Questions submitted by Kris Schaeffer

Enrollment Projections

1. We've seen enrollment projections for all USF and that includes satellite campuses. Correct?

If you are referring to the chart below, which we have presented at past meetings, the chart shows projected overall enrollment growth for the total USF student population which includes branch campuses, online learning, off campus programs, study away, and on-campus programs.

This chart is a demonstrative aid presented to illustrate the intended impact of the Distributed Campus Model within the context of student enrollment over time. It is not purported to provide an exact enrollment projection.

Distributed Campus Model
- Supports the USF mission around city and global outreach
- Generates revenue that allows less on-campus growth
2. Please provide the numbers of students -- current and projected -- for only the main (USF upper and lower) campus.

Total on-campus enrollment at the census date for Fall 2011: 8,731

In the current development of the IMP, we project an average enrollment increase of less than 1% per year of enrollment growth on the Hilltop, starting with Fall 2011.

3. There are various enrollment numbers (2004 IMP, 2010 update, etc.) What numbers are being used currently as the foundation for enrollment and projections of enrollment?

The total headcount as of the Fall census date for USF on-campus enrollment is the baseline for this IMP.

Historically, USF has used enrollment projections as an internal management tool to guide planning for fall and spring new student enrollment and, to the extent that USF is heavily dependent on tuition income, the projections have also been regarded by Administration as minimum targets for budgetary purposes. When those numbers have been published in prior IMPs, the projections were defined as estimates and were not represented nor intended as guaranteed enrollments.

4. Because there are various USF enrollment numbers -- actual and projected -- going forward, would USF provide the person / department responsible for reporting these numbers so there's a trail to follow?

BJ Johnson is the Vice Provost and Dean for Academic and Enrollment Services.

Michael Hughes is the Assistant Dean, Director of Admission.

Although these are the individuals primarily responsible for undergraduate enrollment, there are others who are also involved in graduate enrollment and, with respect to graduate students, admission is decentralized to several individual program offices. The office of Academic and Enrollment Services is responsible for reporting enrollment statistics.

5. You project 1% growth per year. 1% of what number?

The Fall Census of 8,731 will serve as baseline for enrollment projections for this IMP.

In the current development of the IMP, we project an average enrollment increase of less than 1% per year of enrollment growth on the Hilltop (Upper Campus/Lone Mountain and Lower Campus/Main Campus).

There are various academic programs, which you say will reduce the impact of students being physically present in class or on campus -- i.e., online learning, Year Away program.

6. What are the actual plans for the development of these programs?
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Study away, branch campuses and a limited number of online courses already exist at USF, however the University is developing plans to substantially grow these programs, including already having signed an agreement with an online educational vendor to provide the electronic platform and services needed to develop and launch fully online degree programs.

A key goal of these programs is for them to produce expanded revenue streams that will allow USF to grow at a slower than historical rate of growth on the Hilltop campus.

With respect to off campus program moves, USF is currently procuring space that can accommodate off campus programs. The decisions on which programs will be moved to different locations have not yet been made. USF is also in discussions with California community college colleagues to develop 2+2 guaranteed undergraduate transfer programs at branch campuses in northern California.

7. When do you expect to see the entire junior class working / studying off campus?

There is no expectation, and no assertion has been made, that USF’s junior class will study off campus, in its entirety, at any given point in time.

8. When are the online learning programs going to be in place?

USF has previously offered a handful of online courses and certificates, but no USF degree programs were offered online. As part of a major new initiative, however, the Provost recently hired a new Director of Online Education and over the last academic year put in place the administrative infrastructure and governance team to develop online programs. Her goal is to start two online academic programs each year for the next five years. The first major program offering will be in January 2012 with the RN-MSN degree. A second online degree to be offered by the School of Management is in the planning stage.

9. What academic areas are these online learning classes aimed toward?

These new online programs will be professionally oriented graduate programs. We anticipate that each of USF’s five schools and colleges will ultimately offer at least one online graduate degree. As noted above, the RN-MSN program will be the first, followed by the Master of Public Administration (MPA) in fall 2012 and then at least two new graduate online degree offerings to be developed and launched annually.

10. If these are some of the academic pre-requisites such as Freshman English, then how does that really provide less of an impact on our neighborhood? You still have students coming for some classes. True?

We currently have no plans to offer our core curriculum online. As stated previously, we are entering the online graduate professional programs market, and not ones focused on traditional undergraduates.

Online programs provide an opportunity for additional revenue from non-traditional, previously untapped markets. That revenue is intended to help offset the diminished revenue stream resulting from growing Hilltop enrollment at a slower than historical
rate on campus. Students enrolled online would for the most part not be students who come to our hilltop campus.

There is no expectation, and no assertion has been made, that the online degree program offerings will eliminate the need for students to attend classes on campus.

11. What's the impact of adding one student and the need for more faculty, more staff, and more classrooms?
There is no fixed impact for one individual student, however some approximations can be made. As the student population increases, there will be little impact in many areas until that growth reaches a particular level or levels. For example, one additional student will not create a need to hire an additional faculty member, but fifty additional students may. These kinds of trigger points are also not absolute, but the following will provide a rough estimate.

- Planning estimates for undergraduates are approximately 19 square feet of classroom space and 6 square feet of lab space each. Graduate students require approximately 12 square feet of classroom space and no lab space. This includes space necessary to service the classroom space.
- The general standard for faculty office space (full-time) is 120 square feet while staff are allotted an average of 90 square feet, 41% of faculty and 66% of staff are full-time. Some staff (e.g custodial, facilities) do not require offices.
- Faculty and staff generally come to campus and stay on average between 7.5 - 9.5 hours/day. Part-time faculty often only come to campus to teach one or two classes per day for two to three days a week, then depart.

12. What is the ratio of student and faculty?
15:1 (Full Time Equivalent (FTE) students: FTE faculty)
Source: USF Office of Institutional Research

13. When adding faculty, what are the concurrent ratios for trips to campus, office space, etc.? 
Fehr & Peers estimates approximately two new daily vehicle trips would be generated for new employees who drive to work at USF. Not all employees drive to campus. Fehr and Peers’ 2011 survey indicated that faculty and staff who currently drive alone to campus work, on average, 3.64 days per week. (Note however that these data are based on activity prior to the implementation of 2012 Transportation Demand Management strategies.)

See #11 regarding office space estimates.

14. What is the ratio of student and support staff?
11:1 (FTE students: FTE staff)Source: USF Office of Institutional Research

15. What is the ratio of student and square footage of classroom space?
The ratio of academic and administrative space per graduate and undergraduate student, as of Fall 2010, is 109.5 square feet per student (950,751 ft2 /8683 students source: Sightlines study 2010).
16. While the University projected one number for growth, there was actually a higher number of students. We don't need to argue over exactly the number or the percentage. We would both agree that the actual number of students was higher than projection. True?

