty and the University learning environment as a whole. Leadership, service and learning do not take place in the residence hall, clubroom or classroom alone, and these skills—the ideals of our Ignatian vision—are not effectively taught in isolation. This new model would help diminish competition for resources and more clearly focus all resources to support the central outcome of the University's mission—student learning.

The goal of this recommendation was to "better realize the University's mission by creating an environment campus-wide that will be responsive to the concern for the entire life of the student—intellectual, spiritual, moral, social, psychological and physical." It should:
- Facilitate better coordination and synergy among organizational functions and units.
- Improve productivity and responsiveness in student services and educational programs.
- Increase effectiveness and efficient use of resources.

Dr. Margaret Higgins, newly-hired Vice President for University Life, will begin at USF in October 2002. Dr. Higgins will serve as the Chief Student Affairs Officer of the University. She will be a member of the President's Cabinet and the Leadership Team. She will report directly to the Provost and work closely with him and the other members of the Provost's Council to promote a more seamless learning experience for USF students that more closely links classroom learning with student activities.

Living Learning communities at USF
Many examples exist of effective and collaborative learning communities at USF. Long-standing living learning communities such as the Phelan Multicultural Community, the Saint Ignatius Institute community, the Erasmus Project, and the Pedro-Arrupe Justice Education Community have been joined by the new Martín-Báros Scholars community (**http://ww.usfca.edu/residence_life/oncampus/index.html**). The Global Living Community in the Lone Mountain Residence Hall begin accepting residents in

Fall 2002. Student interest in living learning communities is high, and a student group is currently researching additional living learning community experiences that they will propose for start in Academic Year 2003-2004.

The assessment of the impact of existing living-learning communities has been irregular and mostly qualitative. Initial evaluations of the early living-learning communities highlight increased retention and slightly higher GPA's for participants when compared to other students in the residence halls. The Martín-Báro scholars program has an ambitious assessment plan to help determine the impact of this community on the student participants. This plan is available for review in the team resource room.

The careful attention to assessment during the development of the Martín-Báro program has prompted a renewed interest in a formal assessment plan for the other living-learning communities. Several undergraduate students have expressed interest in participating in a comprehensive assessment of the current living learning programs as the first step in a plan to create additional residential learning opportunities.

Irvine Minority Scholars activities

Funding from the Irvine Foundation has allowed USF to offer support specifically tailored to the needs of minority faculty members. Research on issues facing ethnic minority scholars reveals that there are a number of challenges and obstacles that they encounter as members of the academy (Harris & Nettles, 1996). These difficulties include limited ethnic minority role models and peers, scholarly areas of interests that are not shared by other colleagues, excessive university and community service due to their minority status, problems publishing ethnic research in mainstream journals and press, and hostility and misunderstanding encountered when diversifying curricula. Parts of the funded strategies are designed to address these problems by offering a comprehensive program designed to target areas for fostering collegiality, mentoring, and enhancement of teaching and research agendas. Such a program promotes an institutional climate that values and respects the applied and scientific interests and perspectives of our ethnic minority faculty. It also provides ethnic minority faculty opportunities for networking and developing relationships with other faculty and administrators.

The Teaching Academy

The Adjunct Academy (now called the Teaching Academy) was created to assist part-time faculty members to become more effective instructors and maximize student learning. The initial workshop was developed as a collaborative pilot project between the Northern California Consortium Project (NCCP) and the USF College of Professional Studies and the School of Business and Management.

The initial pilot workshops, with the generous support of the Irvine Foundation, were held in October 1999, July 2000, August 2000 and October 2000. Since then, USF has sponsored 7 additional workshops, primarily for the faculty in the College of Professional Studies and the School of Business and Management. Because of growing participation and enthusiasm from the full-time faculty at USF, the name was changed from "Adjunct Academy" to "Teaching Academy." A total of 150 USF faculty members have completed the workshop.

The response to the Teaching Academy has been overwhelmingly positive. The content areas chosen for inclusion in the workshop were "extremely relevant" and the "instruction was exemplary". Participants appreciated the active learning approach and were pleased that "the facilitators not only recognized that we had some experience with teaching, but also encouraged us to share those experiences with the other learners." Most importantly, they were grateful to be more fully included in the USF learning community and very pleased by the Academy's strong emphasis on the Mission of the University as a guide for teaching.

One recent participant summed up many of the comments, "Well done--another way that USF is inclusive and supportive of adjuncts. The word is spreading that USF is a great place to teach and this program adds immeasurably."

Supplemental Instruction program

The Supplemental Instruction (SI) program coordinated by the Learning and Writing Center provides a good example of the learning community concept in action at USF. Based on student requests for tutoring and faculty requests for assistance, likely SI candidate courses are identified in the Learning Center and the College of Arts and Sciences. The Learning Center coordinator then meets with the faculty member(s) and associate dean(s) to discuss whether or not to offer supplemental instruction for a specific course based on student difficulties in the specific class. Science classes are frequently identified for SI assistance.

The supplemental instruction is provided by specially selected and trained student tutors. These students must have already taken the course and been successful, so almost all of them are identified by the faculty members and referred to the Learning Center. These tutors go through a special tutor training program (which includes learning styles and teaching methods) provided by the Learning Center, then they attend the course again so they know what the faculty member actually covered for the week. They meet regularly with the faculty member teaching the course to plan the supplemental instruction content and they hold the actual supplemental instruction sessions for the students in the course at least once a week and sometimes more, depending on the course. For some courses they will offer special sessions during mid-terms and finals.

