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August 15, 1991

The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Post Office Box 9990
Mills College
Oakland, California 94613-0990

To Members of the Visiting Team:

I am pleased to forward to you copies of our Report in preparation for the Special Visit to the University of San Francisco. I believe the Report describes significant changes at the University of San Francisco since the 1988 WASC visit.

The Report has involved extensive participation of faculty and staff. It was circulated broadly in draft form before its final revision.

The University community and I are available to assist the Commission and the Visiting Team as it prepares for the visit. Considerable documentation will be available to the team during its time on campus.

We look forward to the visit in October.

Sincerely,

John W. Clark, S.J.
Vice President for Academic Affairs
I. STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

A. This introductory section describes the three distinct phases of the University’s response to the WASC Commission’s decision letter of March 1989 and the preparation of the Special Visit Report. The first phase began immediately following the Fall 1988 visit.

Soon after the departure of the visiting team, staff members in the office of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) undertook a thorough analysis of the University’s 1988 Self Study Report to document and organize ways of addressing the cited weaknesses. (1) These were refined into priority areas of concern for review and discussion with the Council of Deans. Shortly after the arrival of the new Vice President for Academic Affairs in January 1989, these priorities were realigned in light of those issues identified by the Team Report and the Commission in its decision letter (Exhibits A and B*). Subsequently the Team Report and the Commission letter were distributed to the Board of Trustees and were reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board at its June 1989 meeting.

In the interval between January and June 1989, the University reviewed the various strategies set in place by the previous interim VPAA in Spring 1988 during the Self Study. The Deans and members of the faculty began to address the specific changes related to governance, administrative-faculty relations, university planning, and strengthening of off-campus programs. A new statement of academic goals was drafted and reviewed by individual faculty and with the Academic Forum. Other activities included:

* Exhibits will be made available in the Team room at the time of the visit. All other references can be found in the companion document to this report.
1. The process for integrated academic and financial planning was reviewed and modified, and a new committee structure was set in place to allow for involvement of faculty in planning and budgeting. The new procedure began in September 1989.

2. The organization of the University administrative staff was reviewed by a joint task force of faculty and administrators. Some 38.8 administrative and staff positions were eliminated excluding those new positions which have since been added.

3. Work began on revision and completion of the University-wide strategic plan with the creation of a University Planning Office. This effort was coordinated by a new Special Assistant to the President.

4. An Assessment Task Force began work in the Fall of 1989. Other committees were formed to address special concerns related to faculty governance and peer review. A special Task Force was established to address diversity issues on campus.

5. Other groups were established to begin a systematic review of university information needs and the needs of the off-campus centers for support services.

6. Specific targets were set for enlarging the number of full-time faculty in the College of Professional Studies and for revitalizing all off-campus programs.

By the end of the 1988-89 Academic year, the Executive
Officers of the University were able to meet in a retreat to assess accomplishments and proceed with further planning. In December 1989 the President of the University reported to the Executive Director of the WASC Commission the priorities, plans and accomplishments of this first phase. (Exhibit B)

B. The second phase of preparation for the Fall 1991 Special Visit was initiated in October 1990. The Commission's directive "that the written report for a special visit need not be comparable in size, depth of analysis, or comprehensiveness of a full self-study" guided the formal planning for preparation of the final report. Four major areas of concern were identified by WASC for review: university planning, faculty role in governance, administrative-faculty relations, and off-campus programs. In addition, new WASC guidelines call for a report in two other areas: diversity and assessment of university effectiveness. Six review committees were appointed, one to address each of the above issues. A total of 37 university personnel served on these committees. Faculty were the predominant members of these review groups. Other members included administrative staff and, where appropriate to the issues, students. A point of departure from the usual composition of self study committees was the emphasis on representation from Academic Affairs. Members of the other divisions did not serve on the review groups; however input was obtained from other divisions during the review process. A reference to a designated "review committee" in this Special Visit Report will relate to the work and final report of one of these committees. (2)

Committee members were first brought together in November 1990 for orientation to the review process. The purpose of accreditation was discussed and the University status with WASC described. Appropriate background materials were distributed to each member, including copies of the Visiting
Each of the six review groups was charged to verify the issues of special concern to the Commission, to validate the status of the University regarding those concerns in 1988 and again in 1990-91, and to describe the changes which had taken place. Plans for continuing action and/or recommendations were designated as the concluding section for each of the six individual reports. The review groups selected their own approach to carrying out their charge, and met as often as needed. Materials were collected and studied and interviews were conducted to validate perceptions and confirm findings. In the case of one group, a survey conducted in 1987-88 was repeated and the findings of the two surveys were compared.

Between January and June 1991, regular meetings of all review committee chairpersons and interested committee members were held to discuss progress of the review process and to report methodology concerns. Meetings were held at least monthly, and more often as needed to share findings. The large group meetings provided the opportunity to present preliminary reports, receive recommendations for follow-up, and to present final reports. The members of different committees thus were able to stay informed of the progress of each committee and to benefit from the experience of others. The process was valued for the opportunity to promote consistency in the reports, to alert others to sources of information and other viewpoints, and to create a more informed community. By the close of the 1991 Spring semester, each review group had submitted a final written report of its work accompanied by pertinent supporting materials.

C. The third phase of preparation of the Special Visit Report began with the appointment of a special assistant to
coordinate the final writing on the document and to organize required supporting materials. Responsibility for the content and preparation of the final report was retained by the VPAA, who participated in the actual writing of the final document. The Committee reports were used as a basis for this final report. While this document contains the substance of committee reports, it has been revised to eliminate duplication and provide coherence of style. A draft of the entire report was submitted for review and comment to each of the review group members, the Council of Deans, all full-time faculty, members of the administration, and the University President. Additional supporting materials were collected or prepared as needed by appropriate staff members.

Copies of this Self Study have been sent to the University Board of Trustees, placed in Gleeson Library, and distributed widely to the University community.
II. DESCRIPTION, BACKGROUND, AND HISTORY

The University of San Francisco (USF) first accredited by the Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 1951, was established as the City of San Francisco's first institution of higher education in October 1855 by the Jesuit Fathers. In 1859, the University received its charter from the State of California to confer degrees. USF is the third oldest institution of higher education in California.

The University moved to its present Ignatian Heights location in 1909. In 1978, the adjacent Lone Mountain Campus was acquired. The entire campus presently covers 53 acres, including the property housing the Koret Health Center, which is the newest building on campus.

In 1970-71 the University changed its Board structure from an all Jesuit composition. Presently there are 45 members of the Board, 12 of whom are Jesuits.

The colleges and schools of the University include the College of Arts and Science, the McLaren School of Business, the College of Professional Studies, and the Schools of Education, Law, and Nursing. Nearly 40 undergraduate degree and 20 graduate degree programs at the Master's level are offered, in addition to the J.D. program in the School of Law, and five Ed.D. programs in the School of Education. Basic teaching credential programs and service and specialist credential programs also are offered by the School of Education. The professional programs are accredited and approved by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, the American Bar Association, the American Chemical
Society, the Association of American Law Schools, the California Board of Registered Nursing, the National League for Nursing, the State Bar of California, the California State Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the National Computing Sciences Accrediting Board.

Academic programs operated through contractual relationships with non-regionally accredited agencies or organizations include the Cooperative Bachelor of Fine Arts program with the Academy of Arts College in San Francisco. Baccalaureate and master's programs are conducted by the College of Professional Studies and the College of Arts and Science for Pacific Bell employees in San Ramon. A master's program is also offered by the School of Education at the same site. The University completely controls the Pacific Bell program. All faculty are USF personnel. Pacific Bell provides employees with a tuition payment plan. It also authorizes the USF program to be a part of its extensive employee education program.
SUMMARY DATA FORM

INSTITUTION: University of San Francisco

PRESIDENT/CEO: John P. Schlegel, S.J.

1. YEAR FOUNDED: 1855

2. SPONSORSHIP AND CONTROL: Private, Non-Profit

3. DEGREE LEVELS OFFERED:

   - Associate
   - Baccalaureate
   - Masters
   - Professional
   - Doctorate

4. CALENDAR PLAN: Two Semesters with Intersession/Summer Session

5. CURRENT ENROLLMENT: (Fall 90 census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Undergraduate</td>
<td>3488</td>
<td>3366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Graduate</td>
<td>2347</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Non-degree</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>6331</td>
<td>5693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. CURRENT FACULTY: (Fall 90)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>64.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Ratio: FTE Student/FTE Faculty: 19:1

7. FINANCES: (Fall 91)

   A. Annual Tuition Rate per unit: Undergraduate $400
      Graduate $432**
   B. Total Annual Operating Budget: $75,076,500.00
   C. % from Tuition and Fees: 83.8%
   D. Operating deficit(s) for past three years:
      1988-89    $0
      1987-88    $0
      1986-87    $0
   E. Current Accumulated Deficit: $0

8. GOVERNING BOARD:
   A. Size 44
   B. Meetings per year 4

9. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS:
   A. Number 24 (18 CPS; 6 Education)
   B. Total Enrollment 1819

10. LIBRARY:
    A. Number of Volumes 552,000***
    B. Number of Periodical Subscriptions 2300***

   * includes School of Law and CPS faculty
   ** Law $488/unit; Off-Campus $359/unit
   *** does not include Law Library holdings
RESPONSE TO COMMISSION
RE: UNIVERSITY PLANNING

A. Summary of the Visiting Team Report

The Visiting Team noted that "planning begins with a vision of the University as the University exists at three levels. That vision 1) places it within the social role and value system of Higher Education, 2) identifies it with the community of institutions it considers its peer group, and 3) expresses its unique contribution--the special difference it makes in the lives it directly and indirectly touches." The Team saw "strong evidence of the second aspect in the clear recognition of the Jesuit tradition and the power and beauty of that conception of knowledge and of men and women as teachers and learners." However, what they viewed as less evident was "the embodiment of the Jesuit vision in a larger vision of tradition and a sense of itself as a special and unique institution." (Team Report, p.5)

The Visiting Team judged planning at the University to be "... partial, sporadic and uncoordinated." (Team Report, p.13) They described planning as intermittent. "The process wanders and skips periods or places; trails disappear; good intentions sputter and die. The University seems to us to need more effective structures for getting things done." (Team Report, p.6) In addition, "... the nine levels of planning enumerated on p.126 of the Self-Study do not appear to operate in either a top-down or bottom-up manner sufficient to provide general guidance or capture common purpose. Although the institution has undertaken substantial efforts to find a suitable model for institutional planning, none is yet in place." (Team Report, p.13)
In addition, the Visiting Team noted the lack of substantial faculty involvement in institutional governance which undermined and impeded not only collegiality, but also "any orderly planning process that engages the commitment of those who may be responsible for implementing the plans--the faculty." (Team Report, p.17) In the Commission Letter of March 1989, our previous process was described as deficient in a number of areas--Institutional Planning, Academic Planning, Planning for Physical Resources, and Financial Planning.

B. Verification of the Visiting Team's Observations

Although some individuals disagree with certain of the Visiting Team's observations or interpretations, there appears to be general agreement across the University community that the Team's assessment and evaluation of the University's planning process at the time of the on-site visitation were accurate. There were a number of factors that contributed to the situation as assessed by WASC. At the time of the visit:

- The existing Mission Statement was not formulated by a broadly based constituency, nor did it define USF's specific contribution within the higher education community.

- There was no operative long-term comprehensive University-wide planning process. A Committee responsible for planning and budgeting in actuality dealt only with budgets.

- Planning almost exclusively consisted of "wish lists" from the departmental level.

- The adversarial nature of the USF Faculty Association/Administrative relationships made impractical a cooperative planning effort between the faculty and
Meaningful faculty involvement was substantially absent.

- There was a high turnover rate among executive level administrators, which interfered with the continuity of planning.

- Emphasis was placed on "coping" and practical "fire-fighting" considerations.

- Revenue generation was perceived as the principal goal of planning efforts.

- At the same time, individual academic units developed strategic plans within their own limited areas of responsibility. The consequence was that many plans were formulated throughout the University that were often disjointed and uncoordinated and, occasionally, at cross purposes.

C. Changes Since the Team Visit

We believe the present planning process conforms to WASC standards and meets the major concern of the Commission. Progress has been made on two levels. First, the University has broadened participation in the planning process. Faculty and students are now involved in both the planning and the budgeting process of the University. Four faculty members, one of whom is chair, serve on the Budget Review Committee. That faculty member also serves on the Executive Planning Committee. Three other faculty members serve on the Strategic Planning Committee. Secondly, while separate committee structures have now been developed for the budget and planning review processes, planning and budgeting are so related that the University plans become the focal point of University
1. **Institutional Planning**—The new planning and budgeting process was instituted in Fall 1989 to meet the Standards of 2.b. It was designed by the VPAA and the Vice President for Business and Finance, after broad consultation with the University community, the Planning and Budgeting Committee, and the University President. The cycle for a given academic year begins approximately 18 months in advance. Typically it involves the following steps:

A. **February - May: Planning**

   The planning process for the academic year, 18 months ahead, is initiated. The University’s five-year Strategic Plan is reviewed by departments, colleges, and divisions, and modifications are proposed. Division plans and priorities are reviewed by the Strategic Planning Committee. The modified division plans are submitted by the Strategic Planning Committee to the Executive Planning Committee. The President approves the planning priorities and the updated Strategic Plan and submits it to the Board of Trustees.

B. **June:**

   The Board of Trustees approves the updated strategic plan with appropriate modifications.

C. **August:**

   On the basis of Board approval, the President sets the institutional priorities for the development of the budget for the academic year 14 months hence. The divisions and colleges, through a collaborative process, set goals based on the
President's priorities for use in development of budgets beginning in September.

D. September - December: Budgeting

The Budget Process for the year now 12 months ahead is initiated, based on the Institutional Goals formulated by the President the preceding month of August. The Budget Review Committee reviews last year's budgets. The Budget Parameters document is prepared and distributed. The Departments, Colleges, and Divisions prepare budgets for the following academic year. Division budgets are submitted to the Budget Review Committee.

The Strategic Planning Committee reviews the previous year's performance against the Strategic Plan.

E. January - March:

The Budget Review Committee reviews division budgets submitted in D. above and makes recommendations for the following year in light of the planning priorities approved by the Board of Trustees the previous June, and formulated as Institutional Goals by the President in August (Exhibit C). These recommendations are discussed with the Deans and then sent to the Executive Planning Committee for review. The President approves the Executive Planning Committee recommendations for the University Budget for the following academic year. The budget for the next academic year is submitted by the President to the Board of Trustees for approval. The Board of Trustees approves the Budget in March.
This plan is briefly summarized in Figure 1, on the next page.
## Preparing The Institutional Plan & Budget

### Budgeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>• Budgeting parameters document prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>• BRC reviews last year budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>• Budgeting parameters document published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>• Departments, divisions prepare budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>• BRC Reviews Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>• EPC reviews budget proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>• Trustees Approve Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>• Trustees Approve Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>• Departments review and revise 5-year plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>• Colleges and Deans review and revise 5-year plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>• Divisions integrate plan revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>• SPC &amp; EPC review plan modifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>• Develop next year priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>• SPC reviews last year performance against plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>• Develop next year priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>• Colleges and Deans review and revise 5-year plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>• Develop next year priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>• Divisions integrate plan revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>• Develop next year priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
- Basically, planning is a Spring activity; budgeting is a Fall activity
- Planning begins for year 18 months in advance
- Budgeting begins for year 12 months in advance

**Abbreviations**

- BRC = Budget Review Committee
- SPC = Strategic Planning Committee
- EPC = Executive Planning Committee
In the planning process there are several important subsets which facilitate University and academic planning. These include:

- An external environment review which studies demographic data, ethnic and cultural diversity statistics and estimates of economic factors influencing the University.
- An internal environment review which considers special needs of the University, enrollment projections, and fiscal and economic changes anticipated for the future.

