Year Three Self-Evaluation Report
Seattle University
Seattle, Washington

Submitted to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities
March 1, 2013

Institutional Overview ..... Page 1
Basic Institutional Data Form ..... Page 2
Preface ..... Page 12
Brief Update on Changes since Last Report ..... Page 12
Response to Recommendations in 2010 Evaluation Report ..... Page 14

Chapter One: Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations ..... Page 29
Executive Summary of Eligibility Requirements 2 and 3 ..... Page 29
1.A Mission ..... Page 30
1.B Core Themes ..... Page 32

Chapter Two: Resources and Capacity ..... Page 41
Executive Summary of Eligibility Requirements 4 through 21 ..... Page 41
2.A Governance ..... Page 50
Governing Board ..... Page 56
Leadership and Management ..... Page 60
Policies and Procedures: Academics ..... Page 64
Policies and Procedures: Students ..... Page 68
Policies and Procedures: Human Resources ..... Page 72
Policies and Procedures: Institutional Integrity ..... Page 76
Policies and Procedures: Academic Freedom ..... Page 83
Policies and Procedures: Finance ..... Page 87
2.B Human Resources ..... Page 89
2.C Education Resources ..... Page 99
Undergraduate Programs ..... Page 111
Graduate Programs ..... Page 120
Continuing Education and Non-Credit Programs ..... Page 129
2.D Student Support Resources ..... Page 135
2.E Library and Information Resources ..... Page 154
2.F Financial Resources ..... Page 166
2.G Physical and Technological Infrastructure ..... Page 180

Conclusion ..... Page 197

Appendix: Accreditation Committee Membership ..... Page 199

Institutional Overview

Founded in 1891, Seattle University is dedicated to educating the whole person, to professional formation, and to empowering leaders for a just and humane world.

Seattle University is one of the largest independent universities in the Pacific Northwest. As of fall 2012, the student body of 7,484 students includes 4,589 undergraduates, 1,933 graduate students, and 962 law students. Campus residence halls provide housing for 1,914 students, including 41 percent of undergraduates. Students at Seattle University are among the most culturally diverse in the region; 60 percent are White, 17 percent are Asian, and 15 percent come from underrepresented minorities (Black, Hispanic and Native American). The university has 766 faculty members, of whom 329 are tenured/tenure-track, 196 are full-time non-tenure track, and 241 are part time. The university employs 745 staff members, of whom 699 are full time, and 20 librarians.

The academic program is organized into eight colleges and schools: the College of Arts and Sciences, the Albers School of Business and Economics, the College of Science and Engineering, the School of Law, the College of Education, the College of Nursing, the School of Theology and Ministry, and the Matteo Ricci College. In 2011-12 the university underwent accreditation in engineering, nursing, business and education and received outstanding reports in each area.

Seattle University is recognized nationally and internationally for the quality of its education. The university is ranked tenth among Western regional universities by *U.S. News and World Report*, which also lists the university's engineering programs among the top 50 undergraduate-only programs in the country, the M.B.A. program among the top 100 part-time programs nationally, and the School of Law's legal writing program as the best in the country. The university is included in the *Fiske Guide to Colleges* and in the Princeton Review's *The Best 373 Colleges*. In 2012 the White House awarded Seattle University the President's Higher Education Community Service Award. More than 4,500 students, faculty, and staff volunteer or participate in service-learning courses. In 2011 *Washington Monthly* ranked the university 9th in the nation for contributions to the public good.

The university has a budget of approximately $200 million, an endowment of approximately $168 million, and its FY11 estimated economic impact was $522 million.

This Year Three Self-Evaluation Report was produced by a committee of faculty and staff.

NORTHWEST COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

BASIC INSTITUTIONAL DATA FORM

Information and data provided in the institutional self-evaluation are usually for the academic and fiscal year preceding the year of the evaluation committee visit. The purpose of this form is to provide Commissioners and evaluators with current data for the year of the visit. After the self-evaluation report has been finalized, complete this form to ensure the information is current for the time of the evaluation committee visit. Please provide a completed copy of this form with each copy of the self-evaluation report sent to the Commission office and to each evaluator.

To enable consistency of reporting, please refer to the glossary in the 2003 Accreditation Handbook for definitions of terms.

Institution: Seattle University
Address: 901 12th Ave P.O. Box 222000
City, State, ZIP: Seattle, WA 98122-1090

Degree Levels Offered: ☒ Doctorate ☒ Masters ☒ Baccalaureate ☐ Associate ☐ Other

If part of a multi-institution system, name of system: N/A

Type of Institution: ☒Comprehensive ☐Specialized ☐ Health-centered ☒Religious-based
☐ Native/Tribal ☐Other (specify) _____

Institutional control: ☐ Public ☐ City ☐ County ☐ State ☐ Federal ☐ Tribal
☒ Private/Independent (☒ Non-profit ☐ For Profit)

Institutional calendar: ☒ Quarter ☐ Semester ☐ Trimester ☐ 4-1-4 ☐ Continuous Term
☒ Other (specify) Law School is on a semester system

Specialized/Programmatic accreditation: List program or school, degree level(s) and date of last accreditation by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education. (Add additional pages if necessary.)

Program or School	Degree Level(s)	Recognized Agency	Date
Education	EdD, EdS, MA, MAEd, MEd, MIT, EdS	NCATE - National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education	2012
Nursing	BSN, MSN	Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education	2012
Nursing	MSN Midwifery	Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education (ACME)	2012
Law	Juris Doctor (JD)	American Bar Association (ABA)	2007
Theology and Ministry	MDIV, MAPS, MATS, MAPC, MATL, JD/MATL	American Theological Society (ATS)	2010

Revised February 2011

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Enrollment (Formula used to compute FTE: Undergraduate FTE calculated by dividing total credit hours per term by 15. Graduate FTE calculated by dividing total credit hours per term by 9. Law School FTE calculated by dividing total credit hours per term by 12.)

Official Fall _2012_ (most recent year) FTE Student Enrollments

Classification	Current Year Dates: 2012	One Year Prior Dates: 2011	Two Years Prior Dates: 2010
Undergraduate	4487	4534	4466
Graduate	1517	1685	1749
Professional	896	942	943
Unclassified	0	0	0
Total all levels	6900	7161	7158

Full-Time Unduplicated Headcount Enrollment. (Count students enrolled in credit courses only.)

Official Fall _2012_ (most recent year) Student Headcount Enrollments

Classification	Current Year Dates: 2012	One Year Prior Dates: 2011	Two Years Prior Dates: 2010
Undergraduate	4589	4631	4565
Graduate	1933	2124	2240
Professional	962	1000	1012
Unclassified	0	0	0
Total all levels	7484	7755	7817

Numbers of Full-Time and Part-Time Instructional and Research Faculty & Staff and Numbers of Full-Time (only) Instructional and Research Faculty & Staff by Highest Degree Earned. Include only professional personnel who are primarily assigned to instruction or research.

	Total Number		Number of Full Time (only) Faculty and Staff by Highest Degree Earned					
Rank	**Full Time**	**Part Time**	**Less than Associate**	**Associate**	**Bachelor**	**Masters**	**Specialist**	**Doctorate**
Professor	79	0	0	0	0	4	0	75
Associate Professor	150	0	0	0	0	5	0	145
Assistant Professor	94	0	0	0	0	5	0	89
Instructor	106	0	0	0	6	40	0	60
Lecturer and Teaching Assistant	51	0	0	0	0	17	0	34
Research Staff and Research Assistant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undesignated Rank	25	235	0	0	0	2	0	23

Mean Salaries and Mean Years of Service of Full-Time Instructional and Research Faculty and Staff. Include only full-time personnel with professional status who are primarily assigned to instruction or research.

Rank	Mean Salary	Mean Years of Service
Professor	$120,733.42	21
Associate Professor	$84,288.10	14
Assistant Professor	$74,289.80	4
Instructor	$65,128.23	8
Lecturer and Teaching Assistant	$51,509.41	8
Research Staff and Research Assistant	NA	NA
Undesignated Rank	$65,199.78	6

Financial Information. Complete each item in the report using zero where there is nothing to report. Enter figures to the nearest dollar. Auxiliary and service enterprises of the institution (housing, food service, book stores, athletics, etc.) should be included. The institution's audit materials should be an excellent reference for completing the report.

Fiscal year of the institution:	July 1 to June 30			
Reporting of income:	Cash Basis		Accrual Basis	X
Reporting of expenses:	Cash Basis		Accrual Basis	X

BALANCE SHEET DATA

ASSETS	Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/11-6/30/12	One Year Prior to Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/10-6/30/11	Two Years Prior to Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/09-6/30/10
CURRENT FUNDS			
Unrestricted			
Cash	40,676,632	40,699,270	46,807,290
Investments	427,263	0	2,777,725
Accounts receivable gross	5,519,495	4,832,957	4,154,662
Less allowance for bad debts	(583,562)	(289,406)	(398,444)
Inventories	819,342	709,028	1,010,170
Prepaid expenses and deferred charges	2,708,093	1,603,742	1,438,889
Other (identify): See Note 1	3,348,174	3,957,002	345,650
Due from	0	0	0
Total Unrestricted	52,915,437	51,512,593	56,135,942
Restricted			
Cash	1,236,679	938,668	1,138,067
Investments	0	0	0
Other (identify): See Note 2	18,226,576	18,264,968	25,030,275
Due from	11,792,832	12,712,412	10,031,112
Total Restricted	31,256,087	31,916,048	36,199,454
TOTAL CURRENT FUNDS	84,171,524	83,428,641	92,335,396
ENDOWMENT AND SIMILAR FUNDS			
Cash	3,000,000	100,000	2,078,079
Investments	175,813,169	179,504,113	151,792,762
Other (identify): See Note 3	1,773,592	1,896,817	1,580,411
Due from	0	0	0
TOTAL ENDOWMENT AND SIMILAR FUNDS	180,586,761	181,500,930	155,451,252
PLANT FUND			
Unexpended			
Cash	0	911	911
Investments	0	0	10,783,625
Other (identify)	0	0	0
Total unexpended	0	911	10,784,536
Investment in Plant			
Land	33,949,581	33,644,244	29,891,691
Land improvements	10,741,746	10,507,883	10,471,247
Buildings	258,622,062	253,923,901	206,878,579
Equipment	11,498,317	10,469,403	6,822,695
Library resources	14,656,529	13,811,749	12,831,163
Other (identify): See Note 4	8,927,677	15,690,563	50,176,140

Total investments in plant	338,395,912	338,047,743	317,071,515
Due from	18,015,961	9,808,047	20,807,083
Other plant funds (identify)	0	0	0
TOTAL PLANT FUNDS	356,411,873	347,856,701	348,663,134
OTHER ASSETS (IDENTIFY)	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER ASSETS	0	0	0
TOTAL ASSETS	621,170,158	612,786,272	596,449,782

BALANCE SHEET DATA (continued)

LIABILITIES	Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/11-6/30/12	One Year Prior to Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/10-6/30/11	Two Years Prior to Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/09-6/30/10
CURRENT FUNDS			
Unrestricted			
Accounts payable	5,021,798	5,905,138	9,344,909
Accrued liabilities	14,128,802	14,984,353	16,259,353
Students' deposits	431,160	114,284	40,394
Deferred credits	9,608,771	9,767,410	6,808,985
Other liabilities (identify): See Note 5	1,271,772	253,675	9,090,206
Due to	28,987,355	16,272,455	25,816,300
Fund balance (See Note 6)	0	0	0
Total Unrestricted	59,449,658	47,297,315	67,360,147
Restricted			
Accounts payable	0	0	0
Other (identify): See Note 7	14,259,625	14,764,661	3,553,835
Due to	598,865	432,152	0
Fund balance (See Note 6)	0	0	0
Total Restricted	14,858,490	15,196,813	3,553,835
TOTAL CURRENT FUNDS	74,308,148	62,494,129	70,913,982
ENDOWMENT AND SIMILAR FUNDS			
Restricted	153,462	247,742	0
Quasi-endowed	0	0	0
Due to	222,573	5,815,851	5,021,895
Fund balance (See Note 6)	0	0	0
TOTAL ENDOWMENT AND SIMILAR FUNDS	376,035	6,063,593	5,021,895
PLANT FUND			
Unexpended			
Accounts payable	0	0	0
Notes payable	0	0	0
Bonds payable	0	0	0
Other liabilities (identify): See Note 8	0	0	0
Due to	0	0	0
Fund balance (See Note 6)	0	0	0
Total unexpended	0	0	0
Investment in Plant			
Notes payable	0	0	0
Bonds payable	140,468,422	143,329,661	146,909,661
Mortgage payable	0		0
Other liabilities (identify): See Note 9	6,548,229	5,467,284	7,900,844
Due to	0	0	0
Other plant fund liabilities (identify)	0	0	0

TOTAL INVESTMENTS IN PLANT FUND	147,016,651	148,796,945	154,210,505
OTHER LIABILITIES (IDENTIFY)	0	0	0
TOTAL OTHER LIABILITIES	0	0	0
TOTAL LIABILITIES	221,700,834	217,354,667	230,146,382
FUND BALANCE	399,469,324	395,431,605	366,303,400

CURRENT FUNDS, REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND OTHER CHANGES

	Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/11-6/30/12	**One Year Prior to Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/10-6/30/11**	**Two Years Prior to Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/09-6/30/10**
REVENUES			
Tuition and fees	220,498,102	208,835,569	193,707,338
Federal appropriations	0	0	0
State appropriations	0	0	0
Local appropriations	0	0	0
Grants and contracts	4,335,239	3,753,503	3,446,250
Endowment income	6,842,785	7,736,497	8,627,563
Auxiliary enterprises	15,363,339	15,398,561	14,345,676
Other (identify): See Note 10	12,607,026	11,894,267	7,835,977
TOTAL REVENUE	259,646,491	247,618,397	227,962,804
EXPENDITURE & MANDATORY TRANSFERS			
Educational and General			
Instruction	66,486,648	64,086,203	60,081,138
Research	0	0	0
Public services	0	0	0
Academic support	9,628,640	8,688,931	8,234,857
Student services	24,369,217	22,569,294	20,713,698
Institutional support	56,083,271	55,886,720	55,389,244
Operation and maintenance of plant	12,752,523	12,791,608	11,513,716
Scholarships and fellowships	58,775,221	58,712,150	49,324,745
Other (identify): See Note 11	20,545	(102,145)	48,407
Mandatory transfers for:			
Principal and interest	9,635,060	10,357,938	10,008,905
Renewal and replacements	15,818,000	8,545,000	10,212,000
Loan fund matching grants	0	0	0
Other (identify): See Note 12	100,000	100,000	54,029
Total Educational and General	253,669,125	241,635,699	225,580,739
Auxiliary Enterprises			
Expenditures	7,462,037	7,369,601	7,409,945
Mandatory transfers for:	0	0	0
Principal and interest	0	0	0
Renewals and replacements	0	0	0
Total Auxiliary Enterprises	7,462,037	7,369,601	7,409,945
TOTAL EXPENDITURE & MANDATORY TRANSFERS	261,131,162	249,005,300	232,990,684
OTHER TRANSFERS AND ADDITIONS/DELETIONS (Identify)	0	0	0
EXCESS [deficiency of revenues over expenditures and mandatory transfers (net	(1,484,671)	(1,386,903)	(5,027,880)

change in fund balances)]			

INSTITUTIONAL INDEBTEDNESS

TOTAL DEBT TO OUTSIDE PARTIES	Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/11-6/30/12	One Year Prior to Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/10-6/30/11	Two Years Prior to Last Completed FY Dates:7/1/09-6/30/10
For Capital Outlay	140,468,422	143,329,661	146,909,661
For Operations	51,423,619	51,504,547	52,398,525

Note 1: Assets held under split interest agreements, contributions receivable.
Note 2: Assets held under split interest agreements, contributions receivable, accounts receivable, student loans receivable.
Note 3: Funds held in trust by others, other assets.
Note 4: Construction in progress, prepaid expenses, goodwill (net), other assets.
Note 5: Liabilities under split interest agreements.
Note 6: Fund balances are reported in aggregate at the bottom of the revenues and expenditures section.
Note 7: Liabilities under split interest agreements, funds held in custody for others, US government loan funds, accrued liabilities.
Note 8: Accrued liabilities.
Note 9: Unrealized loss on interest rate swap agreement, accrued liabilities.
Note 10: Contributions, change in value of split-interest agreements, change in value of interest rate swap agreement, miscellaneous revenue.
Note 11: Loan collection and processing fees, loan write-offs.
Note 12: Endowment.

Domestic Off-Campus Degree Programs and Academic Credit Sites: Report information for off-campus sites within the United States where degree programs and academic coursework is offered. (Add additional pages if necessary.)

Degree Programs – list the names of degree programs that can be completed at the site.
Academic Credit Courses – report the total number of academic credit courses offered at the site.
Student Headcount – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of students currently enrolled in programs at the site.
Faculty Headcount – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of faculty (full-time and part-time) teaching at the site.

PROGRAMS AND ACADEMIC CREDIT OFFERED AT OFF-CAMPUS SITES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

No degree may be obtained solely through any of these programs. Figures are from Fall 2012, except the Blakely Island data which are from Summer 2012, as this is a summer only program.

Location of Site Name City, State, ZIP	Degree Programs	Academic Credit Courses	Student Headcount	Faculty Headcount
Blakely Island Field Station, Blakely Island, WA 98222	None	1	9	1
School of TESL, Seattle, WA 98103	None	22	33	12
Photo Center NW, Seattle, WA 98122	None	36	33	14

Seattle University Eastside Center, Bellevue, WA 98004	None	8	112	8

Programs and Academic Courses Offered at Sites Outside the United States. Report information for sites outside the United States where degree programs and academic credit courses are offered, including study abroad programs and educational operations on military bases. (Add additional pages if necessary.)

Degree Programs – list the names of degree programs that can be completed at the site.
Academic Credit Courses – report the total number of academic credit courses offered at the site.
Student Headcount – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of students currently enrolled in programs at the site.
Faculty Headcount – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of faculty (full-time and part-time) teaching at the site.

Programs and Academic Courses Offered at Sites Outside the United States. Report information for sites outside the United States where degree programs and academic credit courses are offered, including study abroad programs and educational operations on military bases. (Add additional pages if necessary.)

Degree Programs – list the names of degree programs that can be completed at the site.
Academic Credit Courses – report the total number of academic credit courses offered at the site.
Student Headcount – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of students currently enrolled in programs at the site.
Faculty Headcount – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of faculty (full-time and part-time) teaching at the site.

PROGRAMS AND ACADEMIC CREDIT COURSES OFFERED AT SITES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

No degree may be obtained solely though these programs. The data in this section are for the most recent full academic year (Summer 2011-Spring 2012). Faculty headcount figures refer to SU-employed faculty delivering the academic credit at the international site; thus, several programs which either are taught by faculty at our partner sites or involve internships are listed with a headcount of zero.

Location of Site Name City, State, ZIP	Degree Programs	Academic Credit Courses	Student Headcount	Faculty Headcount
Argentina Connect 123 (Non-Profit Organization) Buenos Aires, Argentina		INIP 401 15 Qtr Credits	2	0
Austria University of Graz Universitätsplatz 3 8010 Graz Austria		UG Major, Minor, Core, & Elective Credits	1	0
Belize Hotel Mopan 55 Regent Street Belize City, Belize Clarissa Falls Resort Western Highway Mile 70 San Ignacio,		NURS 493 5 Qtr Credits	12	2

Cayo, Belize Tom's Hotel Beachfront, P.O. Box 15 Caye Caulker, Belize				
China The Beijing Center for Chinese Studies 4th Flr, Ningyuan Bldg UIBE No. 10 Huixin East St., Chaoyang Dist. Beijing 100029, China		UG Major, Minor, Core, & Elective Credits	3	0
Chile PONTIFIC CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY Avda. Libertador Bernardo OHiggins 340 – Santiago		MATH 391 MEGR 391 ECEGR 391 5 Qtr Credits	8	1
Denmark Danish Institute for Study Abroad Vestergade 7 DK 1456 Copenhagen K		UG Major, Minor, Core, & Elective Credits	4	0
England Various Locations – field course		ENGL 393 WMST 480 5 Qtr Credits	12	2
France - Paris Various Locations – field course		ENGL 425 ENGL 480 5 Qtr Credits	23	1
France – Grenoble 141 Rue Alliés 38000 Grenoble, France 04 38 70 07 10		FREN 296 FREN 315 FREN 393 15 Qtr Credits	13	2
Ghana Lumana (Non-Profit Organization) Anloga, Ghana		INIP 401 15 Qtr Credits	2	0
Ghana University of Ghana Legon Boundary, Accra, Ghana		UG Major, Minor, Core, & Elective Credits	2	0
Guatemala Hostal Las Marias Calle a San Bartolo La Jacarandas, Lote #7 Antiqua		Law School	3	1
India Center for Knowledge and Skills, (Non-Profit Organization)		INIP 401 15 Qtr Credits	2	0

West Bengal, India				
Ireland Trinity College Dublin College Green Dublin 2, Ireland.		ENGL 310 ENGL 393	20	2
Italy Locanda del Giglio Via Luca Pacioli 60-52037 Sansepolcro (AR), Italy		MGMT 575 Graduate Course	18	1
Italy Various – Field Course		MKTG 594 FINC 594	13	2
Italy – Florence and Rome Various – Field Course		PHIL 220 PHIL 392 PHIL 480	12	2
Japan Sophia University Yotsuya Campus 7-1 Kioi-cho, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 102-8554 Japan		UG Major, Minor, Core, & Elective Credits	11	0
Korea/Japan Various – Field Course		MKTG 594 ECIS 594 MKTG 494 ECIS 494	25	2
Korea Sogang University 35 Baekbeom-ro(Sinsu-dong), Mapo-gu, Seoul 121-742, Korea		UG Major, Minor, Core, & Elective Credits	2	0
Malawi Jesuit Refugee Service Angola, Malawi		INIP 401 15 Qtr Credits	1	0
Mexico Calle Club de Leones 12518 Fracc. La Joya, (La Gloria) Delegacion San Antonio de los Buenos Tijuana, B.C. 22709 C.P. 22420 Mexico		MDLG 480	12	6
Mexico Universidad Iberoamericana Del Niño Poblano 2901 Unidad Territorial Atlixcayotl, 72197 Puebla, Mexico 01 222 229 0700		SP 225 SP 235 SP 392 SP 315 SP 325 SP 393	19	2
Nicaragua – Granada Calle Martirio 421		NURS 493	4	1

Spain St. Louis University Madrid Avenida del Valle, 34 - 28003 Madrid, Spain		UG Major, Minor, Core, & Elective Credits	1	0
Spain C/Molinos 52, 2B 18009 Granada Spain		UG Major, Minor, Core, & Elective Credits	8	0
Vietnam Peace Trees (Non-Profit Organization) Quang Tri Province, Vietnam		INIP 401 15 Qtr Credits	1	0

Preface

Brief Update on Institutional Changes since the Last Report

Seattle University's most recent report to the Commission was its Year One Report, submitted March 1, 2011. Since that time, the university has not made substantive changes as defined by *Policy A-2*. The university continues to make changes and improvements intended to carry forward its mission and enhance its business operations.

Following the completion of a comprehensive compensation and benefits study, the university committed to funding approximately $5 million over several years to address market equity, starting in FY12. All staff and administrator position descriptions were updated in FY12 and a staff merit pay program was initiated. Faculty titles were standardized in FY13.

Implementation of the revised general education program, called the University Core Curriculum, was extended from fall 2012 to fall 2013 to permit faculty more time for course development, among other reasons.

Six new degree programs started: the Health Leadership Executive Master of Business Administration and Bachelor of Arts in Humanities in Leadership Studies in fall 2010 and the Doctor of Nursing Practice, Bachelor of Science majors in Cell and Molecular Biology and Marine and Conservation Biology, and the Bachelor of Arts, major in Digital Design.

The university will graduate its final cohort of Organization Systems Renewal (OSR) students in spring 2013. This program is offered through a partnership with an external organization. The master's degree is a two-year program; no new OSR students were admitted in fall 2012.

In spring 2012, the strategic priority/core theme of Formation for Leadership was broadened to Great Student Experience. It reflects emphasis on first year student engagement, career formation, and student leadership development, as well as deepened pride in the university through enhanced traditions that contribute to higher levels of student satisfaction and success.

An undergraduate strategic enrollment plan was completed in 2012. A graduate plan is underway.

A new chief financial officer joined the university in spring 2012. Two new Cabinet-level positions were established: vice president for human resources and university services and vice president for communications. The School of Law and Matteo Ricci College have new deans. An interim dean is in place at the College of Education for the 2012-13 academic year. Two new senior positions were created within enrollment services: a director of continuing, online, and professional education and a retention director. An associate provost position was refocused on research and graduate education.

The university took steps to manage health care costs by changing providers, extending dependent coverage, launching a wellness program, and initiating employee contributions.

A fitness center opened in September 2011 and the recreational field was renovated in 2012. A new 250-bed residence hall opened in fall 2011. The Douglas was constructed through a partnership and primarily houses juniors, seniors, and graduate/professional students.

Enrollment Services adopted document imaging and the university purchased a new learning management system. The aging campus card system was replaced. A multi-million dollar investment in the wired and wireless network was approved in fall 2012.

Responses to Recommendations in the 2010 Comprehensive Evaluation Committee Report

Recommendation One

The 2005 Regular Interim Report called on the University to "…solidify its proposed Assessment Plan, (to) develop a coordinated system for data collection and interpretation, and (to) clarify how continued oversight will be managed." Although progress has been made in particular areas, such practices are not consistently implemented or monitored across all units and programs of the University. In short, the University still has not yet met the requirement of a true culture of student learning outcome assessment. Given the Commission's history of concern regarding this matter, the Evaluation Committee strongly recommends immediate action on the part of the University to address these deficiencies.

In response to recommendation one of the 2010 NWCCU accreditation report, Seattle University developed and approved a framework for systematic assessment of university, academic program, and co-curricular learning outcomes. The program described in this document forms a clear road map for ensuring that regular and systematic assessment of student learning outcomes takes place at the program and university levels.

At the program level, all academic programs are now required to assess student achievement of each of their learning outcomes within a five year cycle. Programs submit three documents annually to an assessment coordinator assigned by the dean of their college or school. These documents are: 1) an assessment calendar which indicates when each outcome will be assessed over the upcoming five year cycle; 2) an assessment plan which indicates what evidence of student achievement will be reviewed for each outcome; and 3) an annual report describing the assessment-related work from the prior year. These documents serve as a framework which makes clear what full-cycle assessment of student learning outcomes requires while still remaining flexible enough to be applicable across the variety of outcomes appropriate to different disciplines and degree levels.

Assessment coordinators serve as the first reviewers of these reports and, when necessary, work with department faculty to revise reports that do not meet university standards for assessment. When program assessment reports appear to meet university standards, they are forwarded to the college or school dean, the Associate Provost for Academic Achievement and the Assistant Vice President for Planning (AVP). The Associate Provost and AVP review these reports and provide feedback via the assessment coordinator on any reports that still require revisions in order to meet university standards. The assessment coordinator is then responsible for working with programs to further revise and resubmit reports as needed to meet standards. All assessment document submissions are logged and electronic copies are retained in a repository shared by the Office of the Provost and University Planning.

Assessment standards have been integrated into revised academic program review standards which were approved by the Academic Assembly in May 2012. All programs are expected to have fully implemented university assessment requirements and to discuss program improvements made as a result of departmental review of assessment results. If the program review committee does not see evidence of effective assessment being employed to lead to program improvement, they will include this finding of deficiency in their report to the Academic Assembly. Once approved by Academic Assembly, the program review report is reviewed by the department chair and the dean, who then review it with the provost, discussing plans to address deficiencies and/or making commitments to implement program improvements.

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) has responsibility for ensuring the regular and systematic assessment of university learning objectives. The UAC relies, when possible, on assessment work taking place within academic and non-academic programs which intentionally contribute to student achievement of university objectives. The committee supplements program assessment work as needed to meaningfully assess the extent to which all students demonstrate their achievement of each university learning objective.

After approval of a revised set of undergraduate learning objectives (ULOs), the UAC asked faculty from each undergraduate major to evaluate which of their program learning outcomes helped students achieve particular ULOs. As expected, all undergraduate degree programs aim to educate majors to become adept in their discipline (outcome 2). Outcomes in the degree programs mapped onto the other ULOs as well, but not all majors can be expected to achieve any of the other outcomes solely through achieving the outcomes specific to their major. However, since the ULOs were intentionally developed prior to a planned revision of the undergraduate Core curriculum, Core learning outcomes were then able to be structured in ways which map to and largely cover the ULOs. The new Core is outcomes based, with specific Core outcomes emphasized in each Core course. The UAC will meet with, and review the work of, the Core assessment committee to evaluate the evidence that students are achieving ULOs through completion of the Core. The new Core will go into effect fall 2013, and UAC review of Core assessment committee findings will commence in the 2013/14 academic year. Several members of the UAC have been appointed to the Core implementation and Core assessment committees, and the Director of the Core is a member of the UAC, ensuring that the Core is being implemented with due consideration to direct assessment of student learning outcomes.

In April 2012, the university approved a revised set of graduate learning objectives (GLOs). Because there is not a common graduate core, student achievement of the GLOs depends on coverage within each graduate degree program. Graduate programs are mapping their learning outcomes to the new GLOs and, if necessary, are modifying or expanding program learning outcomes to ensure that their graduate students achieve all of the GLOs.

Beyond academic programs, students engage in a wide variety of co-curricular experiences which help them achieve university learning objectives. Through student organizations and activities, service and community engagement, study abroad and participation in campus ministry programs, students find a multitude of ways to grow and learn while enrolled at Seattle University. The Division of Student Development plays a leadership role in systematically assessing the learning outcomes impact of co-curricular programs. Senior leaders of the divisions of Student Development and Mission and Ministry serve on the UAC and regularly discuss their assessment efforts and results with this committee. The study abroad programs are working to integrate their undergraduate program learning objectives with the new Core outcomes concerning global engagement. Additionally, the Seattle University Youth Initiative has hired a full time assessment analyst who has been charged with overseeing assessment of program impacts on community beneficiaries and learning outcomes for participating Seattle University students. The UAC will review the results of these assessment efforts as part of its evaluation of student achievement of university learning objectives.

While the UAC is able to make use of the wealth of assessment information being gathered by academic and co-curricular programs, when necessary, it supplements these data sources with other evidence of student achievement of these outcomes. The university is piloting the use of the ETS Proficiency Profile, which is expected to provide a benchmarked assessment of undergraduate critical thinking, reading, writing and quantitative reasoning abilities both compared to students at other colleges and eventually through longitudinal comparisons of scores near the beginning and end of students' undergraduate careers. The UAC also reviews NSSE results, which provide indirect information on the extent to which students perceive that their educational experiences have contributed to various components of the ULO. Looking forward, the UAC is exploring ways to assess the cumulative educational impact on students as this relates to university learning objectives, including rubric evaluations of the senior synthesis reflection essay assignment, combining this assignment with accumulation of student portfolios of assignments and co-curricular experience, embedding indirect assessment questions in online student course evaluations and systematic gathering of data on graduating students and alumni.

Based on review of both direct and indirect evidence, the UAC will report on student achievement of each university learning objective. The results of this assessment work will be communicated to key faculty groups including the Academic Assembly and the Core faculty, to professional staff involved in student programs, and to the senior leadership of the university. The UAC is also charged with bringing together key stakeholders to formulate responses to assessment results aimed at improving student achievement of university learning objectives.

The university is on track to fully implement the framework for systematic assessment developed in 2011. With the exception of those related to implementation of the new core which were rescheduled when the core launch was pushed back one year, all of the objectives in this plan for the 2011/12 academic year were completed as scheduled. The university recognizes, however, that

meaningful assessment leading to improved student learning is an ongoing process, and it is committed to continuing implementation as well as review and improvement of its assessment practices.

Supporting Documents

1. Proposed Framework for Systematic Assessment (Addendum B of the NWCCU Year One Report)
2. Academic Program Assessment Report Tracking
3. Academic Program Assessment Report, Assessment Calendar and Assessment Plan forms
4. Academic Program Review Guidelines
5. Undergraduate Learning Objectives
6. University Core Curriculum Learning Objectives
7. Graduate Learning Objectives
8. List of Assessment Coordinators
9. University Assessment Committee Membership
10. Academic Assembly membership and charge

Recommendation Two

Since the 2005 Interim Visit Report, the University has made a number of revisions to its institutional strategic planning documents. The Committee notes that strategic plans developed over time do not appear to be well connected. In addition, the Committee notes a disconnect between some unit plans and the University's strategic plan. The Committee therefore recommends the University establish consistent, coherent and data based evaluation procedures to assess achievement of institutional goals and a mechanism for communicating evidence of institutional effectiveness to its many internal and external constituencies.

Seattle University recently undertook a comprehensive strategic planning effort and produced the first university-wide strategic plan since the 2000 *Decade for Distinction*. This effort served a broad range of institutional goals, including responding to this recommendation, adapting to changes in the environment of higher education, setting clear institutional direction, and preparing for an upcoming capital campaign.

In 2007 the university established five strategic priorities; these were later adopted as core themes under the Commission's revised accreditation standards. In 2009 the university developed the *Academic Strategic Action Plan* to support the strategic priority of *Academic Excellence*. At the time of the 2010 NWCCU site visit, the university was in the process of developing action plans for each of the strategic priorities (*Global Engagement, Catholic, Jesuit Character, Formation for Leadership,* and *Investing in the Excellence of Faculty and Staff)*. These plans were completed in 2011 and are characterized by clear goals, measures for success, and assignment of responsibility.

In 2012 the university was ready to integrate the five strategic priority action plans into a comprehensive strategic plan. In fall 2012, the Strategic Planning Council (SPC), comprised of 32 faculty, staff, and students from across the university, was convened. The SPC worked intensively through fall 2012 and winter 2013. The *Preliminary Report from the Strategic Planning Council* was shared with the Board of Trustees and university community in November 2012. Responses to the *Preliminary Report* were used to develop *Fulfilling our Mission in a Changing World: Seattle University's Strategic Plan for 2013-2018*, which will be presented to the Board of Trustees in its February 28, 2013 meeting. If the Board endorses this strategic plan, the university will begin implementation immediately. The first step will be the integration of the strategic plan into a comprehensive financial plan, to be presented to the Board in May 2013.

In designing the strategic planning process, careful attention was given to the importance of integrating planning broadly across the university. The charge from the President's Cabinet to the Strategic Planning Council included 11 points intended to guide the work of that body; the first point required the SPC to "build upon and integrate the significant planning work that has already been done" and the second called for this work to "be guided by and seek the fulfillment of the university mission and strategic priorities." To assist in the realization of the charge, SPC members were provided in August 2012 with copies of the significant planning documents developed over the previous few years. These documents included the strategic priority action plans, the undergraduate strategic enrollment plan (a graduate plan is underway), a diversity task force report, and capital and technology plans. The university also commissioned a scan of the external environmental and internal position statement to assess overall strengths and vulnerabilities.

It is important to note that "build upon and integrate" was not intended to indicate that the SPC needed to include all of previous plans. As noted in the charge, "only the most critical initiatives should be incorporated into the strategic plan; an important part of the work of the council will be to prioritize and limit the initiatives included." To quote a metaphor used during this process, previous planning became the "lumberyard" from which the materials for the construction of the strategic plan were selected.

Recommendation Two calls for two outcomes: "consistent, coherent and data based evaluation procedures" and a "mechanism for communicating evidence of institutional effectiveness". Both outcomes require comprehensive and integrated strategic planning, but such planning does not by itself guarantee these outcomes.

Seattle University has paid careful attention to the elements necessary to support effective implementation. The SPC charge required that the strategic plan "serve as the basis for a companion document that defines resource needs, measurable objectives, and responsible parties." The strategic plan presented to the Board includes these elements, although some confidential elements (particularly resources) will be removed from the public version. Sample measurable

objectives include graduation rates, student enrollment, network reliability, and milestone events such as the launching of new programs.

The development of "consistent, coherent and data based evaluation procedures" requires a process through which progress toward measurable objectives is tracked. The university established such a structure for the strategic priority action plans and will continue to use it for the new strategic plan. Implementation is the responsibility of the Cabinet members designated in each section of the plan, while the Office of University Planning is a partner to help monitor and report on progress. Many of the ways the university currently communicates progress on its strategic priorities will continue under the framework of the strategic plan; these include presenting the budget in terms of strategic investments, email announcements, and open forums.

It is the intent that, upon the approval of the strategic plan by the Board of Trustees, the plan will become well-known by the campus and progress will be reported in a broad and public manner. A public launch—likely through a special convocation called by the President—will support the broad institutional awareness needed to ensure all parts of the institution work in support of the plan. Using the strategic plan to frame financial decisions, particularly the operating budget, and to inform and support the capital campaign will tie resource development directly to the goals of the plan. Financial accountability will be ensured by reporting to the Board on a financial plan that incorporates the strategic plan. Finally, University Planning will coordinate with the Office of the President and Department of Marketing Communications to develop annual progress reports to communicate evidence of our effectiveness in pursuing the goals and objectives outlined in the strategic plan.

Supporting Documents
1. Charge to the Strategic Planning Council
2. *Fulfilling our Mission in a Changing World: Seattle University's Strategic Plan for 2013-2018*

Recommendation Three

The Committee notes the University's commitment to being responsive to the opportunities that emerge in the relatively rapidly changing higher education environment in the greater Seattle area and its flexibility to develop programs and services appropriately. In accordance with Standard 1, however, the Committee recommends the University, consistent with its shared governance model, engage all appropriate constituencies in the planning and implementation of any new programs in order to ensure their consistency with the Mission of the University and its strategic plan, and to meet the challenge of providing adequate resources to sustain them.

Recommendation Three has two separate recommendations. Thus, the university's response is divided into two sections, addressing all critical questions for both sections.

Engage all appropriate constituencies in planning and implementation of new programs

Seattle University has a thorough review process for the planning and implementation of new academic programs. One of the goals of this process is to ensure that all appropriate constituencies, both internal and external to the university, have input into the development of the program proposal. The consideration of new programs is guided by a new program approval form. This form was most recently revised in 2012. The new form requires extensive marketing and budget information, which in turn requires input from targeted constituencies.

Schools and colleges review new program proposals from their programs and departments. New program proposals must pass through a school/college curriculum committee and/or be voted on by the faculty. Once the school/college process is completed, the proposal is then sent to the Academic Assembly, the university faculty governing body, for review and recommendation. A subcommittee of Academic Assembly called the Program Review Committee (PRC), comprised of faculty from throughout the university, is responsible for review of new program proposals. The PRC thoroughly reviews the new program proposals, focusing primarily on the academic integrity and mission fit of the proposed program. The PRC is also supplied with budget information, requests for new faculty or other lines (support staff), and technology or other infrastructure needs required to launch the new program. The director/chair of the proposed program and the dean of the school/college are invited to a PRC meeting to answer questions and address concerns raised by the committee. The committee then develops a recommendation on program implementation and forwards it to the full Academic Assembly.

The program director/department chair and the dean are invited to present to the full assembly in light of the PRC recommendation. The Academic Assembly then votes on the implementation of the program and forwards their recommendation to the provost.

In addition to this thorough review by Academic Assembly, the proposed program budget is reviewed by the Academic Affairs Budget Office, which reports to Vice Provost, which in turn reports directly to the Provost. In conjunction, the Office of the Registrar reviews the program proposal to ensure that it follows university policy with respect to credits, course numbering, etc. The Office of the Provost then reviews the recommendations from Academic Assembly, the Academic Affairs Budget Office, and the Office of the Registrar in order to assess the program for both strategic and mission fit, and viability.

The final step of the approval process is review, recommendation and then a decision to approve (or not) by the Board of Trustees. The Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board of Trustees hears a full presentation on the new program proposal with the program director and dean present to address questions. One of the concerns of the subcommittee is to ensure that all relevant parties have had input into the program proposal. The subcommittee then reviews the proposal and makes a recommendation to approve or not approve to the full Board. The President of the university and the Board of Trustees makes the final decision to approve the program.

The mission fit of programs is examined not just with respect to the adoption of new offerings at the university but also in the review of existing programs, in order to ensure continued mission fit. On the basis of this administrative framework for the approval and review of programs, the university is continually examining existing programs to ensure that they meet the university's expectations for academic excellence as part of the university mission.

Potential duplication or overlap between programs is one of the factors considered in new program proposals, as is alignment with the *Academic Strategic Action Plan*. In the case of major program revisions that require formal approval, transition and notification plans must be established if current students will be impacted.

Meet the challenge of providing adequate resources to sustain programs

The determination of the availability of adequate resources to launch and sustain programs is first made in the approval process for new programs. This approach is followed by a continuing review of resource needs as part of an extensive program review process for existing programs. In the period since NWCCU made this recommendation, the university has reviewed a number of new program proposals and program revisions that illustrate the thoroughness of the process.

<u>New Program Proposals</u>

An example of deliberations made in the case of new programs is evidenced by the recent consideration of a Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) proposed by the College of Nursing. The college of Nursing proposed a Doctor of Nursing Practice. This degree is now required as part of Nursing programs offering masters level courses. The original proposal was to offer the program online coincidental with its launch in 2012. While the program was deemed to be a clear mission fit and a contributor to the academic excellence of university programs, the determination was made that the university did not have the resources available to immediately launch the program as an online program. Therefore the program has been approved as a regular program while the university builds its infrastructure to be able to move it to online status. While the ultimate goal is to offer the DNP as a completely online program, this will only take place as the university builds out its online capacity.

The review process of existing programs was completely revised for the 2012-13 academic year. On the undergraduate level and in coordination with the recent undergraduate strategic enrollment plan, the program review guidelines have been modified so as to include the critical markers to assess the program's viability as laid out in the undergraduate strategic enrollment document. In addition the review is now constituted so as to include an examination of the program from a mission perspective, whether the program is achieving its outcome goals and in the context of a discussion of challenges and opportunities, whether the program is adequately resourced. This approach will allow the university to make relative comparisons between and among programs in terms of their academic strengths, viability, and vitality in terms of innovation. In addition it will allow the

university to shift resources as needed to be able to respond program needs, strengths, etc. while reallocating resources from those programs that are not meeting their program goals.

Major Program Revisions

Sometimes a program revision emerges even before a formal review. A recent example of a significant program revision is the Education Leadership (EDLR) doctoral program. In conversations between the dean of the College of Education and the Provost it was decided that the EDLR program required a significant review and re-organization. Thus, the regular university program review was postponed and the College of Education began a two-year process of internal review.

There were extensive discussions about the future of the program by faculty throughout the college. On the basis of these discussions, a new program structure was proposed; one that opened up the program to a much wider participation by faculty within the college. Furthermore, the College reached out to other graduate programs, e.g., the Albers School of Business and Economics and the College of Arts and Sciences to discuss the possibility of their faculty participating as experts in providing instruction and dissertation advising for doctoral students.

The proposal for this revision was then reviewed in a process similar to that which new programs must undergo (e.g. Program Review Committee, then Academic Assembly, then Office of the Provost with recommendations from Academic Affairs Budget Office and Office of the Registrar). The resulting deliberations concluded with the approval of the revised program for launch in fall of 2012.

Supporting Documents

1. Curriculum change website
2. New Program Proposal Guidelines
3. New Program Proposal Form
4. New Program Proposal Budget Form
5. New Program Proposal Summary Form
6. Revise an Existing Program Form

Recommendation Four

The University has had a long-standing goal of having more of its courses taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty members. However, this goal remains unmet in the light of rising enrollments. The Evaluation Committee recommends the University review relevant procedures and resource allocations, to ensure faculty levels become and remain appropriate in keeping with this long-standing goal.

University goals relating to the distribution of faculty by type are articulated in the *Academic Strategic Action Plan* approved by the Board of Trustees in November 2009. These goals speak to the distribution of faculty teaching in the university core curriculum (taken by all undergraduate

students). The university has not formally articulated goals for the distribution of faculty in undergraduate majors or graduate programs. The office of the provost is currently working with the deans of each school and college to develop goals in each of these areas, and to translate them to school/college staffing targets. It is expected that this process will be concluded by spring 2013.

The *Academic Strategic Action Plan* calls for the university to attain set goals relating to the distribution of faculty teaching core courses by AY 2013-14. These include:

- 66.7% of 100 level core courses to be taught by tenure track faculty
- 80% of 100 level core courses to be taught by full time faculty
- 75% of all core-requirement-meeting sections to be taught by full time faculty.

As of fall 2011, the actual percentage of courses taught was as follows:

- 24% of 100 level core courses are taught by tenure track faculty
- 77% of 100 level core courses are taught by full time faculty
- 79% of all core-requirement-meeting sections are taught by full time faculty.

The university is currently meeting its 2013-2014 goals relating to the percentage of core courses taught by full time faculty. The university is not yet meeting 2013-2014 goals in the percentage of tenure track faculty teaching 100 level core courses. The university has undertaken three initiatives that will help to provide a sustainable solution to this challenge.

- Seattle University has invested in the development of additional tenure-track faculty lines, particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Science and Engineering, which offer the significant majority of courses that satisfy core requirements. Through a combination of new funding and conversion of part time salary dollars, the university has funded a total of seven new tenure track positions in the College of Arts and Sciences, including two in fiscal year 2011, three in fiscal year 2012, and two in fiscal year 2013. The university has also funded the addition of two tenure track lines in the Biology department, which will support both new programs in that department and the increased core science requirements included within the new core, which comes online in fall 2013. Increasing the number of tenure track faculty will continue to be a top budget priority for the university in upcoming years.

- The implementation of the new core curriculum is also intended to increase the percentage of tenure-track teaching at all levels of the core by developing an emphasis in the core on focused, inquiry-based courses that will for many faculty be more attractive and interesting to teach than traditional introductory survey courses. Academic departments are being encouraged to have senior faculty propose such courses. The university has determined to

delay by one year the implementation of the new core, which will also delay for one year any faculty hiring associated with its implementation.

- The university has completed an undergraduate strategic enrollment plan that calls for reduced growth at the undergraduate level and for this growth to be achieved in large part through retention.

Increasing the proportion of tenure track faculty will require sustained investment. While the university is putting place the resources and strategies to accomplish this goal, it is expected that at least a few more years will be required.

Supporting Documents

1. *Academic Strategic Action Plan*
2. Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan Executive Summary

Recommendation Five

The Evaluation Committee notes the University's commitment to position itself favorably with respect to peer and aspirational institutions, especially by establishing the high quality of its academic programs through the "Scholar-Educator" model. The Committee finds that current resources appear inadequate to support faculty members in the attainment of this model. The Committee therefore recommends the University ensure policies, structures, and resources are adequate to meet the needs of faculty research, scholarship, and teaching consistent with its distinctive mission, vision, and values.

Seattle University has made a formal commitment to bring its academic programs and the research and scholarship of its faculty to the next level of accomplishment. To achieve this goal, the university is engaged in a systematic process to make significant improvements and additions to its support infrastructure to enhance its academic programs and support the teaching and research/scholarship of its faculty.

The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) promotes the professional formation of all faculty through a scholarly and interdisciplinary approach to teaching, learning and career development. In 2011-12, 266 faculty (37% of the university's faculty) participated in the services, provided by CETL, intended to support development of effective pedagogy and curriculum. These services are formative, confidential and voluntary. CETL also provides orientation to new faculty through the New Faculty Institute, which includes panels on topics such as the criteria for promotion and tenure and on learning how to balance research/scholarship, teaching and service activities.

The Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects (ORSSP; established in 2010) offers faculty a broad range of services, including pre and post-award grant management and support, liaison with funding agencies, internal review and compliance. ORSSP also shares in the

responsibility to ensure that the mission of the university is considered in grant applications, that the project is conducted according to university policies and procedures, and that funds are expended consistent with grant requirements and generally accepted accounting principles. In collaboration with University Advancement, ORSSP also reviews and manages sponsored funding obtained from private and corporate sources.

The Office of Faculty Services provides a wide range of services for the faculty community, including providing administrative oversight of management of new and ongoing faculty appointments, contracts, recruitments, policy interpretation and procedure compliance, monitoring sabbatical eligibility, payroll, and employment file maintenance, and is a liaison for faculty personnel matters with other administrative units of the university (e.g., Human Resources and the Office of the Finance).

Faculty are supported in their scholarly endeavors through a variety of sources. To better support tenure-track assistant professors in their professional growth as they pursue promotion and tenure, the university instituted the Junior Faculty Professional Development Grant Program in Academic Year 2009-10. This program seeks to enhance the academic quality of the university by supporting the faculty member's development in the areas of teaching and research/scholarship during his/her probationary period. This program provides a one-quarter release from teaching responsibilities and it is typically taken during the faculty member's fourth year of probationary service. These grants/leaves are not competitive, but are awarded to all tenure-track assistant professors who receive a positive mid-probationary review (normally conducted during the third year of probationary service).

Full-time tenured faculty members and professional librarians also receive paid release time to support their programs of research/scholarship and/or professional development. They are eligible to receive a sabbatical leave every seventh year and can take either a one quarter leave for full compensation; a two quarters leave at 50 percent compensation; or one-year sabbatical at 60 percent compensation. During the period of the leave, faculty members are relieved from their standard university responsibilities.

In addition to the Junior Faculty Professional Development Program and sabbaticals for tenured faculty and professional librarians, the university provides several forms of scholarly support. The Office of the Provost offers summer research fellowships to tenure-track or tenured faculty each year through a competitive application process. The Center for the Study of Justice and Society offers support for interdisciplinary research through its Faculty Fellows workshops that bring together up to four groups of faculty a year to read common texts over the course of the academic year and apply the materials to their own research, typically presenting a newly produced manuscript to their group at the final session. Finally, the Division of Mission and Ministry operates the Endowed Mission Fund for Faculty and Staff Development in Mission to encourage programs, projects, and research related to the Catholic and Jesuit identity of the university.

The two libraries on campus are also fully committed to supporting and enhancing faculty scholarship and their course curricula. A reference librarian is assigned to each academic program and is available for consultation with faculty members in that program. In addition, each academic department/program or school/college is allocated a library acquisition budget. A faculty member in each program serves as library liaison and works with the designated reference librarian and the other faculty in that program to acquire materials (books and other items) that will support the faculty in their teaching and scholarship.

As shown in the chart below, funding for professional development of faculty has significantly increased in recent years.

Faculty Support Base Budgets

Type	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13
Junior Faculty Leave	$0	$0	$41,094	$139,579	$139,579	$139,579
Faculty Development	$328,830	$330,901	$341,396	$388,296	$388,296	$433,296
Sabbaticals	$196,650	$204,516	$210,063	$204,554	$177,554	$177,554
Summer Fellowships	$89,710	$93,298	$93,298	$93,298	$106,500	$106,500
Totals	$615,190	$628,715	$685,851	$825,727	$811,929	$856,929

In addition to university level support, schools and colleges provide funding to support faculty. Support provided at the school/college level often includes start-up packages for labs, faculty development funds to cover expenses for research or conference travel, summer stipends, research assistants as well as chairs, professorships and other forms of release time during the academic year.

The faculty of the university have demonstrated success in the rigorous peer review practices maintained by academic journals and by federal grants made through the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. In recent years, the level of research activity directed toward seeking extramural support has increased significantly. The number of grant proposals submitted for sponsored funding increased from 33 in FY2010 to 56 in FY2012. The university generated $4.6 million of sponsored funding in FY 12 (a substantial increase over the $3.1 million generated in FY11) bringing the total ongoing external funding to above $8.5 million. Proposals to the university's Institutional Review Board increased from 55 in 2010 to 61 in 2011.

In order to strengthen institutional focus and to provide senior-level leadership that will facilitate continuing growth in the area of research support, the university has created and funded the position of Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education. This position is intended to advance the academic excellence of the university and support the development of faculty as scholar-educators by developing, coordinating and stimulating research and creative activity across the eight colleges and schools, enhancing external funding, increasing and diversifying research and creative work, managing technology transfer opportunities, ensuring compliance with appropriate laws and

regulations, and identifying and developing alternate revenue sources, including public-private partnerships.

Seattle University has made a number of other notable investments in the university infrastructure which, while not traditionally considered to be in the category of faculty support, bear significant benefits in terms of developing the institutional capabilities that facilitate and enhance the work of faculty. Examples include the development of an office of Global Engagement, which assists faculty in developing international programming, improvements in university technology capabilities, including the development of an internal office of the Chief Information Officer and the purchase and implementation of a new learning management system (Instructure Canvas).

Supporting Documents

1. Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
2. Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects
3. Office of Faculty Services
4. Junior Faculty Professional Development Grant Program Policy
5. Center for the Study of Justice and Society Faculty Fellows Program
6. Endowed Mission Fund for Faculty and Staff Development in Mission

Recommendation Six

Given the critical importance of information technology to the core operations of this institution, the Evaluation Committee recommends the University acquire adequate expertise within university personnel to plan and manage effectively Information Technology Services whether contracted or not.

At part of its FY12 budget, the university created funding for an internal, senior-level, position of Chief Information Officer and for administrative and professional support necessary for an effectively functioning Office of the CIO. The university conducted a national search for the CIO. This search was highly successful as the university hired Charles Porter as its founding CIO. Mr. Porter served from 1974-2004 as the Managing Partner and CIO for Accenture, a global management consulting, technology and outsourcing services company. In this role, he was responsible for worldwide data and call centers and enterprise technology contracts. He concurrently served as CTO for Accenture technology infrastructure services and in this role was responsible for the architecture, technology direction, and product definition for Accenture's infrastructure outsourcing practice.

Under Mr. Porter's leadership, the university has renegotiated its technology services contract with SunGard Higher Education (now called Ellucian), conducted a comprehensive assessment of the university IT estate, reworked processes for assessing performance and customer satisfaction and made significant progress with key vendors including Microsoft and Cisco. The university has been responsive to the technology needs identified by Mr. Porter, including significant new investments in the fiscal year 2012 and 2013 budgets. The university has undertaken a comprehensive reworking of

the campus card system, purchased new systems for learning management and client relations management, and have begun a comprehensive rehabilitation of our network infrastructure.

Chapter One: Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations

Executive Summary of Eligibility Requirements 2 and 3

2. Authority. The institution is authorized to operate and award degrees as a higher education institution by the appropriate government organization, agency, or governing board as required by the jurisdiction in which it operates.

Seattle University is an independent non-profit institution of higher learning organized and existing under the laws of the state of Washington. It operates under the authority of a Board of Trustees. The university offers undergraduate, graduate, professional and doctoral degrees in a full range of studies with 7,579 students enrolled as of fall 2012.

3. Mission and Core Themes. The institution's mission and core themes are clearly defined and adopted by its governing board(s) consistent with its legal authorization, and are appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education. The institution's purpose is to serve the educational interests of its students and its principal programs lead to recognized degrees. The institution devotes all, or substantially all, of its resources to support its educational mission and core themes.

The mission was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 8, 2003. The strategic priorities were adopted in 2007 and revised in 2011 and 2012. The Board of Trustees approved the strategic priorities and the use of the strategic priorities as core themes. The mission and core themes are concerned with the educational enterprise of the university. The university's principal educational programs lead to recognized degrees. All resources support the mission and core themes.

Standard One: Mission and Core Themes

1.A Mission

1.A.1 The institution has a widely-published mission statement—approved by its governing board—that articulates a purpose appropriate for an institution of higher learning, gives direction for its efforts, and derives from, and is generally understood by, its community.

Mission, Vision, and Values (Approved May 8, 2003 by the Board of Trustees)
Mission: Seattle University is dedicated to educating the whole person, to professional formation, and to empowering leaders for a just and humane world.

Vision: We will be the premier independent university of the Northwest in academic quality, Jesuit Catholic inspiration, and service to society.

Values: Care, academic excellence, diversity, faith, justice, leadership

1.A.2 The institution defines mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations. Guided by that definition, it articulates institutional accomplishments or outcomes that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

Interpretation of Fulfillment of the Mission
The university's mission statement was developed in 2002-2003 through a process consistent with Commission expectations relating to both community involvement and board oversight. This process, outlined in detail in the university's 2010 self-study, was broadly participatory and involved faculty, staff and students. The mission statement was formally approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2003.

The mission of the university gives direction to and is broadly understood by the university community. The mission is widely published, including on the university's website and in marketing materials for prospective students; it is also posted in every building. The mission and strategic priorities guide resource allocation, curriculum development and program review. Recent surveys show that alumni, faculty, staff, and students have high levels of understanding and appreciation of the mission.

The vitality and centrality of the mission of Seattle University has previously been noted by the Commission. The report from the evaluation team that visited Seattle University in October 2010 noted that "it was very clear to the evaluation team that this Mission defines the University, including all its activities, and that the goals (or strategic directions) flow from that Mission and are widely understood by the campus community. Indeed, in the experience of the evaluation team, there is an uncommonly high awareness and deep commitment to the mission on the part of everyone with whom the committee members met."

Articulation of an Acceptable Threshold or Extent of Mission Fulfillment

1) **The graduation rate for undergraduates at Seattle University will exceed the national average for four-year non-for-profit universities.** Graduation rates are a broadly accepted measure of how well institutions serve students, used by institutions, prospective students, and outside agencies to evaluate academic quality as well as the likelihood that a student will succeed in obtaining a degree. The six-year average for all undergraduates is the best high-level indicator; it also permits the university to compare itself to a national peer group.

2) **Seattle University results for seniors participating in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will exceed the average scores for universities in the same Carnegie class by a statistically significant margin for each benchmark.** The NSSE is the most commonly accepted indicator of undergraduate participation in activities associated with high levels of learning, particularly the deep learning that is consistent with the university's mission to educate the whole person. NSSE provides benchmark scores for five areas: 1) Level of academic challenge; 2) Active and collaborative learning; 3) Student-faculty interaction; 4) Enriching educational experiences; and 5) Supportive campus environment.

3) **Seattle University will demonstrate the quality of its professional programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels through successful disciplinary accreditation.** As noted in the 2010 NWCCU evaluation committee report, disciplinary accreditation serves as *prima facie* evidence of educational program effectiveness. It also speaks to the university's mission to provide professional formation. Seattle University will demonstrate the capacity to pursue and obtain disciplinary accreditation for those programs to which such accreditation is appropriate.

4) **Seattle University will be classified as a community engagement institution by the Carnegie Foundation.** This classification is a national and independently evaluated metric of community engagement, outreach, and partnerships.

5) **Seattle University students and alumni will volunteer and participate in the civic realm at rates that exceed available comparison groups by statistically significant margins.** Seattle University provides a wide range of curricular and co-curricular activities that seek to empower leaders for a just and humane world, and the rate at which students participate in these programs is a key metric. For current students, these activities include service learning. The university uses rates of alumni volunteerism and civic engagement as an indicator of the impact of a Seattle University education post-graduation.

1.B Core Themes

1.B.1 The institution identifies core themes that individually manifest essential elements of its mission and collectively encompass its mission.

1.B.2 The institution establishes objectives for each of its core themes and identifies meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement that form the basis for evaluating accomplishment of the objectives of its core themes.

The Board of Trustees (BOT) approved five strategic priorities intended to direct the fulfillment of the university's mission: Academic Excellence; Engaging the World; Catholic, Jesuit Character; Great Student Experience; and Investing in the Excellence of Our Faculty and Staff. In approving these strategic priorities, the BOT directed that these should also serve as core themes for accreditation, consistent with the Commission's definition of core themes as individually manifesting, and collectively encompassing, the mission of the university. The university believes that the integration of strategic planning with self-evaluation strengthens and benefits both processes.

When used in the context of strategic planning, the strategic priorities give shape to areas of future effort and investment. As core themes in Standard 1B, they describe what the university expects to achieve every year. This is consistent with Standard Three, Planning and Implementation.

A special note to evaluators on terminology

The university's general education program is known as the Core Curriculum (or, more simply, "the Core") and has Core learning outcomes. Because this terminology is well-established, the phrase "core theme" from the Commission proved to be confusing to the campus. The university has elected to use the term "strategic priority" rather than "core theme" when talking with the campus about accreditation. Evaluators may find that faculty, staff, and students are unfamiliar with "core themes" and are encouraged to use "strategic priorities" instead.

Core Theme One: Academic Excellence

Brief Description of the Core Theme

The promotion of academic excellence is the key strategic goal of Seattle University. The primary measure of academic excellence is student accomplishment of the university's stipulated learning outcomes. Rigorous and engaging curriculum, a supportive environment, and excellence in teaching and scholarship all contribute to the realization of this goal.

Objectives of the Core Theme

Rigorous and Engaging Curriculum

Objective: The university pursues the delivery of rigorous and engaging curriculum in every degree program.

It is the university's objective that every degree program is of high quality and fulfills its specified learning objectives and outcomes. Upon completion of their programs, students will have acquired the capacities, knowledge and skills appropriate to their disciplines and degree levels. Curriculum will be delivered in such a way that it promotes academic rigor and engaged learning.

Indicators of achievement:

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) scores in four benchmark areas
  Rationale: The NSSE contains benchmark scores in four areas: 1) Level of academic challenge; 2) Active and collaborative learning; 3) Student-faculty interaction; and 4) Enriching educational experiences. NSSE measures the time and effort students put into their education as well as the availability of resources and learning opportunities.

- Disciplinary accreditation of professional programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels
  Rationale: Disciplinary accreditation is a rigorous process that comprehensively addresses the quality and standards of a set of academic programs. The peer review model of disciplinary accreditation is of particular value at the graduate level, where appropriate benchmarking data are less available.

- Achievement of learning outcomes
  Rationale: Student achievement of learning outcomes and objectives is the most fundamental accomplishment of an institution of higher education. The university systematically and comprehensively assesses achievement of those learning outcomes.

- Pre-and post-testing
  Rationale: Seattle University will use pre- and post-testing of undergraduates using national, standardized exams in order to better understand the value added of a Seattle University education through student mastery of learning objectives over a period of time.

Campus Environment and Student Success

Objective: A rigorous academic curriculum is complemented by a supportive campus environment that facilitates students' successful completion of their academic degree programs.

To promote high levels of achievement and learning, rigorous academic programs must be complemented by effective support services and a campus environment that enriches the educational experiences of all students.

Indicators of achievement:

- Graduation rate

Rationale: The graduation rate is a commonly accepted measure of how well institutions serve students. It is particularly useful as national and peer data are readily available.

- NSSE benchmark: Supportive campus environment
  Rationale: This benchmark area includes questions on administrative personnel and offices, perceptions that the university has a substantial commitment to student academic success, and time devoted to co-curricular activities, among other topics.

- Adult Student Priorities Survey
  Rationale: The Adult Student Priorities Survey, administered to graduate and professional students, describes the student perspective of the campus environment. It covers a range of applicable topics, including advising, academic services, the campus climate, and service excellence.

Supporting Excellence in Teaching and Scholarship
Objective: The quality of students' academic experience is enhanced through working with faculty members who are supported in their roles as educators and scholars.

Excellence in academic programming requires that faculty successfully fulfill multiple responsibilities, including teaching, scholarship, and service. The university supports the career development of individual faculty members by offering enhanced support for scholarship (including research and creative work) and teaching.

Indicators of achievement:

- Quality and impact of faculty publications
  Rationale: Citation analysis is used to assess the impact of faculty publications, while the acceptance rates of the journals that publish articles by Seattle University faculty indicate quality.

- Evidence for Rigorous and Engaging Pedagogy
  Rationale: In the absence of industry-standard direct measures of teaching effectiveness that work across a range of disciplines, the university relies on student learning as an indicator of the skill of its faculty as educators. The indicators for the Rigorous and Engaging Curriculum objective, especially student achievement of learning outcomes and pre- and post-testing, support this objective as well.

Core Theme Two: Engaging the World

Brief Description of the Core Theme
Education at Seattle University is characterized by the deep and respectful engagement of students and the university in its global and local communities. Seattle University advances global education by strengthening institutional leadership, commitment and capacity in this area. The university

leverages its urban character and enhances the learning of students by making a stronger commitment to the wider community through the Seattle University Youth Initiative.

Objectives of the Core Theme

Service Learning and Community Engagement
Objective: Seattle University provides students with opportunities for transformational service learning and promotes commitment to community action.

Through service learning (curricular and co-curricular), the university provides students with opportunities to develop respectful relationships with a variety of communities. The primary way the university will promote this within its diverse local neighborhood is through the Seattle University Youth Initiative, which establishes sustained connections to the immediate community.

Indicators of achievement:

- Number of students who participate in service learning
  Rationale: A significant proportion of faculty members integrate service learning into their courses, thereby reaching a large number of students. Co-curricular programming provides another avenue for involvement. The university measures one aspect of success through the total number of participants.

- Levels of commitment to community action
  Rationale: Seattle University will measure the effectiveness of this objective through one or more surveys or focus groups that assess the attitudes and actions of its students related to community service. Development of an instrument is underway.

Global Engagement
Objective: Seattle University promotes student development of intercultural competencies through international programs and activities.

The university seeks and promotes global engagement through study abroad, faculty exchange programs, international internships and international community service.

Indicators of achievement:

- Number of students who participate in education abroad
  Rationale: One of the most impactful ways for students to engage the world is through international experience, and this is enhanced through organized education abroad experiences.

- Levels of intercultural competencies
  Rationale: Seattle University will assess effectiveness through one or more instruments, such as the Global Perspectives Inventory (which measures cognitive awareness, intrapersonal

perspectives and interpersonal attitudes) or the Intercultural Development Inventory (which measures cross-cultural sensitivity and behaviors).

Inspiring Dialogue
Objective: Seattle University fosters a dynamic campus environment through dialogue about the cultural, social, and religious complexities of the contemporary world.

The university offers events and programs that promote active and deep conversation within the diverse campus community about topics pertinent to the contemporary world, including cultural, social and religious challenges.

Indicator of achievement:

- Frequency of significant student engagement with people of different perspectives
  Rationale: The university works to inspire dialogue about global issues; through surveys, the university ascertains whether or not students have had significant conversations with people of perspectives different from their own.

- Levels of intercultural competencies
  Rationale: Seattle University will assess effectiveness through one or more instruments, such as the Global Perspectives Inventory (which measures cognitive awareness, intrapersonal perspectives and interpersonal attitudes) or the Intercultural Development Inventory (which measures cross-cultural sensitivity and behaviors).

Core Theme Three: Catholic, Jesuit Character

Brief Description of the Core Theme
Seattle University is Catholic and Jesuit in its origin, mission and vision. As a Catholic institution, it shares with other Christian traditions a belief in the saving work of Jesus Christ. The university respects other faith traditions and recognizes that many people committed to the transformation of society operate out of humanistic philosophical convictions. Seattle University prepares student leaders for a just and humane world. To accomplish this goal, the university hires faculty and staff and recruits students committed to its humanistic, Catholic and Jesuit mission and educates them to understand and put in practice the deepest principles of that mission. The university sees in its Catholic Jesuit mission a call both to understand Catholic thought and culture and to promote ecumenical and interreligious dialogue.

Objectives of the Core Theme

Leadership Formation
Objective: The university prepares leaders for a just and humane world through an integrated program of formation for leadership.

Leadership formation is a component of Seattle University's mission and is recognized in the university learning objectives. This area of responsibility is shared by multiple divisions, requiring collaboration and integration in order to be most effective. The university's mission statement assigns purpose to leadership in the sense of how it can effect change to promote a more just and humane world. The program of leadership formation reflects this purpose; therefore this objective supports the core theme of Catholic, Jesuit Character as well as Great Student Experience. The cross-theme approach lends strength to this objective, as it does to the integration of programs located in multiple divisions.

Indicator of achievement:

- Student achievement of leadership as a component of the university's learning objectives
  Rationale: University-level learning objectives are broken into multiple components, each of which is individually assessed. Leadership is one of these named components and the university uses the framework for assessment of learning objectives to assess achievement of the leadership formation objective.

Recruitment, Hiring, and Education for Mission

Objective: Faculty, staff, and students are familiar with and committed to the fundamental values of the university.

Seattle University has a strong campus-wide commitment to its mission. Faculty and staff are knowledgeable about the mission, how it relates to their work, and how it guides the operations and direction of the university. Seattle University benefits from this common understanding in a number of ways, including a clear institutional identity, the ability to recruit and retain employees who are a good mission fit, and a sense of community and common good. This objective focuses on promoting and expanding mission commitment. The more clearly Seattle University can accomplish this, the easier it will be to recruit, admit and hire a community of people motivated to contribute to and benefit from its educational and spiritual vision.

Indicator of achievement:

- Level of mission commitment
  Rationale: Through surveys of faculty, staff and students, the university measures the degree to which the community understands and is committed to the mission. This includes knowledge of the mission statement itself as well as behavior that demonstrates commitment.

Ecumenical and Interfaith Dialogue

Objective: Seattle University works to increase understanding and dialogue between different faith traditions.

Seattle University embraces a diversity of belief systems on campus, and the global society in which students will live and work is filled with different perspectives. The university encourages ecumenical and interfaith dialogue as a way to promote understanding of similarities as well as differences.

Indicator of achievement:

- Levels of meaningful dialogue
  Rationale: Through surveys, the university will evaluate the extent to which students, faculty, and staff engage in meaningful dialogue and find it contributes to their understanding of different faith traditions.

Understanding of Catholic Thought and Culture
Objective: The university promotes an understanding and appreciation of Catholic thought and culture.

As a Catholic institution, Seattle University belongs to a wider community. Whether or not faculty, staff, and students are themselves Catholic, the university works to build an understanding of what Catholicism is and how it is manifested in a religiously diverse educational community. This objective is pursued through educational and spiritual programs available on the campus and in other settings.

Indicator of achievement:

- Growth in understanding and appreciation of Catholic thought and culture
  Rationale: The university will ascertain through surveys, focus groups, and other methods whether faculty, staff and students find that the university has contributed to their understanding and appreciation of Catholic thought and culture.

Core Theme Four: Great Student Experience

Brief Description of the Core Theme
The university provides a high quality campus life through a student experience that cultivates community and pride, advances an inclusive learning environment, promotes holistic wellness, nurtures faith formation, fosters leadership in service of others and supports professional formation.

Objectives of the Core Theme

Leadership Formation
Objective: The university prepares leaders for a just and humane world through an integrated program of formation for leadership.

Leadership formation is a component of Seattle University's mission and is recognized in university learning objectives. This area of responsibility is shared by multiple divisions, requiring collaboration and integration in order to be most effective. This objective focuses on developing programs and services as well as ensuring that they work together to foster leadership within the student body. It is a shared objective between two core themes: Catholic, Jesuit Character and Great Student Experience.

Indicator of achievement:

- Student achievement of leadership as a component of the university's learning objectives
  Rationale: University-level learning objectives are broken into multiple components, each of which is individually assessed. Leadership is one of these named components and the university uses the framework for assessment of learning objectives to assess achievement of the leadership formation objective.

Engagement in Community

Objective: To promote a community that enables and supports students, the university offers programs that cultivate a sense of belonging and compassion.

This objective acknowledges that leadership and its cultivation do not exist in a vacuum. A vibrant campus community promotes student growth as well as connection. Community-based learning, such as is found in cohort programs, along with a variety of co-curricular programs, are examples of ways the university works to build community.

Indicators of achievement:

- Student participation in activities
  Rationale: Communities are formed through purposeful interactions; participation rates in university-sponsored activities measure the frequency of those interactions.

- Student perception of inclusion within the university community
  Rationale: The university evaluates students' connection to the university through surveys that ascertain students' sense of belonging to a community.

Core Theme Five: Investing in the Excellence of Our Faculty and Staff

Brief Description of the Core Theme

Essential to the growth and development of Seattle University as a great independent university in the Northwest is a commitment to invest in the excellence of faculty and staff. In the spirit of the mission, the university commits itself to a diverse work environment and campus culture marked by care, collaboration and innovation that challenges and supports faculty and staff to perform at the highest levels. Areas of emphasis include compensation and benefits, professional and personal development opportunities, advances in technology and upgrades to the physical campus.

Objectives of the Core Theme

Faculty and Staff Compensation

Objective: The university's system of compensation enables it to attract and retain qualified faculty and staff.

The delivery of the university's mission and first four core themes depends on its faculty and staff; without dedicated and successful faculty and staff, the university could not operate. Compensation is central to the university's ability to attract and retain well-qualified faculty and staff.

Indicator of achievement:

- Benchmarked compensation and market analysis
  Rationale: The university evaluates its compensation against peer institutions and local labor markets to ascertain whether faculty and staff are remunerated at a competitive rate.

Operational Effectiveness

Objective: The university promotes operational effectiveness through excellence in faculty and staff performance.

The university supports and enables its employees to function at high levels. It regularly examines its practices and tools, including technology, provides professional development and training opportunities, and seeks continuous improvement.

Indicators of achievement:

- Achievement of core themes
  Rationale: The effectiveness of faculty and staff is demonstrated through the accomplishment of the other four core themes.

- Annual performance appraisals/professional reviews.
  Rationale: The university uses annual appraisals/reviews to assess and improve each individual's performance. The performance appraisal system is designed to link an individual's responsibilities to larger institutional objectives and to provide specific goals and professional development paths. The university reviews the percentage of faculty and staff members who undergo appraisals and updates the performance appraisal system each year to better meet individual and institutional needs.

- Use of technology to improve business practices
  Rationale: The university deploys technical solutions in areas that stand to benefit the most from improved efficiency, greater security or expanded functionality.

Chapter Two: Resources and Capacity

Executive Summary of Eligibility Requirements 4 through 21

4. Operational focus and independence. The institution's programs and services are predominantly concerned with higher education. The institution has sufficient organizational and operational independence to be held accountable and responsible for meeting the Commission's standards and eligibility requirements.

Seattle University's programs and services are predominately concerned with higher education. As an independently incorporated non-profit institution of higher education, the university can meet and be held accountable to the Commission's standards and requirements.

5. Non-discrimination. The institution is governed and administered with respect for the individual in a nondiscriminatory manner while responding to the educational needs and legitimate claims of the constituencies it serves as determined by its charter, its mission, and its core themes.

Seattle University is governed and administered with respect for the individual in a nondiscriminatory manner as demonstrated by the mission, vision, and values statements of the University as well as the University statement on diversity which describes a beneficial impact of a diverse community on academic and co-curricular programming.

Additionally, the university's non-discrimination policy is compliant with local, state and federal regulations and outlines expectations regarding respect for individuals. Reported violations of the non-discrimination policy are addressed in a timely and systematic way which is compliant with legal responsibilities and institutional values honoring diversity and inclusion. The university has processes in place to address complaints or reports of discrimination and harassment which are compliant with the institutional policy as well as the university's Statement on Diversity. Institutional policies, procedures and practices are compliant with the nondiscrimination policy.

6. Institutional integrity. The institution establishes and adheres to ethical standards in all of its operations and relationships.

Seattle University is committed to just and ethical conduct in all areas of its management and operation. The university conducts annual independent audits of its financial statements and 403(b) retirement plan and completes the IRS Form 990 document in order to ensure accuracy. Additionally, the university has established professional expectations and ethical standards for faculty, staff and students and developed systems to address complaints and grievances in a fair and timely manner.

7. Governing board. The institution has a functioning government board responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and each unit within a multiple-unit institution to ensure that

the institution's missions and core themes are being achieved. The governing board has at least five voting members, a majority of whom have no contractual or employment relationship or personal financial interest with the institution.

Seattle University's Board of Trustees is a 35-member voting board that serves as the university's governing board. The board has final responsibility for the governance of the university in all matters and ensuring the university's mission, core themes and strategic priorities are being achieved.

A majority of members of the Board of Trustees do not have a contractual, employment or financial interest in the university. The university's *Bylaws* address potential conflicts of interest by members of the board. Trustees are advised not to put themselves in a position in which self-interest conflicts with any of their duties. Trustees will not be permitted to make a profit from any self-dealing transaction, whether acting individually or acting as an agent, without demonstrating full disclosure and fair dealing. In addition, the board has adopted its own *Conflict of Interest Policy* requiring trustees to disclose in writing all financial or other interests that constitute a possible conflict of interest.

8. Chief executive officer. The institution employs a chief executive officer who is appointed by the governing board and whose full-time responsibility is to the institution. Neither the chief executive officer nor an executive officer of the institution chairs the institution's governing board.

The President of Seattle University is elected by the Board of Trustees and serves as the university's chief executive officer. The President has the general charge and control of all the university's business affairs and properties and is responsible for implementing and administering university policy, subject to the ultimate governing authority of the board and consistent with the university's *Bylaws*. All university administrative officers and offices are accountable to the President. The President does not serve as the chair of the Board of Trustees.

9. Administration. In addition to a chief executive officer, the institution employs a sufficient number of qualified administrators who provide effective leadership and management for the institution's major support and operational functions and work collaboratively across institutional functions and units to foster fulfillment of the institution's mission and achievement of its core themes.

Seattle University employs a sufficient number of qualified administrators, who provide effective leadership and management for the institution's major educational, support and operational functions and work collaboratively across institutional functions and units to foster fulfillment of the institution's mission and accomplishment of its core theme objectives. Seattle University defines an administrator as a faculty or staff member whose primary responsibility is college, school, division, department, or function leadership and employs a sufficient number of qualified incumbents in these roles.

A university wide update of position descriptions in 2011 included the assessment and establishment of standards of minimum qualifications for all staff positions, independent of the incumbent's credentials and experience that are aligned with external national market information. Subsequently, all currently employed staff administrators meet the minimum qualifications established for the positions they hold. Administrators who also have a tenured or tenure-track faculty position are referred to as "faculty administrators" and these positions outline a similar minimum qualification requirement met by all current faculty administrators. Establishing and maintaining minimum qualifications and ensuring administrators meet them demonstrate those employed in administrator roles are appropriately qualified for their positions.

Effective leadership in administrator positions is defined as the ability to efficiently execute functional responsibilities and to collaborate across divisions to carry out the university's mission and strategic plans.

10. Faculty. Consistent with its mission and core themes, the institution employs and regularly evaluates the performance of appropriately qualified faculty in sufficient in number to achieve its educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever offered and however delivered.

Seattle University employs highly-qualified faculty to meet the teaching, research/scholarship and service needs of the university, its students, and other stakeholders. The University ensures the qualifications of its faculty through its hiring, professional development, and performance evaluation processes. Upon hire, faculty members are required to submit official academic transcripts and degrees are verified through a national clearinghouse. As of fall 2012, 99% of the 323 tenured and tenure-track faculty and 66% of the 182 full-time non-tenure-track faculty had earned terminal degrees in their fields of study.

Each full-time faculty member is evaluated on an annual basis at Seattle University. The *Faculty Handbook* and college/school guidelines outline the process and expected components and areas of professional activity that are to be assessed through annual evaluations, mid-probationary and promotion and tenure evaluations for tenure-track faculty members and promotion evaluations for associate professors who petition for promotion to professor.

11. Educational Program. The institution provides one or more educational programs which include appropriate content and rigor consistent with its mission and core themes. The educational program(s) culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes, and lead to collegiate-level degree(s) with degree designation consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

Educational programs at Seattle University lead to bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees or to certificates in recognized fields of study. The length and requirements of the programs are consistent with the standards within American higher education and with the mission and standards of the

university. All programs have clearly identified student learning outcomes that are assessed on a five year cycle. An extensive program review process ensures that programs deliver a quality education consonant with university expectations.

12. General Education and Related Program. The institution's baccalaureate degree programs and/or academic or transfer associate degree programs require a substantial and coherent component of general education as a prerequisite to or an essential element of the programs offered. All other associate degree programs (e.g., applied, specialized, or technical) and programs of study of either 30 semester or 45 quarter credits or more for which certificates are granted contain a recognizable core of related instruction or general education with identified outcomes in the areas of communication, computation, and human relations that align with and support program goals or intended outcomes. Bachelor and graduate degree programs also require a planned program of major specialization or concentration.

The undergraduate curriculum is grounded in the University Core, which delivers a broad education within the arts, humanities, and sciences. The current Core is in its last year (2012-2013) is on schedule to be replaced by a new outcomes-based Core Curriculum. The new Core, likewise anchored in the Jesuit educational tradition and reflective of the university's learning outcomes, provides students with a solid grounding in disciplinary based inquiry and examination of global issues. The general education component is accompanied by in-depth exploration in a student's major. This Core culminates in a senior-level interdisciplinary and synthesis courses and is complemented within the degree program by specialized courses comprising a major.

13. Library and Information Resources. Consistent with its mission and core themes, the institution maintains and/or provides access to library and information resources with an appropriate level of currency, depth, and breadth to support the institution's programs and services wherever offered and however delivered.

The university's two libraries maintain and continue to build collections of information and knowledge resources -- tangible and digital, on-site and online – sufficient in currency, depth, breadth, and diversity to support the full range of the university's academic programs and much of the scholarly and research activity of students and faculty. Lemieux Library's holdings, as of June 2011, include more than 287,000 print and periodical volumes, 6,500 media items, and online access to over 17,000 e-books and 47,000 full text e-journals. The Law Library maintains a collection of legal resources as required by the American Bar Association for accredited law schools. Estimated law library holdings in June 2012 included: 55,300 print titles, 109,561 microform titles, 32,645 electronic titles, and 2,784 non-book titles (e.g. videos, CD-ROMS). The law library's total title count for the same period was 200,290 and total volumes and volume equivalents was 398,066. Special attention is paid to the currency of legal resources to ensure that patrons have the most up-to-date legal information. Generous hours of access to the on-campus physical facilities, and their collections and services, are supplemented by remote access to the large body of electronic resources through a secure proxy server, enabling easy access for legitimate SU constituents from nearly any

off-campus location at any time. Both collections are continually assessed, managed, and built through collaborative processes involving liaison librarians and faculty who apply documented collection development policies, selection criteria, and generally accepted business practices. Regular librarian interactions with students, through class-based instruction and individual research consultations, contribute to an awareness of needs and the development of the collections. Periodical usage and satisfactions surveys provide additional input to library managers on collections strengths and the need for new or additional resources.

In recognition of the contemporary reality that no single library can expect to acquire or provide access to all the resources required to support the curricular and research needs of its primary clientele, SU's libraries employ a blend of locally-owned resources and access to the collections of other libraries. More than 28 million book and media items held by the 39 members of the Orbis Cascade Alliance consortium are accessible to SU students, faculty, and staff through a shared online catalog and regular courier delivery service. In FY 2011, 6,356 items were borrowed by Seattle University patrons from Alliance libraries. The libraries also provide traditional interlibrary loan services, managed and tracked with ILLiad Resource Sharing Management software, as well as various types of document delivery through commercial services and direct purchasing from publishers.

Both libraries offer programs of instruction and research support, face-to-face and technologically mediated, that help to ensure that their collections of information and knowledge resources are introduced to students and faculty (in anticipation, and at the point, of need) and that these library users develop the ability to evaluate and user the resources productively.

14. Physical and Technological Infrastructure. The institution provides the physical and technological infrastructure necessary to achieve its mission and core themes.

Seattle University's physical and technological infrastructure enables achievement of the mission and core themes. The campus, located on 50 acres near downtown Seattle, has approximately 2.1 million square feet in 37 buildings that include 635,000 square feet of academic spaces spread throughout 14 buildings. The main campus mall is organized around the three tenets of Jesuit education: spiritual, academic, and personal growth. The Chapel of St. Ignatius is the spiritual center of the campus; Lemieux Library and McGoldrick Learning Commons defines the university's academic core; while the Student Center fosters the personal development of students. The university provides housing for 26.8% of the student population throughout 8 residential facilities (41% of undergraduates). The Connolly Complex and two athletic fields support the university's athletic, recreational and fitness programs. The Lee Center for the Arts is a focal point for theatre and arts programs. The campus grounds, with its named gardens and significant plantings, pond and quad surrounding the fountain, provide places for learning, reflection, gathering, community and recreation. The university's mission and core themes are reflected in the planning, development, and management of campus buildings and grounds.

The university creates, renovates, refreshes, and leases facilities necessary to the continuation of key academic and operational activities in support of the core themes. Such infrastructure needs have been identified through strategic planning processes and collaborative outreach to constituents and are prioritized within the institution's Ten Year Capital Plan. The Space Governance Committee provides oversight of processes and timelines developed to more equitably analyze and reallocate space on campus within the context of the core themes. The institution continues to address deferred maintenance needs in both its regular annual operations and long term planning activities.

Beyond physical capital needs, every department of the institution controls or has access to designated equipment funding. Academic departments budget, specify, and maintain equipment that meets the requirements of their curricula and divisional departments are equipped to fulfill their responsibilities. Every department and division maximizes their resources to enable the university to accomplish the goals of the core themes.

Seattle University allocates approximately 5% of its budget to technology, covering maintenance of current infrastructure as well as new projects selected to meet emerging needs. Centrally provided information technology services are governed by a contract and are regularly evaluated. The university hired an internal chief information officer in 2011 to ensure that technology meets university needs. Evaluation of proposed programs and services includes consideration of technology needs; this ensures that new functions have the technology necessary to be successful. Parts of the university's infrastructure, particularly the network, are increasingly inadequate and require updating.

15. Academic Freedom. The institution maintains an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom and independence exist. Faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general.

Intellectual freedom and independence are important academic values at Seattle University, and are guaranteed through the Seattle University *Faculty Handbook* which can only be changed through formal action by the university Board of Trustees. The Handbook sets forth the university's policy on academic freedom as essential to the life of the university and critical to the effective work of the scholar-teacher. It is quoted in full below.

> 10.1 Academic Freedom
> Seattle University values academic freedom as essential to its life and growth as a University. Every scholar-teacher has both the right and the duty to participate freely in the task of searching after and sharing truth in his/her academic discipline. The University actively seeks to have a diversity of ideas examined thoughtfully and in depth by its faculty.
>
> More specifically, the University supports the following statements on academic freedom:

a) Teachers are free to discuss their academic subjects, including their broadest implications, in a climate of openness, freedom and mutual respect joined with a respect for the character and aims of Seattle University as described in its Mission Statement.

b) Faculty members are entitled to undertake research and to publish their results freely and without fear of censorship. Opinions and hypotheses, appropriately so labeled, deserve similar protection.

c) As citizens, faculty members are entitled to speak and act freely as members of the civic community but must avoid giving the impression that they speak for Seattle University on matters of public policy

The policy declares the freedom of faculty to discuss their academic subjects, including their broadest implications, in a climate of openness, freedom and mutual respect, states that faculty members are entitled to undertake research and publish results freely and without fear of censorship. It also affirms that the university actively seeks to have a diversity of ideas examined thoughtfully and in depth by its faculty.

16. Admissions. The institution publishes its student admission policy which specifies the characteristics and qualifications appropriate for its programs, and it adheres to that policy in its admissions procedures and practices.

At the undergraduate level, a holistic review of all applicants is emphasized. Typically, students with above a 3.0 high school GPA are admitted; appeals for applicants who fall below the typical admissions standards are presented to an Admission Review Committee. High school and college transfer transcripts are reviewed for foundation course selection and grading to support the review for success in programs in which prior performance can provide an indication of success in a chosen major such as Nursing, Engineering and some Sciences. A component of Seattle University's core themes is a commitment to global learning through international engagement, thus there is a focus on recruitment of international students. Non-native English speakers must demonstrate a high degree of English language proficiency.

Graduate level and School of Law admission follow program specific admission guidelines and may include grade point average and course specific grade review at the undergraduate level as well as standardized test scores such as the GRE, LSAT or GMAT. These data factors are combined with review of letters of reference and/or applicant essays for a holistic review for program admission.

17. Public information. The institution publishes in a catalog and/or on a website current and accurate information regarding: its mission and core themes; admission requirements and procedures; grading policy; information on academic programs and courses; names, titles and academic credentials of administrators and faculty; rules and regulations for student conduct ;

rights and responsibilities of students; tuition, fees, and other program costs; refund policies and procedures; opportunities and requirements for financial aid; and the academic calendar.

The university publishes online only graduate and undergraduate catalogs each year. The catalogs are fully searchable and provide complete and accessible information on the university's mission, vision and values, admission requirements and procedures, the grading scheme and meaning of grades, details on academic programs and courses, names, titles and academic credentials of faculty and deans, but not on cabinet level administrators, rules and regulations for student conduct , rights and responsibilities of students, tuition, fees and other academic charges, refund policies, opportunities and requirements for financial aid and a pointer to the current academic calendar. The School of Law produces a paper student handbook in lieu of a catalog. This handbook provides the range of information noted for the undergraduate and graduate catalog. Each student is provided a student handbook upon admission and is oriented to the contents during first year orientation. All catalog and handbook information is similarly located on the Seattle University website, which is fully searchable online.

18. Financial Resources. The institution demonstrates financial stability with sufficient cash flow and, as appropriate, reserves to support its programs and services. Financial planning reflects available funds, realistic development of financial resources, and appropriate risk management to ensure short-term solvency and long-term financial sustainability.

Seattle University has a long history of financial stability with balanced operating budgets in every year since the 1970's. The institution's operating budget grew by 15.6 percent from FY2009 to FY2013, with expendable net assets increasing by nearly $23.8 million in that same period. The institution's endowment was valued at $177 million as of June 30, 2012.

The institution is "A" rated with a stable outlook by Standard & Poor's and it anticipates no difficulties in meeting future debt service needs. The university can demonstrate deliberate infusion of funds to capital reserves through both regular budget activities and allocation of surplus operating dollars. The university monitors several financial ratios to ascertain economic health and continues to show consistent, positive progress on all metrics.

The institution has a history of increasingly sophisticated and successful gift cultivation and it has maintained access to third party credit since the 1970's, though it has never accessed these funds to support operating expenses. Operational contingencies exist to deal with short term financial needs and long term financial risk is monitored and regularly reviewed by the institution's executive management. Business risk is mitigated in the short term with appropriate insurance coverage, clear personnel accountabilities, and operational processes and procedures.

19. Financial Accountability. For each year of operation, the institution undergoes an external financial audit, in a reasonable timeframe, by professionally qualified personnel in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Results from the audit, including findings and management

letter recommendations, are considered in a timely, appropriate, and comprehensive manner by the administration and governing board.

The university has consistently received an unqualified opinion on the independent audit of its financial statements. All financial activities area administered in compliance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), pronouncements of the Financial Standards Accounting Board (FASB), and applicable federal and state law.

The Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees provides oversight of matters related to the audits and financial statements of the university including review of management letters. University administration is informed of and reviews general audit activities and the Board of Trustees formally affirms the annual financial statements. Audits of institutional resources will continue to be made public and communicated as appropriate, with annual financial statements posted to the university's public website.

20. Disclosure. The institution accurately discloses to the Commission all information the Commission may require to carry out its evaluation and accreditation functions.

Seattle University accurately discloses to the commission all information the Commission may require to carry out its evaluation and accreditation functions. Beyond this, the university endeavors to function as a good partner to the commission. Where the university is unsure how particular opportunities or potential activities may impact accreditation, it has made a practice of reaching out proactively to the commission, sharing critical information and together determining appropriate steps. Recent examples involve the development of our Doctor of Nursing Practice program, and expansion of online education in the School of Theology.

21. Relationship with the Accreditation Commission. The institution accepts the standards and related policies of the Commission and agrees to comply with these standards and policies as currently stated or as modified in accordance with Commission policy. Further, the institution agrees that the Commission may, at its discretion, make known the nature of any action, positive or negative, regarding the institution's status with the Commission to any agency or members of the public requesting such information.

Seattle University accepts the standards and related policies of the Commission and agrees to comply with these standards and policies as currently stated or as modified in accordance with Commission policy. Further, the university agrees that the Commission may, at its discretion, make known the nature of any action, positive or negative, regarding our status with the Commission to any agency or members of the public requesting such information.

Standard Two: Resources and Capacity

2.A Governance

2.A.1 The institution demonstrates an effective and widely understood system of governance with clearly-defined authority, roles, and responsibilities. Its decision-making structures and processes make provision for the consideration of the views of faculty, staff, administrators, and students on matters in which they have a direct and reasonable interest.

Seattle University's Board of Trustees serves as the university's governing board, having final responsibility for the governance of the university in all matters. The Board delegates to the President and other officers the authority to direct the university, subject to the ultimate determination of the Board and consistent with the *Restated Articles of the Corporation* and amended *Bylaws of Seattle University*.

Stephen V. Sundborg, S.J. is the President of Seattle University. The President is the university's chief executive officer and has the general charge and control of all its business affairs and properties, subject to the ultimate determination and responsibility of the Board of Trustees and consistent with the university's *Bylaws*. The President leads the university's efforts to achieve its five strategic priorities—academic excellence; Catholic, Jesuit character; engaging the world; great student experience and investing in the excellence of our faculty and staff.

The Board of Trustees and President are part of Seattle University's shared system of governance which utilizes the key administrative, faculty, staff, student and alumni positions and committees listed below to effectively run the university and promote transparency, inclusion and debate. Individuals holding administrative positions or serving on committees are informed of their roles and responsibilities during their respective recruitment, hiring and orientation process.

Senior-Level Administration

Executive Vice President: The Executive Vice President serves on the President's Cabinet and oversees the divisions of Student Development, University Advancement, Mission and Ministry, University Counsel, Human Resources, Athletics and Marketing Communications.

Provost: The Provost is the chief academic officer at the university, directs the Division of Academic Affairs and serves on the President's Cabinet. Academic Affairs encompasses the university's schools and colleges, libraries, enrollment and offices supporting academic achievement, faculty affairs and global engagement. The Provost is responsible for academic planning and budgeting; leadership of the Deans' Council; recruitment and development of faculty and support of teaching, scholarship and service activities of the faculty; faculty governance; program development and promotion and recruitment of a talented and diverse student body.

Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs: The Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs is responsible for financial reporting, treasury operations, facilities management, risk management, and endowment management of Seattle University. The Vice President oversees the following offices: Controller's Office; Facilities Services; University Budget Office.

Corporation Counsel: The Corporation Counsel advises the President and the Board of Trustees regarding the legal affairs of the University.

President's Cabinet: The President's Cabinet is comprised of the university's nine Vice Presidents and the Provost. This is the senior decision-making team that makes critical decisions consequential to the institution as a whole.

President's Advisory Council: The President's Advisory Council is an advisory group of senior-level administrators including the President's Cabinet and the deans of the university. The council provides an opportunity for the President to receive and share information and obtain advice from key administrators on issues of importance to the university.

Faculty

Academic Assembly: Academic Assembly is the elected body through which the university faculty participates in decisions involving academic university-wide matters, as well as areas that influence student learning. Such matters include, among other things, academic quality, terms of faculty service, curricula that require coordination across programs, strategic planning, budgets and physical facilities.