Please refer to the enrollment discussion on pages 22-25 of this report.

17. What confidence do we have that USF will not exceed the enrollment projections in this IMP?

USF cannot predict what degree of confidence any neighborhood group may or may not have in the University’s responses to any questions pertaining to USF’s accelerated IMP process.

Historically, USF has used enrollment projections as an internal management tool to guide planning for fall and spring new and continuing student enrollment. Because USF is heavily dependent on tuition income, the projections have typically been regarded by Administration as minimum financial targets. When those numbers have been published in prior IMPs, the projections were defined as estimates and were not represented nor intended as guaranteed enrollment at the University.

USF is engaged in a rigorous examination of its enrollment management methods. Noting that USF has applied enrollment estimates to establish revenue expectations and therefore minimum targets. Also, enrollment management is not an exact science. External variables can have enormous impact on individual's decisions to enroll which can dramatically affect yield. Once a student is offered a spot, we cannot deny that person enrollment. Conversely, if we accept too few or if yield declines significantly, the University can have a significant financial shortfall.

Consequently, we have secured the consulting services of a highly regarded enrollment management-consulting firm, Hardwick Day, to assist us. The methodology for developing and managing enrollment projections is expected to change and, for the 2012 - 2022 IMP, USF intends to manage toward more consistent enrollment predictions and results.

18. We read that because of problems with public colleges, USF has 24% (!) more applications. That’s a substantial increase. Please tell me how USF will NOT take advantage of this increase in applications to increase the total enrollment.

An increase in the number of applications does not translate into a commensurate increase in enrollment. Indeed, more applications provide USF an opportunity to be more selective in the students it admits. Enrollment numbers are managed through the admissions process and resulting yield.

USF did experience a significant increase in applications for Fall 2010 and for Fall 2011. To manage enrollment in 2010, USF lowered its “admit rate” from 69% to 65%. In spite of admitting an academically stronger pool, the yield (the percentage of accepted students who plan to enroll at USF) increased from 21.4% to 22.5%, so enrollment in the Fall of 2010 was higher than anticipated. For 2011, USF again acted to dampen the even larger increase in applications by lowering its “admit rate” from 65% to 56%. This
time the yield did decrease from 22.5% to 20% and the enrollment is almost exactly as anticipated.

As noted above, USF is analyzing ways to adjust its admission and enrollment management methodologies to further minimize the unpredictability of this process. Hardwick Day, who has substantial experience in enrollment management, is developing a plan to guide USF in achieving its enrollment goals.

**Fromm Institute**

*Fromm is a non-profit with a mission to educate people over 50. The Fromm catalog says "Self-governance gives the Fromm Institute a unique identify at USF while remaining an integral part of campus life. . . . Students do take part in other campus activities."

19. If USF provides perks to Fromm students, then may we learn what that is and how that impact on UTA is being mitigated?

The Fromm Institute for Life Long Learning is a separate legal entity that was established in 1976 as a community resource for retired adults over 50 years of age. Fromm classes are held Monday through Thursday in three separate eight-week sessions per year. Considered to be a premiere program in the “learning in retirement” field of higher education, Fromm continues to serve as a model for life long learning programs.

On average, there are approximately 450-500 Fromm attendees and 22 faculty members during any given session. The total Fromm enrollment has remained steady since 2003, at about 1200 people. Fromm attendees are not included in the enrollment numbers for USF. There are approximately 58 total Fromm faculty members, who are primarily emeriti professors.

Prior to 2006, Fromm used classrooms in Cowell Hall, University Center, and McLaren Conference Center. In 2006, the ground floor of the former Xavier Hall (now known as Fromm Hall) was renovated to accommodate Fromm, which included the remodeling of existing office space and the creation of an enclosed courtyard for two new classrooms. Approximately 2000 square feet of new space was added. This project was determined to be categorically exempt from CEQA and only required a building permit. The purpose of the relocation of Fromm to Xavier Hall was to consolidate existing classroom use by Fromm by providing Fromm with dedicated classroom space. Fromm currently uses one office, three classrooms and one conference room on the ground floor of Fromm Hall.

Students of Fromm Institute, have access to the Gleeson Library/Geschke Learning Center. Fromm students may also use the cafeteria, the University grounds, and attend University events open to the public. They may apply for, but are not guaranteed, a USF parking permit or parking slot. Fromm students are encouraged to carpool and take public transportation.

Fromm activity is and will be considered in Fehr & Peers’ transportation analyses. Proposed mitigations arising from those analyses will be incorporated in the IMP.
20. **How is Fromm Institute a part of the IMP process? If not, should it be?**

The activities of Fromm are considered in the IMP process. For example, traffic and parking impacts of Fromm are accounted for in Fehr & Peers’ current TDM evaluation. Mitigations for those impacts will be part of the transportation strategies developed for the IMP.

As a separate legal entity, Fromm Institute itself is not part of the USF IMP.

**Student Housing**

21. **USF makes the case for having more students housed on campus -- better academic results and improved student behavior. Some of this comes from what you say will be a 48:2 student: faculty ratio. You point to Loyola Village as an example where you have faculty living with students. Several problems with using this to make your case:**

- **Ewing Terrace neighbors have many problems with student behavior coming from there.**
- **When talking with students who have lived in Loyola Village, they report that it’s impossible to study there because students are so out of control.**
- **Faculty are not integrated with the students; they live on the west end with student living on the eastern section of the building.**

Loyola Village does not currently operate as a living/learning community as envisioned in the IMP. Because of earlier arrangements with Ewing Terrace, it was determined that staff and faculty who live in Loyola Village would live on the East side of the complex to minimize the potential impact of student behavior on the neighbors. The faculty who reside at Loyola Village live there as private citizens. (However if they come across inappropriate student behavior they will report it to the university.)

Your anecdotal report of students not being able to study is not supported either by our statistics or experience. Loyola Village has the lowest amount of conduct-related issues of any campus residence.

The University ratio of students to faculty is 15:1 and applies to the academic function of the University. The ratio you quote of 48:2 (students to professional staff/faculty) refers specifically to residential housing programs and is based upon best practices in collegiate residential communities. (For example, Santa Clara currently implements a successful living/learning community with this ratio forming the basis of the community.)

We are aware that the level of professionalism of faculty and staff who commit to a living/learning community is fundamentally important. It is our policy and practice to engage residential community staff according to established high standards as well as thoroughly vet their qualifications and require completion of a comprehensive training program.

Part of our challenge is the fact that the apartments for staff in all of our residence halls are outdated and small compared to our competitor institutions. This makes it difficult to attract faculty to live on campus and to interact with students in a programmatic and carefully designed method. A new residential building would help us match our peer institutions by creating apartments where faculty could live and engage students in
specific curricular and co-curricular programming alongside professional staff.

22. Who are these faculty who are going to live among students? If you put 350 students on the upper campus that means you'd need to have 14 faculty live there. Who are they? You're going to put 300 students in USF off-campus housing. Who are the 12 faculty who are going to live with students?