Student participants self-select for SI, but if a student is having difficulty, faculty will strongly encourage them to participate in the additional assistance program. The Learning Center budget pays for the tutors' training and program delivery time. The institution has found that we actually save monies with SI because fewer individual tutors are needed. This is one of the ways we have not had to add significantly to the tutor budget even though the demand has grown significantly. It is a proactive support service for students to help them maximize their learning outcomes achievement; especially in classes that we know are difficult for students. The College of Arts and Sciences faculty and deans have collaborated effectively with the Learning Center on this program and USF hopes to be able to expand this instruction to more courses identified through an analysis of student feedback and course grades.

The following table examines selected course performance by students who participated in Supplemental Instruction in Fall 2001. The control groups are students in the same class who did not participate in SI.

Statistics 101

	SI (n=5)	Non-SI (n=71)
Mean Course GPA	3.2	2.93
A,B,C Rate	100%	87%
D,F,W Rate	0%	13%

Statistics 103

	SI (n=100)	Non-SI (n=220)
Mean Course GPA	3.07	3.09
A,B,C Rate	90%	82%

D,F,W Rate	10%	17%

Chemistry 111

	SI (n=60)	Non-SI (n=86)
Mean Course GPA	2.44	2.25
A,B,C Rate	80%	66%
D,F,W	20%	34%

Astronomy

	SI (n=15)	Non-SI (n=35)
Mean Course GPA	3.36	3.10
A,B,C Rate	93%	83%
D,F,W	7%	17%

- In every course in which Supplemental Instruction was utilized, students had lower D, F, and W rates.
- Slight increases in course GPA were visible in all but one course.
- Anecdotal evidence suggests that students who participated in Supplemental Instruction enjoyed their study sessions and felt their tutors were good support for the class.

WASC Commission recommendation: "How can institutional planning, financial planning, and assessment be integrated together along with the development of an effective system of data collection to support the process?"

Visiting team recommendations:

- *The University should develop a long-range financial projection model to test the interaction and financial impact of alternative planning strategies and to make trade-offs among primary planning variables.*

- *The University needs to continue the open and collaborative environment that characterized the development of Vision 2005 and Plan 2005 for the decision making process relating to prioritizing planning goals and designing implementation strategies.*

In September of 2000, Fr. Privett became President of the University of San Francisco. In addition to the expected and normal challenges of a new president, he faced a $5.2 million dollar revenue projection shortfall. This shortfall was anticipated as a result of a combination of 5,920 Student Credit Hours over-projected in enrollment resulting in $3.7 million variance, and an average undergraduate per unit tuition revenue shortfall of approximately $20 per SCH, resulting in $1.5 million variance in calculated revenue.

Fr. Privett responded by creating the Planning Action Task Force (PATF), with membership from University administration, faculty, and staff. In his memo to the University community on October 3, 2000 he charged the group to "…revamp our current practice in the areas of budgeting and of financial, capital and operational planning, with a view towards implementing an integrated planning-action model that adequately reflects the complexity of the University and more effectively focuses resources on our academic mission by addressing the key strategic initiatives that guarantee USF's continued improvement. "

The Executive Officers of the University worked simultaneously with the committee to address the anticipated short fall in 2001 operating budget caused by the overestimate of the student credit hours and the inadequacies of the formula used to translate student credit hours into revenue dollars. That formula did not adequately account for the current trend of USF students taking additional credit hours at the flat tuition rate; the formula was further

complicated by the different tuition rates in the variety of academic programs offered by the University.

The following individuals were asked to serve on the Planning Action Task Force:

1. Chair: Robert Niehoff, S.J. (Associate Provost and Vice President, Planning and Budget)
2. Larry Brewster (Dean, CPS)
3. Annette Brown (Budget Director)
4. Charles Cross (Vice President of Business and Finance)
5. Sandee Hill (Senior Associate Athletic Director)
6. BJ Johnson (Dean of Academic Services)
7. Stanley Nel (Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences)
8. Roberta Romeo (Assoc. Professor,Nursing and Chair, Budget Review Committee)
9. Terry Stoner (Associate Vice President, Human Resources)

The task force responded with twelve recommendations for University review and comment (http://www.usfca.edu/budget/PATF/PATFreport1.html). They are:

1. The University Life and Academic Affairs divisions should be integrated into a single organizational structure with the Provost as chief administrator.

2. The University should consider the integration of the College of Professional Studies, the School of Education and the School of Nursing into a new unit that might be titled the College of Human Development and Community Services. The identity of each school and college could be preserved for purposes of accreditation, ease of transition, and marketing by the creation of three divisions or schools within such a new college.

3. The creation and staffing of an Office of Sponsored Research is recommended for a trial period of three years.

4. A Faculty Early Retirement Program should be considered to determine its ability to assist faculty in planning for retirement, and provide long-term flexibility in course offerings and fiscal savings.

5. A Staff Early Retirement Program should be considered to assist staff in planning for retirement, and to determine the ability to provide increased flexibility in organizational structure and staffing.

