Preamble: The Staff of the San Francisco Urban Program (SF Urban) looks forward to the collaboration with our main campus toward this six year assessment rotation. We strongly believe in this program and also believe this process will firmly establish SF Urban as an important asset for Westmont College, even beyond its present status as an off-campus program option.

As there is no recent assessment process upon which to build, we have taken the liberty of attempting to set a ‘bench mark’ for that purpose through this report. It is important,
we believe, to allow the Committee to understand how we believe SF Urban approaches and meets many of the Student Learning Outcomes in place. We also wanted to acquaint you with some of the recent internal assessment procedures we have undertaken. Perhaps, in dialogue, we can find ways to continue those processes while also aligning with several Outcomes we will wish to measure throughout these next five years.

We look forward to working through some of the unique aspects of this process, understanding that a program such as ours meets some, but not all, of the normal expectations of a typical academic apartment. At the same time, we believe we also embrace several components, affecting student outcomes, for which the typical department is unable to handle. It is exciting for us to note those unique features of this program.

**Procedure:** The report will follow the Template provided by the Committee. After a review of the mission (with a description and small historical review), we will report on how we see SF Urban meet the individual Student Learning Outcomes, with a special ‘eye’ toward showing how the many facets of the program impact those outcomes. The report will then show two major areas we have recently instituted (prior to being asked to participate in the six-year assessment cycle), to address two areas we wish to assess. While these do not necessarily fit smoothly into one or another specified academic Outcome, they are, nonetheless, crucial areas for our program to address.

### I.1 MISSION:

SF Urban is an intentional residential learning community which equips students in vocational/ spiritual/ personal formation within a global multi-cultural context.

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:** SF Urban is a full-semester off-campus program owned and operated by Westmont College located in the heart of San Francisco. Though not a ‘Department’ in the traditional academic sense (nor recognized as such by Westmont), SF Urban operates in many ways that parallel that type of structure.

The centerpiece of the program is a 24 hour per week internship in an area of the student’s vocational interest. Our internships feature significant hands-on experiences closely supervised by a professional in the field. Internships may be customized for a student and/or served with organizations with which we have a long-standing relationship. The internship counts for 8 units of credit, fully transferable to most accredited institutions (and, by arrangement, 4 or more credits can be used for a student’s major). Internships can be arranged for all academic majors.

In addition, all students take the Urban Studies course (4 credits) studying issues such as poverty, racism, power/privilege, sexual orientation and pluralism, all integrated with a Christian world-view perspective. Students may also choose 2-4 additional credit hours from our Electives (Literature of the City, Creative Writing, The Emergent Church) or arrange for an Independent Study.
Students earn 12-16 credits for the semester. The program operates during both the Fall and Spring semesters.

**PROGRAM LOCATION:** Up to 26 students are housed in our 1898 Victorian home (The Clunie House) centrally located across from The Panhandle of Golden Gate Park. Our three area-resident faculty and two Staff (including a Resident Director in the home) create a close community as students live, learn, play and serve in this unique location. San Francisco is one of America’s most unique and diverse cities, allowing students a fruitful context in which to reflect and grow.

The Clunie House, a former Bed & Breakfast, features newly refinished 2-3 person rooms with private bath. Students prepare their own meals in our newly refurbished kitchen with food supplied by the program and which meets community needs.

**I.2 OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT:**

As this is the first year of our assessment process, we will report on the present status of SF Urban over against the complete list of Student Learning Outcomes as it relates to the following parts of our program:

US- Urban Studies Course  
IN- Internship (Including Practicum Class)  
EE- English Electives  
RE- RS Elective  
CL- Community Life  
SP- Service Projects.

We will then specify our own assessment areas we have specifically targeted. Finally, we will provide an overview of strategies to bring out the desired improvement in those specific areas.