These reviews are conducted by the Strategic Planning Committee and the University Budget Office and contribute to the preparation of a "Budget Parameters" document distributed by the Budget Review Committee in October. The Budget Parameters document summarizes the institutional goals for the coming year, discusses external and internal influences on specific budgeting items, and establishes guidelines for preparing departmental, college and Divisional budget proposals. (4)

3. Academic Planning--At the present time academic planning consists of three components: an overall five-year academic plan, with specific priorities set for the next budget year; a process for review of ongoing programs; and an approval process for new program proposals. All three of these components are presently operative, however they are still in the developmental stage; i.e., some of the procedures are not yet finalized.

The Academic Plan is developed by the Council of Deans in collaboration with the departments and programs of each college. The Plan basically describes in some detail how the
division is going about meeting the goals of the Strategic Plan. Sections of the Academic Plan address the mission and goals of the University, specific division-wide priorities, and specific plans of the colleges to implement the overall divisional plan. A copy of this plan is included with this report. (5)

**Ongoing Program Review** begins with a self study within a department conducted in accord with guidelines from the Dean. (8) The Dean may call for an outside evaluation of the self study. This report is sent to the Joint Committee on Curriculum for its comment and evaluation. Results of this review, together with recommendations, are sent to the VPAA. The VPAA discusses the review with the President. Depending upon the schedule of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board, selected programs will be discussed at a Board meeting. Presently two programs of the College of Arts and Sciences are in the process of review. Copies of these reports will be available to Team members during the visit.

**New Program Review**--New programs may be proposed at any time. If proposals do not originate in a department they are first sent to the appropriate department for review. Departmental recommendations are sent to the Dean and then to the Budget Review Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee. With approval of these two committees the proposal is forwarded to the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee forwards recommendations to the VPAA for action. The President approves the new program. New degree programs require Board approval. New site proposals need WASC approval before implementation. Copies of these proposals will be available for review. The new graduate program in Sports Fitness and Health Management is an example of a program approved through this new program review process. (Exhibit D)
Figure 2 describes the ongoing and new program review process.
The Ongoing Program Review Path

1. Academic Department
   - Initiates Self-Study
   - College Dean & College Council
     - Reviews and Recommends
     - University Curriculum Committee
       - Reviews and Recommends
       - VPAA
         - Consultiess with President
         - Take to the Board as Appropriate
         - Authorizes Changes

New Program Review Path

1. Academic Department
   - Initiates or Reviews
   - College Dean & College Council
     - Reviews and Recommends
     - SPC
       - Reviews & Recommends
       - BRC
         - Reviews & Recommends
     - University Curriculum Committee
       - Reviews & Recommends
       - VPAA
         - Recommends To President
         - President
           - Approves or Sends To B of T / WASC
4. Planning for Physical Resources--Comprehensive planning as called for in Standard 8 C occurs and is based upon the stated academic goals and objectives of the institution. The last comprehensive USF Master Plan was completed in 1979, with an update in 1983. (Exhibit E) At present the Plant Services staff, in cooperation with the Board of Trustees Physical Facilities Committee, is in the process of producing a new Master Plan. This new plan will be responsive to programmatic requirements as indicated in the University’s long-range academic plans.

The new USF Master Plan is being developed by an Architectural/Planning firm in consultation with the Physical Facilities Committee (under the Board of Trustees). Committee membership consists of Trustees, faculty and staff representatives. The committee will integrate its activities with programmatic requirements and long range academic plans contained in the USF Academic Plan 1991-1996 and from interviews with faculty and students and other members of the University community.

In accordance with Standard 8 C.2, the Vice President for Business and Finance has completed a two-year cycle of campus facilities improvements funded by CEFA funds. These funds allowed the University to make a small reduction in the deferred maintenance backlog from $13 million to $12 million. However, this funding obviously comes from a one-time available source. The deferred maintenance budget has been increased by $550,000 in order to provide for continued maintenance of our buildings. Substantial funding of remaining deferred maintenance needs will depend in good part on the next Capital Campaign.

5. Financial Planning--In accordance with Standard 9 B.1, the processes for budgeting are clearly stated in the
Budget Parameters. The Budget Review Committee develops a formal budget planning document, *Budget Parameters*. This document contains institutional priorities, guidelines for planning budgetary line items, goals for overall growth and three year enrollment projections.

As specified in Standard 9 B.2, annual budgets represent realistic assessments of expenditure requirements for academic priorities and support needs. However, assessment of resource availability has tended to be unrealistically generous. Reserves were inadequate to cover revenue shortfalls in fiscal years 1989 and 1990; however, revenue projections were more conservative in fiscal year 1991 and reserves generated approximately a $1 million surplus from operations.

Presently, contrary to Standard 9 B.3, there are no active, significant long-range capital budgets; though the Budget Review Committee has made recommendations in this area. The Koret Health and Recreation Center, telephone and computer acquisition and maintenance improvement have been the most recent capital projects. The University is currently engaged in planning a new capital campaign. In this process, each division has submitted a list of capital needs. These division reports, at the time of this writing, have not been integrated into an institutional capital budget. Further, the University is pursuing a list of its capital needs in connection with the development of its Master Plan.

Currently, short-range capital investment is primarily for office and classroom renovation and computer acquisition. There is no institutional plan nor priority statement for office renovation or computing equipment acquisition. Instead, these needs are pursued by unit managers on an ad hoc basis.
D. Analysis and Evaluation

Planning at USF can be seen as a top-to-bottom and bottom-to-top process. The President and Trustees set the mission statement and the Institutional priorities for the five-year strategic plan, and for the next academic year. The President sets annual institutional priorities for the next planning year. Within these parameters, departments propose priorities to implement institutional goals. These advance through integration into a College and a divisional plan. These latter are integrated into institutional plans and budgets approved by Trustees.

A major objective of the new planning and budgeting process was to provide for the enhancement of faculty participation in the process. The faculty, at present, are constructively involved:

- As members of their academic units they participate in the development and/or review of college/school plans.

- As members of the Budget Review Committee, the Strategic Planning Committee, the Executive Planning Committee, and the Capital Campaign Committee, faculty assume major roles in the review of the University budget, the development of the USF Strategic Plan and in the establishment of planning priorities.

- As members of additional support committees faculty contribute in such areas as curriculum, general education, library resources, various Trustee Committees, the physical facilities and master planning committees.
Committees are linked by a process which results in well-publicized and published statements which facilitate the communication of planning effort results. In Winter 1990 the Strategic Planning Committee produced and distributed the University Strategic Plan for 1991-96 (6). This document has been circulated throughout the University community. In Spring 1989 the Division of Academic Affairs published its academic goals statement (9); and in Spring 1991 produced and distributed campus-wide the five year Academic Plan. In Winter 1991, the President's Select Committee on the Mission of the University, a committee with a broadly based membership, circulated for discussion a reworked and fine-tuned statement of mission. (10) This was approved in principle by the Board of Trustees. According to the USFFA President the present form of the mission statement is of higher quality, in part, because faculty review was invited and acted upon.

The new budget process helps ensure that allocations for individual schools are made on the basis of program needs and strategic plans. The budget proposals are reviewed by the University-wide committees (with faculty representation) and presented to the Board of Trustees for approval.

There are, however, some aspects of the budgeting and planning process which still need attention. Thus far, the University experiences difficulties in the following areas:

- The calendar is very tight; we consistently run several weeks behind schedule.

- As a consequence, the Deans have inadequate time to integrate college plans into a Divisional plan. They also have not had time to consider adequately the evaluation of their budgets by the Budget
Review Committee.

- There has been some confusion and misunderstanding about who is to compose the plan. The Strategic Planning Committee basically wrote the planning document with input from the divisions. In the academic area this was felt to be inappropriate. The departments and colleges believe they should write their plans and submit them for review of the Strategic Planning and Executive Planning Committees.

- The process for appointing faculty membership to the Strategic Planning and Budget Review Committees was deemed inadequate by the Faculty Association.

- Standard 3 C.2 calls for a clear and substantial voice of faculty in matters relating to faculty responsibility. Though much has been done, it is fair to say that the faculty voice is sometimes not as substantial (i.e., effective) as it might be. The reasons for this are complex but include the fact that many important faculty positions on University committees, task forces and special project teams are relatively recent. Time and experience will enable the faculty to more effectively influence University Committee decisions.

- During the planning period, as enrollment projections were altered and unanticipated priorities arose, changes were made in the amount of funds available for departmental budgets. This necessitated the adjustment of budgets throughout the process. Some felt this resulted in an
"instability" in the planning process.

- There is some feeling that the process is too complex and involves too many steps of review.

- The present planning and budgeting process is only two years old, and as yet divisional plans and budgets are not yet adequately integrated. With the development of the USF Strategic Plan, additional effort to link campaign planning and physical plant planning is needed.

To address areas in need of attention some changes have already been made; others are in progress:

- The budget calendar has been revised to provide more time for budget preparation and more time for review by the Council of Deans. Thus major attention will be given by deans to the proposal of an integrated academic plan and budget.

- The role of the Strategic Planning Committee, the Budget Review Committee, the Council of Deans and the Executive Planning Committee will be more clearly defined before the beginning of the next planning and budgeting cycle.

- The Faculty Association and the administration have agreed on a process for appointing faculty to various University committees.

- At this point, we have not been able to eliminate the budget adjustment process that results in periodic changes in budget targets through the budget preparation year.
Divisional plans will be integrated into a University plan by a more active Executive Planning Committee.

E. Future Directions

USF has introduced a new planning and budgeting process which has responded to WASC's basic concerns. We hope that in the future planning and budgeting are interlocked so that institutional priorities guide the allocation of funds through the budgeting process. The process is participatory with significant faculty input. All four divisions of the University are represented in various stages of planning and budgeting.

It is clear, however, that a number of planning details need adjustment. Roles of participants need closer definition. A tightening of the planning-budgeting cycle needs to take place. The University needs to look to simplifying the process while maintaining the effective role of faculty and staff throughout.
A. Summary of Visiting Team Report

In its letter of March 7, 1989 to the University, the Commission refers to "critical deficiencies with regard to Commission accrediting standards". The Commission expressed its concern about the state of faculty-administrative relationships, and the lack of a faculty role in institutional governance, and cites several consequences of "these poor working relationships", including:

"...the University falls substantially short of important elements of Standard Five. Faculty do not exercise central responsibility for the academic programs, quality and character of the institution. Faculty do not engage in processes which would enable it to carry out the responsibilities enumerated in Standard Five. This lack of faculty participation is seen in the absence of peer review, lack of participation in tenure and promotion decisions, lack of role in academic program development, and failure to institutionalize the primacy of the faculty in determining the shape and content of the curricular structure."

"...we believe that there may be no more serious issue at USF than the glaring absence of a substantial faculty role in institutional governance. The current situation does not conform to the expectations of Standard 3.C."

"...without faculty participation, it is doubtful whether academic views are as carefully formulated, weighed, and influential as a sound academic planning process requires."

The Commission therefore supported the recommendation of the Visiting Team that the University be encouraged to "seek new ways to accomplish significant progress in the relationship between the administration and the faculty. This
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will require stepping outside the framework of adversarial collective bargaining by both sides."

The Visiting Team also recommended that:
"...the Administration and the Faculty Union develop mechanisms where none exist and enhance those that do exist for the involvement of faculty in such planning, governance, and management roles as are consistent with the current contract and move the parties towards more collegial working relationships."

"...both the spirit and the letter of the WASC Standards, especially 3B, 3C, and 5, be integral to the next negotiation and that the contract be consistent with these Standards."

B. Verification of Visiting Team Observations

The Visiting Team observations were accurate in noting the crucial importance of faculty participation in the governance of a university and the lack of such participation at USF. At the time of the Team visit an insufficient number of faculty were involved in program and curricular development. Faculty did not serve on University Committees, nor were they involved in faculty selection, promotion or tenure decisions. No peer review process was in place and the role of faculty department and program chairs was ambiguous. Faculty were not involved in the budgeting or planning process and there were no formal lines of communication between faculty and trustees. The level of tension between the faculty and administration was high.

C. Changes Since the Team Visit

1. Formation of Governance Committee—Since the Team Report was issued, the University has responded on several fronts to address Commission concerns. The new Collective Bargaining Agreement* states that the University faculty and

*Reference to the newly reopened document will be indicated by the word "New"; references to the Agreement dated September 15, 1989 through June 30, 1994 will be indicated by the year "1989".
administration "agree to work strenuously, cooperatively and collegially to meet all WASC accreditation standards (Article 6)." A joint faculty-administration committee was established to recommend plans for implementing the Commission recommendations regarding the faculty role in institutional governance. As a result of this joint effort, significant changes have been made to the newly approved Collective Bargaining Agreement that fundamentally change the role of faculty in institutional governance. Faculty now play a much greater role in a wide spectrum of University-wide governance structures, including the Planning, Budgeting, Executive Planning and Trustee Committees.

In accordance with Addendum X of the 1989 Agreement, a Joint University Committee, (the Governance Committee) was established on October 9, 1989. The charge of the Governance Committee was to propose a University Governance System to the University concerning the implementation of Commission recommendations on collegiality, faculty involvement in institutional governance, peer review, promotion and tenure decisions, and the faculty role in academic program development and curriculum. The formation of the committee was announced to the Faculty in a letter by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President of the USFFA on October 9, 1989. (11)

The committee consisted of six members, three appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and three appointed by the USFFA. The membership of the committee currently includes the President and Vice President of the faculty union, a full professor, two Deans and an Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.
The committee began meeting on Monday, October 16, 1989, and has met on numerous occasions since then. In order to ensure the widest possible participation in the process of implementing the Commission recommendations, a letter was sent to all members of the administration and faculty informing them of the committee's activities, and soliciting their comments. In addition, a procedure was set up to ensure feedback from the Council of Deans. The committee formulated a series of "Questions/Issues" that needed to be addressed. The deliberations of the committee were conducted in a spirit of collegiality and joint problem-solving. Even after negotiations began on the new contract, the committee continued to meet outside the formal negotiating arena, and resolved all of the "Questions/Issues" it had set out to consider. The recommendations of the committee were subsequently incorporated into the new Collective Bargaining agreement ratified in March 1991. This document will be made available to the Visiting Team (prior to the visit) when publication has been completed.

2. Changes to the Collective Bargaining Agreement--The new Collective Bargaining Agreement has been specifically modified in a number of areas in order to implement the recommendations of the visiting team.

The University realizes that modifications to the contract, while necessary to ensure that faculty participate fully in institutional governance, are by themselves not sufficient. Much remains to be done to implement some of these provisions. However, the far-reaching nature of these contract changes, and the spirit in which they have been agreed to, augurs well for the future, and is an important step on the road to fundamental change. Changes in the new
collective bargaining agreement are outlined below.