6. A Cost-Benefit Analysis program should be designed and implemented for academic and service operations.

7. Eliminate most of the current practice, called a charge-back, of billing other University offices for institutional services. The University should move to a direct cost allocation for those item costs allocated to departments. All current and new charge-back policies should be reviewed by the President's Cabinet and approved specifically.

8. The PATF recommends that the University engage a consultant to assist in insuring that our Admissions, Marketing, Tuition Pricing, and Financial Aid activity and resources are strategically utilized to enhance the University's fiscal condition and improve the services provided to prospective applicants.

9. All revenues and fees should be recorded and treated as University General Fund revenues. The specific accounting policy to implement this recommendation should be developed by Business and Finance and approved by the President.

10. That all major Capital expenses be specifically budgeted and individually approved in the planning and budgeting process. The policy should be developed by Business and Finance and approved by the President.

11. Food Service Contract management should reside in the Business and Finance Division.

12. Consolidation of duplicated and segmented services that schedule rooms and provide meeting space and room setup found in the offices or functions of Conference Services, University Center, and University Registrar.

The current status of these recommendations, as of August 31, 2002, can be examined in the file "PATF Progress" on the USF compact disc that accompanies this self-study report.

Later, the PATF developed a new comprehensive Planning, Budgeting and Annual Review process that is inclusive and transparent, provides objective

measurements to chart success and ties resource allocations with plans and budgets. The first Annual Reviews will commence in late August 2002 after the fiscal year end. These Annual Reviews will be used to inform the Planning activities that will take place in the fall. Upon discussion and approvals, these Plans will be included in the Budget, which the Executive Officers and President will approve in February 2003. The comprehensive budget and underlying plans for Fiscal Year 2004 will be presented to the Board of Trustees at their March 2003 meeting.

Executive summary of new USF Planning, Budgeting and Annual Review process

Planning Initiative

Departments will create requests for approval of new plans throughout the year. Faculty and staff discussion, review, and prioritization of new plans will be accomplished through regular department and division processes. To standardize the information gathered, departments will complete a Planning Initiative Support Page for each plan that requires more than $50,000 of University resources or new positions or funding (capital items have a threshold of $75,000).Only significant, material changes from on-going operations will be described to the university community in plans. Division or school plans are added to the Pending Approval section of the Planning and Budgeting Executive Summary only with the approval of the respective Dean or Vice President.

Planning and Budgeting Executive Summary

As plans are brought forth by each Executive Officer, they are recorded in the Pending Approval section of the Planning, Budgeting and Executive Summary sample attached) that is periodically presented to the Leadership Team for review. This one-page sheet is intended to allow Executive Officers to simultaneously consider all plans for decision, so that decisions are made in light of University Priorities and plans are approved with respect to other plans being proposed in various departments and divisions of the university. This will encourage synergy and eliminate duplication of efforts throughout the University and will also encourage forward thinking, as plans are proposed with consideration up to 5 years forward.

The Leadership Team and the Cabinet advise the President regarding priorities. The President will approve the plans and can also postpone or eliminate those previously approved, in light of available University resources, current and

future University obligations, and with respect to all university plans, approved and pending approval. Plans may be approved at any time, but the University budget for the future fiscal year will be balanced in February, thus creating a natural approval point in January for the funding parameters for the next future fiscal year.

Budgeting

University budgets will remain static except for the following:
- Tuition Revenue budgets are formulated each year based upon enrollment projections set by the Deans and approved by Academic Affairs, and the tuition rates, as approved by the Board of Trustees
- Non-tuition revenue items will be projected by the responsible managers and reviewed and approved by the Vice President of Business and Finance
- Compensation increases will be determined after considering the recommendations from Human Resources, based on market conditions and contracted obligations with bargaining units
- Capital will be incorporated into the Planning and Budgeting and Annual Review Process
- Inflation increases will be recommended by the Leadership Team and the Cabinet
- Contracts will be budgeted consistent with the University contract obligations.
- Additional university sources of funds are expected to fund plans that will enhance our strategic initiatives and support our Mission, Vision and Values.

Annual Review

Annually, each Dean and Vice President will complete a one-page template briefly stating how their division supported the Mission, Vision and Values of the University during the previous year and identifying specific goals the departments focused on in support of the University Mission, Vision and Values, and Strategic Initiatives. Additionally, Executive Officers will prepare a financial profile of approximately 20% of their departments and programs. The Deans, Vice Presidents and the respective department managers will prioritize the departments to be profiled and will have opportunity to comment and participate in these reviews. The Budget Office will assist units in their financial review process by gathering the data, putting the data into uniform formats or templates and providing benchmarks and best practices data where available. These financial profiles will use standard measures so that departments can

compare themselves against other departments within USF and often, external to USF, thus creating a culture of evidence and standards against which to measure performance, improvements, efficiency and financial contribution to the University.

Expected Outcomes of the Planning, Budgeting and Annual Review Process

Primarily, we expect this process to align various department's goals and activities in support of the Mission, Vision and Values of the University. We hope to reduce duplication and increase the efficient use of our resources; one measure of our success will be the reallocation of resources within our existing budgets. We hope to make this process as meaningful as possible and streamline the work required to monitor our progress toward achieving our Strategic Initiatives and University Goals.

