

Institutional Proposal
Submitted to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Santa Clara University
May 2007

A. Setting the Context and Relating the Proposal to the Standards

A.1. 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.

Santa Clara aspires to be a learning institution; 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." The 7,952-student university has a 155-year tradition of educating the whole person for a life of service and leadership. Its diverse community of scholars is characterized by small classes and a values-oriented curriculum.

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 students are served by 744 total faculty (476 full-time, 268 part-time) and 763 staff (711 full-time, 52 part-time). Our student-faculty ratio is 12.32:1.

The University's goal is to educate men and women for competence, conscience, and compassion. This goal is addressed first and foremost in the classroom. One anchor of a Santa Clara undergraduate education is the University core curriculum, the range of skills and subjects expected of every student. 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 and just world." The University is currently considering a revision of its core; a proposal is currently 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 curriculum is undergirded by a variety of integrative and co-curricular 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 allow students to live with others who are exploring similar interests. Immersion trips provide opportunities to combine reflection with community engagement. Arrupe Partnerships link homeless shelters, schools, ESL programs, immigrant service centers, and other organizations in the Silicon Valley with the curriculum. And the Santa Clara Community Action Program, a student-run organization, provides opportunities for projects focused on civic engagement and social justice. ***One of the goals of the reaccreditation self study will be to evaluate the success of the core, the program and major requirements, the professional school curricula, and the University's co-curricular 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 this goal. 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 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 west. 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 the top 15 MBA 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 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 among the top five. *U.S. News* placed SCU's School of Engineering as No. 29 of the top engineering schools in the country.

These successes are attributable in no small part to the University's faculty. Since the early 1980s, SCU has been committed to the "teaching scholar model" which emphasizes excellence 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; some 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 teaching scholar model is both a mark of the success of the University and a challenge for the future. While the model has helped the University achieve its high regional ranking, escalating pressures for both scholarly publication and classroom excellence have led to requests for increased support and time for research. ***Supporting the teaching scholar model will be a second theme of this reaccreditation self study.***

The University is committed to fostering a community of inclusive excellence. A central component of this goal is diversity among faculty, staff, and students. Santa Clara has worked to increase the inclusiveness and diversity of its faculty and student body in terms of ethnicity and gender. 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 the business school's full-time graduate student body is among the top 20 most diverse. But the University has not been as successful at promoting diversity in the undergraduate programs or among the faculty. One hundred twenty-one faculty members (approximately 15 percent) are minorities. Only a few women of color are on the faculty. Among the undergraduate students, 36 percent are Asian American, Latino, African American, or Native American. SCU has worked to address this problem through two grants from the Irvine Foundation: 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 students of color advising, course design or enhancement, or team teaching. 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. ***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 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 September 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 and a new library/learning commons.

A.2. 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 for 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.

A.3. Proposal Development and Self Review Under the Standards

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 2001 when the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., had urged all Jesuit universities to promote solidarity with the world in their curricular and co-curricular programming. "Students, in the course of their formation," he said, "must let the gritty reality of this world into their lives, so they can learn to feel it, think about it critically, respond to its suffering, and engage in it constructively. They should learn to perceive, think, judge, choose, and act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed." 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 co-curricular 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, or “CFRs”). 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 three issues noted above 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 (CPR) and Educational Effectiveness Review (EER), 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 NSSE data on student advising and our senior surveys to learn whether advising issues can be disaggregated by school, ethnicity, year, or other factors.

A.4. Constituency Involvement

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, ECPPM, and Business; 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/committees.cfm). 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 supervise 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. The site contains an anonymous comment feature. Regular reporting to University governance groups has already begun, with regular updates to administrators, policy committees, and constituency groups.

B. Framing the Review Process and Connecting Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews

B.1. Overview and Expected Outcomes

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
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 co-curricular programs
Enhance the University’s ability to use evidence for thoughtful decision making at all levels of the institution

Proposed Outcomes by Themes

Enhance the degree to which Santa Clara educates students of competence, conscience, and compassion
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

Develop a clearer articulation and a broader understanding of the “teaching scholar model”
Enhance faculty performance as excellent teaching scholars
Develop more effective ways of supporting the teaching scholar model
Develop more effective ways of assessing the effectiveness of the teaching scholar model

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

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 the process 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 CPR and the EER. 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, or by faculty and staff consultants at the University.

Theme One: Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion (CCC)

B.2. Approach to the CPR for Theme One (CCC)

B.2.a Self Assessment

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—the arts; the humanities; and the natural, social, and behavioral sciences—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.