Deans' Council: The Deans' Council is a leadership group of Academic Affairs. The council is chaired by the Provost and comprised of the eight deans of the university's schools and colleges, Vice Provost, Vice President for Enrollment Management, associate provosts, Assistant Provost for Faculty and Business Affairs, and University Librarian. The Deans' Council administers the common elements of school and college operations within university policy and serves as a forum on matters pertaining to the schools and colleges; establishes the specific operating policies and procedures required to administer the instructional program; monitors the execution of policies and procedures; and recommends policy changes to appropriate committees and officers in matters common to schools and colleges. The Deans' Council is a key advisory body in matters of administrating university policy common to schools and colleges and may make recommendations to the Provost regarding university-level academic policy.

Staff and Mid-Level Administration

Leadership Summit: The Leadership Summit provides an opportunity to bring together key members of the faculty, staff and administration to share relevant data and information about the state of the university and to discuss ways to most effectively engage with key challenges and

opportunities. The Leadership Summit has the authority to share information and advise the President and the Cabinet.

Council of Administrators: The Council of Administrators is an advisory group of university directors appointed by the President and representing diverse areas of the university. The council provides an opportunity for the President to receive information and obtain advice on issues of importance to the University from directors of various program areas across the university and provide a forum for sharing information among these directors

Students

Student Government of Seattle University (SGSU): SGSU is the elected representation of the university undergraduate student body. SGSU represents and advocates for the needs and views of undergraduate students, engages students in university decisions, supports student involvement on campus and promotes university spirit. SGSU annually updates the Board regarding student issues and concerns. Additionally, representatives of SGSU attend meetings of the Board to ensure that the views and judgments of students are heard and considered as appropriate in matters that move through the governance process to the Board.

Graduate Student Council (GSC): GSC is the representative group for all graduate students at the University. GSC supports the development of a diverse graduate student body and supports the mission of the University. It advocates for services that better meet the needs of graduate students and serves as a funding source for student-organized graduate events. Representatives of GSC attend meetings of the Board to ensure that the views and judgments of graduate students are heard and considered as appropriate in matters that move through the governance process to the Board.

Student Bar Association (SBA): SBA is the governing organization of the law school student body. SBA is headed by an elected group of student representative—the SBA Council. SBA's primary role is to provide a collective voice on issues facing law students. SBA also organizes a variety of educational and social events and provides funding, governance and logistical support to the student organizations within the law school.

Residence Hall Association (RHA): RHA serves as the voice for the needs of student residents. RHA is an organization comprised of all university residents focused on creating a seamless living and learning environment. RHA utilizes social and educational programming that foster student learning and development through community living in individual halls and throughout the campus.

Alumni and Community Stakeholders

Board of Regents: The Board of Regents is a presidential advisory board comprised of alumni and local business and civic leaders. As advocates, regents promote the university to the greater community and communicate the needs of the community back to the university. Regents are engaged actively in the life of the university attending events, serving as mentors to students, sitting

on college advisory boards and raising funds for university campaigns. There are 60 members on the Board of Regents.

Alumni Board of Governors: The Alumni Board of Governors serves as an advisory board to the university for alumni, educational and community issues. The governors represent the alumni at large and help develop programs, ideas and strategies to establish and promote mutually beneficial endeavors between the university and its alumni.

Shared Governance

Seattle University's system of shared governance relies on an open process to address university-wide matters such as the strategic priority planning process, major hiring decisions, accreditation and certification. The administrator or committee overseeing the matter ensures that the views and judgments of the university's diverse stakeholders with a direct or reasonable interest in the matter are heard and considered. During the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years, the university used an open process on several important matters, including the following:

- The Board of Trustees hired an outside consultant to conduct a presidential leadership assessment. A broad cross section of the university community were invited to participate in facilitated small groups focused on discussing the major challenges facing the university, the leadership characteristics and priorities the President needs to bring to these challenges and how the university can best leverage the President's accomplishments and experience to advance the university's mission and strategic priorities. The consultant compiled the responses and prepared a written report which was distributed to the Board and President.

- In creating the five-year Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan, the university formed a broadly representative steering council which approved the plan after holding open fora (with students, faculty and staff) to give guidance on key enrollment matters, reviewing extensive internal and external data, and considering key strategies and planning scenarios. The President and Cabinet approved a final scenario presented by the steering council and the complete plan was provided to and endorsed by the Boart of Trustees. The University released an executive summary of the plan to the campus community and held open fora to discuss the highlights and respond to questions about related enrollment matters. Feedback to the plan was consistently positive.

- The Provost formed the University Core Revision Committee in January 2010 with three faculty members serving as co-chairs. The co-chairs chose other members of the committee in consultation with the Provost and the Deans to provide broad representation from the university community. Committee members, the majority of whom were faculty, represented the four major undergraduate schools, the Academic Assembly, Student Development Division, and SGSU. Additionally, the Registrar and the Dean of Admissions served as ex-officio members.

The Provost charged the committee with creating a new outcomes-based core curriculum rooted in the university's heritage of Jesuit Catholic education and running a transparent, broadly consultative process.

- Following the approval of a new university core curriculum in May of 2011, the university established a University Core Implementation Committee in fall of 2011. The committee is chaired by the faculty Director of the University Core and assisted by two faculty co-chairs. Additional committee members were chosen in consultation with the Provost and the Deans to provide broad representation from the university community. Committee members, the majority of whom are faculty, represent the four major undergraduate schools, the Academic Assembly, Student Development Division, Student Academic Services, the Library, Registrar, Institutional Research, Information Technology, and SGSU. The committee is charged with implementing the new university core curriculum in a way faithful to the approved design, that is feasible and functional, and that is characterized by clear and transparent criteria and governance.

- The President held a quarterly noon forum open to all members of the university community to update the campus on the latest developments of the university and answer questions.

- Strategic planning processes, including in 2007-08, 2010-2011, and 2012-2013, include opportunities for the campus to learn about the process and provide input.

- Seattle University conducted a national search for a new Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs. Part of the process involved the Executive Vice President setting up open meetings for the campus community to meet the final candidates, ask questions and complete evaluations.

- Human Resources organized open fora to address changes to the university's compensation and benefits package for faculty and staff.

- During the university's NCAA certification cycle, the chair of the steering committee organized open fora for campus stakeholders to review the university's self-study report, comment on its findings an provide feedback about the role of intercollegiate athletics at the university.

Supporting Documents

1. *Restated Articles of the Corporation*
2. *Bylaws of Seattle University*

2.A.2 In a multi-unit governance system, the division of authority and responsibility between the system and the institution is clearly delineated. System policies, regulations, and procedures concerning the institution are clearly defined and equitably administered.

Seattle University is not part of a multi-unit governance system. The university's governance structured is described in standard 2.A.1.

2.A.3 The institution monitors its compliance with the Commission's standards for accreditation, including the impact of collective bargaining agreements, legislative actions, and external mandates.

Seattle University is committed to complying with the standards and requirements of all of its accreditation and certification agencies, including the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (Commission).

The university's Vice President for University Planning and Vice Provost heads the Office of University Planning and oversees the ongoing accreditation process with the Commission. University Planning regularly consults with the Commission for clarification on its standards and policies. Additionally, the University has formed a committee comprised of faculty, staff and administrators to assist with researching, drafting and reviewing responses to the accreditation standards.

When appropriate, Seattle University notifies the Commission of revisions to its planning documents or seeks permission to make revisions. In 2011, the university consulted with the Commission on the following three matters:

- Submitted a revised prospectus for the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, which the Commission approved.
- Clarified when distance education programs require approval as substantive changes and notified the Commission that the School of Theology and Ministry programs do not trigger that threshold.
- Consulted with the Commission on the dissolution of the affiliation with the Organization Systems Renewal Master's program.

The university regularly communicates with its deans and administrators and educates them about the Commission's standards and policies to ensure that university departments are knowledgeable and compliant with the specific legislative actions and external mandates impacting their department. For example, in 2011, Student Financial Services, the Registrar, Academic Affairs and University Counsel worked together to ensure the university complied with the Department of Education's new Gainful Employment rules.

University Planning and University Counsel regularly review the Commission's policies and standards to ensure that the university complies with all accreditation requirements. For example, the university's collective bargaining agreements comply with the Commission's requirements and do not interfere with the university's delivery of education.

Governing Board

2.A.4 The institution has a functioning governing board consisting of at least five voting members, a majority of whom have no contractual, employment, or financial interest in the institution. If the institution is governed by a hierarchical structure of multiple boards, the roles, responsibilities, and authority of each board—as they relate to the institution—are clearly defined, widely communicated, and broadly understood.

Seattle University's Board of Trustees is a 35-member voting board that serves as the university's governing board. The Board has final responsibility for the governance of the university in all matters. The *Bylaws* includes policies that ensure continuity and change in the Board membership. The term of office for trustees is four years with the exception of the President, whose term is indefinite. Seattle University is an institution of higher learning inspired by the Jesuit Catholic tradition but operating independent of the Catholic Church or Society of Jesus.

The university's *Bylaws* address potential conflicts of interest by members of the Board of Trustees. Trustees are advised not to put themselves in a position in which self-interest conflicts with any of their duties. Trustees will not be permitted to make a profit from any self-dealing transaction, whether acting individually or acting as an agent, without demonstrating full disclosure and fair dealing. In addition, the Board has adopted its own *Conflict of Interest Policy* requiring trustees to disclose in writing all financial or other interests that constitute a possible conflict of interest.

A majority of members of the Board of Trustees do not have a contractual, employment or financial interest in the university; however, three members of the Board are employed by the university in administrative and academic capacities: Stephen Sundborg, S.J. is President of the university, Patrick Howell, S.J. is rector and professor of pastoral theology, and Patrick Kelly, S.J. is an associate professor in the College of Arts & Sciences.

Committees of the Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees has, as provided by the university's *Bylaws*, established the following standing or special committees to assist with its governance responsibilities. The purpose, authority, roles and responsibilities of the Board committees are defined in the individual charters. In addition, the university provides each trustee with information about meeting schedules, terms of office, committee structures, conflicts of interest and other materials necessary to understand and carry out their responsibilities.

Executive Committee**:** The Executive Committee has the authority of the Board between Board meetings, subject to such limitations as the Board may from time to time determine. Membership on the Executive Committee consists only of Trustees, and includes the officers of the Board and two at-large representatives.

Academic Affairs Committee**:** The Academic Affairs Committee is charged with providing leadership and counsel to the Board of Trustees on academic affairs matters.

Finance Committee: The primary function of the Finance Committee is to provide leadership and counsel in all areas of the university's business operations, including financial, budgetary, investing, human resources management, and real estate development for housing. The committee works to ensure the financial well-being of the university.

Investment Committee: The Investment Committee is a sub-committee of the Finance Committee and reports directly to the Finance Committee. The primary function of the Investment Committee is to ensure prudent financial management of endowment fund assets in order to serve the long-term best interests of the university while maintaining the inter-generational equity of the endowment fund as a whole. The Board sets all broad policies of the endowment fund consistent with the laws, rules, and regulations and all subsequent amendments related to nonprofit corporations organized solely for the use and benefit of education purposes. The Investment Committee will recommend and track the asset allocation of assets and select, monitor and evaluate the fund's investment managers.

Facilities & Land Use Committee**:** The primary function of the Facilities & Land Use Committee is to ensure a strategic and financially prudent approach to long term campus planning as it addresses major capital projects, opportunities for acquisitions, deferred maintenance issues, and space utilization.

Audit Committee: The primary function of the Audit Committee is to assist the Board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities relating to the integrity of the university's financial statements, the systems of internal control, the independence and performance of the external audit functions, and the university's compliance with related legal and regulatory requirements.

Student Development Committee: The purpose of the Student Development Committee is to ensure that the university focuses on the best interests of all students and their co-curricular experience outside the classroom.

University Advancement Committee: The University Advancement Committee serves to advise, staff and support the various outreach efforts of the university. These initiatives primarily include resource development, alumni relations, government relations and marketing/communications.

Trusteeship Committee: The primary function of the Trusteeship Committee is to ensure that the Board is composed of individuals who possess the skills, talents, experience, dedication and mission-orientation to contribute meaningfully and effectively to the function of the Board.

Intercollegiate Athletics Oversight Committee: The primary function of the Intercollegiate Athletics Oversight Committee is to assist the Board in fulfilling its fiduciary oversight responsibilities relating to the university's program of intercollegiate athletics through eight areas of Board engagement: general oversight responsibilities; executive leadership; athletics department mission; fiscal responsibility; academics and student athlete welfare; compliance; personnel; and communications.

Catholic Jesuit Identity Committee: The primary purpose of the committee is to assist the Board in its fiduciary responsibility for the university's Catholic, Jesuit identity. The committee will assist the Board in exercising its responsibility in the following areas: opportunities and challenges for the university in fostering its identity; the university's programs to maintain and promote its identity; hiring of faculty and staff for mission; education for mission; trustee education for mission; direction and guidance of the university's articulation and promotion of its identity.

Supporting Documents

1. *Bylaws of Seattle University*
2. Members of the Board of Trustees
3. Board of Trustee Committee Charters
4. Board of Trustees Conflict of Interest Policy

2.A.5 The board acts only as a committee of the whole; no member or subcommittee of the board acts on behalf of the board except by formal delegation of authority by the governing board as a whole.

The Board acts only as a committee of the whole and no member or subcommittee of the Board may act in place of the Board unless delegated action of the Board, or as provided by the university's *Bylaws*.

Under the *Bylaws*, the Board has the authority to organize itself and to form committees, as it deems appropriate. The Board has established the following trustee committees to carry out designated duties and responsibilities relating to governance of the university: Executive Committee; Academic Affairs Committee; Finance Committee; Investment Committee; Facilities & Land Use Committee; Audit Committee; Student Development Committee; University Advancement Committee; Trusteeship Committee; Intercollegiate Athletic Oversight Committee; and Catholic Jesuit Identity Committee. The purpose, authority, roles and responsibilities of the Board committees are defined in the committee charters.

Supporting Documents

1. *Bylaws of Seattle University*

2. Description and charters of the committees of the Board of Trustees

2.A.6 The board establishes, reviews regularly, revises as necessary, and exercises broad oversight of institutional policies, including those regarding its own organization and operation.

As the ultimate governing authority of Seattle University, the Board of Trustees is responsible for the strategic direction of the institution and plays an active role in reviewing and establishing institution-wide plans and policies. The Board recently approved and adopted on the following plans and policies:

- Updated the trustee committee charters to clarify the purpose, membership, authority, duties and responsibilities of the committees.
- Adopted amendments to the *Bylaws*
- Adopted a *Statement of Nondiscrimination*
- Approved the *Academic Strategic Action Plan*
- Approved the *Undergraduate Core Curriculum Model* and *Core Curriculum Learning Objectives*
- Approved the *Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan*
- Adopted a *Statement on Diversity*
- Approved a *Whistleblower Protection Policy*

Supporting Documents

1. *Seattle University Bylaws*
2. Board of Trustee Committee Charters
3. Statement of Nondiscrimination
4. *Academic Strategic Action Plan*
5. Ten Year Capital Plan
6. Undergraduate Core Curriculum Model
7. Core Curriculum Learning Objectives
8. Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan Executive Summary
9. Statement on Diversity
10. Whistleblower Protection Policy

2.A.7 The board selects and evaluates regularly a chief executive officer who is accountable for the operation of the institution. It delegates authority and responsibility to the CEO to implement and administer board-approved policies related to the operation of the institution.

The President of Seattle University is appointed by the Board of Trustees and serves as the university's chief executive officer. The President has the general charge and control of all the university's business affairs and properties and is responsible for implementing and administering university policy, subject to the ultimate governing authority of the Board and consistent with the

university's *Bylaws*. All university administrative officers and offices are accountable to the President.

Consistent with best practices for governing Boards and its commitment to investing in the excellence of all the university's faculty and staff, the Board performs an annual performance evaluation of the President. The Board of Trustees engages an independent, outside governance consultant to ensure the confidentiality of the evaluation process. The evaluation format asks trustees to rate the President's performance on key performance elements, offer written observation of the performance, and identify areas for improvement.

2.A.8 The board regularly evaluates its performance to ensure its duties and responsibilities are fulfilled in an effective and efficient manner.

Seattle University's Board of Trustees follows national best practices for institutional governing boards by conducting an annual review of its own effectiveness in carrying out its governance duties and responsibilities.

Under the guidance of the Board of Trustees' Trusteeship Committee, the trustees assess how well the Board performs an array of key functions and measures and evaluates how effectively the trustees themselves are engaged and utilized by the university.

To ensure confidentiality and integrity of the process, the Board engages an outside, independent governance consultant, who receives and records all responses. The consultant prepares a report, which helps guide any plans for improvement for the Board.

In addition, the Trusteeship Committee works on cultivating the best composition of the Board. The committee is charged with developing practices and recommending strategies and policies that attract, orient, organize and engage trustees and ensure that the Board is composed of members who possess the skills, talents, experience, dedication and mission-orientation to contribute meaningfully and effectively to the function of the Board.

Supporting Documents
1. Minutes indicating that Board of Trustees performs annual review (available upon request)

Leadership and Management

2.A.9 The institution has an effective system of leadership, staffed by qualified administrators, with appropriate levels of responsibility and accountability, who are charged with planning, organizing, and managing the institution and assessing its achievements and effectiveness.

Seattle University's system of leadership is effective and staffed by qualified administrators with appropriate levels of responsibility and accountability who are charged with planning, organizing and

managing the institution and assessing its achievements and effectiveness. The University's leadership structure is defined as the President, Provost, Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and divisional vice presidents, academic deans, and associate provosts, referred to as the "President's Cabinet" and the "Deans' Council". The President's Cabinet and Deans' Council are the two most senior leadership groups at the University.

Establishing minimum qualifications ensures those employees in leadership roles are appropriately qualified for their positions. A university wide update of position descriptions in 2011 included the assessment and establishment of standards of minimum qualifications for all staff positions, independent of the incumbent's credentials and experience that are aligned with external national market information. Subsequently, all currently employed leaders meet the minimum qualifications established for the positions they hold. Academic dean position descriptions outline a similar minimum qualification requirement met by all current academic deans.

Additions to leadership positions in recent years have addressed changing institutional needs and have ensured appropriate levels of responsibility and accountability are maintained. Decisions to increase or decrease leadership size are made by the President and appointees are confirmed by the Board of Trustees based on the recommendation of the President, following national searches.

Examples of leadership positions established after 2007 include:

- Vice President for Enrollment Services
- Vice President for Human Resources and University Services
- Vice President for Communications
- Associate Provost for Global Engagement
- Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education

New incumbents have been hired into existing leadership positions since 2007, including:

- Chief Financial Officer
- Provost
- Vice President for Student Development
- Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
- Dean, Matteo Ricci College
- Dean, School of Law
- Dean, College of Nursing
- Dean, College of Science & Engineering
- Dean, School of Theology & Ministry
- Interim Dean, College of Education

The institutional planning process is led by the President, Provost, Executive Vice President and managed by the office of university planning in collaboration with university leadership and the

broader university community. The Office of University Planning supports divisional representatives, coordinates the overall planning process, and provides a channel for communication back to the broader community. Members of the President's Cabinet and Deans' Council serve on an ongoing basis as advocates and implementers of strategic action plans associated with institutional plans, working with the President's Cabinet to ensure that initiatives are properly resourced and the university makes progress in accomplishing its strategic goals.

Accountability for assessing achievements and effectiveness ultimately rests with members of the President's Cabinet and Deans' Council. The President's Cabinet, through the budget process, has the authority to create new staff positions, allocate resources and decide where institutional capacity should be applied. The annual budget is the primary mechanism for funding the strategic priority action plans and goals and intended outcomes are also determined at this level. Individuals in these roles are responsible for managing the financial and human resources in their areas and ensuring programs deliver expected goals and services.

Supporting Documents

1. Leadership organizational chart 2013 (noting new positions added since 2007)

2.A.10 The institution employs an appropriately-qualified chief executive officer with full-time responsibility to the institution. The chief executive officer may serve as an *ex officio* member of the governing board, but may not serve as its chair.
*The terms *board* and *governing board* refer to the institution's governing authority.

Stephen V. Sundborg, S.J., is the chief executive officer of the University. President Sundborg was appointed president in July, 1997 and is appointed to five year terms of service, the next of which is from 2012 to 2017. Fr. Sundborg's full-time responsibility has been to the institution since his appointment in 1997.

All university administrative officers and offices are accountable to the President. In carrying out the responsibilities of office, the President has the general charge and control of the university's business affairs and properties, subject to the ultimate determination and responsibility of the Board of Trustees and consistent with the *Articles of Incorporation* and *Bylaws of Seattle University*. President Sundborg serves as an *ex officio* member of the Board of Trustees but does not serve as its chair.

Fr. Sundborg meets the qualifications for the position of university president as described in the position description for this role and the Bylaws of Seattle University. Further, Fr. Sundborg's qualifications are commensurate with presidents of peer institutions.

Supporting Documents

1. *Restated Articles of the Corporation*
2. *Bylaws of Seattle University*

2.A.11 The institution employs a sufficient number of qualified administrators who provide effective leadership and management for the institution's major support and operational functions and work collaboratively across institutional functions and units to foster fulfillment of the institution's mission and accomplishment of its core theme objectives.

Seattle University employs a sufficient number of qualified administrators, who provide effective leadership and management for the institution's major support and operational functions and work collaboratively across institutional functions and units to foster fulfillment of the institution's mission and accomplishment of its core theme objectives. Seattle University defines an administrator as a faculty or staff member whose primary responsibility is college, school, division, department, or function leadership and employs a sufficient number of qualified incumbents in these roles. A review of data from the National Center for Education Statistics show Seattle University's administrator to student ratio is within the range of its peers.

Examples of key hires since 2007 in administrator positions include:

- Director of Housing and Residence Life
- Director of Education Abroad
- Director of Campus Ministry
- Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
- Director of Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects
- Assistant Provost for Business and Faculty Administration
- Associate Vice President for Facilities
- Assistant Vice President of Alumni Relations
- Director of Career Services
- Director of Magis: Alumni Committed for Mission
- Director of Compensation & Benefits
- Director, Counseling & Psychological Services
- Chief Information Officer
- Controller
- Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education
- Director of Continuing, Online, & Professional Education

A university wide update of position descriptions in 2011 included the assessment and establishment of standards of minimum qualifications for all staff positions, independent of the incumbent's credentials and experience that are aligned with external national market information. Subsequently, all currently employed staff administrators meet the minimum qualifications established for the positions they hold. Administrators who also have a tenured or tenure-track faculty position are referred to as "faculty administrators" and these positions outline a similar minimum qualification requirement met by all current faculty administrators. Establishing and maintaining minimum

qualifications and ensuring administrators meet them demonstrate those employed in administrator roles are appropriately qualified for their positions.

Effective leadership in administrator positions is defined as the ability to efficiently execute functional responsibilities and to carry out the university's vision and strategic plans. Success in this area is demonstrated by an administrator's acceptable performance evaluation and the meeting of goals contained in the strategic priority documents.

Strategic priority documents clearly outline initiatives and action steps necessary to carry out each priority with responsible agents identified. Responsible agents are comprised of administrators across divisions which fosters collaboration across functions and units.

Supporting Documents

1. Sample position descriptions showing minimum qualification requirement

Policies and Procedures: Academics

2.A.12 Academic policies—including those related to teaching, service, scholarship, research, and artistic creation—are clearly communicated to students and faculty and to administrators and staff with responsibilities related to these areas.

Seattle University has developed a broad set of policies relating to all aspects of the academic enterprise. These policies, outlined below, are all publicly available.

Academic policies relating to students are published in the *Catalog* for both undergraduate and graduate programs. The *Catalog* includes summaries of policies relating to classification of students, course work, academic honesty, registration, enrollment, grading, awarding of credit and degree requirements. It also includes policies relating to grade grievances and academic probation. In addition, detailed academic policies are posted on the Office of the Registrar website and are accessible to the public.

Policies relating to faculty appointments, elements of faculty quality, criteria for appointment and promotion, procedures for evaluation, and faculty duties and responsibilities are included in the *Faculty Handbook* and its addendum the "Seattle University Academic Appointments, Titles and Conditions of Employment Document." The policies on faculty duties and responsibilities define the specific duties of faculty members, including teaching responsibilities, understanding of current developments in the appropriate disciplines, advising, scholarly activity and service.

The university has in place an "Allegations of Research Misconduct" that clearly identifies the importance of research integrity in terms of falsification or misrepresentation of data at any stage of the research process. This policy requires that all research done at the university be in compliance with federal regulations regarding integrity of research.

The university has established clear and precise copyright policies and guidelines to help guide the activities and work of faculty, staff, and students related to appropriate copyright practices. These policies are prominently posted on the university's policy website. Communicating and updating these policies is the responsibility of the Office of Copyright Compliance (OCC) which assists faculty in obtaining copyright permission from rights holders and examining specific materials to determine relevant copyright freedoms and limitations. Campus education about copyright policies is communicated through the New Faculty Institute, faculty/staff handbooks and an annual email notice sent by the Office of the Provost.

The credit hour policy is included in the Scheduling of Courses policy. Contact hours are based on the Carnegie unit, which refers to both in and out of classroom student workload standards. The university is in the process of renaming this policy so that its contents are clear. The relevant policy text follows.

> 1. **Lecture and Seminar** – courses with multiple students that meet to engage students in various forms of group instruction.
> These contact hours are considered to be both the **minimum hours required** and the **maximum hours allowed** per week.
> 5 credits = 250 contact minutes (4 hrs/10 mins)
> 4 credits = 200 contact minutes (3 hrs/20 mins)
> 3 credits = 150 contact minutes (2 hrs/30 mins)
> 2 credits = 100 contact minutes (1 hr/40 mins)
> 1 credit = 50 contact minutes
>
> 2. **Lecture/Lab** - courses with multiple students consisting mainly of various forms of group instruction but with some separate component regularly devoted to "hands-on" experience.
> These contact hours are considered to be the **minimum hours required** per week. Each school/department offering these types of courses may determine more contact hours as needed.
> 5 credits = 250 contact minutes (4 hrs/10 mins)
> 4 credits = 200 contact minutes (3 hrs/20 mins)
> 3 credits = 150 contact minutes (2 hrs/30 mins)
> 2 credits = 100 contact minutes (1 hr/40 mins)
> 1 credit = 50 contact minutes
>
> 3. **Lab** – courses with limited instruction where the major focus is on "hands on" experience.
> These contact hours are considered to be the **minimum hours** required per week. Each department offering these types of courses may determine more contact hours as needed. The contact hours for these courses are based on a 2:1 ratio (50 minutes x 2 = 1 lab credit)
> 5 credits = 500 contact minutes (8 hrs/20 mins)
> 4 credits = 400 contact minutes (6 hrs/40 mins)
> 3 credits = 300 contact minutes (5 hrs)

2 credits = 200 contact minutes (3 hrs/20 mins)
1 credit = 100 contact minutes (1 hr/40 mins)

4. **Studio** – courses that provide either private or semi-private lessons or courses that involve an integrated instruction and "hands on" teaching and learning methodology. These contact hours are considered to be the **minimum hours** required per week. Each department offering these types of courses may determine more contact hours as needed.
5 credits = 360 contact minutes (6 hrs)
4 credits = 288 contact minutes (4 hrs/48 mins)
3 credits = 216 contact minutes (3 hrs/36 mins)
2 credits = 144 contact minutes (2 hrs/24 mins)
1 credit = 72 contact minutes (1 hr/12 mins)

5. **Online, Internships, Independent Studies, Practicum/Field Experience, and Research Project** - courses that are conducted via a synchronous or asynchronous online delivery or those that involve self directed and offsite engagement for independent learning and/or experience development.
These contact hours are considered to be the **minimum hours** required per week. Each department offering these types of courses may determine more contact hours as needed.
5 credits = 900 contact minutes (15 hrs)
4 credits = 720 contact minutes (12 hrs)
3 credits = 540 contact minutes (9 hrs)
2 credits = 360 contact minutes (6 hrs)
1 credit = 180 contact minutes (3 hrs)

In compliance with the NWCCU policy on credit hours, Seattle University must periodically review the application of the credit hour policy across the institution and assure that credit hour assignments are accurate and reliable. The Office of the Registrar assesses the classroom or direct faculty instruction component by developing a compliant academic calendar and establishing and adhering to schedule block contact hour standards. Academic calendars are developed to ensure sufficient weeks are provided each term for fulfillment of the requisite weeks of instruction per semester (law school) and quarter (graduate and undergraduate studies). Standard scheduling blocks are utilized to ensure the appropriate classroom time per week is realized for the majority of the class offerings each term. For those limited course offerings which are approved to meet for non-standard time blocks, the Office of the Registrar or Law School Registrar validates contact hour totals for the offered credit level during the manual scheduling and rooming process.

Supporting Documents

1. *Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog*
2. *Faculty Handbook*
3. Academic Appointments, Titles and Conditions of Employment
4. Copyright policy
5. Copy right policy guidelines
6. Office of Copyright Compliance Website
7. University policy website

8. Scheduling of Courses Policy (addresses credit hours)

2.A.13 Policies regarding access to and use of library and information resources—regardless of format, location, and delivery method—are documented, published, and enforced.

Lemieux Library & McGoldrick Learning Commons
As is common among contemporary academic libraries, Lemieux Library relies on a variety of electronic resources, web presence, printed materials, special events, and routine publicity, to make available to users the full range of information on library hours, privileges, services, policies and practices. While the emphasis has shifted to a heavy reliance on web-based content and electronic communications, various forms of print communication are still employed selectively.

Printed signs, posted prominently at major entrances, identify basic terms of access and services afforded to primary constituents, second constituents, and non-affiliates. Good security measures and a solid working relationship between the library and SU Department of Public Safety enable officers to monitor conditions in the facility and to assist in enforcing these policies that reflect the special character of SU as a private institution. Additional printed signage at service desks reinforce and supplement the initial signage presented to users and visitors.

Seattle University Law Library
The law library regularly revises, updates, and posts its information resources policies. The law library's website offers a wide variety of information regarding access, services, and resources. Printed library information is also available at service desks. Tailored information is provided to new faculty, staff, and students at orientations. The library's blog and *In the Stacks* column in the student newsletter also feature information on library services and policies.

Supporting Documents
1. Lemieux Library's Policies web page
2. Law Library web page (see various policies, services, guides, and information)

2.A.14 The institution develops, publishes widely, and follows an effective and clearly-stated transfer-of-credit policy that maintains the integrity of its programs while facilitating efficient mobility of students between institutions in completing their educational programs.

Seattle University publishes transfer credit assessment procedures and policies. To clarify and inform potential applicants ahead of time how a wide variety of credit will transfer and/or apply to their chosen degree, the Office of Admission and Office of the Registrar publish a range of policies reflecting both the rules of credit transfer and of awarding credit for other methods of demonstrating competence, such as AP credit, DANTES/CLEP and credit by examination. For potential transfer, and current students seeking dual enrollment in another institution, the Office of the Registrar publishes and maintains an online course equivalency guide, outlining specific courses

from a wide range of institutions and how those courses are assessed at Seattle University. The Office of Admission validates external transcripts for authenticity prior to awarding credit as another method of ensuring the integrity of the credit awarded for each program of study. To further ensure the integrity of the education, the Office of the Registrar confirms appropriate institutional and/or program accreditation and validity for both domestic and international institutions of higher education prior to awarding credit.

Supporting Documents

1. *Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog*
2. Academic policy website (all academic policies are published on this site)
3. Transfer Credit Policy
4. Transfer Course Equivalency Guide
5. Advanced Placement Policy
6. Credit by Examination Policy
7. Credit for Military Schooling Policy
8. Forgiveness Policy for Undergraduates
9. Grades of Courses Acceptable for Transfer Policy
10. Readmission Requirements Policy

Policies and Procedures: Students

2.A.15 Policies and procedures regarding students and responsibilities including academic honesty, appeals, grievances, and accommodations for persons with disabilities—are clearly stated, readily available, and administered in a fair and consistent manner.

The Associate Dean of Students is responsible for administering the Code of Conduct. The Code of Conduct is posted online and outlines student rights and responsibilities (e.g., Respect for Self, Others, Relationships, Community, Honesty, and Property; Freedom of Expression; appropriate use of copyrighted material), as well as information on appeals processes. New students sign the Redhawk Commitment (a pledge signed by all incoming students to respect self, others, relationships, community, honesty and property) and Code of Conduct during the Integrity Formation session during Fall Welcome. Additionally, students are referred to—and reminded how to access—the Code twice yearly. During these times, an e-mail communiqué is sent to students outlining the university's behavioral expectations of them. The online link to the Code is provided and students are encouraged to consult the Code if they have any questions. The Code also outlines informal and formal complaint procedures, as well as the steps in the student conduct process from initial documentation through hearing and decision. The Code of Conduct can be found online.

The Office of the Registrar is responsible for posting the academic policies online; schools, colleges, and programs are responsible for enforcing academic policies. These policies include, but are not limited to academic integrity, fair process, as well as policies regarding students with disabilities. These policies may be found online.

Seattle University staffs a Disabilities Services office within its Student Academic Services unit. Disability Services provides resources for students with disabilities as well as the faculty and staff working with these students. Information on requesting and obtaining alternative testing procedures, assistive devices, policies, and accessibility and room accommodations are available online. Faculty and staff can access the department's information online.

All professional programs have standards of professional conduct for their students. These standards apply to students while engaged in educationally related activities outside the classroom. All programs are responsible for communicating these standards to their students. Should a student be found by their college or school to be in violation of professional standards of conduct and face dismissal from the program on the basis of this violation(s), the student may appeal this decision through the university-wide Professional Conduct Policy. Note that dismissal from a program may be on the basis of a lack of requisite knowledge, skills or judgment necessary for a professional in the field, failure to demonstrate appropriate professional, ethical, and/or social behavior or the demonstration of unethical or unprofessional conduct. This policy outlines appeal procedures, timelines, the review process, and the option for a Dean's review.

Supporting Documents

1. Code of Student Conduct
2. Academic policy website (all academic policies are published on this site)
3. Disability Services overview for students
4. Disability Services overview for faculty

2.A.16 The institution adopts and adheres to admission and placement policies that guide the enrollment of students in courses and programs through an evaluation of prerequisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to assure a reasonable probability of student success at a level commensurate with the institution's expectations. Its policy regarding continuation in and termination from its educational programs—including its appeals process and readmission policy—are clearly defined, widely published, and administered in a fair and timely manner.

Undergraduate

Seattle University undertakes a thoughtful and holistic evaluation of all applications for admission. This review includes an evaluation of prerequisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to assure a reasonable probability of student success at a level commensurate with the institution's expectations. Its policy regarding continuation in and termination from its educational programs—including its appeals process and readmission policy—are clearly defined, widely published, and administered in a fair and timely manner. The purpose of this review is to ensure that the university admits only those applicants who are academically prepared to succeed in their chosen course of study.

The University utilizes the Common Application, the SU Supplemental Application, personal essays, standardized test scores, letters of application, and a student's high school transcript as resources to

determine undergraduate admission. Additionally, the University utilizes guidelines outlining the minimum number of core courses to be completed by high school graduation. Students whose first language is not English must meet minimum standards for English language proficiency—demonstrated through TOEFL test scores or completion of the Culture and Language Bridge program.

Key decision-makers in the admissions process include admissions staff and the Associate Deans in the College of Nursing, the Albers School of Business and Economics, and the College of Science and Engineering. The Admissions staff determines admission for all freshmen applicants and transfer applicants desiring admission to majors in the College of Arts and Sciences. The Associate Deans determine admission for transfer applicants.

When additional review of an application is required, including in the event of an appeal, the Admissions Review Board is consulted. The Admissions Review Board is comprised of the Dean of Admission, the Associate Provost for Academic Achievement, the Associate Dean of Students, the Director of Student Academic Services, and three associate professors. The Dean of Admission is the final decision maker for admission.

Because the university does not offer remedial courses, students who do not meet the institution's minimum standards are not admitted and are encouraged to improve their academic profiles. Admission applications are kept for up to two years. In addition to facilitating the admissions process for first-time, first-year undergraduates, the university also maintains and implements policies and procedures to admit transfer and home schooled students, as well as General Equivalency Diploma (GED) applicants.

Graduate

In regard to graduate students, the university maintains minimum standards for admission. These requirements include, but are not limited to completion of a U.S. equivalent bachelor or advanced degree from regionally accredited institutions as well as minimum GPA for the last 90 quarter or 60 semester credits of undergraduate work. In the case of international students attending institutions aligned with globally recognized standards, the GPA's of these applicants are converted into U.S. equivalencies when possible. Deans and/or program directors are able to access student test scores, and evaluate supplemental applications, personal statements, etc. in order to determine admission to specific programs.

Policies

Policies regarding continuation in and termination from educational programs are posted online by the Office of the Registrar. These policies include, but are not limited to, the following.

- Academic Probation/Dismissal Appeal: undergraduate and graduate
- Admission (undergraduate, transfer, Matteo Ricci College, and graduate)

- Grading practices: undergraduate, graduate
- Readmission requirements
- Withdrawal

It is important to the university that all policies are applied fairly. The institution has very few claims of unfair application of these policies, and in cases where students have questions regarding the process for their individual situations, the university has established procedures to answer these questions (e.g., appeals processes, ability to speak directly with staff members).

Supporting Documents

1. Academic Probation/Dismissal Appeal: undergraduate and graduate
2. Admission to the University
3. Grading practices: undergraduate, graduate
4. Readmission requirements
5. Withdrawal Policy
6. Academic Policy Website

2.A.17 The institution maintains and publishes policies that clearly state its relationship to co-curricular activities and the roles and responsibilities of students and the institution for those activities, including student publications and other student media if offered.

Seattle University facilitates a number of co-curricular activities designed to enhance the overall student experience. Student clubs represent a major element of co-curricular activities. Recreation opportunities include intramural sports, outdoor adventure recreation, and leisure education activities. Campus Ministry provides opportunities for social justice ministry and student retreats. Peer education/peer helper programs include orientation staff, resident assistants, Peer Health Action Team, Albers School of Business and Economics peer mentors.

Student clubs are expected to abide by the Code of Conduct published by the Associate Dean of Students. Additionally, club policies are posted online by the Office of Student Activities. These policies cover, but are not limited to, publicity content, procedures, food, vehicle rentals, immersion trips, performance/service contracts, equipment rental.

Student media (i.e., *The Spectator* campus newspaper and KSUB radio station) also maintain internally published policies for their staffs. *The Spectator* maintains paper copies of its policies. Participants in intramural sports are expected abide by the guidelines outlined in the *Intramural Sports Handbook*.

Supporting Documents

1. Student club policies
2. *Intramural Sports Handbook*

Policies and Procedures: Human Resources

2.A.18 The institution maintains and publishes its human resources policies and procedures and regularly reviews them to ensure they are consistent, fair, and equitably applied to its employees and students.

In support of core theme five: Investing in the Excellence of Our Faculty and Staff and in accordance with accreditation standards; local, state and federal regulations; and best practices, Seattle University maintains and publishes human resources policies and procedures and regularly reviews them to ensure they are consistent, fair, and equitably applied to employees and students. All policies are published online and available to staff, faculty and students any time, from any place in the world.

The Office of Human Resources maintains a website where the *Human Resources Policy Manual* is housed and available to all faculty, staff and students. All policies in the manual apply to staff employees and some policies apply to faculty, as identified in the manual; the office of human resources is responsible for ensuring policies are reviewed regularly to accommodate legislative changes and institutional needs. All human resources and University policies are compliant with federal, state and local laws and are applied consistently, fairly and equitably to applicable employee groups. Consistent application is demonstrated by ensuring all (staff) employees are made aware of policies during new employee orientation and their responsibility to comply with them and through periodic updates if policies change. In addition, human resources staff take an active role in interpreting policies for employees and students when questions arise and ensure policies are equitably applied by overseeing processes and systems that support employment including hiring, benefits, hours of work, changes in employment status, leave time and leaves of absence, termination and other institutional employment policies.

Examples of policies contained in the *Human Resources Policy Manual* are:

- Recruitment and Appointment (applicable to staff only)
- Compensation policies (applicable to staff only)
- Benefits policies (applicable to faculty and staff)
- Leave benefits and leaves of absence (applicable to faculty and staff)
- Performance evaluation (applicable to staff only)
- Separation/ Termination (applicable to staff only)
- Equal Employment Opportunity (applicable to faculty and staff)
- Sexual harassment policy and complaint procedure (applicable to faculty and staff)
- Nepotism policy (applicable to faculty and staff)
- Americans with Disabilities Act policy and procedures (applicable to faculty and staff)

Additionally, the Office of the Provost maintains a website that is supplemental to the human resources website, which houses policies specific to faculty employees and administrators with a

faculty appointment. These include the *Seattle University Faculty Handbook*, the Seattle University Academic Appointments, Titles and Conditions Employment Document, the Seattle University Rank and Tenure File Preparation Guidelines, and other pertinent policies having to do with issues specific to faculty appointments and employment at the university. The maintenance and updating of the *Faculty Handbook* is the responsibility of the Office of the Provost, which is done in full consultation with the *Faculty Handbook* Revision Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Academic Assembly. The Office of the Provost, the academic deans of the university and the Director of the Library oversee the consistent and equitable application of all university policies that pertain to faculty status, including faculty appointments, criteria for promotion, rank and tenure, and non-renewal.

The Office of University Counsel and the Office of the Controller also maintain university policies web pages which house institutional policies and procedures applicable to faculty and staff. Faculty and staff are expected to know and apply the policies on these pages as they pertain to their work. The Office of University Counsel and the Office of the Controller are responsible for ensuring policies are reviewed regularly to accommodate legislative changes and institutional needs. For example, the non-discrimination statement was updated in 2010 when legislation was changed to ban discrimination based on genetic information. Examples of policies housed on the University Policies page and the Office of the Controller page are:

- Nondiscrimination policy
- Financial policies
- Travel policies
- Copyright policy
- Field trip guidelines
- Whistleblower protection

The Student Financial Services Office maintains and updates a *Supervisor's Guide to On-Campus Student Employment* policy manual that is for both students and campus supervisors. The guide is posted on the Student Financial Services website under the student employment section. Students and supervisors are referred to this document when needed and it is available online, anytime, from any place in the world. Student Financial Services has partnered with Human Resources to provide several professional development sessions to staff members regarding student employment best practices and procedures. These seminars are expected to be offered regularly each year.

Finally, division and department procedures and rules of operation may be referred to as "policies" but are not considered official university policies. These procedures and rules of operation do not conflict with official university policies where content may overlap.

Supporting Documents

1. University policy website

2. Controller's Office policy website
3. *Human Resources Policy Manual*
4. Office of the Provost Policies and Guidelines website
5. *Faculty Handbook* revision committee
6. Rank & Tenure File Preparation Guidelines
7. Academic Appointments, Titles and Conditions of Employment
8. Student employment policies and procedures

2.A.19 Employees are apprised of their conditions of employment, work assignments, rights and responsibilities, and criteria and procedures for evaluation, retention, promotion, and termination.

All employees are apprised of their conditions of employment, work assignments, rights and responsibilities, and criteria and procedures for evaluation, retention, promotion and termination. The method of communication of these items may differ depending on the employee's status at the university as a faculty member, staff person, or student employee.

All faculty employees receive a standard offer letter prior to employment, which includes the terms and conditions of their employment and refers them to the policies and procedures of the University in order to understand their rights and responsibilities. Appointees are required to sign the agreement and return it within a specified period of time. New full-time tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, members are strongly encouraged to participate in a structured faculty orientation program during the first year of their appointments. New faculty members are provided materials which include benefits information, notice of required trainings regarding the prevention of sexual harassment, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, as well as tax and employment compliance paperwork.

All faculty members (including part-time faculty) are provided the opportunity for an orientation into the life of the university by their academic department, college or school.

All staff employees receive a standard offer letter upon hire, have access to their position description which contains work assignments, and are made aware of policies and procedures through a thorough new employee orientation. New staff employees sign a statement acknowledging they are aware that the *Human Resources Policy Manual* is published online and they have a responsibility to learn, know and comply with the policies contained in the manual and that their continued employment is contingent on following those policies.

Criteria for evaluation of staff are available via the annual performance appraisal form which is published on the Human Resources website, accessible to all employees at all times. Criteria for promotion in an incumbent's current role (reclassification) are published on the Human Resources website under the heading "Compensation & Benefits." Criteria for promotion into a different

position are addressed in the recruiting policies, published in the *Human Resources Policy Manual* online. All criteria are available at any time, from any computer with an internet connection.

General criteria for faculty review for promotion and tenure are published in the *Seattle University Faculty Handbook* and the Seattle University Rank and Tenure File Preparation Guidelines. In addition, each department/college/school publishes stipulated procedures and standards to help guide the faculty assessment process.

Staff termination policies are published in the *Human Resources Policy Manual* and faculty non-renewal and termination policies, supplemental to the *Human Resources Policy Manual*, are published in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Student employees are informed of the conditions of employment and work assignments, rights and responsibilities and criteria and procedures for evaluation, retention, promotion and termination through communication with their supervisors. Supervisors are directed by student financial services to refer to the student employee supervisor's guide for assistance with terminations, and student financial services staff are available to answer additional concerns or questions for both student and supervisors. The Supervisor's Guide is available online at all times for reference. Student Financial Services staff also collaborate with Human Resources staff on items that might require additional research.

Supporting Documents

1. *Human Resources Policy Manual*
2. Performance Appraisal form
3. Compensation policies
4. Office of the Provost Policies and Procedures
5. Student Employment Policies and Procedures

2.A.20 The institution ensures the security and appropriate confidentiality of human resources records.

Seattle University ensures the security and appropriate confidentiality of human resources records by using a multi-faceted approach. Human resources records are defined as the official university record of employment and are maintained in electronic and paper format.

Electronic records contain personal, position, and wage information as well as benefits elections and leave balances for faculty, staff, administrator and student employees. Access to electronic records is restricted to employees who have a need to access employment records, limited to Human Resources, Faculty Services, and Payroll staff who have a role in entering or knowing employment data. Requests for access are reviewed by a designated administrator with responsibility for electronic records. Electronic/network system access is audited and access is deleted for employees

who have moved to other parts of the university or have had a job change and no longer need access to employment records.

A recent process improvement has resulted in the immediate termination of network access for staff employees who are leaving the university, which has resulted in greater security of electronic employment records.

Paper personnel files for faculty employees are stored in the Faculty Services office in a locked file cabinet. Files for former faculty employees are stored in locked cabinets or in a secured, alarmed storage area until they are destroyed following the university's personnel records retention/destruction procedures.

Paper personnel files for staff employees are stored in the Office of Human Resources in a locked room in fire-safe file cabinets. Paper personnel files contain personal and position information, performance appraisals and wage increase or promotion documentation. Files of former employees are stored in a secured, alarmed storage area until they are destroyed following the university's personnel records retention/destruction procedures.

Files of former employees are destroyed one time each year using an onsite shredding service which provides a certificate of destruction.

Paper student employment records are stored in the Student Financial Services Office and the Payroll Office. Student Financial Services files are retained in the student financial services offices in secured file cabinets for a period of time before they are moved to a secured storage area for archived documents. Access to archived records is restricted to members of the student financial services office.

Policies and Procedures: Institutional Integrity

2.A.21 The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently through its announcements, statements, and publications. It communicates its academic intentions, programs, and services to students and to the public and demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. It regularly reviews its publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

Seattle University has a clear, accurate and consistent message throughout its various communications channels.