For the complete Planning, Budgeting and Annual Review Process document, Visit http://www.usfca.edu/budget/planning_budget/ or open "Planning process document" on the CD that accompanies this self-study report.

USF Technology Plan

The University drafted a comprehensive technology plan in August 1999 which has served as the blueprint for the technology changes that have occurred since then. A copy of the plan is included on the CD accompanying this self-study report.

Visiting team recommendation: The University needs to establish an institutional research function in order to transfer data into information for use by the campus community.

The Office of Institutional Research was established in December 2000 and is staffed by Dr. Alan Ziajka, Director and Dr. Renata Otterbach, Senior Research Analyst. A list of projects and information requests fulfilled by the office since its founding is provided on the CD that accompanies this report.

College of Professional Studies

WASC commission Recommendation: How are the regional campuses to become part of the learning community?

USF has made a determined effort to include the regional campuses in our developing learning community. During academic year 1999-2000, supervision of the campuses was transferred from the College of Professional Studies to the Academic Services Department (which includes the offices of Admission, Financial Aid, Academic Support Services, Data Services and University Registrar). The staff at each regional campus site now reports directly to the campus Regional Director (rather than the different schools and colleges), facilitating more efficient workflow and coordination of resources. In addition, dotted line relationships were established between the regional campus directors and the regional campus librarians and IT support personnel to further insure integration of services and programs across the University. All position descriptions were reviewed and revised to ensure consistency of services and responsibilities across campuses.

As members of the Academic Services team, regional campus colleagues have been instrumental in helping on-campus staff to understand the special needs of students who pursue their educational goals at a distance. Both on-campus and regional campus colleagues have worked together to modify and enhance services to students and faculty at the regional campuses. Together they have been able to meet the changing needs of the adult students served by the regional campuses. Marketing, recruitment, retention activities, academic support and library services have all become more integrated. An underlying goal of the service modifications has been to provide seamless services – to ensure that students do not understand the University organizational structure in order to get help that they need to be successful.

At the same time as this organizational change took place, the regional sites were redefined as "university-wide" campuses and now host classes for the School of Education, the College of Professional Studies, and the School of Business and Management. They are also the site of executive education classes, faculty development workshops, alumni events and administrative staff retreats.

The number of student services available at the regional campuses has increased significantly. Students now enjoy regularly-scheduled Career Services, Financial Aid, Bursar and Registrar services onsite. Each regional campus has a dedicated

librarian who is available during evening and weekend hours. Instructional presentation equipment is available at each regional campus, and a specially equipped wireless cart at each facility gives faculty members access to 15-18 laptop computers for classroom use.

Fully-equipped faculty offices are available at each regional campus and full-time faculty members are now assigned to each regional campus. Regional campus faculty members are invited to the main USF campus for new faculty orientation activities. CPS regional campus adjunct faculty are strongly encouraged to attend the Teaching Academy workshop and to date, approximately 100 of them have done so. The follow-up workshop, tentatively called the Teaching Update, will be offered twice a year and rotated among the regional campus sites. New student orientation for regional campus students is coordinated with the same group that presents new student orientation on the main campus. Finally, regional campus directors meet together bi-monthly and also meet regularly with the entire Academic Services department.

Visiting team recommendation: The University should address the need for additional resources to support technology at off-campus facilities with a special consideration being given to the question of connectivity to the central campus.

An Ad Hoc Task Force on Technology on the Regional Campuses was formed to make recommendations about the technology needs at those campuses. Continuing the work of the committee, the Academic Services Technology Committee spent several months last year in discussion with ITS, CPS and SOE representatives, and our own library and regional staff membership about the computing resources needed at the University's regional campuses. The following recommendations were presented to the Provost in fall 2001. Please note the updates for each in below the recommendations.

Introduction:
Technology needs have increased dramatically at the regional campuses each year, and can be expected to continue to increase. These needs fall into three primary areas:
- Classroom hardware and software
- Presentation hardware and software
- Individual student Internet access

The committee believes that the time may not be far off when every student in every course may require in-class computing resources and Internet access. Presentation hardware has also become essential in every classroom, and

students have an increasing need to plug in their own laptops and access the Internet.

Exploration of various hardware solutions in these three areas, including consideration of the security of the USF network and relative ease of support underlay the recommendations made below.

Recommendations:

- **Each regional campus should be equipped with at least one wireless cart for in-class use.** These carts would be owned and managed by the campuses, and supported by ITS. Management would include scheduling cart usage and ensuring cart security, in accordance with recommendations from faculty (a subcommittee has been formed for this purpose), ITS and Public Safety. ITS support would include troubleshooting hardware and software, installation of new software, periodic restoration of computers to their original state using Deep Freeze, and user training. All carts should be uniform in their platform and peripheral equipment.

As of fall 02, all campuses have one wireless cart for in-class use.

- **Every regional campus classroom should be equipped with an LCD projector.** In addition, each campus should have at least 2 laptop computers that may be checked out for use in presentations. Otherwise, faculty and students would use their own laptops for presentations.

We have 34 classrooms at the 5 regional campuses and 15 LCD projector/computer combinations. In order to equip each classroom we would need an additional 19 LCD projector/computer carts. (See attached spreadsheet for detail.) We have developed the following plan for achieving the goal of one LCD projector/computer combinations for each classroom at the regional campuses:

Fall 2002

ITS will purchase 4 carts – one each for the North Bay and Sacramento campuses and two for the San Ramon Campus. Thus the campuses will similar enrollment will each have 4 LCD/computer combinations; the campus with the largest enrollment – the South Bay will have 5 and the campus with the smallest enrollment will continue to have 2.

