

Santa Clara University

Institutional Proposal

Submitted to the Western Association
of Schools and Colleges
for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, May 2007



TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Context and Standards	2
Institutional Context	2
Commission Action Letter	4
Proposal Development	4
B. Capacity Review and Educational Effectiveness Review	6
Proposed Outcomes	6
<i>Theme One: Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion</i>	7
<i>Theme Two: Supporting the Santa Clara Teaching Scholar Model</i>	10
<i>Theme Three: Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence</i>	12
Beyond the Themes: Ensuring Student Learning	14
C. Data Gathering Systems and Resources	14
D. Appendices	15

A. Context and Standards

Institutional Context

Located in the heart of California's Silicon Valley, Santa Clara University offers undergraduate curricula in the arts and sciences, business, and engineering, as well as graduate and professional programs in business, law, engineering, pastoral ministries, counseling psychology, and education. A Catholic and Jesuit institution founded in 1851 as "Santa Clara College," we are California's oldest operating institution of higher learning. Santa Clara experienced slow and steady growth during its first 60 years, becoming the "University of Santa Clara" in 1912 when the schools of engineering and law were added. The Leavey School of Business opened in 1926 and within a decade became one of the first business schools in the country to receive national accreditation. An all-male school for 110 years, Santa Clara began accepting women as undergraduates in 1961, becoming the first coeducational Catholic university in California. In 1985, the University adopted "Santa Clara University" as its official name.

The Santa Clara University community includes¹ 4,613 undergraduate students and 3,339 graduate students (974 in law; 715 in engineering; 1,146 in business; and 624 in education, counseling psychology, and pastoral ministries). These 7,952 students are served by 744 faculty (476 full-time, 268 part-time) and 763 staff (711 full-time, 52 part-time). Our student-faculty ratio is 12.32:1; classes are small and the curriculum is values-oriented.

In the words of the 1998 Mission Statement, the University "makes student learning its central focus, promotes faculty and staff learning in its various forms, and exhibits organizational learning as it deals with the challenges facing it." As a Jesuit university it has a 155-year tradition of educating the whole person for a life of ethical citizenship and service to improve society.

Father Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, speaking at Santa Clara University in 2000, articulated a clear vision for Jesuit universities, emphasizing the crucial role of "solidarity" in the education of the whole person for a new century. Kolvenbach urged students at Jesuit universities to "let the gritty reality of this world" into their lives, to learn to "feel it, think about it critically, respond to its suffering, and

engage it constructively." Jesuit education, grounded in academic excellence, promotes a "well educated solidarity" that gives rise to "intellectual inquiry and moral reflection."

The University translates this ideal into the strategic vision of educating citizens of competence, conscience, and compassion, both at the undergraduate and the graduate levels. This goal is addressed in the curriculum, and in other aspects of learning beyond the classroom. One anchor of a Santa Clara undergraduate education is the University core curriculum. The core curriculum is regularly updated in order to ensure that it represents the campus community's best thinking on the knowledge, skills, and values that enable students to achieve intellectual excellence, live as responsible citizens, and develop a "commitment to fashioning a more humane, sustainable, and just world." The University is currently considering a revision of its core: A proposal for revision is under discussion by faculty and trustees. In addition to the core, Santa Clara offers 45 majors through its College of Arts and Sciences, and its business and engineering schools. The University aspires to educate its graduate students for competence, conscience, and compassion as well, by providing opportunities for the study of ethics and justice in professional school curricula.

The graduate and undergraduate curricula are supported by a variety of integrative and cocurricular programs. Three centers of distinction—the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, the Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education, and the Center for Science, Technology, and Society—provide opportunities for integrated and interdisciplinary programming for students, faculty, and the broader community. Residential Learning Communities integrate living and learning, allowing students to live with others who are exploring similar interests. Domestic and international immersion trips provide opportunities to combine reflection with community engagement. Community based learning programs link homeless shelters, schools, ESL programs, immigrant service centers, and other organizations in the Silicon Valley with the curriculum. And numerous Chartered Student Organizations, including student media (newspaper, yearbook, literary and arts magazine), a Multicultural Center, and a student-run community action program, provide cocurricular opportunities in support of an integrated education.

A goal of the reaccreditation self study will be to evaluate the success of curricular and cocurricular programs in educating students for competence, conscience, and compassion. This will be the first theme of the self study. Some standard indicators suggest the University has a solid foundation in relation to the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion. SCU has received national recognition for its blend of academic rigor and character formation. For 17 consecutive years, Santa Clara University has been ranked second overall among the 123 master's level universities in the West by *U.S. News & World Report*. SCU's average undergraduate graduation rate, 84 percent, is the second highest in the country among the 557 universities in its Carnegie classification category. The freshman retention rate, 92 percent, is the highest of master's universities in the region. Santa Clara is also one of the first schools to be recognized for a new Carnegie classification: institutions committed to community engagement.

Among the University's graduate schools, the MBA program was ranked No. 12 among part-time programs in the country in 2006, and the Executive MBA program was No. 21 nationally, according to *U.S. News & World Report's* annual "America's Best Graduate Schools." In 2007 *Business Week* ranked the Business School as No. 27. Santa Clara University's School of Law was named one of the top 100 law schools in the country by *U.S. News*, and its intellectual property law program was ranked among the top five. *U.S. News* placed SCU's School of Engineering No. 29. These rankings indicate that the University is successful as a learning institution. We have chosen to focus on the theme of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion in order to evaluate whether we can become even more effective in this regard.