- **Peer Review**

  Article 21.8 of the new collective bargaining agreement, now mandates the formation of College and University-wide peer review committees, and establishes the mechanism by which these committees will operate. Membership on these committees consists exclusively of faculty members. The committees review requests for promotion and tenure and send their recommendations to the Deans. Thus, a major concern of the visiting team, that "...the collective bargaining agreement...virtually removes the faculty from serious and effective involvement in such matters as peer-evaluation of faculty, i.e., decision making processes in hiring, non-renewal, promotion, and tenure of faculty" is being addressed.

- **Cooperation and Committee Structure**

  Article 4.1 of the new contract now incorporates an agreement that all faculty will participate in the "daily life of the University as part of their normal workload," including service on committees, governance matters and co-curricular matters. Moreover, the University undertakes to "involve all faculty in formulating the policies governing these areas."

  The Visiting Team, in commenting on joint administration-faculty committees in 1988, remarked that the "make-up of these committees....seems drawn [more] to satisfy a concern that both sides be adequately represented than from a concern for choosing those best suited in terms of knowledge and ability." The faculty
and administration now agree explicitly that the "most appropriate faculty shall be selected to serve on college committees." Furthermore, the new article contains procedures whereby faculty are nominated to committees, and protocols designed to ensure widespread knowledge of and meaningful participation by faculty in the work of these committees.

Finally, the faculty and administration agree to "involve students in decision-making processes which affect their education." While students have now also been included as members of bodies such as the Academic Forum and standing committees, their participation in decision-making can be improved. There are structural difficulties. The University needs to explore ways in which student input can be obtained more effectively.

* Department Chairs

The role and responsibilities of departmental chairs, and their relationship to the Dean, have been clarified. Specifically, the contract (Article 27.2) states that:

"The department chairperson shall be accountable to the Dean and shall perform duties and responsibilities as set forth by the Dean. Such duties may include, but not be limited to: communication with faculty, student advising, scheduling, budgeting, program development and review, recruitment, report writing, planning department functions, working with the Dean on administrative responsibilities, evaluation and review of appointment procedures, reporting to the dean on faculty accountability for workload or for funds spent for departmental activities, curriculum and the like."
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The contract provides a specific mechanism for replacement of a department chair who is not performing duties as assigned.

- **Conscientious Objectors**
  
The Visiting Team warned that, with regard to conscientious objectors, "...withdrawal from the union should not mandate withdrawal from faculty governance. This ambiguity has potential to be a highly divisive issue, which will fully test the resolve of both faculty and administration to achieve greater collegiality. Resolution of this ambiguity in a spirit of good faith and avoidance of discriminatory retaliation on both sides should be carefully monitored by the commission." (Team Report, p. 38)

  
The new contract (Article 15.28) explicitly forbids such discrimination, and new language has been added to ensure that, for example, conscientious objectors may participate in the election of chairpersons (Article 27.3). As a matter of fact, faculty who have filed for conscientious objector status currently serve on several college and university committees.

- **Faculty Academic Career Prospectus**
  
The new work load article contains a provision whereby all faculty file an Academic Career Prospectus (ACP) with the Dean, in which they set forth their goals for the short- and long-term in the areas of teaching, research and service, and are given the opportunity to request additional support in these three areas (Article 25.3). Faculty meet annually with the Dean to review their past service and discuss their ACP's. Through the
ACP review, faculty may propose and receive an option to reduce teaching load assignments from 12 to 9 units, and increase research activities accordingly. The University has committed itself to make this redistribution plan available within the next three years to all faculty who submit appropriate research plans approved by the Dean. This should further strengthen the University’s compliance with Standard 5.C.

For purposes of the current discussion on institutional governance, two points regarding the new Article 25 are worth noting. First, the ACP discussion will provide an opportunity for each faculty member and the Dean to agree on a service component to the faculty member’s workload, thus ensuring that faculty members are involved in some aspect of institutional governance. Second, the provisions of Article 25 are specifically exempted from the grievance process. Instead, a mechanism has been developed in which the faculty and administration will jointly undertake to resolve any disputes that may arise pursuant to this article. This represents a small, but nevertheless quite significant change in the sometimes adversarial nature of dispute resolution at the University.

* Collective Bargaining Unit Status

As President Lo Schiavo pointed out to the Commission in his letter of December 20, 1989, progress towards true collegiality was hampered by concerns that full implementation of Standard 5 would adversely affect "its certification by the NLRB (National Labor Relations Board), and, thus, its protection under Federal laws governing faculty relations."
The new contract addresses these concerns in Article 9. The article commits the University to refrain from filing a decertification petition during the life of the contract, and provides a protocol by means of which the USFFA may pursue "a legitimate unfair labor practice charge under the National Labor Relations Act" in the event that the NLRB rules the Association to be "not a labor organization under the Act." The University believes that this provision removes a major obstacle to full participation by the faculty in all aspects of institutional governance.

3. **Other Steps**--A number of steps have been taken outside the formal collective bargaining arena to involve faculty at all levels of institutional governance.

- A faculty representative serves as a non-voting member of the Board of Trustees. There is still some discussion taking place between the administration and the Faculty Association concerning the method by which these representatives are selected.

- Faculty have been appointed as voting members of six committees of the Board of Trustees. This is significant, for as the visiting team itself notes, "Committees meet frequently and assume much of the work of the Board." *(Team Report, p.14)*

- Faculty members constitute a strong presence on both the Strategic Planning and Budget Review Committees. The latter committee is chaired by a faculty member, who also serves as a member of the Executive Planning Committee.

- Faculty members have participated in all executive officer retreats since 1989.

- The Academic Forum has continued to meet on a fairly regular basis, and has served, particularly in recent months, as a venue at which substantive issues related to faculty governance (such as peer review) could be discussed at length.
The Joint University Curriculum Committee is currently composed of 18 members, 17 of whom are faculty.

Of the 15 members of the General Education Committee, which is charged with developing and monitoring the new General Education Curriculum, all but two are faculty.

Faculty constitute a majority of the membership of the University-wide Assessment Committee. Faculty have served on joint University-wide task forces to develop 1) an early retirement plan, and 2) make recommendations for changes in tuition and fees.

All search committees for faculty positions in the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Nursing are composed exclusively of faculty, and are advisory to the Dean.

Faculty currently serve, or have served, on search committees for new deans in the School of Nursing, the College of Professional Studies, and the Library, and have served on previous search committees in the School of Education and College of Business.

Faculty are strongly represented on all committees involved in planning a new Capital Campaign.

In the College of Arts and Sciences, the College Council, consisting of Faculty Chairs, Faculty Association Policy Board representatives and administrators, meet monthly with the Dean. The agenda for these meetings are established by the Dean, the Chair of the Arts Council and the Chair of the College of Science Executive Council. Similar mechanisms exist for faculty-administration cooperation in other schools and colleges, though not uniformly functional.

Major new curricular initiatives currently being undertaken by the School of Business (a complete revision of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum) and by the College of Arts and Sciences (development of new foreign language programs) are being led by faculty.

Student Councils now exist at the graduate level in the Schools of Education and Business, and at the
undergraduate level in the College of Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Business and Nursing.

D. Analysis and Evaluation

In view of the developments described above, the University believes that it has fundamentally altered the governance structure of the institution.

Perhaps more significant, but less easy to document, is the fact that faculty-administrative relations, which are discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report, have improved markedly since the visit in 1988. There is considerably less mistrust, and there is clearly "a surer focus on General University purposes," as the team recommended. (Team Report, p.36) Anecdotal comments from the faculty also indicate that they feel that faculty involvement in University governance is increasing. A sample of their remarks include:

"Faculty now takes greater part in joint administration-faculty union committees, and there is a great deal of good will on both sides."

"The working relationship between the faculty and the administration has improved from dismal in the 1980's to very good in the 1990's. There is a new spirit of collegiality that is very refreshing."

"I am teaching in the School of Nursing and believe that we have been taking a more active role in our own governance. From a personal standpoint, I have had the experience of being a fairly new faculty member who was given a "leadership" position as level coordinator and felt autonomous in the decisions I had to make relative to student placements and agency relationships in the larger community." (Exhibit G)

In large measure, the Visiting Team's concerns regarding Standards 3B, 3C and 5 have been addressed, and we look
towards the future with a positive outlook.

E. Future Directions

It is clear that some of the committees and processes that have been established will need to be assessed in order to measure their effectiveness.

Further progress can be made to ensure full faculty participation, particularly at the departmental level, in planning and budgeting. The role of part-time faculty in governance needs to be examined. The role of students in institutional governance also needs to be examined and strengthened.

While the University still has more to accomplish before it reaches full compliance with commission standards in this area, we believe that crucial and fundamental progress has been made. Important changes in both the contractual and interpersonal relationships between the administration and the faculty have taken place which will allow the faculty to again assume their legitimate and primary role in institutional governance.
RESPONSE TO COMMISSION
RE: ADMINISTRATIVE-FACULTY RELATIONS

A. Summary of Visiting Team Report

The 1988 Visiting Team Report (hereinafter, Team Report) identified administrative-faculty relations as one of two "overarching issues" that "account for the bulk of this situation of poor return for good effort". (Team Report, p.4)

In a follow-up letter, dated March 7, 1989, the WASC Commission stated that:

... the central issues confronting the University revolve, directly or indirectly, around the relationship between the University administration and the faculty ...

The Visiting Team further noted a "deeply embedded hostility and mistrust" which "severely hampers USF's ability to be what it wishes to seem..." They also pointed out that "without faculty and administration working with each other, very little will be accomplished..." (Team Report, p.59).

B. Verification of the Visiting Team's Observations

The Academy for Educational Development Study--A consultant from the Academy for Educational Development, retained by the USF Faculty Association in Spring 1988, conducted a survey of full-time faculty members at the University during the Self Study process. A final report titled, "Attitudes of Full-Time Faculty about Conditions of Professional Life at the University of San Francisco" (hereafter, Millet I) was submitted by the consultant in May 1988. (13) The purpose of the study was to assess the academic climate at the University from the point of view of the faculty.
The survey instrument consisted of 62 statements about working conditions and practices. Eight of these items specifically asked about circumstances at USF. Each was worded positively and called for a response on a five-point scale, from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." Of 190 full-time faculty who received the survey, 130 responded.

The Visiting Team's finding that "troubled relations between administration and faculty are an overarching issue" at USF confirmed the Millet I survey results. The administrators of the survey found:

"...considerable dissatisfaction...about relationships with the Deans and their staffs at the college/school level, and about the relationship of the full-time faculty with the executive management and leadership of the University." (Millet I, Executive Summary)

The report also stated that faculty were not involved effectively in academic governance--not at the college/school nor at the university level. It further noted the faculty perception of a

"...lack of support of an appreciation for the instructional role of the faculty...by the executive management and leadership of the University." (Millet I, Executive Summary)

The Higher Education Research Institute Study--In Spring 1989, USF participated in a 1989 nationwide survey, The American College Teacher, conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA (hereinafter, the HERI Study). (Exhibit F) This study involved more than 35,000 individual responses from 392 colleges and universities. Respondents from USF included nine administrators and 63 faculty.*

* The percentage figures reported in this section should be considered in terms of the total number of faculty and administrators who responded to the survey, rather than in terms of all faculty and all administrators.
The HERI survey asked detailed questions across several broad categories. None of the general categories dealt specifically with faculty-administration relations, although many individual questions did touch upon this topic. For example, under the category, "Professional Goals," the survey asked respondents how important it was to be a good colleague. At USF, 81% of the faculty and 82% of the administrators agreed that it was very important, even essential, to be a good colleague at this institution. This positive response was an encouraging sign. Both groups, however, expressed disappointment about the reality of their professional relationship. Faculty (74%) and administrators (70%) reported having at least satisfactory relationships with other faculty. With other administrators, the level of satisfaction was not nearly so high. Only 37 percent of the faculty and 50 percent of the administrators said that they had satisfactory relationships with other administrators. Regarding the question of professional competence, 70 percent of faculty rated their faculty colleagues as competent, while only 40 percent of administrators considered other administrators to be performing their jobs in a satisfactory manner. Thus, in 1989 neither USF faculty nor administrators had high levels of confidence in nor respect for the administration.

Perhaps the most telling indicator of administration-faculty relations in 1988 was the response to the statement, "The faculty are typically at odds with the campus administration." Fifty-eight percent of faculty and 60 percent of administrators said that this statement was very descriptive of USF. This was a disturbing result in light of the national average. Only 15 percent of respondents from all participating private colleges and universities believed that this statement described their institutions. Both USF faculty and administrators recognized in 1989 that they had a strained relationship which needed improvement.
The HERI Study reported that 80 percent of USF administrators believed they took faculty concerns into account when making policy decisions; however, only 27 percent of faculty agreed, believing instead that they were generally ignored. The national average for faculty at private colleges and universities was 53 percent. Thus, compared to the other private college and university faculties, only half as many USF faculty believed that the administration made policy decisions with their concerns in mind.

This survey also included a category called "Sources of Stress." At USF, 53 percent of faculty cited other faculty as a source of stress. This compared to a national average of 49 percent at private institutions. On the other hand, 80 percent of administrators replied that other administrators were a major source of stress in their lives. The comparable figure for private college and university administrators was 51 percent.

The HERI Study did not constitute an exhaustive analysis of administrative-faculty relations at USF. It did, however, verify that problems existed in that relationship. Tensions in this area ran far higher at USF than at other private colleges and universities, according to comparisons of the USF data with national norms.

Thus, the HERI Study further substantiates the findings of the 1988 Visiting Team.

C. Changes Since the Team Visit

Administration-faculty relationships at USF have changed since the 1988 WASC visit. Some of these changes (described in the previous section) consist of new mechanisms for involving faculty in institutional governance while other less tangible ones are reflected in new attitudes and frequently-
stated commitments by both administrators and faculty to work together for the advancement of the University.

In describing these new attitudes, one Dean wrote to the review committee in January 1991 that:

In general, there has simply been a decrease in the volume (and heat) surrounding this relationship (between faculty and administration.) There is a demonstrable increase in the willingness on both sides to find ways to cooperate on issues of mutual concern.

Likewise, the USF Faculty Association President describes the "...amelioration in over-all atmosphere at USF since 1988 (as) dramatic and pervasive."

Faculty had a voice in choosing the incoming University President, most significantly through their representation on the Trustees' Presidential Search Committee. This has added to the confidence of the faculty with the selection of Father John Schlegel. It also enhances their hope that the new President will bring both new attitudes and new structures that will build upon the improvements in administration-faculty relationships which have occurred since the 1988 visit.

Other quotes from faculty confirm this change in the University climate:

"The shift in faculty-administration relations is typified by the USFFA awards dinner last week. Three years ago the administration refused to contribute monetarily to the awards for distinguished teaching and research, did not attend the USFFA awards dinner, and initially refused even to announce the award at graduation. At last weeks' dinner, the VPAA, three deans, and two associate deans were in attendance. The deans toasted the faculty. The restaurant was rife with ribaldry and good cheer. (My husband, a retiree from another university, spoke wistfully of how
nice it must be to work at a place "where everybody knows your name.") A former member of the psychology department commented on the warm feelings and wit shared during the evening."