Fall 2003, 2004, 2005

Assuming all 5 campuses remain, 5 additional combinations will be purchased in the next 3 fiscal years (FY 04, FY 05, and FY 06) to bring us to our goal of one combination in each regional campus classroom.

- **Every regional campus should have at least five lounge area or library ports for students to plug in personal laptops and access the USF network (including printers) and Internet.** We do not, however, recommend implementation of such ports on a widespread basis (i.e. a hundred, or 15 in each classroom) due to the wiring expense and the security and support concerns associated with such access and personal machines.

We are currently in discussion about additional student ports in the libraries. As of fall 2002, we will also have printers available for students and faculty at each campus.

- **In order to support these technology resources, our committee recommends that staff support be expanded on site in the evening hours and on Saturdays to assist students and faculty.** In the long run, the optimal solution is to have an instructional support technician staff member present from 5-9pm Monday through Friday and from 8am to 12n on Saturdays. In the short run, we recommend that a student worker position be created for each campus. The person in this position would work at a minimum Monday through Thursday 5-7:30pm and Saturdays 8am-12n. Student Employment has indicated that possibilities may exist for hiring student help both from
the USF student population (for some campuses), as well as the student populations of institutions in each regional area.

Approval and funding ($30,000) were given in August 2002 by the Provost to hire one student assistant at each of the five regional campuses. The personnel requisitions were completed and approved by the Associate Provost this week. These positions will report to the regional campus directors with a dotted line relationship to ITS. The regional campus directors will involve ITS in the hiring process to assist in the assessment of the technology skill level of the candidates. (See attached job description.)

Visiting Team Recommendation: The College of Professional Studies should develop a plan for implementing the purpose and goals of the General Education Curriculum that contains unique strategies appropriate for adult learners.

We look forward to adopting the revised University Core curriculum once it is approved. We believe the Core, as proposed by the Joint University General Education Curriculum Committee, will work well for the adult population

served by CPS. In fact, the proposed Core will provide greater flexibility, allowing the College to tailor its general education program to the adult learner.

In the meantime, CPS faculty continue to explore ways to provide undergraduate students with multi-tiered learning options as they investigate their personal location as ethical and moral agents in a highly diverse culture and world.

Approximately 40 percent of entering CPS undergraduate students have completed their GEC requirements, excluding courses to be taken in their major that satisfy the GEC requirements in **analytical skills**, **expository writing, upper division philosophy**, **social science**, and **literature and fine arts**.   The other 60 percent satisfy many of their remaining GEC requirements through their personal and spiritual autobiographies, and other essays submitted in the Portfolio program, or through the CPS Extended Education Program, and courses taken at other universities or community colleges, with prior approval.

In order to insure that the courses offered through the Extended Education division of the College of Professional Studies satisfy GEC standards and learning outcomes, we have begun developing a structure for evaluating and implementing a curriculum that conforms to the newly developed USF Core curriculum standards. We intend to participate in the spirit of the Core curriculum standards currently being developed in area subcommittees while also accommodating the special needs and experiences of adult learners. Thus, we will adopt the learning outcomes developed and approved by USF academic and administrative bodies and shape our curricular offerings so that they conform to the same level of academic rigor. We also will provide and promote opportunities for service learning and cultural diversity across our curricula—not just in Extended Education courses where we offer most of our general education courses. Our required undergraduate introductory sequence or Ignatian Humanities Program accommodates both service learning and cultural diversity; thus students enrolled in CPS degree programs are already meeting the minimum Core standards for cultural diversity and service learning. Nonetheless, we anticipate that soon all other degree programs will also provide service learning opportunities and culturally diverse content.

The exact means by which courses would be evaluated by these standards is currently under review by the College of Professional Studies. The Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee (ASCC)—a faculty elected body—has accepted responsibility for developing the structural means by which courses

would be evaluated on how well they satisfy Core outcomes. The ASCC has agreed in principle to adopt the learning outcomes approved by USF and anticipates establishing a sub-committee whose sole function will be evaluating courses for GEC credibility. Broader curricular issues of how Core standards—including service learning and cultural diversity—would be represented in major requirements and course offerings will be delegated to each program to develop. Any curricular change will then be presented to ASCC for approval.

WASC Commission recommendation: What is the connection between CPS and the rest of the University?

Visiting team Recommendations:

- *The University should endeavor to mitigate the existing tensions between CPS and other units within the institution.*

- *The University should resolve as quickly as possible whether adult education will be delivered primarily through a centralized or decentralized model.*

The College of Professional Studies has undergone significant change since the 1997 WASC comprehensive team visit. We believe the changes in the College are responsive to the recommendations of the WASC visiting team, and have fundamentally improved the delivery and content of our educational programs and service to students. CPS has become a progressively more respected and integral part of the larger University community as a result of these changes.

A new dean was appointed in June 1999 and a new Associate Dean in 2000. Soon after joining the College, he appointed a task force consisting of faculty, staff and an outside facilitator. He charged the task force with assessing how the College might better serve its internal and external constituencies. The task force issued its report in December, 1999.