These successes are attributable in no small part to the University's faculty, supported, of course, by an engaged and dedicated staff. Since the early 1980s, SCU has been committed to the "Santa Clara teaching scholar model" which emphasizes excellence among faculty in both teaching and research. The model rests on the assumption that good teaching is enhanced by research, and research by teaching. It also encourages the participation of undergraduates and graduate students in faculty research. During the 2005-06 academic year, SCU faculty received almost \$2.5 million in external grants and awards for

academic research and programs. Most of the faculty are active scholars; many have received awards for scholarship or teaching. Two faculty members, for example, have recently received CASE (Council for the Advancement and Support of Education) "Teacher of the Year" awards at the national and state levels.

The Santa Clara teaching scholar model is both a mark of success for the University and a challenge for the future. While the model has helped the University achieve its high rankings, escalating pressures for both scholarly publication and classroom excellence have led to requests for increased support and time for research. This self study will address the challenges and strengths associated with the Santa Clara teaching scholar model. Supporting the Santa Clara teaching scholar model will be a second theme of this reaccreditation self study.

Promoting a community of inclusive excellence will be the third theme of this self study. The inquiry will focus on climate, curriculum, and sense of community, as well as recruitment and retention. The University is committed to fostering a community of inclusive excellence. Two grants from the James Irvine Foundation have supported diversity efforts in recent years: 1) Multicultural Advancement Grants, which fund projects and initiatives focused on historically underrepresented ethnic populations in the United States and 2) the Faculty of Color Support Project, which provides grants to faculty of color for conference attendance, student research assistance, course releases for advising students of color, course design or enhancement, or team teaching. The Irvine Foundation has enabled the University to support important multicultural programs.

Santa Clara has worked to increase the inclusiveness and diversity of its faculty and student body in terms of ethnicity and gender, with some success among graduate students. The School of Law has been recognized as one of the 10 most racially and ethnically diverse in the country by *U.S. News and World Report*, and the business school's full-time graduate student body is among the 20 most diverse. But the University has not been as successful at promoting diversity in the undergraduate programs or among the faculty. Eighty-two of the full time faculty members (approximately 17 percent) are minorities. Among undergraduate students, 16.8 percent are Asian American, 12.4 percent are Latino, 2.4 percent are

African American, and .6 percent are Native American. SCU would like to increase these percentages. While the University has made an effort to increase diversity on campus, this remains a significant challenge, one that was noted in the 2000 Commission Action Letter.

The University is well-positioned to build on its strengths and address its challenges. The endowment is strong. The *Chronicle of Higher Education* lists the University's endowment among the top 100 in the United States. Santa Clara's endowment is in the top four among Jesuit institutions (with Georgetown, Boston College, and Saint Louis University), and in the top seven among universities in California. Most of the institutions with greater endowments are significantly larger schools and/or schools with longstanding reputations as elite institutions. In December 2006, a "Campaign for Santa Clara" was successfully completed, raising more than \$400 million. Funds will support endowed scholarships and chairs, innovative uses of technology, and the construction of new buildings: the Leavey School of Business building and a new library/learning commons.

Response to the Commission Action Letter

SCU was reaccredited by WASC in 2000 after an experimental self study undertaken during WASC's transitional period, as the accrediting body moved toward its current model. The self study focused on implementing the University's strategic plan, which had been approved in 1996 (and was revised again in 2001). The visiting team and the Commission Action Letter found much to commend. They noted with approval a broad understanding of the University's vision throughout the campus community; substantial progress in regard to planning and faculty procedures; development of a then-new core curriculum; extensive construction and renovation of facilities; growth of the endowment; and development of the centers of distinction. The Action Letter also made five important recommendations:

1. Improve the library and integrate information resources on campus
2. Clarify the role and placement of the Division of Counseling Psychology and Education
3. Further engage the faculty in assessment and clarify administrative responsibility for assessment
4. Initiate a consistent program review process

5. Increase ethnic and gender diversity in the faculty and in senior positions; increase ethnic (particularly African American and Latino) diversity of administrators, faculty, staff, and students; and incorporate diversity into the curriculum.

The University has addressed each of these five recommendations in the intervening years. Some highlights: A chief information officer has been appointed to head the Division of Information Services, and a new library building is currently under construction. The former Division of Counseling Psychology and Education is now the "School of Education, Counseling Psychology, and Pastoral Ministries" (ECPPM), with its own dean. The University is several years into implementation of formal processes for assessment of learning outcomes and academic program review. Diversity, however, remains an important challenge, and, as noted above, will be a central focus of the self study. Appendix 4 outlines the University's responses to the five Action Letter recommendations in more detail.

Proposal Development

SCU began to look toward the Institutional Proposal and self review in 2004 when President Paul Locatelli, S. J., initiated a two-year University-wide project called "Future Directions." He asked the University community to reflect on the University's goal of "educating the whole person of solidarity for the 21st century globalizing world." The meaning of "solidarity" for Jesuit universities had been a focus of discussion and debate since Father Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J.'s 2000 talk urging Jesuit universities to promote solidarity with the world in their curricular and cocurricular programming. The Future Directions project provided a framework for deepening the conversation about solidarity, globalization, and the goals of a Santa Clara education.

