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INTRODUCTION

The University of San Diego is a community of scholars committed to the pursuit of truth, academic excellence, and advancement of knowledge in liberal arts and professional programs. It is distinguished by a priority on teaching, high standards of scholarship and ethics, and an emphasis on values-based liberal and professional education. In all of its programs, the University seeks to prepare students to use their knowledge and professional skills in the service of humanity. The University is committed to preserve and enrich the dignity of every person who becomes a member of the University community. USD's faculty and staff provide a dynamic learning environment in which students learn both inside and outside the classroom.

As a Catholic institution, the University is committed to examination of the Catholic intellectual tradition as the basis of a continuing search for meaning in contemporary life. The University also welcomes and respects those whose lives are formed by different traditions. The University is a partner to the broader community, and encourages students, faculty, alumni and staff to participate in community service. Further, the University contributes to its community by its economic, professional and scholarly activities.

Located on 180 acres overlooking San Diego's beautiful Mission Bay, the University has a total headcount enrollment of 6,600 students. In the nearly 50 years since the founding of the University in 1949, the University has grown to include the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business Administration, the School of Education, the School of Law, and the Philip Y. Hahn School of Nursing and Related Health Professions. The School of Graduate and Continuing Education coordinates graduate and non-traditional programs. Students may choose from more than 50 undergraduate and graduate degree programs.
ADDENDUM

Since this report was completed, the University has received the enrollment statistics for Fall Semester 1996.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

Opening Fall Enrollment Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Univ. Hdl.</th>
<th>Univ. FTE*</th>
<th>UG Hdl.</th>
<th>UG FTE</th>
<th>GR Hdl.</th>
<th>GR FTE</th>
<th>Law Hdl.</th>
<th>Law FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>5921</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>3732</td>
<td>3545</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>6027</td>
<td>5219</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td>3687</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>6041</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>3901</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6083</td>
<td>5290</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>6202</td>
<td>5324</td>
<td>3915</td>
<td>3657</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6381</td>
<td>5453</td>
<td>3955</td>
<td>3674</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6416</td>
<td>5494</td>
<td>4106</td>
<td>3811</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>6603</td>
<td>5691</td>
<td>4299</td>
<td>3990</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Increment Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Univ.</th>
<th>Univ.</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Increase in Average Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Univ.</th>
<th>Univ.</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

On November 20, 1995 the Academic Vice President and Provost appointed a Fourth-Year Report Committee with responsibility to address the six major concerns indicated in the letter of March 10, 1993 from Stephen Weiner, Executive Director of WASC, to President Author E. Hughes. The letter notified Dr. Hughes that, as a result of a team visit to USD campus from October 13-16, 1992, the University was reaccredited. The letter identified the following six areas of concern: diversity, planning, faculty governance, graduate programs, the library and assessment.

All members of the committee were given copies of the format for the Fourth-Year Reports which were developed by WASC. Two of the original members, Dr. Dennis Clausen and Mr. David McCluskey were unable to serve. Dr. Dirk Yandell, Professor of Economics, was added to the committee.

The Committee met on a regular basis through Spring Semester and in the Summer of 1996. Preliminary drafts were prepared on the major concerns and were reviewed by the full committee. The final drafts incorporated the suggestions of the committee. Committee members also consulted with many members of the USD community and appropriate committees in preparing the drafts. Members of the following committees were consulted:

- Faculty Governance - University Senate, Academic Assembly and members of USD’s Association of American University Professors (AAUP) chapter.
- Planning - Members of the Strategic Long-Range Planning Committee (SLRP).
- Graduate Programs - Academic Deans, the Graduate Council, and the Academic Vice-President and Provost.
- Assessment - Members of the Assessment Committee.
- Library - Members of the Library Committee and the Director of the Legal Research Center.
- Diversity - Members of the Cultural Diversity Committee.

Once the final report was ready it was sent to the President, Vice Presidents, Deans and members of the University Senate for review. The final document with appendices will be sent to WASC at the end of October, 1996 to meet the November 1, 1996 deadline.
DESCRIPTIVE HISTORY

The University of San Diego is an independent, coeducational university chartered under the California Non-Profit Corporation Law. The University includes a College of Arts and Sciences and four professional schools: the School of Business Administration, the School of Law, the School of Education and the Hahn School of Nursing. The total Fall semester 1995 enrollment was 6416 of whom 4106 were undergraduates, 1201 were graduate students and 1109 were enrolled in the School of Law. In the Fall of 1995, the University had a full-time faculty of 271 of whom 97% held doctorates in their respective fields. In addition, USD had a part-time faculty of 246. As of August 31, 1995 Financial Statements, the physical plant assets (land, buildings and equipment) were worth $108,215,233 and the annual operating budget was $108,125,838.

By the intent of its founders and by the mandate of its corporate declaration, the University is a Roman Catholic institution. Its distinctive characteristic within the pluralistic system of American higher education is that it is both independent and Catholic. It is independent in that ultimate responsibility for the governance of the University lies in its own Board of Trustees which consists of forty members. It is Catholic by virtue of its commitment to witness to and probe the Christian message as proclaimed by the Catholic Church.

The University is committed to respecting the dignity of every person who becomes a part of its community. USD encourages the sharing of ideas and values from many different traditions and fosters a climate within which all members of the University community have opportunity for free inquiry and expression.

The University campus occupies approximately 180 acres of tableland overlooking Mission Bay and the downtown business area of the city of San Diego. Situated seven miles north of San Diego Civic Center, the University is near museums, cultural centers and recreational facilities and is served by a network of freeways providing easy access to most San Diego County cultural, business and residential locations. The University is 20 miles north of the Mexican border and 120 miles south of Los Angeles. USD presently has twelve major structures which are utilized for academic programs and administration. In addition, the University operates a student center and several student residential facilities which in Fall semester 1995 housed 1884 students.

In 1952, the San Diego College for Women, chartered in 1949, began classes at Alcala Park, the current location of the University. This institution was administered by a religious community of women called the Society of the Sacred Heart. In 1954, the College for Men and the coeducational School of Law began classes. The name San Diego University was changed to University of San Diego on April 15, 1968. On July 14, 1972, after five years of increasing

---

1 The University's part-time faculty is divided among those who teach introductory courses (the majority who teach 6 units or less) and those who are hired to teach more than six units and receive benefits. In the professional schools, part-time faculty often include those who are employed because of special expertise.
cooperation, San Diego College for Women merged into the University of San Diego, resulting in the coeducational university that exists today.

The University has been accredited by WASC since 1956 and has program accreditations from the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, the National League for Nursing, the American Bar Association, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, and the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy. It also receives authorizations from the Commission of Teacher Credentialing of the State of California and the California Board of Registered Nursing for its Nurse Practitioner Certificate Program.