A number of structural and procedural changes were implemented in the College as a result of its work and feedback from students, alumni, and adjunct faculty. For example:

- The Student Advising and Support Services (SASS) division was established to proactively advise students at every campus, and from the point of entry into their program of study through to graduation.

- The assistant dean position was eliminated and replaced by associate program directors (staff) who report directly to the program directors

(full- time faculty). A secretary is assigned to each of the academic programs.

- The new structure empowers the full-time faculty in oversight of academic programs and College governance.

- One associate dean position was eliminated to fund other staffing positions in the College.

- The Office of Educational Mission and Spirituality of Learning was established.

- The Operations Division was established to oversee budgets, adjunct faculty contracts, cohort schedules, College publications, and related matters.

- Job descriptions in the College were reviewed and revised.

- College procedures, regulations and administrative systems were reviewed and revised to provide more efficient and effective service to students and other constituencies. These changes include student payment plans, grade grievance procedures, and a more efficient method by which books are ordered and delivered to students in a timely manner, personnel evaluations, advising materials, and faculty reimbursement policies.

- The cohort delivery model for graduate programs has been modified to provide students with greater flexibility in selecting elective courses across disciplines. Modifications to the CPS delivery format include a revised calendar that conforms to the wider University system, and significant revisions to the College curriculum (including online and Web-assisted instruction).

The College has experienced other significant changes worth mentioning.

These include:

- Recruiting nine full-time faculty with outstanding teaching and publication records. The number of full-time faculty lines in the College has increased to 19.

- Recruiting several new staff members with extensive experience working with adult students.

- Establishing the Adjunct Teaching Academy. The Academy is a training program designed for adjunct faculty to improve their teaching. The training focuses on a "learner-centered" model of education, and includes uses of technology in the classroom, evaluation of student written work, time management in the classroom, and tools for eliciting timely student feedback. An electronic listserv provides graduates of the academy the opportunity to regularly exchange ideas and classroom experience with their colleagues. Approximately 120 faculty have graduated from the Academy. The goal is to have all faculty attend within the next two years. Several full-time faculty and associate program directors have attended the Academy as well.

- Developing a greater full-time faculty and staff presence at the regional campuses. Frequent classroom visitations to solicit student feedback re: teaching and the curriculum. Ongoing peer evaluation of adjunct faculty.

- Moving CPS into its own building in July, 2001. The College's visibility and stature within the University and greater community are greatly enhanced by having a unique location. The building's design significantly improves communication within the College and helps create a sense of community,

- Integrating service-learning modules into the curriculum.

- Assessing of learning outcomes in new curricular design.

These developments in the life of CPS since the 1997 WASC visit have progressively eliminated tension between the College and other units in the University. Furthermore, the University administration has demonstrated its unqualified support for the College and adult-centered education at USF. The most visible evidence of this support has been providing the College with its own state-of-the-art building. Its new home affords CPS higher visibility, and enhanced stature vis-à-vis the other schools and colleges in the University community.

The dean has earned the respect and friendship of his colleagues. Nine new, full-time faculty already have made their mark in the University by participating on panels, serving on university committees and task forces, working with colleagues in the other schools and colleges to develop joint degree programs (e.g., nursing, education, law), and enhancing the College's reputation through their scholarship.

The 1997 Visiting Team wrote, "A review of the advantages and disadvantages of the "cohort" model used exclusively in CPS should also be undertaken." We are pleased to report that a serious and thorough review of the cohort model was begun in Spring 2000, resulting in a fundamental shift in the way CPS delivers its programs. In brief, the College will offer a blend of the cohort and menu models. The blended approach will preserve the advantages of the cohort (e.g., the unique bonding and support system students enjoy), while providing students with the flexibility of elective courses and exposure to other disciplines and students that is characteristic of the menu model.

The new model includes uniform start and end dates for cohorts that conform to the University calendar. The new model has required unprecedented cooperation and communication among faculty as they revise their curriculum to include elective courses in other programs, incorporate online and Web assisted instruction, and, in the case of undergraduate programs, integrate the new Ignatian Humanities structure into the curriculum. Tuition is now uniform at all campuses. These changes allow CPS students to take elective courses in other degree programs. They can easily work with cohorts at any of our campuses for professional, academic, or personal reasons.

The revised calendar will assist students and the Academic Services division in the University in managing the financial aid process. Finally, this new model and calendar make it possible for CPS to develop with the Bursar a more appropriate and user-friendly payment plan for students. These changes further reflect the integration of CPS into the University community.

Changes in the delivery and content of CPS programs, and the integration of its calendar, financial aid and payment plan with the University are truly revolutionary in scope. They are the culmination of more than two years of honest and open reflection by faculty and staff as the "old" methods were critically evaluated. With the addition of so many highly qualified and experienced faculty and staff, and the very positive work that has occurred in the College these past three years, it is fair to say that the feelings of "tension", "low morale", and "siege mentality" have largely dissipated.

The University administration has made a clear commitment to CPS and adult-focused education. The new building, additional full-time faculty (an increase to 19 since the previous WASC visit), and repeated invitations for the dean, associate dean, and faculty to serve on University committees and task forces is evidence of their support. The dean was one of three USF deans asked to serve on the Planning Action Task Force (PATF).