To guide the discussion, faculty and staff developed thought papers on a number of themes. A foundational paper focused on the University's mission as a Jesuit institution in a globalizing world; additional papers addressed the environment, technology, international education, civic engagement, inclusive excellence, theology and culture, ethics, and justice. In addition, another series of papers was drafted addressing major disciplinary and cocurricular areas

(www.scu.edu/strategicplan/futuredirections). These papers were discussed in a number of fora. A half-day symposium on the theme papers in spring 2005 engaged more than 200 faculty in lively discussions of the University's future and the creative tensions it faces. A series of ongoing conversations brought students, faculty, and staff together to continue the discussion. A joint meeting of the Trustees and Regents in January 2006 involved students, faculty, and staff in conversations with members of the boards. These theme-based discussions laid the foundation for the emergence of the three themes later selected for the reaccreditation self study.

During the same period, the vice provost for academic affairs and the academic deans sent several teams of faculty and staff to the annual WASC meetings. In January 2006 a team of faculty and administrators attended the Oakland WASC workshop focused on "The Institutional Proposal and Beyond." Later that winter, the University Planning Council, one of the University's six standing policy committees, worked through and discussed the "Worksheet for Preliminary Self Review Under the Standards" (www.scu.edu/wasc/criteria.cfm) and the "What Matters" exercise (www.scu.edu/wasc/themes.cfm). The exercise produced a list of 20 possible areas for further discussion. The 20 were subsequently clustered into six categories through a process of widespread discussion.

The University Planning Council developed a 45-question online survey (a synthesis of the 42 Criteria for Review, Appendix 2). The survey, administered in fall 2006, asked faculty, staff, students, and board members to evaluate how well SCU is doing in relation to each of the Criteria for Review and to rate the six possible themes in terms of "what really matters." Respondents included 45 percent of full-time faculty, 14 percent of students, 33 percent of staff, and 29 percent of board members (including Trustees, Regents, and members of other advisory boards). In the online survey, the six possible themes were all ranked "important" or "very important" by a majority of all groups. Through a process of further discernment involving considerations of overall importance to the University, relation to the strategic plan and University goals, relation to student learning, and relation to WASC's Commission Action Letter and Criteria for Review, the following three issues emerged as the themes most appropriate for self study and for evidence-based inquiry:

Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion
Supporting the Teaching Scholar Model
Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence

The online survey also provided a useful perspective on the Criteria for Review. A majority of all four groups agreed that the University meets all the Criteria for Review. In spite of this broad support, however, a few areas may require additional attention: At least 25 percent of one or more groups disagreed "somewhat" or "strongly" with the statement that the University meets the following criteria:

Diversity (CFR 1.5)
Leadership Structures & Processes (CFR 1.3, 1.8, 3.8, 3.10)
Staffing Levels or Qualifications (CFR 3.1, 3.2)
Information Resources (CFR 3.6, 3.7)
Alignment of Priorities (CFR 3.3, 3.5, 4.2)
Student Advising (CFR 2.12)
Stakeholder Engagement (CFR 4.8)

The theme-based self study will incorporate, throughout the Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review, the Criteria for Review (CFRs) noted above that might benefit from further attention. For example, Theme Two (Teaching Scholar Model) will address CFRs 3.1 and 3.3—staffing levels, qualifications, and recruitment/workload—and 3.6 and 3.7—information resources. Theme Three (Community of Inclusive Excellence) will address CFR 1.5, diversity of faculty and staff. Other CFRs will be examined either as part of the self study or independently: CFR 1.8, for example, "timely and fair response to complaints and grievances," is already under discussion by our Faculty Affairs Committee. And we plan to investigate further the results of CFR 2.12, student advising, alongside our data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) on student advising and our senior surveys to learn whether advising issues can be disaggregated by school, ethnicity, year, or other factors.

An important goal in the development of the proposal, as well as the planning for the 2009 Capacity Review and the 2011 Educational Effectiveness Review, is the involvement of a broad University constituency. As noted

above, the University Planning Council has been involved in the process since at least 2004.

Twelve faculty and staff members from across the University participated in the WASC Workshops in January 2006 and 2007 (some attended both workshops). In January 2007, a WASC Self Study Steering Committee was established with faculty and staff from each area of the University: Its 10 faculty members represent Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Law, Business, and the School of Education, Counseling Psychology, and Pastoral Ministries; staff members represent the centers of distinction, the library, and Student Life. In addition, three self study subcommittees were formed, each with seven members (some of whom also serve on the Steering Committee), one for each of the three themes (www.scu.edu/wasc). A call for volunteers to participate in the subcommittees produced 35 responses. Some of the volunteers are now serving on the committees; some will participate at a later date; others will serve as consultants and in the process of revising drafts of WASC documents. Students have participated in board meetings and discussions of “Future Directions,” responded to the online survey, and commented on drafts.

The Steering Committee will serve in an advisory role during the self study process. Subcommittee members will gather and interpret evidence and make recommendations. Members of the Steering Committee and subcommittees will draft portions of the Capacity and Preparatory Report and the Educational Effectiveness Report. Members of the committees will serve from winter 2007 through the fall 2009 Capacity and Preparatory Review, after which some transition in committee membership will occur.