The university recognizes the importance of communications and has created a new position of Vice President for Communications, reporting to the Executive Vice President and serving on the President's Cabinet. The Vice President for Communications will oversee the university's Marketing Communications Department. The department ensures consistency in university-wide communications, including announcements, statements and publications. For example, the

department drafts, edits, publishes and manages the *Seattle University Magazine*, university website, *Connections* community newsletter, and the annual *President's Report*. In addition, the Marketing Communications department establishes clear university-wide rules for marketing materials to ensure clarity, consistency and compliance and regularly holds educational meetings with marketing representatives from the schools, colleges and departments.

Seattle University uses its website and undergraduate and graduate catalogs to communicate the university's mission, academic learning objectives, academic and nonacademic regulations, summary of degree programs, academic course descriptions, university governance structure, accreditation and memberships, and discipline codes to prospective students, current students and the general public.

The university annually reviews and updates its undergraduate and graduate catalogs to ensure their accuracy. Additionally, each college and school annually reviews and updates the summary of its academic programs and degree requirements.

The university complies with the Student Right-to-Know Act and its public disclosure requirements. The university's Institutional Research publishes a report listing completion, graduation and retention rates for degree seeking, full-time undergraduate students:

Freshman Graduation Rate

Cohort	Within 4 years	Within 5 Years	Within 6 years
2008	61%	NA	NA
2007	59%	74%	NA
2006	62%	76%	77%
2005	56%	69%	71%
2004	59%	72%	75%

Supporting Documents

1. *Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog*
2. Institutional Research's demographics and data website
3. Admissions publications: Admissions website; printed materials available upon request
4. Connections newsletter archive
5. Seattle University Magazine
6. President's Report: 2011 and 2012

2.A.22 The institution advocates, subscribes to, and exemplifies high ethical standards in managing and operating the institution, including its dealings with the public, the Commission, and external organizations, and in the fair and equitable treatment of students, faculty, administrators, staff, and other constituencies. It ensures complaints and grievances are addressed in a fair and timely manner.

Seattle University is committed to just and ethical conduct in all areas of its management and operation. The university's Office of University Planning oversees all communications with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and University and ensures that the university is forthright and honest in its dealings with the Commission.

The university conducts annual independent audits of its financial statements and 403(b) retirement plan and completes the IRS Form 990 document in order to ensure accuracy, promote financial integrity and comply with requirements as a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization. As part of its commitment to transparency, the university posts its audited financial statements and IRS Form 990 on the university website for review by the general public.

The university's commitment to high ethical standards also extends to its relationship with its employees, vendors and contractors. The university is committed to paying all employees a living wage and making adjustments as necessary to follow through on this commitment. Relationships with on-campus vendors are managed to ensure their employees working at the university can also be paid a living wage. Additionally, the university supports fair labor standards and safe working conditions for people who produce university-licensed products. The university has an Anti-Sweatshop Committee charged with implementing and monitoring compliance with the university's *Code of Conduct* for producers of Seattle University licensed apparel. As a member of the Workers Rights Consortium and the Fair Labor Association, the university takes seriously its responsibility to examine labor practices of its vendors and contractors.

Seattle University's commitment to social justice and community service is another aspect of its high ethical standards. In 2012, the White House awarded Seattle University the prestigious *Presidential Award for Community Service*—the highest honor the federal government confers on a college or university for civic engagement, service learning and volunteerism.

The university is also committed to the fair and equitable treatment of its students, faculty, administrators, staff and other constituents. The university has adopted a broad nondiscrimination policy and developed systems to address complaints and grievances in a fair and timely manner.

Students: The university holds its students to high ethical standards through its integrity formation overseen by the Division of Student Development. The purpose of the students' integrity formation is to provide an experience that encourages individual accountability, promotes civic engagement, guides personal growth, and cultivates ethical development as students discern and clarify their values. Integrity formation includes a student code of conduct, Redhawk Commitment (a pledge signed by all incoming students to abide by the principles of the code of conduct) and conduct system that establishes standards for student behavior and provides a fair process to hold students accountable for their actions.

Faculty: The *Faculty Handbook* addresses the duties, responsibilities and professional ethics for all faculty members. According to section 9.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*, "the search for and communication of truth is the primary value for any faculty member. The dignity of free inquiry requires that truthfulness characterize every facet of the activity of the faculty member. Such truthfulness will embody personal integrity, intellectual honesty, and accuracy in communicating the results of study and research." The *Faculty Handbook* also states that "free inquiry requires respect for the positions and opinions of others. Each member of the academic community must support such an atmosphere by according to colleagues and students the respect due to all persons. Consistent with its commitment to fairness and satisfying the needs of its faculty, the University has a grievance procedure for faculty with concerns regarding conditions of service, infringement of academic freedom, or alleged violations of the *Faculty Handbook*. Additionally, an ombudsperson position was established in 2012. The university expects to fill the position in early 2013.

Staff: Seattle University is committed to developing and maintaining a positive work environment and recruiting and maintaining capable, committed and caring employees. The *Human Resources Policy Manual* addresses the expectations for all employees. Section 13.22 of the manual states that:

> . . .all employees are expected to accept certain responsibilities, adhere to acceptable business principles in matters of personal conduct, and exhibit a high degree of personal integrity at all times. This involves a sincere respect for the rights and feelings of others and requires that in both the employee's business and personal life the employee refrain from any behavior that might be harmful to her co-workers or the University and its community, or that might be viewed unfavorably by students, alumni, or by the public at large. Whether the employee is on duty or off, her conduct reflects on the University. Consequently, employees are encouraged to observe the highest standards of professionalism and ethical conduct at all times.

In addition to communicating its expectations for employees, the university has established a complaint procedure for employees to follow in instances when behavior is harmful to an employee or to the university.

Entire University Community: The university recognizes its obligation to students, faculty, staff and entire University community to maintain the highest ethical standards. Through the assistance of EthicsPoint, the University has created a secure, confidential reporting line to provide a way to anonymously and confidentially report activities that may involve unethical behavior, improper conduct or violations of Seattle University policies. Additionally, the Board of Trustees adopted a *Whistleblower Policy* which encourages all faculty, administrators, staff and students to report suspected or actual wrongful conduct by university employees.

Supporting Documents

1. Audited Financial Statements for FY12
2. IRS Form 990 for 2009
3. IRS Form 990 for 2010

4. Purchasing code of conduct (includes anti-sweatshop statement)
5. Student integrity formation principles
6. Student Code of Conduct
7. Redhawk Commitment
8. *Faculty Handbook* (includes policy on grievances)
9. *Human Resources Policy Manual*
10. EthicsPoint website
11. Whistleblower Policy

2.A.23 The institution adheres to a clearly-defined policy that prohibits conflict of interest on the part of members of the governing board, administration, faculty, and staff. Even when supported by or affiliated with social, political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. If it requires its constituencies to conform to specific codes of conduct or seeks to instill specific beliefs or world views, it gives clear prior notice of such codes and/or policies in its publications.

Seattle University is an independent institution of higher learning inspired by the Jesuit Catholic tradition. The university is self-governed by its Board of Trustees and is neither controlled nor administered by the Catholic Church or Society of Jesus Oregon Province.

Seattle University identifies itself as a university that welcomes and promotes free dialogue among persons of diverse religious and intellectual traditions. The university encourages and assists all its students, faculty and staff to explore their relationship with humanity, nature, and God and does not seek to instill a specific belief system, world view or statement of faith. The university provides all members of the university community the means to deepen the understanding of their individual faith.

Seattle University prohibits conflicts of interest by members of the Board, administration, faculty and staff and relies on an integrated network of conflict of interest policies:

- The Board of Trustees Conflict of Interest Policy.
- The *Faculty Handbook* prohibits faculty from engaging in activities that would create a conflict of interest.
- The *Human Resources Policy Manual* includes a policy for professional conduct and ethical behavior and addresses conflict of interest. The policy is currently being reviewed and revised.
- Beginning 2013, officers of the university will disclose in writing all financial or other interests that may constitute a possible conflict of interest.

- Students receive integrity formation through the Division of Student Development. All incoming students sign the Redhawk Commitment agreeing to comply with the Code of Conduct.
- The university has a procurement policy requiring a request for proposal process for all major projects.
- The Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects is implementing a financial conflict of interest policy regarding research projects.
- The IRS Form 990 Annual Financial Disclosure

The university holds orientations for trustees, students, staff and faculty and educates each group about the university's expectations and the relevant policies and codes of conduct and makes these materials available online.

Supporting Documents

1. Board of Trustees conflict of interest policy
2. *Faculty Handbook*
3. *Human Resources Policy Manual*
4. Student Code of Conduct
5. Redhawk Commitment
6. Purchasing Policy Manual
7. Policy for financial conflict of interest disclosure and management for investigators in externally sponsored programs
8. IRS Form 990 for 2009
9. IRS Form 990 for 2010

2.A.24 The institution maintains clearly-defined policies with respect to ownership, copyright, control, compensation, and revenue derived from the creation and production of intellectual property.

Seattle University will adopt a copyright ownership policy during the 2012-2013 academic year that describes the rights and responsibilities of faculty and the university with respect to faculty-created works and a patent policy that describes the rights and responsibilities of faculty and the university regarding patentable intellectual property. These policies will be available online and included as appendices in the *Faculty Handbook* (currently under revision).

2.A.25 The institution accurately represents its current accreditation status and avoids speculation on future accreditation actions or status. It uses the terms "accreditation" and "candidacy" (and related terms) only when such status is conferred by an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

Seattle University accurately represents its accreditation status. It is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. The Office of University Planning oversees the institution's accreditation process and status. In consultation with the Provost and the members of the Deans' Council, the staff of the Office University Planning updates the university's accreditation records. The Office of University Planning, the Office of the Registrar and the schools and colleges also conduct an annual review of the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, website and other publicly presented documents to ensure the university accurately represents its accreditation status.

2.A.26 If the institution enters into contractual agreements with external entities for products or services performed on its behalf, the scope of work for those products or services—with clearly-defined roles and responsibilities—is stipulated in a written and approved agreement that contains provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution. In such cases, the institution ensures the scope of the agreement is consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, adheres to institutional policies and procedures, and complies with the Commission's standards for accreditation.

Seattle University has an Office of University Counsel to assist in reviewing and drafting written agreements with external entities for products or services performed and ensuring the scope of the agreements are consistent with the university's mission, comply with university policies and procedures, and are consistent with the Commission's accreditation standards. For example, University Counsel works with various divisions, departments, schools and colleges in reviewing a wide range of contracts including academic affiliation agreements; software and hardware contracts; architecture, design and construction contracts; facility use agreements; faculty and consultant agreements; corporate sponsorship agreements; employment agreements; union agreements; major equipment purchases; education abroad program affiliation agreements; sponsored research projects; and serving learning agreements. Additionally, University Counsel collaborates with the Division of Academic Affairs in identifying how the Commission's accreditation standards impact new academic programs the university is considering.

University Counsel plays an important role in protecting the university and its resources by reviewing risk allocation, consideration, duties and obligations, termination clauses, dispute resolution and other important contractual provisions. When appropriate, University Counsel will engage outside counsel to assist on matters requiring specific expertise such as immigration and tax law.

As part of a risk reduction agreement with its insurance company and to improve its operation, the university has established a Contract Management Program Committee charged with reviewing current contract management policies, procedures and guidelines; developing policies and procedures that govern the creation, review, and signing of university contracts; and educating the campus community about the new policies and procedures. The project will take 2-3 years to complete.

Policies and Procedures: Academic Freedom

2.A.27 The institution publishes and adheres to policies, approved by its governing board, regarding academic freedom and responsibility that protect its constituencies from inappropriate internal and external influences, pressures, and harassment.

The Seattle University *Faculty Handbook* is approved by, and can only be changed through formal action by, the university Board of Trustees. The *Handbook* speaks to the respect for persons that underlies protection from undue influences, pressures and harassment in its definition of Seattle University as "a community of learners, teachers and students bound together by common goals of the educational process, mutual respect for diversity, and the University's mission." The Handbook section on academic freedom is quoted in full below.

> 10.1 Academic Freedom
> Seattle University values academic freedom as essential to its life and growth as a University. Every scholar-teacher has both the right and the duty to participate freely in the task of searching after and sharing truth in his/her academic discipline. The University actively seeks to have a diversity of ideas examined thoughtfully and in depth by its faculty.
>
> More specifically, the University supports the following statements on academic freedom:
>
> a) Teachers are free to discuss their academic subjects, including their broadest implications, in a climate of openness, freedom and mutual respect joined with a respect for the character and aims of Seattle University as described in its Mission Statement.
>
> b) Faculty members are entitled to undertake research and to publish their results freely and without fear of censorship. Opinions and hypotheses, appropriately so labeled, deserve similar protection.
>
> c) As citizens, faculty members are entitled to speak and act freely as members of the civic community but must avoid giving the impression that they speak for Seattle University on matters of public policy

The *Handbook* also sets forth the university's policy on academic freedom as essential to the life of the university and critical to the effective work of the scholar-teacher. It declares the freedom of faculty to discuss their academic subjects, including their broadest implications, in a climate of openness, freedom and mutual respect, states that faculty members are entitled to undertake research and publish results freely and without fear of censorship. It also affirms that the university actively seeks to have a diversity of ideas examined thoughtfully and in depth by its faculty. This section is quoted in full below.

> 10.2 Respect for Religious Beliefs

> Seattle University respects the religious beliefs and practices of all the men and women who contribute to the life of the University. The University employs teachers and administrators without regard to religious affiliation. Faculty members, for their part, shall respect one another's religious and moral beliefs, as well as the Catholic and Jesuit character and tradition of Seattle University.

In addition to the policy on academic freedom, the Seattle University *Faculty Handbook* includes a policy on respect for religious beliefs that affirms that the university respects the religious beliefs and practices of all the individuals who contribute to the life of the university and employs faculty and staff without regard to religious affiliation.

To protect these rights, the *Handbook* also provides a grievance procedure for faculty who believe they have a significant and reasonable grievance regarding conditions of service, infringement of academic freedom or violations of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Faculty, staff and students are protected by the university's Nondiscrimination Policy. This policy stipulates that the university does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity, political ideology or status as a Vietnam-era or special disabled veteran in the administration of any of its education policies, admission policies, scholarship and loan programs, athletics, and other school-administered policies and programs, or in its employment related policies and practices.

The Nondiscrimination Policy also outlines a rigorous investigation and complaint resolution process that involves the Title IX officers and other designated investigators and is consistent with the university's equal opportunity and Title IX obligations. This policy is included in both the *Human Resource Policy Manual* and the *Student Code of Conduct*.

In addition to the Nondiscrimination Policy, the *Student Code of Conduct* also includes a policy prohibiting bias-related harassment that provides students feeling unsafe or threatened because of such harassment with encouragement to seek help from a designated member of the university community who is trained and able to assist. Six members of the faculty and staff are trained to serve in this capacity and their names and contact information are included in the code.

The *Human Resource Policy Manual* includes a policy on sexual harassment that states the university's commitment to maintaining a learning and working environment free from harassment, to investigating allegations of harassment and to taking appropriate corrective action should such harassment occur. The *Manual* also includes a policy on workplace violence that articulates the university's commitment to providing a learning and working environment that is safe for all members of the university community.

Supporting Documents

1. *Faculty Handbook*
2. *Human Resource Policy Manual*
3. Student Code of Conduct
4. 2009 Faculty/Staff Survey
5. Nondiscrimination Policy

2.A.28 Within the context of its mission, core themes, and values, the institution defines and actively promotes an environment that supports independent thought in the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. It affirms the freedom of faculty, staff, administrators, and students to share their scholarship and reasoned conclusions with others. While the institution and individuals within the institution may hold to a particular personal, social, or religious philosophy, its constituencies are intellectually free to examine thought, reason, and perspectives of truth. Moreover, they allow others the freedom to do the same.

The mission of Seattle University, to educate the whole person, (guide) professional formation and empower leaders for a just and humane world, is highly consonant with the values of independent thought and intellectual freedom. The core themes of Academic Excellence, Catholic, Jesuit Character, and Investing in the Excellence of Faculty and Staff are all predicated on an understanding that members of the university have the independence needed to thrive in their academic and professional undertakings.

Seattle University actively promotes an environment that supports independent thought. The *Faculty Handbook* includes a provision speaking to professional ethics that defines the university as a "community of learners, teachers and students bound together by common goals of the educational process, mutual respect for diversity, and the University's mission." This provision also asserts that "free inquiry requires respect for the positions and opinions of others. Each member of the academic community must support such an atmosphere by according to colleagues and students the respect due to all persons. The freedom to criticize is based on scholarly competence and is balanced by a responsibility to seek and accept similar criticism."

Independence of thought is closely linked to academic freedom. The *Handbook* sets forth the university's policy on academic freedom as essential to the life of the university and critical to the effective work of the scholar-teacher. It declares the freedom of faculty to discuss their academic subjects, including their broadest implications, in a climate of openness, freedom and mutual respect, states that faculty members are entitled to undertake research and publish results freely and without fear of censorship. It also affirms that the university actively seeks to have a diversity of ideas examined thoughtfully and in depth by its faculty.

In addition to the policy on academic freedom, the Seattle University *Faculty Handbook* includes a policy on respect for religious beliefs that affirms that the university respects the religious beliefs and practices of all the individuals who contribute to the life of the university and employs faculty and staff without regard to religious affiliation.

Supporting Documentation

1. *Faculty Handbook*

2.A.29 Individuals with teaching responsibilities present scholarship fairly, accurately, and objectively. Derivative scholarship acknowledges the source of intellectual property, and personal views, beliefs, and opinions are identified as such.

Seattle University expects that teaching be conducted with integrity and that scholarship be presented fairly, accurately and objectively. The *Faculty Handbook* states that the search for and communication of truth is the primary value for any faculty member, and that this truthfulness will embody personal integrity, intellectual honesty, and accuracy in communicating the results of study and research. The *Handbook* specifically grants academic freedom to opinions and hypotheses, but in doing so requires that these be appropriately labeled.

The expectations of the university regarding the integrity of academic research programs is fully addressed in the university's policy on "Allegations of Research Misconduct" that identifies the importance of research integrity and the admonishment of attempting to falsify or misrepresent data at any stage of the research process. This policy applies to all research done at the university and seeks to ensure the university is in compliance with federal regulations regarding integrity of research. Additionally, in keeping with federal regulations, the University has revised its Financial Conflict of Interest policies and procedures to ensure objectivity and integrity in research. The university has added support that has strengthened the functioning of the Internal Review Board and has subscribed to Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative to provide training in responsible conduct of research. Much of this work is managed through the Office of Sponsored Research and Special Projects, which takes a leadership role in promoting the integrity of university scholarship and research.

Another example of university policy germane to this standard is the university's copyright policy and guidelines which are intended to help the university to comply with the copyright laws of the United States and to guide and support faculty in following appropriate copyright practices. Like the other policies referenced here, the copyright policy is prominently posted on the university's website. Communicating and updating these policies is the responsibility of the Office of Copyright Compliance (OCC) which assists faculty in obtaining copyright permission from rights holders and examining specific materials to determine relevant copyright freedoms and limitations.

In order to strengthen institutional focus and to provide senior-level leadership that will facilitate continuing growth in the area of research support, the university has created and funded the position of Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education. One aspect of this position is intended to advance the academic and scholarly excellence of the university by working collaboratively with faculty to enhance the amount of sponsored research at the university, the promotion of

interdisciplinary and team-oriented research/scholarship, the use of technology in the scholarly enterprise, and to facilitate public-private partnerships for the university.

The university also maintains policies intended to assist students in understanding and adhering to ethical and appropriate practices in the practice of scholarship. The university's Academic Integrity policy addresses standards of conduct within the academic setting, defines plagiarism, cheating and academic fraud, outlines a process for reporting and investigating allegations of misconduct, and provides potential penalties. While not directly applicable to research integrity, it is worth noting here that all professional programs have standards outlining expectations for students who work in direct contact with clients or patients as part of preparation for their chosen professional field.

Supporting Documents

1. *Faculty Handbook*
2. Academic Integrity Policy
3. Allegations of Research Misconduct Policy
4. Policy for Financial Conflict of Interest Disclosure and Management for Investigators in Externally Sponsored Programs
5. Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects (ORSSP) website
6. Office of Copyright Compliance (OCC) website

Policies and Procedures: Finance

2.A.30 The institution has clearly-defined policies, approved by its governing board, regarding oversight and management of financial resources—including financial planning, board approval and monitoring of operating and capital budgets, reserves, investments, fundraising, cash management, debt management, and transfers and borrowings between funds.

Seattle University's *Bylaws* state:

> The President shall be the chief executive officer of the University and shall have general charge and control of all its business affairs and properties, subject to the ultimate determination and responsibility of the Board of Trustees.

The President frequently communicates with the Chair of the Board of Trustees, and regular financial updates are provided to the Board throughout the year. In recognition of its responsibilities and the growing complexity of the university, the Board of Trustees has established standing committees charged with oversight of specific academic and operational functions.

Four committees provide due diligence in financial matters. The Finance and Audit Committees report and recommend action directly to the Board of Trustees, while the Investment and Facilities and Land Use Committees are sub-committees reporting to the Finance Committee. Financial matters not governed by established policy undergo regular review by the appropriate Board Committee with action items referred to the full Board for general vote.

The Seattle University Board of Trustees reviews, approves, and affirms the creation and revision of numerous policies governing the management of financial resources. Examples include the Policy to Initiate Capital Construction, the Policy to Utilize and Manage Debt-Finance Resources for Capital Acquisitions, the Investment Policy Statement, and the SU Gift Acceptance Policies. In addition, the Board of Trustees approves major operational, capital, or financial decisions through approval of annual budgets, long-term plans and program creation, and through formal resolutions then recorded in meeting minutes and archived with the governing documents of the institution.

The continued development, refresh, and approval of financial management policies to codify established practice are a shared responsibility of the Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs and the Vice President for University Counsel.

Supporting Documents

1. *Seattle University Bylaws*
2. Board of Trustee Committee Charters (includes Finance Committee, Facilities and Land Use Committee, and Audit Committee)
3. Investment Policy Statement
4. Policy to Initiate Capital Construction
5. Policy to Utilize and Manage Debt-Financing Resources for Capital Acquisitions
6. Gift Acceptance Policies
7. Budget for FY13
8. Ten Year Capital Plan
9. Resolution of the Board of Trustees – representative sample

2.B Human Resources

2.B.1 The institution employs a sufficient number of qualified personnel to maintain its support and operations functions. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions accurately reflect duties, responsibilities, and authority of the position.

Seattle University employs qualified personnel in sufficient numbers to maintain its operations functions, demonstrated by the University's success in maintaining its support and operations functions. Support operations include, bus is not limited to: finance, facilities services, human resources, marketing and communications, as well as student and academic support functions, and are operated by staff, temporary and student employees. Additionally, the University uses third party contractors to provide services in the areas of information technology, food service and custodial services.

Support and operational positions have been added or redesigned over time to meet changing needs. The annual university budget process provides an opportunity for assessment of needs and the capacity of a unit to accomplish its objectives. When a unit anticipates it will be unable to accomplish work with currently allocated staff or faculty, or a new program or service necessitates an increase in staffing, a proposal is submitted during the budget process that is reviewed and prioritized by the President's Cabinet.

Examples include:

- Additional and redesigned positions in the Enrollment Services division including admissions counselors and financial aid personnel.
- Creation of the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects and the addition of personnel in that office to address the growing need for support of faculty research.
- Additional personnel in Housing and Residence Life as on-campus housing has expanded.
- Additional personnel in the Controller's Office to manage increased volume and complexity in university finances.
- Additional positions in the Facilities trades areas to address a growing campus footprint.
- Additional personnel in the Human Resources area to carry out several initiatives in strategic priority five: Investing in the Excellence of Our Faculty and Staff.

Criteria and qualifications as well as decision-making and supervisory responsibility (authority) for staff support and operational personnel are clearly stated in online position descriptions used for recruiting and are accessible to employees after they are hired. Position descriptions are updated annually. Procedures for selection are explained in the *Human Resources Policy Manual* online and are accessible to applicants and hiring managers.

A university wide update of position descriptions in 2011 included the assessment and establishment of standards of minimum qualifications for all staff positions, independent of the incumbent's credentials and experience that are aligned with external national market information. Subsequently, all current employees meet the minimum qualifications established for the positions they hold.

Criteria for temporary employment positions are established at the time a need arises for temporary support and are stored in the electronic system used for requesting and approving temporary personnel. Temporary position descriptions are brief as the nature of temporary employment is of a fixed duration and often less complex.

Supervisors are responsible for informing student employees of their conditions of employment including work assignments, rights and responsibilities, evaluations, retention, promotion, and termination. Inquiring supervisors are directed by Student Financial Services to refer to an online supervisor's guide for assistance with terminations, and Student Financial Services is available to answer additional concerns or questions for both students and supervisors.

Supporting Documents

1. Staff hiring policies and procedures
2. Policy for Recruiting and Hiring Full-Time Faculty
3. Sample position descriptions showing minimum qualifications
4. Student employment policies

2.B.2 Administrators and staff are evaluated regularly with regard to performance of work duties and responsibilities.

Administrators and staff are evaluated annually with regard to performance and work duties. In 2012, the completion rate for performance evaluations was 99%.

The Office of Human Resources administers the annual performance appraisal process and a standard form is used across the institution which includes assessment items that incorporate the university mission, vision, and values. The form and process have been the focus of improvement initiatives in recent years and will continue to evolve.

Supporting Documents

1. Performance evaluation form and process website

2.B.3 The institution provides faculty, staff, administrators, and other employees with appropriate opportunities and support for professional growth and development to enhance their effectiveness in fulfilling their roles, duties, and responsibilities.

Seattle University provides faculty, staff, administrators and other employees with appropriate opportunities and support for professional growth and development.

The university provides benefits which promote professional development for faculty, staff and administrators including a tuition remission benefit for education at Seattle University and access to the library and learning commons. A historical analysis of participation in tuition remission programs for faculty and staff shows that in the academic years 2009–2012 186 employees received tuition remission, completing a total of 920 credit hours.

The University sets aside funding each year for professional development activities for faculty and staff. A summary of budgeted and actual spending in professional development accounts shows a steady increase in the investment of university funds for the professional development of faculty and staff, evidenced by a summary of actual spending in these accounts below:

	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
All University Travel & Professional Development Accounts (actual spending)	$2,883,277	$3,559,176	$4,021,398

Seattle University has made a formal commitment to bring its academic programs and the research and scholarship of its faculty to the next level of accomplishment. To achieve this goal, the university is engaged in a systematic process to make significant improvements and additions to its support infrastructure to enhance its academic programs and support the teaching and research/scholarship of its faculty.

The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) promotes the professional formation of all faculty through a scholarly and interdisciplinary approach to teaching, learning and career development by helping to improve pedagogy. Participation is voluntary and confidential. In 2011-12, 266 faculty (37% of the university's faculty) participated in the Center's services. CETL also provides orientation to new faculty through the New Faculty Institute, which includes panels on topics such as the criteria for promotion and tenure and on learning how to balance research/scholarship, teaching and service activities.

The Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects (ORSSP; established in 2010) offers faculty a broad range of services, including pre and post-award grant management and support, liaison with funding agencies, internal review and compliance. ORSSP also shares in the responsibility to ensure that the mission of the university is considered in grant applications, that the project is conducted according to university policies and procedures, and that funds are expended consistent with grant requirements and generally accepted accounting principles. In collaboration with University Advancement, ORSSP also reviews and manages sponsored funding obtained from private and corporate sources.

Faculty are supported in their scholarly endeavors through a variety of sources. To better support tenure-track assistant professors in their professional growth as they pursue promotion and tenure,

the university instituted the Junior Faculty Professional Development Grant Program in Academic Year 2009-10. This program seeks to enhance the academic quality of the university by supporting the faculty member's development in the areas of teaching and research/scholarship during his/her probationary period. This program provides a one-quarter release from teaching responsibilities and it is typically taken during the faculty member's fourth year of probationary service. These grants/leaves are not competitive, but are awarded to all tenure-track assistant professors who receive a positive mid-probationary review (normally conducted during the third year of probationary service).

Full-time tenured faculty members and professional librarians also receive paid release time to support their programs of research/scholarship and/or professional development. They are eligible to receive a sabbatical leave every seventh year and can take either a one quarter leave for full compensation; a two quarters leave at 50 percent compensation; or one-year sabbatical at 60 percent compensation. During the period of the leave, faculty members are relieved from their standard university responsibilities.

In addition to the Junior Faculty Professional Development Program and sabbaticals for tenured faculty and professional librarians, the university provides several forms of scholarly support. The Office of the Provost offers summer research fellowships to tenure-track or tenured faculty each year through a competitive application process. The Center for the Study of Justice and Society offers support for interdisciplinary research through its Faculty Fellows workshops that bring together up to four groups of faculty a year to read common texts over the course of the academic year and apply the materials to their own scholarship, typically presenting a newly produced manuscript to their group at the final session. Finally, the Division of Mission and Ministry operates the Endowed Mission Fund for Faculty and Staff Development in Mission to encourage programs, projects, and scholarship related to the Catholic and Jesuit identity of the university.

The two libraries on campus are also fully committed to supporting and enhancing faculty scholarship and their course curricula. A reference librarian is assigned to each academic program and is available for consultation with faculty members in that program. In addition, each academic department/program or school/college is allocated a library acquisition budget.
A faculty member in each program serves as library liaison and works with the designated reference librarian and the other faculty in that program to acquire materials (books and other items) that will support the faculty in their teaching and scholarship.

As shown in the chart below, funding for professional development of faculty has significantly increased in recent years.

Faculty Support Base Budgets

Type	**FY08**	**FY09**	**FY10**	**FY11**	**FY12**	**FY13**
1078 Junior Faculty Leave	$0	$0	$41,094	$139,579	$139,579	$139,579

1780 Faculty Development	$328,830	$330,901	$341,396	$388,296	$388,296	$433,296
2782 Sabbaticals	$196,650	$204,516	$210,063	$204,554	$177,554	$177,554
2784 Summer Fellowships	$89,710	$93,298	$93,298	$93,298	$106,500	$106,500
Totals	$615,190	$628,715	$685,851	$825,727	$811,929	$856,929

In addition to university level support, schools and colleges provide funding to support faculty. Support provided at the school/college level often includes start-up packages for labs, faculty development funds to cover expenses for scholarship or conference travel, summer stipends, research assistants as well as chairs, professorships and other forms of release time during the academic year.

The faculty of the university have demonstrated success in the rigorous peer review practices maintained by academic journals and by federal grants made through the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. In recent years, the level of research activity directed toward seeking extramural support has increased significantly. The number of grant proposals submitted for sponsored funding increased from 33 in FY2010 to 56 in FY2012. The university generated $4.6 million of sponsored funding in FY12 (a substantial increase over the $3.1 million generated in FY11) bringing the total ongoing external funding to above $8.5 million. Proposals to the university's Institutional Review Board increased from 55 in 2010 to 61 in 2011.

In order to strengthen institutional focus and to provide senior-level leadership that will facilitate continuing growth in the area of research support, the university has created and funded the position of Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education. This position is intended to advance the academic excellence of the university and support the development of faculty as scholar-educators by developing, coordinating and stimulating research and creative activity across the eight colleges and schools, enhancing external funding, increasing and diversifying research and creative work, managing technology transfer opportunities, ensuring compliance with appropriate laws and regulations, and identifying and developing alternate revenue sources, including public-private partnerships.

Seattle University has made a number of other notable investments in the university infrastructure which, while not traditionally considered to be in the category of faculty support, bear significant benefits in terms of developing the institutional capabilities that facilitate and enhance the work of faculty. Examples include the development of an office of Global Engagement, which assists faculty in developing international programming; improvements in university technology capabilities, including the development of an internal office of the Chief Information Officer; and the purchase and implementation of a new learning management system (Instructure Canvas).

The university also provides professional development programs for faculty and staff through the office of human resources and a new position within this area: the director of organizational and professional development. This new position was created in 2008 to assess and monitor the

professional development needs of the staff and to design and implement programs to meet them. Topics for staff professional development programs conducted by the Office of Human Resources have focused on leadership development and verbal and visual communication skills enhancement. In the first year of tracking participation (2011), human resources professional development programs served 564 faculty and staff employees as shown in the chart below:

2011 Human Resources Professional Development Programs	**Total Participants**
Workshops	107
Information Sessions	80
1-Hour Spotlights	32
Online Learning	249
Webinars - Group Viewed	96

Development opportunities for staff employees also include the robust technical training resource of Lynda.com, added in 2012 and the new employee orientation program for staff which is a half day seminar for new staff employees which covers topics such as the history and mission of the university, current topics and initiatives as well as operational items such as benefits enrollment and how to navigate campus. New Employee Orientation includes a lunchtime lecture and discussion about the tenets of Jesuit education conducted by the Office of Jesuit Identity.

Finally, the University's strategic priority, Investing in the Excellence of Our Faculty and Staff, includes an initiative related to professional development which illustrates the institution's commitment to providing opportunities to faculty, staff and administrators.

2.B Human Resources

2.B.4 Consistent with its mission, core themes, programs, services, and characteristics, the institution employs appropriately-qualified faculty sufficient in number to achieve its educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and assure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs, wherever offered and however delivered.

Seattle University employs highly-qualified faculty to meet the teaching, scholarship and service needs of the university, its students, and various stakeholders. The University ensures the qualifications and standard of excellence of its faculty through its hiring, professional development, and performance evaluation processes. Upon hire, faculty members are required to submit official academic transcripts and degrees are verified through a national clearinghouse. As of Fall 2012, 99% of the 323 tenured and tenure-track faculty and 66% of the 182 full-time non-tenure-track faculty had earned terminal degrees in their fields of study.

Seattle University assesses the sufficiency of its faculty primarily in relation to the number of students those faculty are educating. For internal purposes, the university uses a student/faculty

ratio that compares FTE faculty to FTE students. Seattle University data shows that this figure has slightly decreased in recent years.

Overall Fall Faculty Census Tenure and Full Time Percentages

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	5 year change
Total Faculty	672	708	740	727	766	14%
Tenured/TT	315	308	317	319	329	4.4%
% Tenured/TT	47%	44%	43%	44%	43%	-3.9%
Full Time	470	469	483	490	525	11.7%
% Full Time	70%	66%	65%	67%	69%	-1.4%
Part Time	202	239	257	237	241	19.3%
% Part Time	30%	34%	35%	33%	31%	1.4%
Fall Student Headcount (Duplicated)	7,664	7,832	7,906	7,846	7,579	-1.1%
Student/Faculty Ratio	11.4	11.1	10.7	10.8	9.9	-13.2%

For external benchmarking, Seattle University relies on data provided by the IPEDS, which also allows for comparison of faculty staffing to student enrollment, but which uses a different methodology, based upon the ratio of full total FTE enrollment of the student population over a 12 month period to the number of full time faculty. These data show Seattle University to be slightly below the average of its identified peers, indicating that the institution has more full time faculty per student FTE than the institution's peers.

Full-Time Faculty per Student FTE (2010-2011)

Creighton Univ.	16.4
Gonzaga Univ.	19.1
Loyola Marymount Univ.	16.7
Loyola Univ. Maryland	16.3
Santa Clara Univ.	19.1
Univ. of Denver	17.1
Univ. of Portland	19.4
Univ. of San Diego	20.5
Univ. of San Francisco	23.6
Univ. of the Pacific	17.0
Xavier Univ.	19.1
Peer Average	**18.6**
Seattle Univ.	**18.1**

2.B.5 Faculty responsibilities and workloads are commensurate with the institution's expectations for teaching, service, scholarship, research, and/or artistic creation.

Faculty workload at Seattle University is consistent with institutional expectations in the three key areas of faculty service: teaching, research/scholarship and service. The Seattle University *Faculty Handbook* articulates university policy regarding faculty duties and responsibilities, including teaching, service, scholarship and professional development. The *Handbook* defines the normal academic teaching load for tenure and tenure-track faculty as teaching the equivalent of seven five-credit undergraduate courses per year across the fall, winter and spring quarters.

It is common practice at the university that research-active tenure and tenure-track faculty members receive a one-course release from their standard teaching load to support them in their research and scholarly pursuits. Course releases are also granted for certain administrative work (e.g. service as a program director, department chairperson, or assistant/associate dean).

The *Faculty Handbook* recognizes that each school and college has unique disciplinary requirements that impact teaching responsibilities, and allows each school/college to develop formulas for faculty workload subject to approval by the Provost.

Faculty are supported in their scholarly endeavors through a variety of sources. To better support tenure-track assistant professors in their professional growth as they pursue promotion and tenure, the university instituted the Junior Faculty Professional Development Grant Program in Academic Year 2009-10. This program seeks to enhance the academic quality of the university by supporting the faculty member's development in the areas of teaching and research/scholarship during his/her probationary period. This program provides a one-quarter release from teaching responsibilities and it is typically taken during the faculty member's fourth year of probationary service. These grants/leaves are not competitive, but are awarded to all tenure-track assistant professors who receive a positive mid-probationary review (normally conducted during the third year of probationary service).

Full-time tenured faculty members and professional librarians also receive paid release time to support their programs of research/scholarship and/or professional development. They are eligible to receive a sabbatical leave every seventh year and can take either a one quarter leave for full compensation; a two quarters leave at 50 percent compensation; or one-year sabbatical at 60 percent compensation. During the period of the leave, faculty members are relieved from their standard university responsibilities.

Support for faculty research/scholarship comes from a variety of university sources. Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members are eligible to apply each year, through a competitive application process, for summer research fellowships. The Center for the Study of Justice and Society offers support for interdisciplinary research through its Faculty Fellows Workshop program;

the Office of the Provost offers a number of stipends and research grants each year to promote the development of new courses and research, respectively, that focuses on topics associated with the Catholic intellectual tradition; and the Division of Mission and Ministry operates the Endowed Mission Fund for Faculty and Staff Development in Mission to encourage the development of academic programs, projects, and research related to the Catholic and Jesuit identity of the university.

Supporting Documents

1. *Faculty Handbook*
2. Junior Faculty Professional Development Grant Program Policy
3. Center for the Study of Justice and Society Faculty Fellows Program
4. Endowed Mission Fund for Faculty and Staff Development in Mission

2.B.6 All faculty are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner at least once within every five-year period of service. The evaluation process specifies the timeline and criteria by which faculty are evaluated; utilizes multiple indices of effectiveness, each of which is directly related to the faculty member's roles and responsibilities, including evidence of teaching effectiveness for faculty with teaching responsibilities; contains a provision to address concerns that may emerge between regularly scheduled evaluations; and provides for administrative access to all primary evaluation data. Where areas for improvement are identified, the institution works with the faculty member to develop and implement a plan to address identified areas of concern.

All faculty at Seattle University are evaluated in a manner consistent with this standard.

University policy relating to the evaluation of faculty is articulated in the *Faculty Handbook*. This policy is supplemented by each school and college through formal guidelines that articulate process and timeline. The *Faculty Handbook* stipulates that all ranked faculty and all faculty on fixed-term appointments are evaluated annually and that other faculty are ranked according to their circumstances.

The *Faculty Handbook* also articulates the professional responsibilities and standards against which faculty are evaluated, tenured and promoted. It articulates faculty responsibilities, including provisions that teaching excellence is the critical ingredient of quality for a faculty member at Seattle University, that continuing scholarship, professional development and service are expected. It defines the general expectations of faculty relating to the mission, values and Catholic character of the university. It defines the level of teaching and scholarly accomplishment required for promotion in rank.

The *Faculty Handbook* outlines the university's confidentiality provisions relating to faculty evaluation and include a provision that those directly involved in the review process (not including the candidate) have full access to those materials that inform an evaluation. To balance confidentiality

with a faculty member's right to understand the basis of evaluation decisions, the *Handbook* provides that factual material that is judged to be significant and material to an adverse decision be reviewed with the candidate.

The developmental purposes and collegiality of faculty evaluations are also outlined by the *Faculty Handbook*. The *Handbook* stipulates that evaluations be used as the basis of decisions relation to reappointment, promotion and tenure, but also for the developmental purpose of achieving and maintaining excellence as a faculty member. The developmental purpose of faculty evaluation is also reflected in the *Handbook's* provision that progress in overcoming deficiencies and growth in excellence will be a major factor in personnel decisions. When the performance review process reveal areas for improvement, or when performance issues arise outside of the review process, the university works with the faculty member on performance improvement planning. The process is typically managed at the departmental (by the Department Chairperson) or college level (Dean). When such processes are implemented, they are intended, like the evaluation process, to support the success of the faculty member in addressing areas of challenge and help the faculty member realize his/her full potential as a scholar-educator.

The *Faculty Handbook* is supplemented by guidelines that outline specific schedules and processes for faculty evaluation as appropriate to each school or college. While the process for the evaluation varies across the schools and colleges, all academic areas evaluate faculty through multiple indices, including student, peer and self-evaluations.

Supporting Documents

1. *Faculty Handbook*

2.C Education Resources

2.C.1 The institution provides programs, wherever offered and however delivered, with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission; culminate in achievement of clearly-identified student learning outcomes; and lead to collegiate-level degrees or certificates with designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

Mission

The Seattle University mission has three major components: professional formation, education of the whole person, and empowering leaders for a just and humane world.

Seattle University's mission provides the foundation for the formulation of the university's learning outcomes for graduate and undergraduate students alike. Every program, graduate and undergraduate, has learning outcomes specific to that program of study. In turn all programs must map their program level outcomes to the university level outcomes. All new proposed programs that are considered for inclusion in the university curriculum must demonstrate through learning outcomes how their curriculum supports the mission of the university. The program review process requires all programs under review to reflect on their contribution to the mission. Because the program learning outcomes map to the mission of the university and the program outcomes are reviewed in the context of the university learning outcomes (undergraduate and graduate, detailed below), the university is able to assess the degree to which programs contribute to the university mission.

Learning Outcomes

At the university level, there are Undergraduate Learning Objectives and Graduate Learning Outcomes. [Please note: The university uses the terms "outcomes" and "objectives" interchangeably in this sense because of the two different titles.] The faculty revised the undergraduate learning objectives in Academic Year AY 2010-2011 and the Board of Trustees approved them in fall quarter 2011. The faculty revised the graduate learning outcomes in AY 2011-2012 and the Board of Trustees approved them in spring quarter 2012.

Both the undergraduate learning objectives and graduate learning outcomes were revised to better reflect the mission, values and strategic priorities of the university. Following the revision of the undergraduate learning objectives, the faculty began a revision process for the undergraduate University Core Curriculum (General Education curriculum) in winter of 2010 and they are now preparing it for implementation in fall of 2013. The faculty grounded their discussions of the Core revisions on the basis of the revised undergraduate university learning objectives and in the context of the university strategic planning priorities/core themes.

Program faculty determine the curriculum content of their programs based on their professional expertise and judgment and the standards of their fields. The content and effectiveness of program curriculum are reviewed by faculty on a regular basis through assessment of program and course learning outcomes. In addition, faculty review their programs in a seven year cycle as part of the university's standard program review process. The process is focused on ensuring that programs deliver coherent, rigorous education to students with a high level of academic challenge.

Rigor

Program rigor is reviewed on the basis of assessment of student performance in light of rubrics attached to learning outcomes. In other words, each program learning outcome has a rubric associated with its measurement, and the level of program rigor is assessed based upon which level the students are reaching on the rubric. Faculty norm student work and review assessment results to ensure high levels of challenge and high academic expectations. In some cases, programs utilize external examinations to provide an additional point of reference in assessing the strength of their programs. The professional programs, with few exceptions, are all accredited by external professional bodies. Seattle University professional programs have a record of excellent reviews from their external accreditors.

Collegiate Level Degrees and Certificates

All degrees and certificates are reviewed at the time of their introduction and to ensure that they bear the proper designators. Additionally, the university program review process periodically reviews majors on a seven year cycle to ensure that they bear the proper designators. In cases where there are different degrees for the same disciplinary area, e.g., a BA and a BS, there are learning outcomes and curriculum differences relevant to the different designators.

Supporting Documents

1. University Mission
2. Undergraduate Learning Outcomes
3. Graduate Learning Outcomes
4. Assessment website
5. External accreditation list
6. Program review guidelines and calendar

2.C.2 The institution identifies and publishes expected course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Expected student learning outcomes for courses, wherever offered and however delivered, are provided in written form to enrolled students.

Seattle University electronically publishes program and degree learning outcomes. Program outcomes are available on the respective program's webpage. In cases where different degrees are offered in the same discipline, e.g., a BS and BA, the program articulates the differences in the degrees in the learning outcomes for each degree. All programs provide students with course learning outcomes on course syllabi.

Program faculty members are responsible to see that all courses have learning outcomes on course syllabi or are otherwise available. Schools and Colleges are responsible for ensuring that all programs have learning outcomes on their websites, easily available to students, and that these are otherwise well publicized and communicated.

University wide learning objectives (for undergraduate students) and outcomes (for graduate students) are available on the Admissions website. Incoming undergraduate students receive the Undergraduate Learning Outcomes at summer orientation.

Supporting Documents

1. To locate learning outcomes/objectives for each degree, go to www.seattleu.edu, select a school or college, select a department or degree program, and look for the learning outcomes (typically in the menu on the left)
2. Undergraduate Learning Outcomes
3. Graduate Learning Outcomes
4. Course syllabus template, showing course level outcomes as a required element (in the process of approval)

2.C.3 Credit and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, are based on documented student achievement and awarded in a manner consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally-accepted learning outcomes, norms, or equivalencies in higher education.

Seattle University institutional policies follow standard practices and norms in higher education. Credit hours are awarded based on faculty-student contact time over the course of the quarter (or semester for the School of Law). For the quarter system, one credit of undergraduate work is equated to 50 minutes weekly contact time. Undergraduate courses are generally 5 credits or 250 minutes of contact time over a 10 week period. Other undergraduate courses are offered in 1-2-3-4 credit blocks and require contact time proportionate to the number of credits. Graduate courses are 3 credits for a ten-week period. These standards follow accepted practice for institutions on the quarter system.

In order to earn a bachelor's degree, students must complete a minimum of 180 credits. One undergraduate program requires more than 180 credits for completion: Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering requires 192 credits. The only exception to the 180 credit minimum is the Matteo Ricci College, which awards a Bachelor of Arts in Humanities for students who complete a minimum of 135 credits in a three-year program.

In order to earn a master's degree, students must complete a minimum of 45 credits. Of these 45 credits, students must take at least 36 graduate credits at Seattle University. Masters degree programs range from 45 to 117 credits (Masters of Divinity) in the number of credits required of students to complete a program and receive a degree. Students in the School of Law must earn a minimum of

90 semester credits to earn a Juris Doctorate degree (JD). The School of Law also offers four joint degrees with the Albers School of Business and Economics, and three joint degrees with the College of Arts and Sciences. The joint degrees provide students with the opportunity to complete two degrees in less time than if they took them sequentially. The programs promote an interdisciplinary approach to the subject matter. The joint degree process allows completion of selected courses in the Albers School of Business and Economics or the College of Arts and Sciences to satisfy requirements for the JD degree. Conversely, completion of selected courses taken in the School of Law satisfy requirements for the Albers School of Business and Economics or College of Arts and Sciences degree.

Joint Degrees:

Albers School of Business and Economics

1. Master of Business Administration (MBA)
2. Master of Professional Accounting (MPAC)
3. Master of International Business (MIB)
4. Master of Science in Finance (MSF)

College of Arts and Sciences

1. Master of Sport Administration and Leadership (MSAL)
2. Master of Arts in Criminal Justice (MACJ)
3. Master of Public Administration (MPA)

The Education Leadership doctoral program offered by the College of Education is a post-masters program requiring 90 credits to complete an Ed.D. degree.