"In recent years the Executive Officers' Retreat has included several faculty members. I can only speak for my own recent participation, but I felt included as a valued member of the university community."

"The substantial participation of faculty and staff on the Strategic Planning and Budget Review Committees is indicative of the "good faith" effort of the administration to change USF's way of doing business. Although the new process is not without flaws, the university's openness about its budget is quite remarkable. Any change in how one does something is stressful and inefficient, at least in the beginning. The university has persisted in trying to implement and improve the new system, however, despite such expectable difficulties."

"A recent memo from Mr. Mel Swig, the Chair of the Board of Trustees, to faculty and staff acknowledging their participation in student recruitment and retention is the first communication, positive or otherwise, that I recall receiving from the Board." (Exhibit G)

D. Analysis and Evaluation

To determine whether faculty attitudes and perceptions about the conditions of professional life as measured by the Millet instrument had changed since 1988, the Millet survey (henceforth Millet II) was administered again during Spring 1991. (14)

Questionnaires were sent to 185 USF Faculty Association members, the same population surveyed in 1988. The 1991 survey also included 21 academic administrators, 28 full-time law faculty and 6 full-time College of Professional Studies faculty.

Out of 108 returned responses, 87 were usable. The
response rates, based upon usable responses, were: USFFA members, 45 percent (83/185); Law faculty, 7 percent (2/28); College of Professional Studies, 33 percent (2/6); and, academic administrators, 38 percent (8/21).

Comparisons of faculty responses between the 1988 and 1991 results include only USFFA respondents for the 1991 study because only USFFA faculty participated in the 1988 Survey. (Millet II, Table I).

Of the 62 statements about conditions of professional life at USF, the mean responses for 57 items showed that faculty perceived improvements. Twenty-six of those changes in perceptions were statistically significant, according to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Mean responses for the other five items showed a higher level of perceived dissatisfaction, but none was statistically significant under the above-described test. (Millet II, Table II)

Differences in techniques of questionnaire administration between the 1988 and 1991 surveys, along with other technical issues (e.g., questions of non-respondent bias) led to considerable debate and discussion. Notwithstanding the concerns about the purity of the statistical analysis, the data support the substance of the review committee's conclusions.

Faculty reported significant improvements with respect to articulation and communication of the University mission and goals by the academic leadership of the University. They believed that their colleges/schools were better at defining and implementing their goals accordingly; i.e., in a manner consistent with the University mission.

Faculty also felt that Deans were doing a significantly
better job of communicating their concerns. Thus, it is not surprising that faculty saw themselves as more fully represented in college/school planning and decision-making. This perceived change was apparent in both selection of new faculty and support by the colleges/schools for employment and retention of minority faculty.

Faculty reported a greater degree of collegiality within their colleges/schools as well as among the schools/colleges. They also saw significant improvements regarding their roles in selecting deans and in university governance. As one faculty member put it, "The change in faculty-administrator relations is exhibited by the cooperation of both groups on Joint Committees and in the Academic Forum."

Overall, faculty responses indicated that conditions of academic life had significantly improved, as compared to 1988. (Millet II, Tables III and IV) This improvement bodes well for the future.

There are additional indications that the changes described above have had a positive impact upon administrative-faculty relations. Some administrators now appear at USFFA-sponsored events, which they had previously declined to attend. The Vice President for Academic Affairs describes his relationships and interactions with the faculty and with the USFFA officers as "warm and friendly." The faculty agree with this assessment. This contrasts with the previous aura of suspicion and distrust that had long characterized the interactions between faculty and that office.

Faculty opinions now are more influential in Deans' decisions regarding spending priorities within the various colleges/schools. For example, many faculty have within the
past year received personal computers for their offices. Although funds for that equipment had not originally been budgeted, the Deans sought outside funding and re-ordered their priorities based upon input from their faculties to achieve this goal.

Furthermore, the views of the eight academic administrator respondents to Millet II viewed conditions of professional life at USF in ways much closer to the faculty’s opinions. A comparison of administrators’ responses to those of the faculty in the Millet II survey revealed statistically significant differences in perceptions for only three questions. (This analysis also used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Table I provides a summary of these test results; Table II and III show the academic administrators’ responses to the survey.) (See Review Committee Report)

The eight administrator respondents to Millet II reported significantly greater agreement with the statement that increases in administrative positions had benefitted instructional programs. They also expressed stronger convictions that faculty were more concerned with University affairs at all levels, compared to several years ago, and that conditions of academic life had improved in recent years. Faculty who responded to the 1991 survey also believed that significant gains had occurred in each of these areas, relative to the 1988 findings. However, in 1991 administrators reported significantly higher levels of agreement with the positive statements about each of these three topics.

Some items which showed statistically significant improvements in faculty perceptions also demonstrated the need for further progress. While faculty believed that morale and esprit de corps were significantly better than in 1988, the
1991 mean response of 3.6 on a 5.0 scale (where 1.0 is "strongly agree" and 5.0 is "strongly disagree") showed considerable room for improvement. Likewise, the perception that more support existed for faculty travel still fell short of an acceptable level.

E. Future Directions

As described in a previous section of this report, USF has undertaken some fundamental changes in operations since 1988, most notably in the areas of planning and university governance. The results of the 1991 survey substantiate the beliefs of the USFFA President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs that USF has begun to turn itself around. Indeed, the impact of the changes is probably greater than the 1991 study indicates, since changes in attitudes, perceptions and beliefs typically lag behind changes in structures and behavior. Nonetheless, major challenges lie ahead.

For example, the Visiting Team had recommended that "an assessment be made of the degree of administrative congestion in the middle-management levels, and the relationship of effort to results in administrative processes." (Team Report, p.60). In an effort to address this issue, the University in Fall 1989 began a review of administrative positions which resulted in the decrease of 38.8 administrative and secretarial positions in the University. (Exhibit H) However, the process stopped short of a careful review of the lengthy decision-making processes that still remain in place. The report of the University Staff Review Task Force charged with reviewing the staff reductions stated that "the actual reductions achieved fell short of the targets hoped for", and that "since all the functional units of the University's divisions remain in place, there is no substantive change in the University's manner of doing business, and no substantive change in what its business is."
Faculty remained unconvinced that the increased number of administrative positions over recent years has improved the academic environment, even though a statistically significant change occurred in attitudes toward that topic. Administrators think otherwise, as reported above for the Millet II survey. This continued disparity in beliefs about excessive bureaucracy can be resolved only by either substantially reducing the number of staff positions or convincing the faculty that the University is not overstaffed. As one academic administrator observed, "this issue must be put to rest."

Faculty also stated in the Millet II survey that they lacked an effective role in the allocation of income among program areas across the University. In fact, they expressed their highest level of dissatisfaction on this point. These concerns must also be resolved, although faculty representation on the University Budget Review and Planning committees represents an important effort toward doing so. However, some faculty believe that the role of faculty on these committees is too limited.

Of course, USF must also address those areas which faculty described most negatively. They registered levels of dissatisfaction greater than 4.0 on three items in the 1991 survey, compared to 11 in 1988. Those three questions concerned the faculty voice in allocating income among programs at the University level, their understanding of student performance standards in the College of Professional Studies and their feelings that there were not enough full-time faculty positions to provide "... a more adequate range of course offerings."

Taken as a whole, the 1991 responses to the survey questions regarding the College of Professional Studies
programs indicated that some University faculty still do not fully understand and support that operation. They express a lack of familiarity with standards for faculty appointments and student performance. This suggests a need to continue developing cooperative programs between CPS and other units of the University. Recognition of CPS' place in terms of the Mission and Goals Statement is not enough.

Another issue that must be addressed in the future is the question of building effective faculty participation in University governance. Faculty and administrators must continue their efforts to develop mutually satisfactory mechanisms for academic governance. While notable reforms have occurred, as discussed in an earlier report in this document, some faculty remain skeptical about whether they yet have an effective voice in policy matters at the University level. To quote the USF Faculty Association President once again, "For the first time in many years the faculty have exercised a, if not the, principal voice in establishing future directions for USF."

In particular, the Academic Forum is perceived as playing a significantly more important role, as compared to 1988, regarding both its contributions to improving communication between the faculty and administration and its potential for increasing faculty involvement in major policy and program decisions. Levels of faculty uncertainty about whether the Academic Forum can do this effectively, however, remain rather high. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shares the belief that the Forum structure needs further refinement or revision if it is to become an effective mechanism for faculty involvement in University governance. Also expressed was a concern that USF has not yet found an organization system that meets the need for involving faculty in essential decisions in an effective, systematic way without loading them down with...
day-to-day matters that are the administration's responsibilities. The challenge is to develop a strong faculty leadership role in governance which respects the faculty need to give adequate time to teaching and research and other forms of service.

Two of the most heartening changes concern statistically significant improvements in faculty beliefs that conditions of academic life had improved in recent years and that faculty morale and esprit de corps had been maintained at a higher level than in 1988. Despite the magnitudes of these changes, the dissatisfaction which registered on the 1991 survey indicates that USF still has a long way to go. Nevertheless, a comparable gain over the next three years would amount to an admirable achievement.

Further improvements in morale and a more positive view about the conditions of professional life will only occur if the USF community continues to build upon the trust and goodwill which have begun to emerge in relationships between the administration and the faculty. This will necessitate, among other things, even more open communication between the USFFA and the University administration, as well as an increased sharing of information—particularly in the planning and budgeting areas. In any event, further progress towards effective faculty participation in all aspects of University affairs should increase faculty confidence in the University leadership, especially with respect to academic matters.

Additional experience with positive changes in the role of the faculty throughout the institution, as described above, will sustain the present movement towards a healthy relationship between the University administration and its faculty. In some areas there is still a discrepancy between faculty and administrative viewpoints. Given the nature of
the academic environment in general and the long and often adversarial relationship between USF administration and faculty in particular, this may be expected. However, as we continue the work of returning the USF faculty to their role as primary academic leaders, a much needed healing should occur.
RESPONSE TO COMMISSION
RE: OFF-CAMPUS AND NONTRADITIONAL PROGRAMS

A. Summary of Visiting Team Report

The Visiting Team in its report to USF in 1989 made four recommendations in the area of off-campus and nontraditional programs:

1. "...that off-campus programs be assessed against the Institution's mission, and that one or the other be altered so that the correspondence between them is closer". (Team Report, p.60)

2. "...that the University's off-campus programs be brought into compliance with Standard 4.E.2 regarding full-time faculty". (Team Report, p.60)

3. That "attention should be paid to Standard 6 to assure that off-campus programs involve appropriate library and computer usage in their programs". (Team Report, p.60)

4. "...that campus and University structures and priorities be assessed to assure a better fit with nontraditional students". (Team Report, p.60)

The Team Report also noted the need for better integration and collaboration between University faculty and the College of Professional Studies (hereafter, CPS) and between the Professional Studies faculty and the rest of the University. The report stated that "much more work needs to be done before significant levels of trust, understanding and integration can be achieved. Campus faculty are not involved in the hiring of CPS adjunct faculty and CPS faculty have
little or no sense of involvement with the rest of the university faculty". (Team Report, p.28)

In addition, the Visiting Team Report states that "CPS activities outside the San Francisco Bay Area are not consistent with the presently stated goals of the institution". (Team Report, p.12)

B. Verification of Visiting Team Observations

The Visiting Team was accurate in its conclusion that off-campus programs had not provided full-time faculty and instructional services which closely parallel the on-campus operations. At the time of the visit, CPS had no full-time faculty members. All classes were taught by part-time faculty. Many of the full-time faculty of the School of Education had teaching and counseling responsibilities in the off-campus sites, but were heavily stretched in terms of scheduling.

The Commission recommendation "that the off-campus programs be assessed against the institution’s mission, and that one or the other of them be altered so that the correspondence between them is closer" took the institution somewhat by surprise. The then current mission statement declared that USF was dedicated:

"to examine critically and continuously the lifelong educational and professional needs of society and to meet these needs...." (General Catalog, 1989-1991, p.1)

Nevertheless, the Visiting Team correctly noted this deficiency, in that a second mission statement in circulation in draft form at that time, made no mention of off-campus or nontraditional programs. The USF Board of Trustees recently
approved a new mission statement that includes these goals.

The Team Report was correct in calling attention to a need for support at the off-campus sites. Creating University structures and priorities that fit nontraditional or off-campus students was central to our objectives but inadequate in practice. The University as a community had not fully recognized needs of its older, part-time, evening, weekend, and off-campus students. Nor was it yet fully understood "that the academic culture suitable for working adults may appropriately vary from that which is customary for the conventional student." (Team Report, p.29)

In summary, the Visiting Team noted that "although there is much work that needs to be done, on balance USF deserves commendation for positive initiatives taken to bring CPS into greater compliance with Commission standards". In the past several years an effort has been made to ensure that the College programs meet the standards. The following sections report the changes which have occurred as a result of Commission recommendations.

C. Changes Since the Team Visit
1. Mission

In response to Commission concern about the ambiguity of the University Mission Statement, the University Board of Trustees reaffirmed its commitment in the new Mission Statement which clearly states that the University strives to "promote the lifelong learning of mature men and women". This portion of the mission statement is compatible with off-campus and nontraditional programs of study for adult professionals. The beliefs outlined in the Mission Statement are reaffirmed in the Academic Plan for 1991-96, developed by the faculty and Deans of the Division of Academic Affairs. On page eighteen
the plan states that CPS serves the University mission "by providing quality education to adult learners, and to professional and pre-professional students who desire to acquire academic degrees". (5)

2. **College of Professional Studies**

The University has made substantial progress in addressing the following issues raised by the Commission.

*Full-Time Faculty Staffing*—Since the last Team visit, CPS has added ten (with one of these ten currently on sabbatical leave) full-time faculty members in the attempt to reach compliance with the Commission standards regarding a core component of full-time faculty. Another new six full-time positions in the College of Arts and Sciences (hereafter referred to as A&S) are directed toward off-campus and nontraditional students. By full-time we mean professors involved on a full-time basis in traditional faculty roles. These new faculty are diversified in their disciplines, and qualified by academic background and professional experience.

The University has made a commitment to continue to expand the number of full-time faculty over the next several years. Particular effort is presently being taken to ensure that women and minority faculty members are recruited.

*Compliance with Standard 6 regarding Off-campus Centers*—The University has made major strides to comply with Standard 6 for off-campus centers. One of the major decisions made after the Team visit was to enhance the services to the University’s off-campus centers. These primary services include library and computer resources and availability of full-time faculty and academic advising staff.

We determined that our resources would be spread too thinly to support all off-campus sites to this extent, and
therefore decided that this could not be accomplished in all the locations where we had previously offered programs. Consequently, the following changes have been implemented:

1. We have closed the Fresno Center as of January 1991 after all of our existing groups had completed their course work in their cohort program. We continue to provide service to students (e.g., research seminars for graduate students and individual advising to all students requiring assistance) who are still working toward completing their degree requirements.

2. We have reduced our offerings in Southern California by 65% to ensure that we can support students commensurate with our faculty and advising support resources.

3. We have limited offerings to commuting distance to our remaining Regional Centers and satellite offices. The majority of the CPS offerings exist on-campus. The off-campus centers are located in the East Bay (San Ramon and Oakland), South Bay (Cupertino), Southern California (Orange) and the Central Valley (Sacramento).

