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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Case Study Prospectus: Fall, 1972

"The great thing in the world is not so much where we stand as in what direction we are moving."
Oliver Wendell Holmes

Inter-institutional cooperation has become a way of life in American higher education, with varying degrees of reciprocity taking many forms. The University of San Diego is an institution which has experienced many of these forms over a six-year period, and has opted for corporate merger between the two cooperating institutions.

Six years ago, the campus at Alcala Park in the heart of metropolitan San Diego contained the San Diego College for Women, founded and sponsored by the Society of the Sacred Heart; and the University of San Diego College for Men and School of Law, founded and sponsored by the Roman Catholic diocese of San Diego. The only point of contact between the two separate institutions was a fairly well established social and co-curricular program. Today on the Alcala Park campus there is a single, coeducational, independent University, Catholic in the post-Vatican II sense, composed of a College of Arts and Sciences and three professional schools -- Law, Business Administration, and Education.

The case study centers on the intervening six years, and the significance of those years for the present and future of the University of San Diego, thus illustrating an important trend in American higher education. Five focal issues have been identified as fundamental aspects of the merger process and
its aftermath, issues which highlight the past and current struggle of the University of San Diego in the dynamic process of creating its own future.

Focal Issues:

1. Search for identity: accommodation of divergent goals and identities of the College for Women, College for Men, and School of Law through creation of University of San Diego goals and objectives.

2. Anatomy of an organizational process: a "grass-roots" approach to merger, beginning with students, continuing through curriculum and faculty, then administration, and finally Trustees.

3. Anatomy of an educational process: effect of cooperation and merger on educational quality and academic programs.


5. Religious roles and relationships:
   - forging new relationships of a diocese and a religious order to the merged, independent institution;
   - role of priests and religious on campus: presence, not control.

B. Nature of the Case Study Report

The Case Study Report which follows in this volume is the product of a campus-wide endeavor. No special committees were established for its composition and editing. No special studies were initiated in order to be reproduced herein.

Rather, the Report is an articulation and analysis of a campus-wide
undertaking which has involved all components of the institution during the past six years. There were only two loosely suggested "guiding principles" for the presentation of the Report — namely, that those actually involved in the merger process should formulate the various sections in order to keep the final Report as close to the original sources as possible, and secondly, that honesty and candor should prevail in a frank presentation of shortcomings as well as successes, of psychological factors as well as more factual elements. The Report, then, is a product written by and with input from well over a hundred people on the USD campus.

In its various segments, the Report attempts to articulate and analyze some significant issues: How did it happen? Why? What fostered or delayed the process? What was the end product? Was it worth it? What is the direction now? In the Case Study Prospectus above, five focal issues have been identified. Supplementing the Report will be a brief page on each issue, keying various parts of the Report to the issue in question, and probing it further by suggestive queries. The Report itself is keyed to additional material in folders available on campus, for the convenience of those who may wish additional information. (Example: see Folder A-4.)

C. Accreditation History: WASC and State Board of Education

Two of the previously separate institutions now forming the University of San Diego, the College for Men and the College for Women, have been accredited by the Western Association in the past. The third prior component, the School of Law, has been separately accredited by professional groups, the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools. It currently holds both these accreditations.

The San Diego College for Women began classes in 1952. It received its first accreditation evaluation from the Western College Association in the
spring of 1956, requesting at the same time approval by the California State Board of Education for its elementary credential program. Both the College itself and the elementary credential program were given an initial accreditation of three years. At the second joint WASC-State Board visitation in 1959, both groups granted the maximum five-year period of re-accreditation. In the fall of 1961, a visiting team from the State Board of Education came to evaluate the secondary credential program, which was subsequently approved. The 1964 visitation by WASC resulted in reaffirmation of accreditation for another five years. In 1969, WASC gave the San Diego College for Women the option of seeking reaffirmation of accreditation without a formal visit, an option which was accepted by the faculty. The 1969 Report to WASC, forwarded to Referee Dr. William B. Langsdorf, resulted in another five-year reaffirmation of accreditation, until June, 1974. Because of the exigencies of the Fisher Bill, the State Board of Education did not visit the College in 1964, but approved its elementary and secondary credential programs on the basis of written reports, a procedure which was repeated in 1967. In March, 1969, a visiting team from the State Board approved for five years the Standard Teaching Credential with elementary and secondary specialization, and granted a three-year initial accreditation for the programs of preparation for school librarianship and for teachers of the mentally retarded. In the spring of 1972, at the end of the three-year period, the State Board re-approved the two last-named programs.

The University of San Diego College for Men began classes in 1954. It received its first accreditation evaluation from the Western College Association in January of 1959, and was given an initial accreditation of two years. In January of 1961, an evaluation team again visited the campus, and the College for Men was approved by WASC for another two-year period. In December of 1962, and December of 1966, WASC teams visited the campus, and reaffirmation of accreditation was granted, each time for four years, the most recent
accreditation until June, 1971. Because of the rapidly increasing inter-
institutional cooperation between the College for Men and the College for 
Women, it seemed that a visit from WASC to the College for Men would be 
premature, especially since the College for Women accreditation did not expire 
until 1974. Hence, in 1970, and again in 1971, a delay in visiting the College 
for Men was sought and granted, until such time as the two institutions were 
merged and could be visited together, in 1973. In December of 1968, the 
College for Men submitted its first request to the State Board of Education for 
approval of its program for the Standard Teaching Credential with specializa-
tion in secondary teaching. This approval was granted early in 1969 for an 
initial period of two years.

In the spring of 1972, during a preliminary visit, the Senior Commission 
of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, through its representative, 
invited the University of San Diego to consider the option of engaging in a case 
study for its first "joint" reaffirmation of accreditation. In accepting this 
invitation, the University of San Diego becomes the subject of the first case 
study in the region served by the Senior Commission of the Western Association 
of Schools and Colleges.
CHAPTER II
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW 1967–1972

In the fall of 1972, a paper entitled "Towards Merger at USD" was updated to include the finalizing of merger at the University of San Diego and the first official actions of the "new" institution. The paper, prepared for internal purposes, summarizes in chronological form the relationships of the institutions at Alcala Park. Since it enumerates in considerable detail the step-by-step progress of cooperative endeavors, "Towards Merger at USD" is included in this Report as Appendix I, page i. The brief historical report which forms Chapter II of the Case Study will simply give an overview, highlighting the chief issues and the mode of progression towards merger. The reader may consult the chapters which follow and Appendix I for a more detailed analysis.

The San Diego College for Women and the University of San Diego College for Men enjoyed a long history of cooperation in student life areas since the College for Men joined the two-year old College for Women on the Alcala Park campus in 1954. Social affairs, freshman orientation, sports events, and other student activities were shared by both institutions. Prior to the first tentative steps towards curricular cooperation early in 1967, the College for Men had several times sought some measure of reciprocity on the curricular level, initiatives to which the College for Women was unable to respond because its sponsoring body, the Society of the Sacred Heart, was authorized, at the level of higher education, to teach only women. Then came
Vatican II. The Vatican Council's "Declaration on Christian Education" speaks of the spirit of cooperation at diocesan, national, and international levels, asking that "every effort should be made to see that suitable coordination is fostered between various Catholic schools, and that between these schools and others that kind of collaboration develops which the well-being of the whole human family demands." The Declaration further urges that "in every college and university, the various faculties should be at the service of one another to the degree that their purposes allow," and should "unite in a mutual sharing of effort."

It was in February of 1967 that the authorization sought for under the above Declaration was granted, and discussions about curricular coordination were begun. Within less than two months, Sister Nancy Morris and Father John E. Baer, Presidents of the College for Women and College for Men respectively, signed the Reciprocal Agreement (see Folder A-1) which moved the San Diego College for Women and the University of San Diego onto the path towards their mutual future.

The academic year 1967-1968 brought a modest beginning of cross-registration, mostly in upper division courses, by about 150-200 students. Not having available for its use any clear or generally approved plan for combining two colleges, the University of San Diego was forced to devise its own plan as it went along. And since the most compelling reason for unification was the potential improvement and enrichment of the academic program for students of both the colleges, the first efforts were directed at bringing together the curricula of the schools. Thus, during the inaugural year of reciprocal courses, several departments (psychology, biology, mathematics, and all the modern languages) developed joint programs applicable to students of both colleges and taught by both faculties in coordination. Other academic departments adapted their upper division programs to accommodate students of both
institutions. The success of these faculty efforts was attested to by the dramatic increase in cross-registration in the year 1968-1969, when over 500 students in the Colleges for Men and Women were taking coeducational classes. Everyone on campus began to realize that even the terms "College for Men" and "College for Women" were becoming misnomers. It is significant that the augmentation of curricular coordination was largely the result of grass-roots discussions and agreements at the departmental level by faculty members of the two undergraduate institutions. Because of the usual complement of "academic politics," negotiations between departments were frequently anything but bloodless; however, good sense usually prevailed, and faculty members generally recognized, in spite of their understandable "vested interests," that their departments would be immeasurably strengthened by the availability of additional courses taught by competent scholars.

Simultaneously with development of curricular coordination, the two components of the future University of San Diego were working together on other levels. In early September, 1967, shortly after the students enrolled in their first reciprocal courses, the executive heads of the four schools on campus* (Sister Nancy Morris, President of the College for Women; Father John E. Baer, President of the College for Men; Dean Joseph A. Sinclitico, Dean of the School of Law; and Reverend John R. Quinn, Rector of the School of Theology) met and agreed to form a loosely organized group called the Executive Committee, to foster communication on campus and to facilitate the formation of policies involving the entire University community. In the spring

*Note: There were two non-profit, officially chartered educational corporations on the Alcala Park campus: the San Diego College for Women (also known as the University of San Diego College for Women); and the University of San Diego, which included the College for Men and the School of Law; the University of San Diego corporation also included the School of Theology until its transfer in the summer of 1968 to Menlo Park.
of 1968, Bishop Quinn was appointed first USD Provost, and an "Executive Committee Working Agreement" (see Folder A-2) was approved by the College for Women Board of Trustees and by Bishop Francis J. Furey for the USD corporation. Except for curricular coordination between the Colleges for Men and Women, which was carried on virtually independently of the Executive Committee, the increasing cooperation on the campus was developed in large part by the Executive Committee, which met weekly or bi-weekly, according to need and opportunity, including in its meetings the Academic Deans and Treasurers of the College for Men and College for Women and a second representative from the School of Law.

In the new phase of development on the Alcala Park campus, the components of the University sought professional advice in evaluating their progress and in planning for the future. In January, 1968, the Executive Committee commissioned the John Price Jones Company of New York to study the development potential of the University of San Diego. (See Folder A-3.) While guardedly optimistic about the future and potential of the University of San Diego, the John Price Jones report emphasized the urgent need for the creation of a real University structure, common University services, and extensive and close cooperation between the undergraduate schools. Also during January, 1968, the two Presidents, Academic Deans, and Business Officers journeyed to the Claremont Colleges "cluster" to seek information on that highly successful experiment in higher education. The following November, College for Men and College for Women administrators visited Los Angeles to consult the Presidents of Loyola-Marymount concerning their rapidly-developing cooperative endeavor. (See Folder A-4 for reports of the two visits.) Since the John Price Jones Report stressed chiefly the public relations and fund-raising aspect of University development, the Executive Committee thought it wise to avail itself of the educational consultant service offered by the
Association of American Colleges to its member institutions. Accordingly, Father James J. McGinley, S. J., one of the AAC's three consultants, spent a week on campus analyzing the academic possibilities, administrative practices, and financial procedures of the two colleges. In his penetrating report (see Folder A-5), Father McGinley urged: "Recognize the need each institution has for the other, ... and the reason for locking arms to give Southern California's most rapidly growing area a source of private, Church-related, quality, undergraduate education." He concluded that the eventual form of unification would have to be forged right here at USD, for the improvement of its educational service to its constituents.

By the time of the AAC consultant's visit, the institutions on the Alcala Park campus had already joined forces for the first all-USD Commencement in June of 1968, produced the first USD Master Time Schedule, expanded their Boards of Trustees to include lay members, appointed the first USD Director of Development and a USD press relations officer, joined food service activities into a single University-wide endeavor, and combined bookstore and security operations.

Two additional phases in the development of all-University cooperation were the preparation of a "Critical Path Measurement chart" by the Management Consultant Service of Price Waterhouse & Co., and the survey by Cresap, McCormick, and Paget of the College for Women as a part of the national analysis of all schools and colleges of the Society of the Sacred Heart in North America.

In developing its CPM chart, completed in December, 1968, Price Waterhouse attempted to identify all the significant types of information that should be gathered and analyzed before a decision was reached as to the eventual structure of the University. (See Folder A-6.) Faculty workshops and committees functioned over the next few months to outline proposed organiza-
tional structures for the future University (see Folder A-7), and also began the task of studying and combining the General Education requirements for all students.

It was at this point, in March of 1969, when consultants and committees were proposing and recommending, that the students of the University of San Diego took the first definitive step towards a permanent combination of the institutions at Alcala Park by voting to unify the student government associations, a step eventually approved by the Boards of Trustees.

By the beginning of the academic year 1969, the University of San Diego had appointed a University-wide business officer, merged the admissions, financial aid, and registrar's offices, created two all-University departments (religious studies and education), established six joint departments with a single chairman, developed joint curricula in almost all other departments, and unified its graduate division under a single chairman. The direction was clear: there was, by vote of the students the previous spring, a single student body association; the two faculties, in spite of some serious divergences, were rapidly moving towards becoming a single faculty; administrative service areas were largely combined. There remained two distinct administrative structures and two Boards of Trustees. The Cresap, McCormick, Paget study (see Folder A-8) included among its recommendations the suggestion that the participation of the School of Law in the merger process should be discontinued until the two major cooperating institutions, the Colleges for Men and Women, had furthered their work.

It seemed best to the Boards of Trustees at this point to dissolve the Executive Committee and the position of Provost, to accept the recommendation of the two Academic Deans that a single Academic Dean be appointed when feasible, and to undertake a search for a single President of the University of San Diego. At their first joint meeting in January of 1970, the two Boards of
Trustees, with Mr. Gilbert Fox as College for Women elected chairman and Bishop Leo T. Maher as USD chairman, formed a committee to work on the drafting of a legal contract for merger.

The unification function of the Executive Committee was taken over by an informal group known (unofficially and to themselves only) as the "Little Four," composed of the two Presidents and the two Academic Deans, Sister Morris, Monsignor Baer, Sister Sally Furay, and Dr. Henry J. Martin. Their role was to harmonize the administrative workings of an increasingly unified campus in which most of the combined elements still reported to two administrative structures, a sort of "two cooks, one broth" operation. The "Little Four" also had the thankless task of addressing themselves to those segments of the campus wherein grass-roots discussion had proven less than fruitful, and an impasse had developed. Only an extraordinary unity and sensitivity to the problems of the "other side" enabled the "Little Four" to find ways of resolving the deadlocks -- solutions which were acceptable to the parties involved and would not impede the future. For it was not sufficient to solve the problem; it had to be solved in such a way that those who had to work together in the combined operation would find themselves able to do so.

By the fall of 1970, all academic departments except two were combined under one chairman; the joint faculties had begun to meet regularly as a single faculty, most faculty committees, including the important Curriculum Committee, had been consolidated; work was well under way on the draft proposal for the new Faculty Senate; and the Search Committee for a President of the combined University of San Diego was sending announcements around the nation. It was USD's last year as one body with two administrative heads. Since most of the major problems of combined operation at the faculty level had been solved, the faculty set itself to align divergent academic policies of the College for Men and College for Women. Much of the "action" was now
taking place at the Board of Trustees' level, where disagreements still existed. For several years the College for Women Board of Trustees had asked the other Board for a precise delineation of the financial status of the University of San Diego; for several years the College for Men Board of Trustees had asked the College for Women Board to lay down precise conditions under which it would agree to merge. Delays in the responses to these mutual requests retarded the progress of corporate merger. However, the two Boards of Trustees accepted a unified administrative structure, effective in July of 1971. They also held a joint meeting in April, 1971, for the presentation of the 10-Year Master Plan for the University of San Diego, by Ewing Miller Associates (see Folder A-9). And finally, in May of 1971, the two Boards of Trustees appointed Dr. Author E. Hughes as first lay President of the University of San Diego. Dr. Hughes took office in August, 1971.

Dr. Hughes' first year as USD President was largely concerned with unification of the two Boards of Trustees and final corporate merger; the establishment of a Long-Range Planning Committee for the University; the articulation of the future thrust and direction of the to-be-merged institution; laying the groundwork for a broadly-based fund-raising operation, with the help of Community Counseling Service (see Folder A-10); and the reorganization of the University of San Diego's organizational structure into a College of Arts and Sciences and three professional schools (Law, Education, Business Administration). The Faculty Senate constitution was accepted by the two Boards of Trustees (see Appendix II, page vii, for Faculty Senate Constitution. See Folder A-11 for Faculty Senate By-Laws), creating a single faculty in fact as well as in operation, although the School of Law faculty chose not to be a part of the Faculty Senate. A single administrative structure for the College for Men and College for Women libraries had been established the previous spring and was implemented in the fall of 1971.
In May, 1972, the two Boards of Trustees, having ironed out their differences, voted formally to accept the Merger Agreement (including amendments to the USD corporate charter) and By-Laws. Chapter VII of this Report incorporates the Merger Agreement, while the newly adopted By-Laws are included as Appendix III, page xiii. With the filing of the Merger Agreement and new By-Laws in Sacramento on July 14, 1972, the University of San Diego took an irrevocable step on the path it had entered over five years earlier with the signing of the Reciprocal Agreement in April, 1967.

It is perhaps significant to summarize the University of San Diego experiment as a steady progression towards a new beginning, with this progression clearly operating from the grass-roots up. The impetus was given by the administration and the faculty in the years from 1967 through early 1969. By the fall of 1969, it was the students who had taken the definitive step and combined that part of the operation which was theirs to control. The fall of 1970 saw the faculty virtually united in a single academic operation. By mid-summer of 1971, there was a single administrative structure and the University of San Diego operated as one institution despite having two Boards of Trustees. The governing Boards had only to make it official in mid-1972. They had elected new Trustees and set the stage for the future thrust of a new institution. Perhaps USD's most appropriate symbol is the phoenix, consuming itself by fire, and rising young and beautiful from its own ashes.
NATURE OF THE INSTITUTION

Although at the present writing the new University of San Diego could be termed an infant institution, not yet six months old, it is nonetheless, like every nation and people in some sense the product of its past. It is an amalgam of a diocesan college, a women's college which formed part of a worldwide network of schools and colleges, and a professional school. The diocesan college, after a halting and uneasy start, had begun to build academic strengths while retaining its emphasis on the education of the whole man. The women's college shared with the men's college its emphasis on the creation of an atmosphere for independent thought, sound judgments, and the acceptance of the values of freedom and responsibility; these aims were deepened by those which the College for Women shared with its sister colleges of the Society of the Sacred Heart — their strong family spirit and sense of participating personally in a valued, century-old tradition. The professional school concentrated largely on providing men and women with a sound legal education.

When these three components amalgamated into a single entity, they retained certain elements from their pasts but acquired a new identity. It is important to describe the new University of San Diego as it sees itself in the first year after the merger, 1972-1973, prior to a more detailed description of the process by which the new institution was created. Such a description is important because the significant question is not "What was the process?", but rather "To what did the process lead?" Only in the light of what the University
of San Diego is now, and how it sees itself, is there any meaning in a review of how it got there.

A. Its Overall Goals and Objectives

When President Hughes set up the Long-Range Planning Committee for the University of San Diego in the fall of 1971, shortly after his arrival as chief executive officer, he asked the Committee to address itself to the task of articulating goals and objectives for the to-be-merged University. For several months, the Committee, made up of faculty, students, and administration, discussed essential components of the new USD. In April, 1972, the Long-Range Planning Committee asked one of its members, Reverend William L. Shipley, Chairman of the Department of Philosophy, to formulate the Goals of the University of San Diego for presentation to the Long-Range Planning Committee and the University community. In November, 1972, Father Shipley completed the articulation of the Goals below. They are currently being discussed by student, faculty, and administrative groups. The rather extensive notes to the Goals are reproduced as Appendix IV, page xxi, at the end of this Report.

THE GOALS OF USD

USD is a university that is searching —
for its identity
for its future
for the goals that link the two.

It knows its past origins. But it must re-evaluate them in its search for identity.
It knows its present. But it must probe the implications for the future.
It does not know its future.
Its search is oriented toward what may be meaningful and valuable for that future —

toward goals by which its identity may live and grow in that future,
toward educational goals by which its students may be helped to live in that future and to grow as persons.
Identity.

Past origins.

As with humans, so with human communities, consciousness of identity depends upon memories of past experiences.

Its Judeo-Christian cultural origins identify USD as oriented toward a search for human meanings and values toward a distinctive view of man, an evolving view toward the future.

(Consult outlines of Judaic origins and of Christian origins.)

Present traits.

USD is: a new, independent, Catholic university, conscious of its origins with person-centered characteristics:
- small
- student-oriented
- enjoying an advantageous faculty/student ratio
- undergraduate in emphasis

seeking creative change, while retaining its identity.

Goals for the future.

General goals.

As a university: USD shares the objectives of contemporary universities in the pursuit of academic excellence.

While retaining a program of personal development through general liberal education, it will continue to strengthen its professionalism within the specialized arts and sciences, and in its schools of law, business, and education.

Distinctive characteristic: Interdisciplinary programs for culturalization, specialization, and professionalization.

(Consult outline of interdisciplinary programs.)

As Catholic: USD strives to be a Catholic university which is catholic in the ecumenical sense, as well as in the holistic sense, with cross-fertilization of its religious studies and other academic disciplines.

As independent and changing: USD intends to take advantage of its flexibility for creative educational experimentation (such as interdisciplinary innovations).

Distinctive goal.

The goal of USD is leadership in a search for human meanings and values.

Every university stands for leadership of some type — scientific and technolog-
ical, or professional, or artistic. USD concurs in these. What then is distinctive of USD? It stands for leadership in a search which is value-oriented because it is person-oriented. Leadership toward values which are simultaneously humane and Judeo-Christian. Leadership toward a view of the person which includes but transcends the bio-mechanical and the secular-humanist models of man. Toward Christian personalism.

The leadership envisioned is personal and cooperative, liberating and creative. The search, a joint venture of faculty and students, a personal inquiry yet a project of the academic community. A search suited to the origins and the present characteristics of USD. But a search for human meanings and values which can be projected into the unknown future -- for the benefit of the students and of the larger communities of which USD is a part.

Applications to the triad of university functions.

Education: Leadership in the search of the students for personal meanings and values --

- for maturity of self-understanding and self-determination
- for social identity and responsibility
- for the life-sharing experiences of community
- for creativity and leadership
- for goals worth the expenditure of one's life.

(Consult "Advantages of a Value-centered Education," Appendix IV, p. xxix.)

Research: Leadership in an interdisciplinary, cross-cultural, never-ending search for human meanings and values which are significant for man's present life, while open to the future.

Community service: Cultural leadership in the search for a society which is person-centered in its values.

As an institution: Some academic assistance in responding to the principal questions facing our society now and in the foreseeable future -- human questions of rights, of priorities -- which are applicable to person-centered societal problems.

Through its graduates: Individual leadership within the sciences and technology, the professions and the arts, in seeking the broader human implications of their specialized achievements.

With this in mind, USD hopes its graduates will be person-oriented scientists and businessmen, humane professionals.

Specific educational objectives.

The goal of humanizing leadership in a search for values will involve growth in:

- competence: As a person, as a professional, and as a leader.
- commitment: To other persons as most meaningful and valuable.
- communication: Effectively interpersonal and mutually creative -- as a requisite for shared meanings and values, as well as for leadership.
USD views itself, then, as a very human university-community. It is searching for its identity and for its future because man is constantly searching for his identity and for his future.

The search will be founded on hope in man — because it is founded on hope in God.

B. Its Educational Tasks

As its fundamental mission the University of San Diego purports in its undergraduate bulletin to "educate students in their pursuit of knowledge and understanding." In its recent self-evaluation and long-range planning efforts, the general education goals of the University were identified and distinguished from those aims which pertain to the professional or pre-professional education of the students. Although these aims are treated as discrete goals, it is generally agreed that they are not mutually exclusive and areas of overlap do occur.

At the University of San Diego, the general education of each student is intended to provide the environment for maximum intellectual, spiritual, physical, and social development of the individual student. Although there is general agreement as to the academic disciplines which contribute to the students' general education, there is latitude in tailoring each student's program to meet his specific needs. Not only should the student gain an appreciation for the various individual disciplines, he should begin to comprehend the complexities of their inter-relationships.

Paralleling the general educational growth of the student is his preparation for vocational and professional competence. At the University of San Diego, particular emphasis is given to professional development in the areas of law, education, and business. In all three schools faculties have indicated that education in each of the professional areas should provide more than entry-level technical competency. It is intended that the student will have
adequate foundation for eventually providing leadership in his professional area.

A combination of a solidly-based general education program combined with a professional-vocational curriculum in the student's major area of concern should develop the awareness within each student of a need for evolving a personal philosophy upon which his future decisions will be based. It is our purpose to provide an environment where this philosophy can grow in depth and scope and where each student can begin to understand himself, his relationships with his fellow man, and his relationship to God.

C. Its Organizational Structure

On the following page the organization of the University of San Diego is depicted in chart form. The organization depicts the following:

A. Board of Trustees (legal governing body).
B. President (chief executive officer).
C. Division of Functions of the University into:
   1. Business - Physical Plant
   2. Faculty - Students - Curriculum
   3. University Relations

The chart represents the first organizational form following the merger of the San Diego College for Women and the University of San Diego. Moreover, the organization form is a traditional scalar hierarchy where authority vested in the Board of Trustees is delegated to the President who, in turn, delegates to the administrative staff of the University.

Not depicted on the chart of the University are two important participative units. The Faculty Senate, a committee of the whole, excluding the Law School, deals with areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility, namely curriculum, academic regulations, and faculty status. A second
committee, the University Cabinet is concerned with University-wide administrative matters, primarily policy-level in nature.

D. Community Relationships

During the past several months, since its merger with the San Diego College for Women, the University of San Diego has been attempting to broaden and intensify its relationship to the San Diego and Southern California communities. Prior to the current period in the University's evolution it had maintained a "low profile" within the immediate community. The University and the San Diego College for Women were visible physically; outside of the Catholic community they were not widely known.

Concurrent with the process of merging the two separate institutions an attempt has been made to inform the public about the University and to broaden the appeal of the University to a wider cross-section of the college-age student population. This attempt has been made through emphasizing the recruiting-admissions efforts and through an expanded publicity-public relations program.

The effort to change from a less visible "low-profile" institution to one of "high profile" is regarded as essential if the alternative in higher education which the University of San Diego represents is to be made known. Additionally, a wider source of students, a broader cross-section of University personnel, and greater access to funding sources are regarded as essential to the University's growth — perhaps even to its survival.

Within the higher education community the University attempts to offer each student a clear-cut educational alternative to those programs offered by other colleges and universities in the Southern California area. The University of San Diego alternative is a quality, liberal-arts-oriented undergraduate program which includes value concepts which are both taught and lived within the University's community. Religious studies courses are selected by the students.
according to their own religious interests. Faculty and service-oriented staff personnel are urged to provide maximum individual service to every student, and the teaching component of the professional role is regarded as a primary function. Attention to the intellectual, psychological, spiritual, and emotional elements of the student's life as well as the interrelationships among these constitute an educational approach which is intended to be a definite alternative within the higher education community.

With the joining of the University of San Diego and the San Diego College for Women, and with the increased involvement of Catholic and non-Catholic laity in the University, the roles of the Diocese of San Diego and the Society of the Sacred Heart have also changed. Most fundamentally, control passed from the Diocese and the Society to the new independent University. Secondly, the financial support of the Diocese of San Diego was terminated. However, both the Diocese and the Society of the Sacred Heart continue the contributed services of the nuns and priests. Third, the laity became significantly more involved — in the Board of Trustees, the administration, and the faculty and staff. The student body continues to be diversified in terms of its religious background.

Although the roles of the Diocese of San Diego and the Society of the Sacred Heart have been altered, it is important to note that there are still a significant number of nuns and priests on the University faculty and staff. In fact, the merger document specifies that a nun and a priest, when qualified individuals are available, shall occupy top-level administrative posts. Of equal importance is the continuing presence of the religious on the campus of this institution where a demonstrated Christian life-style and an environment of human concern is an integral part of the University's objectives.

Though it is now independent of diocesan control, the University of San Diego confidently calls itself a Catholic institution. It therefore retains a
relationship with the universal Catholic Church other than through the presence of priests, nuns, and Catholic laity among its personnel. In the post-Vatican II Catholic Church, it has been said that "the objective of the Catholic university, precisely as Catholic is to assure in an institutional manner a Christian presence in the university world in the face of the great problems of contemporary society." (Grottaferrata document, 1969.) As a part of its continued search for its own identity and its own future, the University of San Diego attempts to fulfill this objective of promotion of dialogue between the Catholic Church and the contemporary world.
CHAPTER IV

COMPONENTS OF THE INSTITUTION: INSTRUCTIONAL

A. College of Arts and Sciences

1. Its Objectives Within the Institutional goals.

The College of Arts and Sciences is a liberal arts college that is both historically and educationally the central core of the University of San Diego. It seeks to further the goals of the University by stimulating its students to search for human meanings and values in an academically sound manner, that is, by constantly questioning, analyzing, testing, and justifying their basic assumptions or postulates. This search, basic to man's desire for identity not only in today's society but in that of the future, is not limited to the classroom but is conducted as a constant interaction between students, faculty, and administrators. Admittedly, the goals are not always reached and, recently, students have become concerned about the gap between the College's announced goals and its record of performance. Aided by presidential leadership, meetings between faculty, students and administrators, some serious self-evaluation, and student assistance, the College is trying to bridge some of the gaps by identifying classroom experiences which are hindering the search and then finding ways to correct the problems.

To help in the search for human meanings and values, the University recommends, at the lower division level, specific core courses so that each student may achieve some degree of competence in:

(a) Literature, either in English or in another language, because it is one of the major forms of aesthetic expression, and plays a central role in the develop-
ment of culture;
(b) Historical studies, either in history or historically oriented courses in art, music, philosophy, religion, and theatre, because they provide a perspective on the development of human society and culture and detach us from the parochialism of the present;
(c) Integrating sciences of philosophy and religious studies, because they examine the nature and significance of the life of man, and his relationship with himself, his fellow men, and his God;
(d) Social science, because it offers a systematic and critical inquiry into human nature, social institutions, and man's relations with his fellows;
(e) Natural science, because of its methods, its contributions to our understanding of the world around us, and its significance in modern culture;
(f) Mathematics and analytic philosophy, because they foster an understanding of the nature and uses of formal, rational thought;
(g) The arts, because they constitute some of the media through which man has sought, through the ages, to express his deepest feelings and values; and
(h) A foreign language, because it can emancipate from the limits of one's own tongue, provide access to another culture, and make possible communication outside an individual's society.

The significance of the traditional disciplines is affirmed by major programs in the social and behavioral sciences (history, political science, psychology, sociology), the humanities and fine arts (art, English, music), the integrating sciences (religious studies and philosophy), the languages (French and Spanish), and the physical sciences (biology, chemistry, physics, and mathematics). In addition, the College has developed interdisciplinary programs to assist students in studying current major problems through the contributions and research of several pertinent traditional disciplines. Present major interdisciplinary programs are limited to American Studies and Mexican Studies.
though some departments are conducting classes such as Philosophy/Mathematics 181, Symbolic Logic, taught by both the Philosophy and Mathematics Departments and which may be taken for either mathematics or philosophy credit. Interdisciplinary study programs with team-taught courses will constitute a major thrust of the University in the future.

2. Analysis of Prior and Current Organization

(a) Nature of each former separate institution (College for Men and College for Women).

In 1967, with the introduction of several changes in the administrative organization of the College for Women, Sister Sally Furay became the Academic Dean, a position she held until the beginning of the 1971-1972 academic year. Her area of responsibility included the faculty, department chairmen, registrar, Director of Admissions and Financial Aid, Director of the Summer Session, and the Chairman of the Graduate Division. In addition, she was a member of the College's Administrative Council, the top policy-making body within the college. (See Folder B-1.)

At the College for Men, Dr. Steven Schanes became the Dean in 1967 and he was replaced the following year by Dr. Henry J. Martin, who held the position until the 1971-1972 academic year. His area of responsibility included the faculty, department chairmen, division chairmen, Director of Summer Sessions, Dean of Admissions and Records, and the Director of the Educational Development Center. (See Folder B-2.)

The Presidents and Academic Deans of the two colleges shared the conviction that, though it was legally possible to impose unification on the various units of the institutions, it would be psychologically unwise, and counter-productive, to attempt this. It was felt that the resulting merged institution would be sounder and happier if both parties arrived at mutually acceptable
resolutions of their differences.

In pursuit of this end, the generous cooperation of the two Academic Deans was of major significance. Approaching each other with an initial mixture of caution and suspicion, these two administrators soon developed an attitude of trust and respect that was both professional and personal. There were many occasions when sharp institutional differences threatened the success of their efforts to smooth out the path toward unification. In facing these difficult situations the two Deans took the position that in the area of academic regulations there was, generally, no single correct policy which must be regarded as sacred and inviolable, and that the best policy for the soon-to-be-unified University might be one which differed from the old policy of either the College for Women or the College for Men.

Though each college was autonomous, the Academic Deans began, in 1967, to work closely together in order to integrate as far as possible the functions of the two separate colleges. This cooperation began with a program of reciprocal courses and soon included the establishment of a single Master Time Schedule to replace the separate ones (thus aiding the cross-registration of students). Consultations were instituted to avoid duplications in hiring of new members of the faculty. For those disciplines that were exclusive to one college or that were more developed in one college, it was relatively easy to form a single department with a single chairman. For other disciplines the task was much more difficult, but by the beginning of the 1971-1972 academic year, all departmental administrations had been combined with the sole exception of Biology which maintained two chairmen until October, 1971 when the two departments were combined under one chairman.

A new administrative structural change in the 1971-1972 academic year resulted in the establishment of the offices of Vice President, Academic Affairs, held by Dr. Henry J. Martin, and that of Vice President, Curricular
Development and Student Affairs, held by Sister Sally Furay. Their responsibilities were University-wide and, for the first time, the two coordinate colleges were administratively combined, though still financially separate.

(b) The cooperative thrust — origins and development.

Academic cooperation between the two separate schools began with discussions in March, 1967 which resulted in the signing of a reciprocal agreement in April that envisioned the designation of 120 courses in both schools as "reciprocal" courses, i.e., open to both men and women students. (See Folders B-1, B-2, B-3.) Plans for the cross-registration of students were completed during the summer and, in the 1967-1968 academic year, some 150-200 students participated in the initial Reciprocal Course Program.

Meanwhile, prodded by a study of the John Price Jones Company of New York suggesting that serious consideration be given to a merger of the two colleges, the separate faculties began to discuss the implications of such a merger. The faculty of the College for Women, concerned that their "freer, more loosely organized committee system" and administration procedures would be endangered and also that the curricular needs of women differed from those of men in many disciplines, preferred a closer affiliation rather than a merger; or that a single USD charter be adopted granting autonomy for the various schools (Men, Women, Law, Graduate, etc.) within the University. The faculty of the College for Men, many of whom were more favorably inclined toward a merger (perhaps because of continuing financial problems) and who desired a strong faculty voice in the organization of a combined university, suggested the establishment of faculty committees to study the problems that had to be faced.

The differences in the approaches of the two faculties to the question of a merger can, perhaps, be explained by the differing roles of the two faculties in the administration of the colleges. At the College for Women the faculty, led by an administration that subscribed to the 1940 Statement of Principles on
Academic Freedom and Tenure, co-authored by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, participated in a fully developed system of standing committees and played an effective role in meetings of the faculty and administration. The spirit of cooperation among students, staff, faculty, and administration was strong and morale was high. (See Folder B-4.)

On the other hand, the College for Men administrators did not officially accept the statement of the AAUP principles (though they did subscribe to most of them) and maintained a tighter control over the committee system and the meetings of the faculty. This led to the development of an unofficial faculty body (the Faculty Association) that assumed the role of a "watch dog" over the actions of the administrators. In any reorganization of the administrative structure, the faculty of the College for Men hoped to gain effective participation in administrative functions by an officially recognized faculty organization. (See Folder B-5.)

A small step toward the identification of members of the faculty as a single group was accomplished when the separate 1968-1969 Bulletins (catalogs) of both schools included the names of all members of both faculties. Again stimulated by merger studies, one by Mr. David Morrisroe of Cresap, McCormick, and Paget, and one by Rev. James J. McGinley, S. J., AAC Consultant, most faculty members began to meet formally and informally with their counterparts in order to plan for closer academic coordination between the two colleges. (See Folder B-6.) These meetings often brought departmental differences into sharp focus but, in general, the desire to cooperate was strong and the coordinate effort gained momentum. (See Folder B-7.)

Following the first joint faculty meeting in October, 1968, the first Faculty-Student Committee was formed to work out a joint policy on Student Rights and Freedom. (See Folder B-8.) Later, joint committees were formed
to look into the general education requirements, a proposed interim structure for the administration of the University, minority problems, and curriculum. (See Folder B-9.)

Attitudes of the separate faculties of the College for Men and the College for Women toward the future of the University were again reflected in the approaches each took toward unification plans. The faculty of the College for Men initiated a workshop approach that led to the organization of ten committees -- Administration, Admissions, Development, Library, Athletic, Student, Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, and Coordination. These committees met over a three-day period and reported their findings to a joint faculty meeting held on January 21, 1969 (see Folder B-10). Meanwhile, the administration and faculty of the College for Women were investigating alternative organizational structures for the new University as well as an interim structure. Coordination plans of various institutions were studied (Loyola-Marymount, the Claremont colleges, etc.) (see Folder B-11). In addition, a committee of College for Women faculty members organized a group to recommend a proposed interim plan for the structure of the University; this ad hoc committee worked its way through several proposals and then submitted a plan first to the faculty of the College for Women, then to the joint College for Men-College for Women faculty (see Folder B-12).

The joint faculty authorized a joint committee to study the problem further and this committee eventually submitted a proposed interim structure to the joint faculty, and finally, through the Presidents, to the Boards of Trustees for their consideration. (See Folder B-13.) Although the decision as to the final interim structure was clearly made by the separate Boards of Trustees, the role of the faculties in studying and shaping that structure was definitely a major one.
A new organizational structure that became effective July 1, 1972, established the position of Provost, directly under the President, and among other things, responsible for the supervision of several deans including the new Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. In a division of the former coordinate colleges into three schools/colleges the Department of Education was removed from Arts and Sciences and elevated to a School of Education under a separate dean. Also removed from Arts and Sciences were the disciplines of accounting, business administration, and economics which were placed in a School of Business Administration headed by a dean. Within the College of Arts and Sciences, the number of department chairmen was reduced from eighteen to eight. Formerly, each discipline (chemistry, French, physics, political science, etc.) was administered by a chairman with suitable released time from teaching duties to carry out supervisory responsibilities. Under the present system, like disciplines have been placed under the management of a single chairman. Disciplines have not been merged. Rather, faculty members in the various disciplines have been assigned, for administrative purposes, to a chairman who might be in a field outside of but closely related to their field of expertise. The new departments, department chairmen, and the disciplines within each department are:

Department of Behavioral Science

Anthropology (Minor)
Psychology (Major)
Social Studies (Major)
Sociology (Major)

Chairman:
Dr. Gerald Sperrazzo
Department of Foreign Languages
French (Major)
German (Minor)
Latin (Courses)
Spanish (Major)

Department of History and Political Science
History (Major)
Political Science (Major)

Department of Humanities
Art (Major)
English (Major)
Music (Major)
Speech Arts (Minor)
Theatre Arts (Minor)

Department of Interdisciplinary Studies
American Studies (Interdepartmental Major)
Mexican Studies (Interdepartmental Major)

Department of Philosophy
Philosophy (Major)

Department of Religious Studies
Religious Studies (Minor)

Chairman:
Sister Alicia Sarre
Chairman:
Dr. Joseph W. Ruane (Acting)
Chairman:
Dr. Lee F. Gerlach
Chairman:
Dr. Carl L. Gilbert
Chairman:
Father William L. Shipley
Chairman:
Msgr. John R. Portman
Faculty reaction to the reorganization of the departmental supervisory structure was divided. Some could see the logic of administratively combining small departments (those with few students and teachers). Others felt very strongly that the "merged" departments would lose their identity. Many former chairmen who had lost their posts as a result of the combining of the departments of the two colleges and of the new reorganization were particularly vocal in their opposition. But the President, in a series of meetings with faculty and administrators, explained his reasons for effecting the change (reducing the span of control and of released time from teaching for supervisory functions) and held to his decision.

Faculty members complained about the faculty secretaries being under the supervisory control of the business office whose interests, the faculty members felt, did not always coincide with those of the faculty. In order to remove this irritant, the faculty secretaries were placed under the supervision of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. (See Folder B-14.)

In general, responsibilities of the Provost, the Deans, and the chairmen of the departments have been established and, though minor details still need working out, it seems better to be a little pragmatic in order to avoid building rigidities into the system that will later become sources of irritation. For example, the acting Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences has assumed the responsibility for compiling, coordinating, publishing, and distributing the
Master Time Schedules and Final Examination Schedules for the University (except for the Law School). Since the College of Arts and Sciences is much larger than the two schools (Business Administration and Education), it would appear that the College will continue to handle these functions.

(d) Future Plans and Desires.

The University of San Diego, aware that excellence in every area of an unlimited curriculum exceeds its present capabilities, has wisely decided to emphasize those programs in which it can excel. Within the College of Arts and Sciences these are:

1. Center for International Relations
2. Center for the Study of World Religions
3. Interdisciplinary Programs

Although strong emphasis will be placed on strengthening these programs, other areas of excellence or need will not be neglected. Indeed, plans are underway to strengthen our capabilities in Art, Music, Environmental Studies, and other areas. The needs and programs of each of the departments will be expressed in the portions of this report that follow.

3. Department of Behavioral Sciences
   a. Psychology
      i) Development of Merged Departments

      Faculty Resources: In 1967, at the start of the merger discussions, the Psychology department of the San Diego College for Women consisted of one full-time member and occasional part-time faculty members who taught one or two sections of specific classes. The course offerings were minimal and the students generally discouraged from entering the major. At the University of San Diego College for Men two full-time professors were handling the majority of classes and part-time faculty covered the balance of the classes.
At the time of initial discussion of merger, then, there were three full-time faculty members, two professors, both with Ph. D.'s, and one assistant professor, with an M. A.

Curricular Interaction: The curricular offerings of the two departments, at the beginning of merger talks in 1967, largely duplicated each other and had minimal offerings for majors at each institution. At the College for Women, classes had to be offered for extremely small groups since there were few majors, yet a variety of courses was essential. The College for Men offered some additional courses, and class size was larger, but an overlapping use of faculty time characterized both departments. Additionally both departments offered service courses for other areas, mainly education.

With the merger, the combined departments restructured the entire curriculum. The courses taught as service courses, (i.e., counseling, guidance, educational measurements, etc.) were dropped. Courses with minimal student interest were replaced with courses of greater interest to students. The curriculum was oriented towards greater educational breadth and depth of graduates.

In September, 1967 students were allowed to cross-register for courses offered in either department. The following year (1968-1969) the catalogs listed a combined offering though the departments were still separate. The first joint catalog and the official unity of the department under a single chairman occurred in September, 1969. The merger took place without incident. The outcome has been a much stronger curricular offering with more alternatives available to students. Two major programs were developed, one for students who do not plan to go on to graduate work (Plan B), and a second which is pre-professional (Plan A).

As enrollments climbed, additional courses were added. Instructor preparations dropped as multiple sections were introduced. Additional faculty
members were employed and class size rose. Eventually limits had to be set on class size.

Community interest as well as student and faculty interest resulted in discussions which eventually led to the establishing of a graduate program in Psychology with a concentration in Counseling in the Fall of 1970. The area of emphasis reflected the particular competence of the faculty. Student interest in additional practical experience resulted in two master's programs; one research oriented with a thesis, the second with considerable counseling practice. Because of critical faculty shortages, only limited numbers have been accepted into the program. Community response, particularly from parochial schools, has been favorable. The rapid growth of the undergraduate program is, at present, posing a threat to the continuation of the graduate program as the two compete for available faculty time.

Discussions are presently underway to alter the majors and allow students to select required major courses from groups of alternatives. This will allow better assimilation of transfer students into the program, particularly those who have attended community colleges where previously required courses have been taught in the lower division. Rather than duplicating his course work, the student will be able to select an alternative. Additionally it will allow greater diversity for professors, since multiple sections of specific requirements will not be so essential.

Physical and Financial Factors: Since both departments had little equipment, the merger allowed an optimal utilization and precluded the necessity of additional acquisition. Two labs were combined into one, reducing space requirements. Class size increased and eliminated the necessity for duplicating faculty, thus reducing costs. Initially the merged department operated from two locations, occasioning some difficulty in communication. The present department arrangement has facilitated interaction.
Interpersonal Development of Departments: The combined faculties of the two institutions in 1969 numbered only three full-time people — two professors with Ph. D.'s and one assistant professor with an M. A. These three have remained and two additional assistant professors were hired — one in 1970-1971 and the other in 1971-1972. All department members now hold earned doctorates in the field. Additional staff needs are met with part-time faculty, who are specialists in particular areas. The present faculty represents a considerable diversity in training and interests. The areas of development, educational measurement, research design, clinical, social, experimental, and existential psychology are clearly represented. With the diversity of backgrounds it has been possible to expand the curriculum and to bring in part-time lecturers for coverage of necessary classes rather than to fill gaps in the training areas.

In terms of interpersonal activities the merger occurred with minimal stress. The three full-time faculty members worked extremely well together. There was no problem in allocating classes and while teaching styles differed appreciably, all seemed to be equally attractive to students. There was no evidence of overloading in any one person's classes.

The chairmanship fell upon the College for Men chairman without debate since the College for Women chairman preferred teaching to administration. Further, the College for Men chairman was senior in rank and degree at the time of merger. Since the initial appointment the department as a whole has supported the continuation of the chairman in his post.

As additional faculty needs developed, the fundamental criteria were individuals of high professional competence whose personality would blend into a harmonious group. On occasion positions have been left unfilled until the right person was found, though this meant filling the spots with part-time staff.
2) Objectives within institutional and college goals.

In 1968 the two departments cooperated in formulating the objectives. They were first articulated in the College for Men section of the 1969-1970 coordinate catalog and represent our present position as stated in the current catalog.

The departmental concern has been in developing an educationally sound program which meets diverse student needs. To meet these needs has required the careful attention of the faculty. These needs are most often articulated by students in advising sessions and for this reason a strong program of student-advisor relationships has been developed. As each student enters the program he either chooses or is assigned an advisor who continues to work with him as long as he is in the department. Generally this means that each faculty member serves one class, (i.e., freshmen, sophomores, etc.) and then as that class advances it carries its advisor along. This has permitted us to know more about our individual advisees than is possible from class contacts alone. Additionally it spreads the workload fairly well.

The major requirements, while specifically stated, can be altered by the advisor (and frequently are) so that the program can suit an individual's specific needs. Since most of the students do not plan to go on to graduate work the Plan B (liberal arts) major was intentionally designed for this individual flexibility. Whatever plans a student may have for use of his major, the program is flexible enough to serve. The pre-professional major has less flexibility and is intended to provide knowledge in those areas necessary for graduate school admission. This further implies a need to do well on the Graduate Record Examination, a requirement for admission to many graduate schools. This major emphasizes undergraduate competency in the discipline as well as in related areas such as mathematics, science, and English.
3) Current Programs

The present program includes two possible undergraduate majors and the graduate programs as described in the current catalogs. The undergraduate programs are discussed more fully in the previous section. The graduate program also has two thrusts — one prepares the student for immediate employment as a counselor, the second is additional training in preparation for continuation in graduate study. The majority of our graduate students plan to terminate their education at the master's level. For this reason the counseling program stresses practicum and field work experience, which give the student optimum feedback, but which also requires disproportionate amounts of faculty time. In short, we believe we can turn out well-trained professional counselors, at the master's level, but to do so requires more individual attention than our present faculty size permits. For this reason our graduate program has been seriously curtailed. No new students were enrolled last year and our present program calls for the admission of no more than ten new graduate students every two years. The program is cycled so that a maximum of two graduate courses are offered each term. With the unanticipated mushrooming of the undergraduate program as noted on the attached Tables, there may be reason to further curtail the graduate program.