The School of Theology and Ministry offers courses for its Pastoral Ministry program online synchronously to students enrolled in the program who live in Alaska. Students in Alaska participate with their counterparts in Seattle in the same classroom experience mediated by electronic communication. They are able to participate in classroom discussions and have the same course assignments.

The School of Law is on the semester system. Credit hours are awarded based on one credit equaling 50 minutes of weekly contact. During the first year, three of the five required doctrinal courses are offered as four-credit one-semester courses. The other two courses are 6 and 5 credits, respectively, spread over two semesters. There is also a three-credit elective course in the first year. In the upper-division, the most common format is a three-credit course (i.e., 150 minutes of contact time per week for 28 sessions), but there are also courses offered in 4, 2, and 1-credit blocks. Externships and clinical courses vary from one to 12 credits. These standards follow the practices of other law schools on semester system calendars accredited by the American Bar Association.

Standards for online courses are the same as those for other special courses at the university including internships, independent studies and practicum/field experiences. The online courses require the same number of contact hours as regular courses, regardless of whether the courses are synchronous or asynchronous.

Supporting Documents

1. Policy on Scheduling of Courses
2. American Bar Association course scheduling standards

2.C.4 Degree programs, wherever offered and however delivered, demonstrate a coherent design with appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, and synthesis of learning. Admission and graduation requirements are clearly defined and widely published.

All academic programs at Seattle University, graduate and undergraduate, strive to provide students with breadth and depth appropriate to the degree awarded. Program faculty are responsible for ensuring the proper breadth, depth, sequence, coherence and synthesis of learning.

Breadth, Depth and Sequencing

All academic majors at Seattle University consist of a set of required courses and electives. Courses are ranked in levels from basic to more demanding and program curriculum is structured so that students are continually being challenged over the course of their studies. Program faculty determine the sequencing of courses and specify whether courses require, because of tightly knit developmental stages of knowledge acquisition, pre-requisites and co-requisites. Course sequencing is particularly important and common in the natural science and science-related programs, e.g., nursing, engineering and business/economics.

Course pre-requisites are loaded into the university's registration system, SUOnline. Thus the university has safeguards in place to ensure that students are following the proper course sequences in their major fields of study.

The University Core curriculum requires all students to take a senior synthesis "capstone" class. Students almost always take the capstone class in their major. This synthesis course requires that they systematically reflect on their education experience over the course of their tenure at the university. Whenever possible, and in line with the core theme of "Engaging the World," students are encourage to take an education abroad offering for a quarter or longer or participate in an immersion experience in a foreign country.

Program Review

Curriculum coherence, course sequencing, and program breadth and depth are reviewed by program faculty through assessment of program learning outcomes, the university's program review process, and reviews by accrediting bodies where programs carry external accreditation. Every effort is made to make the program review process as thorough as possible. The process is guided by very

stringent and newly revised (spring quarter 2012) program review guidelines. The new guidelines require a self-study of the program in which program faculty, students and alumni participate and a visit by an external reviewer who is instructed to focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the current program, and the challenges and opportunities faced by the program looking forward. The program review subcommittee of the Academic Assembly (SU's faculty governance body) undertakes a complete review of all the documentation provided by the program, including the self-study, the report by the external reviewer(s), and a response to the external reviewer report, and a summary letter from the dean.

The Academic Assembly subcommittee, which includes faculty members from around the university, has been effective in overseeing this process and reviewing programs across the university. Members of the committee have been particularly diligent in ensuring that program faculty address issues critical to academic excellence. Special concern is paid to interdisciplinary, cross-discipline programs where discipline boundaries are, by the nature of the program, intertwined and at times so blurred that the focal points of the program become unclear. When this is the case, weaknesses are clearly identified and consensus reached with the program director, the dean, and the Provost about how to turn these weaknesses into strengths. The program then receives a letter of recommendations from the Provost. In some cases the Provost will request a follow up meeting with the program director and dean in the following year to review progress. The dean of the program's school or college is ultimately responsible for overseeing the review and in most cases the implementation of the ensuing recommendations. The program review process is effective in highlighting concerns and marshaling energies to increase program coherence, sequential connections, and rigor.

Graduate Programs

Graduate programs reflect the latest thinking and best practices in the relevant disciplines and professions and adhere to the requirements of their accrediting bodies.

The Schools of Business and Economics, Law, and Theology and Ministry, and the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Education, and Nursing all have programs that are externally accredited. Their degree programs, in compliance with the requirements of the accrediting bodies, are coherent, logically structured with sequencing and prerequisites, and challenge students intellectually and in the applied sphere. Graduate programs that are not externally accredited are required to have clear and coherent curricula that are focused on both academic excellence and are responsive to the university mission.

Publication of Information

The university electronically publishes admissions requirements, program information including all education requirements, course sequencing and prerequisites in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs. In addition, many graduate programs publish graduate student handbooks for their schools and colleges.

Supporting Documents

1. External accreditation list
2. *Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog*
3. Program review guidelines and calendar

College of Arts and Sciences

4. College of Arts and Sciences Student Codes of Conduct (used for all students)
5. Graduate student handbook for Criminal Justice
6. Graduate student handbook for Psychology
7. Graduate student handbook for Nonprofit Leadership
8. Graduate student handbook for Public Administration

College of Education

7. Student handbook for Adult Education and Training
8. Student handbook for Counseling
9. Student handbook for Curriculum and Instruction
10. Student handbook for Educational Administration
11. Student handbook for Educational Leadership Doctorate
12. Student handbook for Literacy for Special Needs
13. Student handbook for School Psychology
14. Student handbook for Special Education
15. Student handbook for Student Development Administration
16. Student handbook for Teacher Preparation/Education
17. Student handbook for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

College of Nursing

9. Nursing student handbook

College of Science and Engineering

18. Science and Engineering orientation materials

School of Theology and Ministry (STM)

10. STM Student Advising Handbook

School of Law

11. School of Law *Student Handbook*

2.C.5 Faculty, through well-defined structures and processes with clearly-defined authority and responsibilities, exercise a major role in the design, approval, implementation, and revision of the curriculum, and have an active role in the selection of new faculty. Faculty with teaching responsibilities take collective responsibility for fostering and assessing student achievement of clearly-identified learning outcomes.

Curriculum development and revision

The department or relevant administrative unit prepares a proposal describing the nature of the program, the fit of the program with the university mission and goals, the learning objectives for the program, the proposed curricular and pedagogical elements, the projected market demand for

program graduates, and the resources (faculty, space, technology infrastructure, library holdings and subscriptions) required to deliver a high quality program.

Faculty in their schools and colleges develop new program proposals and submit those to the faculty run curriculum committees or faculty at large in their respective units and according to the rules and process of those units. The dean of the school or college reviews the proposal and approves it before forwarding it to Academic Assembly for consideration. Academic Assembly is the primary governance body of the faculty, consisting of faculty elected representatives from across the university. School and college faculty are represented on a proportionate basis. A subcommittee of the Assembly reviews all new program proposals, invites the faculty chair and dean for a presentation to the committee and then forwards a recommendation to the Assembly at large. The sponsoring department and dean make a presentation to the full Assembly which in turn votes to either recommend or not recommend acceptance of the program to the Office of the Provost. The Assembly may also decide to recommend the program with reservations, requiring an early review and report back to the Assembly. The Provost reviews these materials and forwards a recommendation along with the proposal to the Board of Trustees for final consideration.

In all cases, faculty have primary responsibility for the development, implementation, and review of all programs, certificates and individual courses. They utilize expertise in their disciplines and teaching skills to design educational experiences for students that are rigorous and include appropriate learning outcomes. During the approval process, faculty colleagues review the proposals to ensure that learning outcomes are clear and appropriate. All programs are required to have program level learning outcomes, and all courses within the program are required to have course learning outcomes directly related to the program learning outcomes.

Faculty are also responsible for program revision. Most recently the faculty of the College of Education engaged in a two-year process to substantially revise their doctoral program in educational leadership. The process mobilized faculty throughout the college and also included outreach to faculty outside the college who have specializations relevant to the Ed.D. degree. A new organizational structure has been put in place, one that will ensure the rigor of the program and provide students with an outstanding educational experience. This proposal was reviewed by the Academic Assembly after a presentation by the director of the program and faculty from other programs within the College of Education who shared in the redesign and will share in teaching doctoral students.

All academic programs are required to have clear learning outcomes. The outcomes are communicated to students electronically through departmental websites and through syllabi and other printed materials. Program faculty lead the assessment of program learning outcomes. Seattle University requires that all programs review all of their outcomes over a five year period. Each year, the program selects one or more outcomes to review, engages in a study which sheds light on student performance and then submits a report to the assessment coordinator of the individual

college or school. As part of this review, the program faculty stipulates if changes are needed and what changes they are going to introduce. A review of the effectiveness of these changes becomes part of the following years' reviews. Many of the university's professional programs are externally accredited by discipline/profession specific accrediting bodies. The university defers to the assessment calendars of those bodies for those programs. Thus the university requirement sets a minimal standard.

Program faculty ensure that the individual courses offered are comprehensive and integrated in such a way as to provide students with all of the knowledge and skills required for the awarding of the degree.

Selection of new faculty

The composition of search committees and the development of voting policies and procedures are determined at the school/college and/or department/program levels. Full-time faculty hiring involves faculty-based search committees who make a recommendation to a department chair (in cases where a department structure exists), who then makes a recommendation to the dean, who in turn recommends to the Provost. Department chairs and deans make part-time hiring decisions.

Fostering and assessing student achievement of clearly-identified learning outcomes

Faculty in all schools and colleges are directly responsible for the learning outcomes for their courses and programs. All courses and programs are required to have clearly-identified learning outcomes. These learning outcomes are either developed directly by the faculty or are shaped by the faculty in line with curriculum requirements from the relevant external accrediting organization. Faculty are responsible for the structure of the curriculum and how the course learning outcomes relate to program learning outcomes.

With respect to general education requirements, faculty have designed and are now implementing a new University Core curriculum. Faculty established the learning outcomes and then designed courses and course outcomes to support student achievement of these Core learning outcomes.

Faculty are also responsible for fostering and assessing student achievement in their courses and programs. Faculty assess student achievement in multiple ways. From grading individual assignments, to giving course grades, to assessing the result of external standardized assessment instruments and exams, to reviewing graduate school admissions, and faculty are intimately involved with the assessment of the majors in their programs.

All programs are required by the university to review and assess their entire program learning outcomes at least once over a five year cycle. While, the Office of Institutional Research and the University Assessment Committee oversee the assessment of programs, and undergraduate and graduate learning outcomes, it is the program faculty which organize, carry out, and assess the effectiveness of their programs based on student achievement. Faculty develop the rubrics, establish

the benchmarks and the means to assess their programs' outcomes, analyze the results of their assessment activities and then modify and/or redesign their program curricula based on their judgment as to how to best improve student achievement.

The Office of Institutional Research, with the support of the University Assessment Committee, reviews the reports from the programs to ensure there is consistent and quality assessment of student achievement across the university. Of course, many programs are externally accredited and those programs follow a calendar for assessment that is determined by their external accrediting bodies. The University requirements in this regard function as a minimum to ensure that all outcomes are assessed on a regular cycle.

Program outcomes are published by schools and colleges on the individual program webpages.

Supporting Documents

1. Process for new program/course development and curriculum revision
2. Process and documents for revision of the Core Curriculum
    a. The Approved Core Curriculum
    b. The New Core at a Glance
    c. The New Core Course Guidelines
    d. The New Core Learning Objectives
3. *Faculty Handbook*

2.C.6 Faculty with teaching responsibilities, in partnership with library and information resources personnel, ensure that the use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process.

Lemieux Library & McGoldrick Learning Commons

Lemieux Library employs a liaison model in which librarians, in partnership with faculty, are active participants in fulfilling core responsibilities in collection development, research consultation, instruction, and student outreach. The result of this collaboration is the development of information resources and services in support of student learning and faculty research. Liaison Librarians encourage faculty to actively select new books and media in their disciplines and collaborate in expending annual firm order allocations. In recognition of faculty members' expertise in a discipline, the librarians may request recommendations or opinions from faculty to help evaluate or assess resources in the collection both tangible and online. The librarians bring faculty recommendations and evaluations of online e-journals and databases to the Collection Development Group (CDG) for discussion and acquisition. Liaison Librarians also may collaborate with faculty in marketing and promoting information resources to students by contributing to the development of online research guides specific to a particular course.

Through the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Achievement and its annual cycle of review for new programs proposals, course changes, or new majors, the librarians have a direct

opportunity to collaborate with faculty, review the proposals, assess strengths or gaps of current resources, and prepare a library response that is included in the formal university review process.

The library's instruction program teaches information literacy and research competencies to ensure the effective use of library resources in SU's academic programs. In one-to-one partnership with faculty, library faculty provide class-integrated instruction sessions that are customized to the class assignment, desired educational outcomes and the skills and abilities students need to be successful in that class. Supporting materials, such as LibGuides (course or subject specific), handouts, tutorials, pre-assessments, etc. are likewise tailored. Library instruction rooms are equipped with laptops for student use, Smartboard podium computers, and MediaSite lecture capture equipment, to enable delivery and capture of technology rich instruction sessions, and hands-on experience with library-provided electronic resources.

For the last two years, librarians have conducted assessment projects about student learning in the library's instruction program. These assessments have deepened collaborations with faculty.
The library participated in SU's recently-completed three year "Writing in the Majors" grant (funded by The Teagle Foundation) that worked with academic departments to look at the writing and research competencies their students needed to succeed in their major/discipline work. Library faculty participated in a series of departmental workshops on issues of curriculum design, assignment scaffolding, expert insider prose (how different fields/disciplines write) and the connection between academic writing and research. Library faculty led the workshop portion around information literacy.

Seattle University Law Library
The law library uses a liaison model to collaborate with law school faculty in integrating library resources into the learning process. Each law faculty member and program (e.g. centers and co-curricular programs) is assigned a librarian who serves as the primary point person for library resources. Law librarians work with faculty and programs individually to provide tailored research instruction. Additionally, the law library is formally involved in law school curricular development through participation on the Law School Curriculum Committee and at faculty meetings.

Supporting Documents

1. 2009-2010 Annual Report on the library's Instruction Program
2. 2010-2011 Annual Report on the library's Instruction program
3. 2011-2012 Draft Annual Report on library's Instruction Program
4. Role of the Liaison Librarian
5. Law Library Faculty Services Guide
6. Law Library Faculty Liaison Services
7. Statistics on the Use of Law Library and Other Learning Resources for 2011-2012

2.C.7 Credit for prior experiential learning, if granted, is: a) guided by approved policies and procedures; b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students; c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree; d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution's regular curricular offerings; and e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately-qualified teaching faculty. Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students' transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution's review process.

Seattle University does not grant credit for prior experiential learning.

2.C.8 The final judgment in accepting transfer credit is the responsibility of the receiving institution. Transfer credit is accepted according to procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality, relevance to the students' programs, and integrity of the receiving institution's degrees. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that the credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic quality, and level to credit it offers. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements between the institutions.

Seattle University accepts transfer credit from accredited institutions and in special cases, other institutions, but always with safeguards to ensure, in all instances, high academic quality and coherence with respect to the student's program. The decision whether or not to transfer credit is solely the university's. The Registrar's Office in consultation with program faculty oversees transfer of credit and course equivalents.

The university updated the major Transfer Credit Policy (May 2010). The university has several other related policies including those pertaining to Running Start, credit from unaccredited and newly accredited colleges and non-traditional programs. The university also recently updated the International Student Admission policy (September 2011) and the Advanced Placement policy (June 2011).

The Office of the Registrar establishes the criteria for accepting transfer credit based on the requirements of the programs of the individual schools/colleges. On the undergraduate level, the university has transfer agreements with Washington state community colleges. In addition to the Washington state articulation agreements, the university also has agreements with two-year state institutions in Oregon, California, and Arizona.

These articulation agreements outline the number of credits and the circumstances under which credits are guaranteed to transfer. In addition there is detailed information on the transfer of credit

for Core requirements from two and four year institutions. Seattle University publishes on a yearly basis a complete articulation guide for the transfer of credits from in state institutions. These guides are available on the Office of the Registrar website.

Students may appeal to the Office of the Registrar for the acceptance of credit earned at non-accredited institutions. Students must provide a course description as part of their appeal. The Registrar then forwards this description and any other supporting materials to the appropriate academic department for consideration. Should the department choose to decide in the affirmative, the Office of the Registrar posts the credit to the student's record. Should the appeal be denied, the student is notified.

The University publishes summaries of the relevant academic policies in the Undergraduate Catalog and the Graduate Catalog. Both catalogs are available on the university website. Previous editions of the catalog/bulletins are available online beginning with the 1997-98 academic year.

The policies in full are available on the Office of the Registrar website and are accessible to the public.

Supporting Documents

1. Transfer Credit Policy, including out-of-state transfer agreements
2. Admission to the University Policy, including articulation agreements
3. Washington State community college transfer guides
4. Transfer Credit Policies
5. Course Equivalency Search
6. Acceptance of credits policy: International Baccalaureate
7. Acceptance of credits policy: Advanced Placement
8. Acceptance of credits policy: Running Start

Undergraduate Programs

2.C.9 The general education component of undergraduate programs (if offered) demonstrates an integrated course of study that helps students develop the breadth and depth of intellect to become more effective learners and to prepare them for a productive life of work, citizenship, and personal fulfillment. Baccalaureate degree programs and transfer associate degree programs include a recognizable core of general education that represents an integration of basic knowledge and methodology of the humanities and fine arts, mathematical and natural sciences, and social sciences. Applied undergraduate degree and certificate programs of thirty (30) semester credits or forty-five (45) quarter credits in length contain a recognizable core of related instruction or general education with identified outcomes in the areas of communication, computation, and human relations that align with and support program goals or intended outcomes.

Overview
The General Education Component of Seattle University's undergraduate curriculum is referred to as the University Core Curriculum. The current University Core Curriculum (ending spring of 2013) has been in place for over two decades. Under the leadership of the Provost, the undergraduate faculty undertook a significant and wholesale revision of the Core beginning in fall of 2010, developing new learning objectives and a new curricular structure. The implementation of the new University Core curriculum is currently underway and the new University Core will launch for all students beginning in summer of 2013. The new University Core curriculum embodies core themes critical to the intellectual life of the university.

Current University Core Curriculum (ending spring 2013)
Almost all students pursuing their first baccalaureate degree at Seattle University must complete the Core Curriculum. The exceptions are students in the University Honors program and Matteo Ricci College. Please see below for a description of their curricula.

There are 15 courses in the Core Curriculum, totaling 71-75 academic credits, approximately 40 percent of the 180 credits required for a BA or BS degree in most majors. Transfer students complete a modified version of the Core, depending on the number of credits they transfer in from other institutions.

The Core requirements are described in the *Undergraduate Catalog*, and all new undergraduates are given a copy of the *Core Handbook* which describes the requirements and explains the objectives and guiding principles of the Core. Descriptions and details of the program are also published on the University Core website.

The current University Core was designed in 1986 as a reflection of the Jesuit educational tradition and is explicitly presented to both faculty and students in those terms, which provide a clear and compelling rationale for the curriculum's foci on developing critical analysis, ethical and spiritual reflection, multi-dimensional thinking, and a commitment to effective action in service of social justice. Current learning objectives for the University Core are posted on university and Core Web pages and listed in the *Core Handbook*.

Reflecting the university's intention that this program be a formative experience for students, the 15 courses in the program are organized in a three-phase developmental structure. This structure is explicitly designed to begin with the skills that students need to succeed in college and, building on that foundation, assist them in the development of a greater understanding of their role in society and how they can be positive forces in that society.

Phase I: Foundations of Wisdom: This phase of the Core intentionally includes instruction in writing, research including focus on information literacy critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning as a means of preparing students for more advanced work in other classes. This phase focuses on

helping students develop as whole persons with solid critical intellectual skills through studies in college-level writing, critical thinking, and mathematics; a solid foundation of cultural literacy through studies in fine arts, history, philosophy, natural science, and literature; and also begin to become well-rounded thinkers through combining the perspectives of all of the disciplines represented in this phase.

Phase II: Person in Society: This phase encourages students to understand themselves and society in relationship to one another. The central logic of this phase is to combine the insights of the social sciences and the humanities in dialogue with one another through four courses in the social sciences, philosophy, and theology/religious studies.

Phase III: Responsibility and Service: This phase encourages students to think deeply about how they will apply and use their education and includes four courses in ethics, theology and religious studies, an interdisciplinary study of a social problem, and a senior synthesis experience. The Senior Syntheses courses, as well as the Core Interdisciplinary courses, provide integrative capstone experiences for students. Many of the Senior Syntheses courses involve original research on the part of the students or challenging integrative projects.

In addition to this phased course structure, the University Core incorporates two special features designed to encourage student engagement and depth of study. Central to the first year are the Core Freshman Seminars. Every University Core student takes at least one Freshmen Seminar during their first year of study at Seattle University. These seminars have a maximum of 19 students per section, are writing intensive, and are thematically organized around important and exciting academic issues. They also include off-campus, co-curricular experiences. These seminars function as an important part of orienting new students to the university, engaging them in deep study of important issues in a small-class setting where they get to know their faculty member and fellow students.

A second special feature of the University Core is the linkage of some Core courses with the thematic Living-Learning Communities in the residence halls. In these sections, students live in the same residential community with their colleagues from class, allowing them easy access to study partners and collegial support, as well as a stronger connection between the academic experiences in the classroom with the larger lived experience of campus life. The University Core and Housing & Residence Life have collaborated for several years to offer this program.

[Approximately 10 percent of entering freshmen are enrolled in the University Honors program or in the Matteo Ricci College. These two programs have their own versions of a general education program, although in both cases the programs make use of several Core courses as part of their programs of study. These programs will not be significantly impacted by the change in the Core Curriculum. The University Honors Program itself is undergoing a redesign beginning in academic year 2012-13.]

The University Honors Program is a two-year program of study taken in the first two years at Seattle University that fulfills most of Seattle University's Core curriculum requirements through a distinctive curriculum that emphasizes integration of learning. While focusing on the historical cultural tradition from ancient times to the contemporary period, it seeks to provide an interdisciplinary dialogue along with in-depth learning primarily in the disciplines of philosophy, literature, and history, but also in other areas of study in the humanities and the social sciences. Each term students in the program take three courses in three different disciplines organized around a specific historical period with a view to both a horizontal integration of learning across disciplines and a vertical integration of learning within disciplines. Each course engages students in active seminar-style learning, original research writing projects, and oral communication. Students in the program learn to read critically through classroom discussions of primary source material. Students in the program participate in peer review of writing through small group conferences. Students in the program must take an oral final exam with all three professors present in which synthesizing/integrating of learning within and across the disciplines must be demonstrated. Student's in the program participate in a plenary session outside the classroom which involves attending a lecture or cultural event appropriate to their coursework. Faculty teaching in the program in any given term meet twice before the start of each term to discuss overarching themes and topics, and to plan the coursework to both norm and to stagger the workload throughout the term for more effective learning. At the end of each term students write a self-evaluation of all phases of their work throughout the term and faculty write a qualitative assessment of each student's work.

The Matteo Ricci College offers a Bachelor of Arts in the Humanities which is an accelerated three year degree in partnership with local Catholic High Schools. (High school seniors attend Matter Ricci College as freshmen.) In addition the College offers four year degrees in teaching and in leadership. The core curriculum of Matteo Ricci which all students take is grounded in literature, philosophy, and history. In addition students take university Core classes in math and laboratory science. Students take a special 10 credit capstone class which is on a theme with a significant experiential and contemporary issue/problem oriented focus.

Core Curriculum Revision Process

The university began an extensive revision of the Core curriculum in fall 2010. As envisaged in the university's *Academic Strategic Action Plan*, the goals for the revised core included an outcomes-based set of courses that are academically demanding and, to the extent possible, a common set of courses for all undergraduates.

Beginning in early 2010, a faculty committee led a broad and collaborative process to develop a new University Core. After 16 months of work, they presented a recommendation of approval to the Academic Assembly, the faculty governing body, in the spring of 2011. The Academic Assembly approved that recommendation, as did the Board of Trustees in May of 2011. Immediately after the

approval of the new Core, the Core Director formed an implementation committee to lead the university faculty through the process of course design, an update of all university policies to reflect the new Core, plan informational materials for students and academic advisors, and solidify requirements for transfer students. That work is well underway; the university is piloting a number of new Core courses during AY2012-13 and will launch the new Core fully in fall 2013.

New University Core Curriculum (beginning summer 2013)

The new University Core curriculum is a major revision to the program, with new and well-articulated learning objectives, significant changes in the developmental structure of the curriculum, and completely new courses in many categories, designed expressly for the Core. The new curriculum ensures that students are exposed to a wide variety of intellectual traditions and their approaches to inquiry throughout their four years. It assists them in developing the habits of critical thinking and deep reflection that are the hallmark of the Jesuit educational tradition. Based on a developmental model anchored in the Jesuit tradition, students use their experience in the Core both as the basis for in-depth work in their major programs and as the foundation for a lifetime of intellectual, spiritual, and social engagement.

The new revised University Core, while grounded in the Jesuit tradition, is stronger than its predecessor in a number of respects. One of the goals of the new University Core Curriculum is to increase the standard of "Academic Excellence." This goal is in direct support of that Seattle University core theme. The new Core is designed around assessable learning objectives, which will facilitate tracking overall student progress against both rigorous minimal and high aspirational goals for each objective. In addition, the new Core includes an additional class in the natural sciences (see Module III below) and pays particular attention to methods of inquiry in major disciplinary areas (see Module I below). These Core learning objectives were developed to explicitly reflect the essential academic content of the university Undergraduate Learning Objectives.

<u>Learning Objectives of the New Core Curriculum</u>

The main learning objectives for the new Core are as follows:

I. Jesuit, Catholic Intellectual Traditions: Through knowledge of Jesuit, Catholic intellectual traditions and understanding of diverse religious traditions, students will reflect on questions of meaning, spirituality, ethics, values, and justice.

II. Disciplinary Knowledge and Integrative Learning: By studying humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, mathematics, and fine arts, students will learn how different disciplines pursue knowledge. They will learn disciplinary ways of posing questions, gathering and analyzing evidence, developing cogent arguments, and engaging issues related to nature, culture, and society. Students will also learn to integrate knowledge and explore their intellectual passions.

III. Communication: Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of genres and for different audiences and purposes through writing, speaking, and visual expression.

IV. Global Engagement: Students will examine their roles in local, regional, national, and transnational cultures and communities. Students will be prepared to act, from an informed perspective, on local and global issues that surround and affect them.

These four main learning outcomes are in turn each broken down into three sets of sub-goals identifying the knowledge, skills, and values that students should develop through the curriculum.

Modules of the New Core Curriculum

To deliver these objectives, the new University Core is structured around four sequential modules that build on the learning acquired in earlier academic work and extend throughout students' four years at the university. These modules are intended to be taken in sequence, although they are not explicitly designed to directly align with Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, and Senior years. The modules in the University Core are as follows:

Module I: Engaging Academic Inquiry

Module I helps students develop strong academic skills in writing, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and academic inquiry. The six courses in this module include foundational courses in academic writing, quantitative reasoning, and fine art. In addition, this module includes three "inquiry seminars" where students study important questions in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Each of these inquiry seminars is designed to teach students how scholars in these disciplinary areas understand and explore their subjects, and to engage students in the hands-on study of key disciplinary questions. These courses are not broad introductory survey courses, but focused explorations of relatively narrow disciplinary questions, providing deep and engaging experiences in academic inquiry. This reflects an explicit choice by university faculty to focus on depth of learning and student engagement. The goal is to provide students with an holistic and challenging first year educational experience and engages them in and orients them to scholarly inquiry. Most Module I courses will be small, with maximum enrollments of 19 students.

Module II: Exploring the Self and Others

During their second year, students take courses focused on and directly informed by the university core theme of Catholic-Jesuit Identity. All students take a Theology course in this module, where they are introduced to Theology as the academic study of religion and also learn about key elements of the Catholic-Jesuit intellectual and spiritual tradition. In addition, students take two courses based in philosophy: one course on the Philosophy of the Human Person, which introduces students to philosophy as an academic discipline and explores key philosophical problems that have played key roles in the Catholic-Jesuit tradition. The second philosophy-based course is in Ethical Reasoning. This course introduces students to various philosophical approaches to moral theory and helps them develop the skills and mental habits of rigorous ethical thinking in everyday life. While all of the

courses in Module II are informed by Catholic perspectives, they all present students with a variety of philosophical and theological views, arguments and perspectives.

Module III: Engaging the World

During the design of the new University Core, it became apparent that faculty wanted to increase the university's focus on global issues and engagement. This desire led to the development of a module focused on global issues. This focus matches the university core theme of "Engaging the World." In this module, students will take three, 300-level courses with global emphases. One of these courses falls in the category of "Religion in a Global Context," which will explore non-Catholic religious traditions or examine global issues through the lens of spirituality and religion. The other two courses are classified as "Global Challenge" courses. Each of these courses is focused on an important international and global issue or problem, and explores that issue through the lens of an academic discipline in the humanities, social sciences, or natural sciences. Students will be required to take two of these courses, in areas outside of their major area of study (e.g. English majors will take the courses in natural and social sciences, Chemistry majors will take the courses in humanities and social sciences, etc.). As with the Inquiry Seminars in Module I, each section of these courses has a relatively narrow focus to engage students in deep inquiry. Sample course titles include: The Revolution Will Not Be Televised: Literature and Revolution in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries (humanities), Genocide in Historical and Comparative Perspective (social sciences), and Pick your Poison: Global Perspectives of Toxicology (natural sciences).

Module IV: Reflection

Finally, all students take a Senior Synthesis course in their major. While the majority of their work in that course will be major focused, students will also write a reflection paper to capture the breadth and depth of their collective education at Seattle University. This exercise responds to the university's efforts to forefront academic excellence, education of the whole person, and to encourage integration of knowledge through reflection.

Applied Undergraduate Degrees and Certificate Programs

Seattle University does not offer applied undergraduate certificates, degree programs or associate degrees.

Supporting Documents

1. Core Curriculum website (an online guide that replaces a handbook)
2. New Core Documents
    a. The New Core at a Glance
    b. The New Core Course Guidelines
    c. The Approved Core Curriculum
    d. The New Core Learning Outcomes
3. Honors program catalog
4. Matteo Ricci College program catalog

5. University Core catalog

2.C.10 The institution demonstrates that the general education components of its baccalaureate degree programs (if offered) and transfer associate degree programs (if offered) have identifiable and assessable learning outcomes that are stated in relation to the institution's mission and learning outcomes for those programs.

Transfer Associate Degree Programs
The university does not offer transfer associate degree programs.

General Education Components
As detailed above, the university is in the midst of implementing a new general education program, the University Core. Both the current and new University Core curricula have identifiable and assessable learning objectives that reflect the university's mission and general undergraduate learning objectives.

The current University Core Curriculum, which was designed in the mid-1980s, was originally designed around broad goals and then later redeveloped as learning objectives to explicitly reflect the university learning objectives developed in the late 1990s. The Core learning objectives articulate the general education program's role in delivering the university mission (education of the whole person, professional formation, and empowering leaders for a just and humane world) and the outcomes reflect the stated values of the university including academic excellence, faith, diversity, justice and leadership.

The following are the major statements of the current University Core learning outcomes. Each of these outcomes in turn has 2-6 sub-outcomes which elaborate on these major statements.

- To understand key concepts, perspectives, and methods in philosophy, religious studies, and mathematics and in representative disciplines in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities;
- To think critically and imaginatively by conducting purposeful inquiry, using appropriate technological tools for research and analysis, and showing flexible use of various problem-solving methods including quantitative or scientific reasoning;
- To write and speak effectively for different purposes to different audiences, both academic and civic, including the ability to argue persuasively;
- To demonstrate the ability to work with and for others to translate beliefs, thoughts, values and commitments into action, thereby becoming responsibly empowered in the world;
- To develop a world-view that is open to new ideas and persons, understands diversity and multicultural perspectives, and tolerates ambiguity;
- To develop and articulate a personal value system that respects self, others, society, and the created world and considers the relationship between the self and transcendent;

- To understand how the Jesuit/Catholic tradition sees an intimate connection between faith and justice;
- To articulate one's vision of social and environmental justice, to assess one's own personal commitment to justice, and to demonstrate actions taken to ameliorate injustice or to promote a better world.

The new University Core, which will go into effect in fall 2013, was from the beginning explicitly designed as an outcomes-driven curriculum. Developing a set of four main learning objectives for the Core was the first major step in the curriculum reform process, and those learning objectives drove the design of the curriculum. In order to develop the Core learning objectives, faculty workshops began with the University Undergraduate Learning Objectives, which are based on the university mission statement, and worked to articulate the elements of those objectives that should be delivered through a general education program (some of the Undergraduate Learning Objectives are better delivered through majors or non-curricular programs).

The main learning objectives for the new Core are as follows:

I. Jesuit, Catholic Intellectual Traditions: Through knowledge of Jesuit, Catholic intellectual traditions and understanding of diverse religious traditions, students will reflect on questions of meaning, spirituality, ethics, values, and justice.

II. Disciplinary Knowledge and Integrative Learning: By studying humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, mathematics, and fine arts, students will learn how different disciplines pursue knowledge. They will learn disciplinary ways of posing questions, gathering and analyzing evidence, developing cogent arguments, and engaging issues related to nature, culture, and society. Students will also learn to integrate knowledge and explore their intellectual passions.

III. Communication: Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of genres and for different audiences and purposes through writing, speaking, and visual expression.

IV. Global Engagement: Students will examine their roles in local, regional, national, and transnational cultures and communities. Students will be prepared to act, from an informed perspective, on local and global issues that surround and affect them.

These learning objectives drove the design of the new Core curriculum, and each course in the new curriculum has specific and well-articulated responsibilities for delivering portions of these objectives. A detailed curriculum map was developed to ensure that all learning objectives were incorporated in the new curriculum in a systematic fashion. Written guidelines were developed for each course that included the assigned learning objectives, and faculty members have developed nearly 300 course proposals explicitly designed to teach these learning objectives. The course proposals were reviewed by the Core Curriculum Committee and approximately 200 courses were

approved for the 2013-14 academic year. Students will be given an explanation of the new Core, including an explanation of all of the learning objectives for the program. This information will also be posted on the University Core website. The syllabus for each course section in the new University Core will also list the Core learning objectives associated with that course.

The close and clearly articulated connection between the courses in the new University Core and the Core learning objectives will greatly facilitate assessment work in the new curriculum. While there will be a great deal of variety in the subject matter and design of the courses, the common learning objectives and common assignment types in each course category will allow the Core Assessment Committee to collect authentic student work from these courses and evaluate that work using common rubrics. Assessment rubrics are currently being designed for this purpose, and a system of assessment is being established to make sure that all of the Core learning objectives are being assessed on a regular and frequent basis and that that results of those assessment efforts is used to improve the effectiveness of the University Core.

Supporting Documents

1. The New Core at a Glance
2. The New Core Course Guidelines

2.C.11 The related instruction components of applied degree and certificate programs (if offered) have identifiable and assessable learning outcomes that align with and support program goals or intended outcomes. Related instruction components may be embedded within program curricula or taught in blocks of specialized instruction, but each approach must have clearly-identified content and be taught or monitored by teaching faculty who are appropriately qualified in those areas.

Seattle University does not offer applied degree and certificate programs.

Graduate Programs

2.C.12 Graduate programs are consistent with the institution's mission; are in keeping with the expectations of their respective disciplines and professions; and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. They differ from undergraduate programs by requiring greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capacities; knowledge of the literature of the field; and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or appropriate high-level professional practice.

Seattle University offers a broad spectrum of graduate programs distributed across seven of the university's schools/colleges in the following manner. Information about these programs is provided in 2.C.15.

Albers School of Business and Economics
- Business Administration (MBA)
- Executive Leadership Certificate Program (ELP)
- Finance (MSF)
- Health Leadership Executive Master of Business Administration (HEMBA)
- International Business (MIB)
- Leadership Executive Master of Business Administration (LEMBA)
- Professional Accounting (MPAC)

College of Arts and Sciences
- Arts Leadership (MFA)
- Criminal Justice (MACJ)
- Nonprofit Leadership (MNPL)
- Psychology (MAP)
- Public Administration (MPA)
- Sport Administration and Leadership (MSAL)

College of Education
- Adult Education and Training (MA or MEd)
- Counseling (MAED)
- Curriculum and Instruction (MEd)
- Educational Administration (MEd, EdS)
- Educational Leadership (EdD)
- Literacy for Special Needs (MEd)
- School Psychology (EdS)
- Special Education (MEd, EdS)
- Student Development Administration (MA or MEd)

College of Nursing
- Advanced Practice Nurse Practitioner (MSN)
- Nursing (DNP)
- Nursing (MSN)

College of Science and Engineering
- Computer Science (MSCS)
- Software Engineering (MSE)

School of Law
- Juris Doctor (JD)

School of Theology and Ministry
- Divinity (MDiv)
- Pastoral Counseling (MAPC)
- Pastoral Leadership Program (PLP)
- Pastoral Studies (MAPS)
- Transformational Leadership (MATL)
- Transforming Spirituality (MATS)

Professional formation, one of the three foundational elements of the university mission, is central to graduate education at Seattle University. Advanced degrees in business, computer science, criminal justice, law, nursing, pastoral studies and ministry, public administration, and teaching provide the skills and training necessary for individuals to be productive members of their professions. In addition, in accord with another of the university mission's three central elements, to educate leaders for a just and humane world, many graduate programs have a leadership emphasis or component.

The University Board of Trustees approved a new, revised set of Graduate Learning Outcomes in May 2012 on the basis of recommendations from a faculty committee representing all of the graduate schools and colleges. Prior to the Board's action, the new learning outcomes were unanimously approved by the Deans' Council and then by Academic Assembly (governing faculty body). The outcomes reflect the faculty's commitment to a graduate education that is professionally focused and grounded in the mission.

Graduate faculty have established learning outcomes for all graduate programs. Graduate programs are also responsible for meeting all of the university graduate learning outcomes in addition to the program outcomes.

The graduate faculty determine the curriculum content and level of rigor of the university's graduate programs. Graduate programs require study and performance on a level above that recognized as baccalaureate level work. Students are required to study more in-depth, demonstrate advanced level skills and knowledge in their fields, engage in advanced intellectual work and research, and appropriate high-level professional practice. Given the professional nature of the university's graduate programs, emphasis is placed throughout these programs on students' ability to perform and exercise their profession in a variety of real world settings. In addition to technical skills appropriate to the exercise of their profession, all students are required to take courses with an ethics component tailored to their fields. The importance of ethical action is stressed throughout all programs and is critical to fulfilling the university's Catholic-Jesuit mission.

The administration of graduate programs is the responsibility of the deans of the respective schools and colleges, with oversight provided by the Office of the Provost.

The university is moving ahead with its plans to strengthen coordination and presence of its graduate programs. The university established a new position, the Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education, which was filled in the fall of 2012. This Associate Provost's charge is to enhance excellence in graduate education by providing leadership in a broad range of areas including admissions, academic policy, governance, services to graduate students, learning outcomes assessment, and fiscal management. Specifically, the position requires creative thinking and application of best practices to increase cooperation among the graduate programs, design new and

interdisciplinary graduate programs, promote the use of technology in graduate education, raise issues particular to those programs to university-wide discussion, and increase support for research opportunities. Associate Deans from schools/colleges with graduate programs meet on a regular basis with the Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education.

Faculty who teach graduate courses, university program review, student input and requested feedback, and external accrediting bodies, ensure the quality of graduate education. Faculty who teach graduate coursework, in all cases, control the content of their curriculum, following where necessary the requirements of nationally accrediting bodies

Seattle University's professional graduate programs are externally accredited by the relevant external accrediting body:

Albers School of Business and Economics	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
College of Arts and Sciences	National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)
College of Education	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
College of Nursing	Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
School of Law	American Bar Association (ABA)
School of Theology and Ministry	American Theological Society (ATS)

In addition, the masters degree in Criminal Justice is certified by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS).

All graduate programs undergo systematic program review according to internal university approved standards, including those that are externally accredited.

Supporting Documents

1. Graduate Learning Outcomes
2. Assessment Website
3. College of Nursing Faculty Handbook
4. College of Arts and Sciences Faculty and Staff Policies
5. College of Science and Engineering Bylaws
6. College of Science and Engineering Rank and Tenure Guidelines
7. School of Theology and Ministry Faculty Handbook
8. School of Law School Faculty Code

2.C.13 Graduate admission and retention policies ensure that student qualifications and expectations are compatible with the institution's mission and the program's requirements. Transfer of credit is evaluated according to clearly-defined policies by faculty with a major commitment to graduate education or by a representative body of faculty responsible for the degree program at the receiving institution.

Graduate Admissions Policies, Transfer of Credit

The graduate admissions process is managed by the individual schools and colleges. Schools and colleges work in consultation with Graduate Admissions. The graduate faculty, through the governance system of their schools and colleges, establish the admission and application requirements for their programs. Changes to the requirements are approved within the school/college. The requirements for admission are published in the online *Graduate Catalog,* the graduate application instructions, school/college application packets, admission view book publications and on the Graduate Admissions and/or program websites. This information is available to all applicants.

In addition to the *Graduate Catalog*, school and college handbooks provide program-specific information on their prerequisite courses, requirements for letters of recommendation, and so on. Some schools and colleges, e.g., College of Nursing, require personal admissions interviews. The interviews are designed to ensure that candidates for admission fit with the mission, goals and vision of the program.

Transfer students are covered by Transfer Credit Policy 77-01 with respect to transfer of credits. University administered requirements, including GPA, official transcripts, English Proficiency testing are monitored by Graduate Admissions.

While the admissions requirements vary by program, all requirements are set to ensure that students are prepared to enter into their respective programs and to perform at a level above that required for a baccalaureate degree. Faculty also establish standards for satisfactory progress through the program(s).

Graduate Retention Policies

Individual schools and colleges are responsible for tracking retention of their students and developing policies and processes to support student success. The university is undertaking a graduate enrollment strategic planning process in academic year 2012-2013. Part of this planning process will be a review of retention across graduate programs. Tracking retention rates in graduate programs can present unique challenges such as: graduate programs differ widely in their requirements, students can participate in these programs on a full or a part-time basis, there is much greater variety of career trajectories and accomplishments prior to arriving at the university, and there can be many intervening variables, e.g., family responsibilities. The Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education is responsible for monitoring graduate retention and degree completion rates at the university level.

Faculty are deeply engaged with students providing mentorship, support in career planning, and recruitment.

All academic advisors for all schools and colleges track the academic progress of their advisees. All programs have regular probation procedures to ensure that students who are struggling receive additional advising and where necessary, academic support. Probation standards and processes are determined by, and are specific to, the individual schools and colleges. Some programs have mandatory reviews of student progress. The College of Nursing has a separate progression committee in place. The Law School has a special program (the Academic Response Center) which works closely with underperforming students.

Supporting Documents

1. Graduate Admissions website
2. Academic policy website
3. Transfer credit policy
4. Probation policy
5. Graduate catalog
6. Academic Resource Center at the School of Law

College of Arts and Sciences

12. College of Arts and Sciences Student Codes of Conduct (used for all students)
13. Graduate student handbook for Criminal Justice
14. Graduate student handbook for Psychology
15. Graduate student handbook for Nonprofit Leadership
16. Graduate student handbook for Public Administration

College of Education

19. Student handbook for Adult Education and Training
20. Student handbook for Counseling
21. Student handbook for Curriculum and Instruction
22. Student handbook for Educational Administration
23. Student handbook for Educational Leadership Doctorate
24. Student handbook for Literacy for Special Needs
25. Student handbook for School Psychology
26. Student handbook for Special Education
27. Student handbook for Student Development Administration
28. Student handbook for Teacher Preparation/Education
29. Student handbook for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

College of Nursing

17. Nursing student handbook

College of Science and Engineering

30. Science and Engineering orientation materials

School of Theology and Ministry

18. STM Student Advising Handbook

School of Law

19. School of Law *Student Handbook*

2.C.14 Graduate credit may be granted for internships, field experiences, and clinical practices that are an integral part of the graduate degree program. Credit toward graduate degrees may not be granted for experiential learning that occurred prior to matriculation into the graduate degree program. Unless the institution structures the graduate learning experience, monitors that learning, and assesses learning achievements, graduate credit is not granted for learning experiences external to the students' formal graduate programs.

Internships, Field Experiences, Practicum, and Clinical Practices

Seattle University offers graduate credit for internships, field experiences, practicum, and clinical practices. Indeed these offerings are central to all the professionally oriented programs across the university, including programs in the College of Nursing, Albers School of Business and Economics, College of Education and in select programs in the College of Arts and Sciences including Criminal Justice, Psychology, and Arts Leadership. Standards for these courses are similar across the university in terms of contact hours (Scheduling Policy 79.3). Faculty in their respective programs are responsible for the oversight and evaluation of these offerings.

Experiential Learning

Seattle University does not offer experiential learning credit. Seattle University does not offer credit for learning experiences external to students' formal graduate programs.

Supporting Documents

1. Scheduling Policy

2.C.15 Graduate programs intended to prepare students for research, professional practice, scholarship, or artistic creation are characterized by a high level of expertise, originality, and critical analysis. Programs intended to prepare students for artistic creation are directed toward developing personal expressions of original concepts, interpretations, imagination, thoughts, or feelings. Graduate programs intended to prepare students for research or scholarship are directed toward advancing the frontiers of knowledge by constructing and/or revising theories and creating or applying knowledge. Graduate programs intended to prepare students for professional practice are directed toward developing high levels of knowledge and performance skills directly related to effective practice within the profession.

Programs for research/scholarship

The Educational Leadership doctoral program (EDLR) is the only program at SU that requires a doctoral dissertation. The EDLR program provides quality doctoral-level educational experiences

that prepare leaders to serve expertly across a variety of professional roles and contexts within the community (e.g., principals, superintendents, PreK-12 professional development and/or curriculum specialists, nonprofit program directors, HRD specialists, heath/nurse educator leaders, those who lead in public administration, those who lead in theology/ministry and/or spiritual direction, and student affairs leaders in higher education). The aim is to develop experts who skillfully apply transformational leadership in diverse communities for social betterment, which includes the ability to conduct research/evaluation/data collection and interpretation for practical purposes and sound decision-making in community/organizational contexts.

The EDLR program does multiple and regular assessments throughout the program of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions, using clearly defined expectations, assessment criteria, and rubrics aligned with the knowledge base and best practices in the area of leadership studies and candidates' chosen professional areas standards. The EDLR program also requires all candidates to do a dissertation that is an original contribution of knowledge in the candidate's chosen profession.

Programs to prepare students for professional practice

All graduate (masters) degrees at Seattle University prepare student for professional practice.

The Albers School of Business and Economics graduate programs offer advanced, in-depth education to individuals seeking specialized knowledge and skills in a business field. Graduate work encourages students to fully develop professional competencies, and to enhance high-level thinking abilities, including practical application and syntheses. Graduate education at Albers cultivates the critical examination of ethical and value-laden issues in the business professions and the role of business in society. The Executive Leadership Masters Degree, with a health administration option, prepares students to assume leadership positions in for profit and not for profit environments.

The College of Arts and Sciences has professionally oriented masters programs in Public Administration, Nonprofit Leadership, Arts Leadership, Sports Administration and Leadership, Criminal Justice, and Psychology (Existential-Phenomenological Therapeutic Psychology).