The recent Carnegie Classification of USD as a Doctoral II institution is significant because the University is committed to strong teaching which is balanced by a strong interest in research and scholarship. Research and scholarship are important in all units but they are especially important to the graduate and professional units.
SUMMARY DATA FORM

INSTITUTION: University Of San Diego
PRESIDENT/CEO: Dr. Alice B. Hayes

1. YEAR FOUNDED: 1949
2. SPONSORSHIP AND CONTROL: Board of Trustees

3. DEGREE LEVELS OFFERED:
   ____Associate  X  Masters  X  Professional  X  Bachelors  X  Doctorate

4. CALENDAR PLAN: 4-1-4 and several summer sessions of varying lengths

5. CURRENT ENROLMENT:
   A. Undergraduate Headcount 4099 FTE 3811
   B. Graduate Headcount 1126 FTE 712
   C. Law Headcount 1109 FTE 971
   D. Non-Degree
      UG Headcount 439 FTE 381
      Grad Headcount 75 FTE

6. CURRENT FACULTY:
   Headcount:
   Full-time 271 Part-time 237
   Ratio FTE Student FTE Faculty 18.1

7. FINANCES:
   A. Annual Tuition Rate: Undergraduate $14,890 Graduate $540 per unit (doctorate)
   B. Total Annual Operating Budget: $111,975,858
   C. % from tuition and fees: 79.3%
   D. Operating Deficit(s) for past 3 years:
      None
      None
      None
      None

E. Current Accumulated Deficit:

8. GOVERNING BOARD:
   A. Size: 39  B. Meeting a year: four including a three-day retreat

9. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS:
   A. Number: None  B. Total Enrollment N/A

10. LIBRARY: Copley Library 350,000 2,000
    Legal Research Ctr. 324,250 4,528
    A. Number of Volumes  B. Number of Periodical Subscriptions
RESPONSE TO MAJOR CONCERNS

DIVERSITY

The 1992 WASC report recommended that the University should 1) intensify its efforts across a broad front in order to achieve greater diversity among all categories of the campus community and to develop the curriculum toward the teaching of greater multiculturalism and 2) develop new plans for achieving greater multiculturalism after the funds were expended from the Irvine Grant for “Institutionalizing Cultural Diversity.”

The organizational goal of diversity is a complex and difficult challenge. In order to become more inclusive, organizations need to focus on the recruitment and retention of staff as well as on internal environmental change, such as the development among members of the community of a basic foundation of education, awareness, and understanding. While USD has a strong commitment to diversity and multiculturalism, it is still struggling with implementation of that goal.

This section of the report first examines demographic changes at the University, then it reports on the significant activities and programs that were undertaken during the last four years, and finally it provides an evaluation of achievements and changes and discusses the University’s future plans in this area.

University Demographics

Employees

There has been a limited but steady increase in the diversity of the University's work force in the last four years. The data are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATIONS</th>
<th>GRAND TOTALS</th>
<th>WHITE/CAUCASIAN</th>
<th>BLACK/AFR-AMER.</th>
<th>HISPANIC/LATINO</th>
<th>ASIAN/PACIF-IS.</th>
<th>NAT. AM./ALAS.NAT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec./Adm.</td>
<td>154 16.1%</td>
<td>143 92.9%</td>
<td>3 1.9%</td>
<td>6 3.9%</td>
<td>1 0.6%</td>
<td>1 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>250 26.2%</td>
<td>226 90.4%</td>
<td>3 1.2%</td>
<td>8 3.2%</td>
<td>13 5.8%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profess' al</td>
<td>90 9.4%</td>
<td>79 87.8%</td>
<td>4 4.4%</td>
<td>4 4.4%</td>
<td>3 3.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec./Cler.</td>
<td>234 24.5%</td>
<td>182 77.8%</td>
<td>13 5.6%</td>
<td>24 10.3%</td>
<td>10 4.3%</td>
<td>5 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech/Para-profess.</td>
<td>64 6.7%</td>
<td>49 76.6%</td>
<td>1 1.6%</td>
<td>8 12.5%</td>
<td>6 9.4%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Crf.</td>
<td>43 4.5%</td>
<td>31 72.1%</td>
<td>1 2.3%</td>
<td>9 20.9%</td>
<td>2 4.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serv/Maint</td>
<td>119 12.5%</td>
<td>40 33.6%</td>
<td>5 4.2%</td>
<td>60 50.4%</td>
<td>10 8.4%</td>
<td>4 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>954 100%</td>
<td>750 78.6%</td>
<td>119 12.5%</td>
<td>45 4.7%</td>
<td>10 1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BENEFIT-BASED EMPLOYEES MARCH 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATIONS</th>
<th>GRAND TOTALS</th>
<th>WHITE/CAUCASIAN</th>
<th>BLACK/AFR-AMER.</th>
<th>HISPANIC/LATINO</th>
<th>ASIAN/PACIF-IS.</th>
<th>NAT. AM./ALAS.NAT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec./Adm.</td>
<td>170 16.6%</td>
<td>146 85.9%</td>
<td>7 4.1%</td>
<td>9 5.3%</td>
<td>7 4.1%</td>
<td>1 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>271 26.5%</td>
<td>237 87.5%</td>
<td>5 1.8%</td>
<td>13 4.8%</td>
<td>16 6.8%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profess'al</td>
<td>94 9.2%</td>
<td>82 87.2%</td>
<td>2 2.1%</td>
<td>5 5.3%</td>
<td>5 5.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec./Cler.</td>
<td>245 24.0%</td>
<td>177 72.2%</td>
<td>10 4.1%</td>
<td>36 14.7%</td>
<td>18 7.3%</td>
<td>4 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech/Par.</td>
<td>77 7.5%</td>
<td>56 72.7%</td>
<td>3 3.9%</td>
<td>9 11.7%</td>
<td>9 11.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Crf.</td>
<td>44 4.3%</td>
<td>28 63.6%</td>
<td>2 4.5%</td>
<td>10 22.7%</td>
<td>4 9.1%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serv/Maint</td>
<td>121 11.8%</td>
<td>39 32.2%</td>
<td>4 3.3%</td>
<td>69 57.0%</td>
<td>7 5.8%</td>
<td>2 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1022 100%</td>
<td>765 74.9%</td>
<td>33 3.2%</td>
<td>151 14.8%</td>
<td>66 6.5%</td>
<td>7 0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific data on full-time faculty are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Afr-Am</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Am Ind</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The composition of the Board of Trustees includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Afr-Am</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Am Ind</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significantly upgraded efforts made during the last four years to recruit staff, administrative employees, and faculty from under-represented groups have included:

- Outreach activities into the diverse communities of San Diego.
- Contact with agencies serving under-represented groups.
- Group and individual training for managers and supervisors on the effective recruitment and selection of employees from diverse backgrounds.
- The academic deans cited these efforts for recruiting a greater diversity of faculty:
  1. Position announcements specify minority and women candidates are encouraged to apply;
  2. Faculty use contacts through various associations, asking contacts if they know of qualified candidates from under-represented groups;
  3. Ads are placed in publications such as *Hispanic Outlook* and *Black Issues in Higher Education*;
  4. Deans receive reports published by various groups and schools such as the UC Berkeley report on graduating minorities, and letters are written to the graduates;
  5. Deans and USD faculty members attend break-out groups of minorities and women at conferences;
  6. Minority and women speakers are invited to visit USD;
  7. Faculty are sent to conferences dealing with minority recruiting and retention.