A new residence hall building is perhaps years away from being built, so staff and faculty who would live in those facilities have not yet been identified. However, we will staff the building similarly to the staffing of our other residential communities and according to the high standards and vetting practices of our residential directors and assistant residence directors, resident ministers, and residential advisers.

23. If you do not have enough faculty to achieve this 48:2 ratio, will you then limit the number of students until you get enough faculty? Define "faculty" -- does this include graduate students?

Please see #21 above.
Faculty is defined as the teaching staff at the University, both full-time and part-time. Graduate students are not considered faculty.

24. You say that you will "reward" students by letting them live in these new dorms. So you're controlling the students who are already more likely to be better -- academically, behaviorally.

We expect that a new residence hall with newer modes of living arrangements (i.e., suite-style living with shared bathrooms) will become very popular among students and so will provide inherent incentives for co-curricular engagement.

USF's Saint Ignatius Institute (SII) serves as our best example of the type of living/learning community we seek to implement on a broader scale. SII has approximately 100 students, about 50 of whom live together in Phelan Hall. Currently, more of these students want to live on campus, but there isn't enough room, so first and second year students have priority over juniors and seniors. If the Saint Ignatius Institute were able to have two living pods of 48 students, almost their entire living/learning community could live together throughout their four year experience, providing a much better experience overall that includes both lower division and upper division students. The SII students have some of the highest GPAs among students, have the lowest number of student conduct issues, and have one of the highest four-year graduation rates.

25. What about the students who are failing?

USF has a comprehensive strategy and organization in place for working with all students who are not doing well academically, socially or personally. The reasons why students fail individual or several courses are many and varied — from death in the family, to stress, to under-preparation, to substance abuse, relationship issues, and any other host of reasons. As an institution we respond to all of these issues.

26. What proactive measures does / will USF take to control student behavior problems?

All USF students are required to abide by the University’s Code of Conduct and are
subject to disciplinary action if found in violation of the policy (the Code of Conduct is online at www.usfca.edu/fogcutter).

Additionally, USF has a comprehensive set of strategies and programs designed to educate and guide student development. The programs are always being examined, redesigned, and augmented. A sample of some of the proactive measures that USF takes to promote the development of our students includes:

### Orientation Activities
Orientation Activities on the first day of student orientation, providing small group interactions that inform students about respect for the greater community that surrounds USF.

- The “Golden Ticket” - distributed to and signed for by students on Move-In weekend, provides guidelines for behavior and conduct.
- A poster campaign that specifically reminds students about being good neighbors.
- Strict guidelines regarding outdoor events, music, and noise help to minimize the impact on the community.
- Welcome Weekends that introduce students to the City of San Francisco during the first three weekends of the semester.
- Signs posted in every residence hall reminding students about various aspects of the student Code of Conduct.
- On-campus programming (in the residence halls and elsewhere)
- Programming changes each year based on staffing and current issues. Possible future programs could be: “Being Good Neighbors On and Off Campus”, “Knowing YOUR Rights and Responsibilities”, etc. Student Conduct and Residence Life can on creating programs that focus on these issues that can be enacted regularly for students.

### Community Relations Policy
USF is one of the few institutions of higher education that has a specific Community Relations Policy (enacted 2006) for its students.

Students are expected to demonstrate respect for all members of the local community regardless of their place of residence. The following are guidelines for all USF students:

- Be respectful to local community residents. Prohibited behavior includes but is not limited to: littering, loitering, destruction/trespassing of private property, public urinating, public nudity, using rude or abusive language.
- Operate stereos or other electronic equipment at reasonable sound levels, especially late at night or early in the morning.
- Maintain an orderly residence. Examples of a disorderly residence include, but are not limited to: violating drug and alcohol laws, hosting parties where there is public
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drunkenness, excessive noise, or other behavior in disregard of the rights of others, violating the sexual assault or sexual harassment guidelines as defined in the Fogcutter Student Handbook.

The University reserves the right to exercise disciplinary action over students who violate this policy, even if the misconduct occurs off-campus. Students or organizations found responsible for violating these regulations will be subject to the same sanctions imposed for on-campus violations.

Community Relations Position
USF has created a new position whose job responsibilities are specifically to “educate students about the neighborhood and their relationship with our neighbors in the UTA. The individual in this position will participate in the orientation of new students concerning housing and community issues in the residence halls and off campus housing. He or she will also facilitate positive and productive public relations with the neighborhood communities, surrounding campus and off campus student housing facilities. In addition he or she will design and implement programs for students that will assist them to adopt civic responsibilities and to create positive neighborhood relations.

At this date, interviews have been completed and the position is expected to be filled this semester.

Student Conduct
The Director of the Office of Student Conduct Rights and Responsibilities, reports to Assistant Vice Provost for Student Life (currently Julie Orio). Seven full-time and seven part-time staff are trained in student conduct procedures (not including the new position cited above). There are also additional faculty and staff that serve on the Disciplinary Hearing Committee and serve as appeal officers. The Assistant Vice Provost resides on campus.

Disciplinary measures vary according to the specific issue, but key elements of the process include:

- The first incident requires a face-to-face meeting with professional staff
- Out of that meeting comes developmental educational sanctions.
- Sanctions range from warnings to expulsion from the University.
- Repeated violations of the code of conduct triggers increased levels of sanctions.
- These records are maintained and tracked in a comprehensive student conduct database.

USF Department of Public Safety works closely with the San Francisco Police Department in coordinating everything from traffic accidents to criminal behavior, even in cases where USF students, faculty or staff are not involved (as with the recent non-USF related drug activity and shooting on Temescal Terrace).
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On Call Model
In addition to the Public Safety Officers patrol, seven staff members are on-call every night to respond to student related issues. The nightly on-call team is led by a full-time professional and includes other staff such as RA’s and licensed clinicians.

Crisis Management and Behavioral Intervention Team
This team is a critical part of managing student conduct. During the school year, every Monday, this standing committee led by the Assistant Vice Provost for Student Life and attended by staff from Student Conduct, Public Safety, Counseling & Psychological Services, Student Disability Services, Residence Life, Campus Ministry, Student Leadership and Engagement and Student Academic Services meets to review recent activity and manage on-going student concerns. Important outcomes from this on-going process include:

- Provision of effective, consistent responses to complicated student incidents involving multiple departments or divisions.
- Provision of care for immediate health and safety issues, along with the care for the whole person, and balancing of the needs of the individual student with the good of the community.
- Insurance of appropriate confidential notification, communication and action among University departments when incidents of a critical nature have occurred involving individual members of the USF community.