Our departmental weaknesses include too few faculty members to serve the needs of students in and out of class, limited physical facilities for course work (i.e., laboratory, and counseling courses), and insufficient library holdings. There is reason to believe that our growth is still continuing at this unanticipated rate and if so our undergraduate offerings will need to be expanded. Additional sections of classes will be required, both at lower and upper division levels. We currently offer eight sections of introductory psychology during the academic year. This number is proving inadequate. The department does not wish to add additional sections with part-time faculty, since past
experiences have shown this solution to be unsatisfactory. To be effective, introductory courses must be coupled with adequate opportunity for students to discuss the problems encountered in class during office hours. Part-time staff cannot effectively offer this convenience and our greatest strength as a department, in terms of the feedback we are receiving, lies in our concern for the individual student, our availability as advisors, and our high quality of teaching. Departmental concern for the program is also reflected in a constant reappraisal of courses and requirements.

4) Future Thrusts and Plans

We feel our present program is strong and will continue to be so. Constant reappraisal will insure a contemporary program. Our future thrust, then, will be to expand and further improve the existing program. These goals can be achieved by the addition of faculty, greater diversity in course offerings, increased library holdings, and improved physical facilities. There is a need for seminar type rooms and for laboratory space on the undergraduate level and a need for counseling rooms where video-taping and monitoring of interviews is possible on the graduate level. These counseling facilities can double as testing rooms. Plans for these physical facilities have been submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee for the Allocation of Space.

Since we find the present thrust satisfactory there are no plans at this time to alter the direction of the department if adequate funding can be made available. If additional faculty and facilities cannot be funded, then in all probability the graduate program will be re-examined.
### Table 1

#### Number of Psychology Majors per Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>92 undergraduates</td>
<td>119 undergraduates</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>17 graduates</td>
<td>13 graduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129 undergraduates</td>
<td>127 undergraduates</td>
<td>17 B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 graduates</td>
<td>21 graduates</td>
<td>7 M.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

#### Number of Students Registered in Psychology Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Sociology

1) Chronology of Events (Faculty Resources and Curriculum).

During the academic year 1968—1969 and 1969-1970, the Sociology departments of both the University of San Diego College for Women and the University of San Diego College for Men remained under separate chairmanships, although reciprocity of classes was inaugurated (i.e., men and women students were permitted to take classes in either department for full credit). At this time there were two professors (one full professor, Ph. D., and one assistant professor, M. A.), in each of the two departments, making a total of four teaching persons, plus one full-time Associate Professor of Anthropology and Sociology (M. D., M. A.) in the San Diego College for Women Sociology department, who taught the anthropology courses and one or two sociology courses each semester. Course offerings were duplicated in both Sociology departments in 1968—1969; a beginning was made in consolidating courses in 1969-1970.

In 1970-1971, the two Sociology departments were combined under one chairman — a full-time professor (Ph. D.). The rest of the faculty remained as before with the loss of one assistant professor (M. A.) and the addition of one part-time professor (Ph. D.) for six teaching hours. Course offerings were consolidated; duplication was eliminated.

In 1971-1972 one chairman continued to head a merged Sociology department. There was a reduction of one full-time professor (Ph. D.), leaving one Ph. D.; one ABD; one part-time Ph. D., and one medical anthropologist. Classes were further consolidated. N. B. In this year the Master's Degree in Social Sciences was dropped; hence, Sociology lost its M. A. program.

In 1972-1973 Sociology was merged with Psychology and Anthropology to form the Behavioral Sciences Department. Currently Sociology has one assistant professor (ABD) and one instructor (ABD), plus two courses.
(Statistics and Urban Society) taught by part-time personnel. The Anthropology Professor died in September, 1972. Anthropology courses (minor) will be taught in Spring, 1973 by part-time personnel (one Ph. D.; one M. A.).

2) Major Thrust

The thrust of Sociology department courses in both Coordinate Colleges and later, in the merged program was two-fold: (a) to prepare students to enter graduate programs in Sociology; (b) to prepare students for social work, graduate study, and/or professions. Both these aims were developed within the matrix of a value-oriented educational philosophy, in accord with the stated objectives of the University.

Emphasis has been placed on student-teacher relationships.

3) Physical and Financial Arrangements

Although offices for Sociology continued to be located in separate buildings through June, 1972 (Serra Hall and Founders Hall), no problems were experienced on this basis. Meetings were easily arranged and readily attended. With the merging of the departments into one Behavioral Sciences Department in Summer, 1972, physical facilities were also merged.

4) Interpersonal Relations (Psychological Factors)

Although there were some initial disagreements on educational objectives during the first two years of reciprocity, these were finally worked out on the basis of compromises which yet preserved the intellectual and personal integrity of all concerned. From the beginning, the good will of all persons involved was manifest. The areas of disagreement and eventual solutions were:
(1) Major emphasis on theory.
(2) Major emphasis on methodology.
(3) Objections to certain cross-listings on grounds of academic invalidity.

(4) Solutions to above problems:

(a) Emphasis on theory, methodology and applied Sociology worked out equitably by both Sociology departments, with each incorporating values of the other. As a result, theory, methodology and applied areas all receive major emphasis without detriment to the other two. (b) Cross-listings were not resolved. The College for Women faculty (with reference to Psychology and Political Science offerings) simply acceded to insistence of College for Men faculty to retain courses, since it was felt that departmental harmony was more important at this time than concern for single course offerings. (c) The anthropology offerings were allowed to stand because at least the course in Ecology and Modern Cultural Problems could be considered to lie in areas tangential to Sociology. The other two Anthropology courses were held until further discussions. (d) Duplications in course offerings were eliminated by mutual consent: Two courses in stratification reduced to one — Sociology 157. Two courses in family reduced to one — Sociology 153. Course in Marriage and the Family — taken up by the Department of Religious Studies. (e) One faculty member wished to eliminate Statistics as a requirement; rest of faculty wished to keep Statistics as a requirement. Solution came when the Curriculum Committee voted to have Statistics as a requirement for Sociology Majors. (f) At no time was there any "personal" feeling involved in any discussion of objectives, courses, plans, etc.

Following the selection of a single chairman, academic decisions con-
continued to be reached on the basis of democratic principles and procedures.

5) Current Program

In addition to the objectives stated in Section 2 preceding, the department of Sociology has as its future goals: (1) Development and strengthening of basic core courses by: (a) a planned curriculum projection for the next five years — this has been done and charts are available in the Sociology Office. (b) development of a schedule of Sociology courses based on their priority (in terms of content) for certain Sociological areas; as follows: Required courses for major = completed. Courses of Major Importance for Applied Sociology = in progress. Courses of secondary importance for any Sociology Major = in progress. (This paradigm is designed to guide students in their choice of courses, in addition to individual counseling.) (c) formation of a Sociology Majors advisory group (students) to serve as a vehicle for student input into Sociology area planning. (First meeting was held Friday, December 1, 1972, at noon. The second meeting was planned for Wednesday, December 13, 1972, at noon.) (d) formation of a chapter of a Sociology Honor Society — Alpha Kappa Delta — on campus. Meeting to discuss this was held on December 1, 1972. Further developments in progress. Student interest was evident.

(2) Augmenting Faculty. Two full-time faculty members cannot hold down a major departmental area. In preparation now is a document to support request for further faculty. Tables will give student-teacher ratios, student-class ratios, etc. Increase of faculty is a priority need.

(3) Increasing Library Holdings. A study is now underway which will indicate our weakness in this area. One major weakness is the vast loss of sociological periodicals which the joint libraries held and which have, to a large extent, disappeared. This loss was extremely serious for Sociology.
(4) Strengthening the Sociology content for majors. It is essential that the 24 upper division hours for Sociology majors be Sociology, and not Psychology, Political Science or Anthropology. If this is not done, our Sociology majors will not meet the requirements for graduate schools, or even social work jobs. Ideally, Sociology 60 and 145 should be taught by sociologists. Understaffing makes this impossible at present.

(5) Counseling of students has been on a personal and intimate basis with Sociology students. Plans are to make this program more effective by: enabling students to remain with one counselor (if student and counselor reach rapport) throughout the college program, insofar as this is feasible, to make for greater stability and security for the student.

(6) The merging of Sociology with the Behavioral Sciences Department has been an exceptionally happy one. The reasons are: harmonious faculty relations, continuing from early College for Women days; strengthening of Sociology area's needs, requests, with the support of entire Behavioral Science Department; increased inter-departmental discussion on all levels; increased facilities and equipment.

(7) Development of advanced programs in criminology and law enforcement — in progress; medical sociology; and urban studies. In these areas lie job opportunities for students.

(8) Development of Anthropology from a minor to a major, dependent upon student demand. The College for Women has had an Anthropology minor for at least four to five years, with one anthropologist and a list of approximately six to eight courses; Anthropology was combined with the Sociology department at the College for Women. The College for Men had one course in Anthropology (Introductory Cultural Anthropology) given under the aegis of the history department at the College for Men.

Currently, Sociology has one major program for all students. Our
recommendation, based on feedback from students, will be to divide the program into two areas: one for majors planning to continue graduate work in Sociology; one for majors planning to enter the professional fields in and or related to Sociology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Teaching quality.</td>
<td>(1) Limited faculty; two full-time plus one person teaching one course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Concern for students</td>
<td>(2) Insufficient library holdings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Favorable teacher–student ratio</td>
<td>(3) High number of preparations per faculty member (four each).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in comparison with larger schools).</td>
<td>(4) Very limited budget for faculty, for equipment, for speakers, for films.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Counseling of students on above basis.</td>
<td>(5) No research facilities. No computers, no funds, no time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) No graduate program to stimulate undergraduates and research programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Too few faculty for a major; too narrow a viewpoint for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) We are unable to handle ethnic course offerings with present faculty size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9) Over cross-listings of courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Department of Science and Mathematics

a. Development of Merged Department

1) Biology

Faculty Resources: At the beginning of the merger period the College for Men Biology faculty consisted of six full-time faculty, approval for a seventh, (of whom four, Dr. Bradshaw, Dr. Dingman, Dr. Spanis, and Dr. Reck are still at USD) plus about one and one-half FTE in part-time faculty, two professors in residence, Livingston and Pincus, and one research scientist, Schiff. The biology major program at this time (1967-1968) was a large program by comparison to most undergraduate majors at the College for Men, particularly compared with the other sciences. It was viewed within the department as a growing and developing program. At this time the College for Women program was a smaller program, with three full-time faculty (including Dr. Farrens and Mrs. Byrne of present faculty), plus additional part-time faculty. The College for Women Biology department also considered its program strong, though relatively small.

Very early in the merger process, a joint College for Men–College for Women curriculum was developed (Spring, 1968). This allowed for reduction in the total faculty in Biology when opportunities arose. (In addition, changes in Science offerings for non-science majors also acted to reduce total teaching requirements in Biology. Opportunities to reduce faculty did indeed arise, at the College for Men. Two vacancies which arose by resignation were not filled so that in the fall semester, 1969, the College for Men Biology faculty was reduced to four (full-time). The problem of Biology faculty was alleviated by increasing College for Women faculty to three full-time in the fall, 1970. However, this did little for morale of College for Men faculty and, in fact, it contributed to rumors throughout the two colleges that faculty would have to be balanced between the two colleges, in many departments. Events during the
1971-1972 school year have had the net result of reducing the present Biology faculty to five full-time, plus approximately one and one-half full-time teaching equivalents in part-time faculty. Preliminary budgeting plans for next year include six full-time faculty and a slight increase in total teaching time available. (It should be noted that the latest reduction in full-time faculty does not appear to be a result of any deliberate administrative plan, but more as a result of a combination of events during 1971-1972.)

In the opinion of the Biology faculty, the reduction in full-time strength has been a handicap in their attempt to maintain the strength of the program. The reduction in faculty has necessitated adjustments in teaching assignments, thus requiring faculty members to make diverse preparations outside their principal specialty.

Curricular Interaction: In the chronological development the establishment of a joint curriculum by the College for Men and College for Women Biology departments in the Spring semester 1967-1968, was one of the earliest steps in cooperation to be completed. This joint curriculum was accomplished by the College for Women essentially adopting the College for Men curriculum. Since that time no serious re-study or revision of the curriculum in Biology has been accomplished. It is felt by some (including for example, Dr. Farrens) that as a consequence the strengths of the merged department are not being fully utilized. As noted above, the joint curriculum has been a factor in allowing a reduction in number of Biology faculty, despite an increase in Biology students.

Curricular revision in the areas of science offerings and requirements for non-science students have also affected Biology. Prior to merger, most College for Men students met a one-year science requirement by taking a one-year Biology course, including lab, for non-majors. Just prior to the merger period the College for Women adopted a three-semester science requirement, a non-laboratory sequence including only one semester of biological science.
Shortly thereafter, the College for Men, more or less independently, adopted a three-semester science-math requirement (Spring, 1969). This requirement, subsequently adopted jointly, includes a one-semester laboratory course in Biology (Science 13) plus an option, actually used by a rather small percentage of students, to complete a second semester of the requirement in a Biology course (Science 14). The net result as it affects the Biology area is that non-science majors now average only slightly more than one semester of biological science.

Physical and Financial Factors: In terms of physical facilities, we have an area in Biology (as well as in Chemistry) where the merger has resulted in combining the previously separate College for Men and College for Women laboratory facilities. This has increased the actual facilities; however, these facilities are still in separate locations. The College for Women facilities, consisting of three good-sized labs, plus associated storage and prep rooms, are now used for the lower division Biology lab (Biology 3-4), plus some upper division labs, as well as some research. The College for Men facilities, consist of one lower-division lab, used for the non-major Biology courses (Science 13 and 14). Four fairly large labs of varying size and design, three smaller labs, and associated prep rooms used for upper division lab courses.

In addition, a greenhouse -- lath house area located behind Camino Hall and formerly used by College for Women science departments, is now used (at least temporarily) by the Environmental Studies Group, an interdisciplinary group presently active in studying San Diego County Lagoons. (See Appendix V, page xxxi.)

The divided facilities are, at least superficially, but probably more fundamentally than that, one factor in the continued psychological division within the faculty in the Biology area. On the positive side, the availability of equipment from both the College for Men and College for Women Biology
Departments has proven valuable in the various lab courses taught.

In terms of departmental budgets, the division into College for Men and College for Women budgets for equipment and supplies continued until completion of the formal merger and the beginning of the present academic year. At the beginning of the merger period, the College for Men department (in fact all the College for Men science departments) were ending a period of rather extensive spending associated with the rather impressive strengthening of the natural science departments at the College for Men in the preceding few years. The College for Women science departments, on the other hand, had developed at an earlier time, and by the beginning of the merger settled into a rather low-cost maintenance pattern, supplemented by a few (very helpful) gifts or grants. Despite a considerable reduction in equipment and supplies budgets at the College for Men, the imbalance remained. It seemed to the College for Men faculty that the impossible was being asked and multiple standards imposed. On the other hand, the sciences remained expensive and thus subject to criticism though budgets were in fact cut. At the same time the College for Men science departments (and thus the College for Men) were being asked to carry part of the College for Women's share of the student load. (A large majority of the students in science were indeed men, however.) These remarks apply to the science departments in general, and not particularly to the biology department.

As viewed from the College for Women, it was essentially a problem of being asked to merge as (apparently) a junior partner. In view of a longer history and the earlier development of science programs, this implication was felt to be out of place.

It should be pointed out that problems generated by financial inequality gradually decreased in importance as the merger progressed, and the probability of eventual merger appeared to increase. However, the Biology departments were rather slow in feeling the benefits of increased cooperation, since
separate budget administrators (department chairmen) existed until October, 1971.

Psychological Factors: The separate Biology departments at the College for Men and College for Women had each, at the time of the start of the merger process, developed programs of which they were (separately) proud. Each department has had reason to feel that its program has subsequently suffered. The College for Men biologists feel that they have lost some of the strength of their previous faculty. The College for Women biologists feel that the College for Men curriculum which was adopted does not fully exploit the strengths of the department.

As noted above, the divided laboratory facilities (essentially the sum of the old College for Men and College for Women facilities) have tended to maintain divisions. College for Men faculty have usually continued to teach their upper division laboratory courses in Serra Hall and College for Women faculty in Camino Hall. The lower division course for majors (Biology 3-4) and the course for non-majors (Science 13-14) are taught in Camino and Serra Hall, respectively, regardless of the former affiliation of the faculty involved. It may be noted that this arrangement has allowed the preservation of lower division laboratory facilities in both locations.

It should further be noted that the Biology department continued with separate chairmen longer than any other department, and this despite the desire of many of the faculty to combine departments with a single chairman. It would appear that the administration was unable to find any one member of the department mutually satisfactory to College for Men and College for Women faculty and the administration until October, 1971.

2) Chemistry

Faculty Resources: Chemistry departments at both the College for Men
and College for Women had small but strong major programs, with faculty who have without exception remained at USD to the present time. The College for Men faculty consisted of four full-time (Drs. McDermott, Opdycke, Peterson, and Traylor). The College for Women faculty consisted of three (Sister Schmit, Sister Shaffer, Dr. Stiggall). Given that the number of students in chemistry courses was (and is) relatively small, the number in the combined faculty (7) has always appeared rather large. In fact, sabbaticals and leaves of absence have reduced the actual full-time faculty on campus in every year since the merger process began. The average chemistry faculty actually on campus was about 5 1/4 over the period of the merger, and will average 5 1/2 this year. Chemistry faculty have also been utilized in teaching the physical science part of the science sequence for non-science majors, Science 11-12. (Science 11 is partly taught by Physics faculty.)

It would appear that a genuine reluctance to lose well-qualified faculty, coupled with the realization that a rather heavy general education teaching load was developing (Science 11-12) have led to the retention of the entire combined chemistry faculties. It may also be that the rumors of "faculty balancing" (see Biology) which circulated during the merger period had some validity in this area. Suggestions have arisen occasionally to have certain chemists teach certain courses in the biology department, since such an arrangement might offer better utilization of existing faculty resources and also allow the biology department to offer additional courses. Such suggestions have invariably been resisted on grounds of the integrity of the discipline by the biology faculty, and have never been effectuated. It appears that the staffing problems created by the combining of the departments from the two colleges have been particularly serious in the case of chemistry, as compared to other departments.

Curricular Interaction: In the chemistry department, the development of curricular cooperation was a slow, careful, and gradual process. The first
steps were taken in 1968-1969 when the Organic Chemistry Lectures (Chemistry 100A-B) were taught by Dr. McDermott for both men and women. The accompanying labs were however taught separately in the separate laboratories at the College for Men and College for Women. The College for Men chairman at that time (Dr. Peterson) believes that there were several other upper division courses formally open to students from both colleges, but that, in general, these courses were in fact not coeducational when class lists were developed.

Several additional steps were taken during the 1969-1970 academic year. In particular, cooperation was haltingly developed in the first-year General Chemistry course. During the fall semester, the Chemistry 10A lectures were supposedly "team taught" by Sister Schmit of the College for Women and Dr. Peterson of the College for Men. In fact, separate coeducational lecture sections were taught, with the students being asked to choose sections. During the spring semester, only one lecture section was taught, by Dr. Peterson.

In Chemistry 10A-B lab, an interesting integration occurred. Since the laboratory requirements for the two colleges were different (the College for Women required two labs per week, the College for Men only one), it was necessary to have two lab sections, one for men and one for women. During the same 1969-1970 year two sections of Chemistry 100A-B were again taught; both sections were coeducational, with the instructors (Drs. Stiggall and McDermott) teaching in "their own" labs.

The divergence in General Chemistry was resolved (effective in 1970-1971) during this 1969-1970 academic year. The College for Men one-unit per semester lab was accepted, but a two-unit lab course (Chemistry 20) was added as a requirement for chemistry majors. At the same time the different types of chemistry majors at the two colleges were unified. The College for Women had maintained a three plan system (for traditional chemists, bio-chemists,
and an easier plan for chemical technicians); the College for Men had had only a straight chemistry major. The College for Men chemists were able to get the weaker "plan C" abolished, and at the same time accepted, and obtained, the biochemical option. (It may be noted that an early attempt to obtain approval for a biochemistry major had been prevented by the biology department.) Essential coordination of the curriculum and teaching in the chemistry department was thus achieved in time for the 1970-1971 academic year. Upper division offerings were more or less the sum of the courses of the two colleges, however, and were not reconsidered until Spring, 1972, when certain consolidations and revisions were approved.

During the same period the revised science courses and General Education requirements for non-science majors were being developed. The College for Women first developed a new three-semester sequence for the science requirement, to consist of two semesters of physical science, followed by one semester of life science, all without lab, although there was to be an additional (optional) one-unit lab course. (In fact this science requirement was part of a more broadly conceived General Education program, and was to be started in the student's sophomore year, after completion of one year of philosophy.)

At the College for Men, a proposal was developed (largely by Dr. Opdycke) for a three-semester science requirement. This would replace a requirement for two semesters of science at the College for Men, which had normally been met with a one year course in biological science (Biology 1-2, which no longer exists). The proposal, which involved an option for one of the three semesters, was discussed with College for Women administrators and College for Women science faculty, and it was found that one option in the College for Men proposal was very similar to the curriculum developed at the College for Women.
After further compromise, the College for Men adopted a three-semester Science-Mathematics requirement, which is essentially the present USD requirement. Students were required to take Science 11 (Physical Science I); Science 13 (Life Science I); and either Science 12 (Physical Science II), Science 14 (Life Science II) or any math course. The sequence was such that if the option chosen was Science 12 (Physical Science II), then the College for Women sequence was obtained. The courses were introduced for the 1969-1970 academic year. Dr. Opdycke was the principal instructor in Science 11 and 12, with assistance from both colleges. The courses were coeducational from the beginning, and are viewed by the faculty as belonging to the merged University, rather than to either college.

Physical and Financial Factors: In Chemistry we have both the former College for Women Chemistry labs in Camino Hall and the former College for Men Chemistry labs in Serra Hall. The Camino Hall labs include a generally very satisfactory large lab which is used for General Chemistry, an additional similar lab which is used for Biochemistry and Quantitative Analysis, a balance room, prep rooms, coldroom, plus a complete inventory of equipment and supplies. Other than a lack of sufficient total lab space for the entire chemistry labs and equipment, the principal problem with the Camino Hall labs is the lack of any one lab with enough fume-hood capacity for a reasonably-sized lab section of Organic Chemistry. In Serra Hall there are also two good-sized labs, plus several smaller labs and storage. Fortunately, there is one lab with almost enough fume-hood capacity for the Organic Chemistry lab, and it is used as such. Unfortunately, the smaller rooms represent the results of an old, ill-conceived conversion to laboratory and associated uses, are almost totally lacking in ventilation, and consequently have very limited utility as chemistry labs. In summation, despite certain inefficiencies in some facilities, especially in Serra Hall, the principal problem is the inconvenience
of two locations. The merger has brought a set of Chemistry laboratories which is distinctly superior to that available to either separate college.

There are certain aspects of the physical facilities situation which probably do contribute to psychological problems as in Biology. It was not until Dr. Opdycke taught Chemistry 10A–B labs in Camino Hall in 1970–1971 that any interchange between College for Men–College for Women faculty and labs took place. In fact, in 1970–1971 Sister Schmit and later Dr. Stiggall of the College for Women were assigned to assist Dr. Opdycke when he taught in the Camino labs. This course remains to this day the only chemistry lab course in which College for Men or College for Women faculty have "crossed the street" to do their lab teaching.

The matter of the separate budgets and equipment remained a key problem in the eyes of members of the Chemistry Department for a very considerable period. In fact, it was upon this point that Sister Schmit argued for the maintenance of separate Chemistry Departments as late as November, 1970. She felt that the College for Men and College for Women Chemistry Departments should remain separate and develop separate specializations. This point of view was in general not accepted by the other chemists. Sister Schmit's unwillingness to accept any responsibility for College for Men equipment, budgets, or orders apparently delayed appointment of a single chairman for the Chemistry Department until 1971–1972. This was because there was not and still is not a complete inventory of equipment and supplies at the College for Men. Note also that the separate (and unequal) supplies and equipment budgets led to the general opinion among College for Men science faculty that impossibly contradictory standards were being imposed. (See Biology section.) Fortunately, despite the insistence upon the separate identities of budget and equipment, it had been possible as early as Spring, 1969 to consider the fact of joint use of lab equipment when ordering new equipment and supplies.
Psychological Factors: There were serious divisions between members of the College for Men and College for Women Chemistry Departments during much of the merger period. Those divisions occasionally developed into clashes between members of the department, particularly during 1969-1970 and 1970-1971 as noted.

The appointment of a single chairman for the Chemistry Department was delayed until 1971-1972, as precisely noted. When a single chairman (Dr. Traylor) was appointed for 1971-1972, Sister Schmit was to go on sabbatical leave, but she herself had enthusiastically suggested Dr. Traylor as chairman.

It has also been noted above that no member of the Chemistry Department has taught any upper division lab away from "his own" building. The only course in which any "crossing of the street" for lab teaching has occurred is General Chemistry. On the other hand, three out of four College for Men chemists have by now taught Chemistry 10A-B labs in Camino Hall (Drs. McDermott, Opdycke, and Peterson). The actual arrangement of lab courses and instruction has, however, appeared reasonably rational. Remaining remnants of previous divisions between College for Men and College for Women chemistry faculty do not seem to be causing noticeable problems this year.

3) Mathematics

Faculty Resources: During the 1967-1968 year the College for Men and College for Women departments were still independent, although there was interchange of students through reciprocal courses. College for Men had four full-time faculty, College for Women one full-time, one part-time. From 1968 to 1972 the department operated as a joint department, with one chairman but separate College for Men and College for Women budgets. In 1968-1969 the part-time lecturer was no longer needed because of the merged curriculum, we
operated with four College for Men faculty, one College for Women. In 1969 one College for Men position was eliminated by non-reappointment, presumably for budgetary reasons, and since that time we have been operating understaffed with three College for Men and one College for Women full-time faculty.

Curricular Interaction: The separate College for Men and College for Women curricula in mathematics were quite similar and completely compatible, as far as mathematics offerings were concerned, and we formed a joint curriculum in 1968 without any difficulty. The only differences that remained were differences in general education requirements for men and women students in areas other than mathematics.

Physical and financial factors: From 1968 to 1972 the mathematics department operated as a single department academically but as two separate departments financially, with separate College for Men and College for Women budgets. This was not a serious problem, merely an administrative nuisance. On the other hand, the reduction from five to four faculty positions in 1969, presumably for financial reasons has created a serious academic problem. Since 1969 we have been understaffed to the extent that we have not been able to offer all courses approved by the Curriculum Committee. In particular, courses in mathematics review and liberal arts math cannot be scheduled, even when needed. In addition, we are not always able to schedule as many sections of math service courses as there is demand for by other departments.

Psychological factors: The College for Men and College for Women faculty in mathematics have been compatible and cooperative right from the beginning of merger considerations. There had been no psychological problems of merger in mathematics up until 1972.

4) Physics

Faculty Resources: The Physics Department developed from the
College for Men Physics Department only, after the abandoning of physics instruction by the College for Women at the beginning of the merger process. In the Spring of 1967 Dr. Estberg, who was then chairman of the Physics Department at the College for Men, was informed by Sister Schmit that the College for Women was eliminating physics from their curriculum as of that Spring. Thereafter women were to take physics from the College for Men department. Dr. Estberg was asked if the College for Men Physics Department was interested in hiring the person who was then teaching physics at the College for Women. Significantly, no pressure was brought to bear to hire him. Dr. Estberg felt that a better qualified person could be found (Mr. Warren was ultimately hired).

Curricular Interaction: The physics curriculum consists of a rather standard physics major sequence, tailored to consideration of the much less than optimum enrollment in the upper-division courses, but nevertheless designed to prepare a student for graduate work, plus courses designed for the pre-engineering student and the more practically oriented physics major (Physics 70, 180, 181). In addition there is a one-year General Physics course (Physics 42, 43) for biology majors and pre-med students. The curriculum has evolved from a major revision of the Physics curriculum which was approved in 1968 at the College for Men. There was never any curricular interaction between the two colleges in the area of physics other than an initial concern about which physics course the College for Women chemistry students should take to complete their chemistry major. (There are two introductory courses.) It was ultimately decided that the weaker students should take the pre-med course (Physics 42, 43), and the stronger students should take the physics major course (Physics 50, 51).

In the area of physical science there was a very positive outcome of merging the two curricula. The College for Women had just developed a three
semester required science sequence for their non-science majors. In addition this was to be integrated within a required philosophy course in this area. The College for Men had no requirement in physical science. While the philosophy course was changed in the process we did ultimately end up with a three semester science-math requirement for all of our students. (See discussion under Biology and Chemistry.)

Physical and Financial Factors: The College for Women did have considerable resources in physics equipment, particularly at the introductory level. Dr. Estberg inquired of Sister Schmit in the Spring of 1968 if this equipment could be made available for use by the Physics Department, since women students would be taking College for Men physics courses too. He was informed that this equipment could not be used since it might be potentially used for teaching physical science at the College for Women. This equipment was finally made available for physical science in the Spring of 1972 by Sister Shaffer and Dr. Stiggall. In fact, most of it was useful only for physics. Late in the Spring of 1972, most of it was brought up to the physics labs in Serra Hall. It has proven to be a valuable addition to the equipment holdings for lower division physics. (Much of it had never been used before!)

Psychological Factors: All of us in the Physics Department have had many occasions to express our thankfulness that we were not involved with the much more serious personnel problems which we observed in the merger of many other departments.

b. Formation of Science and Mathematics Department

As part of the administrative reorganization of the University which was initiated for the 1972-1973 academic year, the Department of Science and Mathematics was formed to include the disciplines of Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics. To some extent this department parallels the Division of Natural
Science and Mathematics which existed at the College for Men through the 1968-1969 academic year, but in this case it is at the level of department, rather than division. (The division had been subdivided into departments.) The broader grouping that this department now represents should offer not only the administrative advantage of a reduction in independent units, but also the advantage of increased opportunity for cooperation and coordination among the disciplines comprising the department. On the other hand, several of the most important functions of an academic department, such as curricular development, faculty evaluation, student advising, and determination of teaching assignments have normally been handled at the disciplinary level, and it does not appear desirable to automatically reassign these functions to the multi-disciplinary department. Thus the Department of Science and Mathematics is somewhat artificial as a functional unit for certain important academic purposes.

Since arguments may be made for and against the present structure, it should not be surprising that faculty groups are to be found both favoring and opposing the present structure. Certain generalizations may be made, at least tentatively. Faculty in Physics and Chemistry appear generally favorable to the amalgamated departmental structure and its possibilities for increased cooperation. It has been suggested that the very different staffing problems which developed in Biology and Chemistry might have been alleviated if sufficient leadership and cooperation had been shown in the sciences during the merger (Dr. Estberg). Faculty in the area of Biology feel that the disadvantages outweigh the advantages (Dr. Dingman). The course of action favored in the Biology area would be to reinstate the Biology Department and hire quality faculty to strengthen the program. It is also felt that the present structure weakens disciplinary lines and makes more difficult the continued resistance to chemistry faculty teaching in biology and life science courses. There is also an opinion in the Mathematics area that the present lack of alignment between
academic majors and the administrative structure tends to weaken the academic program and to make the recruitment of students more difficult (Mr. deMalignon).

c. Objectives

The several academic disciplines included in the Department of Science and Mathematics are among those fundamental to a meaningful liberal arts education. For those students interested in a major in one of the sciences or mathematics, our objectives must be to provide a strong basis in the fundamentals of the discipline, coupled with the breadth of a liberal arts education and an appreciation of the values which USD supports. Similarly, we must attempt to include, for the pre-professional student, the basic knowledge upon which he may base his professional education. For the non-science major, we attempt to provide courses giving a sufficient exposure to fundamental concepts of the natural sciences and mathematics, and to the methods of these disciplines, so that he may be able to deal more effectively with the technological applications of modern science and the implications, both positive and negative, of our technologically-based society.

d. Current Programs

The Department offers majors in the disciplines of Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics. In terms of numbers of students, the biology major is clearly the largest, and is in fact among the largest of the undergraduate major programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. This major program is particularly strong in environmental biology, both of the Southern California terrestrial areas and of the near-shore marine environment, and in the medically-oriented pre-professional programs, such as pre-medicine, pre-dentistry, pre-veterinary. Both areas are based upon a strong curriculum in fundamental
and traditional biology. The remaining major programs involve far fewer students, and in fact, lack of students in upper division courses is a problem, particularly in chemistry and physics. The chemistry major includes two plans, one in chemistry proper, the other in biochemistry. All the major programs in the department are designed to allow a graduate entering a graduate school to do so without serious deficiencies. Sufficient flexibility in requirements and course offerings to aid the student seeking employment immediately after completing the bachelor's degree is also maintained. The physics major program is also coordinated with a pre-professional program in pre-engineering.

In addition to the major programs, service courses are also offered for majors in related disciplines, as well as service courses in mathematics for students in the School of Business Administration and in the School of Education. Finally, courses are offered to satisfy the Science-Mathematics requirement for non-science majors.

Faculty within the department are involved in an Environmental Studies Project. Current activities of this group include studies of San Diego Bay and Agua Hedionda Lagoon, as well as development of interdisciplinary curricula in environmental studies. (See Appendix V.)

There is also a departmental faculty sub-committee on advising medically-oriented pre-professional students (Pre-Medical Advising Committee, not to be confused with the Pre-Medical Recommendation Committee, which is a broader group involving faculty in several departments).

d. Future Thrust and Plans

The principal new thrust for the department which is being considered is the development of interdisciplinary curricula in the area of environmental studies. A preliminary proposal for a curriculum on the San Diego region is being studied at this time.
The department is also interested in the development of a minor program in computer science; this will be feasible when computer facilities are available on campus. Discussions have involved members of this department (Mr. Zukowski and Mr. Warren), as well as faculty in the School of Business Administration.

The Pre-Medical Advising Committee is investigating admission requirements in several professional programs, and has generated proposals for minor curricular modifications to better adapt our programs to the needs of pre-professional students.

The department has received faculty approval for a new one semester course in Organic Chemistry for non-pre-medical Biology majors.

Finally, the department has proposed a modification of the sequence for the first three courses for the Physics major. This change would integrate the first course, which would be Introduction to Modern Physics, with an honors section of Science 11, the first course in the science sequence for non-science majors.

5. Department of Foreign Languages
   a. Historical sketch

   In September, 1967, a reciprocal course program was initiated in foreign languages. However, freshmen, sophomores, and seminarians were not permitted to participate in the program. In January, 1968, following a meeting between Father J. Vincent Sullivan, Chairman of the College for Men department and Sister Mariella Bremner, Chairman of the College for Women department, it was arranged that the classes taught by the College for Men instructors use the 40-booth Language Laboratory at the College for Women. Arrangements had to be made so that there were no women in the lab at the same time as seminarians. The use of the lab was to implement a recommenda-
tion to the College for Men from WASC.

The second semester, 1968, was filled with many meetings of representatives of the faculty involved, the Chairmen, the curriculum committee, and interested student representatives; they consulted, debated, and tried to discover what was the best thing to do. The controversy over lingual versus audio-lingual grew very strong. Several meetings were held at which the chairmen and the respective Academic Deans (Dr. Steven E. Schanes and Sister Sally Furay) discussed openly the pro's and con's.

Finally on April 4, 1968, Rev. John E. Baer, President of the College for Men, sent a memorandum to the Curriculum Committee of the College for Men stating: "Agreement has been reached between the two institutions that the present exemption (exclusion) of freshmen, sophomores and seminarians from the Reciprocal Program will be eliminated beginning in September, 1968. Except in the most unusual circumstances, there will be no charge made by each institution on a student or instructor basis in any curriculum which is based upon the Reciprocal Course approach. However, if any instructor of one institution is giving a non-reciprocal course at the other institution, full payment will be required for his services. Our examination of the proposed courses to be offered at both colleges for the fall of 1968, indicates that on a reciprocal course basis there could be eliminated jointly, one lower division course in French, Spanish, and German; and in addition, there might well be an elimination of one upper division course in French and Spanish. Thus, cooperative action would produce significant savings to both institutions."

All seemed very congenial following the April 8, 1968 approval by the College for Men Curriculum Committee of the College for Women General Education requirements, when on May 16, 1968, Rev. J. Vincent Sullivan sent a memorandum to the College for Men Curriculum Committee which almost changed the whole plan. However, the problem was solved amicably following
a meeting between Father Sullivan and Sister Bremner.

b. Development of Merged Departments

Faculty Resources: The foreign language faculty of the College for Men was composed of five members, the College for Women of seven. Pooling these resources enabled us to carry on the work with three fewer faculty in September, 1968. At present, Italian is no longer being taught and Latin is taught as a language but not as literature. We have nine full-time faculty members and one part-time in the Foreign Language Department.

Curricular Interaction: The foreign language General Education requirement was one of the most crucial issues at the time of the merger of the College for Men and the College for Women Foreign Language Departments. The College for Men required an intense five-day-per-week first year course carrying a total of ten units. The College for Women also taught language five times a week, but two labs counted as one class and the course carried four units each semester. College for Women students were required to complete the third semester of a foreign language. There were also differences as to placement: the College for Men seems to have placed all incoming freshmen in Language 1; the College for Women placed students who had had two years of a language in high school in Language 2 and those who had had three years of a language in high school in Language 3.

The College for Women requirement has prevailed and students are required to complete a language through the third four-unit semester, no matter where they begin. Latin has been kept as it was at the College for Men and two five-unit semesters of Latin fulfill the foreign language General Education requirement. Students majoring in Accounting and in Business Administration are not required to take a foreign language. Placement in language classes follows the College for Women practice.
The thrust of the Foreign Language Department at the College for Men was to have a deeply-based language major tied in with our western civilization and philosophy courses at USD. The requirements, as stated in the College for Men 1965-1966 Catalogue were: Language 100 (Advanced Grammar), 101 (Advanced Composition), 102 (Advanced Conversation), 110 and 111 (Intensive Readings), and one course each in Individual Authors, Periods and Movements, Types and Forms, and Area Studies.

Although the Bulletin promised that these courses would be given if there were sufficient demand, in practice upper division courses in French were not given at the College for Men at the time of the merger.

The 24 units of upper division work now required for the French and Spanish majors at USD follow what the College for Women was doing at the time of the merger: period courses for the literatures of France and Spain, survey and genre courses for the literature of Spanish America, and such courses as linguistics, French and Spanish civilization and French Phonetics and Phonology.

The main improvement in the program has been that all upper division courses are now taught in the target language, which was not always the case at the College for Men. Men can now major in French, which they could not do before the merger.

German language and literature were taught at the College for Men and at the College for Women. They are taught now at USD. Students may fulfill the foreign language General Education requirement by taking German. They may also minor in German.

Latin was taught at the College for Men and at the College for Women. Very small upper division courses in Latin were given at the College for Men. Since Rev. J. Vincent Sullivan was transferred to parish work, USD has only been offering ten units of elementary Latin and independent study.
Italian, which was taught at the College for Women at the time of the merger, has been discontinued.

Psychological Factors: A feeling of unity has now been achieved in the Foreign Language Department. French and Spanish Honor Societies, which existed at the College for Women, are now open to men.

As the first student from the College for Men began his graduate studies in Spanish at the College for Women, we had to face the fact that he could not follow the courses with ease because they were taught in Spanish and some of his previous courses had been taught in English. Since there were members from the College for Men and the College for Women in the merged department, the question as to whether language classes were to be taught in the target language or not had to be solved. On May 13, 1971, a Memorandum from Sister Furay and Dr. Martin was sent to the faculty of the Spanish Department: Dr. Graves, Sister Mapa, Sister Sarre, Dr. Freitas, and Mr. Roedel. It read as follows:

"As you know, the department of Spanish has operated for the past two years as a unified department, under the chairmanship of Dr. Graciela Graves. Faculty members within the department, however, are still employed by one or the other of the Coordinate Colleges. Since this is true, we have learned that the goals of what used to be two separate departments are at variance. Specifically, there is no universal agreement in the precise objectives of the general education requirement in Spanish. Nor is there agreement on the importance of the use of Spanish in teaching the courses (whether general education or major) or on the prohibition against the use of English in a Spanish class.

"It seems obvious that unless the regulations affecting the methods of teaching Spanish are known and supported by all members of the department there is bound to be confusion and unhappiness."
"In the confident expectation that free discussion and deliberation on these matters by the entire department will produce the unanimity that is so important, we are asking Dr. Graves to convoke a meeting of the department as soon as possible. We are aware of the inconvenience of having special meetings in these last two weeks of the school year, but we feel this matter is too important to wait."

As the result of the meeting, the Spanish Department decided that, except for the grammar in Spanish 1 and 2, all Spanish classes were to be taught in Spanish.

The situation has improved in upper division classes, but the lower division Spanish classes are not yet fully satisfactory.

c. Objectives within the institutional and college goals.

The foreign language department is small, student-oriented and enjoys an advantageous faculty/student ratio. It pursues academic excellence: quality teaching and enthusiasm. Foreign languages form part of a liberal education. Our primary aim in our language classes is communication. Students learn to express themselves in a language other than their own, to understand those of other countries, to enlarge their views.

Ours is not only a Department of Foreign Languages, but also of Foreign Literatures. Our curriculum is designed to teach the language, the culture, the literature, the thought and the impact of France, Spain, Germany, and Latin America today and throughout the ages. It seeks to form a well-rounded individual, able, in his turn, to project the enrichment he has received.

The distinctive goal of USD is leadership in a search for human meanings and values. The study of literature provides a wonderful opportunity for this search and can prove a very enriching and maturing experience. The new Department of Interdisciplinary Studies will help to broaden the vision of our
students. We shall cooperate with it in courses on comparative literature, linguistics, and area studies.

d. Current Programs

French: There are now 133 students (18 majors, and six master candidates) in the French Department in the fall semester 1972-1973. The student choosing French has usually a high G.P.A. and is quite enthusiastic. The department feels that the quality of its students makes up for the lack of quantity.

The incorporation of the French Department into the Foreign Language Department has some disadvantages, mostly for the outside image (as for example being dropped from the list of the MLA), reinforcing the general apathy towards languages. But inside the Foreign Language Department the French Committee has retained its autonomy and works in harmony with the rest of the faculty.

German: Classes are conducted in German with the exception of grammar explanations in first and second semester German. The material studied in class is expanded by referring to cultural, historical, political, and every-day issues as background information to let the student be part of German life and customs.

The only weakness in the program is seen in the number of staff members. At present only one full-time faculty staff member is responsible for the entire German language minor. Unless this staff member teaches up to and more than 15 units per semester, one course must always be eliminated which again leads to inconsistency in course offerings and therefore results in a loss of interest in German on the part of the student. In spite of this handicap the number of students has increased over the last year. The fall of 1972 counts a total of 40 students in the three classes offered.

The library holdings with regard to primary and secondary German
books in major periods of literature are very inadequate. A larger budget is needed to supply our library with at least the bare minimum of books.

Spanish: Spanish is both a General Education subject and an academic major. It can be a teaching major for students preparing for the secondary credential. It is also a good major for students who will teach ESL or who are preparing for the Bilingual Credential. Spanish will be needed by those going into Civil Service or Social Service. It is a useful language for history majors.

For the lower division courses the goal is to give the students "a grasp of the fundamentals of Spanish grammar and syntax, a correct pronunciation, and ease in oral expression," in other words, the mastery of the language and some culture. Spanish 4 (Intermediate and Advanced grammar), 99 (Advanced Conversation), and 101 (Advanced Composition) should complete the mastery of the language. The students, not the teacher, should do most of the speaking. These are taught exclusively in Spanish.

The courses in literature and culture -- all of which are taught in Spanish -- aim at creating greater familiarity with the language. Term papers, oral reports, etc. are excellent practice for future teachers. They give the students, not only knowledge of literature and culture, but also in-depth knowledge of literary works in their multiple aspects. Because of the desire expressed by faculty and students for greater emphasis on Spanish America, a course on Mexican literature has just been introduced. A course on Spanish American literature is taught each semester.

The graduate program in Spanish is small. The Spanish faculty considers it desirable as it offers opportunities for those seeking the M. A., the M. A. T., or the teaching credential. It offers an excellent challenge for the professor.

The USD Guadalajara Program is a definite asset and helps the students to achieve fluency in speaking Spanish. The literature courses are excellent,
but the lack of an adequate library in Guadalajara is to be deplored. Elementary and Intermediate Spanish are crowded into six weeks each, which is not desirable.

The Language Laboratory: USD's 40-booth language laboratory is certainly an asset. A maintenance contract, an efficient director, and yearly replacement of some of the equipment keep it going. Its effectiveness as a teaching tool depends largely on the faculty, some of whom take no responsibility for their classes during their lab periods. Classes that use pre-prepared tapes get excellent results. Laboratory assistants are used so as not to increase the teaching load of those who are teaching 12 units.

d. Future Thrust and Plans

French: The French faculty wish to contribute more and more to our growing institution (we would like to see the students of the School of Business Administration also exposed to languages). The faculty is young, well informed, and flexible, and wants to keep its program up to date. It is in order to do this that Dr. Jeanne Rigsby will use her sabbatical next fall to re-organize the French courses around the great topic of civilization.

German: Mrs. Halvorson has drawn up a proposal for a German major and submitted it to the Curriculum Committee, which in turn referred it to the Long Range Planning Committee. Regardless of the lack of a German major, an additional faculty member is needed in order to facilitate the teaching of the German minor.

Spanish: With the new examinations to be taken by candidates for the teaching credentials, the faculty anticipates having to teach courses not currently offered, which may be needed by those of our majors who are planning to teach.

Department of Foreign Languages: Dr. Gilbert is interested in using
members of the Department for Interdisciplinary courses. The entire department wants to continue to do what it is doing, to try to make its students truly fluent in the language of their choice and to develop them into Americans able to understand and to communicate with other human beings beyond national frontiers.

6. Department of Humanities

a. The Creation of a New Department

In the spring of 1972, at the end of its first year, the new administration of the University of San Diego designed and projected the present Department of Humanities. This involved the integration of four small departments with one that was appreciably larger. The change was entertained, generally discussed, and brought about in the face of a measure of faculty opposition from all the disciplines concerned. The reasons given for the new alignment were economic at bottom and were supported by administrative practicality and right of decision. Thus the academic departments of Art, English, Music, Speech, and Theater Arts were joined. Five chairmen were replaced by one chairing the Humanities. The various fine arts were consolidated and, in structure, the focus of operations had been made more exact and accountable. Considered in the abstract the reorganization is both reasonable and promising. In practice, however, it becomes another matter, for, as one well knew and continues to be reminded, the combined elements are not abstractions.

At present the Department of Humanities, feeling its way toward the coherence it has been asked to achieve, operates as a loose confederation of the still distinct, still self-concerned, areas of Art, English, Music, and Speech. Theater Arts, the fifth area, is quiescent, having as of the moment no faculty and offering no real program. The term, "area," is really not accepted in practice by the former departments. They continue to think of
themselves as distinctive disciplines, as "departments" in the traditional academic sense. A few members of the faculty in the new department work covertly and openly to discourage its efforts to operate harmoniously in carrying out its administrative charge. What all of this means more specifically and suggestively can be seen in the histories, analyses, and evaluations each of the disciplines presents.

b. Art: The Modernizing of a Department

General: During the last four years the Art Department has shifted its predominant character and emphasis from commercial art to art history and studio art. This has been brought about with a minimum of noticeable trauma and is, more than any other particular thing, a reflection of a change in the quality of the program which changes in faculty have occasioned.

By 1968 the College for Men had abandoned all pretense to a fine arts offering. At best, what had been available to the men for some time was but a token course taught by a person working outside his area of proper competence. Thus a complete merger of the art programs of the two colleges was accomplished without a ripple worth mention. The program in art was simply the program of the College for Women, from this point onward open to men on the same terms it was to women. Thus it was possible, despite the continuing clear separation of the two institutions, for a man to major in art and, taking all of his course work in art at the College for Women, to receive his degree from the College for Men.