Several activities, described in the next section, were undertaken to develop an environment within the University which is supportive of the development and retention of employees from under-represented groups, since it makes little sense to hire a diverse workforce if the climate is not welcoming.

**Students**

Over the last four years, the changes in student demographics have been more positive than those among faculty, administrators, or staff. The University has the opportunity to replace approximately 25% of its student body each year, while the replacement for employees is at a much lower rate. For example, significant growth in the percentage of minority students in the freshman class began in 1990--when it went from 15.2% in 1989 to 22.6% in 1990--and that percentage has continued to grow since then:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% FROM UNDER-REPRESENTED GROUPS</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reasons for the increase in the diversity of undergraduate students include the changing demographics in California, increased university recruitment of students from under-represented groups, and increased financial aid making it possible for a greater diversity of students to attend USD.

Responsibility for special efforts to recruit students from under-represented groups is distributed among the entire Undergraduate Admissions staff. Their programs range from an extensive early outreach schedule in which the University hosts elementary and middle school groups on campus to special contacts with community college ethnic programs. Admissions staff attend college fair programs which have a particular emphasis on reaching minority students, such as the Hispanic Scholars program and Children of Migrant Workers. They have also worked with the Young Black Scholars and several other local African American groups. On-campus programs have included bilingual messages for Spanish-speaking parents.

Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) efforts have also been instituted to enhance the recruitment and retention of students of color. The departments of Community Relations and EOP developed the Road to College booklet (English and Spanish) which is designed to provide advice for high school students from diverse backgrounds. A new Road to College booklet, currently being revised, will include a section for 8th graders. The current edition begins its support with the 9th grade.

Students admitted to the University through the EOP program are offered the opportunity to attend the College Performance Workshop. These workshops help to develop study, time-management, and test-taking skills. The University also provides EOP-admitted students a copy of USD's Freshman Survival Guide which was produced last year with the support of the Irvine Grant.

These aggressive steps, along with tutoring and academic advising, help support the Educational Opportunity Program's efforts toward increasing and maintaining the campus's diversity.

Large increases in the amounts of Financial Aid have also contributed significantly to the recruitment and retention of students of color. The USD Diversity Grant—a special program of
financial aid for minority undergraduate students—was begun in 1990-91 and has grown steadily since then. The *Diversity Grant* has been effective in helping to reduce the average loan size for minority students who have substantial financial need.

The Office of Financial Aid continues to take the initiative in helping minority students at USD identify private outside sources of scholarships and grants to help them reduce the size of their loans. Since 1989 the total value of private scholarships and grants that have enabled USD students to reduce the size of their loans has grown from $218,000 to over $600,000.

### Diversity of Financial Aid Recipients
1992/93 - 1995/96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Records</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>2,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Islander</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diversity Grant Recipients
1992/93 - 1995/96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Recipients</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Amount</td>
<td>$563,737</td>
<td>$522,825</td>
<td>$617,150</td>
<td>$744,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Students
The following tables provide the demographic and financial aid data for graduate and law students at USD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PER CENT FROM UNDER-REPRESENTED GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW STUDENTS</th>
<th>PER CENT FROM UNDER-REPRESENTED GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR ENTERING CLASS % TOTAL STUDENTS %</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>DIVERSITY OF FINANCIAL AID RECIPIENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Records</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Graduate Admissions Office, with responsibility for all graduate programs except the Law School, has undertaken several activities to increase the enrollment of graduate students from under-represented groups:

Recruitment efforts have focused on colleges and universities in the states of California, Arizona and Washington, especially those who target historically under-represented groups at their annual graduate school information events. In addition, USD helps to plan and is well represented each year at the California Minority Graduate Education Forum which is supported by a consortium of 44 colleges and universities. The Graduate Admissions staff also recruits at events sponsored by the Navy and professional associations (e.g., National Black Graduate Student Association, National Association of Hispanic Nurses, and the local Black, Hispanic and Filipino nurses associations).

In 1995 USD sponsored a campus visit for San Diego State Chicano/Latino students who attend the Imperial Valley College campus to introduce them to USD graduate programs. In addition, USD continues to recruit for and financially support the Teacher Preparation Program Grant (initiated by the Irvine Grant) which annually supports three or four African American men to earn the Single Subject Teaching Credential.

During 1996 the Graduate Admissions Office will invite selected minority student organizations and EOP directors and counselors from local colleges to come to USD for tours and information sessions about graduate programs offered. It also has submitted a proposal to fund a training program for current graduate students to become recruiters and mentors to minority applicants and newly admitted students. Through presentations, luncheons, meetings, and direct mailing efforts, the Graduate Admissions Office hopes to bring to campus minority students and faculty groups from local colleges and universities, as well as representatives from public service, and community volunteer organizations. Efforts also will be made to send USD personnel to visit these schools and agencies.

The Law School offers the following activities to increase the diversity of its student body:

- An excellent Academic Support program for those who are eligible.
- Merit and need-based diversity scholarships.
- An Alumni Mentor program for career advising.
- Several student organizations including BALSA, APALSA and La Raza work with first year students to assist with orientation needs. These groups also assist with recruiting and providing information to prospective applicants and students.
- An annual Diversity Information Day for prospective applicants.
University Activities and Programs
The following paragraphs describe programs and activities undertaken during the last four years to implement and maintain pluralism at USD. The University's match portion of the Irvine Grant was $665,440. The University has continued support to diversity programs with an annual input of $200,000. ($146,556 for the Campus Diversity Committee and the remainder to diversity scholarships and diversity training.)

Cultural Awareness Training and Curriculum

• Extensive programming to educate and train employees on cultural awareness and to develop multicultural curriculum was undertaken through the Irvine Foundation Grant for Institutionalizing Cultural Diversity (see the University's final Irvine Report for details, Appendix I).