Neighbors and Student Life Meetings
USF has engaged with its UTA neighbors through regular meetings to discuss new initiatives to improve student behavior in our community. Initiatives include:

- Creating “Now we’re neighbors, let’s be friends” campaign on campus.
- UTA representatives meeting with RAs during fall training.
- Creating social opportunities during training between student leadership and neighbors
- Expanding role of RHA in terms of neighborhood relations.
- Exploring possible block party with neighbors, students, faculty, staff - food trucks etc.
- Exploring the development of a mentoring program.

Red Folder Project:
Every full time faculty and staff member was given an informative red folder that outlines how to report and manage distressing student behavior.

My Student Body:
My Student Body is required for all incoming students. My Student Body is a research-based, student friendly, online alcohol education program designed to assist students in making healthy decisions regarding alcohol use in college.

Additional Initiatives
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- Concerted effort toward planning events in advance and with proper approvals, and advanced notification to Glenn Loomis.
- Expand security and modify load in/out times for production company for New Student Orientation and Fall Fest events.
- Athletics – divert visiting team buses to park off site
- Athletics - encourage visitor parking @ Koret
- Athletics - discourage visitor parking in UTA via promotional materials, advance notice

Health Promotion Services (HPS)
HPS offers alcohol education workshops to different groups on campus, such as athletes, individual classes and organized student groups.
HPS spearheaded the smoke free campus initiative and provides resources to faculty, staff and students to quit smoking.

Koret Recreation Center
The Koret Center offers a healthy alternative for students, including fitness equipment and classes, excursions and intramurals.

Public Safety
Public Safety officers conduct community rounds in the residence halls and around campus. Educational resource cards are passed out to students by Public Safety Officers.

Residence Hall Programming
Optional programs cover topics of alcohol and drug education and prevention along with programming related to current issues on and off campus.

27. **How is the success of this student: faculty housing ratio going to be measured and reported to the neighbors?**
The academic success of the living/learning communities will be tracked through existing academic reporting systems. Student conduct issues are tracked through the Comprehensive Conduct Database. The University will consider how best to share such information with neighbors.

28. **If this is not working, what will USF do to mitigate and improve this?**
Please refer to the information provided in the responses above. As with all its programs, academic and otherwise, USF seeks to continually assess its systems and methods through regular measurement and analyses and then designing and implementing improvements based on these assessments.

Student Behavior
**On-campus student housing is related to student behavior. USF says that you’ll get better behavior by having them on campus. Neighbors feel that has not worked at Loyola Village. Why put even more students on campus where the mass of them can act out?**

Please refer to the information provided in the responses above.
29. *We are waiting for a new MOU with the SFPD. I'm not sure that this is the solution to all our student behavior problems. This is reactive -- sends the cops after students who have misbehaved. Let's say that the MOU allows USF Public Safety (correct department?) to intervene. Please describe USF PS: who? how many? where & when they work? PS dispatch (my experience in the past has not been satisfactory)? process? Please describe how USF will adapt to having more authority in the Terraces if the new MOU allows USF PS to intervene.*

The University does not consider the MOU as something that would eliminate the proactive measures that the university enacts and will continue to enact. The goal is to be as proactive as possible. Proactive activities are described throughout this document.

As of this date, the MOU remains the same as it has in the past. The MOU has been currently reviewed and approved by Richmond Station Captain and is back at police Field Operations Bureau and Chief's Office for final approval, although we are told the City Attorney has significant concerns about the document. As we continue forward, neighbors should use the following protocol: for all off campus emergency issues please contact the San Francisco Police Department (911). When an immediate response is needed (large parties, excessive noise) please call the San Francisco Police Department as well as Public Safety Dispatch at 415.422.4201 and supply as many details as possible. USF Public Safety will attempt to coordinate with San Francisco Police Department to determine if USF students are involved and will respond as appropriate in adherence with the Memorandum of Understanding between USF and SFPD.

For non-emergency or non-immediate information the Vice Provost of Student Life encourages neighbors to voice concerns as well as applaud conduct off campus by contacting studentconduct@usfca.edu.

Public Safety currently has a 24/7 dispatcher and a minimum of 2, more often than not 3, armed officers working 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

30. **Please outline what is being done proactively:**

*Students influence students; describe the peer-to-peer coaching programs, orientation, etc.*

Education and accountability serve as the fundamental focus of the approach of USF’s student conduct process. Each student at the University is as capable, as any person is, of making mistakes from time to time. During the student conduct process, students are engaged in an educational conversation to critically examine their actions, behaviors and choices relative to their purpose for being at the University. Students are informed about the progressive nature of the conduct process and what the consequences will be if their actions, behaviors and choices go unchanged.

In addition to the proactive programs outlined in #26 above, when students are found responsible for violating the University’s Drug Free Policy (located in the Fogcutter student handbook, www.usfca.edu/fogcutter), they are mandated to perform a combination of sanctions in the hopes that they will understand how their actions have an impact on themselves, the USF community, and society as a whole.

- Traditional Retribution Sanctions range from monetary fines that support drug and alcohol education to probation, suspension or expulsion.
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- Educational Sanctions range from basic alcohol education, e-chug, (see below) and a warning if the student is found responsible for being present while others consume alcohol illegally, to more involved activities such as writing individualized plans of action for confronting their use and abuse of alcohol, and counseling sessions with Counseling and Psychological Services.

Each student's case is reviewed subjectively and sanctions are determined after the hearing officer assesses which would best serve the student's and community's needs. Drug violations are traditionally addressed with the more involved sanctions from the onset. A student found responsible for their first marijuana violation, for example, is typically sanctioned to fulfill monetary fines, counseling and e-toke. They are also placed on probation and their parents/guardians are notified of their violation in the hopes that education and proactive support can come from both the university and the student's home support system. Statistics indicate that the majority of students found responsible for violating the Drug Free Policy are first-time violators. This suggests that the model of continuing education is thus far successful in increasing the likelihood that students learn from the experience and begin to make responsible decisions about drugs and alcohol.

Sample sanctioning programs include:

**e-chug**
Drawing on Motivational Interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 2002) and Social Norms feedback theories (Haines & Spear, 1996), the e-CHUG is designed to motivate individuals to reduce their consumption using personalized information about their own drinking and risk factors. The e-CHUG was designed, and is updated with the most current and reliable research available.

**My Student Body for sanctions**
My Student Body for Sanctions is an online course designed specifically to help students who have violated alcohol policies make safer and healthier choices - and avoid experiencing problems again. The course provides a strong educational foundation to support campus judicial programs and is an essential component of a comprehensive alcohol prevention initiative.

**BMI Meetings**
Brief Motivational interactions are led by student peers and encourage and promote healthy behaviors.

**CHOICES Group Sessions**
Three educational counseling sessions that help students identify and implement safer, healthier choices regarding the use of alcohol.

**Big Book Study Group Meetings**
e-toke

A marijuana-specific brief assessment and feedback tool designed to reduce marijuana use among college students.

Marijuana reflection questions

Students complete a series of reflection questions prior to going to their Counseling Assessment.