At this point in its development, the program of the Art Department was quite weak. It was a clear reflection of its faculty (one in which personality exercised greater sway than innovation and breadth) and of a vaguely pervasive view of Art as a major for students whose academic enthusiasms were not particularly ambitious. One attraction of the art faculty was, and in a sense
continues to be for some, Sebastian Capella, a serious and able artist, primarily a painter, cast in the Spanish neo-impressionist mold. His has been a two-thirds time faculty appointment (an arrangement he prefers) and his influence on the program has been confined to classes in painting and drawing. One would expect the climate created by such an instructor to be significant, but this is not the case. In a negative way, Mr. Capella's position and accomplishments in the department are somewhat indicative of the nature, problems, and prospects of the Art Department within the University at the present time.

Faculty: Let us leap, then, from 1968 to 1972. The faculty is essentially as large as it was: two full-time members holding ranks of associate and assistant professor (Spuehler and Hanafin), one two-thirds time member (Assistant Professor Capella), and one part-time member (Lecturer Nobile), three women and one man — a proportional matter which influences the character of department options and choices. The dominant force in this group is Therese Hanafin, a graduate of the College for Women and long-time member of the art faculty, recently chairman of the department, presently area coordinator for art in the Humanities Department. Lorri Spuehler, holding the highest academic rank in the department, in her third year at the University, has sought and exercises less power than might be expected in the determinations, arrangements, and primary thrust of the art program. The image of the program seen within the University and in the larger community is the one that appears to be shaped, aimed, energized, and controlled by Professor Hanafin.

Purpose: The purpose of the Art Program at the University of San Diego is two-fold. For non-majors it is dedicated to developing their visual arts awareness and background in two ways. It hopes to develop their appreciation of design, preparing them for their roles as responsible adult consumers, citizens, and tastemakers. It also endeavors to foster in them understanding of the art forms of the world as a basis of communication with people not of their
In the aim to foster visual sensitivity, the Art Program is opposed to a position that couples art only with the entertaining periphery of life. Therefore, the Program works to counter the view that art is either a release or a self-oriented expression cut off from either community responsibilities or the rich heritage of artistic achievement of the past.

Non-majors share the lower division courses with majors. This is done to avoid diluted and patronizing content for the non-major; to provide communion between non-majors and the art majors who will be their creative peers in an adult society; and, with success to date, to uncover unrecognized artistic potential. Student satisfaction is reflected in heavy enrollment and in the frequent election to fulfill the entire General Education Fine Arts requirement within the Art Program. A large number of non-majors continue into upper division art courses as electives, particularly in ceramics and art history.

The Major: The department realizes its responsibilities to the major by insisting upon broad experience. The student is thus encouraged not to limit his personal or artistic growth or his further participation in any emerging opportunities within the discipline. This is accomplished by requiring the completion of an equal number of upper division courses in the areas of two-dimension, three-dimension, and art history. No one course is required. (This plan was devised by Florence Spuehler, primarily.) However, in order to foster the art field's essential demands for individual discipline and expression, "Advanced Problems," is the one specific requirement. Course selection within this framework is carefully supervised by the department through counseling sessions and regular evaluation of the student's work and aspirations. Assignments within each course are adjusted toward the student's major aims. There are no identical major programs of study. Majors are encouraged to participate widely in elective opportunities outside the area of art in order to
expand the background necessary for meaningful expression and the comprehension of art as a career. Toward this end, a minor is not required. However, the results of this recent decision warrant scrutiny.

Since 1968 the Art Program has made appreciable progress beyond the increases in number of majors and total enrollment reflected in statistics. Its reputation has been pretty clearly revised from "poor" to "respectable." It has come from derogation to a sound position in the discipline in the University and larger San Diego community through several factors.

(1) Initiation in 1970 of a permanent, professional exhibition area: Founders Gallery and its attendant critical acclaim. That facility is tied to our educational aims. Beyond the stimulation which it affords student artists, it is an instructional tool for art history and design. The gallery selections do not necessarily reflect the personal tastes of the art faculty. Exhibitions of recognized, uniform excellence are selected and present a balance of all types of art expression in every media and from every locale and era.

(2) Initiation of monthly student exhibitions in the Knights of Columbus (College for Men) Library in 1970.

(3) Commencement of a 4,000 slide library in 1969.

(4) Increased academic stimulation from the addition of CM students. There has been, since the merging of art classes in the fall of 1967, a marked increase in classroom participation. A submissive and conscientious tone has given way to one of dialogue and challenge. The male students have demonstrated a wider ranging inclination in their academic performance. Merging has required a more flexible approach in class sessions and assignments which are more inventive and demanding.

(5) Favorable recognition of the faculty through off-campus exhibitions, awards, lectures, and publication, and an active participation in other off-campus activities in the art and academic areas.
(6) A close and sympathetic rapport between students and faculty.

(7) The confidence and support of the administration.

(8) Constant reappraisal by the entire art faculty has resulted in total renovation of departmental requirements and offerings since February, 1970. At that time the 24 upper-division unit requirement was entirely two-dimensional and commercial in its orientation. The unit requirement was increased to 27 and the areas of graphics, sculpture, ceramics, advanced drawing, painting, design, and art history were introduced. Commercial courses and those of predominantly feminine concern were dropped.

(9) Constant attention by the art faculty to the students' needs in their academic and personal lives has resulted in greatly improved creative yield.

The Future: Based upon analysis of swelling student enrollment, numbers of majors, and recognition of opportunities possible for the graduating student and of the strengths and nature of the University of San Diego, the prognosis for the art program is encouraging. The nucleus of studio courses will probably show little immediate change. Studio "talents" are identified early, before college entrance, and students possessing and wishing to develop them more often than not elect art schools. The four courses in painting have proved by their enrollment to be more than sufficient for student demands.

It is clear from enrollment that art history is an area of great student interest. This preference is encouraged by expanding employment opportunities in the areas of criticism, research, and public education as well as in museums and private enterprise. The scholarly approach and background demanded at USD form a fine preface for specialization. Upper division students have worked closely with the Mayor's Historic Site Board. They have been recognized for research which has spared several historic buildings of aesthetic value such as the Santa Fe Depot and Bachesto Block. Students are also continuously involved in the historic restoration of the Mission San Diego de Alcala.
Faculty: The faculty of the art program has pioneered interdisciplinary courses with the areas of theater and anthropology. Its professors are frequent guest lecturers in other areas.

The art faculty is diversified in its skills. Their flexibility, creativity, and cooperation have made it possible for our program to cover a multiplicity of areas. The complete rapport and cooperation between the four faculty members and a constant, informal exchange of ideas concerning counseling of students and curriculum extends to all areas of planning and responsibility and includes participation in each other's classes.

The Art area is essentially an elective one. The minimal Fine Arts requirement can be fulfilled entirely outside the area. However, the swell of interest as reflected in enrollment indicates the liveliness of the offering and its continuing value to students.

c. English: The Development of a Merged Department

During the academic year 1967-1968 the English Departments of the University of San Diego College for Men and San Diego College for Women began making serious overtures for the purpose of coordinating their offerings. It had become apparent by then that the future of the two institutions lay in some kind of practical rapprochement. It was further apparent to the faculties of the two departments that their separate programs and course offerings were more than amenable. They were, in fact, both constructed on the same principles and represented an essential harmony of approach to the study of literature. Based on an ordering according to genres and historical periods, the two programs invited coordinating, particularly at the upper division level of instruction. Here the two could well slip together with only a little jostling of titles, numbers, and course descriptions. This was accomplished for the Bulletins of the two institutions for the year 1968-1969, and the faculty assignments of the
departments were coordinated and presented as essentially one program of
studies. Faculty resources, in effect, were doubled along with the range of
courses we could offer.

At this stage of affairs, moving into the 1968-69 academic year, the
credentials and qualifications of the combined faculties were fairly impressive.
The teaching abilities of the group were recognized throughout the colleges as
better than average, and the work of a few (McHugh, Gerlach, and Nyce) was
held to be outstanding.

During the academic year 1968-1969, few actual changes took place
which had not been well in the mill by the end of the preceding school year. It
became perfectly clear to all of us that we would continue to move toward a
complete unification of our resources and offerings. This we managed during
the year through combined faculty committees within the departments, bringing
together completely our curriculum from the first general education course in
literature and composition through our graduate offerings. The most noticeable
duplication of effort appeared in the continued double chairmanship of the
departments: Sister McHugh from the CW and Dr. Gerlach from the CM.
However, it was apparent that the English departments were somewhat more
fortunate than other academic pairs of departments in the colleges in the willing-
ness of their two chairmen to work together. This might not have been entirely
predictable, considering the strongminded and rather authoritarian cast of the
two. Suffice it to say that they labored to bring about a unified department and
managed the vagaries and fogs of separate budgetary responsibilities and
separate institutional inclinations (as well as general rumbles of discontent) with
amity and a great deal of mutual respect.

The student response to changes in the wind and in effect during the two
years, 1967-1969, was generally positive. Coeducational classes struck them,
at first, as a boon and sign of the modern spirit coming alive on campus. Such
classes were initially a bit distressing to some members of the faculty, more so to those from the CW than the CM. This latter fact may be indicated in the unwillingness, during this period of coordination, of the CW faculty to offer classes in the CM buildings as contrasted with the eagerness of some CM faculty to teach in the CW classroom buildings. Thus the climate of attitudes was not entirely easy (and, in a sense, has been the slowest thing to change). Even as CW forces suggested that the ways of men tended to erode something of the gentility of literature, the CM forces suggested that the ways of their counterparts were less professional and realistic than they might well be. Yet, all in all, one could see that as troubles went, the Departments of English were in the clear.

The three year period, 1969-1972, was one of virtual unification of the two departments. Sister McHugh was appointed chairman of the officially coordinated departments. (Budgetary responsibilities, however, remained divided and required, in effect - at least on occasion - the reappearance of two chairmen.) A two-year rotating chairmanship, alternating between a CW and a CM faculty member, was agreed upon for the period of operation moving toward an assumed merger or practical cooperative university structure. Sister McHugh agreed, however, to continue as chairman for a third year, 1971-1972, during which time Dr. Gerlach, the natural choice for the new chairman, was on sabbatical leave.

The three years of Sister McHugh's chairmanship were marked by an evenness of temper in the conduct of all affairs of the department. The travails, the ruffles experienced in the department were all directly related to faculty problems, specifically matters of appointment, retention, and termination. These, in retrospect, were handled with admirable tact and consideration for the persons involved. It may also be said that these problems have been an outgrowth of concern for the professional character and development of the
department shown most persistently by Professors McHugh and Gerlach. Their efforts in dealing with these concerns, not always easy to manage in facts and consequences, occasionally marked by principled disagreement, and accompanied by a normal measure of feelings, have been directly responsible for the present faculty complement and character of the department.

This brings us to the present state of affairs. The former Department of English, now designated the English Area, constitutes the dominant element in the new Humanities Department. The chairman of Humanities is a Professor of English, Lee Gerlach. Thus the direction of policy and thrust of studies in English remains essentially intact, and the linking with Art, Music, Speech, and Theater has occasioned no significant loss of departmental sense of identity.

In terms of faculty, the English Department is clearly stronger, more competent, lively, and promising at present than it has ever been. Two of its major forces, Professor McHugh and Associate Professor Benjamin Nyce, are on leave for the year, but their activities in the Orient and in Africa will make them, on their return, even more valuable than before. The four most recent additions to the department (Horobetz, Hill, Clausen, and Grossman) have, singly, and together brought about a noticeable youthful modification in the general temper and style of literary studies. Next year, returned to full strength, the department should be able to provide a program unmatchable by any other in the College. We will, however, continue to show a relative weakness in faculty specialization in the 18th century, medieval literature, and linguistics. This we should aim to remedy in the years immediately ahead.

Curricular structure: The curricular structure of the English department seems fairly stable, unlikely to see any radical or sweeping changes in the years immediately to come. The general education offerings have settled down to a reasonable and promising format. (C.f. Bulletin for English 21, 22, 23, 28,
The combination of writing training and instruction in the literary arts is well balanced and fairly "modern" in aspect, leaning in the direction of world literature and the contemporary rather than toward the older provinciality of English and American literature and the past.

Approximately one-half of the department faculty teaching load is devoted to general education offerings. The instructors do not find the program onerous in any respect since the courses are open enough in definition to allow them to work quite constantly with literary materials they find most pertinent to their talents and interests as well as those of their students.

The course work required of the English major is relatively generous in the options it allows. If anything, some sort of historical pattern might be established as a framework for the requirements, encouraging the students to study, for example, 17th century poetry before 20th century poetry. Further developments specifically designed for the major will probably take two forms: the splitting of a few of the "Big" courses ("20th Century British and American Fiction" into "20th Century British Fiction" and "20th Century American Fiction") and the proliferation of undergraduate seminars concentrating more narrowly on particular authors, forms, and topics. The faculty seems quite satisfied with the upper division, more professionally oriented courses offered by the department. Again, within the Bulletin determinations, the individual instructor has a fair amount of latitude in the construction of his particular course. One is aware, however, that occasionally in the face of the seeking spirit of the "new teacher" this is not entirely adequate.

The program of graduate studies in English is presently undergoing examination by the English faculty with an eye to modifying degree options and the kind of comprehensive exam required of candidates. A reading list for Master's candidates is being prepared, in an effort to define more accurately the body of literary works for which the student should hold himself responsible.
Both students and faculty have observed that it is excessive to require that
the M. A. candidate be prepared to deal adequately with all of English and
American literature. Newer members of the English faculty, qualified by their
earned doctorates, should be working more extensively in the graduate pro-
gram -- both in giving seminars in their specialties and in directing theses.
Finally, the M. A. and M. A. T. programs are beginning to take on new life and
prospects for a truly healthy graduate study situation in English are very good.

Curricular accommodation of interdisciplinary studies which are being
formulated should provide few real problems. The faculty in English is gener-
ally amenable to working out inter-departmental courses of many kinds, and the
competency of a goodly number of its members in particular historical,
geographical, and cultural areas other than those normally associated with
English programs is a fair guarantee that the department will be active in its
support of anticipated curricular adventures. Courses in comparative literary
studies are presently being investigated with members of the Foreign Languages
faculty.

With respect to matters pertaining to the physical plant and the general
budgetary picture of the University, the English Department is reasonably con-
tent. The classrooms are more than adequate in size, character, and quality.
Faculty office space is satisfactory, though office furniture needs improvement.
Salaries are below standard, particularly at the senior faculty levels. Support
for the University literary journal, Pequod, should be provided for in the
Humanities budget. Such support, matched by Associated Student funds, should
be guaranteed for a period of about three years, by which time the journal
could be almost totally self-sustaining on the basis of subscriptions. Editorial
activities connected with the publication of Pequod are dovetailed into the crea-
tive writing offerings of the department.

Objectives: The Department of English operates in all respects within
the framework of University of San Diego objectives. More particularly, we work in the light of fairly traditional conceptions of what literature is and what its study and profession aim to accomplish. Literature, as we see and work to present it, is one of the fine arts. It gives special and untranslatable form to human experience. For the student, the literary work -- poem, play, essay, or novel -- constitutes a distinctive order of knowledge. This is more than a matter of aesthetic experience, more than cultivation, and sensitizing. From earliest times, and in virtually every culture, some exacting acquaintance with such works has been, and continues to be, an essential part in a man's project to become civilized, to be a responsible member of the human community. It is the general purpose of the Department of English to make available and to promote this formal, artistic acquaintance.

The graduated English major has been given the foundations for pursuing further studies in literature leading to the M. A. and Ph. D. degrees. Our students have gone on to complete Master's and Doctoral programs at such universities as Stanford, Brown, University of Michigan, Catholic University of America, University of California, Irvine, University of California, Santa Barbara, University of California, Berkeley, Northwestern, and Pennsylvania. Others have gone on to the careers literary studies also persistently lead to -- in the law, in journalism, in teaching, and in business. The training and education our program offers is demonstrably valuable in terms of our humane objectives and also in very practical terms.

d. Music: The Development of a Program

The Music program at USD started rather modestly with the opening of the College for Women. Vocal music, primarily choral, with some Music Theory and Music History courses formed the curriculum. Piano instruction was soon added and by 1958 some instrumental ensemble classes (strings)
appeared. In the next few years a chamber orchestra was formed including both students and people from the community at large. Opera Workshop was introduced in 1962 and has steadily grown in scope, quality, and level of student involvement. The granting of college credit for off-campus private study was instituted providing the teacher's credentials satisfied the requirements of the department. Meanwhile, course offerings were expanded, recital requirements for performing majors established and by 1970 the music faculty was enlarged to three full-time teachers, one of whom was designated department chairman.

During this time there was a steady growth both in the number and caliber of students involved in the music program. The adopting of a co-educational policy by the University gave a strong impetus to further development. And, almost as an aside, the minor life — never more than choral group training — of the College for Men music program can be mentioned. By 1968 even that had disappeared.

Within the past six years we have had a Metropolitan Opera regional audition winner, who also appeared with the San Diego Youth Symphony and the La Jolla Civic Orchestra, three winners of the San Diego Symphony Young Artists Auditions, and a number of other talented students who have distinguished themselves both on and off campus. Further, a very high percentage of those majors who enter our program and go on to graduate work have been accepted by such schools as Julliard, San Diego State College, U.S.C., U.C.L.A., Indiana University and Catholic University of America. A special music scholarship fund was established in 1971. Sister Aimee Rossi, Dean Emeritus, spearheaded the drive which culminated in a special yearly concert with all proceeds going into the fund.

At the present time we have twenty-five Music majors and a small number of Music minors. Indecision among some of the younger students makes it difficult to give a precise figure. Arrangements have been made to start a
music program for bandsmen from the Marine Corps Recruit Depot. During the
spring semester of 1973 a three unit course in "Harmony" (Music) will be
offered. This whole area may expand according to demand. Present scope
involves work of the bandsmen toward the A. A. certificate.

Our chamber orchestra in recent years has grown to the proportions of
a Symphony Orchestra so that we are now offering "chamber orchestra" as a
select and separate ensemble, while the larger group is designated as the USD
Symphony.

When we think in terms of what our school offers the community, the
USD Symphony, which encourages the active participation of amateur musicians
from throughout this area, must be firmly mentioned, particularly from the
standpoint of public service. Along with our own students there are (in the
orchestra) several alumni and a number of strong prospective USD students as
well as other community members. The number of concerts involving the
orchestra during the school year has been expanded from one or two in the re-
cent past, to four or more. Off-campus concerts are to be given, including
"out-of-town" performances.

The primary needs of this portion of our program at present are (1) a
rehearsal room (with proper acoustical treatment) large enough to accommodate
a sizeable instrumental organization, and (2) additional orchestral equipment,
mainly instruments.

The University Choir constitutes one of the more important student-
participation organizations that we have on our campus. As such, it deserves
some special attention. In recent years this group has become a choir of mixed
voices, though the men are still woefully out-numbered. We are working to
correct this imbalance and are hoping that some of the recent successes of the
choir will attract more singers -- both men and women. The choir has almost
doubled in size since the Fall of 1970 and enthusiasm is high. An outstanding
choral director has been hired on a part-time basis to conduct the group. The needs of this operation at present are (1) portable risers, (2) an acoustical shell, and (3) a properly equipped rehearsal room.

A student organized and directed Madrigal group has given several off-campus programs this past semester. It also took part in the President's Inaugural Festivities. The level of enthusiasm and achievement in this group is extremely high. They represent us most favorably in the community, as evidenced by their recent appearance by invitation at COMBO, the San Diego cultural funding organization. Additional faculty to cover this course is strongly recommended. For the time being a part-time instructor would be acceptable.

The Opera Workshop gives one public performance a semester on two consecutive evenings. This is a very strong part of our music offerings and has steadily grown in student participation and quality of performance. Handled by an outstanding vocal coach all facets of opera are covered from vocal production to stage designing, costuming, acting, blocking, make-up, etc. Most productions are done with a duo-piano accompaniment though some, as the most recent "Dido & Aeneas" by Purcell, with string orchestra. More productions with small orchestra are planned for the future.

Since this course is not restricted to music students, a broader segment of the student body has the opportunity to gain the culturally enriching experience involved in operatic production. Here again, as in the other performing organizations, the goal of the well-rounded artistically aware and sensitive person is being served, and is in fact the main reason for the existence of these groups.

The resident faculty ensemble, the Alcala Trio, is the only one of its kind presently established in this area. An ensemble of this type can be considered a University asset in as much as it adds prestige to the school, attracts audiences to the campus, and provides music students with an ever-
present yardstick by which to measure their own progress and serves as a model of professionalism. All students benefit from an "on-campus" group such as this. It is recommended that members of the ensemble be given released time from their normal teaching load to carry on this activity in accordance with the practice of most other institutions.

Presently three full-time faculty members, with the aid of part-time instructors, carry the entire load of the music program. Considering recent growth and prospects for the immediate future, it will become an increasingly difficult -- if not impossible, task to continue the present level of service without additional full-time faculty.

Facilities: For class piano instruction, we presently use one piano lab equipped with five upright pianos. We strongly recommend establishing an electronic piano lab as a more effective means of teaching this subject.

More practice rooms are needed. Consideration should be given to having the faculty offices in the C117 area revert back to practice rooms and teaching studios as was the original intent when they were designed and acoustically treated. This is a high priority matter and should be dealt with as soon as practicable.

The Future: The following matters should be given serious consideration in the process of solidifying and advancing the program of studies in music:

1. Institution of a Bachelor of Music degree.
2. The development of a music therapy program.
3. The development of a center for the study of early music.
4. Setting up a museum for early instruments.
5. Adding brass and woodwind as string areas of instructional concentration including the forming of a concert band and stage band.

In terms of the question, "where is the music program heading at this University?" the answer seems to be "rapidly forward." Student enrollment
is up, caliber of talent is continually rising and enthusiasm is high. Faculty works very closely with students even to the point of joint performance in ensembles.

It may be worth considering that, because of the unique nature of the subject area and the special directional arrangements a performance-oriented music program requires, the designation of "Department of Music" be re-instated and released time be given to the person responsible for the operation of the program. Considering community interest, consistently rising level of talent among the incoming students, and rapid development of strong performing organizations the concept of "School of Music" is entirely reasonable and should receive energetic future consideration.

e. Speech Arts: The Decline of a Department

The career of the Department of Speech Arts during the past five years has been rather volatile. Before the merger the departments of the two colleges were quite small and their programs were limited in scope and size. However, the courses offered were generally well populated and showed the consistency of tenor which administrative and general education curricular support tend to guarantee.

At the College for Women, Speech was joined with Theater Arts. The regular chairman, Mr. B. R. Van Vleck, was on sabbatical leave during the year 1967-1968, and the acting chairman was Kathleen Zaworski, an instructor with an M. A. from Baylor University. Her area of expertise and interest was theater. During this academic year the emphasis of the department moved rapidly toward theater arts, speech taking on the character of an adjunct to the theater program of studies.

At the College for Men the program had been highly energized in the preceding years by an enthusiasm for forensics and debate demonstrated by its
successive directors. The second Assistant Professor, Richard Lott, continued to press for expansion of the program. In addition to the normally filled general education speech classes, the department could point to a series of highly successful speech conferences and competitions for high school students which it conducted. The program gave great evidence of appreciation and promising life.

During the academic year 1968-1969 changes leading to inter-college cooperation were underway and became a real influence upon the character and emphasis of both departments. At the College for Women, for reasons not entirely clear -- but probably related to personal as much as to policy factors involving the two-member faculty (Zaworski, Theater Arts and Van Vleck, returned, Speech Arts) -- the areas of the Speech and Theater Arts Department were separated and two even smaller departments established. The program in Speech was a one-man operation.

However, it was implicitly supported (with the beginning coordination of the colleges) by the College for Men program which was apparently thriving and promised fairly to take over the life of the discipline on campus. A speech major was offered by the two faculties. Two units of speech continued to be a general education requirement as it had been since 1954. Forensics and debate were still strongly stressed by the department.

The year 1969-1970 saw closer coordination of the College for Women and College for Men faculties and offerings. A single department was established with Mr. Van Vleck as titular chairman and Mr. Lott -- to ease the union -- as Director of Forensics. Another man was employed on a half-time basis. During the year Mr. Lott's prospects and services to the coordinated colleges ran aground in a tangle of personal and professional problems, and he did not return.

During the period from 1969 to the present the only stable faculty
complement has been Mr. Van Vleck. A series of other supporting members have come and gone. The department has had, at its strongest, two members. The support for a vigorous forensics and debate program has waned. The general education requirement has been eroded away, in 1969 to be lumped with aesthetics, art, music, and theater arts in the four-unit fine arts requirement and, by 1972, it no longer served even this category. The major in speech has slipped away until, at present, once more, only a minor is offered and, lacking curricular and administrative support, the faculty has dwindled to one man, Associate Professor B. R. Van Vleck. His energies and enthusiasm, over the course of the changes in recent years, have also waned. The speech program seems to be merely hanging on. There remains, however, a nucleus of students who continue to be interested in an administration-student supported program in forensics and debate; these are a carry over of those who were involved during 1971-1972 in that activity under the direction of a faculty member who did not return this year.

Objectives: The "Area" of speech arts aims to offer every student the opportunity to attain the ability to communicate acceptably in oral English. In addition we offer students the opportunity to achieve specific speech skills and knowledge as well as to develop skills in arts of listening and use of the body in communicating. Further, we work at developing the sorts of skill, technique, and attitude which may result in greater proficiency in criticism, appreciation, interpretation, and evaluation of oral communication. Finally -- though the work of instruction always has humane side aims and values which are unpredictable -- we offer a minor program of studies designed to meet some of the professional requirements generally expected in the worlds of speech arts: radio, television, theater and the school.
The career of the Theater Arts Department closely parallels that of Speech Arts to which it had been tied during most of its career in the institutional structure.

During the year Mr. Van Vleck was on sabbatical leave, with the encouragement of Acting Chairman of the Speech and Theater Arts Department, Instructor Zaworski, theater arts was split off and set up on its own. During 1968-1969, with Miss Zaworski as chairman, the new department offered a minor. Assistance in the program came from Mr. W. B. Hektner in stage production and Mr. S. T. Howell, technical aid, who taught courses in both the Theater Arts and Art departments. One major production and workshop plays were presented.

During 1969-1970 the program in theater studies began to take shape, students were attracted to the promising action, and a major was projected. A minor was offered. One main dramatic production was presented. In the period from 1971 to the spring of 1972 the theater arts program moved along, gradually diminishing in student clientele and losing administrative support somewhat in step with the reshaping of the institution. Miss Zaworski and her program, apparently, ran into persistent difficulties in conflicts with other programs and faculty using the theater area. Sharing facilities among disciplines inclined to use temperament as a means for demonstrating professional status could only be less than promising. In the presence of continued difficulties and waning support, Miss Zaworski offered her resignation. Surprising to some, it was accepted. The program folded.

As of the moment the Theater Arts Department is essentially a paper operation carried under the Humanities Department. It has no faculty and will not have in the coming semester. It offers, thus, no real program. Two courses, cross-listed offerings from English and Speech, will be given during the spring.
These will accommodate a few incomplete minor students, but they are clearly a temporary measure.

Students interested in theater productions have rallied their forces and appealed to the Humanities Department for reactivation of the academic program. They have won support from the Associated Students and are now organized and lightly funded by them as a club. The Humanities Department is also providing them with some minor budgetary support for the two productions they will, on their own, mount during the year -- one in December and one in April. The prospects for the Theater Arts program are rather slim.

g. Objectives of the Humanities Department

Compared to the more usual university organizational design and emphasis, "the Humanities" at the University of San Diego have a different slant. Normally the area referred to rests firmly upon an alliance of studies in literature, language, and philosophy. The visual arts, music, and theater -- if included -- enter primarily as conceptual and historical rather than studio and performance oriented disciplines. Further, with reasonable exceptions granted in the interest of breadth in approach, the typical humanities program consists of a study of Western culture, "the great tradition," beginning with the achievement of the Greeks and running with some sense of historical inevitability to the triumph of the Anglo-American Way. Clearly, our program of studies in the Department of Humanities lacks that sort of thrust.

We are, by organization and area emphases, essentially a department of creative arts. The most academic-concept-history-culture oriented area is that of English. But even here, though we do not have a full-fledged degree program in creative writing, the inclination of the department is to treat literature as an art, a reasonable human activity, a discipline -- rather than a psychological mystery or a body of classifiable historical objects or vectors of
social reality or materials for *Kulturgeschichte*. In all of our courses strong emphasis is placed upon the student's own writing. His compositional imitation of the literary act is not simply ideas at work but a form of the essential process itself, close at hand, personal, a realization of his attention to the similar devotion of others. The actual writing of poems, stories, and plays by our students is persistently, and critically, encouraged. The University literary journal, *Pequod*, has been generated largely for the purpose of giving the student author a respectable place to publish his work in the company of his peers from elsewhere in the country.

Most briefly, then, it has worked out for the present that the Department of Humanities bears the responsibility for training and sensitizing our students to the various arts, to the reality which the senses and our human instruments — eyes, ears, lips, hands, and fabricating imaginations — make available to us. We thus work as teachers and students of each other always at extremely personal levels of engagement — whether it is at the piano keyboard, the potter's wheel, or bent over the text of a poem. Our emphasis is on works of art, as one writer phrased it, "... made one by one and spaced by many years."

Ideas — yes. The culture picture — yes. Relationships with other disciplines — yes. But in the beginning and the end, the main concern of the faculty and students meeting together in the areas of the humanities is the artistic enterprise.

7. Department of History and Political Science

a. Development of merged department

Perhaps the genesis of the currently merged Department of History and Political Science may be found in the Spring of 1968 when the first students of the College for Women were permitted to enroll in a course offered by the College for Men, namely, Historic Site Methods, an archaeological dig at the old Mission San Diego.
In 1968-1969 there took place the first free interchange of classes between students of the two colleges, except for the freshmen at the College for Men. The following year this restriction was removed from the College for Men freshmen. The movement towards cooperation accelerated.

In the early spring of 1969, Dr. Henry Martin, Academic Dean of the College for Men, and Sister Sally Furay, Academic Dean of the College for Women, arranged a meeting of the two History and the two Political Science faculties. The weather was cold, dark, and windy in the patio of the College for Women that day, and this reflected the attitudes of the four groups. There was little enthusiasm for the idea of coming together; in fact, among some, there seemed to be outright hostility towards it. It seemed to be one continuous "This is the way we do it at our place." Certainly it would have been difficult to have foreseen the cordial relation which came subsequently, and then the union which has worked out so well. No doubt it was due to the gentle persuasion and patience of Dean Martin and Sister Furay. Urged and supported by the two Presidents, Sister Nancy Morris and Msgr. John Baer, we all tried to find common and satisfactory ground. Gradually the phrase "our way" began to fade and finally disappeared. The task of eliminating duplications, assigning the faculties to their best areas, the agreements on course descriptions and numbers, proceeded with difficulty but successfully. There was more difficulty over instructors in the same fields, and some unhappiness the first year over finalization of assignments.

The crucial difficulties in History centered in three areas: Who was to teach United States Diplomatic History? Who was to teach Modern European History? Who was to give United States History and Government? The seat of the difficulty was that both faculties had been duplicating these courses for years, and the instructors assigned to them were extremely reluctant to give them to their colleagues of the "other" institution. At this point the two Chairmen of
History, College for Men and College for Women, Dr. Ray Brandes and Sister Catherine McShane got together and demonstrated patient and persistent statesmanship. Many hours were spent in discussion, reasoning, and persuading in the attempt to bring about rapport between these two departments. Many times they returned to their respective faculties with new proposals, counter-proposals, modifications, and changes. Eventually, bona-fide good will and the sincere wish to serve the community better, which really was always their goal, bore fruit. The result was a viable compromise of "give a little, take a little." With the passing of time, the compromise looked good to almost everyone and has worked well. The difficulties of the past are now regarded as trivial, and the two departments have become a reasonably happy family.

The story of the unification of the two Departments of Political Science, although substantially the same, was accidentally different. There were variations on the theme. The two College for Men and College for Women Political Science Departments became united under one Chairman as of the fall semester, 1970, one year after History. The College for Men Department was most reluctant to unite on the basis of numbers. It was thought that since there were over 90 Political Science majors at College for Men and only about 12 to 15 at College for Women, this union should not take place at that time. These figures are somewhat misleading, however, in that students at the College for Women did not declare a major until the second semester of the sophomore year. Agreement came on the following basis: a meeting was called by Father John Baer, then President of the College for Men, in his office in early April, 1970. Present at that meeting, besides Father Baer, were Sister Morris, President of the College for Women, Dean Martin of the College for Men, Dr. Morin, Chairman of Political Science at the College for Women, and Dr. Theil, Chairman of Political Science at the College for Men. It was argued that the combining of the two departments would be in the best interests of USD. Consent was given
by the College for Men, and it was pledged that the chairmanship of the combined departments would be rotated every two years. It is assumed that this might have happened except that after the second year a new approach was made, namely, the combining of the Departments of History and Political Science into one merged Department, which took place in September, 1972, for administrative purposes.

It is too early to assess the worth of this move, but it is already clear that there is a large measure of dissatisfaction among the two faculties. The Chairman, who is a professor of History, feels that he cannot relate sufficiently to the problems, methods, thrusts, plans, and ambitions of the Political Science Department. Also, since the History part of the team outnumbered the Political Science part, the latter is at a disadvantage in our joint deliberations. This problem may be partially solved by separate meetings and separate decisions by each discipline. Yet, with one exception, the Chairman has had more cooperation and help from the Political Science faculty than any Chairman has a right to expect. The fact is that Political Science is understaffed at present for their program.

The Political Science faculty consists of: one lecturer who teaches three units; one lecturer who teaches four units; one professor who teaches four units, but who has two other essential duties, namely, administration of the Graduate Program, Intersession, and Summer Sessions; one professor who is also Acting Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and teaches three units of Political Science. The other three professors each teach twelve units; two of these bear most of the burden of departmental chores.

b. Faculty

Our total faculty resources consist of six professors, three associate professors, five assistant professors, one instructor, and two lecturers with ten Ph. D.'s, five M. A.'s, one J. D., and one B. S. Most members of the
department have served in administrative offices, written books, and participated in a number of extracurricular activities.

What is more important than numbers and degrees is the enthusiasm, dedication to their profession, meticulous preparation, fairness without softness, which the faculty members of this merged department demonstrate. There is nearly always a student, or several students, in conference with instructors. Some faculty members spend more time than others, but all are really committed to our students, demonstrating their interest first, last, and always in instruction.

c. Physical and Financial Factors

Physically, the department has very favorable conditions: offices, classrooms, storage, furniture, office equipment, files, typewriters, availability of copiers of several kinds, clerical help in reasonable measure. There are some who believe that the budget is too low, with insufficient funds for maps, slides, film purchases, the acquisition of art prints, music records, microfilms of newspapers and other documents sorely needed for use in research and writing courses. Several desire availability of a video tape machine.

d. Current Programs

The history section of our department has most of its curriculum centered about four geocultural areas of which the majors must choose three. There is a large variety of offerings. What is lacking in the department is interrelation of these four areas. Most, if not all, are presented as distinct and separate entities with only peripheral overlap into other geocultural areas.

At the moment, the history area is going through something of a crisis. We are losing students to psychology and sociology. Why? They are seeking courses with content and method apparently more attuned to their "electronic"
There is a divergence of opinion within the Department as to the feasibility of our graduate programs. Some feel that the Master's in history has been one of the more solid M.A. programs in terms of numbers of students, and courses offered. With regard to placement, 90% of our M.A. graduates have teaching positions, other employment, or have continued in further graduate studies. Granting M.A.'s has (1) strengthened our upper division program; (2) provided leadership above the undergraduate level in the Graduate Student Association, which has granted funds for speakers and equipment for the Library. Additionally, the M.A. program has sent into the community teachers and administrators, men and women who have influence in hiring, counseling, and working with the department in recruitment of undergraduates. Graduates in the military service have also been instrumental in recruiting other students. Others feel that our M.A. program in Modern European History is dead; it should be given an honorable burial and we should concentrate on strengthening the undergraduate program. Still others find that the graduate program in history leaves much to be desired in the research capacity of students and research materials in the library. These would favor concentrating on one specific area for graduate work and building on that. Such an area would likely be American Studies as an extension of the already existing American Studies major at the undergraduate level. The other areas of Europe, Non-Western World, and Hispanic America are felt to be beyond our capabilities at this time. Those who disagree with this view note that seminars are flexible in content and can accommodate the interest of the students who might wish to concentrate in European or Asian history.

With respect to graduate study in Political Science, there was and still is a clear demand for graduate study in International Relations. The best expertise in the Political Science area of the Department is in International Relations. Military officers of every branch are being recruited in the San
Diego area for this program. There are some arguments against the retention of the International Relations program, some with a tissue of truth, others rather tenuous and specious. Some feel that the Political Science area is understaffed for such a program. It is alleged that our library holdings in this field are indeed scanty. But there are considerable library holdings in the San Diego area where our students are welcome. Cooperation among libraries is the current trend. Hardly any institution thinks "it can do it alone." It is said that the program may dilute the undergraduate offerings, but this is not in accord with the facts.

e. Departmental objectives within the context of the goals of USD

In the forming of the whole person, much attention should be given to the story of man and how he has acted and does act in society. Here then is the "raison d'être" of both History and Political Science. "Man's proper study is Man." So both our disciplines are man-centered; they fit into the goals of USD. Although our particular heritage is the Judaeo-Christian, our disciplines do not confine themselves to this but roam over all civilization, East, West, North, South, Oriental, and Occidental; they are concerned with every race, color, and creed, not on the basis of difference but on the basis of the essential unity of the human race. It is the objective of the department by its two disciplines to help our students to awareness of "right reason" as the political theorists put it, to motivate the student to accept and claim not only his rights within a civil society, but his obligations as well. We dwell on the theme of cooperating within the framework of our political structure even while attempting to effect desirable and necessary changes which man may deem essential to the betterment of society in the world tomorrow. And if man does not learn from history, he must make the same errors time and time again.

Because of our geographical location and cultural heritage, it seems that
a specific objective is to direct attention to Latin America and particularly to
the Hispanic Southwest. Here in San Diego County where approximately 20% of
the population is of Mexican origin, our objective should be to concentrate on
ethnic studies of this culture.

f. Future Thrusts and Plans

The department cannot be all things to all students — it cannot have
depth and breadth in all areas of the world. Considering again our location,
we have plans to reinforce our program in the area of the Mexican-Latin-
American studies, and our historic sites program.

Initiated in 1966 on the grounds of the Mission San Diego de Alcala,
the historic sites program is one of the three or four such programs offered by
a university in the United States. The educational focus is not directed toward
the development of professional archaeologists; instead, it seeks to interest the
student, regardless of his vocational goal, in understanding and appreciating
the importance of preserving the traditional roots of his culture. Team taught
by trained archaeologists and historians, the program emphasizes the necessity
and usefulness of the interdisciplinary approaches necessary to the full and
accurate development of historic sites preservation and reconstruction. The
year 1973 will see a major growth in the programming. The success of the
historic sites program has brought about a number of requests for a broadening
of the effort into prehistoric sites archaeology, and state recognition for salvage
and reconstruction on state-owned parks and historic monuments.

Another plan already "off the drawing board" is intradisciplinary. For
example, three members of the department will offer a course in Political and
Social Revolutions in the Modern World. We shall then eliminate the period
courses and hopefully hit on something more provocative to our "now" genera-
tion. Other courses contemplated in world rather than period context are:
Modern Dictatorships, Imperialism, Nationalism, Man versus Environment, Guerilla Warfare, the Dynamics of Dissent in History, Minorities throughout History, and others. The purpose is to revitalize our offerings by abandoning some of our standard chronological format and so to emphasize interrelated thematic presentations. This approach is to be selective, not interdisciplinary, but intradisciplinary.

An undergraduate major in International Relations has been planned by Political Science to begin in the fall semester, 1973. It will encompass courses taken primarily from the disciplines of history and political science though art, English, religious studies and other disciplines are included.

8. Department of Religious Studies

a. History of the Department

The merger of the departments of theology of the College for Women and the College for Men into the single Department of Religious Studies was accomplished with a minimum of difficulty and a maximum of enthusiasm and efficiency.

There were a number of factors which facilitated this merger: (1) During the summer of 1968 two members of the teaching faculty in the department of theology of the College for Women changed positions. One left the San Diego area and the other returned to teaching in the department of history. The administrations of the two colleges sought the advice of the remaining members of the department to replace these two members.

(2) The strong support and encouragement of the administration and the whole-hearted cooperation of the faculty in having a single religious studies department made the merger a reality in February, 1969. As a matter of record, the department of religious studies was the first completely merged department of the University of San Diego.
As a result of these factors, the joint presidents in consultation with the department, appointed one chairman for the new department of religious studies. This new department developed a program which serves the entire student body of the University of San Diego.

b. Objectives of the Department of Religious Studies

This department subscribes to the 1966 statement of the Association of American Colleges on the question of religion as an academic discipline. The document states that the very concept of liberal learning embraces religious questions and phenomena and that such questions "cannot be ignored by the person who calls himself liberally educated, which means they cannot be ignored by those institutions of higher education which intend to offer a liberal education." (Cf. Statement..., page 1.) Given the goals of this University dedicated to the "ideals of Catholic wisdom combined with those of a liberal education", the primary objective of the department is the academic presentation of the Roman Catholic tradition, of the common orthodox, Christian traditions, and of the traditions of the major world religions.

It must be clearly stated that the department's courses do not address themselves to character formation. The department's concern is with an academic discipline, not the discipline of life. The latter is the province of campus ministry directed by the University Chaplain. This distinction is basic to the academic nature of the department.

c. Academic program of the Department of Religious Studies

The courses of the Department of Religious Studies are made available to the students during:

1. Spring and Fall Semesters
2. Intersession in January
3. Pre-Session and Regular Session of the Summer School
4. Seminar each summer offered by the Ecumenical Center for the Study of World Religions.
During these sessions the department is engaged in: offering the students courses to enable them to learn core themes of Roman Catholic theology, and offering sufficient and varied courses to enable all students to fulfill the general education requirement of nine units. The department's faculty consisting of four Ph. D.'s, two Ph. D. candidates, and three M. A.'s is well-qualified to present this academic program.

d. The Department of Religious Studies and the Ecumenical Center for the Study of World Religions

The Ecumenical Center for World Religions was begun in January of 1972. At that time the Center began establishing academic relationships with the adherents of the major religions of the world.

The Center is a program of the Department of Religious Studies of the University. The Chairman of the Department is the Chairman of the Center, and the Professor of Asian Religions is its Coordinator. From the Southwest United States a support group of men and women serve as an Advisory Board.

The objectives of the Ecumenical Center for World Religions are:

(1) To discover and investigate points of contact between the Christian tradition and other traditions;

(2) To develop a library of the scriptures and writings of the major faiths which will serve as a resource learning center for research and study by scholars of religions; (3) To explore techniques and methods of teaching, on campus and overseas, which will deepen the student's understanding and appreciation of the world religions;

(4) To invite distinguished scholars and interested students of the religions to live at the Center, to engage in scholarly research, and to participate in dialogue with other members of the community.
e. The future of the Department of Religious Studies

We see the following needs for the department of religious studies:

1. The establishment of a major in religious studies. In order to do this, we need to expand the staff to include a professor of historical theology;

2. Development of a graduate program in religious education;

3. An increase in the scope of the Ecumenical Center. We offer at the present time a summer seminar.

f. Conclusion

The faculty of the Department of Religious Studies is completely in accord in promoting our objectives. Our working relationship with one another is congenial and supportive. All of us sense a growing student responsiveness to our offerings and our efforts to assist students outside the classroom. We view the future of the University and our role in that future quite optimistically.

9. Department of Philosophy

a. History of the merger of the Philosophy Departments

Although cooperative curricular programs were authorized by the administrators of College for Women and College for Men and inaugurated for the school year, 1967–1968, only juniors and seniors — to the exclusion of freshmen, sophomores, and seminarians — were able to take courses in each others' colleges. In the next year, 1968–1969, when the restriction on freshmen, sophomores, and seminarians was lifted, some departments even began to merge completely. Not so, however, in the case of the philosophy departments of the respective colleges. Each continued to have separate departments, with separate chairmen and faculty, separate course listings, separate major and minor requirements, and separate general educational requirements. The faculty, however, were listed jointly in each others' Bulle-
tins, and the students could fulfill philosophy requirements from the joint (not merged) course offerings. At the beginning of the school year, 1969-1970, the situation of the separate philosophy departments remained much the same, with the exception that, in the single catalog of the "Coordinate Colleges of USD" the course offerings were consecutively numbered, without overlapping, and the faculty were listed jointly in one listing.

But, as 1969 began drawing to a close, the many informal discussions about merging the departments took on a more formal shape. This was especially true for the two chairmen, Dr. Richard George, who had been chairman of the Women's College philosophy department since 1966, and Father William Shipley, who had been chairman of the Men's College philosophy department since 1960. From the early summer of 1967 their discussions and meetings about joint offerings of courses were concluded satisfactorily enough, but their discussions of merger were fruitless.

The reason for this impasse was a fundamental difference of opinion on the mode of teaching philosophy. Dr. George held that students should be taught the one and only perennial philosophy of Aristotle and Aquinas; Father Shipley held that the learning and teaching of philosophy be not so restricted. Consequently, the former espoused a program for majors in which the courses exemplified the branches of philosophy as treated in the Aristotelian-Thomist synthesis. On the other hand, Father Shipley espoused a program for majors that treated not only all the branches of philosophy, but added six units of historical survey of other philosophers and some electives, allowing the students to learn diverse philosophical systems.

Since this impasse remained, despite the meetings that continued right up to December, 1969, the two chairmen were finally tendered a memorandum, dated December 19, 1969, by their respective Deans, which contained a directive and an ultimatum. The directive stipulated that the two chairmen
were to reach agreement on General Education and major sequence requirements. The ultimatum stated that if this were not done by February 27, 1970, the two Deans would then be charged with the responsibility of structuring the merging of the philosophy course offerings. (See Folder C-1 for the Memorandum.)

With the re-opening of classes for the spring semester, February, 1970, Dr. George and Father Shipley met frequently, at least once a week, with their respective faculties in joint meetings or with each other. Gradually, but with much disagreement and compromise, a single program of required and elective courses for the major in philosophy was hammered out and readied by the ultimatum date, February 27, 1970.

However, the General Education requirements in philosophy had not been spelled out by that date. And, although the two departments continued to meet during March to work out such a program, agreement on it was not forthcoming. Consequently, the Academic Deans of the two colleges called a meeting of all the members of the two philosophy departments on April 7, 1970, in order to come to a decision. Dr. Henry Martin, Academic Dean of the Men's College, presided, with the active presence of the Academic Dean of the Women's College, Sister Sally Furay. Proposals from both sides were considered, revised, amended, and finally decided upon, course by course, by majority vote. Minority reports from those who objected to the vote are recorded in the minutes of this meeting and in those of the Curriculum Committee when the merged course offerings were submitted to them. Then, on April 10, 1970, a memorandum, signed by the two Presidents of the respective colleges, was sent to each of the philosophy faculty requesting their nominations for a single department chairman because, as of that date, the two departments were considered merged. On April 30, 1970, a similar memorandum from the two Presidents announced that Father William Shipley had been nominated by the faculty and that this nomination was confirmed by his appointment to be the
chairman of the merged department.

In the subsequent months, the reappointment of three of the four faculty of the previous Women's College philosophy faculty was announced: Dr. Richard George, Mr. Mark Berquist, and Dr. Joseph Ghougassian. One, Dr. Amado Carandang, was not reappointed because, prior to merger negotiations, he had been given notice of non-reappointment. Similarly, the re-appointment of the four faculty of the previous Men's College philosophy faculty was also announced: Father Shipley, Father Thomas Carlin, Father James Rankin, and Dr. John Swanke.

b. Components

Faculty:

As stated above in the history of the merger, at the time when the two philosophy departments officially merged (April, 1970), there had been four faculty members in each department. One of the four at the College for Women had received notification of non-reappointment before the merger. Of the seven who became members of the merged department, five remain. One other, originally from the College for Men department, left in May, 1972 because he was denied tenure — a decision in no way attributable to the merger. Another, Mr. Mark Berquist, originally from the College for Women department, voluntarily resigned in May, 1972, at least partly because of disenchantment at the direction taken by the merged department.