The College of Education masters programs are designed to ensure that candidates are prepared for professional practice by requiring that the candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to enter the field. For most program those expectations are defined by their professional association standards (knowledge, skills, best practices, and dispositions) and/or by state standards. Programs blend theory and practice in both the classroom and in field experiences (usually internships and/or practica) in preparing candidates to enter their professional fields. In addition, all the master's and educational specialist programs in the College of Education require at least one graduate-level research course. Many of the programs offer specializations and/or state certification options within the professional fields (e.g, principal certification, school counselor certification, teacher certification with multiple teaching discipline options).

All K-12 program candidates are assessed through multiple key indicators, at four key points (except for certification-only programs not requiring candidacy) during their programs: admissions, pre-candidacy, pre-field experience, and pre-program completion. The K-12 key indicator assessments cover all required professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. All non-K-12 programs are required by the university to do an annual evaluation of one of the program's student objectives and to submit a report of the results of that annual evaluation to the university. The professional skills and the ability of candidates to implement best professional practices are assessed during field experiences (internship and/or practicum) in all programs except Curriculum and Instruction (MEd). In this program, students are required to successfully engage in a field-based assessment project. In addition, all programs require a written summative comprehensive exam and/or a portfolio closely aligned with professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions requirements and/or they require state or national exams related to professional knowledge and skills which are normed and/or have pre-determined passing scores.

All K-12 related programs are National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited, with the accreditation to be renewed in October 2012 after a recent Continuing Accreditation Visit by NCATE in May 2012. The Counseling program currently is CACREP (Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs) accredited and the School Psychology program currently is NASP (National Association of School Psychologists) approved. In addition, Washington state has approved all the professional education certificate programs in the College of Education: Educational Administration (Superintendent, Program Administrator, and Principal), School Counseling, School Psychology, and Teacher Education (MIT).

The College of Nursing graduates advance the health of vulnerable populations and the science of nursing through scholarship, the synthesis of knowledge from nursing and related sciences, and effective leadership. Through the integration of the research process and methods, and the utilization of health information technology, with elements of evidence-based practice, graduates promote patient-centered advance practice nursing care. Graduates provide safe and effective, evidence based advanced practice nursing to individuals, families, groups and communities.

The School of Law seeks to educate and prepare students for the competent and ethical practice of law in a global and highly complex society. Close attention is paid to the rapidly changing profession. The curriculum and broader program of legal education is constantly reviewed to ensure that students graduate with both a concern for justice and the capacity to promote it. Faculty teach students to analyze problems – to identify significant facts, analyze and synthesize precedent, interpret statutes, and construct policy arguments – and train them to write and speak with clarity and precision. In the first intensive year, students concentrate on the highly traditional and prescribed basic courses, and on a yearlong legal writing and analysis course that is rated among the best in the nation. The upper-level, elective curriculum allows for choice, innovation, and diversity. Students experience the enriching blend of theoretical and practical course offerings and they may

either select a broad, balanced program of study, or choose to specialize in a particular area of law ranging from commercial law to poverty law.

The School of Theology and Ministry offers degrees that prepare people for professional ministerial leadership, leadership in non-profit and NGO type organizations, and mental health and family counseling. The Master of Divinity and the Master of Arts in Pastoral Studies emphasize that ministers develop spiritual depth informed by compassion, evidence competency for leadership in faith communities, and demonstrate theological breadth and depth for ministry. The Master of Arts in Pastoral Counseling engages people in developing competence as mental health counseling and equips people to pass licensure requirements in Washington state while preparing them to work in agencies or in their own practice. The Master of Arts in Transforming Spirituality invites students to explore traditions of spiritual practice and depth toward equipping graduates to lead others through a variety of spiritual practices such as spiritual direction, retreats, and the arts. The Master of Transformational Leadership equips students with the best in leadership theory and practice, while developing the person through skill building, reflective practice, and commitment to justice. Each degree is a professional degree that integrates academic excellence, personal growth and skill-building and spiritual formation for justice work in a culturally diverse context.

The Albers School of Business and Economics and the College of Arts and Sciences also offer students in selected programs the option of completing a joint degree with the School of Law. The Albers programs are the Masters in Business Administration, Masters in International Business, Master of Science in Finance, and the Masters of Professional Accounting. The College of Arts and Sciences programs are the Masters in Arts Leadership, the Masters in Criminal Justice and the Masters in Public Administration.

Programs for artistic creation

Seattle University does not offer programs on the graduate level that prepare students for artistic creation.

Supporting Documents

1. External Accreditation List

Continuing Education and Non-Credit Programs

2.C.16 Credit and non-credit continuing education programs and other special programs are compatible with the institution's mission and goals.

The College of Education's division of Professional Development and Continuing Education serves Washington state, national and international educators in acquiring post-baccalaureate credits, clock hours, and certificate endorsements. These high-quality courses encompass a wide range of subject matter and are designed to equip educators with the tools and resources they need to improve student achievement. The post-baccalaureate credits or clock hours provide teachers a venue for

lifelong learning opportunities, a means to meet Washington state licensure requirements, and a way for K-12 educators to advance professionally.

The School of Theology and Ministry (STM) offers non-credit education in Scripture and Leadership Training for students' personal enrichment. STM also offers retreats and lectures on a variety of topics related to contemporary social and spiritual issues, and their intersection. These offerings do not include Continuing Education Units unless they are in compliance with regulations quantifying the level of academic excellence, the numbers of hours spent in the classroom, and the appropriate topics under consideration.

The College of Arts and Sciences: The Department of Psychology offers occasional non-credit seminars for professional therapists. The Criminal Justice program offers continuing education opportunities in the area of cultural competency for Criminal Justice professionals in the areas of corrections, policing, and community affairs/rehabilitation.

The Albers School of Business and Economics: Albers provides continuing education offerings in Business Communication, Business Calculus, and GMAT preparation. The Albers Center for Leadership Formation offers a certification in executive leadership. The school also offers post-baccalaureate and post-masters certificates, e.g. International Business, Leadership Formation, etc..

2.C.17 The institution maintains direct and sole responsibility for the academic quality of all aspects of its continuing education and special learning programs and courses. Continuing education and/or special learning activities, programs, or courses offered for academic credit are approved by the appropriate institutional body, monitored through established procedures with clearly-defined roles and responsibilities, and assessed with regard to student achievement. Faculty representing the disciplines and fields of work are appropriately involved in the planning and evaluation of the institution's continuing education and special learning activities.

College of Education: The College of Education is responsible for the academic and fiscal elements of its programs. The course application and evaluation process ensures that all courses/classes meet academic standards. Credit and clock hour fees are set internally.

If a course will also be offered for graduate credit, in addition to the course application process, the course is subject to the same approval process required for any graduate course. Professional development and continuing education courses approved for graduate credit at Seattle University are included in the *Graduate Catalog*. Graduate offerings have higher-level requirements than the professional development, continuing education, or clock hour credits.

Full-time faculty are integrally involved in approving course applications specific to their field of expertise, serving in a consulting/observing/teaching role for off-site courses/ classes, recommending thematic courses/classes that should be offered, and instructing on campus

offerings. Continuing Education faculty have both the specific education and background to support the courses that are being offered. The College of Education monitors instructor ratings of the faculty and maintains high quality control.

All courses offered for clock hours/credits are evaluated to ensure that they follow the course application and are of the highest quality. Any course with an evaluation lower than four on a five point scale is reviewed to determine whether it will be improved or discontinued. Some offerings include formative and summative assessment.

School of Law: The School of Law is approved by the Washington State Bar Association Mandatory Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) Board and the Washington State Supreme Court as an accredited provider of Washington State Continuing Legal Education credits. As such, the school is responsible for the academic quality of all its continuing legal education (CLE) programs. As an accredited CLE provider, the school also ensures that all CLE programs comply with administrative process and document retention regulations set forth by the Washington State Bar Association, specifically Admission to Practice Rule 11.

Washington State CLE regulations require the school to keep on file the program schedule and learning objectives for each CLE offering. Attendee (student) evaluations must be provided and collected for each CLE program, allowing attendees to rate the educational value of each presentation, each presenter and the related course materials in order to monitor and assess whether learning objectives have been met. Tests are not administered and no other measurement is required for CLE accreditation purposes.

Supporting Documents

1. Description of relationship with the School of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL)

2.C.18 The granting of credit or Continuing Education Units (CEUs) for continuing education courses and special learning activities is: a) guided by generally-accepted norms; b) based on institutional mission and policy; c) consistent across the institution, wherever offered and however delivered; d) appropriate to the objectives of the course; and e) determined by student achievement of identified learning outcomes?

All non-credit courses and events are developed and managed by individual colleges/schools/departments/offices and their deans, department chairs, and directors. All colleges/schools track the CEUs and CLEs in house.

The granting of credit or Continuing Education Units follows generally accepted norms relative to the requirements of the respective professional associations.

College of Education

College of Education's division of Professional Development and Continuing Education (PD/CE) serves Washington state, national and international educators in acquiring post-baccalaureate credits, clock hours, and certificate endorsements. These high-quality courses encompass a wide range of subject matter and are designed to equip educators with the tools and resources they need to improve student achievement. The post-baccalaureate credits or clock hours provide teachers a venue for lifelong learning opportunities, a means to meet Washington state licensure requirements, and a way for K-12 educators to advance professionally.

PD/CE is the outreach unit for the college for providing professional development and continuing education for all alumni and their professional organizations. Constituent groups include K-12 teachers, principals, superintendents, and other educational administrators.

The College of Education PD/CE is the only division on campus authorized by the Office of the Superintendent of Public (OSPI) Instruction to provide continuing education credits and clock hours for primary and secondary education administrators and teachers. These credits and clock hours are provided to K-12 professionals and others. Under the auspices of OSPI, Professional Certification Programs (ProCert) are also supported. ProCert is required of K-12 teachers.

PD/CE offers 900-level post-baccalaureate credits, which can be applied with prior approval to some academic programs. PD/CE also offers programs in which participants can choose either post-baccalaureate credits or graduate credit. Seattle University College of Education has contractual relationships with a variety of organizations to offer/support this off-campus learning, including:

The School of Teaching English as a Second Language (S-TESL), Renton School District, Clover Park School District, Puget Sound Educational Service District, Seattle Public Schools, Pierce County Consortium , and the Archdiocese of Seattle. In addition, other local school districts are approved on a case-by-case basis to offer post-baccalaureate credits (900 level) for all off-campus programs the College of Education has worked with to provide credit. In a typical academic year about 2,500 teachers earn 6,500 post-baccalaureate credits and 700 clock hours.

College of Science and Engineering

Project Lead the Way offers middle and high school curricula combined with college preparatory mathematics and science courses. This national program is an excellent introduction to the scope, rigor, and discipline that engineering and engineering technology programs require. High school teachers receive CEUs for participating.

School of Law

Seattle University offers numerous opportunities for Continuing Education Units (CEUs) through its schools and colleges and Continuing Legal Education Units (CLEs) through the School of Law.

At Seattle University, CEUs are granted following the guidelines of the profession, the objectives and learning outcomes of the course, symposia or other learning activities. As a general rule, Seattle University college/schools follow the national guidelines with one CEU equivalent to 10 hours of instruction.

The School of Law has an established committee comprised of associate deans and faculty representatives that identifies the school's priorities for CLE programming. As CLE program needs are identified by the committee, both law school faculty and leading practitioners from the field serve on planning subcommittees to develop specific CLE content for each individual program. School of Law faculty are heavily emphasized as speakers across CLE programs according to individual areas of expertise.

Supporting Documents

1. College of Education Continuing Education
2. Summer in Seattle Continuing Education

2.C.19 The institution maintains records which describe the number of courses and nature of learning provided through non-credit instruction.

Each college/school maintains records of its course offerings.

College of Education

Faculty collect all the grades for their continuing education offerings, these are then inputted by the College into the university Datatel system. The Office of the Registrar then manages the database for these grades and provides transcripts as necessary. Otherwise, individual schools and colleges maintain records whenever there is the possibility that CEUs or CLEs will be granted as a result of a student attending a course, symposia or other learning activity. The division, program or department that is sponsoring the course or event maintains the records for that course or event.

School of Theology and Ministry

The faculty constructed short courses that could serve as prerequisites for entering the school, continuing education for adults in the community, and for recruiting new students. Additionally, the Scripture and Leadership Training (SALT) program has offered a three-year program of development in Bible and leadership training that has attracted students both on and off campus.

College of Arts and Sciences

The Psychology Department graduate program and the Criminal Justice program offer various workshops and lecture seminars focused on professional development .

Albers School of Business and Economics

The Albers Executive Speaker Series is offered twice a quarter in the fall, winter, and spring. Executives from around the Puget Sound region are invited to speak on a topic of their choice and then respond to questions from a selected panel and the audience.

2.D Student Support Resources

2.D.1 Consistent with the nature of its educational programs and methods of delivery, the institution creates effective learning environments with appropriate programs and services to support student learning needs.

Compliance with 2.D.1 is demonstrated through an assortment of established and innovative programs and initiatives. At the undergraduate level, all freshmen and sophomores living in the residence halls, and approximately of the university's half first year transfer students, join a Living-Learning community. The Living-Learning Communities integrate Core Curriculum courses, community-based learning, and residential education to enhance each student's learning experience. In addition, learning assistance programs are readily available to incoming and current students at the undergraduate and graduate level. These assistance programs include tutoring, facilitated study groups, math lab, writing lab, workshops, and individual consultations which provide targeted support for academic success.

The Students of Concern Committee provides an avenue for the early identification of troubled and/or at-risk students. Referrals to this committee are made by faculty, advisors and other members of the campus community who regularly engage with students using a readily available form. The Law School additionally provides the Academic Resource Center, which for 25 years has been supporting diverse and non-traditional students with an intensive seven-week summer program to set a foundation of deep skills for ongoing program performance success.

To meet the educational needs of all students, Seattle University utilizes over 90 classrooms for course scheduling to accommodate class sizes up to 98, with many of these rooms accommodating less than 35 students in light of small class size norms. In addition to this standard classroom inventory, specialized rooms include Mac labs, PC labs, cloud-computing workstations, a mock courtroom, a nursing simulation lab, as well as science- and fine arts-specific lab/studio space. A limited number of classrooms are equipped with synchronous and asynchronous learning technology to support distance learning and recording content for on-demand review.

Seattle University's classroom needs are changing. Advances in science and engineering, along with a revision of the undergraduate Core curriculum, compel the institutional leadership to focus the next capital campaign on raising funds for a new science building. Growth is sought in online and continuing education teaching and learning options which require additional technology investments. To meet these and other aspirational teaching and learning objectives, an Integrated Learning Environments pilot study is underway to collect data and develop metrics needed to assess academic space for the College of Arts and Sciences.

The ANGEL Learning Management System (LMS) exists to support alternative delivery in disaster or hybrid instructional courses and needs. A new, more robust LMS, Instructure Canvas, has been

purchased and will be implemented within the next two academic years to allow for more focused and flexible student engagement.

To honor Seattle University's Jesuit character a network of offices across campus endeavors to foster inclusion and engagement of diverse ideas and experiences by providing service and support for an increasingly diverse community of students. These offices include an International Student Center, Office of Multicultural Affairs, Disability Services, New Student and Family Programs, Transfer and Commuter Student Services, and Campus Ministry.

As part of a comprehensive end-to-end degree and career goal support and guidance plan, students have the opportunity to consult with professional and major related advisors, career counselors, as well as student academic specialists located in the Office of the Registrar. A segmented approach provides for better and more targeted advising for academic program completion as well as career planning.

The university acknowledges constraints in fully realizing aspirations for intensive science research within existing facilities. The plan to address this need is to erect a new science building, fundraising for which will be at the heart of a new capital campaign. Classroom utilization is another identified area of focus. Utilization is particularly heavy during the 10am to 1pm period of the day; during the schedule planning period, not all requests for these timeslots can be accommodated. A classroom utilization study has been launched to assess academic instructional space under the auspices of the Provost and Registrar's offices.

Supporting Documents

1. Academic Advising Support
2. Learning Assistance Program
3. Living-Learning Communities
4. Learning Management System
5. Office of Multicultural Affairs
6. International Student Center
7. New Student and Family Programs
8. Campus Ministry
9. Disability Services
10. Students of Concern Committee
11. Globally scheduled room list
12. Law School Academic Resource Center

2.D.2 The institution makes adequate provision for the safety and security of its students and their property at all locations where it offers programs and services. Crime statistics, campus security policies, and other disclosures required under federal and state regulations are made available in accordance with those regulations.

As an institution, Seattle University maintains a comprehensive university safety and security program, which provides 24/7 coverage and protection for all university students, faculty, and staff at all university properties. The Department of Public Safety publishes a What-To-Do Safety Handbook, which provides safety and security emergency procedures, prevention measures, and personal safety guidelines. Notably, Seattle University publicly posts crime and safety data for all incidents that may impact the university community and notifies the campus community via email any violent crime activity on or near campus in compliance with the Clery Act.

The Department of Public Safety provides 24/7 walk-up access for all students, faculty, staff, visitors and university guests on the main campus. A walking escort can be requested up to two blocks from the main campus 24/7. To further support the community nights and weekends, the Department of Public Safety operates the Night Hawk Safety Escort and patrol program. Community members can be shuttled to addresses within six blocks of the main campus. In case of emergency on campus, main campus community members are supported with emergency call-alert towers, which are installed at all student residential facilities, pedestrian mall intersections, parking lots & garage, and intramural fields. These call towers allow one to press a single button to make an emergency call to public safety dispatchers in the event of a dangerous or concerning situation. Additionally, Seattle University partners with the Seattle Police Department (SPD) to monitor and manage crime in the neighborhood around campus. This close relationship, especially with the SPD East Precinct, located four blocks from the north end of campus, supports highly responsive emergency support and strong criminal prevention, and when needed, investigation support.

On Seattle University's Bellevue campus, which is comprised of academic space in a business park utilized by Albers School of Business, the business park has on-site security responders as well as close connections with the Bellevue Police Department. All academic classrooms at the Bellevue campus are covered with security and duress alerting alarms.

The Department of Campus Public Safety and Transportation began partnering with Margolis Healy and Associates, LLC in the fall of 2012 to conduct a public safety management study. Specific to the assessment of the public safety function on campus, Margolis Healy will critically and constructively evaluate the core functional areas and engage in a combination of interviews, focus groups, surveys, research, document review, and observation with students, faculty, and staff to develop a holistic view of the perceptions and realities of public safety on campus. The assessment of the current public safety model will provide a reasonable foundation from which to evaluate or make key decisions. Margolis Healy will also evaluate the staffing, training requirements, operational procedures, and overall safety and security policies and systems as a foundation of the university's due diligence.

Supporting Documents

1. Annual Safety & Security Report/Clery Act
2. Emergency Information

3. Reported Campus Crime Statistics (via ope.ed.gov/security/)
4. Department Of Public Safety website, includes services description
5. What-To-Do Safety Handbook

2.D.3 Consistent with its mission, core themes, and characteristics, the institution recruits and admits students with the potential to benefit from its educational offerings. It orients students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information and advising about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

Seattle University is compliant with Standard 2.D.3, as demonstrated through a variety of policies and practices. Recruitment practices at all levels reflect Seattle University's commitment to consistency around Standard 2.D.3. At the undergraduate level, a holistic review of all applicants is emphasized. Typically, students with above a 3.0 high school GPA are admitted; appeals for applicants who fall below the typical admissions standards are presented to an Admission Review Committee. High school and college transfer transcripts are reviewed for foundation course selection and grading to support the review for success in programs in which prior performance can provide an indication of success in a chosen major such as nursing, engineering and certain sciences. A component of Seattle University's core themes is a commitment to global learning through international engagement, thus there is a focus on recruitment of international students. Non-native English speakers must demonstrate a high degree of English language proficiency. For those who need extra support, Seattle University offers a culture and language bridge program that some students must participate in by way of supporting success. Graduate programs and the School of Law follow program-specific admission guidelines and may include grade point average and course-specific grade review at the undergraduate level, as well as standardized test scores such as the GRE, LSAT or GMAT. These data are combined with review of letters of reference and/or applicant essays.

Seattle University ensures effective communication about program requirements through student orientation efforts. At the undergraduate level, all new students engage in welcome week activities to support academic and mission fit, engagement and success. Freshmen students are required to attend a two-day orientation session prior to the start of the academic year at which they meet with an academic advisor and get oriented to their first term schedule and the requirements of their program of study. Transfer students receive a program of study form, with their completed transfer credit mapped to their program, included with their Letter of Admission. In addition, they are invited to participate in transfer orientation events which assist in their successful transition to the university. At the graduate level and in the School of Law, similarly purposed yet distinct orientation efforts are in place. The Office of Graduate Admission partners with the Student Development division to provide a graduate student welcome program each term, and graduate advisors provide orientation materials to students early in their program of study if the program does not offer a separate program-specific academic orientation of its own. The School of Law offers a robust first year law program orientation prior to each semester.

Continued advising and degree audit prior to graduation further ensure effective student education about academic requirements. At all levels, students are assigned an academic advisor for the duration of their program of study, and an online degree audit is available for review 24/7 from the web advisor portal. At the undergraduate level, both freshmen and transfer students are required to meet with an advisor for at least the first two terms of enrollment (prior to registration) to ensure solid program of study understanding and to monitor academic progression. Finally, two or more terms prior to the anticipated graduation date, students are asked to apply to graduate. As a result of this application, a formal degree audit is provided confirming the remaining requirements for completion of the program of study.

Supporting Documents

1. Office of Undergraduate Admission
2. Office of Graduate Admission
3. School of Law Admission
4. Summer in Seattle Undergraduate Orientation
5. Undergraduate Welcome Week
6. School of Law Orientation Program 2012
7. Admitted Graduate Student Welcome

2.D.4 In the event of program elimination or significant change in requirements, the institution makes appropriate arrangements to ensure that students enrolled in the program have an opportunity to complete their program in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

In academic year 2011-12 Seattle University announced that the Organization Systems Renewal master degree program would end after spring quarter, 2013. The program is cohort based, and as such, the students in year one and two of the two year program would be afforded the opportunity to complete their degrees with their cohort. It was also agreed that no new student class would be admitted to the university in fall 2012. This strategy provides evidence of Seattle University's commitment to provide the opportunity for students to complete their program of study in a timely manner without disruption.

Seattle University is implementing a new outcomes-based University Core Curriculum at the undergraduate level in the fall of 2013. All students, regardless of where they are in their progress toward degree completion, will be moved to the new core at that time. All currently completed core components will be mapped to the new core components so that no current student will be negatively impacted with having to complete any additional coursework to fulfill the new core than would have been necessary under the old core. Similarly for transfer students, which make up a significant portion of the Seattle University student body, the new core transfer requirements were published in the fall of 2012. A commitment was made to ensure that transfer students would not be negatively impacted with the changes to the core by also mapping requirements so that no

additional coursework would be required to fulfill the new core than the old core at each level of credit transfer.

Supporting Documents

1. Organization Systems Renewal Master's Program Website
2. New Core Curriculum Website

2.D.5 The institution publishes in a catalog, or provides in a manner reasonably available to students and other stakeholders, current and accurate information that includes:

a) Institutional mission and core themes;
b) Entrance requirements and procedures;
c) Grading policy;
d) Information on academic programs and courses, including degree and program completion requirements, expected learning outcomes, required course sequences, and projected timelines to completion based on normal student progress and the frequency of course offerings;
e) Names, titles, degrees held, and conferring institutions for administrators and full-time faculty;
f) Rules, regulations for conduct, rights, and responsibilities;
g) Tuition, fees, and other program costs;
h) Refund policies and procedures for students who withdraw from enrollment;
i) Opportunities and requirements for financial aid; and
j) Academic calendar.

The university publishes online-only graduate and undergraduate catalogs each year. The catalogs are fully searchable and provide information consistent with the standard requirements as noted below. The School of Law publishes a student handbook separate from the Graduate Catalog that is distributed to students and available as a PDF on the Law School website. The Student Handbook serves as the primary reference for law students.

a) From the Undergraduate or Graduate Catalog, a link located in the right hand navigation bar points to the university's mission, vision and values. The Mission Statement is included on page 5 of the *School of Law Student Handbook*.

b) Entrance requirements and procedures are accessible from an Admission link located in the right navigation bar in blue. Information includes selection criteria, probationary and provisional admission, international student considerations and more. Entrance requirements and procedures appear on the admissions section of the School of Law website. This admission information is also available to students applying through the Law School Admission Council.

c) Grading practices is accessible from the *Academic Regulations* link in the right navigation bar in blue. Once at the Academic Regulations page, *grading* is an option located in the red links at the top of the page. A full list of grades, and definitions, is provided. School of Law grading policies are described on page 35 of the *Student Handbook*; a full list of grades and their definitions is included.

d) Academic program and course information is included in each catalog and can be accessed a number of ways. In the right navigation bar in blue there is a link for each school or college. By clicking on one of these links, program information as well as course offerings is provided. Additionally, in the blue navigation bar a link for *Course Descriptions* is also available. Selecting this link provides a full search capability to look up courses individually or to see a list of all courses displayed in alphabetical order. The School of Law grants only Juris Doctor degrees. All law students pursue the same academic program. Academic Requirements for the Juris Doctor degree are listed on page 15 of the *Student Handbook*. Descriptions for law courses are available on the Course Offerings page of the School of Law website.

e) Faculty and administrator listings are accessible from the *University Administration* and *Faculty* links in the blue navigation bar on the right side of the main catalog page. The faculty link provides degree granting institutions and graduation dates for faculty, deans and for Cabinet administrators. Listings for School of Law faculty are available on the Faculty Profiles page of the School of Law website. Listings for senior School of Law administrators can be found on the Dean's Leadership Team page of School of Law website.

f) Student conduct rights and responsibilities are addressed from the link titled *Nonacademic Regulations* located on the right navigation bar in blue on the home page of the catalog. In this section nondiscrimination, bias-related harassment, sexual harassment, students with disabilities and title IX information is presented. The code of student conduct is readily accessible online from the Division of Student Development. The *School of Law Student Handbook* includes an introduction to the code of student conduct and a link to the Division of Student Development website. The School of Law Student Handbook contains an introduction to the code of conduct on page 75 and the academic integrity code on page 77.

g) Tuition, fees and program costs can be accessed from the *Tuition and Fees* link in the blue navigation bar on the right of the main catalog page. Tuition, fees and program charges, as well as information on due dates and payment options can be found here. Information on School of Law tuition and fees can be found on the Tuition and Fees page in the Student Financial Services section of the School of Law website.

h) Refund policies and withdrawal procedures are found under the *Tuition and Fees* link in the blue navigation bar on the right of the main catalog page. There is a Tuition Refund policy

link at the top of the page that jumps the user to the refund schedule for each term, based upon date of withdrawal. Refund procedures for withdrawing law students can be found on page 31 of the School of Law Student Handbook.

i) Financial aid is provided its own link within the catalog also from the blue navigation bar on the right within the catalog. In this section, a menu of links is provided to educate students about applying for aid, scholarships, grants, VA benefits, loans, work study, the impact of dropping or withdrawing from classes and more. Financial aid information for the School of Law is available on page 49 of the Student Handbook.

j) The reference in the right navigation bar to the *Academic Calendar* links students directly to the academic calendar page of the Office of the Registrar site. This calendar provides all academic deadlines, including the last date to withdraw from each term. The *Academic Calendar* displays real-time information, including both academic and non-academic requirements and opportunities. The School of Law academic calendar is available on the Academic Calendar page in the Academics section of the School of Law website.

Supporting Documents

1. Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs Select the academic level and year from the dropdown list at the top of the page.
2. Law School *Student Handbook*

2.D.6 Publications describing educational programs include accurate information on:

a) National and/or state legal eligibility requirements for licensure or entry into an occupation or profession for which education and training are offered;
b) Descriptions of unique requirements for employment and advancement in the occupation or profession.

Several degree programs and certificates prepare students for employment in fields that require certification or licensure. In all cases there is documentation that helps students to better understand the steps to professional practice in that field. The materials describe both the program's practice to adopt the standards and ethics of the profession and how the academic preparation supports the licensure and credentialing process. Each program provides different publication strategies for communicating these requirements.

The most consistent publication is the student handbook for the school/college or program. In the College of Education there are several programs that prepare a student for gaining credentials in the K-12 education system. There are teacher certifications and subject endorsements, school psychology Washington State ESA Residency Certificates, school and community counseling certifications as well as principal and superintendent certifications. All students in this college are provided a copy of the student handbook for their program area in their first term. These

handbooks contain detailed information about the certification and licensure practices for the discipline of study.

The College of Nursing operates similar to the College of Education. Again, the information on RN licensure is located in the BSN student handbook, provided to students at the start of their cohort program.

The College of Arts and Sciences provides online resources to respond to considerations about Washington state licensure for students in the Master of Arts in Psychology program and directs students to inquire further for information on licensure in other states.

The Albers School of Business provides a page on their website devoted to requirements for becoming a Certified Public Accountant or a Chartered Financial Analyst on web pages devoted to career planning.

The School of Law provides coursework specifically devoted to the Bar Exam, the licensure process for the law profession. Similar to Albers, they too devote a specific web page to information on the Bar Exam and studies supporting successfully passing that exam.

Supporting Documents

1. College of Nursing BSN Handbook, see page 38 for RN licensure information
2. College of Arts and Sciences, Master of Psychology Frequently asked questions: See the question titled "what is the curriculum" for licensure information.
3. College of Education
    a. Master in Teaching (MIT) Certification FAQ and Master in Teaching (MIT) Endorsement FAQ
    b. School Psychology Student Handbook, see page 36
    c. Counseling Student Handbook, see page 29
    d. Educational Administration Student Handbook, see page 87 and beyond
4. Albers School of Business
    a. Becoming a CPA Information including exam requirements
    b. Careers in Finance
5. School of Law School of Law Bar Studies Program

2.D.7 The institution adopts and adheres to policies and procedures regarding the secure retention of student records, including provision for reliable and retrievable backup of those records, regardless of their form. The institution publishes and follows established policies for confidentiality and release of student records.

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) provides guidelines for academic record retention that inform Seattle University policy and practice. Undergraduate and graduate paper files have been converted to an electronic storage solution via

ImageNow from Perceptive Software. These records are maintained and managed offsite with full backup services and can be retrieved from any internet-enabled computer, regardless of location. Older files are stored electronically in Alchemy, a software product loaded on a local machine; these files cannot be accessed from an offsite location. However, as of fall, 2012, the files are being migrated into the ImageNow system so full offsite access will be available by January, 2013. During this interim period, backup disks of the software and storage files are located in a fireproof safe in Student Financial Services, located next door to the Office of the Registrar.

Records for law school students from prior to 2002 are stored electronically using the Alchemy software on a law school server with backup disks kept in a fireproof vault. These records can be retrieved remotely as needed. Records from 2002 forward are stored as paper files in the Law School Registrar's Office. They are securely stored in locked cabinets with access managed by the Law School Office of the Registrar. These files would not be accessible if building access was blocked, and are at risk of loss if there were a local natural disaster. In the current academic year, the Law School plans to select and implement an electronic records management system with a goal of having all records (including the old alchemy records) scanned by December 2013.

FERPA guidelines are published on the Office of the Registrar website and an email is sent each January informing all students of their rights. A tool is provided that enables students to grant and remove record access permission at any time. Specialized features allow the student to provide time bound access to a selected range of academic and billing information. To ensure internal consistency with FERPA regulations, FERPA training is required every two years for all employees and student workers who obtain access to student records. Staff members are canvassed about the currency of their FERPA training during annual performance reviews and reminder emails are sent to employees when the deadline for update is about to expire. A new FERPA training program was launched in fall 2012.

Supporting Documents

1. FERPA Annual Notice to Students
2. FERPA Guidelines
3. AACRAO Retention of Records Guide for Retention and Disposal of Student Records (book held in the Office of the Registrar)
4. FERPA student training
5. Seattle University FERPA Training Policy
6. Law School Privacy Rights
7. Law School Student Records and Confidentiality, see page 75
8. College of Education Professional Development/Continuing Education Registration form (see FERPA notification listed at bottom of form)

2.D.8 The institution provides an effective and accountable program of financial aid consistent with its mission, student needs, and institutional resources. Information regarding the categories of financial assistance (such as scholarships, grants, and loans) is published and made available to prospective and enrolled students.

Information on opportunities and requirements for the three general categories of financial aid (grants/scholarships, work-study, and loans) is published on the financial aid website. The information located on this website explains the application process including helpful information on filing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid, details on the types of aid available, and financial aid policies. Both prospective and enrolled students who are awarded any type of aid are annually required to read, and sign a "Conditions of Award" statement which explains the student's rights and responsibilities as a condition of accepting the financial aid funding and prior to any aid being disbursed to the student's account.

In regard to the effectiveness and accountability of the financial aid program at Seattle University, the University participates in an annual audit of the federal financial aid programs which is performed by an independent audit firm, according to the OMB Circular A133, Compliance Supplement.

The School of Law similarly provides information regarding financial aid programs and how to apply (along with other pertinent financial aid information) on the law school website. Students are also advised of financial aid programs, processes and requirements through mailed publications during the application process (*Financing Your Legal Education*), through comprehensive materials emailed to continuing students, and in the mailed award letter packet (*Understanding Your Financial Aid*) that accompanies the award letter for entering and continuing students (award letters are also available online). Law students are required to return a signed copy of the award letter and conditions of award. Information is also disseminated through open houses, presentations and one-to-one appointments, as well as through email correspondence and telephone appointments. Scholarships that arise throughout the year are available on the web site, promoted in the law school student newspaper, the Sullivan Docket and through email.

Supporting Documents

1. Financial aid website
2. Student Financial Services
3. Law School Student Financial Services

2.D.9 Students receiving financial assistance are informed of any repayment obligations. The institution regularly monitors its student loan programs and the institution's loan default rates.

Students who receive financial aid are informed of their loan repayment obligations at the time of making application for the loan. Details of the loan repayment obligation are included in the promissory note signed by the student as part of the loan application process. Seattle University receives annual notices from the Department of Education of the most recent cohort default rate.

Students that are behind in payments or delinquent on the repayment of loans are notified by the loan servicer.

As required by the Department of Education, students who borrow from the federal Stafford loan program, the Federal Perkins loan program, or the Federal Nursing Loan program, are required to complete loan entrance counseling (which includes the borrowers rights and responsibilities) prior to the initial disbursement of the loan to their student account. When students graduate, withdraw or are in an enrollment status of less than half-time, they are required to complete loan exit counseling which informs the borrower of repayment plans and their repayment obligations. The student is referred to the Department of Education's student loan website in order to complete either the Entrance Loan Counseling requirement or the Exit Loan Counseling requirement. Student Financial Services then tracks the completion requirement by means of follow-up reports distributed by the Department of Education.

In the same way as above, law students are required to sign promissory notes and they receive disclosure statements. They must complete entrance counseling prior to receiving funds (which includes repayment information) on the Department of Education's student loan website and complete exit counseling when they graduate, withdraw, or drop below half-time enrollment status. Students are emailed a notice to complete exit counseling that includes additional relevant information and an announcement is made on the Sullivan Docket. As part of exit counseling, the university provides a personal loan history of their law school borrowing with lender contact information; a breakdown of an estimated monthly repayment amounts, including estimated interest paid, under several different repayment choices based on the average loan debt of their cohort; and a Department of Education exit counseling guide on repayment. Law students also have student loan repayment and money management resources available online. Seattle University typically provides an annual presentation by an outside speaker for students entering public interest/non-profit work, highlighting the optimum repayment plans and public interest loan forgiveness programs. Other budgeting, financial management or money management presentations are also offered intermittently. The university provides an in-person group exit counseling session as an alternative or in addition to the electronic or CD method. Students often meet with counselors on a one-to-one basis to discuss repayment options and their responsibilities.

Financial Services then tracks the completion requirement by means of follow-up reports distributed by the Department of Education.

The most current five years cohort default rate for federal Stafford loans borrowed by Seattle University students are indicated in the following table.

Cohort Default Year	**FY05**	**FY06**	**FY07**	**FY08**	**FY09**	**FY10**
Default Rate	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%

Number in Default	19	22	16	28	28	30
Number. in Repay	1,583	1,769	1,808	1,820	1,766	1,783

The most current five years cohort default rate for Federal Perkins Loans at Seattle University as reported on the Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate (FISAP) are indicated in the chart below.

Award Year	**Cohort Default Rate**
2010-2011	9.42%
2009-2010	6.82%
2008-2009	7.32%
2007-2008	10.98%
2006-2007	8.75%
2005-2006	9.69%

Supporting Documents

1. Federal Perkins Loan Promissory Note
2. Federal Perkins Loan Fact Sheet
3. Federal Nursing Loan Promissory Note
4. Federal Nursing Loan Fact Sheet
5. Federal Student Loan Programs Fact Sheet
6. William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program Master Promissory Note Information
7. Seattle University, Student Financial Services
8. School of Law, Student Financial Services

2.D.10 The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates a systematic and effective program of academic advisement to support student development and success. Personnel responsible for advising students are knowledgeable of the curriculum, program requirements, and graduation requirements and are adequately prepared to successfully fulfill their responsibilities. Advising requirements and responsibilities are defined, published, and made available to students.

All students are provided with academic advisement designed to facilitate student growth and success. Information regarding program requirements can be accessed through each program-specific website as well as in the academic catalog specific to a student's entering year.

Curricular offerings by term are published two years in advance on the undergraduate and graduate departmental websites to facilitate generalized academic planning, and the undergraduate and graduate academic schedule of classes, including days and times, is published for a complete academic year to facilitate multi-term schedule planning. All students are provided advisor and Office of the Registrar reviewed degree completion requirements in their final year of study to allow for formal confirmation of progress toward degree in time to adjust curriculum to meet expected

graduation timelines. Finally, the university is considering the development and delivery of adult degree completion and new online education options. Advising plans will need to evolve as the university consider the unique advising needs of any new populations not previously served.

Undergraduate

There are many unique features exemplifying compliance with Standard 2.D.10 for undergraduate students. A mix of professional advisors and faculty advisors are employed across all schools/colleges except in the Matteo Ricci program where peer advisors are deployed. Program coordinators train the peer advisors, oversee the advising quality and partner to provide their services in complex situations. Student Academic Services is charged with coordinating the advising practices of the schools/colleges to promote consistent quality of undergraduate advising across the university. An assistant or associate dean in each school/college is charged with oversight for its advising program and provision of support for the advisors, and training is provided to advisors before being assigned advisees. Each school/college employs professional advisors who receive extensive on-going training. The professional advisors assist faculty advisors when they have technical questions and are dealing with complex issues. To provide the timeliest information available to advisors, *Advising Matters* is a quarterly email newsletter providing updated information and guidance to the undergraduate advisor community, and the office maintains a robust website which provides on demand resources for information on procedures, standard transactions, and service solutions for special populations and students who are academically at risk. For students considering a program change, students and advisors can access the degree audit and degree modeling features of the web portal, SUOnline.

Advising meetings with students are required quarterly throughout the freshman year and through the third quarter of enrollment for transfer students as well as annually for all other students; for both parties to receive optimal benefit from the meetings, advising session expectations and advisor responsibilities are published for both advisors and advisees.

Graduate

There are unique solutions for graduate students that demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.D.10. Graduate students are advised by faculty in their individual programs. Additionally, the School of Business and Economics and the College of Arts and Sciences provide supplementary services from professional advisors related to career planning and engagement.

Law

In the School of Law, first-year students are assigned faculty advisors and meet at least once each semester in a group setting and are available to meet with students one-on-one. Students may stay with their first year faculty advisor for the duration of their program, or they may move to more specialized advisor for the upper division curriculum based upon one of fourteen focus areas. Registration information sessions are held for first year students registering for upper division courses for the first time each April. Focus area curriculum group sessions are also provided to

students moving into year two. Following these sessions are Academic Advising Days at which further one-on-one curriculum guidance is provided to all second and third year students.

Supporting Documents

1. Student Academic Services Website
2. Academic Policies
3. Online Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog
4. Academic department websites: Select Academics link and navigate to specific program
5. Law School Advising
6. 2007 Advising Report
7. 2011 Advising Report

2.D.11 Co-curricular activities are consistent with the institution's mission, core themes, programs, and services and are governed appropriately.

The mission of Seattle University calls for education of the whole person, and the university provides a wide variety of voluntary, co-curricular programs that help fulfill this commitment. All co-curricular activities are monitored and advised by qualified faculty and staff to ensure that safe standards are maintained and that learning outcomes are achieved. There are an abundance of theater, visual art, music, and lectures building on the university values of academic excellence and justice, as well as the mission imperative to educate the whole the person. These activities challenge students to consider different ideas and encourage dialogue on complex issues.

Designed around a common theme, the University's Living-Learning Communities (LLCs) bring faculty, staff, and students together by integrating Core courses, community-based learning, and residential education. All first- and second-year undergraduates living on campus participate in an LLC. Additionally, freshmen commuter students are able to participate in an LLC. University Core courses are linked to LLC themes (e.g., Social Justice, Faith and Great Ideas, Leadership, Wellness) allowing students to register for classes with other residents of their particular LLC. Co-curricular activities include retreats, local and international service, outdoor recreation, dialogues with faculty, and community dinners.

Seattle University students have created over 120 academic, cultural, and interest clubs and organizations, which are individually advised by faculty and student services staff. The Office of Student Activities supervises the system of student clubs and organizations, including club registration, finances, and event registration and advertising. Students can also engage in a wide variety of voluntary activities sponsored by entities such as the Center for Service and Community Engagement (CSCE), Housing and Residence Life, University Recreation, and the Office of Campus Ministry.

The Student Activities website outlines the process for club recognition and policies for remaining in good standing, including advisor agreements, financial policies, and outlines for creating club constitutions. In addition to campus clubs, four student government entities exist on campus—Student Government of Seattle University (SGSU), Graduate Student Council (GSC), Student Bar Association (SBA), and the Residence Hall Association (RHA). These representative bodies are responsible for soliciting feedback from their constituencies and advocating for the needs of the student body. Each of these entities have regulations outlining necessary experience, GPA, and the like necessary for selection/election, remaining in good standing, etc.

To fulfill the obligation to understand student concerns and priorities, SGSU, GSC, and SBA sponsor the annual *State of the Student* survey, and all groups conduct regular meetings, open fora, and structured outreach. SGSU and GSC also solicit applications and select student members of university committees including Academic Assembly, University Regents, Honorary Degree Selection, search committees for faculty and senior administrators. These groups, including RHA, provides some campus programming, while SGSU and GSC allocate seed money for student clubs and organizations to sponsor events and speakers or attend professional conferences. Additionally, groups such as the Student Events and Activities Council (SEAC), RedZone (campus pride organization), and Dance Marathon provide events and activities for students to connect their experience to the University's values of care, diversity, justice and leadership

2.D.12 If the institution operates auxiliary services (such as food service, and bookstore), they support the institution's mission, contribute to the intellectual climate of the campus community, and enhance the quality of the learning environment. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators have opportunities for input regarding these services.

The university's residences and bookstore are the institution's only source of auxiliary revenue. Residence hall revenue is a distinct component of the operating budget, but residence hall expenses are managed as an operating cost of the institution as a reflection of their alignment with academic learning environments and the core theme of providing a Great Student Experience. The institution chooses to manage other service activities through contracted vendor relationships that are recognized as operating expenses.

Seattle University's bookstore support the university's mission and values and contribute to the learning of its students by providing academic resources, campus life needs, and institutional support with a professional level of fulfillment, presentation, and customer service. The partnership between SGSU and the Provost has resulted in increased collaboration regarding issues such as used textbooks and faculty compliance with quarterly ordering deadlines. The Bookstore is an active member of the university's anti-sweatshop committee and works to ensure that products it carries are certified as non-sweatshop-made. The Bookstore also works closely with the Office of Jesuit Identity on the Nicaraguan Artisan Program in the acquisition and sale of artisan gifts, an important mission-based partnership.

The university has a residency requirement for all students of freshmen and sophomore standing. In addition to supporting the living, studying, and socialization needs of residents, all freshmen and approximately half first year transfer residents join a Living-Learning community (LLCs) within the residence halls. Designed around a common theme, the University's Living-Learning Communities (LLCs) bring faculty, staff, and students together by integrating Core courses, community-based learning, and residential education to enhance students' learning experience.

Students have opportunities for input regarding residence halls. Students are able to voice their opinions via the annual Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI) Survey. The data gleaned from this assessment informs the decision making processes of Housing and Residence Life (HRL). Students report high levels of satisfaction regarding the fairness of residential staff, the staff's diversity education efforts, and the professionalism of the custodial staff. In addition to participating in the EBI survey, students also play a role in evaluating the live-in professional and paraprofessional staff by way of an annual survey developed and facilitated by HRL. Faculty input in the regular operations of residence halls is limited to the faculty involved with the LLC program. Staff involvement includes HRL staff as well as Division of Student Development and other senior level university administrators.

2.D.13 Intercollegiate athletic and other co-curricular programs (if offered) and related financial operations are consistent with the institution's mission and conducted with appropriate institutional oversight. Admission requirements and procedures, academic standards, degree requirements, and financial aid awards for students participating in co-curricular programs are consistent with those for other students.

Seattle University provides a wide range of voluntary co-curricular activities for students. All students in good academic standing are eligible to partake in these activities. Positional leadership opportunities require a minimum GPA for students when applying and throughout their tenure. Failure to meet these standards results in probation and/or possible dismissal from his or her position. Individual departments such as Student Activities, Housing and Residence Life, and Campus Ministry are responsible for financial oversight of student organizational financial operations. Regardless of whether a student is involved in a university-sponsored co-curricular program or not, the academic standards, degree requirements, and financial aid awards remain consistent for all students.

Seattle University intercollegiate athletics strives to foster a meaningful collegiate experience for student-athletes, thus inspiring them to: professional formation; engagement with their communities; pursuit of a deeper understanding of justice; action for the common good; and realization of their potential as compassionate leaders.

The revised Athletics mission charges the department with championing "the holistic development of student-athletes inspiring a vital and engaged campus community through the development and

maintenance of a premier, nationally prominent NCAA Division I athletics program, in the spirit of the Jesuit tradition."

Seattle University has enacted robust and effective mechanisms to ensure that athletic programs receive appropriate institutional oversight and are conducted in a manner consistent with the university mission. Athletics is governed by the Intercollegiate Athletics Oversight Committee of the Board of Trustees (IAOC), staffed by the Executive Vice President and University Counsel and chaired by a university Jesuit and sitting member of the Board of Trustees. At the direction of the President, the Executive Vice President and Director of Athletics meets on a regular bi-weekly basis with the President and review general issues related to the building and expansion of the Athletics program. The primary rules compliance administrator, Associate Athletic Director for Compliance Services, meets on a monthly basis with the Executive Vice President and/or Vice President for University Counsel, as does the Faculty Athletics Representative.

The President has also established an Athletics Advisory Board which is chaired by the Faculty Athletics' Representative. This advisory Board has representation from students, alumni, faculty, staff, and the Athletics Department. In summer of 2011, the university formed a standing Gender Equity Committee charged with ensuring ongoing compliance with and commitment to gender and diversity equality as it relates to Athletics participation and programming.

Additionally, NCAA policies undergo thorough review annually, and the university President and Executive Vice President meet annually with the entire Athletics staff to discuss pertinent issues. The Athletic Department maintains systematic review of compliance with NCAA and university policies, such as Title IX gender equity to include sexual harassment. The university successfully completed the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification program in February 2012. The university was commended by the Committee on Certification on both the outcomes of the self-study and the peer review team visit, which was conducted in fall of 2011.