**CHRISTIAN ORIENTATION STANDARD**

**Knowledge:** 1) Students specifically engage in Scriptural integration throughout the program offerings. US- Through readings, class discussions, writing projects and informal discussions on ‘off-hours’, students are encouraged to integrate their knowledge of Scripture and theological understanding with contemporary ‘real-world’ issues. The RE studies course specifically provides instruction in this area as it particularly relates to biblical interpretation in the ancient and “Emergent” church contexts. Some IN contexts (such as the Sojourner Chaplaincy) encourage the student’s use of Scripture, as appropriate in personal preparation for ministry, or for presentations.

2) The US, EE and RE courses incorporate devotional materials in their instruction times. Students have been encouraged to develop habits of church attendance and devotional
times in the house. CL opportunities also exist, such as to accompany staff to church, monthly Taize services and other spiritually nurturing activities.

**Practices:** US requires a small group service project incorporating the integration of one of several principles and/or issues engaged in the course with an imperative toward active love in our community. In addition the entire program participates in at least one full group service project and RE students participate in an additional one. Students are also encouraged to join in as advocates or participants in areas of service which interest them. As an example, several students worked on behalf of political issues during the Fall ’08 run-up to the election.

**Affections:** Our CL provides a weekly devotional time for students in both a small group and full community venue to share from their personal spiritual journeys as well as incorporate aspects of prayer, devotional materials and student led worship. Sensitivities in this area are increased through exposure to US, RE guest speakers, IN supervisors and fellow workers who provide opportunity for students to meet and interact with diverse individuals, to whom they are encouraged to represent the life of Christ in appropriate ways.

**Virtues:** Riding the bus to/from their IN experiences, engaging homeless and displaced persons in ministry and public contexts, hearing from people of diverse and contrary perspectives throughout the city, all provide opportunities for students to follow the patron saint of San Francisco’s admonition to “preach the Gospel at all times; use words if necessary”.

**CRITICAL-INTERDISCIPLINARY THINKING STANDARD**

**General Skills:** Students are strikingly engaged in difficult and relevant issues, stretching their analytical, philosophical and biblical integrative skills with all aspects of the program. Courses stretch students academically, and are engaged in the immediate practical application of these lessons several times a week in the IN portion of their program. Guest speakers, off-hours discussions with their house-mates all serve to continue the exercise of these skills in ways which are intensified from many on-campus contexts.

**Range of Disciplines:** Through the IN portion, students not only work in their own pre-professional internship, but they discuss and interact with the other internships of their fellows through the weekly Practicum meetings. In addition, the US coursework addresses a range of subject matter which calls upon them to both upgrade their own knowledge of a subject and to seek out others from whom they can learn.

**Complex Problem Solving:** The orientation to city and house life, including learning the transportation systems, cooking for themselves and living in close community stretch each student to develop their skills in this area. Though this in itself would be challenging, they do all of this in a very diverse and, at times, alien culture to that which they encounter on campus or in their home environment. Many IN experiences force
them to apply their knowledge and experience to real-world work problems affecting the lives of many customers and clients on a weekly basis.

**Collaborating:** Many students, in their IN are challenged to collaborate with a wide diversity of people who hold differing perspectives on life and faith. Students learn to negotiate through such differences with supervisors and fellow workers on a regular basis. In addition, CL is filled with this opportunity on a daily basis. The challenge of even feeding oneself is usually handled through collaboration with housemates.

**Limits & Appropriate Attitudes:** US and IN experiences confront students with the limits of their own perspectives and judgments. Through the weekly interaction with difficult subject matter, challenging guest speakers and an IN work environment, they are continuously made aware of the need for humility in the learning process. CL allows for an atmosphere where students learn to give and receive forgiveness and grace regularly. Students learn that ‘truth’ may be more difficult to come by without time for reflection and growth.

**DIVERSITY STANDARD**

**Self-reflection:** This is a key element in all SF Urban activities. US specifically addresses issues of race, privilege and class, while also incorporating those discussions into an integrative network applicable to all other topics of the course. RE deals specifically with the historical movements influencing biblical interpretation which also relate to the understanding of self. Students constantly are in process of reflecting upon their own journeys as they engage in CL, IN and city life. San Francisco is such a diverse environment that students cannot ‘hide’ in a demographic majority, but need to affix their own place in the pluralistic community which surrounds them.