Open communication will be maintained with members of the University community throughout the self study process. Feedback will be requested on draft documents through meetings, email, and a Web site. The Web site (www.scu.edu/wasc) serves as a repository for information, resources, committee lists, etc. and is accessible to any member of the University community. The site contains an anonymous comment feature. Regular reporting to University governance groups has already begun, with frequent updates to administrators, policy committees, and constituency groups.

B. Capacity Review and Educational Effectiveness Review

The primary purpose of the self study is to evaluate and improve the University. By framing the self study around the three themes introduced above, we intend to build on strengths and address challenges that are particularly pressing. We hope, throughout all phases of the process, to deepen our self understanding as a university dedicated to both student learning and institutional learning.

Proposed Outcomes Overall

- Strengthen the University’s effectiveness in realizing its educational goals and objectives in both curriculum and co-curriculum
- Deepen our understanding of student learning and develop more effective methods of assessing learning
- Enhance the University’s quality assurance programs through improved processes for review of academic and cocurricular programs
- Enhance the University’s ability to use evidence for thoughtful decision making at all levels of the institution

Proposed Outcomes: Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion

- Enhance the degree to which Santa Clara educates students of competence, conscience, and compassion throughout the curriculum and co-curriculum
- Promote a broader understanding of competence, conscience, and compassion as integrated educational objectives
- Develop more effective indicators of educational effectiveness for the assessment of competence, conscience, and compassion

Proposed Outcomes: Supporting the Santa Clara Teaching Scholar Model

- Develop a clearer articulation and a broader understanding of the Santa Clara teaching scholar model
- Enhance faculty performance as excellent teaching scholars

- Develop more effective ways of supporting the Santa Clara teaching scholar model
- Develop more effective ways of assessing the effectiveness of the Santa Clara teaching scholar model

Proposed Outcomes: Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence

- Increase diversity and inclusiveness
- Foster a deeper understanding of the goal of promoting diversity and a community of inclusive excellence
- Develop more effective ways of promoting diversity and a community of inclusive excellence through improved structures and resources, throughout both curriculum and co-curriculum

The proposed outcomes are ambitious, but we believe that the University will benefit enormously from addressing learning, teaching, scholarship, community, and diversity. The WASC process provides an opportunity for the University to build creative inquiry into its institutional structures and establish a commitment to ongoing self-reflection.

The three themes are described briefly below. In each case, the description is followed by a set of tables listing questions to be posed during the Capacity Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review. Each table indicates the data, indicators, or methods that will be used to address the questions. The inquiries will be undertaken by the WASC Steering Committee, the three WASC subcommittees, and/or by faculty and staff consultants at the University.

Theme One: Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion

Capacity and Preparatory Review

Santa Clara’s strategic plan expresses its fundamental vision in the following words: “Santa Clara University will excel in educating men and women to be leaders of competence, conscience, and compassion.” The meaning of this vision was articulated in the University’s 1999 WASC Accreditation Self Study Report:

The phrase “competence, conscience, and compassion” has emerged at Santa Clara as a shorthand expression of the Jesuit ideal of educating integrated persons who reach their full human potential....Competence intends to give pride of place to the acquisition of knowledge, the practice of critical thinking, the pursuit of lifelong learning, and the application of what one knows. It assumes basic familiarity with the broad areas of knowledge...as well as a deeper knowledge of one field or discipline....Conscience informs and develops the ethical and moral dimension inherent in all human beings, regardless of their religious or cultural background. Compassion nurtures the human desire and will to fashion a more humane and just world; it means using knowledge for the wellbeing of all, especially the poor and powerless.

In the self study we are particularly interested in evaluating our success at supporting integrated learning; we want to explore the *integration* of competence, conscience, and compassion. We will examine the ways that skills, knowledge, and values intersect with a commitment to act with “well educated solidarity.” This will involve assessing the degree to which our students have the capability and disposition to integrate competence, conscience, and compassion. We are currently developing a tool for the longitudinal assessment of our students’ growth as writers and critical thinkers within an ethical or justice-related context, using a writing prompt that will be scored according to a rubric. In addition, we plan to administer tests of critical thinking such as the California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) alongside an empathy scale, and we may incorporate a compassion scale into our surveys of entering and graduating students.

Building on existing data, and supplementing these data with surveys, interviews, and analyses by the committees, the Capacity Review will assess this theme and make recommendations for improvement, focusing on resources, structures, and processes. The following table lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Capacity and Preparatory Review.

Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion: Capacity and Preparatory Review

Table 1

Research Questions	Evidence/Methods/Indicators
To what extent is the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion clearly defined in University documents, policies, and practices? (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.3)	Web pages for students, staff, and faculty, recruitment literature for students, Future Directions postings, job postings and search documents for faculty and staff, student orientation materials, faculty and staff performance review policies, workshops for new faculty, faculty mentoring programs, Center for Student Leadership, bulletins, advising policies, Chartered Student Organizations, student handbook
To what extent is this goal understood throughout the University? (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.4)	Selected questions on freshman survey (CIRP), senior survey (CSS), NSSE, graduate student surveys, faculty survey, staff survey, program goals, mission statements, Ethics Center survey, articles in student newspaper, student event documents, community based learning materials, valedictorians' talks
To what extent is the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion expressed in the learning outcomes of the University's curricular and cocurricular programs? (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.6)	Departmental statements of student learning outcomes, course syllabi, annual assessment reports, core curriculum guidelines, program review documents, cocurricular documents, community based learning documents, learning community documents, centers of distinction materials, guidelines for athletes, Campus Ministry materials
What physical, informational, financial, and organizational resources does the University provide to support the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion? How do the Residential Learning Communities support the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion? (CFR 2.13, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7)	President's, provost's and deans' office documents, program review documents, University grants, school grants, special focus grants; Community Law Center, centers of distinction, center for student leadership, advising center, career center, wellness center, facilities reports, residential learning community documents, student awards, chartered student organizations, campus ministry, commuter student resources
How does the University support the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion in its faculty and staff incentive practices, evaluation procedures, and development programs? (CFR 3.3)	Faculty handbook, R&T procedures, college and school evaluation documents, centers of distinction, grant programs, course evaluation materials, Faculty Development Program, core curriculum materials, staff development programs, staff performance review procedures
To what extent do the University's quality assurance processes (new program approvals, program reviews, assessment of student learning) take into consideration the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion? (CFR 4.1, 4.4)	Assessment report guidelines, program review guidelines, core curriculum guidelines, Academic Affairs Committee guidelines, graduate program assessment, Student Life assessments, Academic support programs

Theme One: Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion

Educational Effectiveness Review

Section B of the Institutional Proposal is structured by theme. In order to highlight the interrelation of the Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review for each theme, we present the plans for the Capacity Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review theme by theme.

The table below lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Educational Effectiveness Review of the goal of educating for competence, conscience and compassion. Several of the projects listed in these tables are already embedded in ongoing assessment projects or research projects. An important caveat: We do not intend to investigate the achievement of competence in every major or area of the core curriculum. This is already occurring (e.g., at the department level, as noted in the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness

Indicators). Nor will we use the widely known Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) to assess student competence. After considering the CLA, the University has decided that a combination of other instruments will provide data more valuable for our purposes. As noted above, our interest is in assessing the *integration* of competence, conscience, and compassion.

Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion: Educational Effectiveness Review

Table 2

Research Questions	Evidence/Methods/Indicators
<p>Do the University's curricular and cocurricular programs achieve those outcomes that relate to its goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion? (CFR 2.7)</p> <p>How can the University achieve this goal more effectively? (CFR 2.7)</p>	<p>Evaluations of the effects of key educational (curricular and cocurricular) experiences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • selected culminating experiences and projects • immersion trips, community based learning, internships, studies abroad, and Residential Learning Communities • leadership and vocation-based courses offered in collaboration with Student Life <p>Comparisons of entering and graduating students (graduate and undergraduate):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • selected course work scored by rubric • responses to relevant questions in HERI, NSSE, and other surveys (including graduate student surveys) • test of moral development <p>Studies of alumni surveys maintained by departments and IR to determine the extent to which alumni engage in work aimed at civic engagement or helping those in greatest need</p> <p>Annual assessment reports and cyclic program review documents</p>
<p>How can the University improve its strategic use of resources to achieve the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion? (CFR 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>Practices and policies of deans and provost, centers of distinction, faculty development programming</p> <p>Entering and graduating students' critical thinking skills, analytic reasoning skills, and information literacy skills (e.g. CCTST)</p> <p>Assessment of selected student learning outcomes in the curriculum and co-curriculum</p> <p>Tenure and promotion processes, faculty and staff evaluation procedures and hiring processes</p>
<p>How can the University improve its use of evidence to assess and enhance its ability to educate for competence, conscience, and compassion?</p> <p>To what extent is the University a planning and learning organization that uses evidence to improve its ability to educate for competence, conscience, and compassion? (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)</p>	<p>Reflections on changes/improvements made as result of ongoing program review</p> <p>Reflections on changes/improvements resulting from faculty evaluation, staff evaluation, course evaluation processes, etc.</p>

Our proposed approach to the assessment of student learning outcomes is presented in this proposal primarily in the sections addressing Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review outcomes for each theme. Please note that all academic units have articulated their mission, goals, and objectives; each submits an annual assessment report. See the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, Appendix 1, and the response to the previous Commission Action Letter, Appendix 4. All academic units undergo program review on a six-year cycle. Appendix 4 contains a discussion of the assessment efforts at our institution since the previous WASC visit and the assessment structures that have been put into place to ensure that Santa Clara is an efficient and effective learning institution. Also, see below, “Beyond the Themes: Ensuring Student Learning.”

As a result of this inquiry we hope to develop more effective indicators of educational effectiveness and to enhance the degree to which an SCU education produces students who are skilled, thoughtful, well-educated “whole persons” of competence, conscience, and compassion. We are aware that this proposal outlines an ambitious project. As noted above, we want to emphasize that many of the inquiries proposed grow organically out of embedded assessment projects already underway or out of projects faculty have undertaken in the course of their own research. Some represent inquiries that we intend to initiate during the period of the WASC reviews and continue beyond 2011 in order to ensure an ongoing assessment loop. One of the early tasks of the Steering Committee will be to further prioritize the research projects, developing more precisely the timeline in Appendix 5.