The budget for Athletics revenue and expenditures is comprised of both operating and restricted activities which are developed under the guidance of the Executive Vice President. Consistent with university oversight of all areas, the President's Cabinet reviews resources needs and revenue potentials as benchmarked against aspirations and peer data. After completing a five-year reclassification business plan begun in fall 2007, the university has contracted the services of Carr Sports Associates for the development of the 2013-2018 Athletics Business Plan.

Per NCAA legislation and EADA reporting requirement, all Athletics revenues (institutional and non-institutional), and corresponding documentation, are reviewed during the AUP audit process. These selections are randomly made, and are reviewed in person, by the assigned KPMG accountant. Consistent with all other campus audits, the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs manages all NCAA required audit procedures.

2.D.14 The institution maintains an effective identity verification process for students enrolled in distance education courses and programs to establish that the student enrolled in the distance education course or program is the same person whose achievements are evaluated and credentialed. The institution ensures the identity verification process for distance education students protects student privacy and that students are informed, in writing at the time of enrollment, of current and projected charges associated with the identity verification process.

The university engages in on online and distance education in limited areas. Differing methods of instruction, and thus identity verification, are employed in each school and college. In the School of Theology and Ministry, students in distance learning courses are involved in synchronous learning. Students are identified through visual confirmation using student ID card photos to validate the participating students. When students engage online, the process of engagement is only enabled via a secure log in to the Angel student learning system. For this component of the coursework, active directory authentication confirms the student identity by virtue of their credentialed log in.

In the Albers School of Business, MGMT 191 is conducted in an online format; however, the online coursework is solely intended to help students identify areas for improvement and preparation for the final exam. None of the online work contributes to the course grade. The grade is determined by the final exam, which is administered in a campus classroom. All e-mail communication is restricted to SU e-mail addresses. If a student writes to the instructor from a private e-mail address, he/she receives a response to his/her SU e-mail address.

In the College of Education's Continuing Education Department, online instruction involves an assigned log-in to the registered participant. The student must use that user log-in to access the site, and at times a synchronous component is included where visual recognition provides identity verification. Off-site classes require sign-in for each participant and the instructor verifies attendance at each session. Typically classes are conducted for teachers in a given school or district where they are well known to each other, and often to the instructor as well, making identity swapping impossible. Students pay by credit card or check, and the name on the form of payment is checked to match the student of record.

2.E Library and Information Resources

2.E.1 Consistent with its mission and core themes, the institution holds or provides access to library and information resources with an appropriate level of currency, depth, and breadth to support the institution's mission, core themes, programs, and services, wherever offered and however delivered.

Lemieux Library & McGoldrick Learning Commons

Snapshot of Information and Knowledge Resources

Estimated holdings at the end of FY 2011 include more than 287,000 print and periodical volumes and 6,500 media items. The library provides access to over 17,000 e-books and 47,000 full text e-journals from publisher packages and aggregator databases. Through thoughtful selection, efficient acquisition, and periodic assessment of these resources, the librarians have built, in conjunction with teaching faculty, a collection that supports the university's mission of teaching and student scholarship and the core theme of academic excellence.

Acquiring and Evaluating Information Resources

Librarians, in partnership with faculty, are active participants in fulfilling their core responsibilities in developing resources for teaching and learning. In their role as subject specialists, the librarians are knowledgeable in identifying and selecting appropriate content, format, and levels of readership in books and journals that will meet students' scholarship and curriculum needs.

All librarians participate in the monthly meetings of the library's Collection Development Group (CDG), a forum for broad discussion and decision-making. Priority is given to the assessment of electronic databases, subscriptions, and collection packages since they account for the largest expenditure of the library's annual Access and Acquisitions budget. Current collection development policies support this priority for electronic format over print in response to the preferences of students and faculty for access to resources wherever and whenever needed. Recommendations by the librarians for new resources in support of both new and existing programs are addressed with internal adjustments to the annual library Access and Acquisitions budget. The librarians also recognize that providing access to these electronic resources whenever and wherever needed is critical to student success. The library provides off-campus users access to these materials through a secure proxy server or virtual lab computers (VLAB). On campus users have access through 24/7 computer labs in the library, 24/7 online chat service from reference librarians, and in-person assistance with the technology and resources during library service hours. Research Services librarians and the librarians responsible for licensing, cataloging, and technology applications give priority and prompt response to addressing access issues to meet user needs.

Additional Resources Accessible through Resource Sharing

Recognizing that no single library can expect to own on site all the resources required to support the curricular and research needs of its primary clientele, current library trends emphasize a blend of

local ownership and cooperative borrowing. The library supplements its onsite collections and licensed online content, through resource sharing including "patron initiated borrowing." More than 28 million book and media items held by the 39 members of the Orbis Cascade Alliance consortium are accessible through a shared online catalog and regular courier delivery service. In FY 2011, 6,356 items were borrowed by Seattle University patrons from Alliance libraries. The library also continues to provide traditional interlibrary loan services managed and tracked with ILLiad Resource Sharing Management software, as well as providing various types of document delivery through commercial services and direct purchasing from publishers. While access to local onsite resources remains strong, evidence also demonstrates the diversity of sources that the library draws upon in order to meet the information and knowledge resource needs.

Assessment and Evaluation of Information Resources

Various reports are being generated with data that will help the library assess and evaluate currency, relevancy, and use of information resources. Information on the size and currency of the collection generated through report modules of the library's integrated system will be used for a variety of assessment projects, for example, to identify books in subject areas with older copyright dates or outdated content as potential candidates for de-selection, and subsequently, to update and enhance the same portion of the collection with new acquisitions. Data available from YBP, the library's new primary book vendor, include content and readership levels for each item purchased. These assist the librarian in the selection process at the time of order but also provide a broader picture of types of materials the library is purchasing in support of programs at each of the academic levels -- at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels.

Data obtained from YBP merged with data from the library's integrated system reports will allow library managers a fuller picture of the relationships among selection, costs, and usage. The library is currently tracking book titles purchased in FY2011 and FY2012 against circulation checkouts to examine elapsed time between point of acquisition and use by a library patron. The FY2011 report shows eleven percent (11%) of new acquisitions showed checkouts within one year of purchase. Two years from purchase the total circulations for the same group of books increased to thirty-two percent (32%). These preliminary data for a small subset of the library's total holdings suggest that resources are being successfully selected within the appropriate subject and readership levels. However, the data also suggests that the titles with no circulation activity after two years may not represent the most effective use of library funds. Preliminary assessment scenarios suggest one or more of the following: 1) at the time of selection, the subject content was not appropriately aligned with the curriculum or in support of potential course assignments, 2) that the resources were not selected with appropriate readership level, 3) that the new resources were not promoted sufficiently among faculty and students to raise awareness of the breadth and depth of the collection. Future resource assessment reports might include how the value of annual firm order expenditures can be cross-tabulated against yearly circulation transactions to reflect return-on-investment ratios.

Librarians evaluate online resources for both subject content and for the potential contribution to the curriculum. The library collects the industry standard COUNTER-compliant usage statistics that report the number of logins and downloads conducted by students and faculty in their research projects. (Launched in March 2002, COUNTER -- Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources -- is an international initiative serving librarians, publishers, and intermediaries by setting standards that facilitate the recording and reporting of online usage statistics in a consistent, credible, and compatible way.) These statistics are valuable for librarians as one measure in determining which information resources are more heavily used and subsequently perhaps provide stronger impact in supporting the curriculum. A future goal is to tie COUNTER usage data with actual cost of materials to help the library assess financial support of curriculum as well as to assist in determining the retention and/or de-selection of resources.

LibQual Survey: Students and Faculty Requesting Library Information Sources

The LibQual Survey conducted in Spring 2012 generated only forty-four (44) comments that recommended improvements or additions to library information resources. Thirty-nine percent (39%) of respondents suggested that the library provide more full-text content of electronic journal collections. Twenty percent (20%) suggested additional resources were needed in specific subject fields such as nursing, business, and psychology, though no format was specified. Another twenty percent (20%) requested more print books and eleven percent (11%) suggested more databases. The remainder of comments calculated less than one percent (1%), one comment requesting more software. The highest percentages of combined comments total fifty percent (50%) = (39% e-journals and 11% databases) and confirm users' preferences for additional online resources. The library is properly aligning its budgeting and collection policies in a manner that maintains its commitment to meeting the needs of students and faculty.

Seattle University Law Library

The Seattle University Law Library maintains a collection of legal resources as required by the American Bar Association for accredited law schools. Estimated law library holdings in June 2012 included: 55,300 print titles, 109,561 microform titles, 32,645 electronic titles, and 2,784 non-book titles (e.g. videos, CD-ROMS). The law library's total title count for the same period was 200,290 and total volumes and volume equivalents was 398,066. Information resources are selected according to the Seattle University Law Library Collection Development Policy, the Seattle University Law Library Selective United States Federal Depository Library Collection Development Policy, and the Foreign, Comparative and International Law Collection Development Policy. As a law library, special attention is paid to the currency of legal resources to ensure that patrons have the most up-to-date legal information. Resources are available in a variety of formats (print, video, microformat, electronic). While the law library collection is located entirely in Sullivan Hall, law library electronic resources can be accessed either on or off campus to facilitate instruction (face-to-face, distance, or hybrid) and research anytime, anywhere.

The law library actively responds to curricular and programmatic changes within the law school by modifying and prioritizing collection development parameters. The library supports law school courses by evaluating a number of factors (how often the class is taught, the number of students registered, whether the course is required for graduation or to complete a focus area, the nature of research and writing assignments, whether the class has been permanently approved as part of the curriculum, etc.). A librarian is a regular member of the Law School Curriculum Committee so as to identify new curricular trends and courses. Additionally, the library liaison program provides an excellent vehicle to monitor the resource needs of constituents. Each faculty member and program (e.g. centers, journals, moot court) is assigned a librarian who serves as their primary point person within the library. Faculty and program directors work collaboratively with their library liaisons in making suggestions for resources. The librarians' regular interactions with students during research consultations and in the classroom provide informal opportunities to better understand student educational and research needs and respond accordingly. Furthermore, law patrons are not shy and do not hesitate to make suggestions in person, via email, by phone, or in surveys.

Supporting Documents

1. ACRL 2011 Statistics
2. Role of the Liaison Librarian
3. FY2011 YBP Content and Select Levels Graphs
4. FY2012 YBP Content and Select Levels Graphs
5. Print Information & Knowledge Resources by Source & Year 2009 to 12
6. Collection Development and Management Policy
7. FY2010 Allocation Report
8. FY2011 Allocation Report
9. FY2012 Allocation Report
10. FY2011 Circulation Statistics
11. FY2012 Circulation Statistics
12. Age of Collection Report May 2012
13. Tracking Select Title Purchases 2011
14. Tracking Select Title Purchases 2012
15. LibQual+ 2012 Survey Results Notebook
16. Law Library History, Stats, & Facts 2012
17. Law Library Budget Allocations 2013-2008
18. Law Library Collection Development Policy
19. Law Library Selective United States Federal Depository Library Collection Development Policy
20. Law Library Foreign Comparative and International Law Collection Development Policy

2.E.2 Planning for library and information resources is guided by data that include feedback from affected users and appropriate library and information resources faculty, staff, and administrators.

Lemieux Library & McGoldrick Learning Commons

The library administration relies on several major survey instruments to understand user experiences and perceptions and to respond to changing needs and preferences of its users. The library has participated in the LibQUAL+ Library Service Quality Survey five times in the last ten years. The University Librarian has consistently worked with representatives of the Associated Students of Seattle University (ASSU) to devise and refine library-related questions for the annual State of the Student Survey. The library participates in, and contributes to, a number of external statistical reports, including the Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL), Northwest Association of Private Colleges and Universities (NAPCU), The Affinity Group of Peer Institutions, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Academic Library Survey. In addition, the library periodically gathers and reports usage and satisfaction data in support of disciplinary accreditation from Association for Theological Schools (ATS), Council on Social Work Education, and the Association for Criminal Justice Education. The results of such participation provide access to a rich body of data for comparative analysis and are used to evaluate library performance overall and to shape program revision.

Library staff have initiated a series of studies and surveys designed to measure usage of the facility and user preferences for services. The results of such studies are being used to modify policies and practices or to refine services. Recent preference studies and usage surveys include: a thorough time-series study of facility usage during spring quarter 2011, resulting in recommendations for policy changes; a point-of-service survey on laptop checkout service that helped to determine the technical specifications of future laptop purchases; a study of volume and purposes of usage of group study rooms that is being used to develop new policies for the use of these popular locations; a quarter-long headcount measurement of usage of the Faculty Lounge in order to assess policies regarding acceptable use; a review of circulation statistics and the class course schedule to determine service hours for holidays and intersession periods, resulting in a new policy for these periods; point-of-use survey of intersession service hours and the use of research assistance services that confirmed the basic service hours were meeting user needs but that led to an expansion of research consultation services in the period between mid-terms and finals; joint survey administered by the Learning Common Partnership to learn more about use of services and to get feedback on ways to improve the service, resulting in a recommendation from students that the library does more marketing of learning commons services.

Seattle University Law Library

The law library regularly obtains input on its services and resources in a variety of ways. Law students provide feedback through the Student Bar Association and by offering suggestions directly. The law library also employs a significant number of work-study students who serve as an immediate sounding board. The law library has received feedback through formal law school and university survey instruments, including the Associated Students of Seattle University (ASSU) State of the Student Survey and the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE). The law library also surveyed law students in spring of 2009 and 2011. The Associate Dean for Library and Information

Technology, library department heads, and relevant library personnel discuss survey responses and act upon suggestions when feasible.

Supporting Documents

1. Lemieux LibQUAL Perceived and Adequacy Means 2004-12
2. LibQual+ 2012 Survey Results Notebook
3. ASSU 2012 State of the Student Undergraduate Survey (Please note that ASSU refers to the Associated Students of Seattle University, which changed its name to Student Government of Seattle University in 2012)
4. ASSU 2011 State of the Student Undergraduate Survey Executive Summary - Library Excerpt
5. L&M Space Usage Project Spring 2011
6. Laptop survey December 2010
7. 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 Group Study Room Usage Analyses
8. FY2011 Circulation Statistics
9. FY2012 Circulation Statistics
10. Intersession Hours Survey Summer 2011
11. Intersession 2011 Questions Asked (Gimlet) Report
12. Learning Commons Partnership Survey report
13. Analysis Law Library Survey of Law Students March 2011
14. Analysis Law Library Survey of Law Students March 2009

2.E.3 Consistent with its mission and core themes, the institution provides appropriate instruction and support for students, faculty, staff, administrators, and others (as appropriate) to enhance their efficiency and effectiveness in obtaining, evaluating, and using library and information resources that support its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered.

Lemieux Library & McGoldrick Learning Commons

Class-integrated instruction

Librarians work closely with faculty members to design library sessions tailored to the needs of a particular assignment and class. For the period AY 2010-2011, the program totaled 182 sessions reaching 3,516 students -- 81% undergraduates and 19% graduate students. For the past two years library faculty have been doing assessment projects focused on student learning and their information literacy development. Librarians track detailed information about instruction sessions in the Zoho database which allows the program coordinator to generate a variety of detailed reports.

Information Services

The public information desks on the second and third floors are largely staffed by student workers who help patrons use the library's services, navigate the building, and find basic information. In-depth questions about finding information or doing research are referred to research service librarians. This service handles a large volume of questions, over 13,000 in academic year 2010-11.

All questions answered at the desks are recorded in the Gimlet database. This database provides both qualitative data as well as a wide variety of statistical reports.

Research Services

Librarians carry a dedicated iPhone during scheduled research on-call hours and are available to assist users in the building or calling on the telephone. Librarians answer questions via a web-based chat service during the work week or via a 24/7 web-based chat service provided by a consortium of libraries from the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU). Students, staff and faculty may schedule one-on-one research consultations with a librarian for individualized help with research projects. Consultation sessions are by appointment and tailored to fit research needs. This service is used predominantly by students. When no research services librarians are available in person, there are multiple ways to get assistance, including by email or via the 24/7 chat service provided by the AJCU. Research questions in all formats are recorded in the Gimlet database which provides a variety of data and statistics that can be used for decision-making and reporting. Research Consultations are recorded in the Zoho database.

LibGuides and other Web Resources

LibGuides is a web-based service that allows library and learning commons staff to organize key resources for subject areas, specialized topics and course-related guides. LibGuides serve as organized portals of subject information which users can access on their own, 24/7. LibGuides provide a form of valuable research instruction, even to those students who do not visit the library building. LibGuides statistical reporting provides detailed information on the usage of each research guide. Video tutorials and library webpages provided additional support to library users.

Technology services

The library provides technology assistance to patrons using any of over 260 workstations, or their own computers and mobile devices, during all service hours. Assistance is provided by student employees and library staff, and covers the use of AV equipment, lab computers, software, etc. In the Media Production Center, students have access to high-end hardware and software for the creation of photo, audio and video projects. Specialized instruction in the use of this equipment and software is offered to all students, and is a prerequisite for access to the most advanced equipment. Cooperation with other campus units, such as the Office of Information Technology, or the Film Studies program allows the library to maximize the quality and range of technology instruction offered.

Collaborative curriculum activities

Librarians worked with faculty under the support of a grant from The Teagle Foundation to review and redesign curriculum to better support the development of information literacy and writing skills. A librarian participates on the core implementation committee and librarians are preparing materials to use in workshops on information literacy that librarians will offer to faculty to support the development of new core courses.

Outreach

Working with the Learning Commons Partnership, a variety of orientations were offered for the campus community including new faculty, new graduate students, freshmen, transfer students, international students, student tour guides, orientation advisors, and athletes. Meetings were held with staff from Commuter and Student Life, Career Services, Alumni Affairs, and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to explore areas to collaborate to provide better services. A joint project has been initiated with Career Service to jointly purchase a database, *Career Insider*, which will be evaluated at the end of one year. A library committee is developing a plan to support students who may be off campus while taking hybrid and online courses. Initial discussions are underway to create a student advisory group.

Seattle University Law Library

Through an active instructional program, the law library teaches patrons to evaluate and use information resources. The varied methods of instruction—informal and formal, one-on-one and group, credit and non-credit, online and in person—accommodate a wide range of learning styles. At the reference desk, reference librarians respond to both legal and non-legal questions posed in person, via phone, and by e-reference. In an average week, the reference librarians typically field 65 questions from law students, 29 questions from law faculty, and 11 questions from alumni. During the academic year, the reference desk is staffed by a professional librarian from 8:30 am to 8:00 pm on Monday through Thursday, from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm on Friday, and noon to 4:00 pm on Sunday.

In addition to one-on-one consultations at the reference desk or by appointment, librarians provide formal lectures, course-integrated instruction, tours, and orientations. They conduct research consultations for faculty research assistants and independent study students. The law librarians offer the following semester long, for credit courses on a regular basis: Advanced Electronic Research and Methodology; International and Foreign Law Research (offered every other year); Legal Research Methods; Online Advanced Legal Research (this course is taught completely online with preference given to evening students).

The law library uses a variety of technologies to deliver resources and instruction to patrons wherever they are. The law library maintains a dynamic website which includes access to the catalog, electronic resources, and library information. In 2011-2012, the library home page was the 4th most viewed law school page. The most visited law library pages were the home page, the database page, and the services page. A variety of online research guides on the LibGuides platform direct patrons to print and electronic resources. The most popular LibGuides during 2011-2012 were on the following topics: US legal system, first year resources, study aids, legal careers, and solo/small firm practice. The law library blog keeps patrons informed of library services and events as well as provides tips on research techniques. The law library blog's number of views increased by 61% in 2011-2012 compared to the prior year.

Supporting Documents

1. 2009-2010 Annual Report on the library's Instruction Program
2. 2010-2011 Annual Report on the library's Instruction Program
3. 2011-2012 Draft Annual Report on library's Instruction Program
4. 2010-11 annual report on Information Services
5. 2011-2012 annual report on Information Services
6. 2010-11 annual report on Research Services activities and accomplishments
7. 2011-12 annual report on Research Services activities and accomplishments
8. SU and Ellucian Library Work Order
9. Statistics on the Use of Law Library and Other Learning Resources 2011-2012
10. Law Library Website
11. Law Library LibGuides
12. Law Library Blog

2.E.4 The institution regularly and systematically evaluates the quality, adequacy, utilization, and security of library and information resources and services, including those provided through cooperative arrangements, wherever offered and however delivered.

Lemieux Library & McGoldrick Learning Commons

Regular and systematic evaluation of resources and services carried out by library staff is a reflection of the commitment and action of the institution generally. The library administration relies on two major survey instruments to understand user experiences and perceptions and to respond to changing needs and preferences of its users, LibQUAL+ and the ASSU State of the Student Survey

The library has participated in the LibQUAL+ Library Service Quality Survey five times in the last ten years. LibQUAL+ is a suite of services that libraries use to solicit, track, understand, and act upon user's opinions of service quality. Developed and offered to the library community by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) since 2000, it has been used by more than 1,200 libraries internationally. The program's centerpiece is a rigorously tested Web-based survey, paired with training and reinforced by follow-up targeted focus groups sessions, that helps libraries assess and improve services, change organizational culture, and market the library. The survey instrument measures library users' minimum, perceived, and desired levels of service quality across three dimensions: Affect of Service; Information Control; and, Library as Place.

In the past, the library has used the LibQUAL+ survey results to improve the physical facility, shape the library's collection development policies, and broaden the technology. In Fall 2011, LibQUAL+ results led the library to increase hours of operation from 85 hours per week to 92.5 hours per week and justified additional library positions and restructuring of the service model to enlarge the size and scope of services in the after-hours 24/7 Zone. The 2012 LibQUAL+ survey was completed in Spring of 2012. Data and comments are being analyzed for future assessment and evaluation.

Various university surveys – some administered within a single college or school and some administered campus-wide (such as The State of the Student Survey and the Seattle University Survey of Student Engagement) – include items relating to demographic information about library users and constituents, patterns of library usage, and satisfaction with library collections, services, and facilities. The University Librarian has consistently worked with representatives of the Associated Students of Seattle University (ASSU) to devise and refine library-related questions for the annual State of the Student Survey. Data are a component of the aggregate information available to library administration and staff to help assess current performance, modify existing operations, or introduce new services. Library technological infrastructure and devices are monitored, tracked, maintained, and assessed as part of SUs Office of Information Technology operations.

In addition to LibQUAL+ Library Service Quality Survey and the State of the Student Survey, the library participates in, and contributes to, a number of external statistical reports including: the Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL); Northwest Association of Private and Independent Colleges and Universities (NAPCU); The Affinity Group Statistics; National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Academic Library Survey. The results of such participation provide access to a rich body of data for comparative analysis among peer and aspirant universities.

Librarians continue to assist in the evaluation efforts that take place at campus or school level. Through the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Achievement and its annual cycle of review for new programs proposals, course changes, and new majors, the librarians have a direct opportunity to review the proposals, assess strengths or gaps of current resources, and prepare a library response that is included in the formal university review process. Data reflecting library resources and services is also provided to departments and schools to assist with external or accreditation review, including Association for example Theological Schools (ATS); Council on Social Work Education; Association for Criminal Justice Education.

The library staff has initiated a series of studies and surveys designed to measure usage of the facility and user preferences for services. The results of such studies are used to modify policies and practices or to refine services. Recent preference studies and usage surveys include: a thorough time-series study of facility usage during Spring Qtr 2011, resulting in recommendations for policy changes; a point-of-service survey on laptop checkout service that helped to determine the technical specifications of future laptop purchases; a study of volume and purposes of usage of group study rooms that is being used to develop new policies for the use of these popular locations; a quarter-long headcount measurement of usage of the Faculty Lounge in order to assess policies regarding acceptable use; a review of circulation statistics and the class course schedule to determine service hours for holidays and intersession periods, resulting in a new policy for these periods; point-of-use survey of intersession service hours and the use of research assistance services that confirmed the basic service hours were meeting user needs but that led to an expansion of research consultation services in the period between; joint survey administered by the Learning Common Partnership to

learn more about use of services and to get feedback on ways to improve the service, resulting in a recommendation from students that the library does more marketing of learning commons services.

The library maintains crucial, integral, and cooperative agreements with individual institutions and consortia that, individually and collectively, provide collections and services to the Seattle University community that supplement Lemieux's own resources.

The university is a member of the Orbis Cascade Alliance, a regional consortium of 39 academic institutions, and the library administration and staff are active participants in Alliance governance and programs. The Alliance has recently transitioned from the status as an affiliated unit of the University of Oregon into a free-standing 501(c)3 not-for-profit corporation. The Alliance operates a number of programs in which SU participates, providing great value to the library and its constituents. Programs with the greatest impact for SU include: (1) the Summit Navigator Union Catalog with direct-end-user borrowing and a five-day-per-week courier delivery service; (2) the Electronic Resources Program, whose joint licensing efforts help the library provide extensive e-resources to its local constituents at considerable financial savings (estimated savings of $75,000 in FY 2009/10 and $81,000 in FY 2010/11); (3) a cooperative demand-driven e-book acquisitions program that promotes shared purchasing and joint ownership of electronic books available to all Alliance constituents; (4) an active Cooperative Collection Development and Management Committee working on initiatives to broader and deeper collections for the membership as a whole.

The library has recently launched its participation in the optional Alliance program, the Northwest Digital Archives (NWDA), which provides a central database of archival and special collections Finding. NWDA also offers participation in grant-funded initiatives (e.g., the IMLS-funded exploration of a specialized cross-search utility) and provides access to a network of specialists. In 2011/2012, SU participated in an Alliance multi-institution grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Center. The grant made possible the services of a Consulting Archivist and also resulted in access to a centrally-hosted application of the online processing tool, Archivists' Toolkit, as well as the creation of an archives manual, a program development plan, and an advocacy and outreach plan that will be used in development and evaluation of the university archives.

The library maintains other useful relationships with similar higher education and academic library organizations. Cooperation with the 28-institution Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities provides low- or no-cost interlibrary loan, reciprocal onsite borrowing privileges, and a shared Virtual Reference Service available 24 hours a day during the major academic periods. Low- or no-cost interlibrary loan and reciprocal onsite borrowing privileges are available through memberships in the Northwest Association of Private Colleges and Universities: Libraries (NAPCU-L) and the Puget Sound Independent Academic Libraries (PSAIL).

Seattle University Law Library

As mentioned above in 2.E.2, feedback about the library is obtained through formal university and law school survey instruments (e.g. ASSU State of the Student Survey and the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE)). The law library regularly administers its own survey (e.g. Law Library Survey of Law Students in March 2009 and March 2011) to obtain more specific and focused feedback. Survey results have been used to improve the law library security, services, and facilities (e.g. increase in group and individual seating; implementation of key card security system).

In terms of cooperative arrangements, both the law library and Lemieux Library are members of the Orbis Cascade Alliance consortium. This provides access to over 28 million items from 37 academic libraries throughout Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. Patrons can borrow materials directly through the Summit consortium catalog (delivery is generally within three to five business days) or on site at member institutions. Through full membership in the consortium and active participation in its governance (e.g. Council and committees) the libraries have regular input into consortial services and activities.

Supporting Documents

1. Orbis Cascade Alliance Website
2. Orbis Cascade Alliance Articles of Incorporation 2010
3. SU-Alliance MOU 20101026
4. Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities Passport Program materials
5. 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 Group Study Room Usage Analyses
6. L&M Space Usage Project Spring 2011
7. Analysis Law Library Survey of Law Students March 2009
8. Analysis Law Library Survey of Law Students March 2011
9. Orbis Cascade Alliance Consortium Summit Catalog

2.F Financial Resources

2.F.1 The institution demonstrates financial stability with sufficient cash flow and reserves to support its programs and services. Financial planning reflects available funds, realistic development of financial resources, and appropriate risk management to ensure short-term solvency and anticipate long-term obligations, including payment of future liabilities.

Financial Stability

Seattle University has a long history of financial stability with balanced operating budgets in every year since the 1970's and positive net cash flows from operating activities since 1996, when the university adopted Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 117.

The institution's operating budget grew from an actual figure of $171.3 million for FY2009 to a budgeted $198 million in FY2013, an increase of $26.7 million or 15.6 percent. In the five-year period from FY2009 (fall 2008) to FY2013 (fall 2012), the university experienced an increase in net tuition and fee revenue of nearly 18 percent or more than $25.5 million.

With total student enrollment budgeted at nearly 7,500 students for FY2013, 85 percent or $168.7 million of operating resources are projected to come from net tuition and fees. Increases in gross tuition and fees and financial aid from FY2012 to FY2013 resulted in a $4.4 million or 2.7 percent increase in net tuition fees over that same period. The remaining FY2013 budgeted revenues are projected in residential revenues (6 percent), endowment income (2.8 percent), bookstore revenues (1.6 percent), annual unrestricted gifts (1 percent), and other components totaling (3.2 percent).

Expendable net assets have increased nearly $23.8 million from FY2009, though the five year period from FY2008 to FY2012, shows expendable net assets decreasing by 22 percent. This is due in part to the decrease experienced from FY2008 to FY2009 as a result of endowment market value losses experienced in fall 2008. After falling from a high of $206 million as of June 30, 2008, the endowment continues to rebound and was valued at $177 million as of June 30, 2012. The university adopted the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act (UPMIFA) effective July 1, 2009, which reclassified approximately $22 million of endowment funds from unrestricted net assets to temporarily restricted net assets.

Endowment income is based on a spending policy of 4.5% of a rolling twelve-quarter average of market values as of December 31. With the worst of the retrenchment recorded as of December 31, 2008, unit values will no longer be anchored by past exceptional market retractions. Thus the endowment is poised to generate more funds for operations beginning in FY2013. To support continued positive performance, the endowment asset allocation was adjusted in 2009 to liquidate largely illiquid non-marketable assets in favor of investments more likely to provide intergenerational equity. Given the long-term nature of these assets, the final adjustments to the new endowment

asset allocation will be implemented in a consistent and deliberate manner over the next several years.

The university monitors several financial ratios to ascertain economic health, including the primary reserve ratio (expendable net assets/total expenses), net tuition dependence ratio (Net Tuition & Fees/Total Income), viability ratio (expendable assets/long-term debt), and the debt ratio (Principal + Interest Payments/ Adjusted Expenses). In each case, the institution exceeds minimum compliance levels or operates within maximum thresholds.

Given its strong enrollments and sound financial management, the institution has had access to third party credit since the 1970's, including an established line of credit of $5 million with Union Bank since 2010. The institution has never accessed these funds to maintain or support operating expenses.

The institution has a history of increasingly sophisticated and successful gift cultivation with the most recent capital campaign - the most ambitious and successful in the university's history - completed in 2009 with $169 million raised towards a goal of $160 million. The university is currently in the planning stages of the next comprehensive campaign to be focused on capital and scholarship needs.

Business risk is mitigated in the short term with appropriate insurance coverage, clear personnel accountabilities, and operational processes and procedures. Operational contingencies exist to deal with short term financial needs within the fiscal year. Long term financial risk is monitored by the Vice President for Finance & Business Affairs and regularly reviewed by the institution's executive management in context of larger business risk deliberations. Long-term financial planning considers the implications of changes to demographic, federal, state, industry, and environmental parameters to the extent reasonable within context. The university is appropriately insured with general liability and property coverage, including earthquake insurance of $150 million.

Debt and Reserves

As detailed in the FY2012 Statement of Cash Flow, net cash provided by operating activities continues to be positive and greater than payments on long-term debt. The institution is "A" rated with a stable outlook by Standard & Poor's with debt equaling $140 million as of June 30, 2012. In addition to affirming the institution's "A" rating in January 2011, Standard & Poor's supported a bond refinancing of $15.3 million in September 2011 with the goal of reducing annual debt services by approximately $80,000.

Long term debt service needs are regularly monitored for adherence to current bond covenants and best practice principles. The institution anticipates no difficulties in meeting future debt service needs. To ensure healthy debt management, the university recognizes that debt capacity will be limited in the near term. Thus, the university's Ten Year Capital Plan anticipates that capital funding

in the next five to seven years will require careful cultivation of philanthropic, institutional, and mixed use funding.

While the FY2012 total capital reserves of $17 million were sufficient to manage planned capital projects, the university recognizes the need to carefully manage liquid resources. Thus, all capital outlays are given significant review by both executive management and the Board of Trustees, usually within the context of the annual budget cycle. Regular budget allocations for non-mandatory transfers include investments in capital reserves, project resources, and interfund loan repayments.

The university can demonstrate deliberate infusion of funds to capital reserves through both regular budget activities and allocation of surplus operating dollars. The budget for FY2013 includes a non-mandatory allocation of $7.6 million, with $5 million to be placed in capital reserves. Due to the university's practice of placing the majority of operational surpluses in capital reserves, nearly $16 million additional dollars were recognized beyond budgeted allocations from FY2008 to FY2012. As detailed on the Ten Year Capital Plan, long-term fiscal planning includes a gradual increase in the budgeted capital reserve allocation to improve university reserves.

Supporting Documents

1. Budget for FY2013
2. Summary of Actuals and Budget FY2009 to FY2013
3. Audited Financial Statements for FY12
4. Endowment Review Executive Summary 6.30.12
5. Five Year Financial Ratio Analysis
6. Standard & Poor's A Rating Affirmation (January 13, 2011)
7. Standard & Poor's Credit Analysis (August 5, 2011)
8. Ten Year Capital Plan
9. Five Year Analysis of Capital Reserve Allocations

2.F.2 Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and responsible projections of grants, donations, and other non-tuition revenue sources.

To ensure disciplined and transparent pursuit of the core themes detailed in the *Strategic Priority Action Plans,* the university has expanded its long-term planning capabilities and seeks to more fully align the planning activities happening at every level of the institution. This process is most clearly demonstrated by the integration of several major planning documents into the annual operating cycle and budget formation. The most significant major planning documents include the Enrollment and Tuition Forecast Model, the Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan, the Ten Year Capital Plan, the Five Year Projected Housing Revenue Summary, and the Five Year Technology Strategy. These major financial planning documents are discussed and refined throughout the year, with major updates before budget deliberations. The process of setting and

approving the annual operating budget in turn affirms major planning assumptions or highlights the need for adjustments.

Enrollment Planning and Development

As the primary driver of fiscal health, enrollment is a shared institutional priority and is the subject of great deliberation as facilitated by the university Provost and Vice President for Enrollment Management in close collaboration with key campus stakeholders. These deliberations are informed by analysis of the most recent information available regarding market demand, capacity, enrollment funnel and financial aid indicators to gauge the need for adjustments to enrollment projections and planning assumptions. These discussions lead to further refinement of the university's enrollment model as well as larger conversations regarding long-term planning of enrollment targets, tuition growth, and institutional aid.

The Enrollment and Tuition Forecast Model is a year-by-year forecasting tool that provides near term projections of headcount, undergraduate and graduate tuition rate increases, and projected fee and tuition revenue. Maintained under the direction of the Provost and Vice President for Enrollment Management, the Enrollment Model incorporates both historical retention factors and real-time environmental parameters that are monitored by academic program leaders and enrollment professionals. The Enrollment and Tuition Forecast Model is founded upon several critical and ongoing enrollment shaping and program development activities.

All conversations regarding future student population characteristics are held within the context of the core themes as detailed in the *Academic Strategic Action Plan*. To that end, an Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan with a five-year planning horizon was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2012 following an extended, deliberative planning process by a collaborative campus steering council which engaged other stakeholders throughout the process.

The Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan defined the institution's parameters for undergraduate enrollment growth and detailed key strategies for successful attainment of long-term goals. The institution is currently developing a Graduate Strategic Enrollment Plan to provide long-term institutional guidance while recognizing the non-homogenous nature of the graduate population with more than 30 distinct degree and certificate programs. The Graduate Strategic Enrollment Plan will be presented for Board of Trustee consideration in 2013.

Tuition discounting, as derived from gross tuition costs and institutional aid awarding, has a marked effect on student attraction, quality, matriculation and retention, and thus receives a great deal of scrutiny and deliberation. This work will be greatly informed by a Tuition Pricing, Aid and Value Study completed in 2012 and by the continuing efforts of the Vice President for Enrollment Management. Total costs of attendance going forward will include two mandatory student fees: a technology fee implemented in 2011 to ensure ongoing funding of student technology needs and a recreational fee implemented in 2012 to provide ongoing support for student-focused and

intramural facilities and activities. Program and mandatory fees are carefully determined in accordance with established peer data comparisons.

Academic program development and retraction is guided by long-term planning and includes revenue and expense planning within the context of institutional strength, market opportunities and environmental risk assessments. Long-term program planning includes the deliberate reduction of projected revenues and related costs when warranted by the environment, historical performance, and a cost-benefit analysis of further investment.

In anticipation of significantly changing demographic, economic, and industry indicators, along with methods of educational delivery, the university is developing new programs to expand offerings to non-traditional populations. In 2012, a revitalized summer program was launched to increase summer credit hours at a slightly reduced price point in response to declining summer enrollment trends in recent years. Going forward, the Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan includes much greater focus on student success and the deliberate cultivation of transfer students. The greater focus on retention and transfer students is expected to modestly grow (less than 10%) the traditional undergraduate enrollment over the next five years with the intent to maintain current transfer percentages through an increased headcount.

The institution is also exploring the development and implementation of an adult education program to further diversify enrollments and better serve the needs of the regional population. Three new positions were created in 2012 to enhance these efforts: an Associate Provost for Research and Graduate Education, the Director of Continuing, Online and Professional Education and the Director of University Retention Initiatives.

The Seattle University Law School

The Law School was purchased in its entirety from the University of Puget Sound in 1994 and follows a semester academic calendar rather than the quarter calendar followed by the rest of the institution. The Law School has its own distinct planning activities due to operational necessity, ABA requirements for autonomy, and certain stipulations of the original purchase agreement. Law School planning is administered by the Dean of the Law School and overseen by the Provost. The Law School has enrollment, tuition, and financial aid plans independent of the institutional documents previously described.

The major financial planning documents of the institution treat Law School finances as separate from all other academic areas, though the Law School adheres to major university planning components (e.g., salary increases, fringe benefit rate). The Law School's contribution to university overhead is maintained at seven percent of operating revenues less financial aid. Any surplus or deficit generated by changes to major planning assumptions are the Law School's to allocate to equipment and enrollment reserves.

Law School senior leadership strives to enroll an academically gifted and deliberately limited number of students each year as it seeks to increase its selectivity and national reputation. Ongoing planning is informed by societal indicators such as diminishing LSAT test participation and media scrutiny of employment prospects. The consolidated Seattle University Budget for FY2013 includes Law School enrollment at 962 students with an annual gross tuition of $39,810 and an average discount rate of 14.5 percent. A revised Five Year Law School Enrollment Plan is scheduled for approval in 2013.

Non-Tuition Revenue Sources

Non-enrollment driven revenues such as endowment income and annual unrestricted gifts are budgeted at reasonable levels given historical performance and environmental factors. Residential revenues account for 6 percent of budgeted revenue in FY2013 and are set using the Five Year Projected Housing Revenue Summary which seeks to optimize revenues while stabilizing bed capacities to ensure a positive living experience for student residents. The Housing Revenue Summary also serves to guide the operational requirements of university-owned and partner facilities.

Restricted resources are an increasingly important contributor to the institution's fiscal health, especially with regard to programmatic support and capital development. Many departmental groups work together to ensure appropriate planning, management, and reporting of gift and grant revenues throughout the institution. Federal and state student aid grants (and loans) are projected and managed by the Office of Student Financial Services, while all other public and private grant development, compliance, and reporting are overseen by the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects. Gift development, stewardship, and reporting are overseen by the Vice President for University Advancement.

The university had $50 million in temporarily restricted assets in FY2012. Approximately $35 million of these assets were endowment funds, with another $14 million solicited and managed by academic units. Programs with a large component of restricted funding are developed on the basis of long-term revenue plans which are monitored and updated regularly. Expenses within such programs are administered per university and departmental policies to ensure awareness of potential impact on the university's operating revenues.

Planning, management, and reporting of invested assets of the institution are the responsibility of the Vice President for Finance & Business Affairs. An Investment Policy Statement, the governing document of the institution's endowment fund, clearly establishes the link between endowment management and the institution's mission. These management activities are guided by the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees and more focused governance is provided by the university's Investment Committee.

The institution's fundraising activities are administered by the Vice President for University Advancement. In 2009 the university concluded the largest and most successful comprehensive campaign in its history. Launched in FY2004, the campaign raised nearly $169 million toward a $160 million goal. The institution is currently developing goals, structures, and timelines for its next campaign.

As the university explores and prioritizes the necessary components to future campaigns and development initiatives, regular meetings between senior executives from the development and academic areas will serve to forge a close and responsive working relationship in support of the institution's core themes. This relationship is supported by University Advancement's management structure. Larger development initiatives and all support activities are centrally housed, but each school and college has a dedicated development officer who seeks to cultivate gifts in support of funding priorities as set by their respective deans. These funding priorities are closely monitored and approved by the Provost and Vice President for University Advancement.

Supporting Documents

1. Enrollment and Tuition Forecast Model – representative sample
2. Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan Executive Summary
3. Ten Year Capital Plan
4. Five Year Projected Housing Revenue Summary – representative sample
5. Five-year technology strategy
6. *Academic Strategic Action Plan*
7. Investment Policy Statement

2.F.3 The institution clearly defines and follows its policies, guidelines, and processes for financial planning and budget development that include appropriate opportunities for participation by its constituencies.

Seattle University's Bylaws state:

> *The President shall be the chief executive officer of the University and shall have general charge and control of all its business affairs and properties, subject to the ultimate determination and responsibility of the Board of Trustees.*

The President frequently communicates with the Chair of the Board of Trustees, and regular financial updates are provided to the board throughout the year. In recognition of its responsibilities and the growing complexity of the university, the Board of Trustees has established standing committees charged with oversight of specific academic and operational functions.

Four committees provide due diligence in financial matters. The Finance and Audit Committees report and recommend action directly to the Board of Trustees, while the Investment and Facilities and Land Use Committees are sub-committees reporting to the Finance Committee. Ratified charters clarify the functions of each committee.

The regular quarterly meetings of the Board of Trustees include a report from the President detailing the general activities of the university. Reports from committee chairs and associated vice presidents provide specific information on related topics. Standing committees generally meet on a quarterly basis, though all committees are authorized to meet more frequently as necessary.

The Vice President for Finance & Business Affairs is recognized as the Treasurer of the institution and is authorized by the Board of Trustees to conduct the university's financial transactions, with the university President, Executive Vice President, Provost, Associate Vice President for Finance, and Controller authorized to sign financial documents. Regular financial planning at all levels is guided by the core themes of the institution as detailed in the Strategic Priority Action Plans.

In accordance with the governance structure of the institution, the Provost acts as the chief academic officer and directs all academic activities. Non-academic activities are directed by the university's Executive Vice President and the Vice President for Finance & Business Affairs. These three executives provide supervision of all other Vice Presidents and Deans and in turn report to the President. The Executive Vice President and Provost are often in attendance at finance-related board committee meetings staffed by the Vice President for Finance & Business Affairs. The President is an ex officio member of all Board committees.

Institutional business functions are primarily administered by the division of Finance & Business Affairs, with all divisions sharing some responsibility for financial management. For example, tuition revenue is managed by the Provost and Vice President for Enrollment Management while University Advancement is responsible for cultivating, reporting, and stewarding gifts. Business risk assessment is the purview of University Counsel, who works closely with financial personnel to limit areas of exposure and ensure best practices. Human Resources, Faculty Services, Housing and Residential Life, and Athletics are responsible for activities that support the university's regular financial operations.

The university has enacted policies governing the use of university resources which are available on the website for institutional policies and the division of Finance & Business Affairs. Operational policies and procedures related to faculty and staff FTE creation, compensation, and management are set and communicated by the Offices of Human Resources and Faculty Services. Policies regarding student employment are set and communicated by Student Financial Services, while policies regarding the use of space and related regulatory compliance are set and communicated by Facilities Services.

The university's primary resource allocation process is the annual budget cycle. The process calendar for budget and planning activities is kept by the University Budget Office and is communicated to appropriate campus constituents at the relevant moments in the cycle. Campus constituents participate in financial planning and development in accordance with their employment

accountabilities. Senior administrators, financial officers, and operational personnel continually participate in financial planning and budget development discussions within the annual budget cycle.

Each division administers its own financial planning and budget development process within the context of the annual budget cycle, with every divisional executive leading their area through resource analysis and formal resource advocacy through the months of November and December. Faculty and staff are encouraged to participate fully in appropriate resource development activities.

Standing committees charged with activity oversight and ad hoc committees formed to address pressing issues are encouraged to develop financial plans and advocate for resources within the context of their charter and reporting responsibilities. Examples include the Rank and Tenure Committee, Space Governance Committee, President's Committee on Sustainability, and Graduate Strategic Enrollment Plan Steering Counsel.

Participation of the undergraduate, graduate, and law student populations are administered by the elected leaders of these associations with student representatives included on all Board of Trustee committees including the Finance, Facilities, Audit, and Investment Committee.

Supporting Documents

1. Board of Trustee Committee Charters, including the Finance Committee, Facilities and Land Use Committee, and Audit Committee
2. Investment Policy Statement
3. Financial Transaction Authorization Resolution
4. Executive Administration Organizational Chart
5. Budget and Planning Guidelines for FY14
6. Budget Request Form for FY14

2.F.4 The institution ensures timely and accurate financial information through its use of an appropriate accounting system that follows generally-accepted accounting principles and through its reliance on an effective system of internal controls.

Planning and budget activities are a shared responsibility, and all departments follow Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), pronouncements of the Financial Standards Accounting Board (FASB), and applicable federal and state law. Accounting and auditing activities are performed by the Controller's Office under the administration of the Vice President for Finance & Business Affairs. The university's data is held in the financial module of its Datatel Colleague enterprise system and transactions are posted in accordance with the university's established Chart of Accounts which closely mirrors the structure of the university's financial statements.

Daily financial resource management is performed at all levels of the institution. Authorized personnel can access financial reports of daily, monthly, or annual financial transactions in the institution's data management system, through the Seattle University Data Delivery System

(SUDDS), and at a request to the Controller's Office or University Budget Office. Financial information is generally current as of the previous evening. Annual information is current as of the month in progress or the end of the fiscal year as appropriate.

Access to financial information is limited to personnel with a business need for the information in compliance with the institution's Policy on Access to Financial Data as administered by the Controller's Office. In addition, the institution has enacted financial policies governing the use and reimbursement of university resources. These and other operating policies are available on the institution's policy website. In support of formal policy, resource management processes have been established to guarantee appropriate oversight, authorization, and control. Examples include employee reimbursement, equipment purchase, institutional credit card purchase, and timesheet record policies.

Within the Controller's Office, internal control procedures have been instituted to ensure that the university's cash transactions receive appropriate scrutiny. Checks in excess of $10,000 require two signatures, and electronic transfers of funds require authorization by two separate senior finance personnel. Accounting policies and procedures for major fiscal processes such as Accounts Payable and Payroll are located on the Controller's Office and HR websites.

Supporting Documents

1. Financial Coding and Chart of Accounts Structure
2. SUDDS Sample Financial Reports

2.F.5 Capital budgets reflect the institution's mission and core theme objectives and relate to its plans for physical facilities and acquisition of equipment. Long-range capital plans support the institution's mission and goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership, equipment, furnishing, and operation of new or renovated facilities. Debt for capital outlay purposes is periodically reviewed, carefully controlled, and justified, so as not to create an unreasonable drain on resources available for educational purposes.