• During the current and last fiscal years, USD funded, through its own operating budget, the continuation of most of the extensive programming developed as part of the Irvine Grant: faculty and curriculum development workshops; faculty, administration and staff workshops to increase diversity awareness; community service-learning activities for students, enhanced by a federal corporation grant to integrate such activities into teaching; luncheon colloquia for faculty and staff to highlight diversity issues; social issues programming for faculty and students; multicultural human relations retreats for students; orientation (for incoming students) team training; science education for minority students; teacher preparation for minority credential candidates; pro bono legal and other volunteer activities. These have now become an integral part of USD's approach to fulfilling its mission and objectives with respect to diversity.

Cultural Diversity Committee

• USD created a new Campus Diversity Committee, co-chaired by a faculty member and an administrator or staff member, which will be ongoing and responsible for "managing" diversity issues throughout the campus. The President's charge to the Campus Diversity Committee is that it "carry forward and enhance the University's commitment to respect the dignity and value of each human being and help institutionalize programs and projects that create and maintain a dynamic and diverse campus community." Besides general oversight, the Committee is charged with establishing and managing proactive strategic plans to foster diversity.

Career Services

• Career Services publications and programs have been designed to reflect both gender and racial diversity. Career Services extends personal outreach to students of under-represented groups through the EOP Orientation Program each summer as well as
through an ongoing liaison with the EOP Director. Outreach is also made to diverse clubs and organizations on campus, with offers by counselors to lead discussions on career issues and to refer speakers of interest from the community. The staff has found that the most effective service outreach comes from establishing individual relationships of trust with diverse students and then working with referrals from these students. The Career Services staff continued to explore new programs and methods of outreach to minority students.

**Student Life**

- The following efforts were made in Student Life around diversity issues during the years from 1992 to 1996:

  1. **United Front**
     
     The United Front, an organization initiated by students includes representation from the Black Student Union, the Asian Student Association, the Filipino "Ugnayan" organization, Aikane O'Hawaii, MEChA, and SAESO, the support group for gay, lesbian and bisexual students. In 1993, a temporary space within the Student Organizations center was given to the group. The following year a more permanent space was created by taking a portion of the game room and converting it to a separate area for the United Front. This space has provided an important haven and source of support for new students of color.

     Initially, the United Front was primarily concerned with being established as an organization and did not envision much support from the Associated Students. As a result of summer workshops and off-campus retreats where members of the Associated Student Government and representatives from the United Front groups spent time together, communication between the two groups was vastly improved. There has been a notable increase in co-sponsorship of programs, and two new directorships were developed by the Associated Students: one for multicultural programs and one for multicultural student issues.

  2. **Incoming Student Orientation**
     
     For the past four years, all entering freshmen and new transfer students have been required to attend a program focusing on identifying the diversity within the entering class. Attendance at this event has been excellent, and the program has been well-received by incoming students.

     During this same period, there has been a continued effort to diversify the membership on the Orientation Team, the group responsible for welcoming the students. For the past three years, the Orientation Team has reflected the diversity of the entering classes.
3. **Resident Assistants**
   The training of all Resident Assistants includes a program in cultural diversity.

4. **Cultural Arts Programming**
   As awareness of multicultural issues increased (partly due to the Irvine Project), the diversity of Cultural Arts programming has also increased. The program's budget has gone from a little over $5,000 per semester to more than $20,000 per semester in the last four years.

5. **ASB Speakers Bureau**
   As part of the Irvine Grant, some funds were available to encourage students to sponsor speakers and other programs around issues of racism and sexism with the hope that students seeing the success of these programs would sponsor their own program in these areas. This, in fact, has happened, and significant social issues programming is now being sponsored by the Associated Students Speakers Bureau and other student organizations.

6. **Weekend Retreats**
   For the past four years, there has been a series of off-campus weekend retreats focused on developing better understanding of differences. These intensive two-day experiences have had a major impact on students attending and have resulted in many students becoming involved with issues of diversity following the weekends.

7. **NASA Summer Workshop**
   For the past four summers, students representing each of the organizations within the United Front and a staff member have attended the National Association of Student Activities week-long summer workshop on cultural diversity. The students attending these workshops have come back with new understanding and have become catalysts for an AS/United Front special Human Relations Weekend which has taken place the following September. This special retreat has probably been the single most significant factor in developing better relationships between the Associated Students and the United Front. Students who have had the summer workshop training have emerged as leaders in the diversity efforts on campus.

8. **Local Student Recruitment**
   For the past four years, USD has been involved with San Diego City College (SDCC) in attempts to change the perception among SDCC students who viewed USD as an all-white, upper-middle class campus unwelcoming to students of color for whom access was extremely difficult. Specifically, the program targeted SDCC's honor students, a diverse group of students capable of handling USD's rigorous academic curriculum. Initiatives have included joint meetings of
members of USD's Associate Students and SDCC's Associated Student groups to target and plan cooperative programming, offering transportation from SDCC to USD for cultural events and major speakers on the USD campus, receptions where students from SDCC had the opportunity to meet with members of USD's multicultural organizations and a series of luncheon workshops which provided SDCC with specific information about the transfer process and the availability of financial aid.

Curriculum

- The University has also supported faculty efforts to move the curriculum toward greater multiculturalism. See Appendix II for a description of diversity-across-the-curriculum course offerings.

Evaluation and Future Plans

At the end of the Irvine Grant period, USD engaged the services of two outside evaluators to examine progress made under the Irvine grant. Their evaluation (Appendix III) validated some of the successes of the four-year effort and pointed to some possible future initiatives. For example, the evaluation found that

Although there is some disagreement about exactly how effective specific programming was, there is general consensus about the outcomes that: (a) the grant invited a greater level of communication about cultural issues among members of the entire campus; (b) the grant and its subsequent programs helped the campus become more culturally sensitive; (c) the programs, sessions, etc., helped people focus on institutional biases and shortcomings and allowed them...to express their frustrations and concerns, and (d) the experience helped in the identification of resources which aid both problem identification and resolution.

The evaluators also noted: "The challenge of operationalizing an institution's commitment to diversity is a significant one. Because of its salience, it is crucial to bear in mind that achieving diversity successes rests more with committing an institution to a process of change, rather than arriving at a specific plateau along the way." The evaluators recommended increasing diversity in all levels of the campus and including a diversity component in the undergraduate curriculum.