**Discussion and Analysis of Issues:** Another key component which transcends all aspects of SF Urban, students are consistently challenged to negotiate through all of these issues in ways which respect and care for the diversity they encounter. Field Trip activities such as our first-day Cultural Walk, visits to Hunter’s Point (African American area noted for poverty and violence), Chinatown, and other areas impact students with experiences from which they can draw material for informed discussions.

**Formulation of Knowledge:** Our courses and CL experiences are constantly challenging the perspectives from which we begin our discussions. Students learn to challenge one another in these areas, even as they are being challenged in the many contexts of IN and city life. In many cases, CL, far from being a ‘norm’ or ‘refuge’ from this activity, is deepened by the realization that even in a more uniform context, diversity is present (yet often unnamed). We seek to ‘name’, and find vocabulary for, fruitful discussions and learning in this area.

**Cross-Cultural Communication Skills:** A major feature of SF Urban is to provide ‘names and faces’ to issues which are otherwise dealt with from a theoretical standpoint. Student experiences in classes and in their IN, including transport to/from the IN site,
allow them to interact with a diversity of persons who represent non-traditional standpoints in student perspectives. These engagements are noteworthy for reducing student acceptance of stereotypes and generalizations. Though our students always appear to be respectful, their time here often allows them to get ‘beneath’ a veneer of niceness, and on into a true appreciation for another who may disagree with them on many levels.

**Process of Making Choices:** SF Urban takes it as a value that students learn best in as independent a learning climate as can be managed appropriately. In such cases, even to the choices they make regarding food preparation, they are constantly weighing advantages of issues affecting their lives. Academically, vocationally, socially and spiritually, they are encouraged toward making independent judgments on a host of matters. Students have the experience of living ‘independently’ for a major portion of their day, only to come together ‘in community’ for the remainder; truly a good balance at their stage of life.

**Essential Christianity vs. Cultural Peculiarities:** Perhaps the first step of learning in this area is the recognition that many cherished practices students come with are, in reality, peculiarities of their own ethnic and/or ecclesiastical traditions. Once that is established, we find students search diligently and without prejudice, to find those they can identify as essentials. Church visits, mandated by the US course, as well as discussions with guest speakers and IN workers, allow the student to see alternative life-styles and perspectives from which they can weigh which should be essentials and those which can be freely chosen or discarded within their faith context.

**Foreign Language:** The city of San Francisco is home to many language groups. Students find they can openly practice their modern foreign language ability in many sectors of the city. Because many of them are involved in ‘helping fields’ through their IN, students often encounter how language knowledge (particularly of Spanish or Chinese) would be of great benefit in their work and witness.

**ACTIVE SOCIAL AND INTELLECTUAL ENGAGEMENT STANDARD**

**Interpersonal Competence:** Another area in which SF Urban excels, particularly in the IN context where students engage in dynamically changing workplaces, which often place them in contexts where their own values clarification must occur in the presence of a diverse population. A major advantage, as well, is that these IN opportunities are in a ‘world-class city’ atmosphere where the expectations are often higher for individual performance than those experienced to date by each student. US and RE field trips, guest speakers and literature allow for a similar engagement in a more academic sense. Topics also spur students to engage one another in ways where they learn to preserve community building in the midst of hard discussions. Finally, but also significant, student-initiated explorations in city life, as well as the intentional Cultural Walk, mandated church visits, service projects and neighborhood studies cause students to continuously exercise this skill.
Sympathy: Our students can look out their room windows and observe homelessness literally across the street. Many of their IN are in “helping fields” where three times a week they are actively engaged with challenged people. US topics provide deeper insights into the causes and needs within these issues. Our own CL standards promote ‘green’ options for use of food and other resources in the house. The very bus rides to their places of work and back provide a similar picture of life that otherwise would be invisible to many. Students learn to move beyond sympathy to activism in word and actions; allowing the Spirit of God to move within them and forever make this a competency in their life.