Counseling Assessments

Some students are sanctioned to speak to a counselor in CAPS for a drug and or alcohol assessment.

Community Standard Fines

Fines help cover the cost of the educational sanctions.

Peer Health Educator Program

The Health Outreach Peer Educators (H.O.P.E) is a voluntary peer education program designed to prepare USF students with the knowledge and skills necessary to promote an understanding of health issues affecting themselves and their peers. The H.O.P.E team's education efforts focus on three health topics: sexual health, alcohol and other drugs, and tobacco use.

31. Please outline what is being done proactively:

· **Dope smoking in broad daylight.**
  Please see #30 above.

· **Hard drugs being sold out of buildings within UTA.**
  We suggest UTA landlords require background checks on prospective tenants.

· **USF PS presence at events, especially at Memorial Gym, soccer field, etc.**
  Public Safety maintains a presence at most special events on campus. Major events like graduations, move in day, men's basketball and soccer, dignitary visits, controversial academic forums, etc. have officers assigned; these assignments range from 1 to 10 officers. All other events receive passing calls by our officers.

*USF was not aware of the problems created for Ewing Terrace, such as student parties at the Education Department parking lot, trash thrown into their neighborhood, loud disruptive students cutting through their neighborhood when the Fulton Street bars close, etc.*
USF Public Safety has received few complaints from that area. To the extent problems occur, we encourage our neighbors to notify Public Safety (please see #31 below).

32. Is there, and where is there, a centralized place to report student behavior problems? It seems that there are various USF places to report. Any incident of disruptive or inappropriate behavior should be reported to USF Public Safety. Illegal activity should be reported to SFPD (see below).

For all off campus emergency issues please contact the San Francisco Police Department (911). When an immediate response is needed (large parties, excessive noise) please call the San Francisco Police Department as well as Public Safety Dispatch at 415.422.4201 and supply as many details as possible. USF Public Safety will attempt to coordinate with San Francisco Police Department to determine if USF students are involved and will respond as appropriate in adherence with the Memorandum of Understanding between USF and SFPD.

To pass on non-emergency or non-immediate information the Vice Provost of Student Life encourages neighbors to voice concerns as well as applaud appropriate conduct off campus by contacting studentconduct@usfca.edu.

33. How are student behavioral problems tracked?

Comprehensive Conduct Database

34. How are efforts to improve student behavior measured to cite that they have a positive impact on student behavior?

Information collected through the Comprehensive Conduct Database provides the data to track the impact of these programs on student behavior.

For the year 2010/11, about 4% of USF students violated USF’s alcohol and/or drug policy. About 0.6% had repeat violations. Those small numbers and, in particular, the steep decline from a single violation to repeated violations indicates that USF’s educational and proactive programs are effective. Consider the obverse view:

- 96% of USF’s student population had no drug or alcohol violations in 2010/11
- Of those students who had a violation, the vast majority had a single violation only (99.4%)

Site selection
Upper campus: you may eliminate a driveway and then use that space for building and having mass right on Turk. Please do not take away the public’s view of open space on the Lone Mountain campus.

35. Baseball field: you mentioned that this would be a possible site. For what? This has many implications for the work we are doing with Traffic Calming. This would mean more traffic and university business on the east end of campus. This is not being planned for in the current traffic calming plans.
In the IMP, USF discloses that the baseball field remains a potential site for future development. Currently, no use other than athletic activities is planned for that site during the time period of this IMP (2012-2022).

36. Loading Dock / Improvement along campus edges

**Improve student use of the sidewalks and increasing the public right of way. It’s difficult for masses of students to use GG sidewalks on the USF side of the street.**

The IMP will outline improvements for the campus edge along Golden Gate, including loading docks, landscaping, and way finding. It is USF’s intention to convert the Golden Gate lot to a loading facility which will mitigate traffic congestion on Golden Gate Avenue.

II. Questions submitted by Linda Dower:

*Re: existing finite campus space and facilities, the impact of USF operations on University Terrace neighborhood, and the US and world economies we might consider:*

1. **Re-configuration and best use of current plant facilities by re thinking program concentration for viability and effectiveness enrollment/content/retention opportunity cost/benefit, such as baseball program**

   This defines the process USF is involved in now and which will continue as we finalize the IMP.

   The IMP Working Committee is analyzing structure, content, and strengths and weaknesses of these programs in the context of USF’s standards of academic excellence and fulfillment of its mission. Also, because tuition income represents a substantial portion of the University’s operating revenues, USF must develop an academic model with a viable and sustainable financial structure. In response both to the need for sustained financial growth and for limited campus growth, the IMP Working Committee has proposed to implement a new structure, the Distributed Campus Model. This new business model would allow campus enrollment growth below historical rates while also generating increased financial resources from non-Hilltop academic enterprises to keep pace with accelerating operating costs.

2. **Humanities, Education and Visual arts at Lone Mountain and Science, Tech and Engineering at USF Nursing, Healthcare off site or at St. Mary’s??**

   Much of this has already been in place, e.g. Education and Professional Studies on the north campus; Science in Harney and now to be in CSI. As shown in the May IMP, the Distributed Campus Model moves this a step further, proposing that some programs move off campus entirely.

   However, dividing the campus into a purely Arts campus on the upper campus and a Sciences campus on the lower campus is not feasible. Undergraduates must take courses in the arts and sciences to fulfill graduation requirements, so at some point in an undergraduate’s career at USF, he/she may, as an arts student, use lab space or may, as a science major, use arts space.

   St Mary’s Hospital provides limited clinical lab space for USF nursing students. The
Hospital has declined USF’s overtures to expand its presence in their facility.

3. **Class structure (as it pertains to parking, traffic and neighborhood impact)**
   - 3 day/wk classes down to 2 days
   - 2 day/wk classes down to 1 day
   - possible seminar format

   In spite of the fact that USF does not have the capacity to compress classes in this manner (at peak times 94% of classrooms are utilized.), class schedules and classroom usage are being evaluated in the context of the Distributed Campus Model to optimize use and efficiency.

4. **Dorm renovations - 1st floor study/reception/lunchroom configuration vs 'pods' re overall costs.**

   USF dorms, for the most part, already incorporate the configuration where study and reception areas are concentrated on the dorm’s 1st floor. However, this configuration has been shown to be ineffective in meeting students’ needs and it now puts USF at a significant competitive disadvantage. The ‘suite” design provides students sufficient study and social space within their respective dorm complexes. Also the suite design supports the goals - and outcomes - of the planned Living Learning communities outlined in the IMP.

5. **Plant operations thru campus using smaller vehicles vs 'thru' Golden Gate.**

   USF Facilities Management currently operates a fleet of smaller (electric) vehicles for use on campus. Those vehicles use Golden Gate only when necessary.