A significant problem was identified during the discussions in the Campus Diversity Committee, as well as in the outside evaluation: that accountability for results is an important ingredient for success in achieving goals related to cultural diversity and that, accountability has generally been missing. Participation in diversity-focused programming and training has been voluntary; nor has the University held people to any specific standards with regard to diversity.
Two activities currently taking place will help shape future diversity efforts:

1. The Campus Diversity Committee is preparing a report to President Hayes. The report will include a synopsis of all cultural diversity-related activities which have taken place this year, as well as specific recommendations. Some recommendations which have been discussed include: holding administrators accountable for diversity in their areas, expanding employee recruitment efforts, developing a multicultural center, having a cultural diversity education requirement for undergraduates, developing an ethnic studies program, concentrating efforts across campus to increase the University's visibility in diverse communities in San Diego.

2. The University has prepared a second proposal to the Irvine Foundation entitled "Creating Cultural Competence" (see Appendix IV). The proposal focuses on developing a set of core cultural competencies for students, faculty, administrators and staff employees, which can be taught and assessed. The proposal also includes recruiting and offering job development for students from diverse backgrounds.

When the University began to examine issues of diversity and pluralism, it focused on basic education and the raising of sensitivity. Awareness regarding cultural diversity issues has been raised, but we must continue to develop a culturally sensitive environment which is supportive of the growth of all students and employees, while holding people accountable for bringing about significant changes in the make-up of our work force and student body.
In 1993 the University began the process of developing a ten-year long range strategic plan for the period 1995-2005. A committee of administrators and faculty, appointed by the president at the beginning of the Spring 1993 semester, set the stage for the planning efforts by 1) recommending a planning process, 2) specifying the appropriate content of a long range plan, 3) suggesting the membership of a planning committee and a method of selection, and 4) preparing a schedule for the development of the plan.

The large Strategic Long Range Planning (SLRP) Committee created by the president contained a few more members than recommended by the original planning committee. Membership included the University's five vice presidents, seven deans, a faculty representative of the University Senate (selected by the Senate's chair), a faculty representative from each of the professional schools (selected by the schools), three faculty representatives from Arts and Sciences, and other administrators and staff representatives. The president chaired the committee.

The committee's activity began in November 1993 and included a day-long workshop in January 1994 at which several presentations (by the president, University administrators, and academic-unit administrators and faculty) were made orally and in writing and discussed by the committee. Meeting regularly through 1994 and the first half of 1995, the committee systematically analyzed and revised the main working documents of the University. Several task forces and subcommittees were created when necessary to work on particular areas within the long range plan, and sometimes were staffed by a combination of committee members and faculty or administrators who were not members of the committee. The committee completed its work and prepared a summary of the Long Range Plan for wide distribution to the academic community in the Fall of 1995. The Summary of the 1995 - 2005 Strategic Long Range Plan is attached as an appendix.

Extensive participation by faculty and administrators and the ongoing interaction between the two groups kept the process open and inclusive. This dimension of the strategic long range planning process will be addressed further in the governance section of this interim report.

The Strategic Long Range Planning Process
The long range planning process included four major elements: 1) review of the mission of the University, 2) environmental analysis, 3) options analysis, scenario development, and development of planning assumptions, and 4) the compilation of the complete long range plan.

1. Mission of the University
Revision of the University's mission statement and general goals was a key part of the planning process. The mission statement provides a framework for all planning activities and defines the institution's purpose. Critics of the former mission statement pointed out
its disorganization and undergraduate-school focus. The updated mission statement reflects the University's continuing commitment to academic excellence, values, individual dignity, holism, and its Catholic identity. Goals and objectives identified in the long range plan were then developed to flow directly from the values identified in the mission statement.

2. **Environmental analysis**

The environmental analysis required a realistic assessment of current conditions to establish a framework upon which future planning could be based. This assessment included an analysis of external trends affecting the University and a review of current internal conditions and trends.

Analysis of external trends (trends that have or will have an impact upon the University's operations, but which are either entirely or mostly beyond the University's control) included economic trends, demographic trends, socio-political/educational trends, and technological trends. Of particular concern to the planning committee members were indications that weakening public financial-aid and loan programs will require additional commitments of internal funds for scholarships and financial assistance; that attention to attracting students from traditionally underrepresented groups will put further pressure on financial support; that technology will continue to change the face of higher education and that maintaining access to current technology will need to be addressed explicitly in the budgeting process; and that the University in future years is unlikely to be able to increase tuition at a rate exceeding the rate of inflation. Strengths in this area include a location that allows the University to take advantage of opportunities beyond a local or regional focus, including natural ties to Mexico and the Pacific Rim; a positive image in the local community; the quality and growing reputations of the faculty; and the beauty of the campus.

The analysis of internal conditions and trends focused on planning elements over which the University exercises a significant amount of control. Positive trends since the last ten year plan include the continued hiring of strong faculty; maintenance of priority on excellent teaching; stronger professional and graduate programs; increases in collaboration with and service to the local community; and significant developments in internationalization and multiculturalism. Areas of concern include the adequacy of assessment processes; insufficient cultural diversity among academic personnel; a larger number of students from dysfunctional environments; and the perception that students are insufficiently motivated and that the undergraduate intellectual climate should be strengthened.

3. **Options analysis and scenario development**

In the options analysis phase the committee used information gathered in the environmental analysis to develop opportunities for discussion. Primary consideration was given to whether options were consistent with the mission and goals of the
University. The committee used several tools to assist these discussions, including resource analysis, niche analysis and threats analysis. Resource analysis identified the people, places, and funding that will be available to pursue opportunities. Niche analysis positioned the University in relation to peer and competitive institutions as well as to institutions the University aspires in some regards to emulate. Threats analysis identified persons, things, or events which could impede the University's progress.

On the resource side, the University is financially healthy except for its relatively small endowment. However, the University expects significant future demand for University-funded financial aid increases in the cost of educational and support operations. The University has also experienced increased competition in its search for grant support and charitable/gift income. The University's campus has the capacity to serve a somewhat larger population; but some physical plant needs must be addressed soon, regardless of future size. These needs include updated science laboratories and classrooms, increased space for the School of Education and the School of Business, expanded sports facilities, and additional parking.

The University is expected to continue to serve primarily students of traditional college age (18-23) at the undergraduate level. The University expects to continue to increase the number and ratio of students who are highly qualified academically. Specific efforts will be made to recruit Catholic students, international students, and students from economically and culturally disadvantaged backgrounds.

Scenario development required the consideration of options and cost/benefit tradeoffs to select a feasible set of goals for inclusion in the long range plan. The short and long range financial requirements of each scenario were identified and the benefits to the University were estimated. Primary consideration was given to the future size of the University's enrollment; this part of the plan is summarized in the next section.