Theme Two: Supporting the Santa Clara Teaching Scholar Model

Capacity and Preparatory Review

Maintaining rigorous and imaginative scholarship (which includes creative activity and performance) while providing excellent teaching both in and out of the classroom forms the basis for the Santa Clara University teaching scholar model. The dual importance of vibrant faculty scholarship and excellent teaching was emphasized by President Locatelli, S.J., in his 2004 SCU Convocation address: “The ideal teaching scholar cannot claim to be a great teacher and do no or little research. Nor could one

claim to be a great researcher and neglect teaching.” By staying active as scholars, faculty serve as good role models to all of their students.

Embedded in the Strategic Plan is the pronouncement that we “prize original scholarship for its own sake and for the contribution it makes to teaching and to the betterment of society. By combining teaching and scholarship of high quality with an integrated education in the Jesuit tradition, faculty strive to prepare our students for professional excellence and responsible citizenship.” To educate students most effectively to be thoughtful, ethical, and intellectually strong leaders in a chosen area of study, faculty must be committed to academic freedom and to intellectual life within and beyond the classroom. They must maintain active scholarship, engaged with advances in their fields. They must interact with colleagues beyond the walls of the University – doing so not only benefits their personal growth as individuals and scholars, it also enhances the reputation of SCU as a lively and relevant academic institution. This directly impacts students by deepening their learning, introducing them to the best current work in the field, giving them models of active engagement, and increasing their career opportunities or their prospects for attending top graduate programs. It also enhances the intellectual climate on the SCU campus itself.

However, there are tensions in the teaching scholar model. Many faculty feel that maintaining an active and successful program of scholarship while teaching a full six-course load each year (and providing service to the University community and the profession) is difficult, at best. It leaves little time for family, friends, or personal reflection. Faculty report difficulty in finding the time to improve an existing course dramatically, to explore new pedagogies, to incorporate innovative technologies, or to develop new courses. They also report that finding the time to investigate a new and exciting potential research path, or to put the finishing touches on an existing project, is nearly impossible.

Building on existing data, and supplementing these data with surveys, interviews, and analyses by the committees, the Capacity Review will assess this theme and make recommendations for improvement, focusing on resources, structures, and processes. The following table lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Capacity and Preparatory Review.

**The Santa Clara Teaching Scholar Model:
Capacity and Preparatory Review**

Table 3

Research Questions	Evidence/Methods/ Indicators
To what extent is the Santa Clara teaching scholar model clearly defined in University documents, policies, and practices? What are the expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service? (CFR 1.1, 1.4)	University documents, policies and practices for recruitment (job postings and hiring policies for tenure track and lecturer positions), evaluation, promotion, and retention (support structures)
To what extent is the Santa Clara teaching scholar model understood throughout the University? (CFR 1.1)	Faculty survey, selected questions on student surveys
To whom does the Santa Clara teaching scholar model apply? (CFR 1.1)	Faculty Handbook, Lecturer Task Force report
How is the Santa Clara teaching scholar model different from other models? (CFR 1.1, 2.9)	Comparative data from other universities on course load, research expectations for tenure and promotion, and research support
What concerns do faculty have about their ability to achieve the ideal of excellence in teaching and scholarship? Do these concerns differ by faculty rank and discipline? (CFR 2.4, 2.8)	Faculty survey and focus group data, report on associate professor focus groups, Lecturer Task Force report
What physical, informational, and financial resources does the University provide to support the teaching scholar model? (CFR 2.9, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7)	Library, office space, lab space, sabbaticals, grants, sponsored projects, course buy-outs, course releases, course clustering, faculty development programming, staff support (e.g., Advising Center, Information Services support)
What is the optimal number of faculty at each rank and each category of employment? What is the optimal student-faculty ratio? (CFR 2.1, CFR 3.2)	Comparative data from benchmark universities, trend data on student-faculty ratios at SCU
How are the University's teaching scholars involved in institutional planning and quality assurance? (CFR 3.11, 4.8)	Program review, governance documents

Theme Two: Supporting the Santa Clara Teaching Scholar Model

Educational Effectiveness Review

While the Santa Clara teaching scholar model is most relevant to the “capacity” to educate our students, there are also important issues at stake relevant to “educational effectiveness.” The table below lists research questions and methods/indicators for the Educational Effectiveness Review.

**The Santa Clara Teaching Scholar Model:
Educational Effectiveness Review**

Table 4

Research Questions	Evidence/Methods/ Indicators
Does the Santa Clara teaching scholar model contribute to student learning? How does it model the process of creative inquiry? (CFR 2.9)	Student survey, survey of student participants in faculty research
How effective are the University's teaching scholars? How are scholarship and teaching integrated? (CFR 2.5, 2.8, 2.9)	Faculty evaluation and focus group data, publication data, syllabi, HERI survey, CVs of successful tenurings and promotions, faculty questionnaire
How can support for the Santa Clara teaching scholar model be enhanced? How can the University enhance work-life balance and reduce the obstacles that faculty face in meeting expectations as teaching scholars? (CFR 3.2, CFR 3.3)	SCU faculty survey, HERI survey, focus groups, analysis of staff services that support faculty roles
How can the contributions of the Santa Clara teaching scholar model to student learning be enhanced? (CFR 3.4)	Student survey, NSSE data, faculty survey, study of graduate school acceptance rates and employment rates of students involved in faculty research

As a result of this process of inquiry we anticipate the following outcomes: clearer articulation of the teaching scholar model, more effective ways of supporting the teaching scholar model, and more effective teaching scholars.