Responsibility: Students take the lead role in obtaining their IN postings, with no guarantees that the interviews they schedule will yield an offer. This provides them a ‘real-world’ experience that exercises many ‘new muscles’ for them. In addition students are provided with a high degree of trust in CL to initiate those experiences which will help build community through student-led worship, community dinners, and exploring the city. “Taking responsibility for your learning” is a term we often use to promote self-confidence and self-reliance in our students; skills that are vital for their success in this and future contexts.

Equipped for Lifelong Learning: Students are involved in a dynamic IN experience in which change is one of the only constants. They learn from supervisors that they need to be prepared to adapt, look ahead and be flexible in their vocational lives. This relates to a student’s experience in the US classroom as they seek to encounter issues for which there may not be ready answers. They learn quickly that their success in all of these environments is contingent on their readiness to continue learning in a wide variety of fields.

Christian Vocation: Exploring one’s vocational area, as a Christian, is a major endeavor here at SF Urban. In effect the classroom experiences continue their on-campus progress in getting to assess themselves and connecting with their faith personally. At SF Urban, they experience that selfhood in a vocational context, participating in their work with a missional understanding even as they do so in contexts where their values may not be the norm. IN, US and CL experiences promote the self-awareness and faith understanding necessary for life’s choices.

Effective Participants: Students have the exciting experience of being counted upon to contribute to the significant work being done in their workplace. They do not have the luxury of simply learning a craft theoretically, but they have the effective learning tool of trial and error in a supportive real-world environment in which they can readily measure the effectiveness of their participation. Many students choose to extend their IN and US into a CL experience which encourages activism and volunteerism into causes with which they have newly become acquainted.

WRITTEN AND ORAL COMMUNICATION STANDARD
Lower to Higher Order Thinking Skills: All classroom and IN experiences incorporate strong written and oral communication requirements including weekly journals, position papers, group presentations and research papers. The IN opportunity frequently encourages them to extend their reasoning and communication to various age/ppeer groups which also requires them to consider audience receptivity and ability.

Rhetorical Effectiveness: See above. In addition, because the courses often engage in areas which have no ready answers, but call for students to wrestle with topics, they have many opportunities to attempt expressing themselves even as they are formulating their own positions throughout the semester.

Creativity and Intellectual Virtues: Students are called upon to present their ideas in many forms, before some diverse audiences and often in a context where immediate critique is available. Each student participates in group presentations to their peers in the SF Urban Program and must also give an oral presentation before supervisors, peers and some professors in the IN workplace. They regularly find creative ways to communicate their ideas before these diverse groups (including use of power point, web design, video, and other forms of oral and creative communication).

Historical and Cultural Awareness: Students experience a thorough participatory overview of San Francisco during their first day Cultural Walk experience. The US course incorporates a neighborhood study and service project which focuses on knowledge of the history and culture of the subjects of their exploration. We encourage students to get to know ‘their city’ well; a city that boasts a broad range of cultures with a rich and colorful history.

Christian Faith Without Clichés: The post-Christian environment of San Francisco erodes most stereotypes from students and offers them a unique opportunity to thoroughly examine forms of communication that can be effective in this peculiar atmosphere where many ‘norms’ from their past are not generally accepted in the community.

Mature, Critical Assessment: Regular feedback is provided through interaction with peers, professors and supervisors. Students quickly realize in coursework and IN contexts that they need to be precise and sensitive as they speak and write about subjects which challenge many of the assumptions found in their previous community settings.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS

Discernment: As students become more culturally aware, and are exposed to a diversity of thoughts and perspectives; they become more discerning about readily accepting sources that fail to be sensitive toward these new communities and positions. They quickly learn that many resources, even those previously trusted without question, have inherent biases which must be considered.
Research and Documentation: Coursework and IN opportunities regularly cause students to not only seek precision in their work, but also to display appropriate research techniques in order to be persuasive in that communication. Many IN experiences call for this to be a major part of the success for the student’s work.