Building on existing data, and supplementing these data with surveys, interviews, and analyses by the committees, the CPR will assess this theme and make recommendations for improvement, focusing on resources, structures, and processes.

B.2.b Outcomes of CPR, Key indicators, Organizational Activities (CCC)

The following table lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Capacity and Preparatory Review.

**Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion: CPR
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? (Standard 1)	Web pages for students and faculty, recruitment literature for students, Future Directions postings, job postings for faculty and staff, student orientation materials, Faculty Handbook, bulletins, advising policies
To what extent is this goal understood throughout	Selected questions on freshman survey (CIRP),

the University? (Standard 1)	senior survey (CSS), NSSE, faculty survey
To what extent is the goal of educating for competence, conscience, and compassion expressed in the learning outcomes of the University's curricular and co-curricular 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, co-curricular documents, learning community documents, centers of distinction
What physical, informational, and financial resources does the University provide to support the goal of educating for CC&C? (Standard 3)	Provost's and deans' office documents, program review documents, Ignatian Center, Ethics Center, and Center for Science, Tech and Society grants, facilities reports, Learning Communities reports
How does the University support the goal of educating for CC&C in its faculty and staff incentive practices, evaluation procedures, and development programs? (Standard 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
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 CC&C (Standard 4)	Assessment report guidelines, program review guidelines, core curriculum guidelines, Academic Affairs Committee guidelines

B.3 Approach to the EER for Theme One (CCC)

Section B of the Institutional Proposal is structured by theme. In order to highlight the interrelation of the CPR and EER for each theme, Section B.2 (Approach to the CPR) and Section B.3 (Approach to the EER) are presented in succession, theme by theme.

B.3.a. Outcomes

The table below lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Educational Effectiveness Review. Several of the projects listed in these tables are already embedded in ongoing assessment projects and/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). After considering the CLA, the University has decided that a combination of other instruments will provide data more valuable for our purposes. We are particularly interested in integrated learning, and intend to focus on the intersections of competence, conscience, and compassion. We are developing a tool to assess 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, and we may incorporate a compassion scale into our surveys of entering and graduating students.

B.3.b. Research Questions, Methods, Key Indicators: Theme One (CCC)

Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion: EER
Table 2

Research Questions	Evidence/Methods/Indicators
Do the University's curricular and co-curricular programs achieve those outcomes that relate to its goal of educating for CC&C? (Standard 2)	Evaluations of the effects of key educational (curricular and co-curricular) experiences: -selected culminating experiences and projects -immersion trips, community based learning, internships, studies abroad, and Residential Learning Communities
How can the University achieve this goal more effectively? (Standard 2)	Comparisons of entering and graduating students: - selected course work scored by rubric

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - responses to relevant questions in HERI, NSSE, and other 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>
How can the University improve its strategic use of resources to achieve the goal of educating for CC&C (Standard 3)	<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, and CCTDI)</p> <p>Assessment of selected SLOs in core curriculum</p>
How can the University improve its use of evidence to assess and enhance its ability to educate for CC&C? To what extent is the University a planning and learning organization that uses evidence to improve its ability to educate for CC&C? (Standard 4)	<p>Reflections on changes/improvements made as result of ongoing program review</p>

B.3.c. Current State of Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

All academic units have articulated missions, 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.

Our proposed approach to the assessment of student learning outcomes is presented in this proposal in the sections addressing CPR and EER outcomes for each theme. Please see also Section C.2 below for 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.

B.3.d. Relevant Criteria for Review

See parentheses, throughout.

B.3.e. Plans for Improving Student and Organizational Learning

All academic units undergo program review on a five-year cycle. See Section C.2 and Appendix 4. See also "Beyond the Themes: Quality Assurance," below.

B.3.f. Overall Plan for Process

As a result of this process of inquiry we hope to have developed 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," with 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 Teaching Scholar Model (TSM)

B.2. Approach to the CPR for Theme Two (TSM)

B.2.a. Self Assessment

Maintaining rigorous and imaginative scholarship 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 most effectively educate students 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 dramatically improve an existing course, 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 CPR will assess this theme and make recommendations for improvement, focusing on resources, structures, and processes.

B.2.b. Outcomes of CPR, Key Indicators, Organizational Activities (TSM)

The following table lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Capacity and Preparatory Review.