6. **Shipping and Receiving plan to mitigate Golden Gate congestion.**

   USF is analyzing the opportunities to improve its shipping/receiving function, with particular interest in reducing the impact of that function on the neighborhood. Fehr and Peers, traffic consultants, are including the analysis in the scope of their work in the IMP.

7. **‘2130 Fulton’?? What’s up with that?**

   2130 is USF’s original address, having been the address of the University’s first building on this site. The University is examining the possibility of changing its address to a more realistic location.

8. **I am incredulous and was at a loss for words. I was really alarmed to see that the IMP does not address neighborhood concerns other than acknowledging them and dealing with parking, which USF needs to do to accommodate their students and visitors.**

   I am very disappointed in light of how long this has been an issue between USF and UT, that there were no concrete suggestions to deal with the current problems, that are a culmination of the last IMP, and projected university growth.

USF considers its acknowledgement of the neighborhood’s concern as a crucial step in effectively identifying, understanding, and mitigating those concerns. Taking the time to review the list of the issues in an open meeting with the community was one of several ways we sought to make sure neighborhood input confirmed our understanding of these issues. Now that we have consensus that our understanding is accurate, we will continue to develop the concrete suggestions you seek.
In addition to making sure we understood our neighbor’s concerns, USF actively implemented substantial and tangible actions in 2010/11 to start to address those concerns, including but not limited to:

Parking & Traffic

- Retain Fehr & Peers traffic consultants to design traffic calming alternatives for University Terrace. The resulting traffic calming plan will complement the IMP Transportation Demand Management plan.
- Provide $1.2 million to pay for traffic calming improvements in UT
- Retain Logistics Coordinator to manage all construction & delivery traffic at USF.
- Implement strict logistics requirements for construction contractors to minimize impact on UT including prescribing construction truck route, prohibiting contractor parking in UT, providing the construction labor force shuttle service to and from an off-site parking lot, requiring contractors to remain on-site during lunch hour, limit work hours to 8-4:30, no weekend work hours (except tower crane install), build sound barrier around construction yard. USF or Cahill will assess fines for non-compliance.
- Redirect Athletics visiting team buses to remote parking, away from War Memorial Gym immediately after drop-off.
- Provide free parking at Koret and other USF lots at high traffic soccer and basketball games.
- Direct patrons to park away from UT in Athletic promotional materials.

Noise

- Retain Charles Salter & Associates to design sound systems and mitigations at athletic facilities.
- Design & install new sound system at baseball diamond.
- Design & install new sound system at soccer field.
- Design and install acoustic dampening at batting cage.

Plans to mitigate the impact of growth

- Establish plan to limit on-campus enrollment growth to less than 1% annually from 2012-2022.
- Propose a new academic/business model: The Distributed Campus Model will restructure and/or relocate key academic programs and provide the means to limit campus growth in a financially sustainable way.
- Significant investment in selected property in San Francisco to relocate selected academic programs and begin implementing the Distributed Campus model (Presidio, 101 Howard)
- Moving selected academic programs off campus will help reduce traffic, parking, and pedestrian volume.
- Consolidate selected academic programs at selected sites – e.g. consolidate X-Arts from 3 campus venues to one, to help reduce traffic, parking, and pedestrian volume.

Relationship with neighbors:
University of San Francisco
Institutional Master Plan
Responses to Neighbor’s Questions

• USF Leadership is committed to working with its neighbors in developing the IMP - please refer to Provost Turpin 5/10/11 letter to UTA, below:

May 10, 2011

Dear University Terrace Association:

On behalf of Reverend Stephen A. Privett, S.J., and the University of San Francisco community of faculty, students and staff, I wish to extend warm greetings to you, our campus neighbors.

A year ago at this time, USF and the University Terrace Association engaged in a negotiation to resolve long-standing and difficult issues. Pledged to begin building the Center for Science and Innovation, the University was called to task by a neighborhood frustrated by issues that seemed unsolvable for years, particularly traffic, parking, student behavior and noise. The negotiation culminated with a Settlement Agreement specifying USF’s commitment to mitigate those issues and to approve the community of the progress of the development of USF’s Institutional Master Plan.

As important as that agreement is, I want to acknowledge another change that is perhaps even more important. President Privett and his leadership team have recognized that USF’s impact on its neighbors must be acknowledged as we develop our Institutional Master Plan. This acknowledgement changed how we structured the process for developing our master plan. USF’s impact on our neighbors is now a factor that we consider with other fundamental considerations in planning, mission, academic quality, student development, and financial sustainability.

The leadership of USF is committed to improving our relationship with our neighbors. As we plan for our future, we recognize our plans will impact you. We are committed to minimizing that impact by developing strategies that reduce growth on the Hillsborough campus. We are committed to mitigating intensity of use by investing in streamlining and implementing best practices. Finally, we are committed to hearing from you, our neighbors, whose daily lives will be affected by the plans we make and to working with you to implement solutions.

Sincerely,

Jennifer E. Turpin
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

• In 2010/2011, USF has worked to develop a transparent, respectful process as it works with its neighbors to
  o Keep the neighborhood apprised of the development of the IMP, including
    • Neighborhood meetings (November 15, February 28, May 10, May 18)
    • Regular and on-going meetings with UTA Board leadership
  o Design traffic calming solutions
Mitigations in the IMP:

- The mitigations outlined above will continue to be implemented and/or completed while the IMP itself is finalized.
- Additional mitigation measures, such as the Transportation Demand Management strategy, will also be finalized and incorporated into the final IMP.

9. Why was loading dock and storage capacity not addressed at the time the University Center was expanded to serve more meals? (Which then requires more frequent deliveries thus more traffic density and congestion)

The 2010 renovation of University Center was not an expansion of that facility. The project reconfigured the internal layout of the dining commons to redistribute the price points and improve the distribution of meals to the USF community. Alternative designs to improve the loading dock capacity and flow are being analyzed in the 2012 IMP process.

10. How many students will be housed in the live/learn environment? Enough to impact foot traffic between schools? Thru UT neighborhood streets. Pedestrian Network!

350 beds are proposed for Lone Mountain campus. The design of the facility may include additional amenities such as food services, social, study, fitness spaces, and classrooms, in an effort to minimize students’ individual needs for multiple daily trips to lower campus.

11. How is the impact of past growth, and now, future growth, on USF operations, of which, Golden Gate has become a ‘service road’ for the movement of equipment, going to be addressed.

The UTA traffic-calming project is anticipated to lessen the use of Golden Gate by reconfiguring it into a limited use street, improving aesthetics and simplifying the loading function. Also, the IMP proposes to move the main campus Visitor Arrival onto Parker which is anticipated to redirect visitor traffic to that street as well as reduce the number of visitors through the Terrace streets from Golden Gate.

12. All of the current construction has been planned for well in advance, Harney Science, dorm reconstruction, etc., so I feel there needs to be some material projects in the 2012 IMP to address current problems since they will not be fixed tomorrow.