4. Compilation of the long range plan
The completed Strategic Long Range Plan is a lengthy document which includes the institution's Mission and Goals statement, objectives to implement the goals, analysis of internal and external factors which affect the University, niche analysis, and enrollment projections. As part of the SLRP process, each major academic and non-academic unit was asked to develop goals for the long range plan. A set of planning assumptions was provided to each unit to assist goal preparation and to insure consistency with the overall mission and goals of the University. These unit plans were submitted to the SLRP committee for discussion and review of compatibility with the University's mission, and were included in the completed plan. There is some concern that there was not sufficient coordination among units in developing the individual unit plans. This concern about integration will be addressed in the "Challenges" section.
Significant Features of the New Plan

The 1995-2005 Strategic Long Range Plan represents a natural evolution of the University rather than a radical departure from its prior direction. Two factors may explain this evolution. First, there appears to be broad consensus among faculty and administrators that the current mission, values, and orientation of the University are appropriate and that a complete overhaul is neither necessary nor desired. Second, the plan can be considered a statement to the new administration that the University values its history and wants to meet new challenges and bring improvement within the context of that tradition.

Although the University's mission and goals remain consistent with the past, the plan includes the flexibility to move the institution forward in new directions. Some notable operational changes for the future include:

- Growth in projected enrollment from about 6250 annual average headcount in 1995-96 to 7200 in 2005-2006. About 30% of this projected growth is expected in graduate programs, including significant percentage increases in graduate enrollment in the School of Business, in the School of Nursing, and in the LL.M. programs in the School of Law. The applicant base is expected to be large enough to support growth in undergraduate and graduate programs without reducing the academic quality of the incoming students.

- Increased focus on technology and information management. A significant effort to improve faculty access to hardware and software had begun prior to the current planning process. Classroom use of technology has increased and is expected to continue to grow, and the University's telecommunications and administrative computing environments will need improvement. The attention on technology also includes the efficient management of information to avoid duplicating information, to improve access to data and the ability to conduct assessment, to streamline many administrative functions, and to allow the University to serve its customers more effectively. President Hayes has indicated that technology will be a priority in future budget deliberations.

- Greater applications of qualitative and quantitative means of assessment. Educational institutions across the nation are striving to improve assessment procedures. The University's current and planned assessment policies are addressed in the assessment section of this interim report.

Challenges, Implementation and Progress Assessment

Although the Strategic Long Range Plan includes the individual plans of each major academic and non-academic unit of the University, there is concern about the integration of these plans. The unit plans were developed independently, with little or no coordination between units during development. Thus, Although the SLRP planning assumptions and the University's mission and
goals statement underlie the individual planning efforts, the lack of communication between units has resulted in plans that do not always appear to be part of an integrated planning effort.

Two other areas in which further efforts are needed are mentioned in the SLRP: (1) further development of the implementation process to ensure that goals are realized; (2) development of a process to link the goals of the SLRP directly to the budget process.

The SLRP is intended to be an ongoing plan that will move the University to the next level of its development. As a living document, the plan and the University's progress toward fulfilling its goals will be evaluated regularly. The plan calls for a regular evaluation of progress and the establishment of a task force to monitor the achievement of the specified goals and objectives in the plan. The task force is intended to develop mechanisms to integrate the plan with the budget process, to set priorities for implementation, and to clarify accountability. A more formal implementation plan, including accountability and time lines for achieving plan milestones, remains to be developed.

Progress has been made in the budget linkage. The University is now explicitly budgeting for 1) facilities renewal, which includes regular maintenance funded by current operating funds, 2) a capital program for deferred maintenance, remodeling and renovation, and 3) current technology, including new and updated equipment. (For example, $500,000 was budgeted this year to improve technology and technological access. Much of this activity in the past had been accomplished with reserve or surplus funds at the end of the budget year, and no explicit plan for replacing outdated or obsolete equipment was in place.)

Overall, the University's Strategic Long Range Plan is a comprehensive document that has clearly identified the mission and goals of the University. The plan draws on the University's strengths and positions the University for continued growth and improvement over the next ten years.
COMMUNICATION AND GOVERNANCE

In the areas of governance and administration [Standard 3], the 1987 WASC Interim Report focussed primarily on problems of communication and interaction between faculty and administration. The University's 1992 response to the 1987 Report reflects a similar focus. The University's 1992 Self-Study, in its section dealing with Standard 3, articulated both communication and governance issues. The focus in the 1992 WASC Report shifted noticeably to issues of faculty governance.

The present discussion of communication and governance will center on the topics and concerns articulated in the 1992 WASC Report's discussion under Standard 3 and it will be organized according to that report's three areas of concern: communication and interaction between faculty and administration; general governance concerns; and the University Senate.

Communication and Interaction Between Faculty and Administration

Regarding faculty/administration communication and interaction, the 1992 WASC Report centered its attention almost exclusively on relations between "the faculty" and the central administration. The University's 1992 reports, however, were not so confined. The topic of communication and interaction between faculty and administration within the University may be broken into three general areas: (1) intra-school; (2) inter-school; (3) between the entire University faculty and the central administration.

A. Intra-school faculty/administration communication and interaction

Within the individual academic units, communication and interaction between faculty and deans (and, in the case of Arts & Sciences, department chairs) remains both extensive and satisfactory. School or college administrators continue to follow the norm of an open-door policy for both faculty and students and are otherwise accessible.

Faculty are kept apprised, both informally and formally on a regular basis, of events and developments within their schools or the college. Academic deans are kept formally apprised of what their faculties are doing on a regular basis, through (for example) responses to their requests for information and the academic unit's merit-raise process. Each academic unit has at least one mechanism for publishing faculty activities to faculty, students, and alumni/ae.

Problems in intra-school communication and interaction seem to correlate with the size and diversity of the academic unit in question: neither faculty nor administrators in the professional schools give evidence of inaccessibility or other failures of communication or interaction; some problems in this regard have been mentioned from time to time within Arts and Sciences, the largest and most diverse academic component of the University.
B. Inter-School Communication and Interaction
The many activities and University-wide committees mentioned in the University's 1992 response to 1987 WASC recommendations continue to be part of the institutional framework for inter-school communication and interaction. Opportunities for inter-school faculty and faculty/administration communication and interaction have significantly increased since the time of the 1992 WASC Report. Several developments at the University during the last four years have created these opportunities: the president and provost searches (discussed under "general faculty governance" below); the continuing movement toward internationalization of the curriculum; curricular and other activities in cultural diversification, undertaken in connection with the Irvine Grant of 1993-96; a movement toward interdisciplinary courses and majors, also most prominently undertaken during 1993-96; creation of a Transborder Institute in 1994; and the steadily increasing computerization and networking of the campus.