The Teaching Scholar Model: CPR
Table 3

Research Questions	Evidence/Methods/Indicators
To what extent is the teaching scholar model clearly defined in University documents, policies, and practices? What are the expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service? (Standard 1)	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 teaching scholar model understood throughout the University? (Standard 1)	Faculty survey
To whom does the teaching scholar model apply?	Faculty Handbook, Lecturer Task Force report

(Standard 1)	
How is the SCU teaching scholar model different from other models? (Standard 1)	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? (Standard 2)	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 3.6, 3.7)	Library, office space, lab space, sabbaticals, grants, sponsored projects, course buy-outs, course releases, course clustering, faculty development programming
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? (Standard 4, also CFR 3.11)	Program review, governance documents

B.3. Approach to the EER for Theme Two (TSM)

B.3.a. Outcomes

While the 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.

B.3.b. Research Questions, Methods, Key Indicators: Theme Two (TSM)

**The Teaching Scholar Model: EER
Table 4**

Research Questions	Evidence/Methods/Indicators
Does the 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 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
How can the contributions of the 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

B.3.f. Overall Plan for the Process

As a result of this process of inquiry we anticipate the following outcomes: clearer articulations 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 (CoIE)

B.2. Approach to the CPR for Theme Three: (CoIE)

B.2.a. Self Assessment

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 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 CPR will assess this theme and make recommendations for improvement, focusing on resources, structures, and processes.

B.2.b. Outcomes of CPR, Key Indicators, Organizational Activities (CoIE)

The following table lists research questions and evidence/methods/indicators for the Capacity and Preparatory Review.

Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence: CPR
Table 5

Research Questions

Evidence/Methods/indicators

To what extent is the goal of achieving a community of inclusive excellence clearly defined in the University's documents, policies, and practices? (Standard 1)	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? (Standard 1)	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, co-curricular programs, and support services? (CFR 2.10, 2.13)	Department and program statements for majors, annual assessment reports, core curriculum guidelines, program review documents, co-curricular documents, co-curricular program goals for community-based learning
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? (Standard 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
How diverse is the University community? How many underrepresented minorities are part of the community? How can we increase these numbers? (CFR is missing)	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? (Standard 3)	Recruitment materials, job postings, structures supporting retention and evaluation, financial aid packages and scholarships granted to minority students
What physical, informational, and financial resources does the University provide to support the goal of promoting a community of inclusive excellence? (Standard 3, also CFR 1.3, 1.5)	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

B.3. Approach to the EER for Theme Three (CoIE)

B.3.a. Outcomes

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.

B.3.b. Research Questions, Methods, Key Indicators: Theme Three (CoIE)

Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence: EER
Table 6

Research Questions	Methods/Indicators
Do the University's curricular and co-curricular programs promote a community of inclusive excellence? How can the University achieve this outcome more effectively? (Standard 2)	Syllabi, departmental and program assessment reports, program review documents focusing on student learning related to diversity, core curriculum materials, community-based learning experiences
How can the University improve its use of resources to achieve the goal of promoting a community of inclusive excellence? (Standard 3)	Survey, focus groups, interviews

How can our policies, practices, and quality assurance processes better support diversity? (Standard 4)	Surveys, focus groups
---	-----------------------

B.3.f.

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.

B.2 and B.3 revisited**Beyond the Themes: Quality Assurance**

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 CPR 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 co-curricular programs such as the Residential Learning Communities. See Section C. 2, below (CFR 1.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7).

For the CPR, 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.3 that were ranked as problematic by at least 25 percent of the respondents in any group.

C. Work Plan and Data Gathering Systems**C.1 Work Plan and Milestones**

The work plan is attached. See Appendix 5.

C.2 Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

The University's Institutional Research Office 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 Institutional Research Office 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 Institutional Research Office 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 Institutional Research Office 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 Institutional Research Office 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 Institutional Research Office 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 independent of the Institutional Research Office, 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.

C.3. Commitment of Resources to Support the Accrediting Review

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. Data Tables
- Appendix 2. Off Campus and Distance Education Programs
- Appendix 3. Institutional Stipulations
- Appendix 4. Responses to the 2000 Commission Action Letter
- Appendix 5. Workplan and Milestones (From Section C.1)

The appendices themselves will not be part of the main body of the final text. Appendix 4 and 5, however, are included in this draft.

APPENDIX 4.

Responses to the 2000 Commission Action Letter:

The Commission Action Letter made recommendations in five areas:

Diversity; Library; Division of Counseling Psychology and Education; Program Review; and Assessment. Brief comments on each follow.

Diversity

The 2000 Commission Action Letter commended the University for offering innovative diversity programming, creating a positive campus climate, and securing external funding through the James Irvine Foundation to support multicultural initiatives. But the commission also expressed concern about three issues: the paucity of women and minorities within the faculty as a whole and in senior positions; the need

to assess strategies for recruitment and retention of minority students, particularly African Americans and Latinos; and the need to consider curriculum redesign to ensure the engagement of all students with diversity issues.