Theme Three: Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence

Capacity and Preparatory Review

The University's 1991 Statement of Purpose outlined a vision of "a community enriched by men and women of diverse backgrounds, respectful of difference and enlivened by open dialogue, caring and just toward others, and committed to broad participation in achieving the common good." Our 1993 University Guiding Principles described the goal of creating and nurturing "a diverse university community rooted in mutual understanding and respect." In 2001, our Strategic Plan identified "Community and Diversity" as one of SCU's six fundamental values: "We cherish our diverse community and the roots that must sustain it: shared values amidst diversity, close personal relationships, effective communication, respect for others, and an engaged concern for the common good of the campus, the local community, and the global society."

The University defines diversity and inclusive excellence in accord with the American Association of Higher Education. Diversity involves individual differences and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability, as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations). Inclusive Excellence involves an "active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity—in people, in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect—in ways that increase one's awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions." ("Making Excellence Inclusive: Diversity, Inclusion, and Institutional Renewal," www.aacu.org/inclusive_excellence/index.cfm)

Diversity, defined in terms of race, ethnicity, and gender, was a central emphasis of the 2000 Action Letter. The Commission recommended that the University be particularly attentive to increasing the numbers of women and minorities, especially African Americans and Latinas/Latinos, in the faculty, administration, and student body. And the letter recommended that the University consider curriculum redesign to ensure the engagement

of all students with the issue of diversity. Appendix 4 describes the University's progress in relation to this recommendation.

Diversity remains a significant challenge for the University: Tensions exist in relation to ethnic and racial diversity. This challenge and the tensions associated with it will be addressed in the self study through a focus on "Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence." It should be noted that the vocabulary of "inclusive excellence" is contested. Some feel that the discursive shift from "diversity to "inclusive excellence" dilutes the movement toward racial and ethnic equality, creating a more diplomatic and less charged vocabulary that actually works against sustained institutional change. Others feel that the terminology is secondary to the goal. The self study will examine this challenge and will develop recommendations for increasing gender, racial, and ethnic diversity, for enhancing a sense of community throughout all constituencies on campus, for administrative structures and resources that will support this community, and for curricular improvements.

Building on existing data, and supplementing these data with surveys, interviews, and analyses by the committees, the Capacity Review will assess this theme and make recommendations for improvement, focusing on resources, structures, and processes. The following table lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Capacity and Preparatory Review.

Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence: Capacity and Preparatory Review

Table 5

Research Questions	Evidence/Methods/indicators
To what extent is the goal of a community of inclusive excellence clearly defined in the University's documents, policies, and practices? (CFR 1.2, 1.5)	Web pages for students and faculty, recruitment literature for students, Future Directions postings, job postings for faculty and staff, student orientation materials, Faculty Handbook, advising policies
To what extent is diversity understood throughout the university? To what extent is it accepted and embraced? (CFR 1.5)	Freshman survey (CIRP), senior survey (CSS), NSSE, faculty survey, staff survey
To what extent is the goal of diversity/inclusive excellence expressed in the learning outcomes of the University's curricular programs, cocurricular programs, and support services? (CFR 2.10, 2.13)	Department and program statements for majors, annual assessment reports, core curriculum guidelines, program review documents, cocurricular documents, cocurricular program goals for community-based learning, learning community documents
What is the campus climate for diversity? What tensions and challenges characterize the effort to promote a community of diversity and inclusive excellence? How are staff integrated into the community? (CFR 3.2, 3.3)	Focus groups, interviews with faculty of color (current and former), staff, students, and administrators, video record and digital archive of spring 2007 discussions of racism on campus, exit and withdrawal surveys, staff surveys
How diverse is the University community? How many underrepresented minorities are part of the community? How can we increase these numbers? (CFR 1.5)	Trend data for students, faculty, and staff, disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, employment category, etc., with special attention to African American and Latino students, faculty, and staff
How does the University support the goal of promoting a community of inclusive excellence in its recruitment and retention practices and its evaluation procedures, for students, faculty, and staff? (CFR 3.2, 3.3)	Recruitment materials, job postings, structures supporting retention and evaluation, financial aid packages and scholarships granted to minority students
What physical, informational, structural, and financial resources does the University provide to support the goal of promoting a community of inclusive excellence? (CFR 1.3, 1.5, 3.4, 3.5)	Leadership structures, office space, support for CML, MCC, Ethnic Studies and Women's and Gender Studies, deans' and provost's support, programming and grant support, data on pay parity for women and minority faculty and staff

Theme Three: Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence

Educational Effectiveness Review

The primary focus of the Educational Effectiveness Review will be to develop indicators and collect evidence of the effectiveness in relation to the themes. In relation to the theme of promoting a community of inclusive excellence, the table below lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence: Educational Effectiveness Review

Table 6

Research Questions	Methods/Indicators
Do the University's curricular and cocurricular programs promote a community of inclusive excellence? How can the University achieve this outcome more effectively? (CFR 2.7)	Syllabi, departmental and program assessment reports, student work, program review documents focusing on student learning related to diversity, core curriculum materials, community-based learning experiences, cocurricular programs and services
How can the University improve its use of resources to achieve the goal of promoting a community of inclusive excellence? (CFR 3.2, 3.3)	Survey, focus groups, interviews
How can our policies, practices, and quality assurance processes better support diversity? (CFR 4.4, 4.6)	Surveys, focus groups

As a result of this process of inquiry, we hope to increase the diversity of our undergraduate student population and our faculty. We also hope to develop a deeper understanding of how the University supports inclusive excellence, a greater appreciation of the challenges associated with the effort to promote a community of inclusive excellence, and a set of more effective practices for the promotion of a community of inclusive excellence.