With regard to the hiring of replacements, it can confidently be stated that given the departure of Mr. Berquist at the time he left, the College for Women would have hired Sister Glowienka; and that given the departure of Father Rankin at that time, the College for Men would have hired Mr. Hurley.

Analysis: Only two additional faculty changes can be attributed directly to the merger of the two departments — namely, the reduction of total faculty needs in philosophy from eight to seven members, and the
departure of Mr. Berquist.

However, the merger itself undoubtedly strengthened the combined department in terms of faculty depth, breadth, and flexibility. Perusal of the Present Faculty chart (see Folder C-2) will reveal the following strengths: almost all doctorates, many years of experience, some unity of background yet plurality of present philosophical orientations. It might be added that the department possesses considerable expertise in the subject-areas of philosophical psychology and ethics — an expertise particularly advantageous for achieving the new goals of USD.

The department needs additional strength in certain historical areas, especially among the modern (as distinguished from contemporary) philosophies. Competence in Hispanic/Latin American philosophies and in the oriental philosophies of the Far East (as distinguished from Arabian philosophies, in which Dr. Ghougassian is competent) would also be desirable, especially in light of the University’s plans for interdisciplinary geocultural majors.

Students

Philosophy majors: The number of students voluntarily opting for a major in philosophy seems to be increasing somewhat since the first steps toward cooperative curricula in 1967, and especially since the merger of the two departments in 1970. In particular, the number of women philosophy majors seems to be rising. Statistical corroboration for these observations is lacking for the years before 1969-70. But a study of the chart entitled Students (see Folder C-3) indicates that in the last three years since the merger of the departments, the number of non-seminarians among the philosophy majors has exceeded the number in the year before that merger. This is significant for two reasons: first, because the seminarians were previously
required to major in philosophy, so that only non-seminarians represented voluntary philosophy majors; secondly, because the seminarians themselves are no longer required to adopt a philosophy major (although they are often advised to do so), and thus their numbers are more meaningful.

**ASB and Phi Sigma Tau:** In 1971-72 the students sponsored an AS Philosophy Club, with a budget of $100. That year the club and its moderator, Dr. Ghougassian, arranged for a lecture by Dr. Victor Frankl which was received very enthusiastically by a remarkable number of students. In 1972-73 student interest led to the installation on campus of a chapter of Phi Sigma Tau, the national honor society for philosophy, with Dr. Ghougassian as its moderator. It should be noted that this chapter is sponsored by the Associated Students, with a budget of $300.00.

**Analysis:** It is hoped that these are indications of growing student interest in philosophy at USD, and of improved rapport between the philosophy faculty and the students. It is thought that the atmosphere of greater flexibility and philosophical pluralism following the merger may have contributed to these improvements.

**c. Organization**

**Structure:** The Department of Philosophy is a single-discipline department within the College of Arts and Sciences. Accordingly, there is no need for area coordinators as in the conglomerate departments. The only administrative position is that of the chairman, a post filled by appointment by the President of the University each year.

**Analysis:** The only significant difference is the reduction to a single department with a single chairman.

**Operation:** The department operates democratically in making all major
decisions, including decisions regarding faculty evaluations, curricular changes, and any extraordinary decisions relating to individual students majoring in philosophy. The matter is discussed at a departmental meeting and voted upon. This procedure is applied also to the evaluation of the chairman by the other members of the department.

There is a maximum of communication within the department, on an informal level whenever possible. All important communications received by the chairman are duplicated and distributed to the other department members.

Autonomy is the operational principle in the conduct of individual classes, including the direction of the course, the approach to be used, the texts, and methods of testing.

Analysis: This mode of operation differs significantly from that of the previous College for Women Philosophy Department, which operated consistently with a different view of philosophical education, as noted above under the history of the merger.

d. Goals and Objectives

Goals: Within the new goals of the unified University, the Philosophy Department recognizes two natural roles: 1) The holistic study of meanings and values; 2) Participation in interdisciplinary studies. The study of meanings and values is an integral part of philosophy. Philosophy can integrate the findings of the arts and sciences, while ranging beyond them in this search. It seeks or implies a view of man, with ethical (value-oriented) consequences. The department will use its competence in the areas of philosophical psychology and ethics to contribute to the joint inquiry and to the professional research into human values. It will encourage the campus chapter of the Phi Sigma Tau (national honor society in philosophy) to provide leadership in the search of the students for personal meanings and values, through its speakers and student
discussions.

The Philosophy Department has pioneered in interdisciplinary studies at USD. It intends to add to its present interdisciplinary offerings and to increase its participation in team-taught courses with other disciplines, especially in the areas of values and of leadership in society.

Objectives:

Curriculum: General Education: Under discussion in the department is a controversial proposal by the chairman, with the following objectives: 1) Flexibility within the General Education philosophy requirement by providing numerous alternatives under each general topic; 2) Optional reduction of total General Education units by combining General Education requirements in interdisciplinary, team-taught courses; 3) Interdisciplinary creativity tending to transform these General Education requirements into assets in attracting prospective students, while actually strengthening the General Education program.

Faculty: In accord with USD's general goal of strengthening its professionalism, an increase in expertise will be promoted by greater concentration on a reduced number of subject areas, corresponding to the interest and background of the individual faculty members.

Students: An attempt will be made to establish honors sections among the General Education offerings in Philosophy.

Analysis: The revision of goals resulted from the merger of the two colleges, at the initiative of the new President, Dr. Hughes, and his Long-Range Planning Committee. The two roles of the Philosophy Department stated above as goals would have been foreign to the viewpoint of the College for Women Philosophy Department, as would the proposal for General Education. The objective for faculty would have been contradictory to the policy of the College for Women Philosophy Department that all its faculty members be prepared to teach each of its General Education offerings.
e. Programs and Curricula

From the inauguration of the cooperative curricula in 1967-1968 until the merger in Spring, 1970, the program at the Women's College remained essentially the same. Likewise, the Men's College also continued the program that had been in operation some years before 1967, which was significantly different from the Women's College. As would be expected, the merged departmental course offerings for 1970-1971, which are still in effect, show the compromise of the two previous different departments.

Thus, an interesting comparison and contrast shows that both previously, and the merged department now, require twelve units of philosophy for General Education, among which is still a course in philosophical psychology. But, whereas the Women's College had required six units of logic, only three are still required -- and only of majors. On the other hand, the Men's College requirement of the Philosophy of Being is now required only of the major, and remains an elective for others. Likewise, only three units of ethics are now required for non-majors. Whereas the Women's College never required the history of philosophy, the Men's College requirement of six units still stands -- but only for majors. (See Folder C-4 for chart of curriculum changes.)

Analysis: There is overall satisfaction with the program among the philosophy faculty at present, with some dissatisfaction concerning details. The pluralism of orientations of the faculty results in students sometimes being unprepared to take a more advanced course from another professor. Also, transfer students are required to take only one course per year of enrollment at USD. Without the introductory course, some are bewildered in an upper division course. Outside of the philosophy department, there are those in other departments who would like to see the General Education requirements in philosophy reduced.
As for the future, the department wishes, of course, to solve the problems mentioned immediately above. And there is always the goal of securing a feeling of harmony in the merged department beyond that which has been achieved — considerable in the light of the previous serious differences before the merger.

f. Resources

Financial: It will be noted that the budgets of the two departments were not merged in the two years subsequent to the merger of their personnel. The departmental merger, therefore, brought about no substantial change in their separate financial resources. When the two budgets were merged for the current year, the amounts allocated for travel and supplies were reduced. (See Folder C-5 for chart entitled Philosophy Department Budgets.)

Physical: Teaching facilities are adequate. Facilities for offices are minimally adequate. The seven members of the philosophy faculty are allotted four offices, which they share in twos, except for the chairman who has his own office. The greatest needs are for better lighting and for two more typewriters, so that each office may be equipped with one. The merger resulted in centralization of the philosophy faculty in one office area. No other important difference can be noted as regards physical resources.

Library: The Philosophy Department's library budget during the past six years is tabulated on a chart identified as Resources: Library (see Folder C-6). The figures for the combined colleges show a significant decrease following the merger of the two departments.

The library collection is quite strong in ethics, and fairly good in the four areas of ancient, mediaeval, modern, and contemporary philosophy. (See Folder C-7.) However, a number of primary source works and many classical studies on prominent philosophers are lacking. This lack is explained by the
fact that little or no consistent systematic effort has been expended by the department toward ensuring completeness and uniformity in the collection. Plans are being made to remedy this defect.

g. Evaluative Summary

In addition to previous evaluative analyses, the following comments can be made:

1. The amount of time and energy expended in campus-wide "politics," meetings, preparations of proposals and reports, consultations with outside experts, searches for a new President and new Deans, and numerous other activities connected with the travail of merger, have inhibited the customary academic pursuits leading more immediately to academic excellence.

On the other hand, a positive benefit of these same "political" activities has been a remarkable improvement in compatibility among the members of the two original faculties and in their practical ability to work well together.

Both phenomena have been observable in the Philosophy Department.

2. Whether the merger of the two philosophy departments has operated to the overall strengthening or weakening of their academic effectiveness on this campus, seems to depend primarily upon one's view of philosophy, its educational role in general, and its relationship to the goals of a Catholic university. In retrospect, it can be seen that the pre-merger view of the College for Women philosophy department was shared by only two of the eight philosophers on the campus at that time. From their viewpoint the merger has been a failure.

The pre-merger view of the College for Men philosophy department has prevailed since the merger by reason of the majority votes of the faculty
members in the merged department. From their viewpoint the merger has been a success, but a qualified or limited success at best. There is little doubt in their minds that the merger was necessary.

10. Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

a. Origins

Unlike the traditional departments already existing at USD, the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies played no role in the agonies of merging the Colleges for Women and Men.

The concept of an Interdisciplinary Studies Department emerged from a series of faculty and administrative discussion groups in the fall of 1971. At that time the vast majority of the faculty indicated that such an academic orientation should be an integral part of USD's long-range planning. This has been a recognition of the obvious academic limitations of pursuing instruction through the narrow lens of a single discipline or a number of unrelated disciplines. It is also recognition that we live in a time of dramatic change which literally forces the academic community to view societal problems through the broad lens view of multi-disciplines.

b. Objectives

Without ignoring the past, interdisciplinary studies should be oriented as much as possible to the present and future. They should emphasize values as they pertain to ethics, logic, and spiritual and intellectual communication. They should inculcate in each student the desire to emerge from college with a sense of leadership in the search for and the practice of human justice and understanding.

Most colleges and universities ingeniously, and often effectively make available prepackaged units of education based upon the formula that x-amount
of class hours somehow equals x-amount of knowledge. These prepackaged units are offered each year through repeated courses that change only slowly with time. For many students, this package is convenient, comfortable, and even productive. Interdisciplinary Studies should attempt to offer its students relatively unpackaged units of concentration that can lead more to "self-learning." In short, the student should be enabled to learn what knowledge is, not be told what it is in predetermined sets of lectures. Above all else, the student should learn how to work with others of both the academic and surrounding communities. In the case of the interdisciplinary courses related to area studies, the student should be able to appreciate and respond intellectually to aspects of other cultures as well as to his own.

c. Current Programs under Consideration

The core of the proposed Interdisciplinary Studies Program is centered about four geocultural areas. These are American Studies, European Studies, Non-Western Studies, and Hispanic/Latin Studies. They will serve as optional majors to the already existing discipline majors. A student may opt to minor in one of these geocultural areas as well, in lieu of a traditional discipline minor. It is anticipated that some of the General Education courses already being taught will be utilized as they relate to these various geocultural areas, to provide greater depth and breadth of preparation. Each geocultural area program will provide concentrations in the music, art, literature, history, political science, sociology, philosophy, religions, economics, language, and anthropology that are pertinent to that specific area. There have been several interdisciplinary courses in the past few years involving such disciplines as history, art, and anthropology, but these have been simply one-shot affairs, usually as Intersession courses.
d. Future Thrust and Plans

After the initiation of the geocultural area studies programs, the department plans to move as rapidly as feasible to the introduction of problem-centered and contracted studies. These will serve as minor areas of concentration, supplementing or complementing the geocultural areas. Problem-centered studies will seek to coordinate multiple disciplines centering on specific thematic concerns. In this manner each discipline will present a different facet of these themes in lectures, discussion groups, group projects and colloquiaums. The following are sample themes that will be considered: The Police and the Policed; Religion and Science: Conflict or Compromise; Technology and Culture; Communication: Information or Indoctrination; War and Peace. Commencing in the fall of 1973, plans are under consideration for initiating a pilot Environmental Study as an extension of the already existing scientific study being made of San Diego Bay and coastal lagoons of the local area. For next fall, History, Political Science, Anthropology, Law, and the Indian Project will combine to begin an interdisciplinary investigation of San Diego County, past, present, and future orientation.

Contracted Studies which will serve as another optional minor field of concentration will involve both academic and practical experiences as the student in collaboration with faculty and other students will construct his or her specific program. Such programs will be directed toward meaningful involvement in the outside community to gain first-hand knowledge of various problems confronting San Diego.

e. Problems Concerning Implementation of Interdisciplinary Studies

These problems are probably not unique to USD and are those faced at any institution when major changes are proposed. The more obvious are as follows:
1) Fear among many "traditionalists" that Interdisciplinary Studies will water down and ultimately displace the established disciplines.

2) Lack of knowledge concerning the working mechanics of Interdisciplinary Studies.

3) Plain obscurantism by some faculty who apparently want change without change.

4) Basic conservatism among some faculty who see no need for change of any kind.

5) Fear that Interdisciplinary Studies will rob the existing departments of majors.

6) Over-sensitivity in some departments that Interdisciplinary Studies will somehow infringe upon their fields of study.

These problems highlight the difficulty of instituting curricular changes that are necessary if Interdisciplinary Studies is to become a viable part of our instruction and learning process at USD.

11. Nursing Education Program

The future of the University of San Diego's small Nursing Education program is currently unclear. The program was initiated by the College for Women in the 1950's as a social science-oriented continuing education program of largely non-professional courses for those who had attended diploma schools and were already registered nurses. Students in the program have generally been women with some years of background in hospital nursing, who desired a broader educational background in psychology, sociology, sometimes special education -- in preference to a more clinically oriented program. Accreditation by the National League of Nursing is neither sought nor desired, since it would require an emphasis on clinical education for nurses. Students who wish to pursue further studies towards a Master's in Nursing are advised not to enroll in USD's program, since such studies require graduation from
an NLN-accredited school. However, a number of USD's B.S. in Nursing graduates have entered graduate work in psychology, special education, and sociology. Requirements for the program are described on page 36 of the 1972-1973 Bulletin.

B. School of Business Administration

1. Its Objectives Within Institutional Goals

The fundamental goal of the School of Business Administration of the University of San Diego is to instill and develop value-based philosophy convictions which will guide graduates in their managerial judgment and decisions. To attain this goal we aspire to academic excellence through offering the needed analytical and communications skills, the basic concepts, and the techniques needed in the general fields of business administration and economics, and other selected disciplines in the arts and sciences; furthermore and to ascertain a valued differentiated product, we emphasize continued and positive personalized student counseling and direction.

It is hoped that our graduates will possess the ethical guidelines needed for their work in the private and public sectors. It is our firm conviction that such a program will strengthen the socio-economic foundation of our city and society. Thus it is also our resolve to establish and nurture strong operational ties and bridges with business and government sectors for discovery and understanding of mutual needs and their satisfaction through the various University programs and services.

2. Historical Background of the School of Business Administration

Prior to the merger of the College for Men and the College for Women, the business administration and economics programs were offered through the College of Arts and Sciences. Then, the current School of Business
Administration was an adjunct or a stepchild of another college and as such, it received second-class citizen recognition and status at best. The courses and the programs offered were only marginally adequate. A number of courses listed in the Bulletin were either offered because certain faculty members happened to be interested in them at that time, or not offered because none were qualified to teach such courses. Furthermore, the selection of courses was not necessarily related to or aimed at satisfying any academic criteria or guidelines set by the accrediting body of Schools of Business Administration. Course scheduling was haphazard and unsatisfactory in terms of students’ needs and graduation plans. In reality and with the exception of the areas of economics and accounting, the students seem to have received a mediocre or submarginal education in the field of business administration in general.

Library facilities for the School of Business Administration now and in the past are very poor. Even the most indispensable volumes and texts are absent. Many a professor's personal library would far outstrip the total holdings of the University in the field of business administration.

When the new President arrived on campus, research activities were conducted to determine the avenues and the directions the administration should take regarding the business administration and economics departments. The result of these findings was a clear and definite need for the establishment of a School of Business Administration to serve the students and the business community of San Diego. With this new orientation and new stature in mind, the School of Business Administration was launched in August, 1972. Prior to the establishment of the School, economics on one hand and the accounting and business administration units on the other, were separate departments chaired by separate heads. This apparently had followed the tradition of the classical approach adopted decades ago by smaller universities. But the trend and the realization of the strong interaction and interdependency of
economics and business administration led the University administration to combine all within the School of Business Administration. The large number of students majoring in the fields of accounting, business administration, and economics led the University to the recognition that these departments should no longer continue as units or sub-systems of the College of Arts and Sciences but must be recognized as separate entities within an independent School.

3. Future Thrust and Plans

The present activities and endeavors of the School of Business Administration are concentrated on the following:

(a) Revising the present curriculum and redesigning it in such a way that it will meet the criteria of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business. We are also introducing numerous courses which are deemed absolutely necessary for students majoring in the fields of economics, accounting, marketing, management, finance, etc.

(b) Developing a general balanced program leading to the Master's in Business Administration. We hope to launch this program in September, 1973, with classes scheduled in the daytime and the evening in order to cater to full and part-time graduate students.

(c) Acquiring the core business administration and economics books for our library.

(d) Placing greater emphasis on student counseling and advising throughout the student's academic life on this campus, in order to focus on the student's individual values and integrity.

Within the next couple of years we expect to offer specialization within the School of Business Administration in the fields of management, marketing, finance, and international management. We are also considering an interdisciplinary undergraduate program for the para-legal profession and another
in business education in cooperation with the School of Education. We plan to evolve a manpower development center which will offer various programs in the field of business administration on a non-credit basis to the San Diego community. Additionally, we hope to establish a business and economic research center to conduct the needed business and economic projects in cooperation with the local, state, private, and public sectors. We plan to investigate and work towards the establishment of a graduate program in cooperation with the Law School which would lead to an M. B. A. -J. D. degree. All these programs will be developed with the main objective that they will satisfy the guidelines of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business.

4. Faculty

Every attempt is being made to select the most qualified available candidates with the terminal degree, i.e., Ph. D. or D. B. A. in their respective fields.

5. Conclusion

We are confident that the philosophy and goals which guide our activities will in the foreseeable future result in an ethically educated graduate whose orientation will be not only on organizational and economic progress but also on concern for the human dignity of his fellow man.

C. School of Education

1. Introduction

The University of San Diego School of Education is engaged in preparing teachers for service in the 48 school districts of San Diego County, other counties
within the State of California, and the nation. The 48 school districts in this county are responsible for the education of over 410,000 students. The University of San Diego has the added obligation of pre-service and in-service training of teachers for the schools of the San Diego Diocese which serves over 26,000 students, as well as participating in the training of teachers for other dioceses.

The need for excellence in education is becoming more and more self-evident to the man-in-the-street. The University of San Diego can, with planned growth, meet the needs for preparing educators with a variety of professional skills and competencies. Recognizing the fact that the field of education is becoming increasingly more competitive, the School of Education focuses its program on the preparation of high-quality leadership personnel in the field of education. At the present time, there exist few institutions of higher learning in teacher preparation where teachers are prepared to handle a wide variety of children who manifest varying kinds of learning problems. The thrust of the School of Education is to prepare all of its students to be effective change-agents in educational settings serving today's and tomorrow's youth.

Because of the small size of the University of San Diego, and its historical foundations, there exists the atmosphere for coalescing professional training in the field of education with the values of Judaeo-Christian ethics. One area of excellence to which the University is already committed is the area of Special Education. Data from the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicates that personnel trained by colleges and universities in 1969 met only a small percentage (less than 11%) of those teachers needed in the area of Special Education. Therefore, the University of San Diego, with the quality program and excellent training facilities in a major metropolitan area, is in the unique position to offer teacher-training programs which can provide for a combined teacher preparation program which includes elementary and secondary education preparation along with Special Education preparation.
Evidence of the viable position of the University of San Diego in preparing professional educators is the rapid growth pattern of the School of Education program. In the 1967-68 academic year, full-time equivalent student enrollment was 138; the full-time equivalent student enrollment for 1972-73 (not counting the 1972 Summer Session) is 295. The recognition of the importance of meeting children's special learning needs is evident in the upsurge of enrollments in programs offered by the Division of Special Education. In the 1967-68 academic year, the full-time equivalent enrollment was 30 students. In the 1971-72 academic year (without counting the 1972 Summer Session enrollment), the full-time equivalency enrollment was 93 students. The actual number of full-time students enrolled - not on an equivalency basis - went from zero students in 1967-68 to 24 full-time students in 1971-72. It is obvious that both pre-service candidates and teachers already in the field recognize that they must possess the skills and competencies that meet all children's needs in classrooms.

2. Philosophy

In keeping with the ideals of a democratic society, the philosophy of the School of Education is that every child is entitled to an educational experience which will enable him to develop to his maximum potential in all areas of living. To assist him in accomplishing this, it is our philosophy to select, educate, and graduate teacher trainees who will be qualified and competent in educating the child or young adult.

Values can be changed or enhanced only when people communicate with other people. The very size of the University of San Diego functions to attain this end. Within the University of San Diego School of Education the interaction between student/student and student/faculty permits the fullest development of both professional and personal values.
3. Objectives

The major objectives of the training program in the School of Education are:

- To train outstanding specialists in the area of Special Education. This particular program emphasizes the training of teachers in the area of learning disabilities, mental retardation, and emotional disturbance.

- To train elementary and secondary teachers who have an understanding of not only the basic educational needs of children, but also a sensitivity for special learning needs of boys and girls.

- To train counselor educators to meet effectively the counseling needs of boys and girls at all educational levels.

- To train ancillary personnel, who because of particular needs in their professions, seek the development of competencies and skills in the area of education.

Specific objectives within the School of Education’s program are:

- To provide the student with the skills and experiences necessary for the diagnosis of the educational needs of normal and handicapped children.

- To provide the student with the technical competence necessary to design and carry out educational programs for normal and handicapped children.

- To provide the student with the understanding of the role of general education as it relates to Special Education.

- To provide the student with the understanding of the role of the community and its resources and life program planning for normal and handicapped children.

- To provide the student with academic and practical experiences necessary for credentialing and certification as a teacher of normal and/or handicapped children in the State of California and other states.

- To provide the student with an understanding of the role that environmental deprivation plays with respect to effective learning of the child.

- To provide an intensive internship experience in a variety of supervised-educational programs for both normal and handicapped children.

4. Development of merged department

In the spring of 1967, when the first timid steps were taken to explore the feasibility of admitting women into the College for Men program, and admitting men into the College for Women program, the CW and CM both had secondary credential programs, and the CW also had an elementary credential program.
and the beginnings of specialized preparation in mental retardation and in school librarianship. The Presidents and the Academic Deans of the two institutions were in general agreement that a fairly free selection of courses and teaching majors from either of the colleges would enhance the programs of both men and women students. Tentatively, these administrators approved the policy that women students should be held to the requirements established by the College for Women department of education, and that men should have to meet College for Men requirements. Nevertheless, they agreed, within this general framework considerable latitude should be allowed so that students could select courses from the offerings of either of the colleges.

At the College for Women, Sister Margaret Guest was chairman of the department of education. In the College for Men, Dr. John F. McGeever was chairman, replaced after his untimely death early in 1969 by Dr. Jack Morrison. Encouraged by the Presidents and Academic Deans of the two institutions, the two chairmen of the separate departments began during the 1967-1968 school year to look into the feasibility of working towards eventual unification. Their early efforts, however, could hardly be regarded as either enthusiastic or highly productive.

Each of the original developers of the two programs had enjoyed great freedom in devising a curriculum which, in the judgment of its creator, would ideally prepare the student for a career in effective classroom teaching. It soon became apparent to each of the negotiating parties that neither was ready to abandon his program in order to adopt the other's. The older of the two programs, that of the College for Women, had developed certain distinctive, well-defined characteristics: insistence upon depth of academic preparation, provision that all candidates have some preparation to work effectively with children of minority groups and subcultures, provision for numerous and varied experiences in public school classrooms. Without doubt, a good measure of the reluctance
to merge programs was attributable to the honest conviction of each chairman that his own program was superior to that of the other institution and should not therefore, for professional reasons, be changed. It seems just as clear, however, that the frequent short-term collapses of unification efforts which plagued the months from the fall of 1967 until December, 1968 were in part the results of a kind of institutional pride so strong that it tended to blind each of the parties to the real virtues of the other. In addition, there were members of the non-education faculties of both the colleges who were conscientiously persuaded that unification of the colleges would not be to the advantage of their respective institutions. Such persons often exerted a significant, though indirect, negative influence on the education faculties by encouraging and enforcing their determination to resist unification.

By spring of 1969, it appeared appropriate that the Presidents should adopt a more decisive posture toward those few departments which continued to postpone or evade a final decision on unification. Accordingly, in July, 1969, the two Presidents issued a joint announcement of the appointment of Dr. Robert E. Nelson (until then a member of the College for Women education faculty) as chairman of the all-University department of education. Further, at the opening of the 1969-1970 school year the offices of the previously separate education faculty members were brought together in Camino Hall in the hope that happier personal and professional relationships would be encouraged.

The benefits of Dr. Nelson's leadership and the contiguous office arrangements were then instrumental in stimulating the efforts to make needed curricular adjustments in the secondary credential programs. Elementary education, counselor education, and special education did not need such adjustments, since they had been exclusively developed and taught at one institution or the other prior to or during the merger period.
5. Program Growth

Within the growing School of Education, several individual programs have taken shape and have received University support. The program in Counseling and Guidance formerly under the College for Men has been established as an accepted and improved training program within the University structure as the Counselor Education Division of the School of Education. Credential programs and Pupil Personnel Services are also offered in this particular program. Quality in terms of students participating in the program, in terms of faculty additions and of visiting clinical specialists have added to the overall focus of this particular division. Increased attention to the practicum aspects of this program by using direct viewing through one-way glass and indirect viewing through video hardware should result in our product being of a higher quality.

A major thrust in the Secondary Education Division, particularly within the past year, has been the establishment of a special Secondary Education and Master's Degree sequence which is expected to attract quality students from throughout the United States to a special summer program where a student can complete a program in summer only under both regular and visiting faculty. Such a program innovation offers opportunities for students already employed in the field in a variety of positions to obtain additional fiscal benefits. This same kind of thrust is being reflected in a major concentration being placed on the 1973 summer sessions. Student load within this division has increased to such an extent that additional faculty has been appointed. The new faculty will assist in implementing the summer program and an enriched and larger academic year program. Additional courses have been approved for offering under this division beginning with the summer session of 1973.

Special Education has shown a similar kind of growth over the past three years. The current Acting Dean of the School of Education was originally brought into the University to teach in the field of Special Education. Under his
direction, the program has increased with the addition of a full-time faculty member in the year 1970-71 as division director, and another additional faculty member added for the academic year 1972-73. Student enrollment in this area has been increased in all courses previously offered and in additional courses which have been added to the curriculum.

Trends in Elementary Education have not shown a comparable growth in terms of enrollment, yet innovative opportunities for learning experiences have been provided within this division as well as in other divisions. A combined Standard Teaching Credential in Elementary Education and Special Education has been approved by the School and the divisions involved. Special workshops in the area of Reading and Reading Diagnostics were offered during the summer session 1972 under the auspices of this division. A unique grant-writing course was offered during the post-session for persons in private school settings. It is hoped that additional faculty will also be appointed in this division in the future.

The establishment of the External Degree programs at El Centro and Oceanside with a Master's in Education has resulted in increased enrollment, recruitment for future courses, and additional funds to the University. Such a program has also resulted in improved public relations and has fostered the image of the University as a center which is attuned to immediate local needs.

The University received two federal grants over the past two years, in the area of preparation of professional personnel in Special Education of the mentally retarded. These grants totaled $22,500 each year and have provided for senior year traineeships and graduate fellowships for a number of students. In addition to the funds given to the students, support grants in the amount of $2000 for each undergraduate and $2500 for each graduate student were paid to the University to cover the cost of instruction.
Physical Facilities: Beginning in September, 1970 the entire Department of Education moved to new space in DeSales Hall, the main administrative building on campus. The Education Department's suite of offices is located on the fifth floor of this building, where each faculty member has a private office. Also located in the Education suite are three classrooms, including one seminar room with an attached observation room and one-way glass. In addition to these classrooms, other classrooms are available in the several classroom buildings on campus. The facilities now also include an Educational Technology Center where video equipment and other audio-visual materials are located for student and teacher usage. This Center is also used as a studio when necessary.

Curriculum Materials: A wide variety of educational curricular and instructional volumes is available in the Curriculum Laboratory. With the combining of the curricular materials from the College for Women Library and the Knights of Columbus Library, the Curriculum Laboratory has been able to increase both its holdings and its service and accessibility to the students and faculty. All such materials are now available on the second floor of the Knights of Columbus Library where working space, stacks, and office space have been provided for the Curriculum Library. This center includes both curricular guides, professional books, and various reading, arithmetic, and language development series. One of its drawbacks is the insufficiency of classroom and storage space near the Curriculum Library, a lack particularly felt by the elementary credential program. The Curriculum Library's hours are the same as the regular K.C. Library hours, and a part-time curriculum librarian is available each day.

Located in the Education offices are a variety of educational materials, including audio-visual equipment such as a 16mm projector, overhead projectors, and tape recorders. Equipment also includes a newly acquired video-recording system with portable capabilities. Both back-pack and zoomar lens cameras
is currently strong, and will continue to be so. For this reason it is the goal of this department to maintain its FTE enrollment at approximately 25 FTE, while increasing its selectivity in admissions, and demanding greater competence of its graduates. Finally, because of the geographic location of the University of San Diego, the department proposes to develop bi-lingual and bi-cultural emphases designed to improve teacher effectiveness in Mexican-American communities.

Several areas have been selected for future emphasis by the Special Education Department. They are as follows:

**Emotionally Disturbed:** Dr. Nelson has been granted a sabbatical leave for the 1972-1973 academic year for the purpose of post-doctoral study in the education of emotionally disturbed children. Upon his return, a program to train teachers in this area is anticipated. Development of a master's degree in this area will be carried out if student demand warrants it.

**Early Childhood Education of the Multiple-Handicapped Child:** This area of emphasis is presently in the planning stages and should be fully developed within three to five years, depending upon demand.

**Learning Disabilities:** It is expected that a great deal of emphasis will be placed upon this area in the next three years. Faculty interest and ability in this area are such that it should be a major component of the Special Education Program in the future.

Other programs in the planning stage include:

The development of a program in physical education and recreation at an undergraduate minor level. The focus of the University community on recreation and physical education would certainly provide optimum training sites for such personnel. Particular emphasis here might be in the area of physical education and recreation of the handicapped and women's physical education.
The development of a religious education program at the graduate level under the auspices of the School of Education and the Department of Religious Studies. Such a program could be patterned after the summer program currently being offered by the Secondary Education Division in summers only. Father Dennis Ryan, the Director of the CCD program of the Diocese, has indicated a great deal of interest in this area. This could also be expanded into an academic year program.

The development of strong courses and a program in the area of administration of education at local, state, and national levels should be considered by the School of Education.

A business education program should be considered in cooperation with the School of Business Administration.

D. School of Law

1. Objectives Within the Institutional Goals

The primary purpose of the School of Law is to provide qualified men and women with a sound legal education. In recognition of the career objectives of the large majority of its students, the School of Law exposes its students to the necessary skills, legal principles, and attitudes to equip them to enter the private or public practice of law. It is recognized, however, that a legal education may be of benefit to those planning to engage in numerous other fields of endeavor including public service, and for some, may be viewed as an advanced form of liberal education.

In attempting to achieve its education objectives, emphasis is placed on the following:

(a) Lawyering skills. Throughout the student's law school education, but especially in the first year, he is taught how to analyze a problem rationally, logically evaluate alternative solutions, and design the framework for
implementation of adopted policies. This method of rigorous rationality, while essential to the practice of law, is also beneficially transferable to non-legal problems and materials.

Students learn to perform research in legal materials through written exercises and projects and role-playing experiences. Exposure is provided to other practice skills such as oral advocacy, interviewing and counselling, negotiation, and trial techniques. Education in these lawyering skills is often combined with community service especially in the legal clinic program whereby students render legal aid to indigent clients and perform part-time internships in public and private agencies under the supervision of practicing lawyers.

(b) Philosophy of law and professional responsibility. In order to effectuate properly the role of lawyers in society, a law student should understand the function of the legal process which he is committed to serve and largely operates. Since the law does not exist as a self-contained discipline but constantly interacts with the social process, law students must be aware of all those social, scientific, human, moral, and religious forces which mold the law and are in turn influenced by it. It is hoped that the requirement of an undergraduate degree will provide the law student with the essentials of the liberal education which is required for him to become a complete lawyer, but it is recognized that it is desirable to make the law student explicitly aware of those specific areas where the law interacts with other disciplines.

The School of Law, in recognition of its professional mission and its Catholic heritage, joins the other schools of the University in a "commitment to human values." To this end, increasing emphasis will be put on a value-oriented education by attempting to sensitize the student to the value choices involved in various fields of law and the nature of the legal process. The emphasis is on making value questions explicit rather than indoctrination in any one set of values. Such considerations may be explored in any course
and become particularly apparent in courses in Jurisprudence and Professional Responsibility. The student also has an opportunity to exercise these responsibilities in the clinical program and the administration of an honor system and honor court, as well as by participating in the design and operation of University parking and disciplinary systems.

2. Relation to the Process of Merger

The School of Law was established in 1954, along with the College for Men, as part of the University of San Diego. In its early years a few aspects of its administration were controlled and performed by University personnel, but its educational function has been largely autonomous and independent of the University and its other component parts.

When the merger process began early in 1967, the Dean of the School of Law, like the President of the College for Men, was still reporting directly, at least on financial matters, to the Bishop of San Diego, who held the title of President of the University of San Diego. Hence, when the Executive Committee was formed in September of 1967, the President of the College for Men, the President of the College for Women, and the Dean of the School of Law held equal positions in this group which initiated and coordinated the non-academic segments of the cooperative endeavors. Thus, during the two years between 1967 and 1969, the administrative head of the School of Law played an active role in many aspects of the growing centralization. His role, however, seems to have been a personal one which did not involve the law faculty; and indeed the Dean of the Law School was insistent on safeguarding the autonomy of the Law School in every way possible, even to the point of opposing attempts of other members of the Executive Committee to centralize certain USD services.

By the fall of 1969, it seemed clear that the process of merger would
be fostered by concentrating on the College for Men-College for Women relationship, and leaving the question of the Law School's relationship to the University to be resolved at a future date. From this point onward, the School of Law, even through its administrative head, did not take an active part in the process of merger between the two Coordinate Colleges, and indeed continued at times to resist closer affiliation with the remainder of the University. A structural change had been effected by the University Board of Trustees in November, 1969, when the Bishop resigned as President of USD and Monsignor Baer, President of the College for Men, was appointed President of USD, including the School of Law. However, in general, the structural change remained pro forma as far as the School of Law was concerned.

3. Relation to the Total Institution at Present

Although organizationally the School of Law is now one of four academic components of the University of San Diego, it continues to be unique in several regards. As a professional school, subject to the accreditation requirements of the American Bar Association, Association of American Law Schools, and the State Bar of California, the School of Law maintains autonomy over its educational policies including such matters as curriculum, admission standards, faculty tenure, retention and promotion, size of student body, library acquisitions, class schedule and calendar, grading and evaluation, and selection of student aid and award recipients. Consequently, while it is subject to the budget making process of the University and to the President, Provost, University Cabinet, and Board of Trustees in matters of general administration, it is not subject to nor a member of the Faculty Senate but rather the law faculty acts as its own academic senate.

Unlike many other segments of the University, the law school presently
indigent persons with their legal, social, economic, and psychological problems in a clinical setting. It would also seem that students in these other disciplines could be benefited by exposure to legal considerations and methods of analysis. Effective collaboration could be achieved by combining the traditional specialization of the law in means and processes with those of other disciplines dealing more explicitly with ends and value choices.

Hope has been expressed that joint degree programs will be soon developed in law and business and law and other disciplines within the College of Arts and Sciences. In addition opportunities exist for post-graduate interdisciplinary programs and for community education.

There is also great potential, but as yet little progress, in providing legal training with the aid of the law school to undergraduate and graduate students in other parts of the University. For example, general education in law, legal process, and methods of legal problem solving is once again being recognized as a legitimate part of a liberal education. Courses in legal process would serve as helpful supplements to specialized courses in Political Science and Business.

The law school could also play a useful role in the training of undergraduates as legal paraprofessionals. There is a growing market for individuals who, while they do not possess a law degree, have some training or experience in performing legal tasks of a limited, standardized, and specialized nature either under the supervision of a lawyer or as a member of an affiliated occupation such as real estate, insurance, banking, or accounting.

The listing of these potential relationships between the law school and the total institution, while affirmatively recognizing the mutual strength which could be developed by close cooperation, also acknowledges the present failure both on the part of the law school and the other components of the University to realize this potential.
E. Graduate Division

Until the fall of 1969, the College for Men administered its own Graduate Division as did the College for Women. The College for Men's graduate program which offered Master's level work in Education and History as well as several Master of Arts in Teaching programs, was administered by the late Dr. John McGeever. Upon his death, the Graduate Division was administered by Dr. Henry Martin. At the College for Women, Sister Helen McHugh was the administrator of graduate programs. The College for Women offered Master's degree programs in English, Education, (with concentrations in Elementary and Secondary), French, Spanish, and Social Science, as well as a number of credential programs.

During the spring semester of the academic year 1968-69, meetings were held between administrative officials of the College for Men and College for Women and both faculties, concerning the possibility of one merged University Graduate Division. Apart from the understandable, very human personal suspicions, animosities, and rivalries which had developed over the years between the two institutions, and between elements of the two faculties, which arose during the various steps of the merging process, and which did arise in the discussions concerning a merged Graduate Division, the meetings of that spring did produce an agreement. By the fall of 1969, the Coordinate Colleges would have one Graduate Division. Announcement of this first institutional merger of academic programs was made at the annual Commencement in June, 1969.

The Graduate Division of the University now offers Master's degree programs in Education, English, History, French, Spanish, Psychology, and Political Science, as well as credential programs in Elementary, Secondary Education, Counselor and Special Education, and Library Science. A Master's in Business Administration is tentatively planned for September,
Graduate enrollment in 1970-71 was 171; in 1971-72, 229; in 1972-73, 269.

F. Special Sessions

1. Summer Session

Until 1969, the College for Men and the College for Women conducted their own Summer Sessions, each had its own summer school director, its own summer school offerings, and did its own recruiting. In the summer of 1969, Dr. Steven Schanes administered the College for Men Summer Sessions while Sister Agnes Murphy administered the College for Women Summer Session. The summer of 1969 was the first time cross-registration for College for Men and College for Women students was implemented for summer school courses. With the appointment of Sister Agnes Murphy as the Director, Summer Sessions for the Coordinate Colleges in the fall of 1969 were administered by one person. Sister Murphy administered the 1970, 1971, 1972 Summer Sessions.

Beginning in 1969, the Summer Sessions were divided into three parts; a 3-week pre-session in June, a 6-week regular session stretching from late June through July, and a 3-week post-session in August. Regular curriculum courses as well as special workshop offerings have traditionally been part of summer school offerings. In past years, the College for Women's enrollment was made up very largely of religious women plus regular College for Women students, while the College for Men's enrollment was made up largely of College for Men students.

Although it has always been possible for students to take courses from Intersession and Summer Session offerings to complete their Baccalaureate program sooner than the prescribed four years, efforts will be made in the future to persuade the departments to make a more extended effort to offer
G. The Library

1. Its Objectives Within the Institutional Goals

The Library maintains as its objective the regular library services to faculty and students. It seeks to do this with professional excellence and technical competence. With the growth of new schools, it will try to gather needed materials with as much efficiency and economy as possible.

2. Analysis of Prior Components

Prior to the merger, the College for Women Library had about 90,000 items of library material, but it was understaffed. It did not meet the standards set by the Western College Association for associate clerical staff. It was too highly dependent on student help. Granted this handicap, the service offered was good because of the dedication of the religious and lay staff. This may account for the handicap not being mentioned in prior WASC evaluation reports.

The Knights of Columbus Memorial Library served the College for Men. By the time of the merger, it had over 110,000 items of library material, plus a growing microfilm collection. During most of its existence it has been budgeted favorably, receiving frequently 6% to 10% of the college budget. After the merger, this percentage was cut almost in half.

3. Process of Cooperation

Physical Factors: The Knights of Columbus Memorial Library building is being vacated and both college libraries are being housed in the Camino building. The Library in Camino Hall is being expanded to meet the new needs. It is hoped that this expansion will take care of future needs for five years. The professional library staff requested two years to make the physical move. Only one year was granted, and a short one at that (until June, 1973). Hopefully, in that time, a library system will be developed to
make over 200,000 items of library material available to faculty and students.

The physical move is proceeding quite well. By January, 1973 it is hoped that the periodical department will be moved to Camino and be in operation by the opening of the spring semester. The reference collection is processed and ready to move as soon as space is available on the main floor of Camino. All other departments in the KC Branch are "in process."

Psychological factors: For many years before the merger, both head librarians had talked of the necessity of uniting both libraries, first as a system and then in one physical location. There was complete agreement on that. When Msgr. Baer asked Father Dollen to return to the College for Men in 1968, Father Dollen suggested that Mr. W. Roy Holleman, then head librarian at CW, be named head librarian, starting the process of merger. It would have hastened the merger by some years, in fact if not in law.

Our only fear was that the library budgets and staff would be reduced in a merger - which fear has been borne out this year. While hopes for the success of the merger are high, morale is low. This is the result of many factors - lack of consultation on staffing, budget, and planning. We foresee a successful physical merger, but we predict a certain amount of sub-standard service in the next year or more.

H. External Degree Program

The External Degree Program at the University of San Diego began in the fall of 1971, with the impetus of Dr. Patricia Watson's spade work at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot and Dr. Robert Nelson's work with the East County teachers at Imperial Valley College in El Centro. These two members of the faculty initiated coursework whereby University of San Diego professors would travel to the Marine Corps Recruit Depot and to El Centro to teach regular degree program offerings.
From its inception, USD's External Degree Program was not a typical extension program but rather one in which regular USD professors taught regular academic offerings to duly qualified undergraduate and graduate students.

Through the work of Dr. Gilbert Oddo and Dr. DeForest Strunk, another External Degree Program was added in spring, 1972 for North County teachers at Mira Costa College in Oceanside.

Beginning in September of 1972, the External Degree Programs, administration of which previously had been under the supervision of the Academic Vice-President, were combined with other administrative functions in one office under the directorship of Dr. Gilbert L. Oddo. In September, 1971 there were 48 students enrolled in the External Degree Programs. By September, 1972 the program had more than 100 students, with teachers in El Centro and Oceanside taking classes leading to a Master of Education degree in Educational Psychology and students at MCRD taking courses leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree.

It is the University's hope that the External Degree Program will continue to grow in number of students, and the Director's hope that sometime in the not too distant future, the University can augment the locations and do for South County teachers what it is offering for the others, that is, establish an External Degree Program at Southwestern College.

I. Advanced Placement Program

1. Brief History of the Program

Origins: The Advanced Placement Program at the University of San Diego was begun in 1963 as a venture between University High School, for its gifted students, and the University of San Diego College for Men, in order to attract good students. This original program was in effect for seven years and existed solely between these two institutions; CM gave credit for courses
taken, even when students eventually took classes from the San Diego College for Women when reciprocal classes began in 1967.

Expansion of the Original Agreement: In the spring of 1970, plans were formulated by the Academic Deans of CM (Dr. Martin, currently Professor of Education) and the CW (Sister Furay, currently Provost of USD) to expand the program to include several additional public and private high schools. During the 1970-1971 academic year, 22 students enrolled from La Jolla High School and San Miguel as well as University High; and during the 1971-1972 academic year, 35 students enrolled from University High, La Jolla, Francis W. Parker, and Clairemont High. This fall (1972-1973), there are 26 students enrolled from University High, Francis W. Parker, La Jolla, and Point Loma; these students have enrolled for 83 units and their overall mid-term grade point average is 2.602. (See Folder D-1 for a breakdown of high schools involved, grade point averages, courses studied, etc., from 1970 to the present.)

As originally agreed upon by University High School and the CM, this program would be only for gifted students. These students were to be recommended to the program by the high school and were to meet CM admissions standards; were to be permitted a maximum of 6 units per semester except with special authorization; were to continue in the program if they received A or B grades; were to be discontinued from the program if they received D and F grades; would be recommended by the college to withdraw if they received a C, but on recommendation from the high school could continue. For the most part, these standards are still in effect.

2. Success of the Objectives

To 1967: In August of 1967, Father Cornelison, Principal of University High School, wrote a report which asked why students from University High were not enrolling at USD. At that time, Father Cornelison sent a questionnaire
to the 27 students who had participated in the program the two previous years to determine why only one of the 27 had enrolled at USD. From the 14 responses to the questionnaire, he determined that the primary reasons were that there was a lack of encouragement from faculty and students, that most students had not considered the College for Men in the first place because it was too small and had a poor academic reputation, and that most students were poorly impressed with the students at the College for Men.

Since 1970: Since 1970, the objective of having Advanced Placement students enroll at USD has been met slightly better than reported by Father Cornelison's questionnaire in 1967; five students enrolled at USD after having come here as Advanced Placement students during the years 1970-1972. Since there were 57 students during this two-year period versus the 27 during the two-year period of Father Cornelison's report, one can see that, in spite of the large percentage increase, the number of Advanced Placement students enrolling at USD has been somewhat minimal.

3. Comments

In January and October of 1972, USD faculty comment re the Advanced Placement students was sought from those who had these students in their classes. There seems to be no general feeling definitely pro or con. Some faculty have indicated negative experiences which they attributed to lack of maturity and self-discipline on the part of the students, and to poor screening by the high school; other faculty members have had positive reactions, even to the point of saying they were unaware of the fact that such students were Advanced Placement students until late in the semester.

Comments were sought in December, 1972 from the three high school counselors most closely involved with this program (University High, La Jolla High, and Francís Parker). Without exception, they had nothing but praise
for the program. Their students especially liked the opportunity to enroll in college-level courses which are not specifically tailored to them as high school students, and in classes in which they are not identified as high school students. Students said they liked the variety of courses, and preferred the "richer fare" they found at USD.

4. Future Plans

Though the Advanced Placement Program began nearly ten years ago at the College for Men as a means of attracting good students, the primary motivation of its expansion in 1970 was to provide a service to local high schools which, for budgetary or other reasons, were unable to provide certain types of courses for their gifted students. Thus, the Program is seen by the University of San Diego as a relationship with the high schools, rather than as a relationship with individual students from these schools. It would seem that the future of the Program, which is currently under scrutiny, will hinge on whether this small service to the local educational community warrants continued authorization for a small number of students to enroll for credit in college classes at reduced tuition (currently half the regular rate).
CHAPTER V

COMPONENTS OF THE INSTITUTION: NON-INSTRUCTIONAL

A. Student Affairs

1. History

Prior to the beginning of the merger period, the functions of Student Affairs in its modern sense were performed largely by the faculty and administration on an ad hoc basis. This means that the advising or consulting role or working with individuals and student groups was often assumed by interested faculty and/or administrators either on an interest or delegated level. Personal counseling by peers, faculty, or anyone who was available at the time tended to take place when needed. Faculty advising was somewhat more formalized in that every student was assigned an advisor which often led to the contact person for the new student to identify with; consequently academic advisors often became personal counselors as well.

In both institutions the disciplinary aspect of the colleges and the residence hall programs were the identifiable roles of the Dean of Men's or Dean of Women's offices or their equivalent. The establishment of rules and regulations and their implementation and enforcement seemed to be their major role, along with the responsibility for the student government. In the College for Men, the Dean of Men was also very active in fostering the Athletics program.