The University has made efforts to address these issues. Progress is most visible in relation to gender. The number of women with full-time faculty appointments, for example, has risen from 146 in 1999 to 188 in 2006. The number of female associate professors has increased from 47 in 1999 to 59 in 2006, and the number of female full professors has increased from 21 in 1999 to 33 in 2006. The number of women in leadership positions has increased as well: In 1999, 18 women served in leadership positions (provost, vice provost, associate provost, dean, associate dean, or department chair), while 30 women served in these positions in 2006. And the number of women on the boards of Trustees and Regents has increased from six to 23. However, the University has been less successful in increasing the numbers of minority administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

In relation to climate and curriculum, diversity-related programming has expanded, numerous grants have supported teaching and scholarship for faculty of color, and multicultural curricular offerings have increased. Yet tensions exist: Many members of the community feel that progress has been, at best, incremental in terms of increasing diversity on campus and fostering a climate that can support inclusive excellence. Concerns have been raised about resources and funding as we approach the end of the James Irvine Foundation grant. These challenges will be addressed in the self study through a focus on "Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence."

Library

The Action Letter called for immediate attention to the library and urged an integration of information resources on campus. Although the integration of information resources into one administrative division had already begun two years later, in 2000 the University made this division a stand-alone portfolio by appointing a tenured faculty member to serve as vice provost for information services and chief information officer. The Library, Information Technology, and Media Services all report to this vice provost. The three units remain separate entities, although there is increased collaboration, particularly in terms of facilities planning. There is also growing collaboration in terms of curriculum support, particularly between the Library's subject specialists and the instructional technology resource specialists in Media Services.

The most important change in the Library since 2000 is in the area of facilities. In October 2003, construction began on an Automated Retrieval System (ARS) with capacity for approximately 900,000 volume equivalents. The ARS, completed in January 2005, was the first phase of a new library facility on the site of the more than 40-year old Orradre Library. In early 2006, the Trustees approved moving forward with construction of a full new library facility, currently known as the "Learning Commons and Library." When completed in 2008, the new facility (total cost, \$95 million) will be close to 200,000 gross square feet on four floors and will house the staff of all three Information Services units. The new facility will provide much enhanced space to serve the needs of both students and faculty, including nearly 30 collaborative rooms, where students can work in small groups; a Faculty Development Lab; and an "Information Commons" with high-end computers, space for laptop use, library reference materials, and assistance from staff in all three Information Service units. Construction of the new facility is on schedule; it is expected to open for the fall term, 2008. During the construction phase, library access is available to students and faculty at temporary sites across campus.

Counseling Psychology and Education

The Action Letter noted a lack of clarity in regard to the role and placement of the Division of Counseling Psychology and Education, and expressed concern about the paucity of full-time faculty. The Division has since been moved out of the College of Arts and Sciences, becoming a school with its own dean in 2000. After two years of leadership by interim deans, a new dean was hired in 2006. Since 2000, the number of full-time faculty in Counseling Psychology has increased from six to 10, and in Education from three to 17 (nine tenured/tenure track and eight lecturers). In 2002, the Graduate Program in Pastoral Ministries, which shares most of its faculty with the undergraduate Department of Religious Studies, was incorporated into the school; thus it became the School of Education, Counseling Psychology, and Pastoral Ministries

(ECPM). With increased staffing and structural reorganization, the School of ECPM is better able to fulfill the University mission, mentor graduate students, and maintain a solid curriculum.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes

The 2000 Action Letter commended the University for the initial work it had undertaken on the assessment of learning. However, the letter recommended greater attention to the assessment of educational objectives and centralization of the responsibility for assessment. In response to the recommendations, the vice provost for academic affairs began working with the Academic Affairs Committee in 2003 to develop a formal assessment process. Launched in fall 2005 and documented in a detailed set of “Guidelines for Assessment of Learning Outcomes,” this process requires every academic program to have a mission statement, a set of goals and learning objectives, a curriculum alignment matrix, and a six-year plan for assessing learning objectives. Every program is also required to submit an Annual Assessment Report. Almost every academic program has now identified learning objectives, begun to gather evidence of actual outcomes, and submitted an assessment report. Most departments, however, are still struggling with how to do assessment in ways that are manageable and academically meaningful.