Beyond the Themes: Ensuring Student Learning

As noted above, we are aware that this inquiry is ambitious. However, we see the WASC review as an opportunity to enhance institutional self-understanding at many levels through a deliberate, carefully planned and sequenced inquiry into themes that are central to the University's identity and goals. The self study will also provide an opportunity to look beyond the themes at two issues of central importance to quality assurance that were flagged by the Commission Action Letter: assessment and program review. During the Capacity Review we will review our annual assessment report process, our program review cycle, our capstone courses, and our approach to the collection and review of culminating experiences (e.g. portfolios, theses, projects). We hope to initiate a process leading to deeper engagement of the faculty in the use of rubrics at multiple levels (course, department, program) and in the assessment and program review processes in general. Particular attention will be devoted to the core curriculum. In addition, we plan to develop a more intentional process of assessing cocurricular programs. See Appendix 4 (CFR 1.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7).

For the Capacity Review, we will also prepare a brief listing of the services, policies, or practices relevant to each of the Criteria for Review. Particular attention will be devoted to those items noted above in Section A that were ranked as problematic by at least 25 percent of the respondents in any group.

C. Data Gathering Systems and Resources

The University's Office of Institutional Research collects, maintains, and analyzes data about the University; provides reports to senior administrators and others to support institutional planning and decision making; supports institutional and specialized accreditation self studies; and provides information to federal and state agencies as well as educational, professional, and commercial organizations.

The Office of Institutional Research annually prepares a wide variety of reports, including updates of required WASC data exhibits; program-specific data to support the University's program review process; numerous surveys (NSSE, FSSE, HERI, CIRP, CSS, Survey of Recent Graduates); IPEDS reports; reports for college

guides (*U.S. News & World Report*, *Peterson's Guide*, and others); benchmark comparisons (faculty salaries and institutional performance indicators); and special studies ranging from student retention to diversity to financial aid optimization. The office maintains an open-access Web site with standard institutional data as well as a limited-access Web site of all previous survey questions and results, allowing comparisons across time and across surveys.

The Office of Institutional Research consists of four professional staff: the director, two senior research analysts, and a data mart manager devoted full-time to development of a much-needed Institutional Research data mart. The director and one senior research analyst are on 11-month appointments. The data mart is still under development and is only partially available at the present time for reporting purposes. A search is currently underway to fill one of the senior research analyst positions.

The Office of Institutional Research exhibits a high level of dedication and technical competence in reporting and analyzing institutional data. Its efforts are hampered, however, by the fact that the PeopleSoft information systems used by the University (Student, Human Resources, and Finance) are designed for performing individual transactions rather than historical reporting. This limitation is compounded by other characteristics of the University's current data environment: lack of an institutional data warehouse; multiple database systems maintained by different offices; inadequate oversight, training, documentation, and communication of system changes; and use of inappropriate reporting tools and shadow systems by different offices. As a result, the Office of Institutional Research must spend a great deal of time manually cleaning up data to ensure accuracy and consistency, when it could use this time more profitably for analysis and reporting.

To address these issues and recommend an information governance system at the institutional level, the provost will appoint a committee this spring with representatives from the Provost's Office, Institutional Research,

Information Technology, Enrollment Management, Student Records, Finance, and Human Resources. The Office of Institutional Research will also continue to develop its data mart, which will allow it quickly and accurately to access and manipulate much of the data in the PeopleSoft Student System.

Another important aspect of data gathering and analysis, which is distinct from though supported by the Office of Institutional Research, is the assessment of student learning outcomes. Santa Clara instituted a formal assessment process in fall 2003 and appointed a director of assessment in April 2007 to lead and coordinate this process at the University level. Appendix 4 describes the status of assessment in more detail.

Santa Clara University has committed sufficient resources for the self-review process. Resources will cover faculty and staff expenses for committee members, travel expenses to attend conferences and workshops (including but not limited to WASC conferences), two full-day retreats for committee members during the four-year process, office space, costs associated with hosting the two site visits, and other expenses. A portion of the time of the director of assessment and the associate provost for faculty development (who serves as chair of the Steering Committee and accreditation liaison officer) has been dedicated to the self study process. An administrative assistant provides clerical and technological support.

D. Appendices

Appendix 1. Required Data Exhibits

Appendix 2. Online Survey, fall 2006

Appendix 3. Institutional Stipulations

Appendix 4. Responses to the 2000 Commission
Action Letter

Appendix 5. Work Plan and Milestones

¹ Numbers here refer to fall 2006, except the staff total, which is from fall 2005.