When the Associated Student Bodies merged in the spring of 1969, a re-definition of roles and duties for the respective student affairs offices was necessitated. The division of responsibilities first took place with
reference to student government functions (i.e., funding, governmental aspects, social, and cultural programming). As this progressed, the desirability of merging the Student Affairs Offices and functions became apparent. Work on a Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities drew attention to the need for uniform rules and regulations for all students. The offices were physically merged under the titles Dean of Men and Dean of Women and there was an increased effort to provide a coordinating function for the traditional student affairs processes. The greatest changes developed in the fall of 1971 when the titles Dean of Men and Dean of Women were dropped for the new Office of Dean of Students which incorporated the old functions and gave impetus to developing new roles for Student Affairs. Two distinct areas of concentrations were the goals. The first was to train the resident assistants more adequately in handling peer counseling models and personal conflict intervention. This program was initiated in the late summer of 1971 with the residence hall staff. The second goal was a concentration on the student government and student organizations to diffuse the advisor model and establish the Dean of Students' Office in a consultants' role model. It was felt that this would help to establish a sound self-image for students and their organizations by allowing them to experience the success and failure of their own decision-making. A great deal of time and effort was placed in the specific area of financing since the ASB had accumulated a sizable deficit.

2. Merger in Student Government

The first definitive step towards permanent realignment of the dual college structure on the Alcala Park campus was made by the students, who had a long history of cooperation at the student government and social levels. In October of 1968, barely more than a year after the inauguration of the Reciprocal Course program, Mr. Eric Johnson and Miss Terry Graves,
ASB Presidents, arranged the first joint College for Men–College for Women ASB meetings to discuss merger of the Associated Student Body organizations. A panel of faculty, students, and administrators discussed the issues involved in such a step.

From the time of this meeting until the following March, student committees worked on a Provisional Constitution for the Associated Students, producing a document which was more or less a re-hash of the College for Men AS Constitution. On March 4–5, 1969, the students voted to experiment until May with the Provisional Constitution. About two-thirds of the members of the student bodies cast ballots, and 85% of the voters favored the experiments. Because of their fear that a joint AS government would minimize the participation of women, some College for Women students opposed the new plan strongly; however, only 214 of the 550 College for Women students voted at all, and of these, 78% favored the experiment.

Since the change in ASB structure required the approval of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Gilbert Fox, Chairman of the College for Women Board, invited Mr. Johnson and Miss Graves to present their views on the question of ASB merger at the March, 1969 meeting of the College for Women Board. Mr. Johnson noted that the Provisional Constitution was to be in effect only six weeks, then be reevaluated; Miss Graves indicated that, while many women students were in favor of the ASB merger, they preferred an alternate constitution and were drawing up such a document incorporating a senatorial system.

The College for Women Board of Trustees endorsed the experiment, approved continuance of the Provisional Constitution beyond the six-week period since it would scarcely be possible to finalize a new one in that amount of time, recommended development of a new constitution, and withheld financial merger of Associated Student funds until an acceptable permanent
constitution emerged and each article was presented, voted on, and accepted by the students. Through its President, the College for Men also accepted the Provisional Constitution and the ASB merger. In the spring of 1970, the students voted acceptance of a new senatorial form of AS government, effective in the academic year 1970-1971. Minor revisions in the spring of 1971 brought the AS Constitution to its present form. (See Folder D-1.)

3. Housing

The housing services were probably the most divergent of Student Affairs functions prior to the merger. Both the operations and the physical accommodations differed. The women occupied a traditional dorm facility, while the men were in apartment style quarters. Staffing in the women's halls was primarily the function of the Religious of the Sacred Heart, with a moderator to counsel and monitor the women in each class. The men utilized a student prefect system, with disciplinary rather than counseling functions, reporting directly to the Dean of Men.

In the fall of 1970, the men moved from their apartment style facilities (which became the Graduate Center Apartments) to DeSales Hall, previously a seminary facility. Beginning in the fall of 1971, men's and women's housing came under a single administrative head, the Associate Dean for Residence Affairs. The head resident - student resident assistants system, with a continuing staff training program, is still utilized in men's and women's residences.

Proposals are being drawn up at present to utilize full-time resident counselors living in the dormitories. Current discussion centers also on isolating certain mechanical functions under a resident manager, while the responsibility for enforcement of regulations would hopefully become a community effort with each individual assuming personal responsibility.
4. Campus Programs

In the fall of 1972, a new structure for the Office of Student Affairs included a Coordinator of Campus Programs, responsible for advising and assisting the Associated Students in any academic, social, religious activities. The Coordinator is responsible for clearance of such programs, assisting the sponsors in planning, and acting as liaison between the sponsors and other University offices. Present programs include activities such as lectures, films, dances, homecoming, volunteer community service, the Experimental College, Academics Day, and orientation programs.

Planned for the future are the establishment of a USD Coffee House; development of a peer counseling program; weekend workshops in leadership, communication, religion; student interest surveys; and a program committee for long-range planning.

5. Recreation

A new position, Coordinator of Recreation, was created in the fall of 1972, as an impetus to a new thrust in extra-curricular activities for students; leisure time activities for faculty, staff, administration, and alumni; and better utilization of the University's athletic and recreational facilities. Prior to this time, recreation at USD had consisted of facilities (swimming pool, gymnasium, football field, and tennis courts) available to students on a limited and irregular basis, a minimal intramural program, operating mainly through the AS government, and primary use of the athletic and recreational facilities of the University for intercollegiate athletic programs.

The management of all athletic and recreational facilities is now the responsibility of the office of Coordinator of Recreation. Scheduling is done as fairly as possible among intercollegiate athletics, intramurals, other organized activities, and free recreation. This office is also charged with
the development of new recreational programs for the USD community, in order to create and maintain an environment for the individuals and USD to explore, experiment with, and foster techniques, skills, and attitudes that provide for personal and community refreshment, relaxation, enjoyment, and re-creation.

6. Campus Ministry

Prior to the merger, there were two chaplains appointed - one to the College for Men who also served the College for Women in the past several years, and one to the School of Law who also served as Library Director of the School of Law. As part of his ministry, the chaplain of the College for Men said daily Mass at noon on school days, held dorm Masses on weekends for both men and women, and was involved in BOSS weekends (three day retreats) for USD students who chose to attend. Additionally, he sponsored several desert trips - another form of retreat, and established an "open-door" policy at his apartment which has fostered get-togethers and rap sessions for individuals and groups.

As a result of the merger, the chaplain of the College for Men, Reverend Benjamin Carrier, has become the chaplain of the University of San Diego, with total responsibility for the liturgical life of the USD community. The Coordinator of Campus Programs has, as part of his responsibility, the task of assisting the chaplain in the campus ministry. A campus ministry committee established this fall has developed a student sacristans group, a Bible study group which meets weekly, folk groups responsible for music at noon Masses, and other ministry programs. Its major effort is to revitalize the ministry on USD's campus.
7. Student Health

The addition of a medical doctor at specified times, assisted by a registered nurse, has strengthened the health program and allowed adequate services to students. The health service is essentially diagnostic, with more serious cases or emergencies being referred to private practice or hospitals.

8. Future Thrust

Future growth plans include more emphasis on the counseling needs of students. Specific projects needed are in the areas of communications with the rest of the University community, and goal setting for the Student Affairs area, consonant with the new goals of the University. Through communication we hope to educate the University community to an awareness of Student Affairs and its role on campus, as well as to aid in pointing out areas of student concern which need attention.

B. Academic Services

1. Introduction

The area of Academic Services consists of Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, Educational Development Center and Educational Opportunity Program. Its history as an administrative entity is short as these offices were consolidated into Academic Services in July, 1972.

As the title implies, this is a service area. Each office exists to serve a different need in the University community. Whatever unity the area has comes not from the services offered which vary from office to office, but rather from our clientele. The students all need to be admitted and registered. Additionally, many need financial packaging, counseling, and supportive services. Frequently therefore a student will be affected by all or most of the offices coming under the Academic Services umbrella. Our purpose
Within the institutional goals is to assist these students in a Christian, personalized, and professional manner.

Because the specific objectives, process of merger, current operation, and future thrust differ for each office, each has been asked to provide these in the sections which follow.

2. Admissions

Objectives Within the Institutional Goals: The most important function of the admissions office is to seek high school students and transfer students who want to share in the growth of the University community — students who exhibit the potential which will bring to realization the distinctive goal of the USD Community — leadership in a search for human meaning and values. The process of recruitment demands a realistic understanding of and appreciation for the University, its goals, its direction, its Christian value-oriented environment and most importantly the academic expectations it has of its students. The recruitment and selection of students who can meet the standards of an academically competitive community, who represent a diversity of cultural and social backgrounds, and who possess unique personal qualities of leadership is a major concern of the admissions office.

Process of Merger: The admissions offices of the College for Men and the College for Women were completely separate and each school was responsible for recruiting and carrying out the process of admission independently. By mutual agreement, the two admissions directors made plans for joint recruiting in the fall of 1968, thus eliminating the duplication of recruiting effort. Since admissions policies varied in the two colleges, the necessity for uniform standards became apparent. In February, 1969, the joint faculties established a common admissions policy for the coordinate colleges. (See Bulletin, page 18.) On July 1, 1968 the administrative
The decision to merge the College for Men and the College for Women undergraduate admissions offices became effective. The Director of Admissions (1969-70), Mr. Barend, reported to the Academic Deans – Dr. Martin, College for Men; Sister Furay, College for Women. The formation of a joint Admissions Committee to be composed of both elected and appointed faculty members was approved by the joint faculties in the fall of 1969. Student representatives would participate in meetings concerned with admissions policies. The newly formed Faculty Senate in October, 1971, approved a committee with elected faculty, and administrators in functional roles.

Expanded recruitment into the areas of public and independent schools has resulted in a substantial increase in the number of students from these schools, totaling over 60% for the freshman class in 1972. The aspects relevant to merger including coeducational classes and expanded course offerings seem to have appealed to students in public high schools. A steady increase in the number of students attracted to the campus from the local area indicates the more favorable image of the University in the local community as well as a trend for more students to attend local colleges. The merger has required a period of adjustment on the part of the admissions program. The drop in enrollment during the first year of merged admissions staff seems to indicate a re-establishing of personnel and a re-organization of the entire admissions function. Lack of adequate physical facilities at the time of merger of the admissions offices was an additional factor.

In the four years 1969-1972, the number of applications has increased while the percentage of acceptance has remained approximately the same (74-75%). The percentage of rejection, however, has decreased from 18% in 1969, to 9% in 1972. This could be an indication that we are attracting applicants who are closer in qualifications to our admissions standards and therefore there is less need for rejection.
The percentage of accepted students that have enrolled has declined from 66% to 56%. The increasing cost of private education, the consequent need for more financial aid, and the fact that more students are making multiple applications are significant factors accounting for an increase of students who do not enroll after acceptance.

The 1969-1972 Admissions Statistics and Student Profiles are in Folders E-1 and E-2.

Current Operation: The admissions staff includes a Director and Assistant Director of Admissions, three full-time Admissions Counselors, one secretary and five Work-Study students whose combined work totals 65 hours per week. From the end of September through December, intensive recruiting was done in San Diego and all of Southern California and selected schools in the San Francisco Bay area. Other states or areas included were major cities in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and Hawaii. We are aware of the growing need to establish and develop close relationships with high school guidance and counseling personnel to explain the academic programs offered at USD as well as the educational and personal growth opportunities available to students. This rapport with guidance personnel is considered of primary importance.

The Future: The Admissions staff is acutely aware that the competition for freshman and transfer students will be very keen these next years. Both the University of California system and California State Universities and Colleges have begun active recruitment programs. However, our experience indicates that many students are seeking a small, independent, student-oriented college with a strong academic program. Because financial need is an important factor in the ultimate enrollment of students we would recommend the location of the financial aid office near Admissions to facilitate communication. Also the Admissions Office should be placed in an area more
accessible to the general public.

3. Financial Aid

Objectives Within the Institutional Goals: All financial aid awarded to undergraduate and graduate students at the University of San Diego is based upon a careful analysis of the students' financial need. When need is demonstrated, every effort is made to award a package that is tailored to the student's needs and academic qualifications. Moreover, aid offers are made to be competitive with those of other schools so that the student is required to make his choice on bases other than finances. The primary purpose of the Financial Aid Program is to provide financial assistance to students who, without such aid, would be unable to attend the University of San Diego.

Process of Merger: Until July 1, 1969 there were two financial aid offices - the University of San Diego College for Men and the San Diego College for Women. Each filed their own applications for federal funds, made awards, and reported expenditures separately. Each had its own director.

Merger was difficult. Even though the offices were centralized in one location, the director had to operate under two distinct budgets. It was not until July 1, 1970 that the federal programs were merged and not until 1971 that institutional financial aid programs were conducted through one budget. This allowed for more efficient accounting and allotment of funds. Folder E-3 shows Federal and Institutional Aid expenditures from 1966 to projected 1972-1973.

Current Operation: Over 800 applications for financial assistance were received for the 1972-1973 school year. Approximately 80 students were turned away due to lack of funds.

The following depicts the current programs and levels within the
financial aid budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship and Grants</th>
<th>$62,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Direct Student Loan</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunity Grants</td>
<td>$61,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Work Opportunity</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Work Study</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Tuition Waivers</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistantships</td>
<td>$15,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Fellowships</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminarian Grants-in-aid</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Tuition Discounts</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Tuition Discounts</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Scholarships</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Private and Restricted Scholarships</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Assistant Program</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Grants-in-aid</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Insured Student Loans</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Student Aid Fund Loans</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $1,195,594

In addition to the above, 114 veterans are in attendance and are receiving assistance.

The total program is currently administered and accounted for by one full-time director, a full-time secretary/clerk, and two part-time work-study students.

The Future: With experts predicting that by 1975 educational costs may almost double, and with the cost of education rising more rapidly than the general economy, it appears certain that financial aid will become a critical factor in the total fiscal position of the University of San Diego.

We can expect increasing support of our aid program from federal and state sources in the years to come. California recognizes the financial crisis facing private schools and it is our responsibility to keep federal sources aware of our needs. As a result, increased federal funding is an immediate and on-going objective of the financial aid office at the University of San Diego.

The financial aid budget is increasing in size and scope. Federal aid
programs are also increasing in size and scope. The burden of the accountability and needs analysis for these programs falls upon the financial aid officer and his staff. This suggests that additional personnel will be needed in the near future to accommodate the changes brought about by the higher education amendments of July 1, 1972. Changes in the Insured Loan Program, and the creation of the Basic and Supplemental Opportunity Grant Programs will increase current paperwork by at least one-third. Machine-processing systems are inevitable. In addition, the establishment of a Financial Aid Board is needed to assist in setting and implementing general aid procedures and operation.

4. Registrar

Objectives Within the Institutional Goals: The purpose of the Registrar's Office is to effectively manage the registration and records system of the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, and Education, so that both faculty and students of these schools can be served in the most efficient manner possible.

Process of Merger: In January of 1969, the College for Men Registrar (Mr. Peter Barend), and his staff moved to the same physical location in Founders Hall as the College for Women Registrar (Sister Mariella Bremner). The first joint registration took place in the spring of 1969; however, the two Registrars administered the records of the two schools separately for that semester and the summer of 1969. The main difficulty experienced during this time was the confined space due to the number of workers in one office.

In August of 1969 one Registrar was appointed for the College for Men and the College for Women (Mr. Nicholas M. De Turi). From the fall of 1969 to the fall of 1971 the Registrar answered to two supervisors (the Academic Deans of the College for Women and the College for Men), and administered the records system separately based on the College for Women and the College for Men academic requirements. The main difficulty experienced during this period was one Registrar and
his staff administering two sets of separate academic requirements based on College for Women and College for Men policy.

Beginning with the fall semester, 1971, the Registrar has administered the records system under one supervisor (the Vice-President of Academic Administration during the 1971-1972 school year, and the Director of Academic Services for the current school year), based on one set of academic requirements.

The main advantage of working under one supervisor and one set of academic regulations is that it allows for much more efficiency in administrative and clerical matters.

Current Operation: The Registrar is responsible for the maintenance and certification of the permanent academic records of all current and past students of the University, with the exception of the Law School. It is his responsibility to see that all necessary enrollment and grade data is supplied to the appropriate administrators so that they may evaluate the managerial and instructional processes of the University.

The Future: The records system of the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, and Education are currently operated on a manual system. If the computer feasibility study currently being conducted presents a positive report, the Registrar would certainly investigate the possibilities of converting to a computer system. Among the determining factors would be costs, and whether the system would serve students, faculty, and administrators in a more efficient manner than the current system.

5. Educational Development Center

Objectives Within the Institutional Goals: The purpose of the Educational Development Center is to enrich the student's academic experience and to increase his or her efficiency in dealing with the normal demands of an academic
community. To accomplish this purpose the Center provides professional counselors to offer help to students who seek increased self-understanding and insight into academic, vocational, and personal problems. Academic assistance is available through the Reading and Learning Laboratory and the Efficient Study Program.

Process of Merger: The Educational Development Center is an outgrowth of the College for Men's counseling service. Prior to the establishment of the EDC, the counseling service consisted of one faculty member, Dr. Gerald Sperrazzo, professor of psychology. With the aid of a $15,000 grant from Mr. Clarence Steber, Trustee, the present EDC facilities and initial laboratory and office equipment were acquired in 1967.

The Educational Development Center was merged at the inception in the sense that the services it provided were equally applicable and available to men and women students. However, comparatively few women were seen from 1968 to 1969 due perhaps to the fact that the Center had an all male staff and/or perhaps to the fact that the College for Women did not refer students to the Center. During the years 1967-1969, staff salaries were paid from College for Men budget and the Director reported to the College for Men Academic Dean, Dr. Henry Martin. In 1970 staff salaries were paid jointly by the College for Men and the College for Women and a woman Director was hired who reported to both the College for Men and College for Women Academic Deans, Dr. Henry Martin and Sister Sally Furay. Since 1970 there has been a steady increase in the number of women seeking the Center's services and the ratio is now about two men to one woman.

In 1971 the Center reported to the Vice-President of Student and Curricular Development (Sister Furay). In 1972, further reorganization placed the Center under the administrative office of the Director of Academic Services (Dr. Watson) who in turn reports to the Provost (Sister Furay).
Perhaps because the current Director was interviewed and hired by, and reported to both Academic Deans, she always considered the Center as belonging to both Colleges and therefore a part of the University versus either College for Men or College for Women separately. No difficulty was experienced in reporting to both Academic Deans. The fact that the Center has continued to report to one of these under various titles has provided continuity of understanding and assistance.

The staffing pattern for the Center from 1967 to the present is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Reading Specialist/Advisor</th>
<th>Communication Specialist-Advisor</th>
<th>Counselor/Therapist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Dr. G. Sperrazzo*</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Mr. Conrad*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Dr. G. Sperrazzo*</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Mr. Conrad*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Dr. R. Phelps</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Mr. Conrad*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Dr. P. Watson</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Mr. Ormond*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Dr. P. Watson</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Mr. Ormond*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Dr. P. Watson*</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Mr. Schurr</td>
<td>Fr. Donovan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates part-time appointment

Each staff member has general counseling as a primary duty. In addition, Dr. Watson also serves as Director of Academic Services, Mr. Schurr as instructor in Efficient Reading and English as a Second Language, and Dr. Donovan as therapist and marriage counselor.

Current Operation: The Educational Development Center serves several distinct groups of students which in September, 1972 numbered as follows: 160 Undeclared Majors, 105 Foreign Students, and 110 students in the Educational Opportunity Program. In addition, the Center serves all students as individuals who wish to take advantage of the services offered.

The Center has, by design, an "Open Door Policy" within which students from the groups defined above plus other individuals can see any staff member at any time he or she is not already occupied with a student. These "walk-ins" are not required to fill out forms nor are folders established for them unless repeat visits are indicated. It is estimated that approximately 8-12 students
are seen daily on this basis throughout the academic year. In the preceding two academic years, September through May 1970-71 and 1971-72, 850 men and 493 women were seen by appointment.

The Future: No change is foreseen in the basic purpose of the Educational Development Center - personal counseling with students by a professional staff. However, student concerns shift with changes in society and counseling staffs must be attuned to and knowledgeable regarding these concerns. For this reason a future thrust will be for EDC to be viewed not only as a Center to help individual students, but also as a source of insight for faculty and administration regarding student concerns.

6. Educational Opportunity Program

Objectives Within the Institutional Goals: The purpose of the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) is to enroll in the University of San Diego able people from minority groups and low income backgrounds, assist them in financing their education if need exists, and make available academic support to help insure their success as University students.

Process of Merger: The Educational Opportunity Program was inaugurated when six minority group students were accepted in the fall of 1968 and eleven in February, 1969. These students did not meet normal admission standards but gave evidence of strong motivation. Many of them were contacted through COPE (Community Opportunities Program for Education), a San Diego County organization composed of representatives from minority groups who met with civic and educational leaders to foster educational opportunities for minority students. Tutorial assistance was offered these students and the Educational Development Center made its programs and counseling services available to them.

In June 1970, the College for Women and College for Men Presidents,
Sister Morris and Msgr. Baer, defined the administrative structure of the EOP as consisting of two part-time Co-Directors, one Black and one Chicano, and the EDC Director as Co-ordinator of the EOP. The Educational Opportunity Program was therefore merged from inception in the CW-CM sense. However, the Co-Director/Co-ordinator concept proved difficult to administer in that areas of authority and responsibility were questionable. Consequently, a situation evolved in which each Co-Director worked almost exclusively with his own group and there was little Program agreement. This situation, together with other administrative changes in the University which would place the Co-ordinator in the new position of Director of Academic Services as well as retaining the position of Director of the Educational Development Center led to the recommendations:

1. That the EOP become an administrative entity rather than a sub-unit of the Educational Development Center.
2. That a single part-time Director, either a Chicano or a Black, be appointed to be responsible for the EOP.
3. That the EOP Director report to the Director of Academic Services.
4. That two part-time Assistant Directors be appointed as well as two peer counselors and five tutors.

These recommendations were approved by the EOP Committee and were implemented in September 1972.

Although there was Committee and administrative agreement concerning a single part-time Director, the implementation has not been easy. Dr. Brandes, a Professor of History of Mexican-American descent, was appointed Director. The Black former Co-Director, Mr. Moore, was offered a position of Assistant Director which he refused on the grounds that he should have been appointed Director due to his long association with the program. Two Assistant Directors were appointed, Mary Howell, Black, and Antonio Aldana, Mexican-American. Both are USD graduates and are enrolled in Law and an M.A. program in Urban Affairs respectively. The Black students on campus and the Black
Community still have not fully accepted the current staff and students.

Current Operation: The manner in which EOP is organized in 1972–73 permits a range of operations not possible on this campus previously. A single Director, Dr. Brandes, is now responsible for the Program. In addition to budgetary and staff supervision, he serves as liaison with administration, faculty, and student groups such as MECHA and BSU. The Assistant Directors are involved in recruiting in two ways: with the USD admissions staff, and through the HEW Talent Search Program. The two peer counselors oversee a tutorial/counseling program and maintain all EOP student files with necessary data on academic progress. The five tutors meet a certain number of hours each week with EOP students having academic difficulties. These are individualized tutorial sessions; one student may have more than one tutor dependent upon the courses in which he has problems.

The Future: The EOP should demonstrate growth consistent with the growth of the University. As more low income and minority students are recruited, additional efforts must be made in concert not only with the Development Director to raise funds, but also with the EOP Committee and Financial Aid Director to insure more and better student financial packaging.

EOP has this year begun a small library for its students. It is hoped that financial assistance can be obtained to build a library of many volumes on ethnic studies.

C. Business Affairs

1. Objectives Within the Institutional Goals

Throughout the entire merger process, the basic objectives within the Business Affairs areas have been as follows:

(a) Eliminate duplication of services wherever possible.

(b) Reduce expenses while increasing efficiencies of operation.
(c) Provide support services to the instructional programs, based on needs, resources, and priorities.
(d) Improve internal control and reporting to facilitate better financial decision making.

2. Historical Report

Prior to June of 1969, the College for Men, College for Women, and Law School essentially operated their own independent business affairs. Each School, being completely autonomous, managed its own affairs. The three Schools were using a simplified cash receipts and disbursements system with little or no functional cost accounting or budgeting. With the beginning of "joint functions," a system of cross-billing was initiated. (See Exhibit A—Pro forma Income Statement for Period Ending June 30, 1969, on next page.)

With the appointment of the first University-wide Business Manager, a fourth entity was created, known as the "joint." This entity was responsible for administering the shared functions. Among the three Schools an elaborate system for determination and allocation of costs of the "joint" was instituted and conducted until merger.

As more and more of the business management functions and service functions were centralized, the cost allocation became more complex. Most revenues were still attributed to the separate institutions, while an increasing number of expenditures were attributed to the "joint" entity. (See Exhibits B and C—Period Ending August 31, 1970 and 1971, on following pages.)

In January of 1970, the accounting functions of the College for Men and College for Women were consolidated, and a system of combined income-expenditure accounting instituted while separate accounting controls over cash was maintained. This system of separate cash accounting was continued until the effective date of merger.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College for Men</th>
<th>School of Law</th>
<th>USD Combined</th>
<th>GW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$746,280</td>
<td>$521,816</td>
<td>$1,268,096</td>
<td>$482,456</td>
<td>$1,750,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining and residence</td>
<td>206,632</td>
<td></td>
<td>206,632</td>
<td>280,075</td>
<td>486,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore income, net</td>
<td>9,495</td>
<td>7,513</td>
<td>17,008</td>
<td>6,797</td>
<td>23,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic activities</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and wages</td>
<td>946,185</td>
<td>386,678</td>
<td>1,332,863</td>
<td>638,659</td>
<td>1,971,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>453,349</td>
<td>114,588</td>
<td>567,937</td>
<td>241,994</td>
<td>809,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and student aid -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminarians</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>132,561</td>
<td>42,180</td>
<td>174,741</td>
<td>65,277</td>
<td>240,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated student body activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,040</td>
<td>7,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Loss</strong></td>
<td>(582,738)</td>
<td>(14,117)</td>
<td>(596,855)</td>
<td>(183,642)</td>
<td>(780,497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocese of San Diego</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>586,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>586,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed services</td>
<td>117,407</td>
<td>117,407</td>
<td>132,132</td>
<td></td>
<td>835,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and grants from foundations, individuals and government</td>
<td>45,852</td>
<td>44,055</td>
<td>89,907</td>
<td>43,527</td>
<td>133,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale of donated assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,223</td>
<td>10,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>723,259</td>
<td>70,055</td>
<td>793,314</td>
<td>185,882</td>
<td>1,565,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends and interest</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>3,676</td>
<td>17,129</td>
<td>20,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>18,006</td>
<td>26,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>728,576</td>
<td>77,264</td>
<td>805,840</td>
<td>221,017</td>
<td>1,026,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess of income over expenses</strong></td>
<td>$145,838</td>
<td>$63,147</td>
<td>$208,985</td>
<td>$37,375</td>
<td>$246,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO AND SAN DIEGO COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

## STATEMENT OF ALLOCATION OF JOINT REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

### FOURTEEN MONTHS ENDED AUGUST 31, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocated to</th>
<th>University of San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego College for Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College for Men</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other student fees</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>2,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking revenues</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>38,776</td>
<td>38,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>11,848</td>
<td>$11,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-study grant</td>
<td>11,402</td>
<td>11,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed services</td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>13,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore sales</td>
<td>57,381</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>149,242</td>
<td>11,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EXPENDITURES:** | | | | | |
| Business manager | 29,877 | 29,877 | 59,754 | 29,877 | 89,631 |
| Administrative and general | 3,122 | 3,122 | 6,244 | 3,122 | 9,366 |
| Security | 35,023 | 7,148 | 42,171 | 29,305 | 71,476 |
| Ground maintenance | 26,447 | 8,441 | 34,888 | 21,383 | 56,271 |
| University development | 26,061 | 26,061 | 52,122 | 26,061 | 78,183 |
| Bookstore | 63,528 | 63,528 | 127,055 | 63,528 | 190,583 |
| Registrar | 25,275 | 25,275 | 50,550 | 25,275 | 50,550 |
| Admissions and financial aid | 67,674 | 67,674 | 135,348 | 67,674 | 135,348 |
| Education | 50,806 | 50,806 | 101,612 | 50,806 | 101,612 |
| Religious studies | 27,648 | 27,648 | 55,296 | 27,648 | 55,296 |
| Summer session | 26,455 | 26,455 | 52,910 | 27,979 | 54,934 |
| Other (net) | 7,189 | (5,510) | 1,679 | (2,622) | (7,943) |
| **TOTAL** | 389,106 | 69,139 | 458,245 | 356,123 | 814,368 |

**EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES OVER REVENUES**

| | | | | |
| **University of San Diego** | $239,864 | $57,273 | $297,137 |
| **San Diego College for Women** | $272,763 | $569,900 |
### UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO  
AND  
SAN DIEGO COLLEGE FOR WOMEN  
STATEMENT OF ALLOCATION OF  
JOINT REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES  
YEAR ENDED AUGUST 31, 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
<th>Allocated to</th>
<th>University of San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>College for Men</td>
<td>School of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous student fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,804</td>
<td>$ 1,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,603</td>
<td>$ 3,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,201</td>
<td>$ 8,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,377</td>
<td>$ 1,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal work-study grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 29,133</td>
<td>$ 29,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 11,000</td>
<td>$ 11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocese priest housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 26,700</td>
<td>$ 26,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 33,686</td>
<td>$ 33,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate center rent</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 40,286</td>
<td>$ 40,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore sales</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 70,910</td>
<td>$ 70,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 202,600</td>
<td>$ 202,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 345,948</td>
<td>$ 345,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES:</th>
<th>Allocated to</th>
<th>University of San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>College for Men</td>
<td>School of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 28,241</td>
<td>$ 28,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 12,103</td>
<td>$ 12,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing and services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 19,730</td>
<td>$ 19,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,433</td>
<td>$ 4,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone service</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,377</td>
<td>$ 4,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,185</td>
<td>$ 4,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,694</td>
<td>$ 4,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,506</td>
<td>$ 4,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 11,651</td>
<td>$ 11,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,506</td>
<td>$ 4,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 28,202</td>
<td>$ 28,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 28,202</td>
<td>$ 28,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language lab</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,399</td>
<td>$ 2,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,329</td>
<td>$ 2,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 37,812</td>
<td>$ 37,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate division</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5,605</td>
<td>$ 5,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student aid</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,474</td>
<td>$ 4,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,493</td>
<td>$ 2,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 54,559</td>
<td>$ 54,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 32,453</td>
<td>$ 32,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer session</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 41,443</td>
<td>$ 41,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,332</td>
<td>$ 3,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and general</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,945</td>
<td>$ 50,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical plant</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 386,259</td>
<td>$ 386,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 982,488</td>
<td>$ 982,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES OVER REVENUES**  
**$636,540**  
**$80,645**  
**$717,185**  
**$503,231**  
**$1,220,416**
As more confidence and mutual trust emerged among the three Schools, a reliable system of fiscal accountability and internal control developed. Also, the formal preparation and adoption of a combined budget for the University of San Diego and the San Diego College for Women was instituted. Uniform policies for budget planning and control were also developed.

3. Organizational Structure

During the period from June 1969 to August 1970, the business affairs functions of the three Schools reported to their respective heads. During the early part of this same period, the "joint" business affairs reported to the still existing Executive Committee, made up of the President of the College for Men, the President of the College for Women, and the Dean of the Law School. Business affairs also reported to two Boards of Trustees.

From the period September 1970 to August 1971, the "joint" business affairs reported to two Presidents--President of the University of San Diego and President of the College for Women, and to two Boards of Trustees.

In the period from September 1971 to May 1972, the "joint" business affairs reported to one President--the President of the University of San Diego and the College for Women, and to two Boards of Trustees.

4. Development of Support Areas

The development of centralized support services in the merger process includes physical plant and maintenance, centralized purchasing and other services, such as telephone, postal, etc.; auxiliary services, such as housing, food service, bookstore, and printing and duplicating. Also developed were the non-academic personnel function and University Security. The Office of Special Events has functioned in order to generate income from the use of available facilities by off-campus groups.
As each service support function was initiated, it was organized to provide service on a campus-wide basis. The fact that there existed two separate corporate entities and three Schools did not adversely affect the support functions organizationally. The difficulties that were experienced in their formation were the result of unclear lines of authority and responsibility because of provision of services to more than one administrative network. Nevertheless, each service function in its initiation attempted to further the merger process and to unify those aspects of the institutions with which it was concerned.

Physical Plant

The centralization of the operation and maintenance of the Physical Plant began in June, 1970. Prior to that time the three Schools employed their own maintenance staffs. The College for Women maintained its own complete physical plant operation. The College for Men and Law School contracted out grounds maintenance, and the College for Men contracted out custodial services. Security was a shared contracted service for all three Schools. During the first year it was determined that the contracted services could be provided more economically with better services if the Physical Plant Department took them over. This was accomplished with the expected results. Since that time, because of budget limitations, the Physical Plant Department has been operating with a shortage of manpower, but able to maintain a minimum standard of maintenance for the University. The School of Law still maintains its own custodial crew.

Purchasing

Centralized purchasing for the campus was initiated in April, 1970. It took almost two years to accomplish what could be considered a fairly well
centralized purchasing function due to the previous tradition of decentralized purchasing. Policies have been adopted, which include competitive bidding and centralization of purchase contracts, such as xerox, maintenance contracts on office equipment, etc. These policies have assisted in achieving cost benefits.

**Personnel**

The centralization of record-keeping and employee Personnel Policies, as well as recruiting for non-academic personnel and the centralization of benefit programs, was accomplished over the period of two and a half years. A Handbook of Personnel Policies and Procedures was drawn up. (See Folder F-1.) Centralized salary administration and job classifications have also been undertaken during this period. An affirmative action program has been developed under this function and is in the process of being implemented.

**Other Services**

From June, 1969 to August, 1972, there were other services developed. These had been provided by each of the Schools and were centralized, including such areas as postal service, telephone service, security service, food service, and the relocation of mens’ undergraduate housing. Provision was also made for graduate student and married student housing.

In each instance the specific function was evaluated as a separate function of each School, a program for centralization was developed with adequate cost justification, and procedures evolved for the implementation of the change. The degree of success in each of these ventures was directly related to the understanding and cooperation of the three Schools. The Law School proved to be the most unwilling to relinquish any control.

The Special Events area, that is, the administrative office which supervises the use of vacant facilities for the production of income has grown
from a nominal few thousand dollars of income in 1970 to an excess of $75,000 net income for the past year.

5. Current Programs

As of September 1, 1972, the entire business affairs area is organized and staffed to provide completely centralized services in support of the academic programs. (See Organizational Chart, including Budget Control and Responsibility, Exhibit D on next pages.)

While there is still much improvement needed in the area of financial reporting and budget controls (possibly utilizing data processing), and in the operation and maintenance of the physical plant, these improvements require additional financial resources. These additional financial resources, when available, must be allocated in terms of overall institutional priorities.

D. The Faculty Senate

1. Prior Separate Faculty Meetings and Organizations

Prior to the establishment of the Faculty Senate of the University of San Diego, each separate college held faculty meetings that were called by the respective Presidents who established the agenda and presided over the meetings. At the College for Men, the Faculty Association, an unofficial advisory body, served as that faculty's major single voice though at no time did its membership constitute a majority of the faculty of the college. A chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), established in 1966, served a comparable function for the faculty of the College for Women, though it differed from the Faculty Association in that it was officially recognized and its national policies accepted by the administrators of the college. The AAUP chapter of the San Diego College for Women became campus-wide on March 26, 1969 and changed its name to the University of San Diego Chapter. (See
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2. Development of the Senate

In February, 1970, both the AAUP Chapter and the Faculty Association passed resolutions asking for a discussion by the joint faculty of the possibility of forming a Faculty Senate. The two Presidents, Msgr. John E. Baer and Sister Nancy Morris, placed the request on the agenda for the next joint faculty meeting, March 18, 1970, and, at the meeting, the faculty authorized Dr. Ernest N. Morin, President of the AAUP Chapter, and Dr. Jack Opdycke, President of the Faculty Association, to select an ad hoc committee from among the faculty members to study ways to organize a Faculty Senate (see Folder G-2).

The ad hoc Committee on the Faculty Senate, chaired by Dr. Gilbert L. Oddo, completed a draft copy of a proposed constitution for a Faculty Senate and presented it to the faculty at a special meeting called by the committee and held on April 29, 1970. The proposed Senate, a representative one to consist of sixteen full-time members of the faculty, was rejected by the faculty as being too small a body. However, the faculty did approve the idea of a Faculty Senate based on AAUP principles but to include all full-time members of the faculty (see Folder G-3). At its next "official" meeting on May 6, 1970, the joint faculty directed the committee to expand its membership to eleven members and to return with a new draft proposal in September. The committee accepted the suggestions of the faculty, decided to meet frequently throughout the summer, and elected Dr. Morin chairman, replacing Dr. Oddo. (See Folder G-4.)

During the summer months of 1970 the expanded committee examined the structures of faculty bodies of colleges and universities throughout the nation, designed then revised more than half-a-dozen constitutions to fit the
USD situation, and finally agreed on one to be submitted to the faculty at a meeting called by the committee and held on September 30, 1970. At that meeting a few changes in the document were made at the suggestion of members of the faculty, then the revised Constitution was submitted to the joint faculty at a meeting called by the Presidents and held on October 7, 1970. Several more changes were adopted at that meeting following which the joint faculty voted to submit the revised Constitution to the faculty for ratification with the vote to be conducted by means of a secret ballot by mail. (See Folder G-5.)

Of the 104 persons entitled to vote for ratification, 70 returned their ballots and, of these, 41 voted to accept the document while 21 chose not to accept it. The committee was divided as to how to interpret the results and decided to ask the joint faculty for its advice. The joint faculty felt a sufficient number of faculty members had expressed approval and moved to submit the Constitution to the Boards of Trustees for their consideration. Both Boards approved the idea of a Faculty Senate in principle but asked that the proposed Constitution be made more explicit. (See Folder G-6.)

Following the semester break, the committee held a series of meetings with the two Presidents (Msgr. Baer and Sister Morris) to try to establish points of agreement, divergence, and lack of clarity in the Constitution submitted to the Boards of Trustees. The approach of the Presidents was extremely positive and helpful—their ideas as to needed changes were quite acceptable to the committee. For example, in order to meet a request for more specific information in regard to the proposed Faculty Senate standing committees, the ad hoc committee drew up a set of proposed by-laws spelling out the composition and activities of these committees (see Folder G-7). Finally, at a meeting held on May 12, 1971, the joint faculty approved a Constitution that incorporated changes desired by both administrators and faculty members (see Folder G-8).
Meanwhile, the Boards of Trustees, aided by a search committee that included students, faculty members, administrators, and trustees was completing its search for a new President to be the Chief Executive Officer of both the College for Men and the College for Women. The person selected, Dr. Author E. Hughes, presiding over the opening faculty meeting on August 31, 1971, stated that both Boards of Trustees had approved the Faculty Senate subject to the new President's approval. He asked for an opportunity to study the proposal more carefully and to meet with the committee that had drafted it. At these meetings, minor changes in wording were suggested and accepted by the committee after which the proposed Constitution was accepted by the Boards of Trustees and the faculty. (See Folder G-9.)

With final approval of the Constitution, the ad hoc Committee on the Faculty Senate completed plans for the election of officers of the Senate, and in the ensuing election, Dr. Ernest N. Morin was elected Chairman, Father William L. Shipley, Vice-Chairman, and Dr. Patricia Watson, Secretary. When, at long last, the historic first meeting of the first Faculty Senate of the University of San Diego got underway at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, October 26, 1971, administrators (President Hughes and Dr. Martin) shared the agenda with faculty members. (See Folder G-10.) Much time had been lost in gaining the necessary approvals and in conducting the elections needed to fill the Faculty Senate offices. And, there was considerable work ahead in the approval of the By-Laws and the election of faculty members to the approved committees. Yet, as the minutes of the meetings show, the faculty accomplished much work in the fall semester with both administrators and faculty members pitching in to prove the value of the Senate. (See Folder G-11.)

During the spring, 1972, semester student leaders John Murphy, Student Body President, and Gary Schons, Student Body Secretary of Academics, addressed the Senate, and a student reporter for Vista, the campus newspaper,
was allowed to attend the meetings. A few of the many subjects discussed were policy on rank and tenure, the increase in tuition, the use of faculty secretaries, the faculty salary scale, student rating of teaching, curricular matters, and possible Law School participation in the Faculty Senate. In these meetings faculty members and administrative officers, including President Hughes, Vice-President Martin, and Vice-President Sister Furay, were heard in stimulating and sometimes vigorous debate. Several faculty members complained to the chairman of the Senate saying that they were inhibited by the presence of these administrative officers. Some thought they ought not be given a place on the agenda. Others thought they ought not to be allowed to become members of the Senate. The desire to eliminate administrators as members of the Senate was expressed in proposed changes to the By-Laws submitted to the Faculty Senate at its meeting on May 2, 1972. Changes proposed by the President in the organizational structure of the University (the addition of a Provost and three new Deans along with the elimination of the two Vice-President positions) would make obsolete those portions of the Constitution and By-Laws that referred to the old positions. Therefore, changes were needed, and those who were opposed to the participation of administrators in the Faculty Senate perceived an opportunity to accomplish their removal in the process of changing the documents. But the suggested amendments failed to receive the necessary majority vote of the faculty and, at the end of the academic year, the Faculty Senate found itself with a set of By-Laws and a Constitution that had been made obsolete insofar as the participation of the new administrative officers were concerned. Yet proposed corrective changes had not been accepted by the faculty, and the President had voiced concern that the changes sought would not allow administrators to express themselves on the different issues raised on the floor of the Senate. Obviously, something had to be done during the summer to resolve this problem. (See Folder G-12.)
Members of the Faculty Senate's Committee on Organization and other interested (available) Faculty Senate members and administrators met with President Hughes several times during the summer to discuss the role of administrators in relation to the Faculty Senate and to its committees. An acceptable agreement was reached with the President and this agreement (expressed in changes to the Constitution and By-Laws) was ratified by members of the Faculty Senate. (See Folder G-13.)

3. Current Operation

The achievements of the Senate this year have included:

(a) Agreements with the President: concerning the roles of administrators in the Senate and on Senate committees ("functional participation"), and concerning the "primary responsibilities" of the faculty, to be exercised through the Senate.

(b) Reorganization: revision of the Senate's Constitution and By-Laws, restructuring of two major committees to allow greater autonomy to the new Schools of Business Administration and Education, creation of a new committee on Academic Affairs.

(c) Faculty evaluation: the proposal of new procedures and criteria for evaluating faculty members for purposes of tenure, of promotion, and of merit increases in salary.

4. Future Plans

Among the objectives of the Senate for the future are the following:

(a) To operate more creatively within its primary responsibilities in the initiation of academic programs and the establishment of curricular priorities.

(b) To stimulate the initiative of individual faculty members and faculty committees toward that end.
E. University Relations and Development

The Office of University Relations was the first University-wide office under the program of merger for the University of San Diego. A Director of University Relations was appointed on September 1, 1969, and goals were set which included (1) the establishment of a strong fund raising program which would be based on (2) the building of a stronger community image for the University.

Unfortunately, relatively rapid turnover has characterized the small staff in Development and Public Relations. Since 1969, there have been three different directors of the program and for almost a year the position was vacant. Other positions have also had short tenure. As a result, the basic fund raising portion of the program has not yet been successful.

"A Program of the Seventies" was announced in 1969 with a goal of seventeen million dollars. The program produced few gifts. In January, 1972, under the guidance of a consulting organization, the University began a second effort with a more modest goal of eight million dollars. Activity in this campaign has underscored the need to continue to build closer community ties if major success is to be assured.

Accordingly, last July 1st, the University employed a new Director of University Relations, Dr. Gilbert L. Brown, who has had broad general experience in college public relations and development, as well as an academic background. Since his term of service in his last employment was thirty-two years, there is some hope that the problem of turnover in this position has been solved.

During the past year, substantial improvements have been made in working with constituent groups. President Hughes has established a warm
rapport with the community. A strong program in public relations has been organized and excellent media relations now exist. Separate alumni organizations have been merged under a new charter and the new officers are enthusiastically working toward building a strong single organization. The new Board of Trustees is representative of the Southern California community and is providing leadership in the Development area.
A. Analysis of Prior Components

An analysis of the annual net operations of the University of San Diego and the San Diego College for Women during the merger period highlights the relative financial positions of the parties to the merger. It is important to note that in the determination of net operating results for each year, all transfers to other funds are considered operational items.

The audited financial statements for the San Diego College for Women for the period ending June 30, 1968 show an operating surplus of $271,761; for the next fiscal period, July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969, the College for Women audited statements show an operating deficit of $52,043 (see Folder I-1 for 1968 and 1969 audit reports). The University of San Diego School of Law, which engaged its own independent auditor for the period ending June 30, 1969, had an operating surplus of $8229 after the subsidy of $26,000 from the Diocese of San Diego (see Folder I-2). The accounts for the University of San Diego College for Men, which were unauditable at this time, showed an operating surplus of $143,935 after the subsidy of $560,000 from the Diocese (see Folder I-3).

The reason that the College for Men statement remained unaudited was that, because of the condition of the financial and accounting records, and because of the intermingling of transactions between the Diocesan office and the College for Men, it was virtually impossible to complete an audit. Another
major problem in this regard was that the College for Men and School of Law did not recognize fixed plant assets in their financial statements. Such records were maintained by the Diocese. However, upon investigation, it was determined that there were no historical cost records available for the fixed assets of the then University of San Diego. During 1969, an appraisal was made of the entire campus, including the College for Women, in order to obtain comparable estimates of value of the assets of the respective institutions. These appraisals became the basis for a debt to the Diocese by the University of San Diego. This debt was based on the same ratio of assets, at appraised value, as the debt of the College for Women to the Province; the latter debt represented the unpaid portion of the actual Province loan for construction costs of the College for Women.

The total subsidy from the Diocese to the College for Men and School of Law for the period ending June 30, 1969 was $586,000. The only additional direct subsidy to the University from the Diocese was $191,000, received during the next fiscal period, July 1, 1969 to August 31, 1970. After the $191,000 subsidy, the combined operating deficit of the College for Men and School of Law was $692,931. The following year, September 1, 1970 through August 31, 1971, the University of San Diego operating deficit was $569,296, with no subsidy -- a decrease of over $300,000 in the USD operating deficit as compared to the prior year. (See Folder I-4 for 1970 and 1971 audit reports.)

For the period ending August 31, 1970, the College for Women had an operating deficit of $160,146, because of a large capital expenditure for fire doors, for which funds had been accumulated in prior fiscal years. The last separate College for Women audit, for the period ending August 31, 1971, showed an operating deficit of $64,046 (after a correction in the 1972 audit report restating deferred revenue). (See Folder I-5 for 1970 and 1971 audit reports.)
For the fiscal year ending August 31, 1972, the first University of San Diego audited financial statements subsequent to the merger show the combined results of operations with an operating deficit of $415,962 -- a decrease of over $200,000 in the combined operational deficit as compared to the prior year. The major causes for the continued reduction of the size of the operating deficit over the past several years are increasing tuition, increased enrollment, tighter controls over expenditures, and a planned increase in the student/faculty ratio in the undergraduate school. The audited financial statements for the period from September 1, 1971 to August 31, 1972 are reproduced on the following pages.

A crucial event concerning the financial situation of the University of San Diego, as it affected the merger process, occurred when the first lay trustee of the College for Men, Mr. Clarence L. Steyer, died in the spring of 1971. He bequeathed part of his estate to the University of San Diego in the amount of approximately $450,000, and thus changing considerably the financial situation of one of the parties to the proposed merger.

B. Financial Statements and Charts

On the following pages are reproduced financial statements and internally prepared analyses:


2. Current Unrestricted Fund -- Comparison of Budget to Actual -- for the Year Ended August 31, 1972. (Page 204.) (See Folder I-6 for detailed breakdown.)