During the last four years, both the central administration and the individual academic units have increased efforts to disclose unit activities, and the activities of their faculties, to each other. Examples include: regular distribution of the undergraduate, graduate, and law bulletins to all University faculty members and administrators; the distribution to all University faculty and administrators, in 1995, of a report of the faculty's 1993-94 scholarly publications and professional activities; distribution to all University faculty and administrators of undergraduate and professional-school publications designed for the alumni of the respective academic units.

C. Communication and interaction between central administration and faculty
The central administration continues to insure wide distribution of the various publications mentioned in the University's 1992 response to the 1987 WASC Report, and to encourage members of the University Cabinet and President's Advisory Council to share and explain the minutes for these groups. Regular publications -- Faculty Newsnotes, Alcalá View, USD Magazine, Annual Reports, the annual Honor Roll of Donors -- are supplemented with numerous University-wide notices of programs, speakers, projects, and community-service activities. University departments such as Human Resources, Academic Computing, and Office of Sponsored Programs regularly publish information to the faculty about developments in their areas.

In 1994 the University Senate decided against routine distribution of its minutes to all faculty members, on grounds its budget would not support the expense. Some of the individual academic units, with Senate encouragement, copy and distribute the minutes to their faculty as a matter of course. In addition, the academic deans and faculty senators report regularly on Senate activities to their respective faculty constituencies.

In 1994 the central administration instituted two programs to publicly recognize and to reward faculty members for exceptional contributions, especially in teaching and scholarship. Based on each academic unit's screening and selection processes, University
Professors are chosen from the University-wide faculty who have demonstrated outstanding, balanced, cumulative career contributions supporting the mission and goals of the University. Steber Professors, who are faculty members in the School of Business Administration or the Department of Theological and Religious Studies, are recognized for substantial contributions in teaching, research, and University service.

President Hayes has continued two Fall semester traditions initiated by President Hughes: an annual address at convocation that identifies and explains significant University developments; an annual address later in the Fall to the University Senate, followed by a question-and-answer session, that among other things identifies areas of concern and special needs for faculty and academic-unit attention. The genuine desire of the central administration to consult with and inform the University Senate leadership, noted in the 1992 Self Study, continues unabated in 1996.

D. Strategic Long Range Planning

In 1993 the University commenced work on a ten-year long range plan. Brief discussion of this planning process illustrates the maturation of the University in faculty/administration -- and general -- communication and interaction.

In previous long-range planning efforts, faculty -- and especially the faculty of the professional schools -- felt left out of the process at the University level. The president and provost were determined to make the current long-range planning process relevant to the entire campus community, all faculty included, and a matter encouraging widespread and active participation. The structure and selection of the Strategic Long Range Planning Committee have been discussed in a previous section of this Report. Suffice it here to note that this Committee, in its broad representation of campus constituencies, included faculty representatives, chosen by faculty, from all the University's main academic sectors.

Faculty representatives played a substantial role, along with administrators, in drafting a new mission statement for the University; in drafting various goals statements; and in creating the working assumptions upon which the committee's planning efforts were to be based. The president and provost gave regular progress reports to the University community and held meetings with the University's academic units and with staff to discuss and receive input on the progress of the planning process. Planning within each academic unit was delegated to the academic unit, and the faculty of each academic unit was largely responsible for developing the unit's own long-range plan. Throughout, the process was characterized by efforts of all concerned for openness and widespread participation and communication within the committee and between the committee and the University community.
The implementation strategies for the planning process have yet to be finalized, but thus far the process has been successful in encouraging both the fact and the feeling of widespread campus participation and interaction.

**Faculty Governance: General**

Recommendation 3.2 [1992 WASC Report, at 34] states: "The administration and faculty should explore ways to strengthen the faculty role in a system of shared responsibility for governance." At the University the concepts of "governance" and "shared governance" receive translation at two levels: the academic unit; the University as a whole.

Academic freedom not "governance" defines the realm of autonomous decision-making by individual faculty within the scope of their University employment. As used in this report, "faculty governance" refers to majoritarian or super-majoritarian decision-making by groups of faculty, acting formally or informally under the auspices of the University, that have impact either on the faculty group itself, or on larger and typically more diverse groups within the University, or on the operations of the University or one of its areas or units.

In theory at the University, all faculty "governance" activities thus defined result in "recommendations" (including conscious failures to make recommendations) rather than "final decisions" made on behalf of the University. That "recommendations" not "final decisions" are the products of faculty governance activities does not mean faculty have little or no responsibility in University governance. Formal faculty recommendations typically are made either to the University's president or Board of Trustees, and either or both are "free" in theory to disregard or modify those recommendations. In tradition and practice, however, the University's president and Board of Trustees have accorded almost complete support to the finalized "recommendations" made by recognized faculty bodies in most areas of faculty involvement, and have accorded substantial support to finalized faculty recommendations in the remaining areas.

"Faculty governance" issues arise in three contexts: intra-school; inter-school; and the University as a whole. The 1992 WASC Report focusses almost entirely on governance issues in the University as a whole. Thus, on page 32 the Report states: "The role of the faculty in governance at USD has been a matter in contention for years, presumably since the inception of the University itself." Aside from a few isolated incidents over the years, this statement would be false if it were meant, either in 1992 or in 1996, to refer to governance within academic units. To take another example, on page 36 the 1992 Report states: "Faculty at present cannot in any substantial or comprehensive sense be regarded as responsible for the academic development of the institution." After laying aside the vagueness that inheres in terms like "responsible" and "academic development," this statement could not possibly have been meant to refer to academic development within or between particular academic units of the University; it must instead refer to "academic development" of the University as a whole.
The University recognizes American Association of University Professors principles on faculty governance, and adapts AAUP policies in many of its own policies. The University notes with pride that in 1995 the national AAUP conferred its Konheim Award for outstanding chapter on the University's AAUP chapter.

A. Intra-school or college faculty governance

General statements like these characterize faculty-governance issues at the University in 1996:

Within their individual academic units, faculty take primary responsibility for the unit's academic development, from what goes on in the classroom (individual faculty responsibility) to what is required of a student to graduate, to what the school's or college's general curriculum looks like.

Faculty take primary responsibility for curricular and long-range planning for their respective academic units.

An extensive committee structure characterizes intra-college or intra-school governance, with each faculty member expected to be an active member of at least one or two committees the findings and recommendations of which are presented to the school's or college's full faculty body for deliberation and vote.

Faculty take primary responsibility for faculty hiring, retention, tenuring, and promotion decisions within their respective academic units.

Faculty take primary responsibility for determining the extent to which their academic unit emphasizes teaching, scholarship, and service in faculty-status issues.

Responsibility for budgetary and resource-allocation matters reposes in the dean of the school or college, with substantial faculty input sought and received in these matters. In some schools and the college, committees of the faculty provide input to the dean; in others, input is given by the faculty acting as a whole.