4. An additional academic advisor has been hired and trained to support students in the Central Valley.

5. The section on library resources outlines in detail the measures we have taken to deliver library access to students meeting at off-campus sites.

6. We have purchased computers (both Macintosh and MS-DOS machines) for the San Ramon and Sacramento Centers to provide for in-class instructional use as well as electronic communication with on-campus information resources. Our goal is to provide these additional computers at the remaining centers in the upcoming fiscal year.

In addition, Gleeson Library has provided computer work stations with CD-rom bibliographic databases for all of the CPS off-campus Regional Centers.

7. A fully equipped computer classroom/lab will be completed in our San Ramon Center by June 1992. The classroom will seat 25 students. We are moving our San Ramon Center in September 1991 to accomplish this goal.

**Governance Changes**—Attention has been given to the integration of CPS faculty into the academic decision making process of the College itself and the academic life of the
University as a whole. Within the College there has been a major attempt to move from an administrative model to an academic model. The establishment of academic departments and chairs within the disciplinary areas has been the first step. During the 1990-91 year, the Dean and the faculty of the College prepared a faculty handbook which has been presented to the Vice President for Academic Affairs office. It is being reviewed for consistency with other groups of faculty at this writing. Once edited and approved, it will specify in detail the faculty role in the college including probable establishment of department chairs.

CPS faculty now serve on several University committees including the General Education, Assessment, Curriculum, Academic Computing and University Mission committees. There has also been an increase in the amount of collaboration between the CPS faculty and faculty of the other schools. Some faculty in A&S teach courses in CPS and also evaluate candidate portfolios. Advisory committees have also been established between philosophy and theology faculty in A&S and faculty in CPS to collaborate on the ethics and religion courses taught by the CPS faculty.

The University through the collaboration of CPS and the College of Arts and Sciences has designed and put into operation a complete four-year accelerated baccalaureate degree program for mid-career professionals with 0 to 24 college units. Our first client is Pacific Bell. Faculty from both colleges collectively attend faculty orientations each semester. Each module offers an A&S course and a CPS course. When these two courses dovetail in content, the faculty are encouraged to meet and coordinate the material each will be teaching. This is a new program and has occurred in a small number of courses, but there has been unanimous support from both sets of faculty for the enrichment to
students and faculty which this process as afforded. We believe this program is especially important to the mission of CPS and the University as a whole for two reasons. It broadens the curriculum so that the College can serve students at the freshmen and sophomore as well as the junior and senior levels. It also creates an opportunity for cooperation between A&S, CPS, the library, and the various academic service departments. This program illustrates the type of cooperative effort that the Commission envisioned in its 1989 report. It can be a model for future efforts.

CPS and A&S faculty and administrators are also working closely together in an effort to develop and teach courses in Organizational Behavior, Telecommunications and the GEC to adult learners.

Curricular Changes--CPS has moved towards implementing a full General Education Curriculum for its undergraduate students. Beginning in the 1990-91 academic year all CPS students must satisfy the full philosophy and theology GEC requirement, by either transferring in the courses or completing them at the University. Course offerings both within the programs and in our supplementary curriculum have been scheduled so that students have ample opportunity to meet these requirements. In addition, when the University implements its new general education curriculum, all new CPS students will be responsible for satisfying its requirements or the equivalents.

CPS has, from its inception, been oriented towards delineating and meeting educational outcomes for each of its courses. It has monitored student and faculty reactions continuously. In response to this feedback, CPS has lengthened the courses in all of its programs, undergraduate and graduate except the MPA which will be lengthened in accord
with all graduate programs effective June 1992. All graduate programs which used to be 18 months will be 27 months long by June 1992. Undergraduate programs which were 13 to 16 months in length, depending upon the program content, are now 17 to 20 months in length in the 1991-92 fiscal year and will grow to 20 to 22 months by June 1992. A notable example of how and why we modify curricular offerings is the changing of a course covering both research methods and statistics together (which previously was covered in seven sessions) to two separate courses, one on research methods and the other on statistics, each six weeks in length meeting four hours per week.

CPS began to increase the length of its courses in 1989 as recommended by the Visiting Team. A plan is currently in place to adjust the curriculum of the College so that by 1995 all courses in all programs will have eight additional contact hours.

3. School of Education

The previous Visiting Team was critical of the workload burdens of full-time Education faculty. To address this issue, the number of off-campus Education students at the University has been reduced from 801 in Spring 1987 to 363 in Spring 1990. An academic Associate Dean was appointed in 1990 who has specific responsibility for the oversight of School of Education off-campus programs and academic program quality.

Though the enrollments in some off-campus centers has decreased, the involvement of full-time Education faculty was extended beyond teaching to include more student advising, program planning, and coordination, and to participate in the review of qualifications of adjunct faculty assigned to off-campus programs. Most of the current School of Education full-time faculty have also taught previously in off-campus
courses. In the San Ramon center, for example, of the ten courses offered for the Master’s degree program, six are taught by full-time faculty. In addition, each off-campus site is now assigned a full-time faculty member as responsible for coordinating the academic program and for the initial review of adjunct faculty applications for teaching in the program. Each off-campus center sponsored by the School of Education also has a full-time faculty member who serves as an advisor to individual students. Faculty advisors and faculty coordinators each receive compensation for these duties, either as redistribution of teaching load or as supplemental salary, according to policies established in August 1990. (17)

4. McLaren School of Business

The McLaren School of Business (with WASC pre-approval) established an MBA program for a select group of managerial students in Hong Kong using a distance-learning model developed at Stanford University. In this program, regular faculty videotape their lecture presentations, send them to students in Hong Kong and periodically visit the site for additional instruction, advising, tutoring, and administering final examinations.

In this program, there is compliance with Standard 4.E.2 requiring full-time faculty involvement in the planning, delivery, and evaluation of the program as well as the provision for appropriate time for students to question their instructors and to discuss academic concepts with faculty.

The sponsoring organization in Hong Kong has agreed to purchase all student textbooks and library reference materials and to make these available to the 30 students on site. Again, the provisions of Standard 4.E.2 for ready access to learning resources appear to be met by this procedure. The
plan included provisions for assessing student outcomes. This program is described in the Substantive Change Report submitted to WASC in July 1990. (15)

5. Services

The University has moved closer to the goal of providing off-campus students with the same level of services as on-campus students. One of the efforts in this area is a publication called The Outreach, which is published by the University's Office of Student Outreach Services and Programs. The purpose of the publication is to provide targeted information on all University services to commuter, adult and off-campus students. It provides information on the hours and types of student services available and provides detailed financial aid information. Through articles by campus leaders such as the President, and the Director of the Student Health and Counseling Services, our hope is that students will also feel closer ties with the University community. (16)

Hours of operation for all student service offices (including financial aid, registrar, bursar, career services, health and counseling, recreation center, and library) have been extended to include evening and weekend hours. Satellite offices for campus ministry, career services and student outreach services have also been established at the Lone Mountain campus for CPS and Education students.

Financial aid services are extended to off-campus students through financial aid staff meetings with students on site and through the processing of their financial aid applications in personal interviews with trained counselors. Telephone consulting is also provided.

6. Off-Campus Library Resources

In response to the recommendation referring to library
and computer usage, several changes have been made in off-campus library resources since 1988. The University is moving towards compliance with Standard Six and is closer to compliance than it was in 1988. Among these changes are:

- New positions for a professional librarian and a library assistant for off-campus programs
- Toll-free telephone and FAX machine installations
- Comprehensive library orientation and instruction programs
- Basic library collections on site (at the San Ramon, Sacramento and Orange CPS sites)
- Library automation plan for "dial-up" access

The Off-Campus Services Office was established in Gleeson Library in Fall 1988. A full-time professional librarian was assigned exclusive responsibilities for library services to off-campus students. This librarian coordinates the delivery of services and library instruction to all off-campus programs and is responsible for the development of the site libraries. To keep current, the off-campus librarian is an active member of the Extended Campus Library Services Section of the American Library Association. A half-time librarian position has been budgeted for 1991-92 to serve the San Ramon, Sacramento, and Cupertino sites. The Orange County site has the cooperation of the librarian of the St. Joseph’s Center Library.

The improvement of library services to USF off-campus users is included as a strategy in the University Strategic Plan 1991 – 1996. The Dean of the University Library has been active in serving as an advocate for the library needs of these students. An outstanding accomplishment has been the funding and selection of an automated system for remote access.
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to the library catalog. Installation of the system will begin in November 1991. Planning continues in the creation of the site libraries for the CPS students. Further work needs to be done for Education and Nursing programs which lack permanent USF-operated sites.

**Computer Searches/Document Delivery**--In fiscal year 1989-90, one-third (360) of all computer searches were completed for Off-Campus students and faculty using the BRS, DIALOG, National Library of Medicine, SIN, and OCLC-EPIC bibliographic utilities. In the same fiscal year 3,400 pieces of research materials were delivered to Off-Campus students and faculty. Two-thirds of this material came from USF's libraries (Gleeson and Kendrick Law); the remaining third was acquired from other libraries with the aid of the online OCLC Interlibrary loan subsystem. Half of the total library ILL borrowing was done for Off-Campus patrons.

**CD Roms**--Since Fall 1989, Gleeson Library's Reference Department has installed over a dozen CD-Rom database indexes to be used on a variety of work-stations -- standalone, networked, and remote-accessed. Printing, downloading, and searching are offered at no charge on the ten microcomputers in the Reference Room; and in July 1991 these Indexes became accessible through any USF VAX terminal or any personal computer with a VT emulation telecommunications program.

**Online Catalog**--Installation of an integrated library automation package from Innovative Interfaces, Inc. is in progress. Holdings of both Gleeson and Kendrick Law Libraries will be included in this catalog. The System Operator/Catalog Librarian is coordinating the operation of the system, which will be housed in the library. The online public access catalog (OPAC) will be available on hard-wired terminals in the library, over the campus VAX and ethernet networks, and
through any personal modem.

Site Libraries--Two site libraries (San Ramon and Sacramento) have microcomputers with dial-in access to the campus CD-ROM indexes and the library catalog. Installation of systems in Cupertino and Orange is planned for 1991-92. InfoTrac CD-ROM work stations with printers are in place in all four centers. InfoTrac provides easy access to article citations from academic journals and newspapers. In addition, the San Ramon and Sacramento microcomputers have a database of USF's journal holdings and their own CD-ROM drives for reference works and multimedia encyclopedias. Printed copies of the library's journal holdings are distributed to all sites.

Preparing Students--A variety of printed search aids for the CD-ROM indexes is available at the main and site libraries. Information on the library and its services for Off-Campus students is disseminated by a brochure. Every effort is made by the various schools and colleges to get a copy of this brochure to each new student. Also, information about the library is included in the orientation materials prepared by each school or college with an Off-Campus program.

More detailed specifics on using all libraries and Gleeson Library, in particular, are presented in a printed Handbook. This publication is used in conjunction with regularly scheduled orientation workshops for CPS Off-Campus undergraduates. Copies are distributed to all students in the Orange programs.

D. Analysis and Evaluation

USF has made significant progress since the 1988 Team Visit in continuing to make fundamental changes in the coordination of off-campus programs. The number of full-time
faculty in off-campus programs has increased from zero to sixteen in order to increase the faculty's level of involvement in the off-campus or nontraditional programs, either through their physical presence in off-campus sites or, where budgetary or geographic constraints are too severe, through assignment to other programs which link the full-time faculty member to the off-campus student. The nature of the teaching load for faculty in Education is changing as full-time faculty are more involved with off-campus sites. The level of service for off-campus students has increased in many areas and the quality of services has improved. Overall, USF is moving closer to offering off-campus students the same services as on-campus students.

There is at least anecdotal evidence that these services are of significant value. One instructor notes that she,

"had the occasion to be very involved this year in student services to ICEL students in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Without exception the students praise highly the promptness and thoroughness by which the personnel of Gleeson Library attend to their toll free calls. Books and articles are dispatched in just a couple of days, always postage-paid, and the suggestions and advice of these same personnel in response to questions from students is courteous and truly helpful. In its efforts to bond off-campus students more closely with the on-campus culture, the staff of the Gleeson Library has been unusually supportive". (Exhibit G)

E. Future Directions

The future goals for the off-campus programs are to continue to increase the levels of support at the remaining off-campus sites, to increase the number of full-time faculty and to continue to integrate the academic life of CPS with that of the main campus. USF also will continue to build an academic governance structure within CPS that is closer to
that of the main campus. The rewards of these actions will be positive for the entire University.
V. CHANGES AND ISSUES CONFRONTING THE INSTITUTION

A number of significant changes have taken place since the time of the last WASC visit in December 1988. The following list summarizes the more important of these changes:

- A new President of the University was appointed July 1, 1991. Father John Schlegel, S.J., succeeds Fr. John Lo Schiavo, S.J., who served as President through the past 14 years. Fr. Schlegel comes to the University with administrative experience from Creighton, Marquette and John Carroll Universities. At John Carroll, President Schlegel served as Academic Vice President and Provost.

- Since the last visit the following executive officers have assumed their present positions: John W. Clark, S.J., Vice President for Academic Affairs; Stanley Nel, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences; Paul B. Warren, Dean, School of Education; H. Jay Folberg, Dean, School of Law; Norma L. Chaska, Dean, School of Nursing; and David K. Oyler, Dean of the Gleeson Library. At the time of this writing, Robin W. Pratt serves as Acting Dean, College of Professional Studies.

Although stability in administrative offices is preferable in the abstract to instability, and the rapid turnover among these administrators has been a source of concern to the University (and was noted in the last Visiting Team report), the newly appointed deans seem without exception to enjoy solid and widespread support among their faculty. If these relations continue, they
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can only enhance the planning process and the academic mission of the University.

- The University has received a final recommendation from the Joint Committee for the revision of the General Education Curriculum. The new General Education proposal is presently being reviewed by the Executive Planning Committee for presentation to the Board of Trustees, who hold final authority for authorizing the modification of the core.

- The University has opened a new Koret Health and Recreation Center, containing facilities for the use of students, faculty, alumni, and some neighborhood residents. The facility is not used for inter-collegiate athletic competition.

Several new academic programs have been introduced or expanded significantly, including:

- An Executive MBA program in Hong Kong (WASC approval for a new site granted).

- A Master's Program in Private School Administration in Honolulu (WASC approval for a new site granted). (Exhibit I)

- A section of an existing Master of Arts in Writing Program and a section of the School of Education's Multicultural Education Program at our existing San Ramon site.

- An expansion of our Pacific Bell degree completion program in San Ramon from 16 students in Fall 1988 to 291 students in Fall 1991 plus 259 students now enrolled in the new four-year program.

• Introduction in Fall 1991 of an elective sequence in three modern languages: Japanese, French, and Spanish.

• New Affirmative Action procedures have been introduced for the appointment of faculty and staff.

• A new staff development program (ARETE) has been introduced training faculty and staff in leadership and client service. The Program also offers training in diversity issues. To date, over 367 personnel have participated.

• The library is in the process of installing a fully integrated on-line automation system. This system will computerize the public catalog, circulation and reserve, acquisitions, cataloging, and serial control.

• Since the last WASC visit, the School of Nursing received reaccreditation of its baccalaureate program from the National League for Nursing and the California Board of Registered Nursing. Several Credential Programs of the School of Education were also reaffirmed by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, State of California.