3. Percentage Relationships of Income and Expenditures Data at Selected Private Universities. (Page 205.)


5. Statement of the Debt Structure of the University of San Diego. (Page 212.)
   (See Folder I-7 for supporting papers.)
Board of Trustees,
University of San Diego,
San Diego, California.

We have examined the balance sheet of the funds of the University of San Diego as of August 31, 1972, and the related statements of current funds revenues, expenditures and transfers and changes in fund balances for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, the aforementioned financial statements, with the exception of the plant fund balance sheet and the statement of changes in plant fund balance, present fairly the financial position of the funds of the University of San Diego at August 31, 1972, and the changes in fund balances and the results of their operations for the year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applicable to educational institutions (Note A) applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

Further, in our opinion, the plant fund balance sheet and the statement of changes in plant fund balance do not present fairly the financial position of the plant fund and the changes in the fund balance in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles inasmuch as the assets invested in plant are recorded substantially at appraisal amounts rather than at cost (Note B).

Certified Public Accountants.
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

BALANCE SHEET

AUGUST 31, 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>Current funds</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Endowment fund</th>
<th>Plant fund</th>
<th>Agency fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Loan fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH</td>
<td>$ 218,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENTS, at cost (Notes A and C):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities (quoted market $70,297 and $93,875 for current fund and endowment fund, respectively)</td>
<td>101,763</td>
<td>$ 9,355</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 97,185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTS AND NOTES RECEIVABLE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student receivables (less allowance for doubtful accounts of $15,900)</td>
<td>28,351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes receivable (less allowance for doubtful amounts of $56,000) (Note D)</td>
<td>46,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>607,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48,717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVENTORIES, at cost</td>
<td>96,460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ASSETS</td>
<td>27,232</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$	ext{475}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUE FROM OTHER FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTED IN PLANT (Notes A, B, C and F):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$	ext{7,762,266}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,118,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, equipment and library books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,444,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$	ext{567,967}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,379,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$	ext{475}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES PAYABLE (Notes B and C):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank, unsecured</td>
<td>$ 970,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 23,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,093,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTS PAYABLE AND ACCRUED EXPENSES</td>
<td>266,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT DEPOSITS</td>
<td>98,082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUE TO OTHER FUNDS</td>
<td>444,031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFERRED REVENUE (Note G)</td>
<td>449,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCIES AND COMMITMENTS (Note F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND BALANCES (DEFICIT) (Notes A and B)</td>
<td>$(1,660,158)</td>
<td>$ 95,026</td>
<td>$634,791</td>
<td>$487,950</td>
<td>$25,260,954</td>
<td>(40,906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$	ext{567,967}</td>
<td>$ 95,026</td>
<td>$634,791</td>
<td>$510,756</td>
<td>$28,379,864</td>
<td>$	ext{475}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to financial statements.
## UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

**STATEMENT OF CURRENT FUNDS**

**REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS**

**YEAR ENDED AUGUST 31, 1972**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues/Expenditures</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and general:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees</td>
<td>3,394,035</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,394,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts (including contributed services of $106,944)</td>
<td>272,458</td>
<td>43,910</td>
<td>316,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government grants</td>
<td>110,443</td>
<td>61,671</td>
<td>172,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTED SERVICES</td>
<td>13,682</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>20,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>41,767</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student aid</strong></td>
<td>3,852,465</td>
<td>105,581</td>
<td>3,958,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary enterprises:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student residence and board</td>
<td>454,286</td>
<td></td>
<td>454,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary residence and board</td>
<td>58,786</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>8,409</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>207,579</td>
<td></td>
<td>207,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print shop</td>
<td>40,028</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>105,950</td>
<td></td>
<td>105,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent income</td>
<td>102,469</td>
<td></td>
<td>102,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>4,829,972</td>
<td>176,461</td>
<td>5,006,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and general:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>2,099,499</td>
<td>74,704</td>
<td>2,174,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>379,901</td>
<td></td>
<td>379,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and maintenance of physical plant</td>
<td>348,616</td>
<td>12,930</td>
<td>361,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored programs</td>
<td>179,947</td>
<td></td>
<td>179,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored research</td>
<td>489,595</td>
<td></td>
<td>489,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>489,595</td>
<td></td>
<td>489,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>217,092</td>
<td></td>
<td>217,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educational and general</td>
<td>249,555</td>
<td></td>
<td>249,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student aid</strong></td>
<td>3,784,258</td>
<td>105,581</td>
<td>3,889,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary enterprises:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student residence and board</td>
<td>336,950</td>
<td></td>
<td>336,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary residence and board</td>
<td>74,874</td>
<td></td>
<td>74,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>151,715</td>
<td></td>
<td>151,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>224,314</td>
<td></td>
<td>224,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print shop</td>
<td>59,007</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>5,898</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent expense</td>
<td>29,275</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures and transfers</strong></td>
<td>4,974,481</td>
<td>176,461</td>
<td>5,150,942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES OVER REVENUES BEFORE TRANSFERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excess of expenditures over revenues</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144,509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSFERS TO PLANT FUND FOR:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfers to Plant Fund for:</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>218,108</td>
<td></td>
<td>218,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments on notes and accounts payable</td>
<td>53,345</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total transfers</strong></td>
<td>271,453</td>
<td></td>
<td>271,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS OVER REVENUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excess of expenditures and transfers over revenues</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 415,962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 415,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to financial statements.
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES
YEAR ENDED AUGUST 31, 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current funds</th>
<th>Loan fund</th>
<th>Endowment fund</th>
<th>Plant fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUND BALANCE (DEFICIT), September 1, 1971
(Note A):
As previously reported
Transfers
Restatement of deferred revenue
As restated

ADDITIONS:
Unrestricted current fund revenues
Gifts and donations
Government grants and appropriations
Investment income
Rent income
Matching grant charged to current fund expenditures
Transfers to unrestricted current fund expenditures
Additions to plant facilities
Reduction of notes and accounts payable
Increase in plant assets to appraisal amounts (Note B)

DEDUCTIONS:
Current fund expenditures and transfers
Transfer to unrestricted current fund income
Refunded to grantors
Provision for doubtful amounts
Administration and collection costs
Reduction in funds in accordance with fund purposes
Rental expense
Disposal of plant facilities

FUND BALANCE (DEFICIT), August 31, 1972
(Note B)

See notes to financial statements.
A. General:

The University of San Diego maintains its accounts on the accrual method. In accordance with accounting practices generally followed for educational institutions, no provision is made for depreciation on buildings and improvements on furniture, equipment and library books. Additionally, donated investments or other assets are recorded at market at the date of the gift.

During the year ended August 31, 1972, pursuant to a merger agreement executed in June 1972, the University of San Diego merged with the San Diego College for Women. The assets, liabilities and fund balances of the two institutions have been combined. Results of operations are presented on a combined basis from the beginning of the year. The fund balances (deficit) as of the beginning of the year have been combined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego College for Women</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$1,170,689</td>
<td>9,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>52,697</td>
<td>22,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan fund</td>
<td>376,337</td>
<td>56,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment fund</td>
<td>24,874</td>
<td>81,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant fund</td>
<td>15,393,051</td>
<td>3,967,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency fund</td>
<td>(31,220)</td>
<td>8,942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined results of current funds operations of the University of San Diego and the San Diego College for Women for the year ended August 31, 1971, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Excess of expenditures over revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of San Diego</td>
<td>$2,939,954</td>
<td>$3,290,646</td>
<td>$350,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego College for Women</td>
<td>1,464,888</td>
<td>1,444,545</td>
<td>(20,343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restatement of deferred revenue</td>
<td>(74,900)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>$4,329,942</td>
<td>$4,735,191</td>
<td>$405,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Invested in Plant:

At June 30, 1969, the University of San Diego (prior to the merger described in Note A) recorded in its accounting records appraisal amounts for assets invested in plant based upon appraisals of the American Appraisal Company for land and certain improvements; the Catholic Mutual Relief Society of America for buildings, furniture and equipment; and the University administration for on-site improvements (not included in the other appraisals).

In addition, during the year ended August 31, 1972, the University of San Diego recorded at appraisal amounts the plant assets invested in the San Diego College for Women based upon separate appraisals which had been made concurrently with those appraisals mentioned above. The excess, $19,574,523, of appraisal amounts over cost has been credited to the fund balance. All subsequent additions to these accounts have been recorded at cost.

Portions of the land, buildings and improvements used by the University were acquired and constructed over a 20-year period and the costs were borne by the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego. Even though title to the land was held by the University, no record was maintained of the assets. Under an agreement with the Diocese dated August 31, 1969, the University reconveyed certain land used solely for church and Diocese administration. In recognition of the amounts previously expended by the Diocese, the University issued its note for $1,930,458 (see Note C). The agreement provides among other things that in the event the University does not function as a Catholic University, all land, buildings and equipment of the University become the property of the Diocese and the Society of the Sacred Heart, according to an agreed-upon formula.

C. Notes Payable:

Notes payable to a bank includes $850,000 in 5-1/4% to 6% demand notes and a $120,000 6% note, payable $40,000 annually on July 1, plus interest.
C. Notes Payable (continued):

A note of $23,706, collateralized by the endowment fund investment in real estate, is payable $254 monthly, including interest.

Plant fund notes payable of $3,093,948, non-interest bearing, consist of $1,930,458 (Note B) to the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego and $1,163,490 to the California Province of the Society of the Sacred Heart. The notes are payable in annual installments of $50,000 and are collateralized by substantially all of the plant fund assets.

D. Loan Funds:

Notes receivable represent principally amounts loaned under the National Defense Student Loan Program. Such notes are repayable to the University as agent for the sponsor of this program.

E. Retirement Plans:

The University participates in insured retirement annuity plans covering all professional, non-professional and administrative employees. The University's expense for the year ended August 31, 1972, in connection with the annuity plans was approximately $62,000.

F. Contingencies and Commitments:

Assets invested in plant, with a carrying amount of approximately $15,600,000, are collateral for a $1,100,000 note payable by the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego to Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company.
F. Contingencies and Commitments (continued):

During 1972, the University entered into a contract to construct a residence for the University president at a cost of approximately $118,000, to be funded from current fund revenues. The residence is scheduled for completion in December of 1972. A total of $54,394 has been expended at August 31, 1972.

G. Deferred Revenue:

Deferred revenue of $449,052 relates to tuitions and fees for the 1972 fall semester.
### UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

**CURRENT UNRESTRICTED FUND**

**COMPARISON OF BUDGET TO ACTUAL**

**FOR THE YEAR ENDED AUGUST 31, 1972**

|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|

#### INCOME

**Educational and General**

- **Tuition and Fees**: $3,447,800 | $3,460,765 | $3,394,035 | $66,730 | 1.93%
- **Endowment**: -- | -- | -- | -- | --
- **Gifts**: 25,000 | 25,000 | 48,434 | (23,434) | 93.35%
- **Contributed Services**: 170,156 | 168,556 | 156,173 | 12,383 | 7.35%
- **Federal Government**: 99,000 | 100,435 | 110,443 | (10,008) | 7.008%
- **Other Income**: 40,500 | 41,800 | 70,256 | (28,456) | 70.256%

**TOTAL EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL**: $3,782,456 | $3,796,556 | $3,779,341 | $17,215 | 0.45%

**Student Aid**: -- | -- | -- | -- | --

**Auxiliary Services**: $935,400 | $996,400 | $957,098 | $39,302 | 3.94%

**TOTAL INCOME**: $4,717,856 | $4,792,956 | $4,736,439 | $56,517 | 1.18%

#### EXPENDITURES

**Educational and General**

- **Administration**: $640,947 | $638,374 | $651,325 | $(12,951) | (2.03)%
- **Instructional**: 2,082,028 | 2,099,170 | 2,091,222 | 7,948 | 0.38%
- **Library**: 363,467 | 367,032 | 379,901 | (12,869) | (3.51)%
- **Physical Plant**: 252,205 | 254,840 | 289,248 | (34,408) | (13.50)%
- **Other Educational and General**: 363,501 | 375,604 | 408,107 | (32,503) | (8.65)%

**TOTAL EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL**: $3,702,148 | $3,735,020 | $3,819,803 | $(84,783) | (2.27)%

**Student Aid**: $295,000 | $275,775 | $308,190 | $(32,415) | (11.75)%

**Intercollegiate Athletics**: $140,593 | $141,643 | $151,716 | (10,073) | (9.11)%

**Auxiliary Services**: $670,531 | $732,145 | $730,319 | 1,826 | 0.26%

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**: $4,808,272 | $4,884,583 | $5,010,028 | $(125,445) | (2.57)%

#### OPERATING BALANCE

- **$ (90,416)** | **$ (91,627)** | **$ (273,589)** | **$ (181,962)**

#### Debt Retirement

- **$ 140,000** | **$ 140,000** | **$ 53,345** | **$ 86,655**

#### Capital Additions and Renovations

- **$ --** | **$ --** | **$ 89,028** | **$ 89,028**

**TOTAL NON-OPERATING CHARGES**: **$ 140,000** | **$ 140,000** | **$ 142,373** | **$ (2,373)**

#### NET DEFICIT

- **$ (230,416)** | **$ (231,627)** | **$ (415,962)** | **$ (184,335)**
### Percentage Relationships of Income and Expenditure

#### Data at Selected Private Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Catholic Institutions</td>
<td>2000-4000</td>
<td>USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>48.11</td>
<td>54.73</td>
<td>64.04</td>
<td>74.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Education and General</strong></td>
<td>70.55</td>
<td>76.87</td>
<td>79.60</td>
<td>80.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>19.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |          |             |             |               |
| **Expenditures** |          |             |             |               |
| Educational and General |          |             |             |               |
| Administration    | 18.36    | 14.98       | 16.62       | 12.69          |
| Instructional     | 33.81    | 43.33       | 38.93       | 44.47          |
| Library           | 3.62     | 3.62        | 3.84        | 6.79           |
| Physical Plant    | 9.64     | 8.44        | 8.60        | 6.02           |
| Other Educational and General | .76    | 3.36        | 6.88        | 6.91           |
| **Total Education and General** | 66.19 | 73.73       | 74.86       | 76.88          |
| Student Aid       | 9.53     | 7.56        | 8.95        | 6.80           |
| Athletics         | .82      | .82         | 2.80        | 2.80           |
| Auxiliary Services | 23.46    | 18.71       | 16.19       | 13.52          |
| **Total Expenditures** | 100.00 | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Debt Retirement</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
<td>$199,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Deficit</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>$226,000</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Unrestricted Fund</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational and General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>$3,460,765</td>
<td>$3,963,940</td>
<td>$503,175</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed Services</td>
<td>168,556</td>
<td>83,068</td>
<td>(85,488)</td>
<td>(50.7)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>100,435</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>13,565</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>(19,100)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,796,556</td>
<td>$4,253,708</td>
<td>$457,152</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>$996,400</td>
<td>$1,049,000</td>
<td>$52,600</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ESTIMATE INCOME</strong></td>
<td>$4,792,956</td>
<td>$5,312,708</td>
<td>$519,752</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES** |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Educational and General** |   |   |   |   |   |
| Administration            | $638,288  | $666,605  | $28,317  | 4.4  | 12.7 |
| Instructional             | 2,071,983 | 2,336,231 | 264,248  | 12.8 | 44.5 |
| Library                   | 368,742   | 356,540   | (12,202) | (3.3) | 6.8 |
| Physical Plant            | 303,813   | 316,465   | 12,652   | 4.2  | 6.0 |
| Other Educational and General | 354,712   | 363,300   | 8,588    | 2.4  | 6.9 |
| **TOTAL EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL** | $3,737,538 | $4,039,141 | $301,603 | 8.1  | 76.9 |
| Student Aid               | $275,775  | $357,115  | $81,340  | 29.5 | 6.8 |
| Intercollegiate Athletics | $141,643  | $147,260  | $5,617   | 4.0  | 2.8 |
| Auxiliary Services        | $732,445  | $710,118  | (22,327) | (3.0) | 13.5 |
| **TOTAL ESTIMATE EXPENDITURES** | $4,887,401 | $5,253,634 | $366,233 | 7.5  | 100.0|

| OPERATING BALANCE         |   |   |   |   |   |
|                          | $ (94,445) | $59,074   | $153,519 |   |   |
| Debt Retirement          | $140,000  | $140,000  | --       |   |   |
| **ESTIMATED SURPLUS (DEFICIT)** | $ (234,445) | $(80,926) | $153,519 |   |   |
## UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

### ESTIMATED INCOME

#### 1972-1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition and Fees:</th>
<th>1971-1972</th>
<th>1972-1973</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>Approved Budget Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Undergraduate (1150 FTE @ $1650)</td>
<td>$1,741,975</td>
<td>$1,897,500</td>
<td>$155,525</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regular Fees</td>
<td>92,750</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(92,750)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduate (150 FTE @ $1800)</td>
<td>258,240</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>11,760</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Law School-Day (600 FTE @ $1700)</td>
<td>844,000</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Law School-Evening (250 FTE @ $1200)</td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External Degrees</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50,190</td>
<td>50,190</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Summer Session</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intersession</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Application Fees</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>20,250</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Graduation Fees</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Parking Fees</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other Fees</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(8,000)</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,460,765</td>
<td>$3,963,940</td>
<td>$503,175</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Endowment:

| 13. Steber Memorial Fund  | $ --      | $ 20,000  | $ 20,000          |

#### Gifts:

| 14. Unrestricted Gifts    | $ 25,000  | $ 50,000  | $ 25,000          |

#### Contributed Services:

| 15. Priests                | $ 48,556  | $ 23,334  | (25,222)          | 28.0                      |
| 16. Nuns                   | 120,000   | 59,734    | (60,266)          | 72.0                      |
|                            | $ 168,556 | $ 83,068  | (85,488)          | 100.0                     |

#### Federal Government:

| 17. College Work Study Program | $ 100,435 | $ 101,000 | $ 565            |
| 18. Recovery of Indirect Costs | --        | 13,000    | 13,000           |
|                                | $ 100,435 | $ 114,000 | $ 13,565         |
## ESTIMATED INCOME: Page 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Interest Vending &amp; Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$ 15,300</td>
<td>$ 16,200</td>
<td>$ 900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Athletic Department</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Parking Fees</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 41,800</td>
<td>$ 22,700</td>
<td>$(19,100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Aid:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Endowment</td>
<td>$ --</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Gifts</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ --</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall &amp; Dining:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 200 women @ $1400</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 280,000</td>
<td>$(20,000)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 160 men @ $1200</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Seminary Room and Board</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 530,000</td>
<td>$ 472,000</td>
<td>$(58,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Graduate Center</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$ 65,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Bookstore</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Special Events</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Printing &amp; Duplicating</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Rental:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Summer Room and Board</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Use of Facilities</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Religious Housing</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 62,400</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$(22,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AUXILIARY SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>$ 996,400</td>
<td>$1,049,000</td>
<td>$ 52,600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. President</td>
<td>$71,600</td>
<td>$81,250</td>
<td>$9,650</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provost</td>
<td>98,821</td>
<td>89,025</td>
<td>(9,796)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development</td>
<td>68,444</td>
<td>86,945</td>
<td>18,501</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Business Affairs</td>
<td>63,202</td>
<td>47,270</td>
<td>(15,932)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Controller</td>
<td>72,349</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>5,651</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personnel</td>
<td>24,646</td>
<td>28,680</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University Services</td>
<td>18,551</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Academic Services</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25,430</td>
<td>25,430</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Affairs</td>
<td>51,676</td>
<td>53,420</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Admissions</td>
<td>103,004</td>
<td>85,835</td>
<td>(17,169)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Registrar</td>
<td>38,945</td>
<td>38,980</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Financial Aid</td>
<td>27,050</td>
<td>31,770</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$638,288</td>
<td>$666,605</td>
<td>$28,317</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dean</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$44,270</td>
<td>$44,270</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Humanities</td>
<td>239,256</td>
<td>220,620</td>
<td>(18,636)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Foreign Languages</td>
<td>118,429</td>
<td>134,825</td>
<td>16,396</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Philosophy</td>
<td>90,164</td>
<td>96,360</td>
<td>6,196</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>115,705</td>
<td>118,105</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. History and Political Science</td>
<td>181,695</td>
<td>167,305</td>
<td>(14,390)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Religious Studies</td>
<td>72,222</td>
<td>72,390</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,113,965</td>
<td>$1,158,018</td>
<td>$44,053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Instructional (continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Law School</td>
<td>$582,240</td>
<td>$674,685</td>
<td>$92,445</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. School of Business</td>
<td>73,942</td>
<td>131,838</td>
<td>57,896</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. School of Education</td>
<td>124,506</td>
<td>165,270</td>
<td>40,764</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Graduate Programs, Summer Session, Intercession, External Degrees</td>
<td>147,028</td>
<td>176,190</td>
<td>29,162</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Audio-Visual</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Faculty Secretaries</td>
<td>23,502</td>
<td>23,430</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Instructional                          | $2,071,983| $2,336,231| $264,248          | 100.0%     |

### Library:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Colleges</td>
<td>$193,642</td>
<td>$180,490</td>
<td>$(13,152)</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. School of Law</td>
<td>175,100</td>
<td>176,050</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Library                                | $368,742  | $356,540  | $(12,202)         | 100.0%     |

### Physical Plant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Administration</td>
<td>$68,891</td>
<td>$56,045</td>
<td>$(12,846)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Custodial Service</td>
<td>79,006</td>
<td>95,612</td>
<td>16,606</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Building Maintenance</td>
<td>93,085</td>
<td>93,752</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Utilities</td>
<td>101,520</td>
<td>110,075</td>
<td>8,555</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>70,656</td>
<td>86,310</td>
<td>15,654</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Transportation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Housekeeping</td>
<td>54,299</td>
<td>50,383</td>
<td>(3,916)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Custodial Service - Law School</td>
<td>27,800</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Allocation to Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>(191,444)</td>
<td>(203,712)</td>
<td>12,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Physical Plant                         | $303,813  | $316,465  | $12,652           | 100.0%     |

### Other Educational and General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Educational Development Center</td>
<td>$56,374</td>
<td>$32,310</td>
<td>$(24,064)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Educational Opportunity Program</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13,760</td>
<td>13,760</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Campus Ministry</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>14,910</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPROVED EXPENDITURES: Page 3

### 1972-1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1971-1972 Budget</th>
<th>1972-1973 Budget</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Health</strong></td>
<td>$14,531</td>
<td>$14,820</td>
<td>$289</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postal Service</strong></td>
<td>$44,643</td>
<td>$47,516</td>
<td>$2,873</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephones</strong></td>
<td>$55,814</td>
<td>$65,134</td>
<td>$9,320</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$(15,000)</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Expense on Borrowed Capital</strong></td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleges</strong></td>
<td>$164,775</td>
<td>$222,500</td>
<td>$57,725</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Law</strong></td>
<td>$111,000</td>
<td>$134,615</td>
<td>$23,615</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercollegiate Athletics</strong></td>
<td>$141,643</td>
<td>$147,260</td>
<td>$5,617</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence Hall &amp; Dining</strong></td>
<td>$359,023</td>
<td>$326,434</td>
<td>$(32,589)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seminary Room and Board</strong></td>
<td>$87,915</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$(87,915)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Center</strong></td>
<td>$23,590</td>
<td>$27,556</td>
<td>$3,966</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bookstore</strong></td>
<td>$198,347</td>
<td>$202,333</td>
<td>$3,986</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Events</strong></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$80,570</td>
<td>$76,570</td>
<td>1913%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing and Duplicating</strong></td>
<td>$59,570</td>
<td>$73,225</td>
<td>$13,655</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $354,712

Total: $363,300

Increase: $8,588

Percentage: 100.0%
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
UNRESTRICTED CURRENT FUND BALANCE
AND LONG-TERM DEBT
JULY 1, 1969 - AUGUST 31, 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted Current Fund</th>
<th>San Diego Col.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 7-1-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24527)</td>
<td>158913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Expenditures and Transfers over Revenue</td>
<td>(160146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(150047)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 8-31-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(174574)</td>
<td>(1233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Expenditures and Transfers over Revenue</td>
<td>(64046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 8-31-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31638)</td>
<td>(65279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Expenditures and Transfers over Revenue</td>
<td>(415962)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 8-31-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104116</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Diocesan Subsidy of $191,000.

Long-Term Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 8-31-70</td>
<td>1930458</td>
<td>1213490</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>3343948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 8-31-71</td>
<td>1930458</td>
<td>1213490</td>
<td>160000</td>
<td>3303948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 8-31-72</td>
<td>1930458</td>
<td>1163490</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td>3213948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short-Term Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Balance 8-31-70</th>
<th>Balance 8-31-71</th>
<th>Balance 8-31-72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>900000</td>
<td>850000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VII
THE GOVERNING BODY

A. The Merger Process

1. Introduction

The official minutes of the Boards of Trustees of the San Diego College for Women and the University of San Diego during the merger period evidence that the same pressures, fears, and forward strides alternating with hesitations which characterized the "grass-roots" negotiations were influential at the Board level as well. Perhaps the order of progression of the merger—that is, curriculum, students, faculty, administration, governing boards, in that order—rendered the Boards' role during much of the merger period at least partially one of responsiveness to movements initiated elsewhere within the organization. It was a wise role, one particularly geared to fashioning a viable combined institution; for it is a truism that people tend to support that which they have helped to create; the Boards' restraint in allowing faculty and administrators to work in their own way to achieve unification may very well be responsible for the positive attitude towards the merged institution which is now evident on the Alcala Park campus.

But the Boards of Trustees delegated to no one their fundamental responsibility of determining the kind of institution the new University of San Diego would be, its financial contours, and the relationship of the original sponsoring organizations (the Diocese of San Diego and the Society of the Sacred Heart) to the newly merged institution. In several of these areas, there were
sharp differences of opinion between the Boards — divisions which required
careful negotiation and which delayed the merger for many months.

It would be a mistake to suppose that there existed from the start
in the minds of members of the Boards a clear vision of the final form the
cooperative endeavor at Alcala Park would take. Many a turn in the road
obscured the vision. Unification of some kind there would be — this was clear
from at least mid-1968 on, when it became obvious that the future of the two
colleges was inextricably intertwined, a fact often underscored by curricular
and administrative decisions which were for all practical purposes irreversible,
if students were not to be shortchanged.

Not to be overlooked in a discussion of the process by which the two
Boards of Trustees came to final agreement, is the significant factor of
comparative equality in the bargaining positions of the two institutions.
Elsewhere in American higher education, efforts at convergence of two cooper-
at ing institutions have foundered because a small institution felt it would be
absorbed by a larger one, or a single-purpose school feared loss of identity
in rapprochement to a highly diversified partner. In 1967, when the College
for Men and College for Women cautiously approached each other through
the modest beginnings of a reciprocal course program, they were both basically
liberal arts institutions, despite the presence of a sizeable major in business
administration and accounting at the CM; they were fairly comparable in size,
both under 1000, though the College for Men had several hundred more students
than the College for Women; both were Catholic schools; they were strategically
located across the street from each other, so neither had to "give up" its
campus. Each had its strengths: the College for Men was larger, belonged to
the same legal corporation as the rapidly expanding School of Law, and was
well on the way to energizing its somewhat weak academic history by the
recruitment of strong faculty. The College for Women had a stronger
accreditation record and academic history, was demonstrably more stable financially, and enjoyed a distinctive identity as a "Sacred Heart school," sharing a worldwide tradition.

These were the relative positions as the academic year 1968 opened. The prior first year of the merger, 1967–1968, had involved the Boards of Trustees minimally, largely because the Boards themselves were made up entirely of clerics and religious. Even somewhat significant financial issues (such as the agreement to drop the $30 per unit payment between CM and CW very early in the reciprocal course program) were handled at the administrative level. In the case of the College for Men, clerical Trustees, who were also the Diocesan Consultors, concerned themselves little with affairs of the University; at the College for Women, the religious Trustees were also the administrators of the College, so had only to consult themselves. By the fall of 1968, both Boards had diversified their composition. The College for Women had filed revised Articles of Incorporation in Sacramento in August, electing at the same time four new lay Trustees who joined six Religious of the Sacred Heart on the Board. In October, the University of San Diego Board elected five lay Trustees and a priest who joined the twelve clerical members of the Board. (It might be noted parenthetically that by the time of the merger, July, 1972, the College for Women Board consisted of six religious and seven lay Trustees, while the University of San Diego Board had seven clerics and seven lay Trustees.)

2. Relationships Between the Two Boards of Trustees

During the early months of the academic year 1968–1969, neither of the newly constituted Boards of Trustees discussed the merger situation on the Alcalá Park campus at any great length. The Price Waterhouse and Company "Determining an Acceptable Structure for a Combined University"
was in preparation; the AAC consultant Father McGinley presented his recommendations; the College for Women awaited the report of Cresap, McCormick, and Paget which was part of the nationwide study of schools of the Sacred Heart; and ad hoc faculty committees were outlining proposed structures for various forms of a combined University of San Diego. By February of 1969, the University of San Diego Board began to evidence its concern that the College for Women was moving too slowly relative to the prospective "merger or consolidation of the University with the San Diego College for Women." (USD Board minutes, February 3, 1969) The same minutes indicate that a "decision on the part of the College for Women is expected in March" - when the Cresap, McCormick, and Paget study was to be completed. Meanwhile, the CW Board discussed the proposals of the CW faculty committee, but felt it could take no action on it until it received the results of the Cresap, McCormick, and Paget study, though its minutes do record (March 27, 1969) the earliest reference to the desirability of considering seriously "the search for a man who might serve as the new President of the University according to a plan similar to that passed by the CW Faculty." This reference motivated the CW Board to pass a motion that representatives from the two Boards of Trustees meet "to discuss mutual problems."

The USD Board agreed to such a meeting, and it was held in late April, 1969, just after the College for Women had received its official report of the Cresap, McCormick, and Paget study. This study recommended 1) that the College for Women formally state that it would go forward with its unification with the College for Men, but would keep its financial independence for at least three years; 2) that a three-year financial plan be prepared immediately by both schools, including enrollment assumptions, student-faculty ratios desired, salary projections, tuition projections, other expenses, and commitment of personnel on the part of the Society and the Diocese; 3) that the
unification should proceed in a two-step process, first with the College for Men, then eventually with the School of Law; and 4) that within six months an Acting Vice-President or Provost be appointed to complete the tasks in the critical path measurement chart prepared by Price Waterhouse. (This chart had not yet been implemented because of lack of personnel.) The joint committee of the two Boards discussed these recommendations, and the minutes of the subsequent meetings of the two Boards reflect confusion as to the results. The College for Women Board minutes (April 29, 1969) indicate that the joint committee accepted the Cresap, McCormick, and Paget recommendations, and the committee further suggested the initiation of a joint drive for funds and the establishment of a committee to search for a President of the University. The CW Board accepted all these recommendations. The USD Board minutes, on the other hand, specifically state (May 19, 1969) that no agreement was entered into by the joint committee except that "the process of unification be not delayed, that its commencement be publicly announced, and that it be implemented by the appointment of a coordinator for both colleges," along with the joint drive for funds and the search committee for a single President of USD. The USD Board also moved that a single Academic Dean of both the College for Women and the College for Men be appointed for the ensuing academic year (1969-1970) and that the current Academic Dean of the College for Men be appointed to fill the position.

Another meeting of the joint committee of the two Boards was held just prior to the May, 1969 meeting of the College for Women Board of Trustees. The members of the joint committee from the USD Board expressed their shock and consternation at the stipulation in the Cresap, McCormick, and Paget report that financial merger be delayed for three years. The USD Trustees indicated that they would have the requested three-year planning and projection data within three months, after completion of their audit. The
joint committee accepted the recommendation that a coordinator of unification be appointed, as well as a single Academic Dean, until such time as a President could be appointed. At its subsequent regular meeting (May 22, 1969), the CW Board accepted the recommendation that USD and CW search for a coordinator of unification, but voted that two Academic Deans be retained until these offices could be merged smoothly (since the Academic Deans had not been consulted about the merger of their offices prior to the joint committee and USD Board action). At the same meeting, Sister Morris, President of the College for Women, urged the formation of a committee which would draw up a "list of stipulations or conditions which the Society of the Sacred Heart would require in a merged University." The members of the Board agreed that persons selected for such a committee should be Religious of the Sacred Heart.

At their May, 1969 meetings, members of both Boards of Trustees weighed another significant responsibility which was prominent in the merger, and received a report from the two Presidents that a faculty-administration committee had been established for the purpose of rearticulating the philosophy and objectives of the University of San Diego. A questionnaire was being distributed to trustees, administrators, faculty, students, alumni/ae, and friends of the University to solicit their ideas for the proposed statement, which would then be submitted to the two Boards of Trustees for their approval.

Thus, by the summer of 1969, the chief points of contention between the Boards of Trustees of the two cooperating institutions emerged and began to come to a focus. The University of San Diego Board was to grow increasingly impatient at what it termed "dragging its feet" by the College for Women Board. With greater clarity of vision, the USD Board saw the "handwriting on the wall," and had reached a conclusion about the necessity of merger into a single entity as soon as possible. The College for Women Board saw the vision less
clearly; it was still possible to move towards a cluster-college concept or some other form of consolidation. But the CW Board had a vivid picture of another aspect of the situation: it was apprehensive about the undefined relationship between the CM and the Diocese; it knew vaguely of the huge CM deficits and Diocesan subsidies, though it had not yet received the precise financial data it had requested; it was certain that these matters had to be resolved before it would consent to a merger or other legal arrangement.

Little was to happen at the Board level until the following November, 1969, because of two developments: 1) Bishop Francis J. Furey of San Diego was transferred to Texas, and his successor as President of the University of San Diego and Chairman of the USD Board, Bishop Leo T. Maher, did not arrive until October; and 2) as already noted in Chapter VI, the accounts of the College for Men were found to be unauditable. The two Boards of Trustees did accept, at their fall, 1969 meetings, the "University of San Diego Trust Fund" for the receipt, administration, and distribution of contributions, and also ratified the joint CM-CW application to the federal government for student aid. At its September meeting, the College for Women Board elected as its chairman Mr. Gilbert Fox, currently Regional Vice-President of the Bank of America. Though the CW Board did discuss at its November meeting alternatives possible in settling the assets of both corporations in the event of a merger, it could make no decision in the absence of specific financial data from the University of San Diego; the Board was assured that such information would be available by December, but did not, in fact, receive it until many months later. The hoped-for clarification of the relationship between the Diocese of San Diego and the University was begun at the November meeting of the USD Board of Trustees, when Bishop Maher resigned as President of the University and the Board elected Msgr. John E. Baer, President of the College for Men, as President of the University of San Diego, including
both the College for Men and the School of Law. Bishop Maher was elected Chairman of the USD Board of Trustees.

By the time of the November meetings of the Boards, the two Academic Deans (Dr. Henry J. Martin and Sister Sally Furay) had forwarded their detailed study of their offices, recommending that a single Academic Dean be appointed. The USD Board accepted the recommendation that Dr. Martin be named Academic Dean of both institutions. It further adopted the recommendation of the joint committee of the Boards for the immediate establishment of a Search Committee for USD President. Arrangements were agreed upon for the first joint meeting of the two Boards in early January, 1970.

Before this historic meeting of the two Boards, the CW Board, which had not acted on the material presented in November, met again in December, following a meeting of the Board Chairman, Mr. Fox, with the religious community of the College for Women at which the management of the assets in the event of a merger was discussed. After giving to the CW Board an account of his meeting with the religious community, Mr. Fox brought to the attention of the full Board four documents which had been sent to him by various groups within and without the academic community: one listed several conditions which the religious community wished to be met in establishing a University structure; the second, written in the name of a number of CW lay faculty and staff, expressed concern over the changes taking place on campus, especially the seeming displacement of Religious of the Sacred Heart in administration, specifically the position of Academic Dean; a third document, signed by students, faculty, staff, and parents, signalized the growing loss of Sacred Heart spirit on campus; the fourth document, forwarded by a group of faculty members from all three schools on campus (CM, CW, Law), requested that the Board establish immediately the position of Executive Vice-President and name Sister Furay to the position. It was clear that the various CW "publics"
were involving themselves in the merger issue, and that their voices were being heard by the Board of Trustees. The CW Board also approved and commended the study made by the Academic Deans, accepted the recommendation that Dr. Martin be named Dean provided "that Sister Furay be appointed and act as Executive Vice-President for both corporations now and for the successor corporation in the future." (CW Board Minutes, December 18, 1969). So enthusiastic was the CW Board's response to the recommendation to form a search committee for a single USD President that it voted the establishment of such a committee the day following the joint unofficial meeting of the two Boards in January, and created, subject to USD Board approval, its portion of the Committee to find a President by the fall of 1970 at latest. The CW Board minutes again reflect concern with clear specification of conditions for merger, noting: "Mr. Fox then asked Sister Morris to inform the Board of the conditions that the CW Administration feel must be met in order to perpetuate the strong educational influence and esprit de corps of the Society of the Sacred Heart in a future merged university." (CW Board minutes, December 18, 1969)

The first joint meeting of the two Boards in January was a stormy one. The USD Board evidenced its continued frustration with delays on the part of the CW and the CW's lack of clarity with regard to specific conditions for merger, while the CW Board reiterated its insistence on precise financial data from USD and articulated its misgivings about the blurred connection between the Diocese and USD. There are no minutes of this meeting (since it was an unofficial one), but the minutes of the CW Board meeting several days later summarize the three conditions which Bishop Leo Maher felt were necessary prior to further discussion: "1) There must be drawn up a contract in writing; 2) which would be binding upon the contracting parties; and 3) which would clarify the assignment of responsibility based on the
financial contribution and proportion of assets of the two corporations."
(CW Board minutes, January 7, 1970). A joint committee had been formed to
draft the legal contract, but the CW Board felt that certain questions should
be answered by the Society of the Sacred Heart prior to a meeting of the
committee to draft the legal contract:

1. The Society of the Sacred Heart must be asked whether it wishes
to be a sponsoring organization of the future university.
2. Would the Society be amenable to contributing its existing assets
to the new coeducational university with only the debt of $1,500,000
[actually $1,263,491] to be repaid to the Society?

Once these questions were answered by the Society, the CW Board felt that
the following questions should then be resolved by the joint committee:

1. What will be the relationship of the Diocese to the new institution?
2. What will a forecast of the balance sheet for the next five years
look like? (assets vs. liabilities; profits or losses?)
3. What are the desires of the Religious of the Sacred Heart with
regard to the new institution?
4. What are the desires of the Diocesan priests with regard to the
new institution? (CW Board minutes, January 7, 1970)

At the official meeting of the USD Board several weeks later, a report was
given on the above requests, following which Bishop Leo T. Maher made the
first clearly articulated statement which appears in the minutes of either
Board concerning the Catholicity of the proposed new institution; he emphasized
that in his opinion, "any device or vehicle used to effectuate the proposed
merger must adhere to the principle that the identity and image of the University
as a Catholic institution must be maintained." (USD Board minutes, January 19,
1970) On this issue there was never any disagreement between the two Boards
of Trustees.

By the official March meetings of the two Boards, the Provincial of
the California Province of the Society of the Sacred Heart, who had been asked
to seek clarification of the Society's position relative to its relationship to the
University of San Diego, reported that the Society's central government in
Rome "leaves at the Provincial level the decision of how to negotiate the merger
of land, buildings and assets with the USD Corporation." (CW Board minutes, March 19, 1970) Therefore, the Provincial Council of the California Province and its Financial Advisory Board were holding meetings in late March and early April to respond to the CW Board's request. Simultaneously, the USD Board continued its work of clarifying the relationship between the University of San Diego and the Diocese of San Diego. The USD Board reconveyed to the Diocese, "in consideration of the financial contributions by the Roman Catholic Bishop of San Diego," title to the two buildings on campus (the Diocesan Office and the Immaculata Church) which had always been used for diocesan purposes, though title had been vested in the University at the time these buildings were constructed as a part of the Alcala Park complex; the Board further resolved that "title to all other land which is now vested in this corporation, including but without being limited to the land upon which DeSales Hall is located, be retained by this corporation." DeSales Hall was the building housing the diocesan seminary, to be converted to University use in the fall of 1970. Finally, the Board voted to acknowledge an indebtedness to the Bishop of San Diego in the amount of three million dollars, and to execute a promissory note and trust deed detailing payment terms. (USD Board minutes, March 16, 1970).

At its April, 1970 meeting, the Board of Trustees of the College for Women adopted three conditions for merger, one of which created an impasse with the USD Board which was not resolved until nine months later. Only by implication from the minutes of the various meetings does another action of the CW Board appear: its decision not to exercise its legal power to go forward with merger negotiations until it had consulted the Society of the Sacred Heart about the conditions under which it would agree to the retention of its personnel at USD. In the unanimous view of the CW Board, which by this time was made up of half lay and half religious Trustees, it was critically important to
ensure the presence of Religious of the Sacred Heart in the new institution. Hence, though the CW Board had full legal power over the assets, it chose to use this power only in accord with conditions under which the Society would leave its personnel in San Diego. Thus, at its April, 1970 meeting, the CW Board discussed and accepted unanimously the following conditions for merger set by the Provincial Council of the California Province, in consultation with the chief administrators of the College for Women:

The Society of the Sacred Heart will give full moral support for the USD merger and as much personnel as possible including contributed services, as far as the Province finds it feasible, provided that:

1. the University be academically and financially free, having specifically in mind an independent educational entity that is economically viable and having educational integrity, without external control or subsidization (excluding contributed services and gifts),

2. the new Board consist of 1/2 of its members elected or appointed by USD and the other 1/2 by the College for Women, i.e., neither former Board will preponderate in determining the constituency of the new Board,

3. there be another Religious of the Sacred Heart, as well as the Dean of Women, or like position, on the educational decision and policy-making level of the day-to-day operation.

(CW Board minutes, April 16, 1970)

At a meeting of the ad hoc committee of the two Boards of Trustees, these merger conditions were discussed and clarified. There seemed to be little problem about the first two conditions. Relative to the third, the minutes of the committee meeting (April 17, 1970) read:

With regard to point three, there developed a substantial amount of discussion and some disagreement which will require a meeting of the CW Board of Trustees to resolve. The representatives of the USD Board were willing to accept the stipulation that there be two RSCJ administrators in key positions, but they preferred to delete the phrase "on the educational decision and policy-making level of the day-to-day operation" because they felt that it limited the new President in choosing those persons and those positions most suited to help him administer the newly merged institution.

Prior to the next meeting of the CW Board, Sister Morris, CW President,
held meetings with the religious community and with the entire CW faculty, lay and religious. At each meeting the decision was unanimous to stand behind point three in all of its parts. After hearing reports of these two meetings on May 13, 1970, the CW Board voted to retain point three as a merger condition. The minutes of the discussion reveal the Board’s rationale:

The most fundamental issue for the SDCW in the question of merger is the position of the Society of the Sacred Heart in the future merged University. This position determines the Society’s ability to serve the diocese and is the reason for the Society’s being in San Diego. The University can never leave the diocese, but the Society can serve the diocese in higher education only by being part of the University. The Society has given much towards the work of education in the Diocese of San Diego and wishes to continue to serve in the same way, as a unit, not as a collection of individual teachers and counselors. (CW Board minutes, May 13, 1970.)

Given the impasse on the merger conditions, the CW Board Chairman, Mr. Fox, noted that the combining of the offices of the Academic Deans and additional discussion on alternative forms of merger must await negotiations on the three preliminary conditions.

Faced with reiteration of the three conditions, the USD Board of Trustees at its May 18, 1970 meeting discussed the situation, noting that "both the members of the Committee who represented the University and the priest-faculty members of the University were opposed in principle (not to a member of the Religious of the Sacred Heart filling the position of Dean of Women, but) to tying the hands of the President by compelling him to utilize the services of a subordinate not of his own selection." Several alternatives were proposed: deferring further negotiation until selection of a new President; proposing an organizational structure for the unified corporation which would include an Executive Committee of one priest, one RSCJ, and one layman, or creating an advisory board to the President with the same composition. These alternatives were not acceptable to the CW, and no action was ever taken on the proposal. One bright spot in the USD Board’s May, 1970 meeting was the announcement that the City Planning Commission had approved the "lot-split,"
and hence the property transfer, deed note, and deed of trust authorized at the previous meeting could be completed by mid-June, 1970, with the amount of indebtedness as $1,930,538 and an interest-free promissory note calling for annual payments of $50,000 commencing in 1972.

At the first meeting of the USD Board for the academic year 1970-1971, it was reported that the Board attorney and other representatives "had again met with the attorney for, and other representatives, of San Diego College for Women in an effort to resolve the impasse resulting from the insistence by San Diego College for Women" on the third condition for merger discussed above. The meeting "had not been productive of any result." (USD Board minutes, September 21, 1970.) After discussion, the USD Board adopted the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the University of San Diego does hereby authorize and request the attorney for the University to cooperate with the attorney for San Diego College for Women in the preparation of a draft of the proposed "agreement for merger" of the University and San Diego College for Women, that such draft incorporate alternate provisions reflecting the wishes of each party on points on which they are not in agreement and that such draft be presented to the Board of Trustees of the University and to the Board of Trustees of San Diego College for Women for their consideration. (USD Board minutes, September 21, 1970.)

At its meeting in October, the CW Board of Trustees adopted an identical resolution. It looked as if there might be progress again.

The financial question raised frequently by the CW Board was still at issue, and the minutes of the November 30, 1970 meeting again reflect the Board's concern: "It was pointed out that the financial statement from the USD Board, which was asked for several months ago, has not yet been received, and, hence, our Board has not sufficient information on which to make final judgments. Mr. Gerald Hitzeman indicated that his office could produce such a financial statement within six weeks." But further complications had arisen which were to delay for many more months the requested financial report. (It
must be remembered that at this time, January 1971, neither Board had in its possession an audited financial statement for the College for Men. As noted in an earlier chapter, the College for Men accounts proved unauditable for 1968-1969; the University had completed in August, 1970 a 14-month fiscal period designed to shift the fiscal year to September-August reporting.) The January 25, 1971 CW Board minutes describe the new financial complications: "When the auditors...were brought in on September 1, 1970, to do the preliminary audit work, they apprised Mr. Hitzeman of the fact that, in their present condition, the books were unauditable and that a considerable amount of review, analysis, and scheduling work would be necessary." This work was undertaken internally, and had as one of its results a replacement of the accountant. The audit was not, in fact, completed until the end of May, 1971.

By the January, 1971 meetings of the two Boards of Trustees, the impasse which had developed over the third merger condition of the CW Board had seemingly been resolved, and both Boards accepted in substance the following resolution of the issue:

The position of Dean of Women (or Associate Dean of Students, depending upon the title conferred from time to time on the person holding such position) shall be filled by a Religious of the Sacred Heart and the position of Chaplain of the University shall be filled by a Priest of the Diocese of San Diego, so long as qualified persons are available for such positions. In addition, subject to approval of the President of the University, every effort shall be made to provide for and maintain, in positions on the educational decision and policy-making level of the day-to-day operation of the surviving corporation, an additional member of the Religious of the Sacred Heart and an additional Priest of the Diocese of San Diego, for so long as qualified Religious and Priests are available for such positions. (USD Board minutes, January 18, 1971.)

The disputed merger condition had, in effect, been accepted by the USD Board, and the CW Board had willingly, even enthusiastically, agreed upon a corollary condition with respect to priests of the Diocese of San Diego.

It looked as if the University of San Diego was headed into the final stretch in the spring of 1971. The Search Committee for a President, launched
in May, 1970 by the two Boards, had been working throughout the year and was interviewing candidates in March and April. A draft merger agreement was drawn up, and exhibits were being prepared by the Board attorneys. The administration and faculty had agreed upon a proposed single organizational chart, and this structure was adopted without much difficulty by the two Boards of Trustees. At an April joint meeting of the two Boards, the Master Plan for the University of San Diego was presented, and a joint committee was appointed to make recommendations for membership of the ultimate unified Board of Trustees. Once the 1969-1970 audited financial statements were completed, the financial issue could be resolved. At an historic joint meeting on May 21, 1971, the two Boards of Trustees, voting separately, quickly agreed upon the appointment of the Search Committee's first choice for the President of the University of San Diego, Dr. Author E. Hughes.