The IMP will outline the proposed projects and associated mitigations for the 2012-2022 time period.

III. Questions submitted by Richard Rabbitt:

1. I previously pointed out the inconsistencies between the enrollment numbers that USF submitted to the City of San Francisco in June 2010 (which remain as the most current official statement by USF to the City of its enrollment numbers and projections) and those implied by the information presented to neighbors at a neighborhood meeting in May 2011. I also pointed out inconsistencies between
what USF has projected in the past in its 2004 Master Plan and what has actually turned out to be the case.

At a May neighbor meeting, Michael London incorrectly stated that the numbers that I provided were not accurate and not taken from USF’s own published statements. He stated that USF would be providing a detailed written response to the issues raised in my communication.

I have not received any response to date.

Although USF already has this info and is already aware of it, I am providing (see attached) excerpts from the 2004 IMP and the June 2010 update that provide cross-referenced source info for the numbers set forth in my prior communication (e.g., the "#1" in my summary sheet was taken from the "#1" circled on USF 2004 IMP). In case there was any doubt, this proves that all of the numbers set forth in my summary sheet were taken directly from USF's own published numbers with the exception of the one number that was explicitly noted as an "extrapolation" given that USF's own statements regarding the draft 2012 Master Plan have been, to date, extremely vague.

Mr. Rabbitt’s assertion that Michael London “incorrectly stated that the numbers Mr. Rabbitt provided were not accurate and not taken from USF’s own published statements” is not correct.

Based on the video recording of the May 18 meeting, the exchange between Mr. Rabbitt and Mr. London was as follows:

May 18, 2011
UTA Community Meeting; USF IMP
Richard Rabbitt (RR)/Mike London (ML) transcript re enrollment projections

29.27 RR – “Mike, happy to address this issue later in the meeting; I did want to have a discussion about if you look at past IMPs, they say you expect growth of X% and if you look at actual numbers, the actual growth has been much in excess of that. So a legitimate question is that what is the assurance to people that if you say 1% growth, what assurance do you have that’s how it will actually turn out?”

30.0 ML – “There’s a lot of questions in there so I’ll try to parse it out. First of all, we’ll try to take questions at the end. That’s one thing we want to talk about. It’s a very legitimate topic. Numbers can be misleading so at this juncture I would posit that I don’t agree with your premise: “that the actual numbers are at odds with the what was forecast” but we can debate that later. I think that I don’t have an immediate answer to your question on once you forecast a number, how do you work to that forecast. And I don’t have an answer for that, but we will get you a written answer.”

30.45 RR – “I’m happy to talk about that later and so forth. I did want to note that what I passed out to some people here, those numbers are based solely on USF’s own published stuff, so...”
Regarding the questions about to enrollment growth on campus and the estimates outlined in past IMP’s, it is important to note that enrollment and other projections submitted in past IMPs to the City of San Francisco have been presented in the context of planning for the future and based on defined assumptions. Such estimates have not been characterized as a guaranteed outcome.

The 2004 IMP projections were based on projected demographic changes for US High School Graduates (please see chart below)

![Number of High School Graduates, 1994-2022: West](chart)

However, those assumptions were adversely affected by external conditions and, for certain periods, actual enrollment was at variance with the projections.

The 2004 USF IMP states:

*USF has experienced stable growth in student enrollment (about 1.7% per year) in the past five years. This growth is expected to slow between now and 2015, flattening out at approximately 7,450 students. Within this ten year period, growth in undergraduates enrolled at the San Francisco campus is projected to be 4%, with 5% growth in graduate students and*
This enrollment projection was a target used by USF to estimate revenue for budgeting purposes. Although enrollments were not projected to increase as indicated in the industry projections, the following changed conditions were not known at the time the projections were made:

1. Funding for public higher education in California declined dramatically, necessitating enrollment limits and/or declines, thus increasing the number of students interested in private educational institutions in California.
2. Interest in enrollment in nursing programs rebounded from its low in the early part of this decade.
3. Administration of our cooperative program with the California College of Arts and Crafts (CCAC) became problematic, necessitating a discontinuation of the program and a subsequent creation of our own fine arts program.

For those reasons, enrollment grew on the Hilltop campus between 2004 and 2007 at a higher than expected rate.

### University of San Francisco
**Hilltop (upper & lower campus) Enrollment, 2004 - 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hilltop enrollment</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Annual Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 03</td>
<td>7,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 04</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>7,497</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>7,728</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>7,956</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>7,990</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>8,106</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>8,683</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 11</td>
<td>8,731</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2008, conditions again changed, even more dramatically. In 2008, the national economy experienced its most severe challenge since the Great Depression. Profound and fundamental economic upheaval occurred and those forces had a direct, negative impact on USF.

For example, some of the most damaging impacts on USF included the loss of almost $50 million from endowment principal, causing a multiyear decline in endowment income. Endowment income, which has not yet recovered to 2006 levels, has experienced a cumulative 70% decline.

As a result, USF was forced to act and secure its financial footing. In 2008/09, the University reinforced its diminished revenue stream by increasing tuition and increasing enrollment.

In USF’s June 10, 2010 IMP update letter to the City of San Francisco, the University stated:
1. **Enrollment and Employment Data**

The following is an update of the enrollment and employment data and projections provided in the 2004 IMP. This information is for the main San Francisco campus only and excludes regional campuses.

The 2004 IMP stated that USF had experienced stable growth in student enrollment of about 1.78% per year from 1998 to 2003. The IMP predicted that enrollment growth would slow but the actual increase in enrollment from 2003 to 2010 was 13.4%, representing an annual rate of growth of about 1.8%, roughly the same as the rate of growth the IMP indicated had been experienced over the previous 5 years. The upper end of the 2015 projection is based on an annual growth rate of about 1.7% per year consistent with the historic growth rate.

USF is not stating, as Mr. Rabbitt speculates in his neighborhood handout of May 18, 2010, that as of 2015, USF “… will cease growth completely.” Further to address the quote that USF “wildly exceeded growth projections”, this statement leaves the misimpression that the projected numbers were somehow an exact science or a maximum ceiling. Neither is correct. The growth projections were estimates based on certain assumptions; conditions changed causing the projected numbers to be exceeded.

To summarize:

- The circumstances that affected that assumption for the period 2004-2008 and caused USF to change its enrollment decisions were negative funding trends in public higher education, increased interest in nursing education, and the development of a fine arts program after a cooperative program with CCAC failed.
- The 2008 economic crash forced USF to take corrective actions to secure its financial footing; maintaining stable enrollment growth in a fundamentally changed economy was no longer a responsible financial option.
- USF implemented significant changes to increase tuition income, its primary revenue stream, as other revenue sources declined.