• The University is preparing for a major capital campaign which will be announced publicly within the next two years. Thus far, the Divisions have prepared priorities for the campaign. It has been determined that the major objective of the campaign will be the enhancement of endowment.

• New instructional experiences in the School of Law since the 1988 visit include an expansion of community service
programs. Students provide faculty-supervised legal services to clients and receive credit as part of regular course work. These experiences are provided in the Narcotics Prosecution Clinic in the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, a mediation clinic in Family Law matters in the East Bay, and a new asylum component of the USF Law Clinic for Central American refugees.
VI. RESPONSE TO THE COMMISSION
RE: DIVERSITY ISSUES

Since the 1988 visit, WASC has mandated that all visits include a review of two additional areas: diversity and assessment issues. Diversity issues are discussed in this chapter, with Assessment following in Chapter VII. In its letter to Accreditation Liaison Officers dated February 11, 1991, the Commission requested that the content of the University's Institutional Report regarding diversity include its major activities to promote student, faculty and staff diversity (Standards 1.B, 5.B and 5.D) and its appreciation of cultural diversity in the curriculum (Standard 4.B).

A. Comments from the Visiting Team Report

While the Team Report did not directly address the issue by name, it contained several references to diversity at USF. Specifically, the Report included the following observations regarding WASC standards:

"The University makes a conscious effort to follow a non-discrimination policy and actively recruit minority students. The effectiveness of the University's recruiting efforts and especially support services for students is not clear. The University recognizes the need for increased diversity in the faculty, but minority students still find few minority faculty members with whom to relate". (Team Report, p.11) (Standard One).

"The number of minority faculty is relatively small, and the institution needs to do more in order to achieve diversity in the faculty population. While it is true that some efforts in this area are being undertaken, it is not clear that a policy exists to define not only the need for diversity (as a function of affirmative action), but also a rationale and a justification for the specific kinds of diversity that may be attempted". (Team Report, p.33) (Standard 5)
"The Office of Personnel Services is managed in a highly professional manner, and its programs represent an agenda of significant initiatives in respect to staff. The recognition and strengthening of the importance of the Affirmative Action Program is an example of a recent improvement. The University of San Francisco is strongly committed to the spirit of and belief in equal employment opportunities for all groups of employees; it is cognizant of the legal requirements and is scrupulous in their observance. While the institution is to be commended for its efforts, there remains continuing need for greater diversity in the campus population" (Team Report, p.35) (Standard 2).

B. The Commitment to Diversity

The University Mission Statement at the time of the visit spoke in terms of admission standards "without regard to ethnic background;" to promote an "awareness....of the diverse cultures of the San Francisco Bay Area and of the world" in all University students; and of the commitment to provide "distinguished faculty and staff" for its educational programs. The commitments towards services for students were expressed in terms of enhancing student achievement of "academic, personal, and professional excellence". Mission Statements related to the needs of society were general and expressed as a reflection of the Catholic and Jesuit traditions of higher education and promotion of social "justice among all people."

Notwithstanding the generality of the Mission Statement at that time, the University did articulate strategies for staff training programs; retention activities for undergraduate students in general, and minority students in particular; new approaches to orientation of new students; and advising for students at risk.

Simultaneous with the increased emphasis placed by WASC on diversity issues, the University began its review of the Mission Statement which culminated in the new document
approved in January 1991 by the Board of Trustees. This document clearly expresses the University commitment to "prepare men and women to shape a multicultural world"...a commitment which will be articulated in the sections C and D which follow, including the development of specific multicultural support services and academic responses in programs and staffing, and staff training.

At the University level, the Strategic Plan has identified a series of activities addressing goals established to promote multiculturalism at USF. These goals relate to ethnic and gender diversity of the faculty and staff and the increased diversity of the student body through recruitment and increased student support services. One strategy to promote multiculturalism is to give the "highest priority to the hiring of qualified ethnic minority faculty and staff in all schools and colleges and divisions of the University." In terms of students, a representative strategy is to "target academically qualified ethnic minorities in student recruitment efforts so as to reflect the demographics of California." (6)

A deepening of commitment is also expressed through the development of strategic planning and budget priorities in the Academic Plan. In the Academic Plan, a strategy important to the commitment to diversity (and to planning and budgeting) is to "increase [the number of] underrepresented minority students and increase financial aid, as well as... increase in minority faculty members." (5)

In Spring 1989, the Division of Academic Affairs reviewed and adopted a restatement of existing strategic goals defined as the Academic Goals Statement (9) which recognized the cultural diversity of the University, its environs, and its student body. This document expressed a continuing commitment
"educate the less-advantaged student," and to involve them in "decisions regarding their educational program" at USF; and a commitment to recognize members of the University community with "diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds as a source of enrichment in the University," and as "full participants in community life."

This initial plan for Academic Affairs was expanded to a fuller, five-year document in 1991. This plan describes a vision which reflects student, faculty, and program development within the context of several parameters. The planning parameters for the next five years reflect (among others) social justice, principles of diversity, the culture of the University, and enrollment goals related to the quality and diversity of the student body. (5)

The commitment to diversity thus has been deepened and clarified since the last Team Visit. This commitment is expressed in detail through the Academic Plan and provides 1) a rationale for diversity at USF; and 2) a basis for continuing program and staff development.

C. **Implementing the Commitment: The Present State of Diversity at USF**

1. **Presidential Leadership**—To emphasize the importance of diversity on campus, USF's new President, in his first weeks in office, announced, "This (Diversity) is an area in which I will be addressing personal leadership and for which I will be held accountable." He also announced the appointment of a Director of Diversity reporting directly to the President. A $200,000 fund was created to support diversity objectives over the next four years. These funds will be used for curriculum development, lectures, workshops, and projects enhancing multicultural awareness among students. (Exhibit J)
2. **Academic Programs**—During the last several years the University has been fortunate to receive considerable impetus in developing diversity programs through a substantial grant from the Irvine Foundation. The purpose of the grant was to assist faculty in developing awareness of diversity issues and to develop a campus atmosphere of openness and support of ethnic diversity. The grant provided the University with a significant increase in moral commitment to diversity through program design and the introduction of a number of new activities on campus. Although the funding for the grant was discontinued after the support of the 1990-1991 programs, those programs planned and initiated under grant auspices have set a direction within the University, a direction which we believe will have a long-term impact on making the University a supportive environment for ethnically diverse students, faculty and staff. In particular, the following areas have been influenced by the grants.

- **Faculty Recruitment.** Presently women represent 28% of the full-time faculty. Minority represent 9% of faculty. As documented in the 1989-90 EEOC report (Exhibit L), they are distributed among the ethnic groups in the following pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Females</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New affirmative-action guidelines have been introduced into the process of recruitment and employment of faculty. Faculty searches now provide for special efforts to bring minority candidates into the vacancy pool. New efforts are being made to announce vacancies in publications which are more likely to provide minority candidates; a minority faculty member from USF makes an annual recruitment visit to schools which might provide minority candidates. A special
consultant was engaged to help in designing this new recruitment procedure. This consultant also provided the institution with a number of names of minority faculty who could become candidates for vacancies. Special efforts were made to give minority candidates the opportunity to meet with minority members of the faculty. Further, before a search is judged ready for the on-campus interview stage, the Dean must certify that the applicant pool or the recruitment process reflects University goals in this area. Efforts this year, as estimated as of this date, indicate the University anticipates the appointment of six additional minority instructors (3 Blacks, 1 Hispanic, 2 Asians) to the full-time faculty. (Exhibit M)

- **Curriculum Changes.** Diversity priorities are reflected in the curriculum. Special funds were provided to several faculty members during the summer of 1990 to redesign courses in order to add a multicultural dimension to the curriculum. More importantly, the General Education core, proposed for introduction in the Fall 1992 contains two new courses specifically addressing ethnic diversity and international culture. A special lecture was sponsored by the College of Arts and Sciences (Department of Theology and Religious Studies) addressing the approaches to learning by various ethnic groups. A course on "Race and Ethnicity in American Politics" will be offered in Spring 1992.

- **Academic Outreach Programs.**
  USF also addresses its commitment to diversity through academic outreach programs. These programs not only assist those in need in the Bay Area but also provide USF students with a "hands on" opportunity to assist those in need. This commitment to community outreach is illustrated through the following examples.
•• Summer Enrichment Program

The first USF Summer Enrichment Program was held in the summer of 1990. The program was a four week non-residential program for 20 Bay Area Black and Hispanic high school sophomores and juniors. Its purpose was to provide an intensive academic program as well as cultural and athletic activities for students. Academic emphasis was placed on writing, speaking, mathematics and computer instruction. Program participants were also given free use of all University computer, library, classroom, and recreational facilities. Six Black and Hispanic USF faculty members served as instructors in the academic courses. Black and Hispanic USF students served as tutors in the summer program.

•• Tutorial Program

In order to continue the momentum gained during the Summer Enrichment Program, USF offered a student tutorial program during the 1990-91 academic year. The goal of the tutorial program was to continue to help the high school students build upon their writing, math and computer skills. Twelve Black and Hispanic USF tutors worked with the 20 students from 2-3 hours each week. The high school students were again free to utilize all USF facilities. The program presented an excellent opportunity to assist the high school students in gaining additional academic skills while allowing them to interact with Black and Hispanic students who served as role models.

There is some evidence that the programs were beneficial for the students. The tutorial program director stated that "a number of students have raised grades from D's and F's to C's and even B's", and one student stated that the programs "showed me something of what college would be like. I've learned more about my own values, expository writing, and I've gotten in shape from the benefit of the Koret Center. I met new people, I got a
taste of college, (learned) teachers are not monsters, learned new things through the classes. Now I can use a computer!"

Upward Bound and Counseling Programs

The School of Education presently participates in three outreach programs to the San Francisco community. First, it conducts an Upward Bound program providing summer academic courses and workshops, as well as tutorial and counseling support for educationally and economically disadvantaged high school students from diverse racial and ethnic background. The Upward Bound program also conducts an academic year program which provides tutorial support to students throughout the year. In the 1990-91 school year, more than 100 students participated in the program. During the past ten years, approximately 90% of those who completed the project have enrolled in college. College completion rates also remain high. A second program sponsored by the School of Education engages graduate students in the Counseling and Psychology program into the Mission District where they counsel children and families at inner-city counseling centers. This program provides opportunities for faculty and students to work with children and parents in need of assistance in a Family and Child Counseling Center located in the Mission District and in outreach programs in Mission District schools. In a third project, the School of Education initiated an honors program to recognize student performance in Bay Area schools. In Spring 1991, 21 students from Bay Area public junior and senior high schools were recognized in a special ceremony. The purpose of the awards ceremony was to honor students who were nominated by their schools for consistent academic excellence or for showing the most academic improvement. This will become an annual event.

Visiting Scholars Program

As part of the Irvine funding, a series of outstanding
scholars visited the campus during the 1990-91 academic year. The scholars addressed multicultural issues in classes, public lectures, and informal meetings with students and faculty. (Exhibit N)

The visiting scholars were:

- Dr. Lenneal Henderson.
  Distinguished Professor, Government and Public Administration, the University of Baltimore.

- Dr. Nicholas Mohr.
  Distinguished Visiting Professor, CUNY.

- Dr. Richard Delgado.
  Charles Inglis Thomson Professor of Law, University of Colorado.

- Dr. R. Baxter-Miller.
  Professor of English and Director of the Black Literature Program, University of Tennessee.

- Dr. Orlando Taylor.
  Dean, School of Communications, Howard University.

- Dr. Nathan Jones.
  Director of Religious Education, Archdiocese of Chicago.

The scholars gave campus-wide and departmental lectures, consulted with faculty on curricular matters and visited with faculty in various departments to provide specific training in diversity issues.

In addition, the College of Arts and Sciences sponsored and funded a faculty symposium entitled The African American Tradition in Literature. It featured the following panelists:

- Dr. Trudea Harris
  Professor of English, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

- Dr. William J. Harris
  Associate Professor of English, State University of New York at Stonybrook.
• Dr. R. Baxter Miller
  Professor of English, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

• Dr. Horace Porter
  Associate Professor of English, Stanford University.

• Dr. Patricia Hill
  Professor of English, University of San Francisco.

• **Student Services.** In Fall 1990 Asian-American, Hispanic, and African-American students comprised 22% of the 6331 students enrolled at the University. Of these, 324 or 5.1% were African-American, 350 or 5.5% were Hispanic, 35 or less than 1% were Native-American, and 682 or 10.8% were Asian-American. The University is progressing toward a student body mix which we hope will reflect the multicultural and ethnic diversity of California. A detailed University enrollment is contained in the Appendix of this Self-Study.

• **Student Recruitment**
  Specific efforts undertaken by the Admissions Office have helped bring about a new mix in the undergraduate student body. Strategies utilized include:

  • Visits to all high schools, especially Catholic high schools, in the San Francisco Bay Area with significant populations of underrepresented students.

  • Three recruitment visits to junior colleges in San Francisco, Marin, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties each year, and visits to junior colleges in Solano, Alameda, Contra Costa, and Sacramento counties at least once per year. Transfer agreements for general education requirements are in place for all of these schools. Additionally, USF attends college fairs in the Fall and Spring of
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each year sponsored by junior colleges in Southern and Northern California.

- Attendance at college fairs in Northern and Southern California sponsored by the California Student Opportunity and Access Program.

- Active support of the Minority Transfer Program at Foothill College in Santa Clara County.

- Participation in programs sponsored by the Achievement Team Conference of the Los Angeles Unified School District, and the Young Black Scholars, also in Los Angeles. Both of these programs focus on the academic achievement of minority ninth and tenth grade students.

- Attendance at the annual Northern California Upward Bound Program college fair. In addition, at least three California Upward Bound program student groups visit the USF campus each year. During the visits the Admissions Office provides lunch and a guided campus tour for the students.

- Soliciting the efforts of the student groups Club Latino, and the Black Student Union, and the Office of Multicultural Student Services in assisting the recruitment effort. Co-sponsored activities have included a Minority Admissions Day, telephoning accepted underrepresented students, and the participation of minority students in programs such as the "Sleeping Bag Weekend".

- Black alumni participation in the Annual Admissions Office Phonathon, and in regional receptions across the country.

- Minority group representation in all USF admissions materials.

3. Multicultural Student Services--In January 1990 the
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University, through the Office of Student Development, established the Office of Multicultural Student Services to respond to the issues of student diversity. (Exhibit 0) The goals of the Office are to:

a. Foster the multicultural vision for the University;

b. Improve the quality of life for the multicultural student community;

c. Improve the interaction between "international" and "domestic" students;

d. Provide a range of cross cultural opportunities for the University;

e. Develop institutional and individual appreciation for the value of different cultures; and

f. Provide advocacy, support, advice and programming.

The overall efforts have been promising. In its first fourteen months of operation the Office has developed several programs and activities designed to enhance multicultural student services, such as sponsoring the Ninth Annual Conference on Minority Affairs of the American Jesuit Colleges and Universities. The office is also responsible for the following activities which enhance our diversity efforts.

- **The Phelan Multicultural Community**

  A pilot program for providing a multicultural living/learning experience in the Phelan residence hall has been developed for the 1991-92 academic year. The floor will house 22 sophomore and upperclass students. Activities will include "monthly festivals, tickets to selected cultural events in the Bay Area, guest speakers from the academic, business and professional communities, Fall and Spring community retreats, and involvement in community service projects." The residents of the community will reflect the diversity that exists on the USF campus and will provide a
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model laboratory for multicultural interaction and learning.