A possible merger of CPS and the School of Education was one of the twelve recommendations proposed by the Planning Action Task Force. The original recommendation was that:

> *The University should consider the integration of the College of Professional Studies, the School of Education and the School of Nursing into a new unit that might be titled the College of Human Development and Community Services. The identity of each school and college could be preserved for purposes of accreditation, ease of transition, and marketing by the creation of three divisions or schools within such a new college.*

The rational for this merger is that the "new college" could have a primary "professional education" focus, which with more effective marketing, could make it possible to significantly extend and enhance current programs. The creation of new programs could also be better facilitated. At the undergraduate level, the Bachelor of Arts in General Studies (BAGS) program, a BA completion program integrated with a teacher credential program, for example, might have a better chance of resurrection if the College of Professional Studies and the School of Education were included in a single administrative unit. Thus, all of the required resources could be assembled to launch a successful BAGS program.

As the largest college of the University by head count, the "new college" would have a larger pool of resources, and competition for resources among the schools would be reduced. This new college might also achieve economies, generate efficiencies, and be more strategic in addressing the professional education market, and enhance academic options and student services.

This merger could also potentially decrease the "isolation" of the College identified by the 1997 visiting team.

At this point, the Provost has determined that the School of Nursing will not participate further in these discussions. The Dean of CPS has assumed the interim Deanship of the School of Education upon the retirement of the SOE Dean in July 2002. Faculty and Staff are discussing and considering this merger and a faculty-staff task force will explore the issue with the assistance of an external consultant. The Provost will make final decision on the School and College structure after these discussions are completed and the task force submits a recommendation to him.

WASC Commission recommendation: What is the internal rationale for defining the optimal size of the faculty in CPS?

The number of fulltime faculty in the College of Professional Studies has increased to 19 since 1997. Nine full-time faculty members with outstanding teaching and publication records were recruited and the number of full-time faculty lines in the College has increased by two.

Unfortunately, it continues to be difficult to develop a model to accurately determine the exact number of fulltime faculty for the College because the role of the fulltime faculty has changed significantly and the results of these changes much be assessed before further predictions can be made. A series of interrelated factors are involved:

- Ongoing curricular improvements that have extended and redefined the role of fulltime and part-time faculty within the programs.
- Restructuring within the College: the new structure empowers the full-time faculty in oversight of academic programs and College governance and also established fulltime faculty in the program director positions previously held by staff members.
- Developing a greater full-time faculty and staff presence at the regional campuses. This includes frequent classroom visitations to solicit student feedback about teaching and the curriculum and ongoing peer evaluation of adjunct faculty.
- Modifications in the cohort delivery model for graduate programs have provided students with greater flexibility in selecting elective courses across disciplines. Modifications to the CPS delivery format include a revised calendar that conforms to the wider University system, and significant revisions to the College curriculum (including online and Web-assisted instruction).
- The uncertainty about a possible merger between the School of Education and CPS. The implications are myriad but include the CPS faculty joining the USFFA, collaborative curricular offerings by the two schools, and possible teaching assignments by CPS faculty in the SOE and SOE faculty within CPS.
- The implementation of the new Core Curriculum is still being planned by the CPS faculty. The impact on faculty workload of the new mission requirements (service learning and cultural diversity) are not clear.
- Enrollment issues and the continued viability of selected regional campuses will ultimately influence the number of full-time faculty needed within the College.

V. Description and evaluation of major changes and developments since the last visit including plans for changes and improvements

Many of the major developments that have occurred at USF have already been referenced in the previous sections of this report. Since the last WASC visit, USF has gained a new President, a new Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, a new Board of Trustees chair and vice chair, a new Vice President for University Life, a new Vice President for Business and Finance, a new Controller, a new Bursar, a new Vice President for Budget and Planning, a new Chief Information Officer, a new Dean of the College of Professional Studies, a new Dean of the School of Education, a new Dean of the Law School, a new Office of Institutional Research, a new Registrar, a new Office of Assessment and Teaching Resources, and new Office of Sponsored Research. The University also developed and adopted a new Mission and Vision statement, including several strategic initiatives. The Mission accurately articulates the character of USF as a Jesuit, Catholic, urban institution with a global perspective.

There is a renewed sense of vitality and purpose at the institution. Departments, programs, schools and colleges, and the University as a whole are articulating learning outcomes and developing creative and effective strategies for assessing the achievement of those outcomes. The new Planning and Budgeting process brings a level of attention and transparency to these key activities that the institution previously lacked. The new leaders bring fresh perspective and an innovative vision to addressing continuing concerns.

We are pleased with the progress made since the last WASC comprehensive visit, but are well aware that we still have more to accomplish.

The institution has made satisfactory progress towards articulating the student learning outcomes described by our Mission and Vision statement. Student expectations for both the curricular and co-curricular experiences are better explicated than in 1997. Those learning outcomes will provide a tangible starting point for the conversation about better integrating the curricular and co-curricular experiences.

Previous institutional attempts at planning and budgeting were episodic and insufficiently strategic in scope. The new Planning and Budgeting procedure and the new administrative structure to support it demonstrates the University's commitment to change and helps assure continuing success of these complimentary processes.

Below are the summarized PATF Recommendations as of January, 2001, and the current status of these Recommendations.