2. I am attaching another 1 page document, which is a copy of USF’s own "Distributed Campus Model" which purports to show the projected growth of "on-campus" and "off-campus" populations from 2012 through 2022. The graph does not expressly provide any "on-campus" numbers for any of the following: 2012, 2015, or 2022. However, the 2012 number appears to be just above 8,000 (presumably the 8,106 from 2009), the 2015 number would appear to be around 8,200, and the 2022 number would appear to be around 8,800.

When USF provides its explanation of enrollment numbers, I would like USF to explain why its June 2010 submitted projections state enrollment of 8,350-8,950 but this chart appears to put that number at just 8,200 and how will it be possible that USF will only have an on-campus student enrollment in 2022 of about 8,800 students if it is projecting to have 8,350-8,950 in 2015 and it projects approximately 1% growth per year thereafter?
What would be very interesting to know is whether USF is sticking by the apparent statement made by this graph that USF's on-campus population in 2012 will be the same as 2009? Is that correct?

USF’s comments pertaining to the 2012 IMP have not been vague. The Distributed Campus Model chart is a demonstrative aid presented in order to illustrate the intended impact of the Distributed Campus Model within the context of student enrollment over time. It is not purported to be any type of exact enrollment projection. The on-campus enrollment in 2012 will not be the same as in 2009.

USF has engaged a consulting firm, Hardwick Day, to develop an enrollment projection model. That work product is expected to be complete in November 2011.

3. Do USF's own internal enrollment projections show only 8,100 or so on-campus students projected to be enrolled in 2012?

The Distributed Campus Model was not intended to provide an enrollment projection. It is a demonstrative aid to illustrate the intended impact of the Distributed Campus Model and to show the differences in the rates of growth between on-campus and off-campus functions.

4. What was the fall 2010 enrollment and the spring 2011 enrollment?
   On-campus, fall 2010: 8,683
   On-campus, spring 2011: 8,347

5. If USF wishes to treat the neighbors as "stakeholders", USF should make available to the neighbors the same detailed enrollment projection information that USF provides to its staff for their own planning purposes.

USF does not, as a matter of practice, distribute the details of its enrollment projections to its stakeholders. The details of the compilation and analysis of projections are an internal management tool. Generally, in higher education, enrollment details are considered proprietary, as they are a key part of an institution’s competitive strategy.

USF recognizes the public’s and the City’s right to know enrollment projections and will consider providing that information in the appropriate context and timeframe.

6. USF should not provide one set of statistics to the neighborhood and the City and another set internally.

USF does not provide one set of statistics to the neighborhood and the City and another set internally.

Enrollment reports are generated from a central database. Any projection is a function the assumptions applied to a given algorithm at a particular time.

7. Also, there should be an explicit discussion as to how these enrollment projections are derived and what processes will be in place to modify University courses of action should the actual enrollment numbers begin to deviate from the projected numbers.

USF will provide an opportunity for that discussion at the appropriate time.
USF has engaged Hardwick Day to assist in developing an enrollment projection process. We anticipate that work will be available for discussion in November 2011.

8. Will there be some internal process set up to monitor the compliance of actual enrollment with projections?

Yes.

9. As you probably know, USF has supposedly had a TDM program in place for over 30 years, which supposedly started as early as 1980 when Kendrick was approved and USF was required to commence diligent implementation of what was then called a TSM plan in the 1979 Transportation Plan for USF.

   As you can see from the attached, this supposedly continued into 1993 and in the 1993 Master Plan it was stated that USF would aggressively implement TDM actions.

   References to USF’s TDM program continued in 1996, 2002, and 2004 documents (the last being USF’s last master plan) -- and some others not included here.

   However, when one looks at the actual progress in the plan measured by the few datapoints that appear to have been gathered over a 30 year period (really only 2 datapoints as far as I can determine), the drive alone % actually increased, the shared ride decreased, walk-bike was about the same, and only transit had a very mild increase.

   The 1993 and 2004 numbers are exactly the same -- which makes sense since the 2004 IMP just took the same numbers as used by the 1993 IMP. A 2005 Faculty survey (small sample and just faculty) returned numbers that had a very high drive alone % (74%).

The investment and impact of USF’s TDM programs is significant. First however, please note that Mr. Rabbitt’s conclusion that the drive alone rate has increased is not accurate. The USF faculty/staff/student drive alone-rate in 2010/2011 is 36%, a 33% reduction over the rates reported in 1993 & 2004.

This substantial decline in the drive-alone rate since 1992 is one example of successful development and application of strategies to both encourage the use of alternative transportation as well as to discourage individual automobile use.

Since 1992, USF has implemented 22 specific initiatives to manage transportation to campus.

The programs and investments initiated by USF include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Kendrick Hall (Law) parking lot constructed. 128 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Safety Escort service established (dusk-dawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Transportation Mgr position established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Transit promotions, sale of passes &amp; maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Shuttle service – campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Rideshare coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Carpools - free parking for &gt;3 riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Preferential parking for carpools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Promo/Educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Koret Deck built for parking – 65 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Reserved parking for carpoolers - 25 spaces @ Koret 7-10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Commuter Check program - transit subsidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Guaranteed trip home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Carpool parking fees reduced by 50-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Muni Class Pass implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Telecommuting/Flex hours implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Improve bike facilities (15 bike rack on campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Promote City Carshare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bike facilities – racks @80; add 12 more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Designate spaces (2) for City Carshare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Promote Zimride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Zipcar- 4 designated spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. So my question to you and Saskai and FP is: can you explain to the neighbors how the "new" TDM program efforts will be different from the old "aggressive" TDM efforts? How often will measurements of modal splits be measured (annually?), will there be some mechanism to assure accuracy of those measurements, what has been the annual budget for TDM over the last 30 years and is that going to increase, how often will regular updates of concrete, measured progress be provided to the neighborhood and will those efforts be compared against what efforts are being undertaken by other schools such as
University of San Francisco  
Institutional Master Plan  
Responses to Neighbor’s Questions

**UCSF?**

USF currently allocates approximately $720,000 annually for its TDM programs. These expenditures are allocated among several units on campus and are comprised of direct and indirect costs (programs incorporated into staff duties such as coordinating promotional programs, the Safety Escort service, and Guaranteed Trip Home).

USF’s substantial annual budget allocation for TDM programs demonstrates the University’s commitment to continuing to reduce the demand for automobile transportation to and from campus and to build on the successful programs now in place. Traffic consultant Fehr & Peers is developing a Transportation Demand Management plan, which will be included in the 2012 IMP. Their recommendations are expected to build upon past successful strategies as well as implement new strategies, based on their quantitative and qualitative research. Comparisons against TDM programs at other schools are expected to be incorporated in their report.

The question of how modal splits will be measured and the mechanism to ensure accuracy of those measurements, along with the reporting methodology is expected to be incorporated in the recommendation of the TDM by Fehr & Peers.

We agree that the absence of consistent data points to track progress is a concern. The 2012 TDM is expected to include specific recommendations to develop a system for tracking those data to facilitate monitoring and enforcement.

____________________________________