- **Graduate Internship Program**
  The Graduate Internship Program supports the University commitment to diversity by introducing School of Education Master's students to the field of Multicultural Affairs. Intern responsibilities include student program development and implementation, intercultural sensitivity training, student leadership development, and program evaluation. The program has been successful, both in terms of the Intern experience, and the services provided to the USF community.

- **Language Learning Tables**
  Multicultural Student Services sponsors a monthly program in the Dining Commons for students who are interested in learning to speak a language other than English. The primary purpose of the program is to help support student intercultural exchange in a casual environment, while they are developing language skills. Faculty of the Modern Language Department participate in the program.

- **Minority Student Association Leadership Retreat**
  Student leaders representing the Asian Pacific American Association, Black Student Union, Club Latino, and Hui o' Hawaii participated in an overnight leadership retreat. The goal of the retreat was to provide an atmosphere where minority student leaders could begin to work together on the challenges facing their respective clubs. As a result of the retreat the level of communication between the groups and their leaders has improved.

- **Liaison Work with Student Groups**
  The Office of Multicultural Student Services has worked closely with on campus multicultural student groups to sponsor important activities such as "Barrio Night", the Club Latino
"Amigos" program, the Hui o' Hawaii "Luau", the International Student Association "Culture Night", and a series of programs with the Black Student Union for Black History Month.

- **Outreach in Campus Ministry**

  Each year the USF office of Campus Ministry coordinates a series of community outreach opportunities for USF students. The groups served by students through Campus Ministry tend to be from lower socio-economic groups and therefore tend to be from minority populations. The USF students who volunteer to serve closely reflect the diverse USF student population. Service opportunities include bedtime readings to children at the Haight Family Shelter, ongoing food and clothing collection and distribution for people in need, participation in a detention ministry program at San Quentin prison, and organizing weekend off-site experiences for homeless children living in shelters. Students are also called upon to respond to one time needs and events. The 1989 earthquake is a classic example. While the University closed for a week after the earthquake, the Campus Ministry office remained open for 14 hours each day. The office became a nerve center for student and staff volunteers and a collection point for money, food, and clothing.

4. **Staff Programs**--Since the 1988 Visiting Team Report, the overall size of the University's administrative staff has been downsized. However, despite the downsizing, the percentages of ethnic minority and women staff since 1988 have remained relatively stable between approximately 25%-27% of the total University exempt and non-exempt workforce. The number of full-time minority staff on campus is now 25.3%, broken down into the following categories:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Females</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Black Males</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Females</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Asian Males</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Females</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hispanic Males</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University has established a policy on sexual and other unlawful harassment. (Exhibit P) In addition, all collective bargaining agreements for unionized faculty and staff contain provisions addressing prohibitions on discrimination and sexual and unlawful harassment; the Affirmative Action Officer provides staff assistance and orientation to operating units regarding compliance with federal and state legal requirements for position advertising guidelines, interview guidelines and techniques, and the recruitment process for all searches.

The Office of Personnel Services conducts staff awareness sessions on cultural diversity on a regular basis. These include workshops on Valuing Diversity, Understanding Yourself and Working with Others, and Diversity Skills: Communications. In addition, Personnel Services has integrated diversity components into all new employee orientation sessions and all professional development activities. There are specific diversity components in professional development workshops on interviewing, supervisory leadership, and developing talent. Thus far 367 staff members have participated in our "Service Excellence" and professional development programs.

The Office of Multicultural Student Services has conducted staff training for Residence Life staff and resident assistants and for staff in the Student Health and Counseling Center. In addition, student staff in the residence halls are also given comprehensive multicultural training. In addition to the staff training provided by the Office of Multicultural Student Services, all Residence Life staff are given a multicultural reader at the beginning of the academic year. The reader initially contains six articles with questions and response sections for discussion among the staff. Every two weeks after the beginning of the year a new article is distributed to the staff and discussed in group meetings. The
Residence Life staff reflects the diversity of the USF campus with 15 of the 46 student staff members coming from underrepresented or minority backgrounds.

D. Analysis and Evaluation

A major concern of the previous Visiting Team was the effectiveness of University recruiting efforts and support services for minority students. The present plans for minority student recruitment, articulated by the University Admissions Office are quite clear at this time, and describe specific visits to targeted high schools and to community colleges and the frequency with which such visits are planned. The University participates in activities with the California Student Opportunity and Access program, minority student transfer programs, and special activities in other parts of the State with groups addressing the educational goals and needs of minority groups.

The Visiting Team also questioned the number of minority faculty available to serve as role models for minority students. Certainly the plans and commitment for minority faculty recruitment and the provision of curriculum offerings reflecting ethnic and cultural issues are more clear. Some progress has been made in both areas and the leadership exists in both areas to maintain the momentum.

The development of the new Office for Multicultural Student Services shows promise. The alliance with minority educators and program directors of other Jesuit Schools and Colleges will be valuable as USF works to enhance support services for minority students.

The Visiting Team’s request that the University develop a rationale and justification for specific kinds of diversity is addressed in the Academic Plan for 1991-96. The priorities for diversity for the entire University are based on the University Mission Statement, demographics in San Francisco
and California, social issues, and the Jesuit character of the University.

The Mission Statement of the University supports volunteer activities through its tradition of social justice and its commitment to development of leadership. The University campus provides outreach services for the San Francisco Bay Area Community and also on campus for the University community. The value of outreach is also reflected in the curriculum, where students are provided the opportunity to work with individuals and families with specific needs. It is worth noting that some Colleges and Schools have developed their own plans to address minority issues through outreach programs. Clearly, however, the curriculum offerings can be enriched by providing more opportunities to allow for the application of theory to practice, thus providing the students with realistic community outreach.

E. Future Directions

The University accepts its responsibility to be more responsive concerning its written value statements related to social justice and its obligation to provide both educational opportunities and service to minority populations and underrepresented groups. However, the University is still staffed by a faculty and administration which is predominantly male-caucasian; and the staff ethnic mix is inadequate. The culture of the University is beginning to change with the progress that has been made to date; especially in student enrollment and support services. The door has opened for increased sensitivity to minority issues in faculty staffing, and hence, in curriculum offerings. The likelihood for continued development in these areas is very real.
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VII. RESPONSE TO COMMISSION
RE: ASSESSMENT ISSUES

A. Development of Assessment at USF

1. History of Assessment at USF--Evaluation as a concept, and assessment as a means to that end, is gradually becoming a more visible thread in the cultural matrix of USF. The traditional forms of evaluation to assess operations and outcomes--whether in the form of program reviews reported to the Board of Trustees, analysis of expenditures for a granting agency, follow-up studies of graduates for professional accrediting bodies, Freshman and Senior surveys conducted for needs assessments, or exit interviews to analyze retention problems--have been conducted by most Schools and Colleges and administrative departments over time. Faculty and administrators carry out activities to obtain student perceptions of courses and formally assess student achievement within their courses. In addition, students participate in a variety of formal and informal activities to evaluate their instructors. But until the development of the accreditation standard for a broader view of assessment at the institutional level, little was ever done in a systematic, formal way to provide for an ongoing measure of the success of the University in achieving its stated purposes. Assessment was more a process of evaluating resource input and process than outcomes. Little was done to coordinate, organize, and communicate throughout the University the evaluation findings that are produced by the many small projects carried on each year. Still less did such assessment lead to program changes.
2. Assessment at USF: New Beginnings--A small core group of faculty and administrators, committed to evaluation theory and methodology, had been effective in developing recommendations for institutional research and assessment during the Self Study conducted for the Fall 1988 accreditation visit. These recommendations were included in the planning priorities presented by the Deans to the new VPAA in January 1989. (18)

During the Fall 1989 semester, in response to the recommendations of the Deans, the VPAA formed a Task Force on Assessment. The charge to the Task Force was to further the involvement of faculty members in assessment activities, to increase the utilization of assessment results, to make recommendations for assessment at the University level, and to initiate new assessment projects. (19) The task force members included undergraduate and graduate student representatives, and representatives from the faculty, administration, and staff. Several members of the Task Force attended the AAHE Assessment Forum in May 1989, and others attended the Fifth Assessment Forum on Assessing the College Experience in June 1990. Task Force members also attended the Sixth Assessment Forum in June 1991.

B. The USF Experience with Assessment

1. Planning for Assessment--Activities carried out by the Assessment Task Force during its first year included collecting information about all assessment activities in progress at the University and providing a central location for all available interim and completed evaluation projects. Plans were made for the development and publication of a newsletter titled Assessment Update. The newsletter is now distributed throughout the University and reports issues related to assessment activities on campus. It also brings attention to developments on a national level. (20)
Another aspect of the instructional thrust of the Task Force's work has been the review of the purpose and methodology of assessment in general, and the development of an official definition of Assessment for university purposes. The resulting definition, adopted to guide both the work of the Task Force and future activities related to assessment at the University level, was based on discussions between and among task force members, the deans, and faculty. The definition reads as follows:

"Assessment is a planned and structured process by which the University measures the impact its programs have on students, relative to the University's stated mission." (21)

Assessment efforts based on this definition will seek answers to the following questions:

- What knowledge and abilities do we intend for students to acquire?
- Do we provide the opportunity for students to acquire that knowledge?
- Are students successful at acquiring the intended abilities? If so, to what extent?
- If students are unsuccessful in acquiring the intended knowledge and abilities, where specifically, do they fall short?

The Task Force has developed a philosophical approach that views assessment as a way to improve the quality and quantity of learning by providing information to improve student learning in both the curricular and co-curricular areas. In the curricular areas, assessment must be a faculty-driven diagnostic and formative evaluation process aimed at improving student learning and determining the effectiveness of the curriculum.
The definition and philosophical approach to assessment were published by the Task Force in the 1990-91 newsletters. During the academic year, members of the Task Force met with representatives of each school and college, each division, and the University Curriculum Committee to inform them of the charge and activities of the Task Force and to encourage development or continuation of assessment projects.

2. Completed Assessment Projects at the University--
Copies of completed assessment projects will be available for review during the Special Visit. These include:

THE ERASMUS PROJECT--The report of external evaluators funded by the VPAA to assess the experiences of the faculty and students at the end of the first year of a new learning-living residential program. The faculty members who developed the program requested the evaluation to enlist support for its continuation and to make recommendations for its improvement. (Exhibit Q)

EVALUATION OF THE ST. IGNATIUS INSTITUTE--The report of an in-depth and extensive faculty study commissioned and funded by the Dean of the College of Arts and Science at the request of the Board of Trustees. The program provides a four-year integrated curriculum in the tradition of Christian humanism and is based on the great books approach of Western Civilization, while emphasizing the major works of Christianity and the Catholic tradition. This evaluation provided for both self-study and assessment input from external evaluators. In this study use was made of standardized assessment tools available from the Educational Testing Service. Data also were collected from alumni of the program. (Exhibit R)
ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS--As part of the preparation for this Special WASC Visit, a review committee repeated the 1988 survey of faculty perceptions of administration-faculty relations. This assessment project is described in a prior section addressing Administrative-Faculty Relations.

ATHLETIC STUDY--The status of intercollegiate athletics at USF was evaluated in Fall 1989 by a committee of students, alumni, faculty, staff, and Trustees. The purpose of the study was to determine the adequacy of resources to support competitive programs consistent with the purposes of the University. Historical reports (related to the restoration of basketball), marketing reports, focused group interviews, and a survey provided the sources of data collected from students, student athletes, faculty, staff, and alumni. During the process, the Athletic Department conducted a self study. General findings of the assessment led to recommendations to promote morale, increase physical and financial resources, and to strengthen the coaching staff. (Exhibit S)

3. Assessment Projects in Process at USF--As a model for the kind of assessment activity that could be carried out at the institutional level to assess University effectiveness in achieving stated purposes, the Assessment Task Force planned a survey of the University community to address some of the value issues reflected in the University statement of mission and goals. In Fall 1990, a survey instrument was distributed to members of the USF community--faculty, staff and students--to assess knowledge of the mission of the University, congruency of personal values with those expressed in the Mission Statement, and to assess efforts to act on personal values and those expressed in written institutional value statements. The analysis and final report of this survey is still in process but will be available when the Visiting Team
arrives. (Exhibit T)

Other new assessment projects have been planned which are based on the work of the Assessment Task Force. These include a study of the impact of the university experience at USF on a sample of seniors for which USF has ACE Freshman Survey data and another study applying William Perry's scheme of the intellectual and ethical development of college students to an assessment of the ways in which USF students make their college experiences meaningful.

A new approach to program review has also been developed, as discussed in the section on Planning. These reviews will be conducted in each of the Schools to assess strengths and weaknesses of all programs and to make recommendations for continuation, improvement or cancellation of programs. The model for the review approach adopted may also prove useful in the development of proposals to initiate new programs. The model for review has been developed by the Deans in collaboration with the Joint Committee on University Curriculum. Target dates for program reviews will be set by the VPAA in collaboration with the Deans, and reports made to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

4. Planned Assessment Projects--The future assessment plans for the schools, colleges, and divisions at USF are described in the following sections. See also the Report of the Assessment Review committee.

The College of Arts and Sciences' strategic plan includes program review for each of the departments. A newly initiated series of regular, ongoing reviews includes the use of outside evaluators. Components of program review include program self-studies and development plans; surveys of current students, faculty, and alumni; and evaluations by external
The **School of Education** will be assessing the ways in which it is carrying out the mission of both the School of Education and the University. To this end it is developing a model of its own based on the University-wide review process. An assessment of doctoral programs will be underway during the 1991-92 academic year, and will be followed by reviews of programs at the Master's level. A review of screening and admissions processes also will be undertaken.

The **College of Professional Studies** is planning to conduct departmental evaluations every fifth year. These evaluations will be tied to the mission and goals of the University, to the mission of the college, and to the goals for evaluation established by the University for program review, including faculty effectiveness and student quality and performance. The College of Professional Studies plans to have outside evaluators assist in the process.

The **School of Nursing** has completed a self-study for accreditation of its Master's program. A survey regarding advising in the School of Nursing was undertaken with faculty advisors and students. The results of this survey led to changes in advising of all students, and a freshman advising program was developed. Now, students with academic difficulties are mentored. Assessment also includes a review of the entrance SNET exam to assess academic skills of undergraduate and graduate students. Such a review will assist improving support services within the School. The assessment of achievement (graduating GPA and SBN scores) has led to new progression standards in the School.

The **School of Business** has plans to assess the outcomes for each course offered. This assessment will address
speaking, writing, and analyzing abilities as well as integration of material across areas. An emphasis will focus on how skill development can be enhanced.

Assessment activities for the Library include the following: a review of collections by subject or discipline, ideally involving faculty in an organized program of development; an incorporation or a strengthening of the assessment component in on-site library orientation tours and off-campus services; a study of the library's attempt to contribute to "lifelong information literacy" among students; and an assessment of the impact of library automation.

The Student Development Division is active in the assessment area. Traditionally the division uses assessment information for planning and budgeting on a yearly basis. This division plans to continue its assessment in the areas of residence life, multicultural services, counseling, career services, athletics, freshman survey, and student outreach services. No new plans are being considered in light of the extensive assessment projects that are undertaken annually.