Organization and Communication: Several opportunities exist for each student to work through many/all of the available tools for communicating in group and individual presentations in US, EE, RE and IN contexts. On-site computers make these tools available if the student does not have personal access to their own devices brought with them.

Integrity: Students are aware of the expected standards of integrity for their work in the academic and IN contexts.

Ethical Issues: We discuss ethics as a major part of a holistic integration of our faith and lives. Our expectations are that our students are mature in their faith journey to understand the real consequences of taking such short-cuts.

Possibilities and Limitations: Technology is a useful tool at SF Urban but has never been emphasized as a major part of the program here. Students much more are engaged with people in their classes, CL and IN experiences. Few, if any, spend much time in the house and with technology (including the lack of having a TV here) that this has not appeared to be a problem. Many are far too busy exploring the city to overindulge in these areas.

II. DATA AND INTERPRETATION

II.1. AREAS TARGETED FOR ASSESSMENT BY SF URBAN STAFF

Prior to the Assessment process, SF Urban Staff had agreed to investigate two areas which appeared problematical for our future success. Neither of these come out of a perceived deficiency in the current state of Student Outcomes mentioned above, but each, in its own way could prevent the Outcomes specified from being available to the maximum number of students we desire. A brief description of these two areas and their present concerns follows:

1) Recruitment: SF Urban is one among the many choices a Westmont student can make for their off-campus experience(s). In addition, SF Urban accommodates students from Gordon, Wheaton, Houghton and Azusa Pacific (during my two plus years here). However, SF Urban continues to come short of a full house of 26 students in the Fall (the more popular semester) and has a lower number in the Spring Semester.

We desire to assess where our methods of recruitment can be more effective and how we can better communicate our message to prospective applicants and participant schools.
2) Perception of Liberalism: The SF Urban Program, located in the unique environment of San Francisco and dealing with many provocative issues regarding the urban scene has been historically criticized for either ‘being liberal’ or having a ‘liberal agenda’ from some critics, particularly on the Westmont campus. The staff desire to be sensitive and responsive to this perception, realizing, at the same time, that such judgments are relative in nature and often state more about the ‘critic’s’ starting point than serves as an effective measurement of the program’s quality.

We desire to assess how best to be self-aware of how we represent some of the uniqueness of our context as well as how we present the topics which are an integral part of our program. We desire to be academically effective in exposing students to alternative viewpoints while balancing that with a string commitment to follow the convictions of Christ and the essentials of traditional Christian faith.

Future Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

As a Staff we have determined that we wish to add three Outcomes for assessment beginning with the 2008-09 academic year. These areas are:

1. Christian Vocation
2. Cross Cultural Communication Skills
3. Sympathy

We believe these are areas in which SF Urban is strong, yet we want to be sure our perception is accurate and demonstrable. In the process of the assessment period forthcoming, our staff will look forward to interaction with the Assessment Committee to refine our efforts and to work on these additional areas.

ASSESSMENT METHODS

- 1. Recruitment: Last year in an effort to involve students in this process, we instituted Student Focus Groups. These groups were made up of an equal amount of present students who were invited to dinner with several of our staff members to discuss various aspects of the Program’s recruitment processes and what aspects of the program attracted them to participate. A survey of these issues was developed by the staff. A copy of this survey is attached to this report.

  o The raw data has been gathered together in hard copies and filed at the main office of SF Urban. A summary of the findings of the survey is developed by the Staff Assistant and presented to the staff at the earliest convenience.

  o External Voices for this area of interest are provided by Dr. William Wright in his periodic assessments as well as solicited in discussions with Westmont faculty and staff as well as other Urban Program staff from
sister-institutions. SF Urban has been the site of two Urban Directors’ conferences (2006 & 2008) where topics such as recruitment have been discussed.

- The staff regularly reviews these materials as they become available and attempts to incorporate aspects of the findings into future recruiting activities.