To provide greater support for this process, which has previously been supported through internal peer consultants and periodic workshops offered by a professional assessment consultant, the vice provost for academic affairs appointed a tenured faculty member with assessment expertise to fill a new half-time position as director of assessment in April 2007. The director will lead and coordinate Santa Clara's overall assessment strategy and implementation, advise academic and co-curricular programs in their assessment efforts, advise the WASC Steering Committee and subcommittees on assessment issues, provide direct assessment services to the core curriculum, and chair a new University Assessment Committee with representatives from each college and school.

The proposed new core curriculum includes a set of learning objectives that provide a foundation for the content of Santa Clara's general education program. Assuming this proposal is approved by the Board of Trustees on May 18, 2007, a formal assessment plan will be developed as a high priority for implementation of the new core curriculum.

The Institutional Proposal outlines several assessment instruments that will be used to provide and analyze evidence related to the three themes selected for our self study.

Program Review

The 2000 Commission Action Letter stated “a broad and sustainable infrastructure is needed for the assessment of quality and student learning at the program level.” Beginning in fall 2002, the vice provost for academic affairs began working with the Academic Affairs Committee to develop a formal program review process. Four academic departments conducted pilot program reviews beginning in spring 2003. Thirty-two academic programs have now completed program reviews; four programs are in the midst of self studies; and another six programs will begin self studies within the next year. By the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review visit, all academic programs leading to undergraduate, graduate, or professional degrees are expected to have completed self studies. Every academic program is expected to undertake a program review every six years.

To reflect and incorporate the organizational learning that has taken place over the past five years of program review, the “Guidelines for Academic Program Review” have been revised, updated, and expanded each year for programs beginning reviews in that year. The current process centers on a self study culminating in a report that includes:

- Mission, goals, and objectives
- Capacity issues related to faculty, students, courses, and resources
- Educational effectiveness issues related to curriculum, pedagogy, scholarship and creative work, professional service, student learning outcomes (incorporating assessment evidence), and post-graduation outcomes

- Comparative position in relation to direct competitors and best practices
- Summary of strengths and weaknesses
- Action plan
- Discussion questions for external visiting team and others
- Required attachments for documentation

The self study is followed by a visit and report by an external visiting team, the program's response to internal and external feedback, and a discussion with the Dean's Office and Provost's Office about next steps.

Each Dean's Office is responsible for coordinating program review within its college or school in accordance with University guidelines. The vice provost for academic affairs is responsible for general oversight and for continuing refinement of the process in consultation with the deans, faculty, and Academic Affairs Committee.

Program reviews have varied widely in quality and utility, with noticeable improvement in both each year. The process to date has resulted in many changes related to curriculum, pedagogy, resources, and initiatives to improve educational effectiveness at the program level.

Appendix 5 (Section C.1)

Work Plan and Milestones

All tasks will be undertaken by the WASC Self Study Steering Committee, the WASC subcommittees for the three themes, or by consultants in the University community.

<p>Spring 2007 Complete Institutional Proposal Consider revisions to questions associated with surveys: HERI, NSSE, CSS, CIRP, etc. Data Inventory: IR Web site and other University sites Locate preliminary info for CFR Worksheet</p>
<p>Summer 2007 Conference call with WASC Proposal Review Committee, June 27, 2007 Review feedback from conference call; revise Institutional Proposal if necessary Prepare for studies to begin in 2007</p>
<p>Fall 2007 Proposal approval anticipated Review feedback from Proposal Review Committee Prioritize research questions; further develop timeline for research inquiries Begin building CPR and EER evidence and data portfolios Initiate four-year cycle of CCTST and CCTDI testing and other assessment projects Identify other appropriate assessment tools for core curriculum</p>
<p>Fall 2008 Full-day committee retreat to evaluate evidence to date and make adjustments as appropriate Assess CPR and EER evidence Review and reflect on evidence</p>
<p>Winter 2009 Assign writing tasks for CPR Update proposal data tables Complete CPR data tables</p>
<p>Spring 2009</p>

Prepare CPR report Circulate drafts for community response Submit CPR report to WASC
Fall 2009 Host CPR visit Evaluate two-year cycle of CCTST and CCTDI testing; make recommendations regarding critical thinking and analytic reasoning in the curriculum Review other assessment tools and results
Winter 2010 Half-day committee retreat to review feedback from site visit team; bring new committee members up to speed; review the timeline and adjust as necessary Continue to build and assess/interpret EER evidence
Fall 2010 Review and reflect on EER evidence Outline EER report Assign writing tasks
Winter 2011 Prepare EER report Circulate drafts for community response Submit EER report to WASC
Spring 2011 Host EER visit

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