Capital budgets align with the policies, practices, plans, and governance structures established by the university to support the institution's core themes. The university's Space Governance Committee (SGC) has established a process to more equitably analyze and reallocate space on campus. Within the context of the core themes, the SGC solicits, evaluates, and prioritizes the university's various short and long-term physical capital needs. An annual capital allocation is made available for the Space Governance Committee to address minor space alterations, relocations, FF&E requests, public space improvements, and other small projects. In addition, the SGC can recommend the inclusion of more substantial projects in the Ten Year Capital Plan.

Administered by the Associate Vice President for Facilities under the guidance of the Vice President for Finance & Business Affairs, criteria for major projects listed in the Ten Year Capital Plan include those projects that will support the future growth and needs of the university and provide facilities

that are student focused. Each project will address the educational and recreational needs of the students with selection and prioritization heavily influenced by the institution's core themes.

The Ten Year Capital Plan tracks aggregate capital costs for the current fiscal year and projected costs for the next ten fiscal years. Project costs are shown according to funding source: direct institutional support, private partnership resources, or donated gifts. Where funding from these three sources may be deemed insufficient, the Ten Year Capital Plan may identify the need for debt financing which would be reflected in budget planning as a component of mandatory capital transfers. To ensure healthy debt management, the university recognizes that debt capacity will be limited in the near term.

Major acquisitions or capital projects are affirmed through formal resolutions of the Board of Trustees. The timing of capital project implementation is informed by policies approved and continually affirmed by the Board of Trustees. The Policy to Initiate Capital Construction defines the amount of funding from all sources that must be on hand before capital construction can commence. The Policy to Utilize and Manage Debt-Financing Resources for Capital Acquisitions sets the guiding principles of the university's use and management of capital debt.

Beyond the inclusion of equipment within capital project budgets, other capital equipment investments include technology resources overseen by the Office of Information Technology. Financial planning and budgeting for technology investments are informed by the work of the Chief Information Officer hired in 2011. Technology needs are prioritized in accordance with their centrality to the core themes of the institution or to operational capacities necessary to support the core themes. Near term technology funding is guided by a Five Year Technology Strategy regularly reviewed by the Cabinet.

As detailed in the FY2012 Statement of Cash Flow, net cash provided by operating activities continues to be positive and greater than payments on long-term debt. The institution is "A" rated with a stable outlook by Standard & Poor's with debt equaling $140 million as of June 30, 2012. In addition to affirming the institution's "A" rating in January 2011, Standard & Poor's supported a bond refinancing of $15.3 million in September 2011 with the goal of reducing annual debt services by approximately $80,000.

Long term debt service needs are regularly monitored for adherence to current bond covenants and best practice principles. The institution anticipates no difficulties in meeting future debt service needs. To ensure healthy debt management, the university recognizes that debt capacity will be limited in the near term. Thus, the university's Ten Year Capital Plan anticipates that capital funding in the next five to seven years will require careful cultivation of philanthropic, institutional, and mixed use funding.

Supporting Documents

1. Space Governance Committee Charter
2. Ten Year Capital Plan
3. Resolution of the Board of Trustees – representative sample
4. Policy to Initiate Capital Construction
5. Policy to Utilize and Manage Debt-Financing Resources for Capital Acquisitions
6. Five-year technology strategy
7. Audited Financial Statements for FY12
8. Standard & Poor's A Rating Affirmation (January 13, 2011)
9. Standard & Poor's Credit Analysis (August 5, 2011)

2.F.6 The institution defines the financial relationship between its general operations and its auxiliary enterprises, including any use of general operations funds to support auxiliary enterprises or the use of funds from auxiliary services to support general operations.

The university's residences and bookstore are the institution's only source of auxiliary revenue. Residence hall revenue is a distinct component of the operating budget, but residence hall expenses are managed as an operating cost of the institution as a reflection of their alignment with academic learning environments and the core theme of providing a Great Student Experience. The university has a residency requirement for all students of freshmen and sophomore standing.

Budgeted bookstore revenues are generated primarily through textbook rentals and retail sales. Revenues offset operating expenses and provide a contributing margin to the institution to defray overhead costs. Bookstore revenues in FY2013 are budgeted to be $3.2 million or 1.6 percent of total projected revenues with a budgeted contributing margin of $280,000. While this is an improvement over recent years, the institution recognizes that operating margins will be constrained in the near future as the university bookstore industry continues to shift from textbook sales to textbook rentals and electronic formats.

The institution chooses to manage other service activities through contracted vendor relationships that are recognized as operating expenses. These include food service (Bon Appetit), information technology (Ellucian), and custodial services (WFF).

Supporting Documents

1. Budget for FY13

2.F.7 For each year of operation, the institution undergoes an external financial audit, in a reasonable timeframe, by professionally-qualified personnel in accordance with generally-accepted auditing standards. Results from the audit, including findings and management letter recommendations, are considered in a timely, appropriate, and comprehensive manner by the administration and the governing board.

The university's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30 of the following calendar year, with independently audited financial statements made available in November. The independent audit in most recent years has been completed by KPMG LLP. The university has consistently received an unqualified opinion on the independent audit of its financial statements. All financial activities area administered in compliance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), pronouncements of the Financial Standards Accounting Board (FASB), and applicable federal and state law.

Prior to 2008 the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees provided oversight and management of the annual independent audit of the university's finances. In 2008 a new Audit Committee was formed to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on matters related to the audits and financial statements of the university. The Audit Committee charter details the group's responsibilities concerning the integrity of the university's financial statements and its systems of internal controls, the independence and performance of the external audit functions, and the institution's compliance with related legal and regulatory requirements. Under its new charter, the Audit Committee will ensure the continuation of transparent, independent, and well-communicated auditing activities.

Oversight of annual audits has and will continue to include review of management letters with appropriate discussion of proposed business practice adjustments. Such review will also occur in regular and ad hoc audits of other university functions. For example, an external, independent audit of federal student financial aid is completed each year as is an NCAA audit of athletic resources. Reviews by state and federal entities also fall within the governance of the Audit Committee.

In FY2010 the institution established an Office of Research Services and Sponsored Projects to assist faculty and staff in the pursuit of external funding opportunities while ensuring compliance with federal regulations and requirements as well as policies, procedures, and guidelines of the university. Since the establishment of this office, the institution has greatly strengthened the internal control structure in place for federal and private funding. This improved control environment has been evidenced through a decrease in findings in the federal grants audit as well as recognition by KPMG LLP of marked advancement in this area.

University administration is informed of and offers broad oversight of all audit activities and the Board of Trustees formally reviews and affirms the annual financial statements. Audits of institutional resources will continue to be made public and communicated as appropriate. Annual financial statements are posted on the university's public website and are also provided upon request. Discussions concerning audit findings, management letters, internal controls, and external recommendations are a regular occurrence at meetings of the Audit and Finance Committees.

Supporting Documents

1. Audited Financial Statements for FY12

2. Charter for Board of Trustee Committees, including the Audit Committee

2.F.8 All institutional fundraising activities are conducted in a professional and ethical manner and comply with governmental requirements. If the institution has a relationship with a fundraising organization that bears its name and whose major purpose is to raise funds to support its mission, the institution has a written agreement that clearly defines its relationship with that organization.

All development personnel adhere to multiple institutional policies governing gift cultivation, acceptance, management, and reporting. These policies are made available in both written, electronic, and online form and conform to the best practices and ethical guidelines published by the Association of Fundraising Professionals, the National Committee on Planned Giving, and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education.

All new fundraising staff complete a full training in advancement standards and protocols designed to enforce ethical and operational policies. Many of these protocols promote the management of gifts in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and relevant federal and state requirements such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). All gift-related data information is held as privileged with access to donor and gift records subject to strict security guidelines as well as a Confidentiality Policy.

There is no foundation or other separately incorporated fundraising organization bearing the university's name or related designation.

Supporting Documents

1. Alumni Donor Database Confidentiality Policy
2. Gift Acceptance Policies

2.G Physical and Technological Infrastructure

Physical Infrastructure

2.G.1 Consistent with its mission, core themes, and characteristics, the institution creates and maintains physical facilities that are accessible, safe, secure, and sufficient in quantity and quality to ensure healthful learning and working environments that support the institution's mission, programs, and services.

Seattle University is located on 50 beautifully and sustainably landscaped acres in the heart of Seattle. It is an urban campus of approximately 2.1 million square feet in 37 buildings that include 635,000 square feet of academic spaces spread throughout 14 buildings. The campus has developed along the city street grid system with pedestrian-only streets. The main campus mall is organized around the three tenets of Jesuit education: spiritual, academic, and personal growth. The Chapel of St. Ignatius is the spiritual center of the campus; Lemieux Library defines the university's academic core; while the Student Center fosters the personal development of students. The university's mission and core themes are reflected in the planning, development, and management of campus buildings and grounds.

Creating and Improving Campus Facilities

The university creates facilities that have been identified through strategic planning processes and provide more capacity with which to fulfill the mission and initiatives. (See Building Information List.) The Lemieux Library and McGoldrick Learning Commons, combining new construction and renovation, was completed in 2010. This new facility blends student academic support services, scholarly research, collaborative learning, and social interaction supported by technology resources. Seattle University School of Law's facilities expanded in 2010 to include the School of Law Annex located less than a block from Sullivan Hall. Now home to the law school's successful clinical and externship programs and student publications, the Annex also has new classrooms, offices, and a large multipurpose room for law school events.

In 2011, the William F. Eisiminger Fitness Center opened, featuring over 21,000 SF of recreational, fitness and athletic space. Serving to enhance the university mission to develop the whole person, the facility supports University Recreation's programs in Intramurals, sports clubs, outdoor adventure and fitness. In September, 2011, the university increased its residence capacity by 259 beds when the Douglas opened. The Douglas is a partnership between the university and the developer Seneca Group. The students living in the building pay rent directly to Seneca, which owns the building. SU owns the land and collects rent on the land from Seneca. Many decades in the future, ownership of the building will revert to the university. The university is leasing 6,000 SF of space on the ground floor for the students who reside in the building.

In 2012 Logan Field was renovated, creating an outdoor community gathering space and multipurpose recreation area for all students, including those involved in intramurals, club &

recreational sports and intercollegiate athletics. Resurfacing the field with synthetic turf allows Logan Field to withstand continuous use, and the addition of lights on the field increases the available field time for the university community.

The *Academic Strategic Action Plan* (2009), which articulates the university's first strategic priority, academic excellence, specifies the planning and development of a new science teaching laboratory building. This building is currently in the programming stage of the development process.

After the newly renovated and expanded Lemieux Library and McGoldrick Learning Commons had been open for almost a full academic year, the university conducted a survey focusing on the overall contribution of the facility to the campus and the university as a whole, as well as its impact on users' personal experience studying or working at Seattle University. (See Lemieux Library and McGoldrick Learning Commons Post-Occupancy Evaluation: User Survey Summary of Results.) The overall satisfaction with expanded Lemieux Library and McGoldrick Learning Commons was very positive: a total of 87% were either "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied." Among the data collected, 87% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that "the look and feel of the new Library and Learning Commons reflects the university's commitment to learning and academic excellence;" and 87% agreed or strongly agreed that the facility "inspires study and learning."

Through an ongoing succession of remodels and upgrades, the university assures the quality of the facilities on campus. To build on the strong foundation of leadership formation and to be more intentional about forming leaders, the university took its commitment a step further in 2010 with the remodel of the Pavilion, renamed the James C. Pigott Pavilion for Leadership. Some of the enhancements include new gathering spaces in the lobby, including a conference room; two mentoring "cubes," which flank the main entrance and open out onto patio areas; new glass walls that connect the lobby with Career Services on one side and New Student and Family Programs and Commuter and Transfer Student Services on the other; skylights that provide greater natural light; an expanded terrace on the pavilion's south side; and a new elevator inside of the building.

In 2010 the building at 1218 E. Cherry St. was renovated and reprogrammed as the Ed and John O'Brien Center for Athletic Administration, honoring the great Seattle University basketball and baseball players. The O'Brien Center renovation is strategic for the university's continued progress towards NCAA Division I excellence and signifies the accomplishment of the 2007 – 2010 Strategic Priority, Division One Athletics.

Other upgrades and refreshes to the campus facilities include the Engineering Lobby, the Bellarmine Lobby, the computer labs on campus and the student study areas in the Pigott Building. Classroom audits have been instituted, scheduled for the week following each quarter, and adjustments are made as needed. (See Sample Classroom Audit Form.) A Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) Planned Maintenance program has been initiated to assure that furniture and carpet in campus facilities are replaced on an ongoing basis. (See FF&E Pricing for Planned Maintenance.)

Signage and wayfinding audits have been instituted and design work has been funded so that campus signage needing repair or replacement can be identified. (See Signage Wayfinding Presentation.) Improvements have been made and projected improvements for the future have been developed.

The Integrated Learning Environments (ILE) project investigated innovations in teaching and learning space that the university could consider for future Facilities projects. (See Integrated Learning Environments Presentation.) ILE concepts support Seattle University's efforts to foster collaborative learning through bundles of informal and formal teaching and learning spaces, empowering students as leaders in the classroom by giving them the tools and informal spaces to facilitate group work and teach each other, and providing faculty flexible teaching environments and equipment that support multiple pedagogy, whether formal instruction or collaborative group work. The university intends to pilot an Integrated Learning space. Next steps that are being discussed include assembling a core work group charged with shaping the direction of ILE and developing and proposing a vision or direction for ILE at Seattle University.

As recommended in the *Academic Strategic Action Plan*, the ground floors of facilities along the perimeter of campus have been programmed to support the university's goals including community engagement and student retention. Adjunct faculty offices and Human Resources, both in leased spaces in the Rianna, face 12th Avenue. The Law School Annex and the O'Brien Center are in recently renovated university facilities opening out to Columbia and Cherry Streets, respectively. The Center for Service and Community Engagement was intentionally located in storefront offices on the ground floor of the Douglas to make their presence visible to both students and the neighboring community. The Eisiminger Fitness Center is clearly designated as a Seattle University facility and welcoming to campus users on 14th Avenue. Another tenet of space use is to locate academic functions in the campus core; the adjunct faculty offices were recently moved from an outlying leased facility to increase accessibility to students.

Facility Maintenance and Modernization

The university prides itself on the maintenance of its facilities and grounds. In the 2009 faculty and staff satisfaction survey, more than 90 percent of respondents reported the overall appearance of the campus to be pleasing. A survey of students living in residence halls reported that students' overall satisfaction on the timeliness of facilities repairs, facility cleanliness, attitude of cleaning staff, and temperature regulation is high relative to the university's peers. (See Residence Hall survey results.) The success of the services provided is due to the commitment and dedication of the staff. Facilities Services employs 94 well-educated, qualified, and experienced staff members devoted to the mission of the university. The Facilities Services annual operating budget increased by 59.6 percent from FY 2005 ($10.4 million) through FY 2012 ($16.6 million). (See Facilities Annual Operating Budget.) The square footage of the campus has been increasing consistently; however, operational costs are lower than that of peer institutions. (See Operational Costs Peer Comparisons.)

For the past 12 years Facilities Services has utilized a Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) that allows the campus community to submit work requests and maintenance needs to the Facilities Resource Center. The requests are prioritized and assigned to a shop or a manager who responds within the appropriate timeframe. Through the CMMS, Facilities Services has also developed preventive maintenance schedules for systems and equipment. Performance is assessed through statistical reports generated by the CMMS and follow-up surveys. The department has transitioned to a new CMMS that will enhance the availability of the data for more timely review. This process ensures that resources are devoted to the most critical needs.

Devoting resources to address deferred maintenance and facility modernization was identified as a priority in the 2009 *Academic Strategic Action Plan*, the first of the university's strategic initiatives, as well as previous planning documents: the 2007 *Facilities Master Plan*, the 2008 *Housing Master Plan*, the *2008 Utility Master Plan* and the 2008 *Sustainable Master Plan*. (See Facilities, Housing, Utilities Master Plans.) There is substantial deferred maintenance due to underinvestment in previous years. In 2004, the university began working with Sightlines, a consulting firm that collects data related to campus facilities and provides tools to monitor and assess needs and investments from year to year. According to Sightlines, the estimated facility modernization and deferred maintenance needs at the university totaled approximately $138 million as of FY 2011 and are growing annually based on the cost of annual planned maintenance. (See Annual Stewardship and Asset Reinvestment Backlog.) The backlog has been decreased due to the large investment in the construction of Lemieux Library and McGoldrick Learning Commons, which incorporated renewal of the existing library's systems. Upcoming renewal and replacement options will need to be focused on the residence halls.

Facilities Services conducts annual outreach to key campus areas, such as Housing and Residence Life, to identify facility needs. The information gathered is combined with Sightlines data (deferred maintenance) and individual building studies to create the annual planned maintenance project list. Since FY 2005, funding devoted to planned maintenance has increased from $1.35 million to $2.9 million. Sightlines recommends an annual funding target of $10.1 million based on projected obsolescence of assets. Presently the university is funding at 37 percent of the target. Peer institutions are funding at an average level of 27 percent of the annual target. (See Annual Funding Target Peer Comparison.)

The university leases facilities off the main campus to support university goals. The principal sites include classroom space for graduate programs in the Albers School of Business and Economics in Bellevue and a College of Nursing clinical instruction facility at Swedish Hospital in Seattle. Planning, maintenance, and accessibility at these facilities are similar to the same functions on the main campus. Full-time staff located at each site report facility issues through the same basic processes used on campus, and the facilities are included in the annual safety inspection schedule. All facilities are managed under leases and the combined obligations of the university and landlord-provided operational staff ensure that these facilities are maintained and operated to the same standard and level of service as the main campus.

Campus Environment

The campus grounds and landscaping provide a welcoming and supportive environment for learning and development. There are over a dozen gardens and green spaces on campus that provide for a variety of uses: educational, recreational, reflective, commemorative, agricultural and wildlife habitat, supporting academic and spiritual growth among the students and campus community. (See Garden Inventory.) The Ethnobotanical garden, with plant signage translated into Lushootseed (language of the first people of Seattle), was a partnership with an anthropology professor. Rock specimens utilized by geology courses were incorporated into the garden. A Shakespeare Garden was developed at the Fine Arts Building to highlight plants noted in Shakespeare's plays. The most recent garden installation is the organic orchard on the east side of campus facing the neighboring community that supports wildlife habitat, the community and Seattle's urban fruit tree project. The parcel acquired by the university on Broadway at E. Columbia St. was landscaped to integrate with the campus and provide a welcoming entrance along the west side. Renovation and improvements to the Pea Patch Program better serve the campus community and students' requests for gardening assistance that enhances their living communities are heartily supported.

Commitment to Campus Sustainability

The university has been committed to sustainability for more than 20 years. As a Jesuit and Catholic university, the institution reflects the Jesuit ethic expressed as "a commitment to respect and care for the community of life." The university has identified sustainability as a key strategic area and the *2009 Academic Strategic Action Plan* has identified sustainability as a learning objective. As a charter signatory to the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (2007) and a member of the Seattle Climate Partnership (2006), the university incorporates sustainability values into campus management.

To further this commitment, in 2010 the university approved the Climate Action Plan: *Deepening and Advancing the Commitment to Sustainability*. There are four goals in the Climate Action Plan: expand sustainability in the curriculum, expand sustainability in student development programs, increase sustainable practices in university operations, and share knowledge with others. The President's Committee for Sustainability was formed to oversee implementation of the plan. Progress towards achieving Climate Action Plan goals is tracked and reported annually to the President's Committee on Sustainability, the President and campus community.

The goal of carbon neutrality was achieved by switching the campus buildings' heat source from steam and natural gas to gas only; installing energy efficient equipment, such as the new gas boilers that have reduced campus carbon emissions by 2 million pounds annually; and buying carbon offsets for the university's remaining building emissions. Proactive utility management is continuous and seeks out the best solutions to achieve efficiency in usage and cost has resulted in 30% less power consumption than the university's peers. (See Energy Consumption Peer Comparison.) The *Princeton Review's 2012 Guide to 322 Green Colleges* gave the university a Green Rating of 95, improving

upon last year's score of 94. For the second year in a row, Seattle University ranks highest of all 28 Jesuit institutions and is the top scoring institution among 10 Washington independent colleges and first among the 12 peer universities. (See Green Colleges Rankings.)

Work began in the 1960s that has transformed the university into a model for sustainable and ecological gardening practices. The campus has been pesticide-free for more than 20 years. In 1989, the university's landscape was designated a Backyard Wildlife Sanctuary by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and in 2007 the National Wildlife Federation qualified the campus as a Wildlife Habitat; the campus continues to be maintained to these standards. Waste reduction efforts continue to improve the campus recycling rate and in 2010, Seattle University was awarded the Washington State Recycling Association's "Recycling Institution of the Year" award for the compost program. Recent new construction and remodels have been built to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) criteria. Recent buildings that have been attained LEED Gold certification include Admissions and Alumni Building, Law School Annex, Lemieux Library and McGoldrick Learning Commons and Eisiminger Fitness Center.

Space Planning and Governance

The physical infrastructure of the campus has been serving the university well in its ability to fulfill its mission and support its programs. The university is taking steps to address the sufficiency of space and the right kind of space for the future, which must be done through space analytics, space governance and campus planning integration. As an urban campus, the density is slightly above that of the university's peers in the number of users per 100,000 square feet.

The campus has tailored a space governance process that reflects new leadership organization, the Space Governance Committee (SGC), with members appointed by the Provost, the Executive Vice President and the Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs. Besides these three delegates, Facilities Services supports this process with two staff. The Space Governance process has been developed to more equitably analyze and reallocate space on campus within the context of the core themes. Clearer pathways now exist for departments needing to address new space requirements with the introduction of the Move, Add, and Change (MAC) form. Signatory requirements, an important part of the policy and procedure, qualifies that each and every request has been approved within their unit and division before it may be considered by the committee. The campus planner and staff are available to assist the applicant through the mechanics of the process and to better provide a planning perspective for the request.

The Space Governance Committee (SGC) is empowered to take action on all MAC requests, thus streamlining a formerly cumbersome process. A new, more strategic level ability to recommend mid-cap funding projects to the Cabinet is now in place. Mid-cap projects are items considered essential to the operations of the university that require less than $2 million in funding but are too large in scope or cost to be addressed by the annual capital project allocation. Other requests such

as those for furniture and refurbishment of space may, in more cases, be redirected to Facilities Services staff who have the ongoing operational expertise to address those requests.

The many questions concerning information on space that one encounters on a regular basis must have at its foundation, a strong information infrastructure, to help guide and inform decision-making. The constraints of campus space need to be taken into account when developing and expanding programs. The university is now looking into the matter of providing more space analytics, from space utilization of classrooms and laboratories to questions of the extent of faculty office overcrowding. A Classroom Utilization Study under the auspices of the Provost and Registrar's offices has been launched to assess academic instructional space; this study is an integral part of the ongoing space and capital project planning process.

Campus plan integration is an important strategic tool and the university has made it a priority to help address the many and complex challenges it faces and will continue to face. With the recent approval of the Strategic Enrollment Plan (SEP), campus planning is taking on a study to review potential impacts of this plan across master plans and other plans already in place on campus. This review shall provide a facilities analysis and support the integrated strategic plan headed up by the University Planning office.

Campus Safety and Security

The university provides a safe and secure campus by maintaining a comprehensive university safety and security program affording protection for all university students, faculty and staff at all campus facilities. The Department of Public Safety has 19 FTE trained officers and 50 part-time student officers and is staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The staff are well trained in First Aid and CPR with AED (Automated External Defibrillator). Emergency response stations are located throughout the campus, allowing anyone from the campus community to press a button to make an emergency call to Public Safety in the event of a dangerous situation. Campus emergency notification systems, which include emergency text messaging, commercial-grade amplified area-wide broadcasting systems, and campus network alert systems, are in place. Fire alarms and suppression systems are tested routinely in academic and residential facilities and the campus emergency phones are regularly tested across the campus. Security on campus is assured through facility security alarm programming and key and card access controls that enforced by immediate response to any incidents. The university partners with the Seattle Police Department to monitor and manage crime in the area. This close relationship with the East Precinct, located four blocks from campus, assures quick emergency response times. The programs and services creating a safe campus that these resources support are described in Standard 2.D.2.

Campus Accessibility

The university builds and maintains accessible facilities. All new facilities and renovation projects are planned and constructed to adhere to all City of Seattle building codes, health and safety standards, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance codes. Each building is equipped

with wheel chair access ways, door-assist devices, and elevators. Restroom facilities, drinking fountains, campus telephones and emergency call stations, entries to residence facilities, and campus pedestrian malls are all accessible. Braille and raised lettering are utilized on signage. Replacement elevators include voice announcements. Furniture and fixture solutions include accommodation for accessible work stations, student work areas, and faculty needs. ADA-compliant furniture is kept in stock and distributed to meet current student needs and a fund is maintained by Human Resources to address other ADA related equipment needs. The facilities and grounds are inspected by Public Safety and Facilities Services staff to identify deficiencies to accessible access features and/or pathways. Accessibility projects have been included as part of Planned Maintenance, the Space and Capital Projects process, and major capital projects. Campus parking lots have adequate accessible parking stalls and additional spaces are designated as the need arises

Supporting Documents

1. Building Information List
2. Library Post-Occupancy Evaluation: User Survey Summary of Results
3. Sample Classroom Audit Form
4. FF&E Pricing for Planned Maintenance
5. Signage Wayfinding Presentation
6. Integrated Learning Environments Presentation
7. Residence Hall survey results
8. Facilities Annual Operating Budget 2008-2012
9. Operational Costs Peer Comparisons
10. Facilities Master Plan
11. Housing Master Plan
12. Utilities Master Plan
13. Annual Stewardship
14. Asset Reinvestment Backlog
15. Annual Funding Target Peer Comparison
16. Garden Inventory
17. American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment
18. Climate Action Plan
19. President's Committee for Sustainability Charter
20. President's Committee for Sustainability Annual Report FY12
21. Energy Consumption Peer Comparison
22. Green Colleges Rankings
23. Space Governance Committee
24. Move Add Change (MAC) form

2.G.2 The institution adopts, publishes, reviews regularly, and adheres to policies and procedures regarding the safe use, storage, and disposal of hazardous or toxic materials.

Hazardous materials management is dictated by several university policies including the Accident Prevention Plan (1998, revised 2007), Chemical Hygiene Plan (1996, under current revision), and the Waste Disposal Procedure (1990, revised 2011). The approach is also governed by various Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act regulations. Procedures and policies are enforced by Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, City of Seattle Fire Marshall's Office, and Washington State Department of Ecology. The Spill Prevention Program and Training (1990, revised 2011) provides direction and procedures for implementation. The Environmental Health and Safety Office in Facilities Services responds to incidents and reviews all issues for consistency with university policy and state regulations.

Disposal of materials are solely the responsibility of Environmental Health and Safety as defined by Seattle University's Waste Disposal Procedures. Material is scheduled for disposal at the end of each quarter or sooner if necessary. Laboratory exhaust systems are evaluated annually for integrity as directed by the Chemical Hygiene Plan. Profiles and manifests on materials disposed of are on file in the Environmental Health and Safety Office and available for review by regulatory agencies. The university Environmental Health and Safety policies, procedures and programs are published on the Environmental Health and Safety page of the Facilities Services website. Policies and procedures are periodically reviewed to incorporate recent regulations by the Environmental Health and Safety Officer and relevant stakeholders; the Laboratory Safety Plan is under review and will involve the faculty and staff from the science departments. Materials Safety Data Sheets are maintained and available for campus use. The budget recently approved by the Board of Trustees included the addition of a Chemical Hygiene Officer, bolstering the capacity of the Environmental Health and Safety Office.

Supporting Documents

1. Accident Prevention Plan
2. Chemical Hygiene Plan
3. Waste Disposal Procedure
4. Spill Prevention Program
5. Spill Prevention Training Log
6. Profiles and Manifests of Disposed Materials
7. Chemical Hygiene Officer Position Description

2.G.3 The institution develops, implements, and reviews regularly a master plan for its physical development that is consistent with its mission, core themes, and long-range educational and financial plans.

The university engages in ongoing planning, implementation and review of its plans for the physical development of the campus. Over the last decade, the university has developed several plans to guide its growth for the future: Facilities Master Plan, *Academic Strategic Action Plan*, Housing Master Plan, Sustainability Master Plan, and 10 Year Capital Plan. These plans provided a foundation to the most recent planning document the university, the Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP). Seattle

University is one of 13 major institutions in Seattle that meet the criteria established by the Seattle Land Use Code to develop a MIMP, which creates unique zoning rules for the institution. The objectives of a MIMP are to balance the needs of major institution development with the need to preserve adjacent neighborhoods and it is developed in collaboration with a Citizens Advisory Committee. Direction and information from the foundational documents and plans were incorporated in the MIMP, so that it represents the mission, values and aspirations of the university, as well as serving as a document within the framework of city planning.

The MIMP is a long-range plan; its goals are to strengthen the vitality of the academic community as a setting for student life, enhance and unify the university's mission, identity and visibility within the community, assure capacity to meet foreseeable long-term space needs, incorporate sustainable principles into all aspects of design and construction, increase pedestrian safety, promote a positive working relationship with the community, and activate 12th Avenue. The plan incorporates planned and potential near-term projects for implementation to achieve the university's goals while defining a long term framework to accommodate growth up to 9,200 full-time students in the context of continually evolving needs. The near-term plan defines projects that include strengthening the academic core with increased academic facilities and adding housing and student life facilities, which support core themes of the university.

The MIMP incorporates the university's goal to be a leader in sustainability, including principles that incorporate sustainable design approaches into the design of all physical campus elements, conserve non-renewable natural resources, make sustainable features visible and available as learning and teaching opportunities, build structures for permanence and quality as well as flexibility and design new and renovation projects to meet LEED standards.

The MIMP is in the final stages of the public approval process. Seattle City Council approval is expected by the end of 2012. Once approved, the university will have the capacity to grow to 4 million GSF, a significant increase over the current 2.1 million GSF.

The Ten Year Capital Plan guides the university's efforts, in accordance with its strategic initiatives and set priorities, in planning a timetable for major capital projects. This plan also includes property acquisitions that have been identified as advantageous to the campus, anticipated planned maintenance needs and minor capital projects. Criteria for major projects listed in the Ten Year Capital Plan included those projects that will support the future growth and needs of the university and provide facilities that are student focused. Each project will address the educational and recreational needs of the students. Selection and prioritization were heavily influenced by the five strategic initiatives, and tied to the Campus Master Plan, the Housing Master Plan, the *Academic Strategic Action Plan* and the evolution of the deferred maintenance schedule. Initially developed in 2010, the Ten Year Capital Plan is approved by the Cabinet and is reviewed and updated regularly by the Facilities Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Supporting Documents

1. Major Institution Master Plan (MIMP)
2. DPD Directors Report
3. Ten Year Capital Plan

2.G.4 Equipment is sufficient in quantity and quality and managed appropriately to support institutional functions and fulfillment of the institution's mission, accomplishment of core theme objectives, and achievement of goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services.

Academic departments budget, specify, and maintain equipment that meets the requirements of their curricula. For example, the College of Nursing developed a state-of-the-art clinical teaching lab replicating hospital settings, the Lee Center for the Arts is a black box theatre equipped for stage productions, and the Pacific Northwest Diabetes Research Institute (PNDRI) houses the Seattle University Interdisciplinary Life Sciences Research Laboratory.

The Athletics and Recreational Sports Departments support their programs with the requisite facilities and equipment. With the addition of the Eisiminger Fitness Center, which houses appropriate space and equipment for recreational and fitness programs, the Connolly Center has been able to enhance the space and equipment needed for the athletics and aquatics programs.

Divisional departments are equipped to fulfill their responsibilities: Public Safety has two "Nighthawks," vehicles they use for the safety escort program and life safety equipment for emergency response. Facilities Services has a fleet of street-legal and electric vehicles for maintenance uses and Grounds and Landscaping has a large inventory of equipment to maintain to the campus and athletic fields.

Every department and division maximizes their resources to enable the university to accomplish the goals of the core themes. Ongoing success will be enhanced by examining how the university manages and allocates resources for equipment, which currently varies among the departments on campus.

Supporting Documents

1. Equipment Inventories

Technological Infrastructure

2.G.5 Consistent with its mission, core themes, and characteristics, the institution has appropriate and adequate technology systems and infrastructure to support its management and operational functions, academic programs, and support services, wherever offered and however delivered.

Seattle University considers technology an essential tool for teaching, learning, and business operations. Technology applications, equipment, and the network are appropriate in that they meet the needs of the campus and adequate in that they are available to those who need them when needed. The university has a contract with Ellucian (formerly SunGard Higher Education) to staff the Office of Information Technology (OIT). The current contract covers July 2011 through June 2015. In FY13 approximately $10M is dedicated to technology.

Technology services are semi-centralized. Some services are provided to all users through OIT while others are specific to certain areas and may be provided by OIT, a department, or a combination thereof. An overview of the university's technology estate follows.

Common (shared) technology

The wired and wireless network is the highest priority for near-term investment. Demand has grown at the same time that the network equipment has reached its end of life. While critical needs continue to be met so the university can continue to fulfill its mission and core themes, there are significant constraints in meeting all demands. The current network infrastructure will not support the university's aspirations. For instance, wireless access is not available in all areas. Where it is available, the connection may be too slow to support all uses and access points are frequently overloaded. Student disappointment is highest within the residence halls where recreational Internet use requires more bandwidth.

The university recognizes the magnitude of the problem and the size of the requirement investment (approximately $6M, plus maintenance funding). In fall 2012 the university approved a multi-million dollar investment in the network. Previously the university made interim improvements that were necessary but not sufficient. Residence halls did not have wireless access until FY11, and bandwidth purchased was doubled in FY12. Projects currently underway include improvements to firewalls and access controls. Traffic shaping technology will soon enable the university to promote quality of service and prioritize core activities such as teaching and learning over recreational use.

The telephone system was converted to Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) in 2011. This project allowed the university to avoid a costly replacement of the legacy phone system while giving users more functionality. Emergency phones located throughout the campus and classroom phones were not converted to VoIP for safety purposes.

Colleague is the university's ERP system and supports student, financial, and human resource information. Since it was implemented in 1997 the university has continually upgraded and customized Colleague. Such work is informed by external audits and reviews, including a review of the human resource module in 2011 and a technical audit in 2012. The university is currently forming an ERP strategy as it expects to replace or substantially refurbish Colleague in the next few years. Access to Colleague is based on employee function and all users must be FERPA trained.

A broader group of people view ERP data through the Seattle University Data Delivery System, called SUDDS. SUDDS is a web-based data warehouse containing admissions, registration, and budget reports, among others. SUDDS users must also be FERPA trained. SUDDS is maintained by OIT and Institutional Research.

Students have access to computers (PC and Mac), software, and printers through computer labs, kiosks, and the virtual desktop infrastructure (VDI). VDI is a virtual lab environment that can be accessed from anywhere with an Internet connection and web browser. VDI provides students, faculty and staff with a standard lab desktop that has common and academic software titles pre-installed. Lemieux Library and McGoldrick Learning Commons contains many workstations for individual and group use, including specialized equipment and software in the Media Production Center.

All employees are provided with appropriate workstations and business software. With the exception of the Law School, all computers are replaced on a four-year cycle through the centrally-funded Computer Refresh Program (CRP), administered through OIT. The Law School purchases and maintains its own equipment. Workstations come equipped a standard desktop image that includes Microsoft Office, Adobe Reader, and virus protection.

Core academic business is conducted through SU Online. Students register for classes, access unofficial transcripts, and view invoices. Employee information includes pay advices. Students, faculty, and staff are provided with campus cards for identification, library privileges, building access, meal plans, and on-campus debit functions. They may also connect their campus card to a US Bank checking account. The campus card system was extensively upgraded, both software and hardware, in 2012, and uses Blackboard technology.

The Ektron content management system (CMS) is used for the majority of the university's websites. Templates and initial site development are managed by Marketing Communications and OIT while individual departments have responsibility for managing content. The university uses Ektron templates to ensure that each school, college, and program publishes required information such as degree requirements. The Law School uses a different CMS and the Athletics department uses a third-party provider for their website. The university has a mirror site to ensure continuity and communication during emergencies.

Classrooms are equipped with a standard array of technology, including a computer or laptop hookup, a projector, DVD player, and document camera. Many meeting rooms have similar equipment or have a TV screen. Additional audio/visual equipment is available upon request, including microphones, speakers, and portable computer carts with projectors, and screens. Some classrooms have supplemental technology. Law School classrooms have built-in microphones that are used for audio recordings and conferencing; faculty can also request that guest lectures and special events be video recorded and made available through a media server.

Distance education is supported with audio and web conferencing equipment, lecture capture software (Echo 360), and hybrid streaming software (Blackboard Collaborate). Seattle University expects to expand its systems and infrastructure to support more online, hybrid, and blended courses. The university has worked to standardize tools and create a solid infrastructure in order to support the growing demands of academic programs in this area.

The university is currently transitioning between learning management systems. The current application, Angel, will be replaced by Canvas. Canvas was selected for its ease of use and broad functionality and will permit the university to offer more technology-mediated curriculum.

Specialized technology

Many departments have specialized academic or business needs that technology addresses. Consistent with the core theme of Academic Excellence, the university recognizes that different disciplines have different requirements for instruction, research, and scholarship. When new academic programs are proposed, technology is a component of the requested start-up funds; the process is similar for new services and positions.

Five of the eight schools and colleges have their own computer labs or have laptops for mobile labs. These labs have software essential to the academic requirements of a program, for instance, AutoCAD in College of Science and Engineering's CAD lab. In some cases the labs provide general computer access in a larger discipline-specific lab, for instance, the Clinical Nursing Lab located a few blocks from campus has a computer lab for instruction and casual student use. When practical the university permits student access to software through the virtual desktop infrastructure. Business students can access statistical software in this way without needing to visit a lab or purchase it individually.

Consistent with the core theme Investing in the Excellence of Our Faculty and Staff, the university looks for ways that technology can improve business practices. University Advancement uses Raiser's Edge for fundraising; other areas may get request or get access to alumni information from Raiser's Edge as well. Enrollment Services uses Image Now, a document imaging system that connects to Colleague, to process applications. The most recent endeavor in this area is a Client Relationship Module, or CRM. This FY13 project will support communications with prospective and current students, alumni, donors, and other constituents.

Supporting Documents

1. List of technology applications
2. List of computer labs

2.G.6 The institution provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations.

Support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators

Technology at Seattle University is managed by the chief information officer, a university employee. The Office of Information Technology (OIT) is staffed through a contract with Ellucian and is overseen by the executive director, an Ellucian employee. OIT is organized into four support areas.

1. Learning technologies: instructional design, learning management system, media services, audio/visual support for classes and events, distance education, etc.
2. User services: desktop technicians, help desk, computer refresh program, computer labs
3. Application services: Colleague (ERP system), web services, document imaging, etc.
4. Network services: wired and wireless network administration, etc.

In 2011 the university moved from an onsite technology help desk with limited hours to a remote help desk; both services are from Ellucian. This shift enabled services to be expanded to 24/7 and made available to students. The university saw this expansion of help desk services as a natural response to the growing centrality of technology and a prerequisite to online education.

The Law School operates its own help desk and has a separate technology support staff. This is appropriate given that Law School technology environment is different from the rest of the campus. When Law School users experience problems, the Law School help desk may escalate problems to OIT if it is beyond their control.

When new applications or systems are proposed, additional staffing is considered and funded if appropriate. Additional staffing or reallocation of time is also considered when an application is adopted more broadly or when support becomes more complex. While departments with discipline or function-specific technology generally work directly with a vendor for technical support and training, OIT may assist with servers, database connections, or other back-end technologies that departments are not expected to master.

Training for faculty, staff, students, and administrators

All faculty, staff, and students have unlimited access to lynda.com for software training. Over 1500 modular, in-depth training videos are available on 300 applications, including Microsoft Office products. The Microsoft IT Academy provides both training and certification.

OIT offers training on the learning management system, the content management system, audiovisual equipment, and VoIP phones. Training takes the form of classroom-based instruction, online articles and tutorials, and one-on-one consultations (particularly for faculty with respect to learning technologies. Open computer labs are monitored by assistants who offer just-in-time training. In Lemieux Library and Learning Commons, the Media Production Center provides training on audio visual equipment and software.

Faculty and staff can request training on Colleague, SUDDS, Raiser's Edge, ImageNow, and other applications through departments most familiar with the applications. Depending on the breadth of use, training ranges from by request to regular monthly sessions. Major projects are funded with training for both system administrators and users.

2.G.7 Technological infrastructure planning provides opportunities for input from its technology support staff and constituencies who rely on technology for institutional operations, programs, and services.

In 2011 Seattle University created a chief information officer (CIO) position to provide institutional leadership over technology. The CIO meets weekly with the executive director of the Office of Information Technology to review pending technology matters; these individuals function as the official liaisons for Seattle University and Ellucian. The university, through the CIO and other stakeholders, generally specifies what it would like to do and Ellucian provides guidance on how to best achieve that end. This permits technology staff to have considerable input into technology planning and operations while ensuring that the university remains the core decision maker.

Major technology initiatives such as the new learning management system and replacement of the campus card system are each managed as projects, with stakeholder representation on the project team and a biweekly debrief with the CIO. Stakeholders, including faculty, staff, students and administration, are involved from the selection of a solution through the implementation.

The university uses regular surveys to assess satisfaction. Each help desk contact triggers a survey when it is closed, permitting Ellucian and Seattle University to monitor performance by type of problem or request. Additionally the university uses flash surveys during the academic year. Each month a portion of faculty, staff, and students receive short surveys on one of approximately twenty area of service: training, classroom support, SU Online (a web application), etc. The surveys take less than one minute to fill out and respondents are promised that if they return a survey they will not receive another one for the rest of the year. The university and Ellucian use the data to select a limited number of areas to focus on for improvement. For instance, the survey revealed that many users were not familiar with the features of their new phones and OIT created new training materials in response. Future surveys will show whether these materials have been effective.

Small-scale technology governance occurs through operating groups. Colleague, the university's ERP system, is managed through the Colleague Operating Group. Similar groups manage the campus card system and the web. These groups consist of stakeholders and technical staff who jointly review needs, prioritize OIT work, and in some cases allocate funds. The operating groups have been successful as they permit users and OIT to effectively govern distinct areas of operations; larger issues are escalated to the CIO and executive director of OIT.

The Cabinet provides oversight over major technology decisions through the budget process and regular consultations with the CIO. The CIO meets with Academic Assembly (the faculty governance body) and the Association of Students and Seattle University (ASSU) on topics such as policy revision and areas of satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Academic Assembly also has a standing Faculty Technology Committee.

Supporting Documents

1. Sample technology satisfaction survey data
2. Colleague Operating Group charge and membership

2.G.8 The institution develops, implements, and reviews regularly a technology update and replacement plan to ensure its technological infrastructure is adequate to support its operations, programs, and services.

Seattle University allocates about $1M per year on technology refresh. The largest component of this is the computer refresh program whereby all workstations outside of the Law School are replaced on a three- or four-year cycle. Approximately $150,000 is dedicated to classroom technology refresh, covering computers, projectors, TVs, and other audio visual equipment. Additional funds are used for servers, storage, and so on. Whenever possible, the university provides technology start-up funds for new programs and services in order that they be adequately equipped from the beginning. In FY12, following increased demand, the university expanded the hours that professional audio visual support staff are onsite; the budget also contained $20,000 for equipment.

In 2011 the university established a technology investment strategy which incorporates maintenance requirements as well as areas of desired new work. The plan is intended to help establish budget priorities and facilitate multi-year budget commitments; as such, it is focused on areas where current resources are inadequate to meet goals. It is updated on regular basis to reflect funding decisions and new information. For instance, in 2011 the Office of Information Technology (OIT) estimated the cost to substantially replace and expand the wired and wireless network infrastructure and maintain the network at a steady pace thereafter. Given the level of investment OIT estimated, in 2012 the university engaged Cisco to conduct a complete network audit. This more detailed information on scope and cost was incorporated into the investment plan and is being used by the chief financial officer to determine the best funding strategy given all technology needs.

Technology is also a component of the university's strategic plan, indicative of the importance of technology to curriculum delivery as well as business operations.

Supporting Documents

1. Five-year technology strategy
2. Computer refresh program overview

Conclusion

In its 2011 *Year One Self-Evaluation Report* to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, Seattle University aligned institutional planning with NWCCU standards and timelines. In the *Year One Self-Evaluation Report*, the university confirmed its commitment to its mission of educating the whole person, professional formation, and empowering leaders for a just and humane world. The university developed core themes based upon the five strategic priorities of the university (Academic Excellence; Global Engagement; Catholic, Jesuit Character; Formation for Leadership; and Investing in the Excellence of Our Faculty and Staff) and defined those outcomes that constitute successful fulfillment of the mission and core themes.

In the 2013 *Year Three Self-Evaluation Report*, the university builds upon this work by demonstrating that it has the resources and capacity to fulfill its mission and core themes. The *Year Three Self-Evaluation Report* evaluates and documents the physical, human and policy infrastructure that allows for the delivery of quality educational programs and the fulfillment of student learning outcomes.

Seattle University is in compliance with the standards addressed in the *Year Three Self-Evaluation Report*. The sufficiency of our resources and capacity is demonstrated through the success of our students. Six year graduation rates for undergraduates have climbed into the mid-seventies, reaching 77% for the most recent cohort. *National Survey of Student Engagement* benchmark scores among seniors exceed the mean of the university's Carnegie classification by statistically significant margins. In academic challenge benchmarking both the first year and senior samples were at or above the mean score for of the top 10% comparison group in 2012.

As described in the report, Seattle University makes appropriate investments in its institutional infrastructure, including human resources, governance and policy, educational programs, and physical and technological infrastructure.

Seattle University's most critical resource is its faculty and staff. The university employs a sufficient number of faculty and staff. The individuals serving in these roles are qualified, provided opportunities for professional development and training, and evaluated regularly. Additionally, Seattle University's faculty and staff have a tremendous commitment to the mission of the university and the care of students, which is integral to the fulfillment of all our institutional goals.

While the resources and capacity of Seattle University are consistent with NWCCU standards, the university echoes the refrain spoken at all universities: we would benefit from having more. Space and facilities have become a challenge and limit the university's ability to grow or expand traditional academic programing. The technology infrastructure, particularly the wired and wireless network, is no longer adequate for growing needs and requires significant work.

Seattle University appreciates the opportunity to partner with NWCCU to practice and sustain the model of peer oversight implemented through regional accreditation.

Appendix: Accreditation Committee Membership

Robert Dullea	Vice President for University Planning and Vice Provost, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Joyce Allen	Registrar
Carol Wolfe Clay	Professor, College of Arts and Sciences, Academic Assembly Representative
Ruth Donohue	Manager of Human Resources
Doug Duncan	Associate University Counsel
Robert Duniway	Assistant Vice President for University Planning and Director of Institutional Research
Heather Geiger	Manager of University Planning
Donna Horn	Manager of Operations and Quality, Facilities Services
David Lance	Assistant to the Executive Vice President and Assistant University Counsel
Charles Lawrence	Associate Provost for Student Success
Ivette Serna	Director of University Budgets
Jocelyn Tidwell	Administrative Coordinator
Tim Wilson	Assistant to the Vice President, Student Development