- **2. Liberalism:** We specifically adjusted the Final Retreat Evaluation form (we use an evaluation at Mid-Term as well), to question students’ perceptions of the topics we discussed and their view of how varying viewpoints were treated. At the same time we asked if students felt “heard”, particularly seeking to see if those who felt they were under-represented would indicate that their perception was aided by choices of topics, the time allotted for discussion of contrary viewpoints, choices of guest speakers, or other cause.

  - The raw data of these evaluations is collected and filed at the main office of SF Urban. A summary of findings is presented to the staff by the Staff Assistant.

  - External voices have been solicited from Dr. William Wright in his periodic evaluations, from among previous SF Urban Alumni, faculty (both from among those who have praised and criticized the Program in this area), and from discussions with other Urban Program Directors (see above).

  - The staff regularly reviews these materials/ discussions and attempts to incorporate aspects of the findings into future activities.

**II.2 Interpretation of the Results**

1) **Recruitment:** Students have provided many insights into the effectiveness of the recruitment process. Student perceptions are that the SF Urban Program is under-represented on the Westmont campus. They are generally favorable to new attempts at informing the campus about the program (A new E-Newsletter, an improved Website), but have also indicated that distance and absence of essential personnel often causes students to have a lack of awareness about the program vis-à-vis other more visible programs (because of faculty presence on campus who are involved and/or departmental requirements).

2) **Liberalism:** Our first survey specifically targeting this perception provided results that would not confirm this perception among students concluding their Spring 2008 Semester. On the contrary students indicated they were feeling ‘heard’ with few exceptions. Those who felt otherwise would target fellow students, not the faculty, as creating an un receptive atmosphere at times. There was the on-going perception that not ‘all views’ were equally represented during the discussion of every topic.
Our interpretation of this data focuses on the fact that we may have had a heightened sense of these issues, and that they would be surveyed, as we moved through the semester. If so, this bodes well for sensitivity on these issues in future semesters. We do, however, believe that there will not be an equal treatment of all views possible in the eyes of all students. Yet we will, as a staff, encourage one another on toward such a goal as much as is possible. For some students, we believe, the presentation of views to which they had not formerly been exposed, leaves a strong impression.

III. USING THE RESULTS AND NEXT STEPS

As we move forward, we will want to keep the following in mind:

1. Our assessment data needs more time to provide useable evidence for trends in these areas.
2. We will want to work toward expressing these assessment areas in terms of how they affect Student Learning Outcomes in the future.
3. We will begin to specifically assess three Student Learning Outcomes: Christian Vocation, Cross-Cultural Communication and Sympathy.
4. We will wish to incorporate SF Urban Alumni in many of these discussions to understand their ‘seasoned’ views, perhaps even to ascertain if immediate perceptions change over time, particularly as they relate to perceptions vis-à-vis the context of years spent on campus verses now graduated alumni who have the context of the ‘work-world’ experience (which may be similar to that experienced while at SF Urban).
5. We have been offered 12 hours of volunteer professional consulting from a marketing professional acquainted with our program. She will help us position ourselves according to the Student Learning Outcomes, market trends and our assessment results.

IV. DATA FOR PROGRAM REVIEW

Included in this report are copies of the (uncompleted) surveys mentioned above as well as faculty/staff data. As this is the first year we have little built up over any past years which would be relevant to include at this time.

V. TIME LINE

We have yet to develop this in detail. We have scheduled “Planning Days” on November 19 and January 9 to plan the next round of assessment on the issues we have targeted, as well as move toward aligning those efforts with the newly chosen Student Learning Outcomes, while continuing to track the two we have been assessing already.

VI. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS
• Student Learning Outcome Chart  
• Faculty Charts (3)  
• Time Line  
• Recruitment Assessment Tool (Questions for Student Focus Groups; blank)  
• Perception Assessment Tool (Summary of Spring 2008 Final Evaluation; completed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcomes/Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What does the Learning Goals mean?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where are the Learning Outcomes met?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to the learning standards</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- Where are the Learning Outcomes met?
  - I introduced D developed M mastered
  - List courses required in the major, i.e. **HIS 001**
  - **HIS 009**
  - ...
  - We do not have progressive contexts, all work is done in one semester here. We are targeting our Urban Studies class for this measurement.