Academic Services areas also will continue with existing projects. They do not have plans for any new assessments at this time.

C. Assessment at USF - Analysis and Evaluation

In this section are reported some findings about assessment issues gained during review activities conducted to prepare for the Special Visit. The major conclusions drawn from the analysis led to the development of recommendations for what will need to be done next. The findings are organized in accordance with the key issues identified by the Commission to be of concern, as noted in Draft 2 of the Commission's Policy Statement on Assessment. (22)
1. **Institutional Sensitivity about Assessment**—The level of awareness about assessment and assessment activities varies. Faculty and administrators are most familiar about the specific assessment activities in their schools or areas. Administrators and former administrators are generally more aware of assessment activities than faculty and staff members. A few administrators know more about the types of assessment activities on campus than those administrators, faculty, and staff who have had little contact with previous assessments. Exceptions to this are those administrators and faculty who have been involved in accreditation visits to other schools or program reviews with which they were directly involved. A few staff members are knowledgeable about activities conducted within their Divisions. The majority of University faculty and staff who were interviewed by the review committee generally agree that there is insufficient dissemination of information about the results of assessment activity and that there is a need to coordinate assessment. This view is consistent with the experience of the Assessment Task Force. Many individuals on campus have strong beliefs about the role, force, and utility of assessment and believe the value of assessment is best seen in outcomes which enable the University to:

- determine the quality of education provided by USF;
- strengthen the ways in which the University mission is served;
- shape the direction of the strategic plan;
- initiate the integrated planning/budgeting process each year;
- determine the nature and quality of on- and off-campus learning environments;
- assess its culture, programs, services, and ethos;
- draw alumni back into the University;
- improve curriculum to meet student needs, state
guidelines, and accrediting agencies' standards.

In the words of one administrator, "The value of assessment lies in the ability to use what we glean from it and to develop a method for validating the best of our curricular and educational decisions and give direction for changing our poorer decisions." Another has said "The Assessment Task Force has begun to raise attention to assessment, but we have a way to go. Its value is providing a measurement of quality and ensuring we are delivering what we say we are delivering."

2. Review of Working Definition of Assessment--Many University Division staff view assessment from a limited perspective, as their experience with assessment is focused within a division or within a program. More attention needs to be directed to broadening the ideas of the University community so that assessment is perceived more globally.

The working definition of assessment has been accepted as appropriate. Several people interviewed during the review process, however, indicated that the definition needs to include a statement on who will oversee the assessment effort. Two individuals felt that the responsible body should report to the President and have the authority to assess all areas (academic, university relations, business and finance, and student development). Another respondent indicated that the definition was a "great first step, but that it leaves something out." The respondent went on to say "assessment is broad based and academic achievement is only one component of institutional effectiveness. Institutional assessment should also consider planning, budgeting, and management."

3. Value and Impact of Completed Assessment Projects--The worth of funding and carrying out an evaluation effort can
most often be determined through an examination of the effects of the assessment process and the use made of the assessment findings. Some examples of the impact of assessment at USF are included here.

The Erasmus Program—The evaluation team strongly recommended that at least one of the faculty members leading this program should be a woman. The College plans to implement this recommendation in the 1991-92 academic year. Several other minor recommendations will also be implemented immediately. The program will be continued for the present.

St. Ignatius Institute—The evaluation of the St. Ignatius Institute revealed a program that has maintained high academic standards and has contributed directly to the mission of the institution as a Catholic, Jesuit university. Nevertheless, several problems and potential weaknesses have been uncovered. In order to address these, the Dean, the Director of the program, and faculty will over the next semester formulate a development plan that will concern itself with at least the following issues:

1. Resolving a dispute between the Theology Department and the Institute concerning hiring of faculty to teach Theology courses.

2. Revising the curriculum, particularly in the areas of Theology and Philosophy.

3. Enhancing the interaction between the Institute and other programs.

4. Expanding co-curricular aspects of the program.
At the direction of the Board of Trustees, this plan and any other action taken will be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees in December 1991.

Student Needs Assessment--In Fall 1988, the Office of Student Development conducted a study of student attrition at USF. The overall study was based on the compilation and integration of five separate studies focused specifically on international students, freshmen resident students, opinion surveys of resident students and the findings of a standardized survey instrument developed by ACT. The overall study provided explanations of why students leave USF and resulted in an assessment of student perceptions about the quality of student services. This study was in progress at the time of the last Team visit. For this report we are able to provide comment on the value and some of the decisions which were made as a result of the assessment.

The student retention report was valuable because it helped the entire campus to focus on student retention issues at USF. The report was shared with students, faculty, administrators, and members of the Board of Trustees. The one and two year attrition rates for incoming cohorts are lower due to the efforts of these groups. The one year attrition rate for Freshmen entering in 1982 was 27.3% and the two year rate was 44.1%. For the Freshmen cohort entering in 1988, the one year rate was 17.7% and the two year rate was 29.1%. This reduction in the attrition rate was due in part to the following University actions:

- Increased service office hours and training sessions for employees in service offices such as the registrar, bursar, and career services,
- Establishment of an on-campus Student Health Clinic and the opening of the Koret Health and Recreation Center,
• Development of strong student advising programs in the Colleges,
• Positive efforts to reduce the amount of friction between the faculty union and administration and to stabilize the University's financial situation,
• Development of a program for exit interviews to determine why students withdraw from the University. This information is shared with the Deans and faculty of each college.
• More attention directed throughout the University toward helping students feel welcome and encouraging them to stay.

Athletic Study--A second phase of action took place in the Athletic Department after the initial evaluation. In this second phase, a marketing plan was developed for the Athletic Department, a management audit of the department was completed, and additional resources were targeted for areas of need outlined in the report. In addition the USF Board of Trustees reaffirmed its commitment to fund a competitive Division I athletic program, and to begin an Athletic Endowment Campaign in the future.

At the present time, the Athletic Department is using the goals and timetables outlined in the Athletic Evaluation Report as benchmarks for progress. The very specific staffing, scholarship, and program recommendations in the report will be a road map for the department for at least the next 3-4 years. The value of the process is that it has focused the energy of the department in one direction--a direction that was set by all members of the University community, students, faculty, administrators, alumni, and Trustees.

4. Overall Institutional Plan--There is no formal
structured overall plan for the assessment of University effectiveness at the time of this writing. Efforts during the past two years have focused on increasing the sensitivity of the University community to the benefits and value of assessment. Much instruction and orientation has taken place, and policies and procedures have been put into place for formal structured ongoing assessment through program reviews within the colleges. The need for assessment at the University level has been articulated and accepted. Most important, steps are taking place to initiate formal assessment of the revised general education curriculum on an ongoing basis when it is initiated this next Fall. This evaluation will measure how the University mission is realized in the GEC requirement for undergraduate students. The GEC evaluation plan will be the first component of the overall institutional plan for assessment of effectiveness and will address achievement of University outcomes.

Program reviews will become the second piece of the broader plan. This has begun, but will occur more systematically once it has been determined that the strategies and approaches developed for measuring relationships between program goals and outcomes and the University Mission are both valid and reliable.

Congruency between student values and University values, and the development and persistence of student values; (including perhaps an assessment of graduates' community service, volunteer activities, role as leaders, and the like), will become a third dimension of the overall plan; but only over time. It is thought that the community survey of values, currently in the analysis phase, will clarify some of the questions that need to be asked when assessing this aspect of University purposes.
Factors influencing the development of the eventual overall plan, in addition to University commitment to and awareness of assessment, include identification of the leadership talent to coordinate University assessment, and allocation of financial resources to support assessment. As the relationship between assessment, planning, and budget decision-making becomes closer, and as assessment approaches and strategies become more effective, the comfort level in allocating University funds to assessment will rise and be perceived in cost-effective terms.

An initial indicator that bodes well for the development of a coordinated plan for assessment of University effectiveness includes the involvement of alumni in program reviews planned at the College level by the College of Arts and Science and the School of Education. A second positive indicator is the collaboration occurring between and among the Task Force on Assessment, the University Committee on Curriculum, and the Joint Committee for the General Education Committee. A third, most important factor, is the growing interest among the faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences for the identification and/or development of criteria for measuring outcomes of their departmental majors.

The review process for the Special Visit also produced findings indicative of faculty values for assessment. One individual stated that "he would like to see the University community become more convinced of the value of the assessment...to see it as an enhancement, not a threat." Others suggested that assessment can be a way for the University to gain information that will guide effective change; as a way to understand how we are affecting our students.

5. Success in Utilization of Assessment--The model
projects identified above, all have assessment components built into their structures. In addition, the Budget Review Committee, the Staff Reduction Task Force, the Portfolio Process in the College of Professional Studies, and the Financial Aid Task Force were identified as having specific assessment components within their activities that were viewed as being successful by those individuals who were interviewed.

While no unsuccessful assessments were identified during the review process, some assessment reports were viewed as poorly disseminated. This aspect was viewed as "disappointing". A number of those interviewed went so far as to indicate that assessment was futile because results frequently were not acted upon. Most felt that faculty were involved in some assessment activity but should be involved more extensively.

6. Faculty Involvement in Assessment--Review participants believed that faculty are involved in assessing their own areas but not in a coordinated manner. There was agreement that the role of faculty is key to effective assessment, because they are the closest to the client, and have a central role in University governance. Mechanisms exist presently for students to evaluate faculty, but few mechanisms exist that go beyond the learning environment to the co-curricular environment. One administrator indicated that no assessment should proceed in any academic support unit unless there is full faculty involvement: "It is crucial that faculty become involved in assessment, that they buy into it, and that they provide their expertise." Associated with this was the belief that faculty have a greater role in peer review.

Beyond the current efforts of the Task Force on Assessment, there is an ongoing need for someone to be
responsible for a central depository of assessment information and standardized instruments, to be a resource person on the assessment process, to disseminate evaluation findings, and to serve as a coordinator for University-wide assessment activities. What is needed at this stage in the assessment process is a commitment on the part of the institution at the highest levels—the President and the Vice Presidents. These individuals would act upon the results of assessment projects as indicated.

In the words of one administrator, "assessment must proceed in a logical and coherent fashion, with faculty and administrators working, planning, and developing assessment strategies and methods together." Both undergraduate and graduate students indicated that their ideas should be elicited and considered in the process of developing assessment models or projects. Students believe they should have access to assessment findings. Generally, the individuals who were interviewed said they would very much like to learn about and discuss assessment projects and results.

7. Linking Assessment to Institutional Planning—It was generally agreed by those interviewed that institutional planning involving faculty was in its beginning stages at the University. An assessment plan also is just being developed by the Assessment Task Force. Both planning and assessment are in early developmental stages at this time. It is too soon to determine how effectively they will contribute to the institution’s improvement efforts.

During the review interviews, some individuals indicated the University’s Strategic Plan should focus attention on the need for on-going institutional research. The institutional planning effort has already drawn upon existing internal and
external data sources. The fact that a member of the Strategic Planning Committee also served on the Assessment Task Force was seen as a positive step toward coordination of planning and assessment and a positive force for distribution of assessment findings. The academic plan and the overall strategic plan have both used available assessment data. Both plans will stress that future development and use of assessment strategies are integral to planning and improved effectiveness at USF.

D. Summary of Review Findings about Assessment

The development of a working definition of assessment is viewed as a positive and necessary step toward acceptance and full implementation of assessment at the University. Consideration must be given to broadening that definition beyond the teaching-learning activities in Academic Affairs to include assessment of the activities of all departments and units in all University Divisions. It is assumed that all such units work within the parameters of the University Mission and Goals, and thus have an active part in contributing to the effectiveness of the University.

The appropriate administrative structure must be developed for 1) the coordination of existing assessment efforts and 2) the development and melding of evaluation activities into a structured plan for the assessment of University effectiveness. The roles of and the relationship between institutional research and assessment should be examined simultaneously.

The fundamental responsibility for program review within Academic Affairs and curriculum development and improvement must remain with the Deans and the faculty. But the results of assessment in these areas must be made available as needed for the assessment of University effectiveness. The role of
the coordinator is vital, to ensure that assessment data and findings collected from the schools and colleges are in a form that is usable for University-wide assessment purposes. The University alumni are a powerful resource for assessment of 1) University effectiveness in the development of values and practices unique to the Jesuit tradition and mission of the University and also in 2) the effectiveness of academic programs which develop a base in liberal education for career preparation. Where appropriate, assessment designs and strategies should reflect the involvement of University graduates.

E. Recommendations For the Future of Assessment at USF

After two years of orienting the University community to the purposes and approaches to assessment, several recommendations were made and are included in the report of the Review Committee. The more salient of these include the need for:

- A coordinator for planning and implementation of university-wide assessment activities who reports directly to the VPAA. This coordinator would serve as an ex-officio member of the Assessment Task Force or Joint Committee on Assessment and serve as a resource person to the University community about assessment;
- Reconstitute the Assessment Task Force as an official Joint University Committee on Assessment with full representation of faculty, staff, and students from each Division and each School and College; each of whom would serve as liaison persons between the Joint Committee and the constituency to facilitate the assessment process and communicate assessment findings;
- Continued effort in 1991-92 on targeted assessment activities developed in collaboration with the VPAA and based where appropriate on the work and recommendations
of both the earlier Task Force and the review committee for the Special Visit;

- Identification of specific University-wide assessment activities to provide data for decisions regarding future University policy and/or future University planning and budgeting priorities;

- Implementation of appropriate University-wide assessment activities designed to evaluate effectiveness of selected areas of the new University Mission Statement.
VIII. MAJOR ISSUES FOR THE FUTURE

The University of San Francisco will confront certain issues of major importance to the quality and future development of the institution. A description of these issues and how the University is responding to them is reflected in each of the major sections of this Special Report. In sum, these concerns relate to:

• **The precarious nature of financial support for higher education and for private higher education in particular.** USF plans for growth in its undergraduate student population. Our students are already heavily dependent on federal and state funding for the costs of higher education. These costs are rising more quickly than private giving and government support are anticipated to rise.

• **Our perseverance in tightening the procedures for the budgeting-planning process.** Participation of the faculty in these processes must be expanded. A more flexible process will promote adequate review and decision making.

• **Maintaining the momentum towards involvement of faculty in governance.** Important changes in both contractual relationships and in relationships between the administration and the faculty must be nourished. The road will be a bumpy one, but can be smoothed out as the faculty and the administration continue to work together.
• Developing an appropriate arena for faculty and administration to work together in decision making. The present structure of the Academic Forum needs to be strengthened as a setting for faculty-administrative dialogue in policy and program issues.

• Promoting the level of acceptance and support for off-campus programs. The University is making positive steps forward to involve full-time faculty in the development and implementation of programs offered in its external campus settings. Faculty with full-time responsibilities in off-campus instruction are becoming more involved in the governance activities of the main campus.

• Acting constructively on value statements reflecting commitments to diversity in faculty and staff appointments. The culture of the University is adaptive and responsive to strong leadership and direction. Diversity in curricular programs and support services will augment the University's efforts to respond to the changing culture of the San Francisco Bay Area served by the institution.

• Assessing the ways in which the institution does what it says it will do. The next steps towards measuring the effectiveness of the University in terms of its stated purposes lie in the development of a coordinated plan for assessment.