At the CW Board meeting following the choice of Dr. Hughes as USD President, the University Business Officer gave the financial report of the University of San Diego and the San Diego College for Women. The official minutes note that "the Board members were clearly disturbed by the financial report." (CW Board minutes, May 21, 1971) While the way had been smoothed for merger in all other areas, it became apparent that the financial predicament would compound the problem. After long discussion, the CW Board voted unanimously that the San Diego College for Women and the University of San Diego operate as a coordinated University under a single administrative officer for the foreseeable future. The Chairman of the CW Board forwarded to the members of the USD Board the rationale which led to their decision.

The financial information for the USD corporation was presented in response to the CW Board request in 1969 for more precise fiscal data prior to serious negotiations concerning corporate merger. The accumulated deficits of over $1,000,000 and the current cash flow problems of the USD corporation raised the question of the short-term and long-term effects on the SDCW corporation and the provincial corporation of a possible merger while such critical financial difficulties exist. In addition, it appears that both corporations will show operational deficits during the current and the 1971-1972 fiscal years.

Discussion centered on the "conditions for merger," adopted by unanimous vote of the CW Board of Trustees at its April 16, 1970 meeting... and discussed over the past year by both Boards of Trustees. Explicit in the first "conditions" are financial independence and economic viability....

... The Board could not but feel that this condition, viz, that the new institution be "financially free" and "economically viable," was not met, given the one million, eighty-six thousand dollar ($1,086,000) accumulated operational deficit, with a sizeable operational deficit projected for the coming year (1971-1972). The financial difficulties of the USD corporation are far more serious than had been anticipated. The University of San Diego does not have any current plan for financing its accumulated and projected operational deficit.... Either long or short-term borrowing by the merged institution would seem to require the province and diocese to subordinate their present trust deed security to the collateral demands of the new lender. All these issues raise serious doubts about the possibility of financial independence and economic viability in the near future. (CW Board minutes, June 3, 1971)

The relationships between the two Boards of Trustees remained ambiguous across the summer of 1971 when the University of San Diego moved into the new organizational structure which has already been discussed (Chapter III). President Hughes took office in mid-August, and set about at once to analyze the financial situation of the institution and to propose terms for merger which might be acceptable to both parties. In September, Dr. Hughes presented to the Boards his proposal for consummating the contemplated merger, presenting a revised five-year financial plan showing an operation "in the black" in the final two years. Because of the absence of its Chairman, the USD Board deferred discussion until its next meeting.

The CW Board analyzed the proposal at some length, coming to the conclusion that the inequities noted in the June rationale for postponement of merger could be eliminated if the University's operating deficit of $900,000, incurred
since the inception of merger discussions, could be cured or satisfied; and if the relationship (including the financial tie) between the University and St. Francis Seminary could be clarified.

Both of these seeming inequities were handled by November of 1971 to the satisfaction of the majority of the CW Trustees. Bishop Maher made a commitment in January, 1972 to assume the $56,000 per year cost of seminary support and the maintenance of non-USD priests living on campus. (Note: When USD acquired the former seminary building for University purposes, it had agreed to the support and maintenance noted above.) Capitalized over a period of years, this commitment by the Diocese represented a large saving for USD as well as a further clarification of the issue of the relationship between the University and the Diocese. Further, the first lay trustee of the College for Men, Mr. Clarence Steber, had bequeathed his estate of approximately $450,000 to the University of San Diego; this bequest represented a further reduction of the financial inequity which had been a stumbling block for the College for Women Board. At its November 11, 1971 meeting, the CW Board accepted the President's recommendation that "in view of the additional financial shifts which have occurred since the start of negotiations... that it would be a fair, just and equitable solution for our Board not to ask for the $900,000 adjustment to the debt." The CW Board summarized its action by agreeing that, in its interpretation, the three original conditions for merger laid down in 1970 were satisfied or revised, and that "therefore at this point nothing constitutes an impediment to merger." (CW Board minutes, November 11, 1971.)

The institutions at Alcalá Park were indeed on the final stretch during the early months of 1972. There remained only revisions to the draft document for merger to agree upon, exhibits to be finalized, and a new University structure to be adopted. The fateful day that had been so long in the making
was May 18, 1972, when the Merger Agreement and amended By-Laws were adopted by both Boards of Trustees, effective on the effective date of merger. The long negotiations were at an end on July 14, 1972, when the Agreement to Merge and amended By-Laws were filed in Sacramento, creating the new University of San Diego.

B. The Merger Agreement

On the following pages is reproduced the "Agreement to Merge...", the contractual arrangement which specifies the nature of the new University, the conditions of the agreement, and the amendments to the Articles of Incorporation which assure the fulfillment of the conditions.

C. Present Board

1. Composition

It was the intent of the two Boards of Trustees of the original University of San Diego and the San Diego College for Women, that the new University of San Diego Board of Trustees would be designed in such a way that (a) the investment in assets and the continuing interest in higher education of the Diocese of San Diego and the Society of the Sacred Heart would be protected, (b) the size of the Board would be increased, and (c) the composition would be varied. A maximum of eleven "carry-over" members was permitted by the merger agreement.

Accordingly, the Boards of Trustees by the design of the corporate charter and the By-Laws provided for special classes of membership which consist of the Bishop of San Diego and the Provincial of the California Province of the Society of the Sacred Heart and their appointees. A consenting vote of this class of membership is required for disposal of the University's assets or the University's dissolution. On all other matters members of all classes
of Trustees vote equally. Through this technique, discontinuance of the University requires Diocesan and Provincial approvals.

A full complement of members of the Board is thirty-five. At present there are twenty-six members who represent a wide variety of interests and occupations including businessmen, physicians, lawyers, educators, and clergy. There are eighteen men and eight women; minority groups are also represented. There are six religious members. Bishop Leo T. Maher was elected chairman.

2. Responsibilities

Each newly appointed trustee has been asked to support the University (a) by lending his particular experience as expertise in providing overall direction at the policy-making level; (b) financially, by contributing as his means permit to the University's development program; and (c) by assisting the University in its effort to enrich its public image and increase its public support.

A group of men and women who accept the challenges outlined above should provide the University a positive thrust in its search for an identity among the fine private Universities in the Southwest and in the United States. Although there has been no documented commentary of the total Board concerning the University's future, the attitude of one trustee in his letter to the President of the University probably indicates their corporate concern.

I concur that we are searching for our future and, from an internal viewpoint, also a definite identity. From an external and public relations viewpoint, this can only develop in time as a result of our proper evaluation and all our efforts in the proper direction. This ties in with my personal ambition for the University of San Diego which goes beyond the orientation that we aim for something "meaningful" and "valuable," namely, that we strive for academic greatness.
SAN DIEGO COLLEGE FOR WOMEN, hereinafter sometimes
called COLLEGE, and UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO, hereinafter sometimes
called UNIVERSITY, state and agree as follows:

WHEREAS:

1. COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY are each non-profit educational
institutions of collegiate grade within the State of California,
each having been incorporated under the provisions of the Education
Code and the General Non-Profit Corporation Law of the State of
California, each being validly existing, and each being in good
standing. Neither of said corporations has any members other than
the persons constituting their respective Boards of Trustees.
COLLEGE has a board consisting of thirteen (13) Trustees on which
there are two (2) vacancies. UNIVERSITY has a board consisting of
fifteen (15) Trustees on which there is one vacancy. Neither
corporation is taxed under the Bank and Corporation Franchise Tax
Act.

2. COLLEGE was founded and has been sponsored and
financially supported by THE SOCIETY OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS
(a religious community of women, the members of which are known as "Religious of the Sacred Heart") acting through California Province of the Society of the Sacred Heart, a corporation (the Administrator of the temporal affairs of said Society within a geographical area including all or a portion of the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego.) UNIVERSITY was founded and has been sponsored and financially supported by THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE of San Diego (a geographical governmental subdivision of the Roman Catholic Church) acting through The Roman Catholic Bishop of San Diego, a corporation sole (the Administrator of the temporal affairs of the Roman Catholic Church, except for the temporal affairs of religious Orders, within the Diocese of San Diego.)

3. Until recently, COLLEGE has been devoted to the higher education of women, and UNIVERSITY'S College for Men, the higher education of men, and UNIVERSITY'S School of Law to the higher education of men and women.

4. By reason of their physical proximity, their common religious heritage, the establishment of a program of coordinated and cooperative education, including the exchange of faculty members and students, and the adoption and execution of plans for the sharing of common services, COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY are now, in the view of the public considered to be, and are for many purposes, a single co-educational institution. Furthermore, it is recognized that an effort to continue the programs in higher education by the University of San Diego and the San Diego College for Women is an
effort requiring the support of more than a single agency or organization. If the total thrust and impact of the UNIVERSITY and COLLEGE are to be increased or even sustained, the combined efforts of the Diocese, the Religious, and the laity are required.

5. COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY believe that present conditions as applied to these two institutions, require modification of the concept of maintenance of an educational institution devoted to the training of persons of only one sex.

6. The present financial conditions and the present academic standings of COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY are in major part due to monetary contributions by their respective sponsoring institutions and to the dedicated and donated efforts of the Religious of the Sacred Heart (in the case of COLLEGE) and priests of the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego (in the case of UNIVERSITY.)

7. The aims and objectives of the COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY, guided by the principles enunciated by the Second Vatican Council, include: (1) the pursuit of academic excellence, (2) the promotion of scientific research, (3) the advancement of Judeo-Christian and other cultures, (4) the education of men and women of all faiths in such a manner as adequately fits them for post-graduate endeavors, (5) the maintenance of academic integrity in the pursuit of truth and the exercise of academic freedom, (6) the preservation of the identity of the academic complex as a Catholic institution, (7) the maintenance of a strong program of Roman Catholic Theology, and (8) the creation of an environment favorable to moral and spiritual development.
In furthering such aims and objectives, it is recognized that the new, unified University must become economically self-sustaining; its governing board and administrators must remain free to select academic and administrative personnel on the basis of competence without regard to affiliation with particular institutions, and without regard to religious persuasion.

8. The new, unified University is a "joint venture" in higher education. This venture is being undertaken by the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego, the Religious of the Sacred Heart at the San Diego College for Women and by the laity who play an increasing role in University governance, administration and teaching. It is recognized that the contribution of the Diocese and the Religious is more than a contribution of assets. The men and women whose lives have been dedicated to the development of the separate institutions have concurrently contributed to the spirit of the new University, a spirit which should separate this University from any other private or public institution of higher education in the San Diego area. Furthermore, it is recognized that success of this joint venture in education will be highly dependent upon the degree to which the meaning of Christianity becomes manifest primarily through the people. As the University grows, it is expected that the role of the laity, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, especially in the area of financing will increase; that funding will not be received from the Diocese or the Province; and that the need for public support of private education will be fully recognized and shall be pursued. The new University
9. The Boards of Trustees of COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY, the parties hereto, deem it desirable and in the best interests of both corporations, their members and the community which it is the privilege of the corporations to serve, that COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY be merged into a single corporation known as UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO.

10. (a) COLLEGE represents that it is a corporation with the status indicated in Paragraph 1, with power to own property and act as an educational institution.

(b) COLLEGE represents that it has the members and Trustees identified on that certain list marked Exhibit "D", entitled "List of Members and Trustees of San Diego College for Women," a copy of which has been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to UNIVERSITY.

(c) COLLEGE represents that it is the owner of the land described on that certain schedule marked Schedule J-1 and of the Improvements described on that certain schedule marked Schedule J-2, copies of which have been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to UNIVERSITY; that said land and improvements are subject only to the encumbrances described on that certain schedule marked J-3, a copy of which has been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and
furnished to UNIVERSITY, and that it has entered into no presently effective contracts or commitments, including teaching contracts, other than those listed on that certain schedule marked Schedule J-4, a copy of which has been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to UNIVERSITY.

11. (a) UNIVERSITY represents that it is a corporation with the status indicated in Paragraph 1., with power to own property and act as an educational institution.

(b) UNIVERSITY represents that it has the members and Trustees shown on that certain list marked Exhibit "C" and entitled "List of Members and Trustees of University of San Diego," a copy of which has been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to COLLEGE.

(c) UNIVERSITY represents that it is the owner of the land described on that certain schedule marked Schedule I-1 and of the improvements described on that certain schedule marked Schedule I-2, copies of which have been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to COLLEGE; that said land and improvements are subject only to the encumbrances described in that certain schedule marked Schedule I-3, a copy of which has been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to COLLEGE, and that it has entered into no presently effective contracts or commitments, including teaching contracts, other than those listed on that certain schedule marked Schedule I-4,
a copy of which has been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to COLLEGE.

IT IS THEREFORE AGREED:

1. The constituent corporations shall merge into a single corporation by COLLEGE merging into UNIVERSITY, the surviving corporation, which shall survive the merger, pursuant to the provisions of the Corporations Code of the State of California. Upon such merger, the separate corporate existence of COLLEGE shall cease and the surviving corporation shall become the owner, without other transfer, of all the rights and property of the constituent corporations, and the surviving corporation shall become subject to all the debts, liabilities and obligations of the constituent corporations in the same manner as if the surviving corporation had itself incurred them. All rights of creditors and all liens upon the property of each of the constituent corporations shall be preserved unimpaired, limited in lien to the property affected by such liens immediately prior to the time of merger. Any action or proceeding pending by or against any constituent corporation may be prosecuted to judgment, which shall bind the surviving corporation, or the surviving corporation may be proceeded against or substituted in its place.

2. The name of the surviving corporation shall be UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO. The specific and primary purpose, the purposes, powers, limitations on powers, the purposes to which assets are dedicated, the county where the principal office for
the transaction of business shall be located, and the number of trustees shall be as appears in the Articles of Incorporation of UNIVERSITY, as amended, and as to be amended as hereinafter set forth.

3. The matters with respect to which the Articles of Incorporation of the surviving corporation are amended, as of the effective date of the merger, are as follows:

(a) Subparagraph (j) of Article II is amended to read as follows:

"The monies, properties and assets of this corporation shall be and are hereby irrevocably dedicated to religious, charitable and educational purposes and shall not inure to the benefit of any private individual. Upon the liquidation, dissolution or abandonment of this corporation an undivided 2/3rds interest in and to all of the monies, properties, and assets of this corporation shall be distributed to THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF SAN DIEGO, a corporation sole, and an undivided 1/3rd interest shall be distributed to CALIFORNIA PROVINCE OF THE SOCIETY OF THE SACRED HEART, a corporation, or its successor, provided, however, that in the event that either said corporation sole or said corporation should not qualify as an exempt organization under the provisions of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code the share of the monies, properties, and assets of this corporation which would otherwise be distributed
to said corporation sole or said corporation hereunder shall be distributed to such funds, foundations and corporations organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable or educational purposes which do qualify as exempt organizations under the provisions of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code as it now exists and may hereafter be amended as may be selected and designated by the Board of Trustees of this corporation."

(b) The following Article is added to the Articles of Incorporation of the surviving corporation:

V

(a) The persons who are the Trustees of this corporation from time to time shall be its only members and on ceasing to be a trustee any such person shall cease to be a member.

(b) There shall be three classes of membership in this corporation.

The number and qualifications of the members of the first class of membership shall be as set forth in the By-Laws of this corporation.

There shall be not less than two persons in the second class of membership. Only those persons are qualified for membership in the second class who are either the California Provincial of the RELIGIOUS OF THE SACRED HEART or a person or persons selected by her.
There shall be not less than two persons in the third class of membership. Only those persons are qualified for membership in the third class who are either the Incumbent Bishop or Administrator of THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF SAN DIEGO or a person or persons selected by him.

(c) The following Article is added to the Articles of Incorporation of this corporation:

VI

The vote or written consent of all of the members of the second and third classes of membership of this corporation and of at least 2/3rds of the members of the first class of membership of this corporation shall be required for any amendment of subparagraph (j) of Article II of these Articles and for the amendment of subparagraph (b) of Article V of these Articles and for the approval of the sale, lease, conveyance, exchange, transfer or other disposition of all or substantially all of the property and assets of this corporation.

4. By appropriate resolution by UNIVERSITY adopted contemporaneously with adoption of a resolution approving execution of this agreement, the By-Laws of UNIVERSITY have been amended, effective on the effective date of merger, to read in their entirety as shown on that certain document marked Exhibit "B" and entitled "By-Laws of University of San Diego, a California non-profit corporation," a copy of which has been signed or initialed
by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to COLLEGE.

5. The names of the persons who shall constitute the Board of Trustees of the surviving corporation and the terms of their respective Trusteeships are shown on that certain document marked Exhibit "F" entitled "List of Trustees and Terms of Offices of Trustees of University of San Diego, a California Non-Profit Corporation following the merger with and into UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO, a California Non-Profit Corporation, of San Diego College for Women, a California Non-Profit Corporation," a copy of which has been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to UNIVERSITY and to COLLEGE.

6. The surviving corporation shall have a pro-forma balance sheet and operating statements as shown on that certain document marked Exhibit "G", a copy of which has been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and furnished to UNIVERSITY and to COLLEGE. Said statements are based on the statements of COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY prepared as of August 31, 1971. Said statements of COLLEGE and UNIVERSITY are marked Exhibit "H", have been signed or initialed by the officers of the constituent corporations executing this agreement and have been furnished to COLLEGE and to UNIVERSITY.

7. Gifts to COLLEGE and/or UNIVERSITY shall be deemed hereafter gifts to the surviving corporation.
8. Prior to the effective date neither COLLEGE nor UNIVERSITY will, without first obtaining the written approval of the other, engage in any activity or transaction, other than in the ordinary course of its business, except as contemplated by this agreement.

9. The directors of either constituent corporation may, in their discretion, abandon this merger, subject to the rights of third parties under and contracts relating thereto, at any time before the merger has been completed.

10. This Agreement of Merger may be executed in any number of counterparts, and all such counterparts and copies shall be and constitute an original instrument.

11. The merger shall become effective upon the filing in the office of the Secretary of State of the State of California of an executed counterpart of this agreement of merger and certificates of the respective corporations as provided by Section 4113 of the Corporations Code of the State of California.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement of Merger to be executed by their respective officers thereunto duly authorized and have caused their respective corporate seals to be impressed hereon on this 26th day of June, 1972.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

By

President

And

Secretary

SAN DIEGO COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

By

President

And

Secretary
CHAPTER VIII
THE LONG-RANGE PLANNING EFFORT

A. The Campus Master Plan

Under the leadership of Mr. Gerald Hitzeman, University Business Officer, a long-range development plan for the University of San Diego was initiated in the fall of 1969, within a few months after Mr. Hitzeman's arrival on campus. The completed Master Plan for the University of San Diego was presented to the joint Boards of Trustees of USD and CW in April, 1971. (See Folder J-1.) The comprehensive plan, prepared by Ewing Miller Partnership, includes the following parts:

1. Regional, City and Vicinity Factors - including maps, charts, and text;
2. Parking and Circulation Study - including vehicular and pedestrian circulation, parking and parking distribution, and a four-phase implementation plan;
3. The Instructional Space Study - including maps, enrollment projections, faculty-staff-administration projections, space utilization studies, and a four-phase implementation plan;
4. The Housing Study - including maps, housing survey, proposed housing areas, seminary-site plan, and a four-phase implementation plan;
5. The Recreational Study - including areas and the four-phase implementation plan;
6. The Master Plan - summarizing and interfacing the other chapters.

B. Development Plans

During the current year, the University has begun the development of an aggressive new support program. A complete written plan itemizing steps has
been formulated. There are five major facets to this effort.

A series of advisory boards is being established to assist in program planning and also with the goal of involving a larger segment of the community with the University.

A conscious effort is being made to establish a continuing series of events which will attract individuals and groups to the campus and to University events.

A strong publicity and promotional program has been devised which will be directly involved in the implementation of the goals of the University.

The alumni organization is now established and has held a successful charter dinner. Future plans are to develop geographical committees to assist in the public relations and development effort.

Parents are being involved more for the first time and will be invited to serve on the community committees being organized. We are also contemplating the organization of a parents group when staff time will permit.

We have initiated a wide ranging fund-raising program which is gradually being transformed from the immediate crash program recommended by the consultants. The long-term program envisions the creation of annual support groups, one of which is now already established; specific annual giving programs for alumni and for the School of Law; a program in deferred giving; and a Leadership Gifts effort involving members of the Board of Trustees as well as Community Leaders.

Although starting from a negligible base, we believe the program as contemplated will gradually expand and provide major support for the University during the next decade.

C. The Long-Range Planning Committee

In the fall of 1971, several months after his arrival on campus,
President Hughes established a Long-Range Planning Committee composed of faculty, administration, and student members from the College for Men, College for Women, and School of Law. Faculty members of the Committee were elected by the Faculty Senate. The skeleton outline presented to the Committee included the areas of Corporate Statements, Administrative Organization, Academic Programs, Ancillary Programs, Fiscal Program, and Physical Plant. (See Folder J-2.) During December, 1971 and January, 1972 task forces headed by members of the Committee worked with various academic departments to work out long-range plans for academic areas, including experimental programs. A considerable amount of the Committee's effort during the early months of its existence went into discussion of the philosophy and objectives of the University of San Diego. In the spring of 1972, the Committee asked one of its members to prepare a statement incorporating the Goals of USD (see Chapter III). Charts of organization were drawn up by the President and discussed by the Committee, to be implemented during the current academic year. Across the summer, several members of the Committee worked on a comprehensive Communication System, which has been completed and is soon to be disseminated.

The Long-Range Planning Committee continues in operation, although it has met during the current academic year only to review the Statement of Purpose which it had commissioned Father Shipley to write, and to agree that the Statement should be distributed for campus-wide discussion and possible emendment.

D. Space Allocation Study

As part of the long-range plan for physical facilities, the President established in September, 1972 a Committee to Recommend Guidelines for the Allocation of Space, composed of administrators, faculty members, staff
members, and students from the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Law, and the Graduate Students Association. The Committee concerned itself with academic, non-academic, and student needs. It had two purposes: a) to consider immediate space priorities and make recommendations concerning these; and b) to establish guidelines for long-term space requirements rather than analyzing or allocating space on a long-term basis. By the end of November, the Committee had completed and submitted to Dr. Hughes its "Recommended Guidelines for the Allocation of Space" (see Folder J-3) and was concluding its work on immediate space needs.

E. Financial Projections

Long-range financial plans and long-range enrollment projections are inextricably intertwined for an institution which currently receives almost 75% of its operating income from student tuition and fees (see page 205 of this Report for detailed data). The recently merged University of San Diego has been developing the historical information which will hopefully enable it to attain considerable accuracy in the risky business of predicting enrollment in an era of nationwide decline in the number of students attending independent schools. (See Enrollment Chart at the end of this Chapter, page 252, for historical enrollment data for all segments of the University of San Diego.)

Simultaneously, the new University is revising its budget procedures to involve more fully the various Schools, College, and support areas. To aid in the budgeting process and decisions, the University developed this past fall for internal purposes an analysis of faculty-student statistics which interrelates on a comparable basis the various academic segments of the University. (See statistics on page 250 and the Supplementary Data on page 251.)
With this data on enrollment, faculty statistics, academic projections which are part of the new budgeting process, identification of space needs, and other information, the University of San Diego is developing long-range financial plans which will enable it to both stabilize its financial position and strengthen its academic quality.

In past years' operations, expenditures which might have been capitalized as plant assets have not been distinguished from those which are truly "current operations," as was pointed out in Chapter VI, page 193. Long-range financial planning for the University will attempt to describe more accurately those expenditures which are directly related to the current period and those which are "transfers to plant assets." The identification and separation of current operating budgets from capital budgets should enable the University of San Diego to match the source of funds with channels of expenditures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL/ COLLEGE</th>
<th>Courses offered</th>
<th>Total class enrollment</th>
<th>Avg. studies per course</th>
<th>Stud. units generated</th>
<th>Instructional F. T. E. E (12 units)</th>
<th>F. T. E. F</th>
<th>Avg. fac. load</th>
<th>Stud. units per instruc- tional F. T. E.</th>
<th>Fac- stu. ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Admin.</td>
<td>26 0</td>
<td>809 0</td>
<td>23.4 0</td>
<td>1827 0</td>
<td>6.5 6.5</td>
<td>6.5 12</td>
<td>281.1</td>
<td>18.7 18.7</td>
<td>18.7 18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behav. Sci.</td>
<td>25 2</td>
<td>630 17</td>
<td>25.2 3.5</td>
<td>1878 51</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td>11.7 275.6</td>
<td>18.4 18.4</td>
<td>18.4 18.4</td>
<td>18.4 18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For. Lang.</td>
<td>27 4</td>
<td>420 22</td>
<td>15.6 5.5</td>
<td>1545 66</td>
<td>9.2 9.5</td>
<td>11.7 175.1</td>
<td>11.7 11.3</td>
<td>11.7 11.3</td>
<td>11.7 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist.-P. Sci.</td>
<td>36 7</td>
<td>708 50</td>
<td>19.7 7.1</td>
<td>2260 168</td>
<td>10.75 11.25</td>
<td>11.7 225.9</td>
<td>15.1 14.4</td>
<td>15.1 14.4</td>
<td>15.1 14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>67 1</td>
<td>1230 9</td>
<td>18.4 9</td>
<td>3508 30</td>
<td>16.7 17.2</td>
<td>11.6 211.9</td>
<td>14.1 13.7</td>
<td>14.1 13.7</td>
<td>14.1 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>24 0</td>
<td>612 0</td>
<td>25.5 0</td>
<td>1836 0</td>
<td>6 6.25 12</td>
<td>12 306</td>
<td>20.4 19.8</td>
<td>20.4 19.8</td>
<td>20.4 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Studies</td>
<td>23 0</td>
<td>404 0</td>
<td>21 0</td>
<td>1452 0</td>
<td>5.5 5.75 12</td>
<td>12 284</td>
<td>17.8 16.8</td>
<td>17.8 16.8</td>
<td>17.8 16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci./Math</td>
<td>45 0</td>
<td>919 0</td>
<td>20.4 0</td>
<td>3267 0</td>
<td>17.7 18.2</td>
<td>11.1 184.6</td>
<td>12.3 11.97</td>
<td>12.3 11.97</td>
<td>12.3 11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Degree</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>60 85</td>
<td>20 213</td>
<td>180 255</td>
<td>1.75 1.75</td>
<td>- 248.6</td>
<td>16.6 16.6</td>
<td>16.6 16.6</td>
<td>16.6 16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>300 35</td>
<td>6063 419</td>
<td>20.2 12</td>
<td>18,708 1273</td>
<td>89.35 92.4</td>
<td>223.6 14.9 14.4</td>
<td>14.9 14.4</td>
<td>14.9 14.4</td>
<td>14.9 14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>176 4694</td>
<td>4694 618</td>
<td>23 11381</td>
<td>24 499.2</td>
<td>33.3 31.9 31.9</td>
<td>31.9 1070.7</td>
<td>31.9 1070.7</td>
<td>31.9 1070.7</td>
<td>31.9 1070.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Courses offered</td>
<td>Total class enrollment</td>
<td>Avg. studs. per course</td>
<td>Stud. units generated</td>
<td>Instruc- tional F, T, E, (12 units)</td>
<td>F, T, E, Fac.</td>
<td>Avg. fac. load</td>
<td>Stud. units per instruc- tional f.t.e.</td>
<td>Instr. fac-stu ratio D=F15un +E I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behav.: Anthro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>410 17</td>
<td>25.6 8.6</td>
<td>1230 51</td>
<td>4.5 4.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>234.7</td>
<td>18.97/1</td>
<td>18.97/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>174 0</td>
<td>21.8 0</td>
<td>510 0</td>
<td>2.25 2.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>15.1/1</td>
<td>15.1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For. L.: French</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>121 16</td>
<td>13.4 8</td>
<td>395 48</td>
<td>3 3.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>147.7</td>
<td>9.8/1</td>
<td>9.5/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38 0</td>
<td>12.7 0</td>
<td>152 0</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>10.1/1</td>
<td>9.2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latín</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 0</td>
<td>12.7 0</td>
<td>152 0</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>10.1/1</td>
<td>9.2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>234 6</td>
<td>16.7 3</td>
<td>887 18</td>
<td>4.8 4.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>184.4</td>
<td>12.3/1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.-P. S: History</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>408 24</td>
<td>19.4 6</td>
<td>1221 90</td>
<td>6.25 6.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>209.8</td>
<td>13.98/1</td>
<td>13.4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Sci</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>300 26</td>
<td>20.8 6</td>
<td>1039 78</td>
<td>4.5 4.75</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>248.2</td>
<td>16.5/1</td>
<td>15.7/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human: Art</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>289 0</td>
<td>19.2 0</td>
<td>631 0</td>
<td>3 3.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>210.3</td>
<td>14/1</td>
<td>13.6/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Arts</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>706 9</td>
<td>22.1 9</td>
<td>2377 30</td>
<td>9.3 9.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>258.6</td>
<td>17.3/1</td>
<td>16.9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>706 9</td>
<td>22.1 9</td>
<td>2377 30</td>
<td>9.3 9.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>258.6</td>
<td>17.3/1</td>
<td>16.9/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>205 0</td>
<td>12.8 0</td>
<td>393 0</td>
<td>3.4 3.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>7.7/1</td>
<td>7.5/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50 0</td>
<td>10 0</td>
<td>107 0</td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>7.1/1</td>
<td>6.5/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci-M.: Biology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>310 0</td>
<td>23.8* 0</td>
<td>1134 0</td>
<td>6.5 6.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>174.5</td>
<td>11.6/1</td>
<td>11.3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>215 0</td>
<td>16.5* 0</td>
<td>693 0</td>
<td>4.7 4.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147.4</td>
<td>9.8/1</td>
<td>9.6/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>264 0</td>
<td>20.3 0</td>
<td>988 0</td>
<td>4 4.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>16.5/1</td>
<td>16.1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>130 0</td>
<td>21.7* 0</td>
<td>452 0</td>
<td>2.5 2.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>180.8</td>
<td>12/1</td>
<td>11.6/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>331 226</td>
<td>22.1 14.3</td>
<td>877 669</td>
<td>6.75 7.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>15.3/1</td>
<td>13.7/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. E.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36 0</td>
<td>6 0</td>
<td>24 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.6/1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib. Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 10</td>
<td>9.5 10</td>
<td>49 32</td>
<td>.5 .5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Labs not counted as separate classes.
### USD Enrollment

#### Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total U.G.</th>
<th>FTE U.G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Fall: 157</td>
<td>Spring: 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Fall: 214</td>
<td>Spring: 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>CW</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Fall: 371</td>
<td>Spring: 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Fall: 377</td>
<td>Spring: 234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>On Campus</th>
<th>External Degree</th>
<th>FTE Grad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>FTE 7+10</th>
<th>Avg FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budgeted Enrollment 1972-1973**

- Fall: 350
- Spring: 300

**USD Enrollment: Law**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Headcounts:**

- 1969-1970: 1,145
- 1970-1971: 1,145
- 1971-1972: 1,145
- 1972-1973: 1,145

*MCRD students included in total.
*External degree FTE included in Total Grad. FTE
CHAPTER IX
ATTITUDINAL ANALYSIS

Attitudes are always more difficult to assess than actions. One learns the attitudes of another by direct communication from that person, by observation of the way he approaches reality, by awareness of the spirit he imparts in conversation and action. Probably the reader of this Report is already aware of faculty and administration attitudes towards the merger and the future of USD, since the composition of the Report was largely their work. Generally, faculty and administrators share a sense of relief and a sense of hope – relief that they no longer have to think "mine" and "thine," but "ours," hope that USD, the only Catholic institution of higher education south of Los Angeles, has a dynamic future ahead. The reader may also have sensed a certain confusion and even resentment on the part of some about what they see as the University's priority system, which does not seem to them to place sufficient stress on the academic components of the institution in the budgeting process. On the whole, though, the attitudes of faculty, staff, and administrators reflect a growing confidence that a campus-wide community effort can move USD forward, as long as the institution carefully articulates its priorities and follows them.

About today's mobile student generation it would be misleading to make a generalized statement. USD doubtless has the usual number of students who want only to "get through." It also has a larger than average number of determined, hard-working students who are willing to spend their own energies and their own money to continue their education at an independent institution.
where tuition is rising. Events of this past fall semester have borne witness that USD has a small group of thoughtful, articulate students who are listening carefully to the way USD describes itself in the public media and in its draft Goals Statement, and who are raising serious issues about where USD might be failing in the implementation of its own values in the educational process. These are students who believe in the University of San Diego. They have chosen USD and like what they find here. But they want to help effectuate a condition in which the concern for the individual which USD claims as a goal is more evidently demonstrated on campus, classes are more stimulating, students take more responsibility for their intellectual development (for the student group is quick to point out that they themselves are part of the problem at USD), and the highest priority at USD is clearly on the educational process and the scholarly endeavor.

In the fall of 1972, in anticipation of this case study, a random selection of alumni and alumnae of the College for Men and College for Women were sent an attitudinal questionnaire which asked for comments on three simple questions: "1. My attitudes toward the College for Men or College for Women and what they stood for while I was a student; 2. My attitudes towards my Alma Mater, as an alumnus during the merger process years, 1967-1972; 3. My current attitudes toward the merged University of San Diego and its announced plans." The various attitudes which emerged from the responses to this questionnaire might be termed a microcosm of the on-campus attitudes prior to, during, and since the completion of the merger. This Case Study Report might well close by summarizing some of the results of the survey.

In articulating their own attitudes towards their school during the time they were attending CM or CW, the alumni and alumnae commented on the "sound Christian-oriented education," the concentration on "development of the whole man," the personal quality evidenced in good rapport with
instructors, the fine instruction, the "integrity of the educational process wherein the ideas and ideals being taught were also being lived," the "Sacred Heart spirit and tradition which could be found in no other school," the "stress on the feminine mind," the "calmness along with freedom of thought." On the negative side, they spoke of the fact that "co-ed would be better," that there had been "constant change in administration which hampered development," that the "duplication of faculties and facilities was ridiculous" and that "whatever the institutions stood for could be accomplished through one university" or that the school "had not seemed to stand for anything," that "liberalizing the women's college would produce a more stable, matured graduate," that the "emphasis on the feminine mind would disappear in merging," that "emphasis on the religious aspect was no longer very important on campus after 1969."

Comments on attitudes during the merger process years were similar to those on campus. Some alumni and alumnae indicated that they knew little about the process, except bad rumors. Others were delighted with what they did hear, but thought the process was taking too long - perhaps because of the "power struggle on campus," noted one. Still others spoke of alternating between "extreme discouragement and great hope in the future," or of being "a little saddened so many things were changing," of feeling "concern for the religious that they would be losing what they worked so hard to establish." Two students who were on campus during the merger reflected differing views - one was adamantly opposed to the merger at first but by graduation was convinced that it was the best thing possible for USD, while the other was "slightly bitter during the merger process" because students were not made aware of what was going on and had to watch as "an academic battle began between professors at both colleges." Another was glad to see her Alma
Mater "keeping up and not stagnating by living in the past."

Reflections on the merged University of San Diego ranged from nostalgia to strong enthusiasm, with the latter predominating. One alumna noted that USD "is not, nor will it ever be, the same institution I attended," but spoke of great hope and faith in the University and those working for it. Others commented that the streamlined University represents a "quality move towards educational progress." Still others expressed wholehearted support: "The University seems to be moving in the right direction."
APPENDIX I

TOWARDS MERGER AT USD

February, 1967, to August, 1972

February, 1967: Authorization to College for Women by central government of Society of the Sacred Heart to begin coordination at USD

March, 1967: Discussions begun about USD curricular coordination

April, 1967: Signing of CW-CM Reciprocal Agreement by CM and CW Presidents

Summer, 1967: Finalizing of plans for USD cross-registration in the academic year 1967-1968

Fall, 1967, and Spring, 1968: 150-200 USD students involved in initial Reciprocal Course Program

September, 1967: Formation of USD Executive Committee

November, 1967: Agreement re USD’s first joint graduation in Civic Theatre

January, 1968: Visit of CM and CW Presidents, Academic Deans, Business Officers to Claremont "cluster colleges" to study their mode of coordination.

John Price Jones study of fund-raising potential of USD (report received in mid-March, 1968)

February and March, 1968:

A) Development (by departments) of joint curricula in:
   - psychology
   - biology
   - mathematics

B) Development (by departments) of almost complete reciprocity in upper division courses in:
   - English
   - history
   - sociology
   - chemistry
   - philosophy
   - political science
   - speech arts

March, 1968: Adoption by CW and CM of identical Academic Calendar for 1968-1969

April, 1968: Development of joint curricula in all modern languages:
   - Majors: French, Spanish
   - Minors: German, Italian

April, 1968: Appointment of Bishop Quinn as first USD Provost

Letter to faculties about closer cooperation

Approval by Bishop Furey and CW Board of Trustees of Executive Committee Working Agreement
June, 1968: First joint USD Commencement at Civic Theatre
Arrangements with Hi-Continental for University-wide food service:
--CW cafeteria: all CW and CM resident students
--CM cafeteria (Lark): snack bar and student union
--deSales Hall: faculty dining room
Letter to CW parents about proposed unification

July, 1968: Expansion of Boards of Trustees by 5 lay members (out of 11) for CW, and 5 lay members (out of 18) for USD
Revision by CM-CW administration of CM-CW Reciprocal Agreement to broaden its scope
Meeting of CW faculty and CM faculty re implications of merger
Decision to have all-university bookstore in operation by September

August, 1968: Appointment of USD's first Director of Development
First USD Master Time Schedule
Appointment of first members of new University Advisory Board of Directors
Appointment of Tipton Security Patrol on all-campus basis

September, 1968: Appointment of Press Relations officer
Cross-registration in joint curricula and reciprocal courses of over 500 USD students for nearly 2,000 credit hours
Agreement upon adoption of first USD joint summer session in Summer, 1969
Study of USD situation by Association of American Colleges consultant, Father James McGinley, S.J.; report and recommendations
Commencement of Cresap, McCormick, Paget study of the Society of the Sacred Heart, including USD-CW situation

October, 1968: Joint CM-CW ASB Meeting re merger of ASB organizations
First joint CM-CW Faculty meetings (October and November)

November, 1968: Visit to Loyola-Marymount by Father Baer, Sister Morris, Sister Furay. Purpose: to study their mode of coordination
Agreement for joint CM-CW Registration in January, 1969, and combining of Registrars' offices

Establishment of ad hoc Joint Committee of CM and CW on General Education Requirements

December, 1968-January, 1969: Faculty workshops to outline organizational structure of the future combined University of San Diego

February, 1969: Establishment by faculties of first Joint USD Admissions policy for CM and CW.
Creation of first single all-University department, the Department of Theology
March, 1969: Joint CM-CW Committees on Interim Structure for USD and on Philosophy and Objectives of USD
Change of CW AAUP Chapter to all-USD AAUP Chapter, by vote of the Chapter
Vote by CM and CW students to unify student government associations

April, 1969: Approval by Boards of Trustees of merger and provisional constitution of CM and CW student government associations
Creation of lien on SDCW assets, held by California Province, secured by a Trust Deed -- amount of lien based on remaining construction debt to the Society as ascertained by Price, Waterhouse auditors in the certified 1967-1968 audit of the San Diego College for Women. Terms of the lien set by the Province.

Completion of Cresap, McCormick, Paget's study of USDCW
Joint Committee of the two Boards of Trustees recommends:
   a) that the process of unification continue to go forward formally, partially through setting up a search Committee for a new President of the combined University; b) financial independence for approximately three years.

May, 1969: Presentation of Interim Plan to faculty by Joint Committee on Interim Structure, including concept of a single USD President
First Joint Honors Convocation at USD
Unification of USD Graduate Divisions under a single chairman

June, 1969: Appointment of first USD university-wide business manager

July, 1969: Merger of Admissions and Financial Aids offices of USD
Creation of a second all-university department, Education
Establishment of six joint-USD departments with a single chairman:
   English       Spanish
   history       speech
   mathematics   psychology
Development of joint curricula in: chemistry
   political science
   sociology

Retention of separate department and curriculum: philosophy

September, 1969: Election of first lay Board of Trustees chairman at College for Women
Adoption of Trust Fund agreement by Boards of Trustees (concerning allocation of unrestricted gift monies)

Fall, 1969: Centralization of CM and CW business offices

October, 1969: Naming of CM President as president of USD Corporation, including CM and School of Law
Establishment of Joint USD Admissions Committee by faculties
November, 1969: Dissolution of Executive Committee and position of Provost
Agreement to search for a single USD President
Recommendation by CW and CM Academic Deans to Boards of Trustees
    that a single Academic Dean for USD be appointed
Establishment of joint CM-CW faculty evaluation system

January, 1970: First full joint meeting of the two Boards of Trustees
Agreement to draft a legal contract for merger; formation of a
committee to work on such a contract
Formal request by College for Women Board to the Society of the Sacred
Heart for conditions under which it (the Society) wishes to proceed
    with any merger
Inauguration of USD's first Intersession

February, 1970: First meeting of new Joint USD Curriculum Committee

March, 1970: USD Board of Trustees authorizes transfer of title of Diocesan Office and
Immaculata from USD to the Diocese of San Diego, subject to
compliance with city "lot-split" ordinances.
Inauguration of Committee to Establish a USD Faculty Senate
Authorization by Boards of Trustees to shift to a September 1 - August 31
fiscal year

April, 1970: Meeting of the Provincial Council of the California Province of the Society of
the Sacred Heart, with administrative officers of the San Diego College
for Women present, to set up the Society's conditions for merger.
Unanimous acceptance by the College for Women Board of Trustees of the
three conditions for merger set by the Provincial Council, in
consultation with the chief administrators of the College for Women
Establishment of joint Philosophy Department
Establishment by the faculty of an ad hoc faculty committee to draft a
proposal for a Faculty Senate

May, 1970: Non-acceptance of one merger condition by USD Board of Trustees
CW Board of Trustees decision to hold to all three merger conditions of the
Provincial Council, in spite of opposition of USD Board members to some
aspects of the conditions
Establishment by Boards of Trustees of Search Committee for President of
USD
Establishment by faculties of Joint Committee on Academic Standards to
study divergencies in CM-CW academic requirements

June, 1970: Elimination of diocesan subsidy to the College for Men and Law School
(except for contributed services of priests)

Summer, 1970: Clarification of USD's property title - transfer of title of Diocesan
Office and Immaculata to Diocese of San Diego
Creation of lien on USD assets (exclusive of Sports Center properties),
    held by Diocese of San Diego, secured by a Trust Deed, for
construction indebtedness
Establishment of joint departments with single chairmen in all academic
areas except biology and chemistry
September, 1970: Formation of Joint Library Committee
October, 1970: Acceptance by faculty of USD Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (several years in the making)

    Agreement by Boards of Trustees to begin draft of proposed "agreement for merger"

November, 1970: Endorsement by Boards of Trustees of Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities
January, 1971: Presentation of draft merger document to Boards of Trustees - acceptance of three merger conditions laid down by CW - substantive acceptance by Boards of Trustees of draft document for merger
March, 1971: Acceptance by the Boards of Trustees of a unified Administrative Structure for the combined University of San Diego, effective July 1, 1971
April, 1971: Presentation to Joint Boards of Trustees of the 10-Year Master Plan for the University of San Diego (Ewing Miller Associates)
May, 1971: Joint Meeting of the two Boards of Trustees to nominate Dr. Author E. Hughes as first lay President of the combined University of San Diego

    Faculty Senate constitution passed by joint faculties
June, 1971: Official election of Dr. Hughes as President by Boards of Trustees

    Acceptance of a document indicating that the first condition for merger (economic viability and financial independence) had not yet been met, and that merger negotiations would thus have to be delayed, pending satisfactory resolution of the financial obstacles. (CW Board action)

July, 1971: Alignment of CM and CW academic policies on number of units for graduation, add/drop regulations, class attendance, transfer of credit, and other such regulations
Summer, 1971: Survey of fund-raising potential of USD by Community Counseling Service
September, 1971: Agreement by the CW Board of Trustees to have the President’s house built on CW property, the house to be financed by the total University Proposal from USD President, Dr. Author E. Hughes, re merger

    Acceptance of Faculty Senate constitution by Boards of Trustees
    Establishment of a single administrative structure for CM and CW libraries
October, 1971: Establishment of combined biology department under single administrative head
Fall, 1971: Establishment of Long-Range Planning Committee for USD
November, 1971: Report to the College for Women Board of Trustees by Dr. Hughes of a change in the financial position of the College for Men because of:

a) $475,000 unrestricted gift from the Steber estate and foundation

b) Assumption by the Bishop, beginning January 1, 1972, annual seminary and priest maintenance costs which had been University responsibility. Capitalized over some years, this is a sizable shift in USD’s financial picture.

    Consensus of the CW Board that the three original conditions for merger were now satisfied.
Special Committee of Boards of Trustees appointed to rework merger document

December, 1971: Inauguration of Dr. Author E. Hughes as President of USD

Meeting of Special Committee of Boards re merger document

January, 1972: Employment of Community Counseling Service for fund-raising, pending permanent appointment of USD University Relations Officer

Acceptance by Boards of Trustees of Principles of revised merger document

April, 1972: Announcement of USD's new organizational structure, including reorganization of departmental structure within Arts and Sciences

May, 1972: Formal acceptance by USD and CW Boards of Trustees of Merger Agreements (including amendments to the USD corporate charter) and By-Laws

June, 1972: First meeting of reorganized USD Board of Trustees - election of corporate officers

July, 1972: Merger finalized with filing of Agreement and By-Laws in Sacramento

Summer, 1972: Establishment of new USD organizational structure

Appointment of Acting Dean of Arts and Sciences: July, 1972

Appointment of new Dean of School of Law: August, 1972

Appointment of Dean of new School of Business Administration: August, 1972

Appointment of Acting Dean of School of Education: September, 1972

Appointment of Director of University Relations: September, 1972

August, 1972: First official meeting of new USD Board of Trustees - ratification of actions of June meeting
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CONSTITUTION of the FACULTY SENATE
of the
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

PREAMBLE

We, the Faculty of the University of San Diego, in order to provide for participation by the faculty in the formulation of policies relating to the effective discharge of the university's educational mission, do hereby establish, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Senate of the University of San Diego.

Article I: Purpose

The Faculty Senate aims to contribute to a clearer understanding of the responsibilities of the university community, of its problems and their solutions. The Senate will have as its purpose:

-- to support the stated goals of the University;
-- to promote intellectual excellence within the framework of a Catholic culture;
-- to provide a means to regular communication and cooperation between the faculty and trustees, administrators, students and the community;
-- to provide a unified voice for the faculty;
-- to further and safeguard the interests of the faculty as a whole;
-- to encourage faculty contribution to the formulation of academic policy relating to the development and welfare of the University;
-- to assist in developing the relationship between the University and the social, political, religious and economic communities of which it is a part.

The success of this endeavor depends on the recognition of the appropriate roles and interdependence of trustees, administrators, faculty, students, and others interested in the University, and that this interdependence calls for adequate communication among these groups, with full opportunity for joint planning and effort.

Article II: Functions, Powers, Duties, and Responsibilities

Although final authority in determining the nature of the University and its policies rests in the Board of Trustees, or may be delegated by it to the President, the faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which
relate to the educational process. Therefore, the Faculty Senate will facilitate the full exercise of these responsibilities, according to the following mode of procedure:

A. A decision or recommendation of the Faculty Senate will be forwarded to the President who, together with the chairman of the Faculty Senate, will determine an appropriate date for a reply. The reply will indicate the response of the President in one of the following forms: approval; submission to the Board of Trustees, if applicable; rejection and return to the Faculty Senate with reasons given for such rejection; or referral back to the Faculty Senate for additional data or for a reconsideration based upon the President’s submission of additional data.

B. All Senate decisions, policy recommendations, advisory opinions, agenda and meeting times shall be presented in writing to the President of the University, to appropriate administrative officers, and to the members of the faculty. At the discretion of the faculty, they may be made available to the ASB officers.

C. The Faculty Senate shall make recommendations relative to the awarding of academic and honorary degrees.

**Article III: Membership**

All full-time members of the faculty are by virtue of their appointment with the University, members of the Senate. The Faculty Senate shall be the judge of the faculty status of all other individuals for purposes of Senate membership.

**Article IV: Meetings**

A. The Faculty Senate shall meet regularly at its discretion.

The meetings of the Senate may be attended by any administrative officer of the university. Non-members may address the Senate with the consent of the Senate.