---

**Assessment Methods:**
- Rubrics
- Portfolios
- Capstone
- Poster session
- External Jury
- Exit interviews
- Written Surveys
- Etc.

---

**Final Retreat Evaluations**
- Practicum Portfolio, Memos and Research Paper for Urban Studies, Final Retreat Evaluations
- Practicum Portfolio, Memos and Research Paper for Urban Studies, Final Retreat Evaluations, Supervisors’ Evaluations
- Practicum Portfolio, Memos and Research Paper for Urban Studies, Final Retreat Evaluations, Supervisors’ Evaluations
Faculty Information for Karen Andrews  

Year: 2007-08

Date of hire:  8/15/1997

Sex and Ethnicity:  Female/ White

Rank:  Assoc. Prof.

Tenure status:  Tenured

Teaching Load:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Number of Duos*</th>
<th>Other departmental responsibilities</th>
<th>New Preps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Staff Mtgs, Recruitment Trips,</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in several service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>projects, Cultural Walks and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Grammar &amp; Adv. Comp.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>evening guest speaker events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Grammar &amp; Adv. Comp.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Studies and Internships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average load 14.25

Mayterm 0

Research Update:  Sabbatical Application (2010), Paper Read, Christianity and Literature, 5/08

*Duos are the term we use for one-on-one meetings between the faculty/staff and students. Students pick which faculty/staff they wish to meet with and meetings occur normally every other week throughout the semester.
Faculty Information for Brad Berky  
Year: 2007-08

Date of hire: 1/5/1990
Sex and Ethnicity: Male/ White
Rank: Asst. Prof.
Tenure status: 3 Year Contract

Teaching Load:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Number of Duos</th>
<th>Other departmental responsibilities</th>
<th>New Preps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Urban Practicum</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Staff Mtgs, Recruitment Trips,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Urban Practicum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Participation in several service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>projects, Cultural Walks and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayterm</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evening guest speaker events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies and</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Update: Summer “Human Trafficking” Course research, Cambodia & Thailand.
Faculty Information for Scott McClelland  Year: 2007-08

Date of hire: 6/1/06
Sex and Ethnicity: White Male
Rank: Admin/ Faculty
Tenure status: None

Teaching Load:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Number of Duos</th>
<th>Other departmental responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>The Emergent Church (RS 117)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Primary Administrator; Recruiting on several campuses, Publicity, Facility Management, Staff Mtgs, Recruitment Trips, Participation in several service projects, Cultural Walks and evening guest speaker events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>The Emergent Church (RS 117)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Average load | 3.5 | N/A
| Mayterm|                                 |                   |               |                                                                                                                                                           |
| Independent Studies and Internships | 1         |                   |               |                                                                                                                                                           |

Research Update: Revision of commentary on *Galatians* for *The Evangelical Commentary on the Bible* (Baker, Gary Burge, ed.; publication date, late ’08/ early ’09); Review of book in *Review of Biblical Literature* (Oct., 2008); Guest Speaker: *Paul in Ecumenical Perspective*, two sessions at St. Patrick’s Seminary, Menlo Park, CA; Adjunct Professor of New Testament, Fuller Theological Seminary (Northern California and Coastal California); Co-Pastor, Miraloma Community Church, San Francisco.
## MULTI-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN

### SF Urban

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Means of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recruitment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Group Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perception of Liberalism</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Retreat Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Christian Vocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum Portfolio, Supervisor Evaluations, Student Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cross Cultural Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Studies Memos, Class Writing Assignments, Supervisor Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sympathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Duo Evaluations, Student Writing Assignments, Retreat Evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.  
7.  
8.  
9.  
10. 
11. 
12. 

**Comments/Reflection:** It is our intention to continue measurement of the areas we in process of assessing; We also have decided to begin measuring the three additional Outcomes listed above. We believe SF Urban excels in these areas and wish to see if our impressions are demonstrable.

(From BYU Hawaii)