1. Integration of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs

The Student Affairs and Academic Affairs divisions should be integrated into a single organizational structure with the Provost as chief administrator.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

Dr. Margaret Higgins, newly-hired Vice President for University Life, will begin at USF in October 2002. Dr. Higgins will serve as the Chief Student Affairs Officer of the University. She will be a member of the President's Cabinet and the Leadership Team. She will report directly to the Provost and work closely with him and the other members of the Provost's Council to promote a more seamless learning experience for USF students that more closely links classroom learning with student activities.

Better integration of curricular and co-curricular student experiences is a major goal of the new USF leadership. We expect that this will be a significant theme for our next WASC educational effectiveness review.

2. Integration of College of Professional Studies and the Schools of Education and Nursing

The University should consider the Integration of the College of Professional Studies, the School of Education and the School of Nursing into a new unit that might be entitled the College of Human Development and Community Service[6]. Initially the identity of each school and college would be preserved for purposes of accreditation, ease of transition, and marketing. This could be achieved through the creation of three divisions within this new college.

At this point, the Provost has determined that the School of Nursing will not participate further in these discussions. The College of Professional Studies and the School of Education are currently reporting to the same Dean. Faculty and Staff are discussing and considering this merger. The Provost will make a final decision on the School and College structure after these discussions.

A highly participatory process facilitated by an external consultant is planned to help determine the resolution of this recommendation.

3. Food Service Contract

Food Service Contract management should be done by the Business and Finance Division.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

The Business and Finance Division has assumed all oversight and management of the food service operations, facilities management and related contracts.

4. University Revenues

All revenues and fees are recorded and treated as University General Fund revenues. This policy should be developed by Business and Finance and approved by the President.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

The Revenues are recorded as General Fund revenues and are no longer allocated and transferred to auxiliary support accounts.

5. Capital Budgets

It is the recommendation of the PATF that all major Capital expenses should be specifically budgeted and individually approved in a budget planning process, by the University Budget Committee, the Cabinet, President, and the Trustees. This policy should be developed by Business and Finance and approved by the President.

The Capital Budgeting Process has been developed and is pending approval by the President. The Capital Budgeting process rolls into the University Budgeting Process where Capital Budgets affect Operating Budgets.

6. Room Scheduling

Consolidation of duplicated and segmented services that schedule rooms and provide meeting space and setup found in the offices or functions of Conference Services, University Center, and University Registrar.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

The Scheduling Task Force has been working to create a "one-stop shopping" program for University users. They have thoroughly researched and selected a software program, CEO/Scheduler Plus to support this function.

7. Cost Analysis Program

A uniform Cost Analysis program should be designed and implemented for the University academic and service operations.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

The Annual Financial Review Process has been developed and is pending presidential approval as part of the entire Planning, Budgeting and Annual Review Process. The Financial Annual Review Process informs the University Planning Process.

8. Eliminate Charge-backs

Eliminate most of the current process of billing other University offices for institutional services. This billing process is called a charge-back. The University should discontinue charge-backs and move to a direct cost allocation for those items for which costs must be allocated to departments. All current and new charge-back policies should be reviewed by the President's Cabinet and specifically approved.

Most University charges for service are no longer allocated and transferred to and from support accounts. Notable exceptions are in the areas of Plant and Central Stores where departments are charged for supplies and services as direct costs of operations.

9. Review of Admissions, Marketing, Tuition Pricing and Financial Aid Strategies

The PATF recommends that the University engage a consultant who could assist in insuring that our Admissions, Marketing, Tuition Pricing and Financial Aid activity and resources are strategically utilized.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

The University did engage the services of Maguire Associated which issued its report in May 2001. We have implemented many of the recommendations offered in the report. The University has also created a separate Office of Graduate Admissions and is currently seeking a director of this new office and a new director of its Undergraduate Admissions Office. USF has also engaged the services of the College Board to assist in implementing a financial aid strategy tool during the 2002-2003 academic year.

10. Creation of an Office of Sponsored Research

The creation and staffing of an Office of Sponsored Research is recommended for a trial period of three years.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

The University has created this office and is currently conducting a search for a Director of Sponsored Projects. We hope to have this position filled sometime in Fall of 2002.

11. Faculty Early Retirement Program

A Faculty Early Retirement Program should be considered to determine its ability to provide long-term fiscal savings and flexibility in course offerings. If such a program is

deemed to be potentially beneficial, a joint committee should be convened to investigate more fully, the options, costs and potential benefits to the University. It is important that the University review other University's early retirement programs to gain knowledge of successful and unsuccessful models. The USF Law School's Phased-In Retirement Program appears to be successful.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

A committee has been appointed to study the feasibility of such a program and will make a recommendation to the University. The Leadership Team, Cabinet and President will consider this recommendation.

12. Staff Early Retirement Program

A Staff Early Retirement Program should be considered to determine its ability to provide long-term fiscal savings and increased flexibility in organizational structure. If such a program is deemed to be potentially beneficial, a committee of staff should be convened to investigate more fully, the options, costs and potential savings to the University. Given, the current labor market, replacement staff may not always yield a salary savings to the University. This aspect should be carefully considered before going forward with a Staff Early Retirement Program.

Status as of September 13, 2002:

The formation of a committee to evaluate this option has been discussed at President's Cabinet.