At its discretion, and upon the vote of a majority of the members present, the Senate may hold closed sessions.

B. Special and emergency meetings of the Senate may be called at the request of the chairman, the President, or upon petition of at least 20% of the Senate membership.

C. The time, place, and agenda of each regular open meeting shall be announced to all members of the faculty and administration at least five school days prior to such meeting.

D. A quorum of 50% of the membership is required to conduct Senate business.
E. Any member of the faculty or administration wishing to place an item on the agenda for the Senate's consideration may do so by submitting it in writing to the chairman of the Faculty Senate. All such requests must meet the deadline for publication of the agenda.

F. Student petitions directed to the Senate and signed by 10% or more of the student body will be considered by the Senate. All such requests must meet the deadline for publication of the agenda.

G. The rules contained in the most current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Senate in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with this constitution or any special rules of order adopted by the Senate.

Article V: Officers

A. Officers of the Faculty Senate, elected at the last meeting of each academic year, shall be a chairman, a vice chairman, and a secretary. They shall assume office immediately upon election, shall serve for one year, and shall not be eligible to serve more than one consecutive term in the same office.

B. The duties of each officer shall be as follows:

1. The chairman shall serve as the presiding officer, call meetings, and preside over the meetings of the Committee on Organization.

2. The vice chairman shall preside over the Senate in the absence of the chairman and shall act for him in times of temporary incapacity.

3. The secretary shall supervise the work of the official recorder, present the minutes at each meeting, file, and under the guidance of the chairman, transmit communications of the Senate.

Article VI: Committees

The Faculty Senate shall accomplish its work through the use of standing and ad hoc committees. Each committee is an agent of the Senate and makes its recommendations to the Senate. Committee membership shall be as determined by the Senate and all Senate members are eligible for committee membership.

Committees of the Faculty Senate may include as voting members persons who are not members of the Senate. Administrators shall have the right of functional participation in committee activities whenever the deliberations of the committee concern their respective administrative functions. When so participating, the administrator shall have all the rights and privileges of committee membership. Each committee is free to
initiate consideration of matters within the scope of its responsibilities. Standing committees shall meet at least once each semester and shall file with the Committee on Organization a written summary report of their activities at the end of each academic year. No faculty member shall serve concurrently on more than two standing committees. At their discretion, on matters of a private or confidential nature, Senate committees may hold closed meetings.

A. Standing Committees.

The Senate shall have the following standing committees:

1. Committee on Organization
2. Committee on Curriculum
3. Committee on Graduate Studies
4. Committee on Admissions
5. Committee on Scholarships
6. Committee on Libraries
7. Committee on Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Rank, and Tenure
8. Committee on Faculty Status (other than Rank and Tenure)
9. Committee on Grievances
10. Committee on Faculty Senate Procedures
11. Committee on Academic Affairs

B. Membership on Non-Senate Committees.

Upon invitation, the Senate shall elect members to serve on such non-Senate committees as the Committee on Institutional Planning and Development, the Committee on Student Relations, and the Committee on Athletic Policy.

C. Ad hoc Committees.

The Senate shall be empowered to select from its membership such ad hoc committees as may be appropriate for consideration of a particular issue.

D. Responsibilities of Committees.

The responsibilities of each committee shall be as follows:

1. Committee on Organization.

The Committee on Organization shall serve as the organ for coordination and communication of matters pertaining to the Senate. As such, it shall plan the agenda for Senate meetings; receive all reports, general information, and correspondence pertaining to the Senate; refer items of business to appropriate Senate committees; recommend for Senate consideration items of business not under the jurisdiction of existing Senate committees; act in emergency situations for the Senate when so requested by the President of the University, when it is impossible to gather a quorum of the Senate.
2. The Committee on Curriculum.

The Committee on Curriculum shall serve as the general undergraduate curriculum committee and shall advise and assist the Senate in its consideration of such undergraduate curriculum matters as the General Education requirements, requirements for the major and minor, the establishment, deletion, and/or revision of specific courses of study, and the establishment and/or deletion of departmental majors and minors.

3. The Committee on Graduate Studies.

The Committee on Graduate Studies shall serve as the general graduate curriculum committee. The committee shall advise and assist the Senate in its consideration of admission policies for graduate students, of specific courses of study, and the addition and/or deletion of graduate majors.

4. The Committee on Admissions.

The Committee on Admissions shall recommend to the Senate policies relating to the admission of undergraduate students.

5. The Committee on Scholarships.

The Committee on Scholarships shall serve as the general scholarship committee. It shall represent the Senate in all actions relating to the receipt and awarding of scholarships.

6. The Committee on Libraries.

The Committee on Libraries shall serve as the general library committee. It shall assist and advise the Senate in promoting the effective operation, growth, and development of the libraries in such a way as to best serve the interests of the total academic community.

7. The Committee on Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Rank and Tenure.

The Committee on Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Rank and Tenure shall recommend to the Senate policies concerning faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure. This committee shall also serve as a review board in disputes involving faculty appointments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure. This committee shall also review and make recommendations to the President in all matters concerning promotion and tenure of faculty members.

8. The Committee on Faculty Status (other than Rank and Tenure).

The Committee on Faculty Status shall develop and recommend to the Faculty Senate personnel policies concerning faculty members to include, but not be limited to, leaves of absence, sabbatical leaves, research grants, awards, retirement, salaries, and fringe benefits.
9. The Committee on Grievances.

The Committee on Grievances shall recommend to the Faculty Senate policies concerning academic freedom and professional ethics, and receive grievances and evaluate evidence of alleged violations of policy in the areas of academic freedom and professional ethics. This committee shall also receive grievances and evaluate evidence in other areas of faculty concern.

10. The Committee on Faculty Senate Procedures.

The Committee on Faculty Senate Procedures shall foster faculty awareness of the spirit and letter of this Constitution and its by-laws; call to the attention of the appropriate officer or committee any deviation from the proper use of this Constitution; review this Constitution and its by-laws annually to ascertain whether some revision is called for.

11. The Committee on Academic Affairs.

The Committee on Academic Affairs shall be the Senate's agent for the promotion of academic excellence at the University of San Diego in its policies, its standards, and its practices. It shall keep the Senate informed of promising experiments and developments in other universities, and shall recommend them to the faculty when advisable. It shall encourage the proposal of creative innovations at the University of San Diego and assist in their evaluation. It shall study the conditions affecting teaching at this university, and make recommendations for improvement. It shall review "those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process," carefully considering student opinions in these matters and informing the Senate of significant findings.

Article VII: Amendments

Amendments to this constitution will become effective when approved by a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the Faculty Senate and when further approved by the Board of Trustees.

Article VIII: By-laws

By-laws may be adopted by the Faculty Senate to implement this Constitution, such by-laws to become effective when approved by a majority of the total membership of the Faculty Senate. If in the interpretation of the President the by-laws significantly alter the intent of the Faculty Senate Constitution, the by-laws in question must be approved by the Board of Trustees.
ARTICLE I
MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Classes of Membership. The classes of membership in this corporation shall be as set forth in the Articles of Incorporation.

Section 2. Composition of Membership. The persons for the time being constituting the Board of Trustees of this corporation shall be the only members of this corporation and shall, for the purpose of any statutory provision or rule of law relating to non-profit corporations, have and exercise all of the rights and powers of members of this corporation.

ARTICLE II
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Section 1. Corporate Powers. Subject to any limitations contained in the General Non-Profit Corporation Law of the State of California, the powers of this corporation shall be exercised, its property controlled and its affairs conducted by a Board of Trustees.

Section 2. Number of Trustees. The number of Trustees of this corporation shall be thirty-five (35).

Section 3. Qualifications of Trustees. Except as provided in the Articles of Incorporation, the only qualification required of a Trustee is that he be possessed of good moral character and, in the judgment of the Trustees electing him, have an interest in the furtherance of the purposes of this corporation.

Section 4. Voting Rights of Trustees. Each Trustee shall be entitled to one vote.

Section 5. Property Rights of Members. No Trustee or member of this corporation shall have any right to the property of this corporation.
Section 6. Termination of Rights. All rights of a Trustee or member in this corporation shall cease on death or other termination of his Trusteeship or membership.

Section 7. Transfer of Membership or Rights. No Trustee or member of this corporation may transfer his membership or Trusteeship or any right arising therefrom.

Section 8. Dues and Assessments. No Trustee or member of this corporation shall be liable for dues or assessments.

Section 9. Liability for Obligations, Misfeasance and Malfeasance. The Trustees, members and officers of this corporation shall not be personally liable for the debts, liabilities or obligations of this corporation. The provisions of Subdivision (f) of Section 830 of the California Corporations Code relating to indemnification of officers and directors of corporations who may be sued for misfeasance or malfeasance are specifically incorporated into these By-Laws and the Board of Trustees of this corporation shall have and exercise the authority conferred thereby on the conditions therein contained.

Section 10. Election and Tenure of Trustees. The Trustees of this corporation may be elected at any regular or special meeting of the Board of Trustees duly called and had. In the event that a trustee is elected to fill a vacancy in the Board of Trustees, his term of office shall be co-extensive with the unexpired term of office of the Trustee whose office becomes vacant. In all other cases each Trustee shall hold office for a period of five (5) years or until his successor is elected.

Section 11. Ex-Officio Trustee. The election by the Board of Trustees of a President of the corporation as provided in Section 2 of Article III of these By-Laws shall constitute his election as a member of the Board of Trustees and he shall serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the corporation until he shall resign or be removed as President or become otherwise disqualified to serve or his successor should be elected.

Section 12. Vacancies. A vacancy or vacancies in the Board of Trustees shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation, disability or removal of a Trustee or Trustees. Vacancies in the Board of Trustees shall be filled by the remaining Trustees or by the sole remaining Trustee, though less than a quorum. Trustees may be removed only by the vote of a majority of the other Trustees.

Section 13. Regular Meetings of Trustees. The Board of Trustees shall hold at least four regular meetings per year. The Board shall provide by resolution for the time and place, either within or without the state of California, of such meetings. Notice of the time and place of such meetings, following such resolution, is
Section 14. Special Meetings of Trustees. Special Meetings of the Board of Trustees for any purpose or purposes may be called at any time by the Chairman of the Board, the President or by any five Trustees. The person or persons authorized to call special meetings of the Board may fix any place, either within or without the State, as the place for holding any special meeting of the Board called by them. Written notice of the time, place and purpose of special meetings shall be delivered personally to each Trustee or sent to each Trustee by mail or by other form of written communication, charges prepaid, addressed to him at his address as it is shown upon the records of the corporation, or if it is not so shown on such records or is not readily ascertainable, at the place in which the meetings of the Trustees are regularly held. Such notice shall be mailed at least 72 hours prior to the time of the holding of the meeting. Action taken at any meeting of the Board of Trustees, however called and noticed and wherever held, shall be as valid as though taken at a meeting duly held after regular call and notice, if a quorum be present and if, either before or after the meeting, each of the Trustees not present signs a written waiver of notice or a consent to holding such meeting or an approval of the minutes thereof. All such waivers, consents, or approvals shall be filed with the corporate records or made a part of the minutes of the meeting.

Section 15. Quorum. A majority of the Board of Trustees shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Board, but, if less than a majority of the Trustees are present at said meeting, a majority of the Trustees present may adjourn the meeting from time to time without further notice.

Section 16. Action Without Meeting. Any action required or permitted to be taken by the Board of Trustees under any provision of the Corporations Code of the State of California may be taken without a meeting if all members of the Board shall individually or collectively consent in writing to such action. Such written consent or consents shall be filed with the Minutes of the proceedings of the Board. Such action by written consent shall have the same force and effect as the unanimous vote of such Trustees. Any certificate or other document which relates to action so taken shall state that the action was taken by unanimous written consent of the Board of Trustees without a meeting and that the By-Laws of the corporation authorize the Trustees so to act and such statement shall be prima facie evidence of such authority.

Section 17. Robert's Rules. In matters not covered by these By-Laws, meetings of Trustees shall be conducted in accordance with the rules of parliamentary procedure known as Robert's Rules of Order.

Section 18. Powers of Trustees. Subject to any limitations which may be contained in the Articles of Incorporation of this corporation or elsewhere in these By-Laws, or in the General Non-profit Corporation Law of the State of
California and, without prejudice to the general powers of this corporation therein set forth, it is hereby expressly declared that the powers of the Trustees shall include the following:

First: To appoint the President and to have ultimate authority over the selection and removal of all other officers, agents and employees of the corporation and to prescribe such powers and duties for them as may not be inconsistent with law, with the Articles of Incorporation of this corporation or these By-Laws, fix their compensation and require of them security for faithful service.

Second: To conduct, manage and control the affairs and business of the corporation and to make such rules and regulations therefor as may not be inconsistent with law or with the Articles of Incorporation of this corporation or the provisions of these By-Laws.

Third: To change the principal office for the transaction of the business of this corporation from one location to another within the County of San Diego, State of California; to fix and locate from time to time one or more subsidiary offices of the corporation within or without the State of California; to designate any place within or without the State of California for the holding of meetings of the Trustees and to adopt, make and use a corporate seal and to prescribe forms of certificates of membership and to alter the form of such seal and of such certificates from time to time as in their judgment they may deem best, provided such seal and such certificates shall at all times comply with the provisions of law.

Fourth: To acquire in the name of the corporation by purchase or otherwise property of any kind and to borrow money and to incur indebtedness for the purposes of the corporation and to cause to be executed and delivered therefor in the corporate name promissory notes, bonds, debentures, deeds of trust, mortgages, pledges, hypothecations or other evidences of debt and securities therefor.

Fifth: To elect a Chairman of the Board of Trustees, who shall preside at the meetings of the Board, and a Vice Chairman of the Board of Trustees, who shall preside in the absence of the Chairman.

Sixth: To accept for the general purposes or any special purpose of the corporation, gifts, legacies, devises, donations, and contributions, in any amount or in any form, upon such terms and conditions as the Board may determine; to establish policies for fund raising, and the seeking of governmental grants, and to invest endowment funds and other funds of the corporation.

Seventh: To confer academic, professional and honorary degrees and to issue diplomas.
Eighth: To have ultimate authority over regulations concerning scholarships, fellowships, professorships, assistantships and internships and the qualifications therefor.

Ninth: To have ultimate authority over the determination and establishment of curricula, faculty compensation and assignments, standards for student accreditation, admission, matriculation, and entitlement to degrees, student tuition and fees, and regulations in the field of student conduct.

Section 19. Executive Committee and Other Committees. The Board of Trustees may by resolution appoint an executive committee and such other committees as the Board of Trustees, in its discretion, may deem appropriate. In the event that the Board should appoint an Executive Committee, said Committee shall be composed of at least five Trustees, one of whom shall be the President of the University, one of whom shall be a member of the first class of membership, one of whom shall be a member of the second class of membership and one of whom shall be a member of the third class of membership. The Board of Trustees may delegate to the Executive Committee all of the powers and authority of the Board in the management of the business and affairs of the corporation except the power to adopt, amend or repeal By-Laws. In such event, all rights, privileges, and powers conferred by law or by these By-Laws upon the Board of Trustees shall be vested in the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee, if appointed, shall select a Chairman who shall have the power to call meetings of the Executive Committee and who shall preside at all meetings of the Executive Committee. A majority of the members of the Executive Committee, if any, shall constitute a quorum. Notice of meetings of the Executive Committee, if any, shall be given and such meetings shall be called and conducted in the same manner as in these By-Laws provided for notice of meetings of the Board of Trustees and the call and conduct of such meetings. Minutes of the meetings of the Executive Committee, if any, shall be kept in the same manner as in these By-Laws provided for the keeping of minutes of the meetings of the Board of Trustees and copies thereof shall be mailed to each member of the Board of Trustees within two weeks after the holding of any such meeting.

Section 20. Membership Book. This corporation shall keep a membership book containing the name and address of each member of the Board of Trustees. The election or appointment of each Trustee shall be recorded in the book together with the date of the election or appointment of each Trustee. Termination of any trusteeship shall likewise be recorded in the book together with the date on which the trusteeship ceased and the cause of such termination.

ARTICLE III

OFFICERS OF THE CORPORATION

Section 1. Officers. The officers of this corporation shall be a President, a Vice President, a Secretary and a Treasurer. The corporation may
also have at the discretion of the Board of Trustees one or more additional vice presidents, one or more assistant secretaries, one or more assistant treasurers and such other subordinate officers as the Board of Trustees may find from time to time necessary or appropriate to appoint.

Section 2. Election. The President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer shall be chosen annually by the Board of Trustees and each shall hold his office until he shall resign or be removed or become otherwise disqualified to serve or his successor shall be elected.

Section 3. Removal and Resignation. Any officer may be removed either with or without cause by a majority of the Trustees at the time in office at any regular or special meeting of the Board, or, except in the case of any officer chosen by the Board of Trustees, by any officer upon whom such power or removal may be conferred by the Board of Trustees.

Section 4. Vacancies. A vacancy in any office shall be deemed to exist in the event of the death, resignation, disability or removal of the person holding the office. Vacancies shall be filled by the Board of Trustees.

Section 5. President. The President shall be the chief executive officer of the corporation and shall, subject to the control of the Board of Trustees, have general supervision, direction and control of the business and officers of the corporation. He shall have the power to call special meetings of the members of the corporation and special meetings of the Board of Trustees of the corporation, and with the Secretary or an Assistant Secretary, he shall execute on behalf of the corporation, when authorized by the Board of Trustees, all deeds, mortgages, leases and conveyance transfers and contracts of the corporation.

Section 6. Vice President. In the absence or disability of the President, the Vice-President shall perform all of the duties of the President and when so acting, shall have all of the powers of and be subject to all the restrictions upon the President. He shall have such other powers and perform such other duties as may from time to time be prescribed for him respectively by the Board of Trustees.

Section 7. Secretary. The Secretary shall attend to the giving of all notices of meetings of the Board of Trustees and of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. He shall attend all such meetings and shall act as Clerk thereof and shall keep the minutes of the proceedings thereof. He shall keep or cause to be kept a book or books of minutes at the principal office of the corporation or at such other place as the Board of Trustees or the Executive Committee of the Board may order of all meetings of the Board of Trustees and of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees showing the time and place of each such meeting and if a special meeting, how it was authorized, the notice given of each such meeting, the names of those
present at each such meeting and the action taken at each such meeting. He shall keep
the membership book of the corporation. He shall be the custodian of the seal of the
corporation and shall affix the same to all instruments requiring the seal after the same
are executed. He shall have such other powers and perform such other duties as may
be prescribed by the Board of Trustees or the Executive Committee of the Board of
Trustees or by these By-Laws. He may delegate any such power or duty to any Assistant
Secretary chosen by the Board of Trustees or the Executive Committee of the Board of
Trustees.

Section 8. Treasurer. The Treasurer shall keep and maintain or cause to be kept
and maintained adequate and correct accounts of the properties and business transactions of the corporation,
including accounts of its assets, liabilities, receipts, disbursements, gains and losses. The books of account shall at all reasonable times be open to inspection by any Trustee. The Treasurer shall collect and receive all monies that may be due the corporation and shall deposit all such monies and other valuables in the name and to the credit of the corporation with such depositaries as may be designated by the Board of Trustees or the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. He shall disburse the funds of the corporation as may be ordered by the Board of Trustees, shall render to the President and Trustees, whenever they request it, an account of all of his transactions as Treasurer and of the financial condition of the corporation and shall have such other powers and perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Board of Trustees, or the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees.

ARTICLE IV

ACADEMIC OFFICERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Section 1. Academic Officers. The President of the corporation shall hold the
academic title "President of the University." All other academic officers of this corporation shall be the persons from time to time holding such offices as the Board of Trustees may from time to time by resolution designate as academic offices. Their duties shall be such as may from time to time be assigned to them by the Board of Trustees or by the President of the University. Their terms of office shall be such as may from time to time be determined by the Board of Trustees of this University or by the President of this University. They shall be appointed by the President of the University. Provided that qualified persons are available, at least one office in the area of student affairs and one additional position in the educational decision and policy making level of the day to day operation of the UNIVERSITY shall be filled by Religious of the Sacred Heart. Provided that qualified persons are available, the office of Chaplain of the UNIVERSITY and an additional position on the educational decision and policy making level of the UNIVERSITY shall be filled by Priests of the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego.
ARTICLE V

CONTRACTS, CHECKS, DEPOSITS AND FUNDS

Section 1. Contracts. The Board of Trustees may authorize any officer or officers, including an academic officer or officers, or other agent or agents of the corporation, in addition to the officers so authorized by these By-Laws, to enter into any contract or execute and deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of this corporation and such authority may be general or confined to specific instances.

Section 2. Checks and Drafts. All checks, drafts or orders for the payment of money, notes and other evidence of indebtedness issued in the name of the corporation shall be signed by such officer or officers, including the academic officer or officers, or agent or agents of the corporation and in such manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board of Trustees. In the absence of such determination by the Board of Trustees, such instruments shall be signed by the Treasurer or an Assistant Treasurer and countersigned by the President or a Vice President of the corporation.

Section 3. Deposits. All funds of the corporation shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of the corporation in such banks, trust companies or other depositaries as the Board of Trustees may select.

ARTICLE VI

Section 1. Amendment of By-Laws. These By-Laws may be amended or repealed and new By-Laws adopted by the vote of a majority of the members of the Board of Trustees at any Trustees' meeting, except that Section 19 of Article II and Section 1 of Article IV of these By-Laws, and a By-Law fixing or changing the number of Trustees may be adopted, amended or repealed only by the vote or written consent of 2/3rds of the Trustees.

ARTICLE VII

MISCELLANEOUS

Section 1. Principal Office. The principal office for the transaction of the business of this corporation shall be at the University of San Diego, Alcala Park, San Diego, California, or at such other place within the County of San Diego, State of California, as the Board of Trustees may from time to time designate.

Section 2. Recording By-Laws. These By-Laws and all amendments thereto shall be recorded in a book which shall be kept in the principal office of the corporation.
NOTES CONCERNING THIS STATEMENT OF THE GOALS OF USD.

1. Form of the statement:

   This statement is intended for those contributing to the decision as to what goals the new USD should adopt. The form of presentation for the Bulletin or for other publications might require adaptation and re-writing. This will apply to whatever official statement of goals is finally adopted.

2. USD as searching:

   In my opinion, the affirmation that USD is searching for its total identity is not an indication of weakness or confusion, but of clear-eyed objectivity and honesty, which might prove very attractive to modern youth. In fact, are not all alert colleges and universities searching today? This is especially true of Catholic universities.

   Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P. asserts: "When we see the attempts in all countries since the last war to find a new status for university education, whether academic or scientific, and when we see all that has been published in recent years -- much of it showing signs of panic -- on the 'idea of a university,' it seems obvious that the university is at present going through a rather critical phase. Some even go so far as to wonder if the university has not lost its essential meaning as a factor of culture and humanization..." (The Catholic University: A Modern Appraisal, edit. Neil G. McCluskey, S.J., University of Notre Dame Press, 1970, p. 58.)

   Michael P. Walsh, S.J., president of Fordham University, states: "To summarize the entire paper it might be said that at the moment the nature of the Catholic university is in the state of becoming. While the future is uncertain (due to the many forces at work) trends can at least be identified..." (ibid., p. 57.)

3. Methodology: USD must evaluate its strengths, past and present, to determine its goals for the future.

   Past: traditions on which it is founded (Judeo-Christian)
   Present: its advantages in comparison with other universities
   Future: a distinctive trait based on the two preceding

4. Past origins: The outline of Judaic origins is based on Huston Smith, The Religions of Man (Harper and Row, 1958). But the outline itself, as well as the interpretation of his material to reflect a view of man, is mine.

5. Present traits: The self-evaluation groups of faculty and administrators established by the president last year, clearly indicated their conviction that USD is:

- primarily a teaching university, oriented toward student-learning
- a small university with a close faculty-student relationship.

These characteristics can be used advantageously:

- in a program emphasizing personal development of the individual within the group, of the person as a member of society
- in a program to equip the students with the skills of leadership.

6. Distinctive goal:

What is distinctive about the proposed goal?

- The objective of USD's search
- The origins of its search
- The type of search
- The role of leadership

7. Objective of USD's search:

The study of values is attracting the interest of scholars in diverse fields. To mention a few: In biology, Ludwig von Bertalanffy and Theodosius Dobzhansky. (Perhaps Rene Dubos, the Nobel prizewinner, should now be included here.) In mathematics and philosophy of science, Jacob Bronowski. In philosophy, Nicolai Hartmann and Max Scheler. In physics and philosophy of science, Henry Margenau. In psychiatry and neurology, Viktor Frankl. In psychoanalysis, Erich Fromm and Rollo May. In psychology, Gordon Allport and Abraham Maslow. In sociology, Pitirim Sorokin. In theology, Bernard Häring and Paul Tillich.

Christian personalism, as used here, implies a view of man which is:

- open to the meanings and values of individual experience and of all arts and sciences
- open to an intramundane human future which will continue to change
- open to transcendent meanings and values
- open to transcendent Value-Persons
- open to a transcendent human future

Thus the search of USD will be completely open-ended.

8. Origins of the search:

- Personal experiences of values
- Personalistic implications from the sciences
- The arts as revelatory of human dimensions
- Judeo-Christian meanings and values as insights for further exploration

9. Type of search:

- A joint search by faculty and students
  - Both personal and academic
  - Interdisciplinary, cross-cultural, ecumenical

10. Role of leadership:

    One of the greatest needs of our students as members of society is to gain a realistic, positive view and attitude toward the role of leadership as a service in the group, rather than as dominating and authoritarian.

    Leader: "a person who by force of example, talents, or qualities of leadership plays a directing role, wields commanding influence, or has a following in any sphere of activity or thought" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary).

    Arts of leadership:

    The students need to be equipped with the tools of effective leadership: psychological, sociological, and political. Considerable knowledge of the factors of leadership is available in the fields mentioned. USD should aid the students -- both men and women -- in their acquisition of this knowledge and of the corresponding skills.
11. Applications to education -- creativity:

Abraham S. Maslow comments: "My feeling is that the concept of creativeness and the concept of the healthy, self-actualizing, fully human person seem to be coming closer and closer together, and may perhaps turn out to be the same thing.

"Another conclusion I seem to be impelled toward, even though I am not quite sure of my facts, is that creative art education, or better said, Education-Through-Art, may be especially important not so much for turning out artists or art products, as for turning out better people." (The Farther Reaches of Human Nature, Viking Press, 1971, p.57.)

A secondary educational benefit may be indicated by Erich Fromm: "The only cure for compensatory destructiveness is the development of the creative potential in man, his capacity to make productive use of his human powers." (The Heart of Man, Harper Colophon Books, Harper and Row, 1968, p. 33.)

Thus the fine arts -- as well as the liberal arts -- can be means toward this objective. This corresponds well with the background and present advantages of USD.

12. Applications to community service -- cultural leadership:

Vatican II, Declaration on Christian Education, article 10: "The hoped-for result is that the Christian mind may achieve, as it were, a public, persistent, and universal presence in the whole enterprise of advancing higher culture..." (Consult the entire passage. Also, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, articles, 61, 62.)

13. Specific educational objectives -- competence:

Personal competence: As including the character necessary for commitments which involve long-range goals. (Consult Gordon W. Allport, Becoming (Yale University Press, 1955, p. 29.)

Professional competence: It is my conviction that the proposed goal of leadership toward human values will reinforce the importance of professional competence, since without it, little effective leadership within society is probable.

14. Specific educational objectives -- communication:

By interpersonal communication is meant:
A double art of two-way communicating and listening, expressive of personal values and mutual understanding, mutually creative and liberating from aloneness.

This is a requisite for the discovery of shared human meanings and values. It is also a requisite for the type of leadership envisioned.

15. USD VIEWS itself:

In the view presented here, USD rejects:

amnesia regarding the past -- with resultant disorientation
fixation in the past -- with one's back turned to the future
immobilization in the present -- focused on what is already passing away
blind acceleration into the future -- without humane values for orientation

USD presents itself:

with empathy for the student who is searching for the identity and the future of man
with its own eyes on the future as the goal of the present
but with the resources of a Catholic university
so that their joint search may expand horizons and stimulate freedom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judaic Meanings</th>
<th>View of Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Meaning in God</strong></td>
<td>man's goal and highest values (based on his view of God):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personalistic - transcending matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unific - unified, orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>love-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Meaning in creation</strong></td>
<td>man as: free, creative, responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>man as: psycho-physical (therefore partly material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/material goods as valuable, and subject to man's dominion/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Meaning in man</strong></td>
<td>man as: limited yet god-like (spiritual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sinful yet free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>confident (not in himself but) as a child of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Meaning in history</strong></td>
<td>man's life as historical-within-society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but as historically opportunistic vs. deterministic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and thus involving socio-moral responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/application to social reform, and thus to leadership/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Meaning in morality</strong></td>
<td>man as subject to moral law (personal obligation as a human)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Meaning in justice</strong></td>
<td>man as endowed with inalienable individual rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and with duties of social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. Meaning in suffering</strong></td>
<td>human values learned in suffering:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suffering for others (love as universal brotherhood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIII. Meaning through revelation</strong></td>
<td>man's way of life as illuminated by God's actions in history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IX. Meaning through God's &quot;chosen people&quot;</strong></td>
<td>cultural leadership: toward higher human goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toward the &quot;spirit-ualization&quot; of humanity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christian Origins

Christian Values

I. In Jesus' life and message: love of God
love of each individual -- extended to universal brotherhood
unselfishness
practical friendliness

commitment -- uncompromising, of the whole person
-- to God and to the community of God's people
-- with faith and trust

hope -- especially regarding a future life

dignity of every person -- without distinctions of sex, race, social status

justice -- sensitivity to the personal rights of others

respect for individuals who are different (even evil)

morality as disposition of heart (conscience)

truth

truthfulness -- including sincerity, fidelity, loyalty

esteem for marriage, parents, children
respect for and obedience to authority, but under God

leadership as a service

gratitude


spiritual initiative vs. conformity to the world

values of the spirit vs. materialism

ambition for power and rank

sensuality

prudence, humility, self-control, courage

values in suffering -- especially for love of others

II. In early Christians: Jesus as the perfect model for human living (values as above)

Christians as filled with and guided by the Spirit
(new life, in communion with God)

life-sharing experiences of Christian community (See III.)
fraternal love of every individual and respect for the personal equality of all, without racial, social, or sexual distinctions

uncompromising hope of future improvement (human excellence)

freedom -- with individual and social responsibility

fear -- through joy
freedom from - guilt -- through peace
egoism -- through love

III. In the Church:
A community of Christians advancing toward the future, with Christ
A community filled with and guided by the Spirit
A community with hierarchical leadership, under Christ, the leader
A community united and pursuing unity
A community made holy and pursuing the perfection of the Father through love
A community with a mission to all men

INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

interdisciplinary

specialization

professionalization

culturalization -- person-centered (general education)
geo-cultural (majors)
problem-centered (projects within traditional majors)

legal
educational
economic
Some pertinent definitions (from Webster's Third New International Dictionary, unabridged):

**interdisciplinary**: characterized by participation or cooperation of two or more disciplines or fields of study; drawing on or contributing to two or more disciplines

**multidisciplinary**: combining several specialized disciplines (as those in the field of applied social science) for a common purpose

**general education**: a program of education ... intended to develop students as personalities rather than trained specialists and to transmit a common cultural heritage

**liberal education**: education based on the liberal arts and intended to bring about the improvement, discipline, or free development of the mind or spirit

**culture**: 4a: the state of being cultivated; esp: the enlightenment and excellence of taste acquired by intellectual and aesthetic training: the intellectual and artistic content of civilization: refinement in manners, taste, thought

   b. acquaintance with and taste in fine arts, humanities, and broad aspects of science as distinguished from vocational, technical, or professional skill or knowledge

**ADVANTAGES OF A VALUE-CENTERED EDUCATION**

**Values and the Person**

The most important commodity that a person has is his own life, and his ability to spend it by his free will. What he will spend is his actions--either short-range and transient, or long-range in the form of commitments.

One's values are the standards or criteria by which he decides "what's worth it in life" for him. What he expends--namely, himself, his own life, his own actions--is too important to be wasted lightly. But by not buying something with it, he wastes it, since life will not stand still. Accordingly, he is frustrated if he does not know what to buy with it, if he does not know "what's worth it in life."
Values and Education

Accordingly, if education means developing a person's abilities for living most maturely and most fully, then education is value-centered by its very nature. Moreover, a value-centered education is a person-centered education in the truest sense.

In fact, every form of education teaches the individual some values. In some cases, unfortunately, it teaches him that life is valueless. Often it does not teach him this explicitly but implicitly, simply by not teaching him values, and thereby implying that such a study is worthless in his education.

Thus every education teaches values; but not every education is value-centered. A value-centered education enables the student to reflect upon his values and to re-evaluate them.

Principal Personal Values

Positively speaking, the greatest values are truth and good and beauty--each of which must be personally organized into a unity within him. Otherwise he feels fragmented, "dis-integrated," and disoriented as a person.

From this viewpoint, the principal questions pertinent to a value-centered education are:

What is true?
What is good? (That is, what is worth the expenditure of my life and energies?)
What is beautiful?

And the main goals of a value-centered education seem reducible to two:

To see it the way it is. To love it for what it's worth.

Conclusions

Value-centered education is person-centered in two ways:

1. By helping the person to know himself, it helps him to know how to spend himself most profitably. This accords well with Socrates' famous dictum: Know yourself.

2. When he finally discovers what's worth it in life, he will find that the answer is:

To know other persons and to love other persons--namely, to see them the way they are and to love them for what they are worth. He will find that persons are:

the most meaningful, the most valuable, the most beautiful.*

Value-centered education is also freedom-centered education. It helps a person to develop his freedom to know and his freedom to love. These are the highest human values.

*Note: This in no way contradicts the Judeo-Christian conviction that the highest value is God. For the God in which they believe is a personal God. And human persons are to be valued especially as images of God.
APPENDIX V

REPORT

ON

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES PROJECT

DURING THE SUMMER OF 1972 AND PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Dr. Estberg, Dr. Stiggall, Dr. Bradshaw and Dr. Peterson

In the Spring of 1972 a group of faculty members in the sciences (Estberg, Peterson, Stiggall, Bradshaw and Warren) developed a proposal for an environmental studies program. This proposal was submitted to Sister Furay on April 13, 1972 for consideration by the University Cabinet. It was divided into a short and long range program. The short range part included a proposal to initiate the project with an interdisciplinary study of San Diego Bay. This project was to be funded in part by an NSF Institutional grant for science which had been awarded to the University over the previous two years. The second part of the proposal outlined future research efforts, a development of a curriculum in environmental studies, and plans for the development of an environmental studies laboratory.

Shortly after submission of the proposal the Cabinet approved the first part and encouraged seeking outside funding for the second part of the proposal. Early in August an additional $5,000 was granted to the program by the San Diego Gas and Electric Company in support of a proposal from Dr. Bradshaw to initiate a study of Agua Hedionda Lagoon.

The following is a brief report of the accomplishments of the program during the summer and an indication of future plans for the project.

Participants

About 21 people participated in various phases of the summer research effort. There were four faculty members from the University of San Diego - Dr. Bradshaw (Biology), Dr. Stiggall (Chemistry), Dr. Estberg (Physics), and Dr. Peterson (Chemistry). Three students from the University of San Diego supported by the NSF grant participated full-time in the project - Bill Ames (Physics), Jim Marshall (Biology), Mike Richards (Biology). Five additional University of San Diego students have also been involved part-time in the project - John Ludwig (Biology), Lynne Fisher (Biology), Pete Olympia (Biology), and Tony Sproull (Biology).

Other academic institutions have also participated in the project. A summer project oriented Oceanography course offered at the University of California at San Diego by
Richard Seymour of Scripps Institution of Oceanography provided 6 students who participated in the cruises to work on studies related to our San Diego Bay Project. Other students who participated in various aspects of the project were from Western Washington State College, Grossmont College, and the University of Pennsylvania. Also some work was done for us by Fay Wolfson who is presently working at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Preparation for Summer Data Collecting Series

The preliminary work completed this spring and early summer included the planning of methods of data collection from San Diego Bay and the development of the greenhouse and adjacent facility to process and analyze the samples collected in the bay. Sampling stations were established in the bay and equipment was purchased for the sampling cruises.

Experience gained by Dr. Bradshaw and students during the previous academic year provided much of the practical knowledge for the summer data collecting cruises. The winches that had been installed on the research vessel "Mistri" for lowering and raising sampling devices were very effective. In addition two salt water pumps were installed to wash the samples through screens of predetermined sizes.

Meetings were held in the spring and summer with individuals who either had carried out research work in the bay or who had an interest in supporting the project. Considerable support was extended and suggestions were made as to how the USD project could best be coordinated with other research efforts. Individuals with whom discussions were held included Dr. Glenn Flitner, Coordinator of the Marine Studies Program at San Diego State University; Dr. C. Cooper, Head of the Ecology Program at San Diego State University; Dr. Richard Ford who had previously done research in San Diego Bay and presently coordinates the Sea grant program for San Diego State University; Mr. Dennis O'Leary, Executive Officer of the Regional Water Control Board; Mr. F. Buchholz, co-director of research in San Diego Bay for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Mr. Clawson, representative of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Mr. F. Coates, director of the San Diego County Integrated Regional Environmental Management Office (IREM).

The total cost of the improvements to the greenhouse and adjacent rooms and lath storage area was approximately $540 excluding student labor. This is within the $875 estimate submitted to the Cabinet on May 31, 1972 for limited development and temporary use of the facility. The whole area was in a state of disrepair from not being used for the last several years. The cleanup time alone took several days. It should be pointed out that the majority of the actual work was completed by the students working with us. The only contribution from physical plant was the use of a truck for about one hour.

Polyethylene sheet has been placed over the greenhouse room to keep water out and to reduce the inside temperature. At present many of the glass panels leak and considerable
work needs to be done if the area is to remain dry. With this temporary roof the greenhouse room has provided a very suitable area for preliminary specimen analysis and sorting. The natural lighting and available bench space has made it possible for several people to work simultaneously. It is our hope to initiate controlled environment experiments under natural lighting conditions in the future. The area presently being used can be easily modified to accommodate such experiments.

The lathed area was restored and made secure by repairing the doors and replacing lath sections. Shelves were installed for storing sampling equipment and samples brought back from the field. A freezer was purchased and installed for storing samples preparatory to chemical analysis. Surplus sinks from the Serra Hall Chemistry laboratories are being installed in this area and in the greenhouse.

Field Work, San Diego Bay

The summer sampling cruises were primarily intended to obtain data regarding the benthic conditions of San Diego Bay. About 24 cruises were made during the months of June, July, and August. Five replicate bottom samples were taken at each of 68 stations located throughout the Bay. In addition, simultaneous measurements of depth, temperature, water transparency, and water current velocity and direction were taken while surface and bottom samples were collected for later analysis of salinity and dissolved oxygen. Separate sediment core samples for analysis of particle-size, nitrogen, organic carbon, and heavy metals were collected for later laboratory analysis. Material from the bottom sample was washed through two screen sizes on board ship and the retained materials including living organisms and assorted debris were stored in containers. At the end of each day's run all the collected samples were returned to the laboratory for storage and subsequent analysis. Most of the students mentioned above participated in these cruises under the supervision of Dr. Bradshaw and Dr. Stiggall.

Data Analysis: San Diego Bay

Laboratory analysis of the samples was carried out concurrently with the sample collection. Apparatus for the chemical analysis was set up in one of the chemistry laboratories (Room 29) in Camino Hall. Techniques were developed and analysis of samples was begun by Mike Richards and John Ludwig under the supervision of Dr. Stiggall.

The sorting and identification of biological specimens was initiated by Dorothy Norris, Dan Todd, Dee Bradshaw, Fay Wolfson, Victoria Bradshaw, and Lynne Fisher under the supervision of Dr. Bradshaw.

The analysis of the size distribution of the sediment was begun by Jack Bradshaw, Jr. as a part of a Geology project for which he will receive academic credit at Western Washington University.
Analysis of the circulation pattern in the Bay has been initiated by Bill Ames, with advice from Dr. Estberg, and Dr. Richard Seymour of Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Students from the University of California at San Diego assigned to the project completed studies on different phases of the project including: Analysis of water current patterns in San Diego Bay, Results of trawling within San Diego Bay, and the Distribution of the Olivela within San Diego Bay. This latter paper was considered by Dr. Seymour to be one of the finest student papers in his summer class.

Field work and Analysis in Agua Hedionda Lagoon

The long range plan included comparative studies of the lagoons in the San Diego region in order to better isolate those factors which are important in the development of marine life in these areas. The San Diego Gas and Electric Company which operates a power plant using cooling water from Agua Hedionda Lagoon was interested in funding such a project in conjunction with planned expansion of their power plant.

Details of the new project are contained in a proposal from Dr. Bradshaw to Mr. Joseph Dietz, Manager of Environmental Coordination of SDG & E, dated August 3, 1972 (A copy of this proposal is available). The study is being carried out in conjunction with similar work offshore in the receiving waters of the power plant by the consulting firms Bechtol and Woodward Envicon Incorporated. The offshore portion of the project is part of an environmental impact study being prepared for the Environmental Protection Agency. Preliminary reports are due in September and November with completion of the project scheduled for February 1973.

The project, which was initiated in August is primarily designed to assess the environmental relationships of the benthic community and is similar to the program being carried out. Five days of field work using a boat provided by San Diego Gas and Electric Co. have been performed by Dr. Bradshaw, Dr. Peterson, and Dr. Estberg with student assistants Dan Todd, Dorothy Norris, Jim Marshall, and Sandy Campbell.

Specimen separation and identification is being done in parallel by the same group presently working on the biological analysis in San Diego Bay.

Other Contributions to the Summer Program

Dr. Peterson spent June and July at Argonne National Laboratory studying environmental effects of nuclear power plants and the development of an environmental studies course at the college level. This experience should prove valuable in future research efforts and will be of immediate use in developing a program to integrate the environmental studies into the University curriculum. At the end of the summer Dr. Peterson went to the National Science Foundation in Washington D.C. to investigate possibilities for future funding for the project.
Dr. Estberg spent 8 weeks at Utah State University participating in a research institute on the application of systems techniques to the description of biological problems. Many of the techniques presented at this institute appear to be applicable to developing a model describing the ecology of the San Diego Bay.

Summer Expenditures

Total expenditures against the NSF institutional grant as of August 4, 1972 were $2,894.34. It is anticipated that the August expenditures will bring the total for the summer to around $4,000. A breakdown of this amount into separate categories appears below:

Approximate Expenditures against NSF grant for Summer 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty expenses</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student salaries</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician salary</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials for greenhouse improvement</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incidental expenses</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected expenditures for the summer of 1972 were $8000 (see page 34 of the budget in the proposal of April 13, 1972).

The major reason for the reduced expenditures is primarily the result of a policy decision to keep the NSF grant open as long as possible. There is no time limit on its use and we feel that it will be very useful in attracting additional grants in the future to have current NSF support.

Although Dr. Stiggall had been offered a salary to participate in a summer institute at the University of Texas she rejected this offer and volunteered her time this summer in order to help get the project off to a good start. Dr. Bradshaw also volunteered his time and thus there were no expenditures for faculty salaries.

Student salaries were slightly higher than anticipated because we were able to hire several additional well qualified students to work on the project.

Equipment expenditures were essentially zero because equipment was provided by the chemistry, physics, and biology departments.

Publicity

A perceptive article - Marinelife Returning to the Bay - published last fall in the San Diego Union indicates the kind of publicity expected from the project. Further publicity is being arranged through the Public Relations Office of San Diego Gas and Electric Company and with Sara Finn.
Summary of Accomplishments

The environmental studies project has had a very encouraging beginning. The research phase of the program is on schedule despite the unexpected addition of the Agua Hedionda project.

The very successful and congenial interaction of faculty and students from several disciplines and different universities has been one of the most gratifying aspects of the project. With continued support it appears that the program has a good chance for success. Suggestions for the future follow.

Prospects for future funding

Several sources of outside support have already been explored using the original proposal drafted this spring (April 13, 1972).

The National Science Foundation has been contacted through the efforts of Dr. Estberg and a personal visit by Dr. Peterson this summer. The chances of obtaining support amounting to approximately $12,000 for next summer and the following intersession through the Undergraduate Research Participation Program are very encouraging. There is some possibility that half of the funding for a major equipment purchase (Atomic Absorption Spectrometer) can be obtained through the National Science Foundation. A planning grant from NSF administered through the County of San Diego has a very good chance of being obtained for a consortium of Universities including the University of San Diego. While the purposes of this grant do not fall within the scope of our project, future recommendations resulting from the study made under this grant will very likely include a recommendation that research of the type we are initiating receive government support. We are working closely with J. Winters of the Law School, Ed Coates who will administer the grant for the County, C. Cooper who is negotiating the grant with NSF, and Dick Ford who will make recommendations about future research in the lagoons and near shore area.

It was hoped that a large College Science Improvement Program (COSIP) grant might be obtained from NSF in order to integrate our program into the curriculum. Although chances for such a grant appear to be rather poor because of reduced funding for COSIP, we do plan to submit a preliminary proposal (see comments under "Curriculum Plans"). It would appear that the chances for funding through the California Water Quality Control Board are also very slight. Other State agencies, however, have not yet been approached.

Several contacts have been initiated with the Environmental Protection Agency. It would appear that the research as outlined in our proposal is not fundable under their guidelines. However, they have suggested several specific problems in the area of pollution control for which they might give us some support.
The San Diego Gas and Electric Company grant was indicated earlier in this report. There is a good chance that further small grants will be made available through sources such as this.

Dr. Brown, Director of University Relations, has been approached by both Dr. Estberg and Dr. Bradshaw in order to inform him of our program and to explore the possibility of attracting support from private sources. It would appear that one of the most fruitful means of obtaining support might be to appeal to individual donors for help in constructing a permanent laboratory facility for the program. However, it is clear to ourselves and to Dr. Brown that such support cannot be effectively solicited until a decision is made about a site for such a laboratory facility. We have pointed out in our proposal that such a laboratory would be extremely valuable in attracting funding for the program. We are anxious to resolve this question with the administration at the earliest possible date.

Future Curriculum Plans

Although the chances of NSF COSIP support for the program are very slight, we have been invited to submit a preliminary proposal to them outlining how we intend to integrate our program into the curriculum. Apparently our only chance of support would be based upon our being able to generate a truly unique and promising plan of development. It is our feeling that even if not supported such a proposal would serve the extremely useful purpose of focusing our attention on the development a specific plan for implementing this aspect of the program. Carl Gilbert has already been approached and is interested in developing a plan for integrating the program into the social sciences. Dr. Peterson who spoke with the COSIP program director, is interested in developing a curriculum for the sciences in this area. Dr. Dingman and Mr. Warren have also expressed a similar interest. We hope that a plan can be developed and submitted to the curriculum committee sometime this year.

Some preliminary ideas were presented about the curriculum development in the original proposal. The timetable for implementing these ideas now appears to be as follows:

1. a fall series of seminars by participating faculty and students on their own contribution to the project - fall 1972
2. participation of students in the project through "199" courses and in the ecology course being offered - fall 1972
3. possibly two environmentally oriented courses during the intersession: One including field work in San Diego and Agua Hedionda Lagoon; and another on the question of "The Energy Crises" - Intersession 1973
4. a lower division course introducing students to the kind of work being done in the project. (Possibly in partial fulfillment of their G.E. science requirements) - fall 1973
5. introduction of a major or minor in Environmental Studies - fall 1973
Future Research Plans

Having completed a summer series of sampling of the benthic environment in San Diego Bay and Agua Hedionda Lagoon, a synoptic sampling of the water for hydrographic purposes is being planned for the month of September. This will include collection of fish and plankton samples.

We hope to have those samples collected in the summer series at least partially by the end of the fall semester. In addition, a winter series of measurements similar to those obtained in the summer will be initiated in the month of January.

The number of personnel working on the project will be limited during the academic year until a means of integrating the program into the curriculum has been developed.

Dr. Bradshaw will be working on the project 1/2 time and funds to support two student assistants through the work study program have been promised. In addition we intend to hire one or two technical assistants to work on biological sorting and species identification.

Once preliminary specimen sorting has been accomplished we intend to make them available to "199" students and students in the ecology class for individual or group projects.