In some of the matters over which the faculty have primary responsibility, most notably those dealing with faculty hiring and tenuring, the central administration exercises an oversight or veto function; and from time to time an academic unit's faculty (typically when deeply divided) does not get what its majority wants from the central administration. Disputes over curricular matters that pertain to a single academic unit are resolved by faculty within that academic unit, sometimes with informal negotiation with or mediation by the central administration.
B. Inter-school faculty governance
The period 1992-96 has witnessed significant growth in inter-school activity at the University. In part this activity has come in response to significant initiatives spearheaded by the central administration, such as internationalization of the curriculum and Irvine Grant-related developments to increase campus multi-cultural diversity. In part this activity has come in response to governmental mandates, such as those requiring policies for receiving federal grants and for misconduct in federally funded research. In part increased activity is due to initiatives between and among schools and/or the college in the direction of co-sponsored academic programs and interdisciplinary courses.

Disputes over curricular matters that involve more than one academic unit are uncommon and are resolved either by informal faculty-controlled negotiation or before the University Senate, a faculty-controlled institution of central administration. Controversy with respect to these curricular matters has been rare during the period 1992-96. Inter-school programs generally are developed by interested faculty and submitted for discussion and approval to the University Cabinet, where approval (and subsequent approval by the president) typically comes readily. Perhaps the most significant controversy in this regard concerns the University's new department of engineering, which began as a somewhat unwelcome member of Arts and Sciences, but in 1995 was transferred to membership in the School of Business after extensive faculty and administration analysis and consent of all faculties concerned.

C. Faculty governance and the University as a whole
Contention over the role of faculty governance -- both within the University and as addressed by Recommendation 3.2 of the 1992 WASC Report -- points almost exclusively to the role of "the faculty" in the governance of the University as a whole. "The faculty," in this context, inevitably refers to the entire faculty of the University, typically in situations in which "the faculty" might be arrayed against "the central administration" or "Board of Trustees" in a binary, us-versus-them way. Such situations are neither impossible to imagine at the University, nor purely hypothetical; but they are rare.

Contention over the role of entire-faculty governance at the entire-University level takes three general forms: individual faculty members or groups of faculty and other individual faculty members or groups of faculty; faculties of one or more schools and faculties of other schools or the college; faculties of one or more schools or the college and the central administration. In the first two forms of contention, the central administration may be asked to mediate; in the last form, the central administration is a contending party.

Individual faculty members disagree with each other over the extent of the faculty's governance role of the University as a whole. For example, some faculty members, even within particular schools, believe faculty members should leave the placement and
purpose of the next building on campus to the central administration, while other faculty members believe faculty should have a significant voice in both of these matters.

More significantly, faculties divide on the question of faculty role in University-wide governance because they generally disagree, academic unit by academic unit, on the extent to which centralization of governance is appropriate. The Law School faculty and administration, for example, have long argued for decentralization of and control over a variety of academics-related areas, contending that the Law School requires a significant independence of action in offering programs, in competing with other law schools for students and faculty, in placement functions, and in development activities; the other professional schools have begun to share in that argument, for similar reasons. The faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences expresses the desire for more decentralization of control over its academic mission, but tends to express antagonism toward decentralized, independent school-by-school (or college) governance over areas like development and financial aid. The issue of more or less decentralization remains unresolved; to the extent Recommendation 3.2 implies the argument ought to be resolved in a particular way, significant numbers of the University's faculty disagree with the recommendation.

Meanwhile, a University-wide committee structure, already fairly extensive in 1992, has become more extensive in 1996. A majority of professional-school faculty and a significant plurality of Arts and Sciences faculty serve on one or more standing or ad hoc University-wide policy-making or policy-implementation committees. University-wide standing committees include:

Assessment Committee
Retention Committee
Health Sciences Evaluation Committee
Scholarship Committee
Experiential Education Steering Committee
Commencement Committee
Library Committee
Parking Committee
Budget Committee
Benefits Committee
Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects
Internationalization of the Curriculum Committee
Academic Computing Committee
Social Issues Committee
Admissions Committee
University-wide ad hoc committees with significant faculty representation currently include the Strategic Long Range Planning Committee and several committees created to deal with the National Collegiate Athletics Association's Athletics Certification program.

The University Senate, a University-wide governance committee, includes nearly two dozen faculty members in its composition. In addition to its Executive Committee, the Senate also has several standing committees -- Jurisdiction, Faculty Status, Honorary Degrees, and Budget -- whose members may (and usually do) include faculty who are Senate members. The University Senate also fields ad hoc committees, the members of which are all or mostly regular faculty, some of whom typically are not Senators. For example, ad hoc Senate committees in 1995-96 include the University Name and Logo Committee and the Committee on Acceptable Use of Electronic Communications.

These developments furnish ample evidence that the University's faculty are increasingly assuming responsibility in the academic life of the University as a whole. Other matters mentioned in the 1992 WASC Report materials that are referable to University-wide faculty governance, such as proposals to expand the faculty representation on the Presidents' Advisory Council and on the University Cabinet, have been tabled to allow the University's new president to engage in her own review of the University-wide governance structure.

Progress between 1992 and 1996 on entire-faculty governance at the entire-University level has centered on the University's searches for its next president and provost. These activities deserve comment here because, although they are more ad hoc than systematic in character, they illustrate the maturation of the faculty's function and role in University-wide governance.

1. The provost search, 1992-93. The 1992 WASC Report (together with the University's preparatory materials) refers to campus uncertainty over near-term retirements of the University's provost and president, who had held their respective posts since before the University became coeducational in 1972. The provost was the first to announce her retirement, to be effective June 30, 1993. In March 1992, the Board of Trustees initiated the campus search process for the provost position, informing the president of its interest in that process, calling for "broad faculty participation on the Search Committee," and suggesting that the faculty Chair of the University Senate serve as that committee's chair. President Hughes and the Senate Chair selected six faculty members -- one from each of the professional schools and two from the College -- from nominations made by the faculties of the respective academic units. A ten-member provost search committee was created, seven members of which were members of the full-time tenured faculty. Search committee membership was later expanded to include a staff member, an alumnae, and three former Chairs of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees participated in the end-stage deliberations of the committee.
The search committee brought several provost candidates to campus for two-day visits in December 1992, during which candidates were interviewed and evaluated by various University constituencies, including faculty. Although this search proved to be unsuccessful -- some candidates did not receive widespread support while others withdrew or declined the University's offer, generally because of uncertainties over the impending retirement of President Hughes -- the University's faculty, administration and trustees worked well together in this search effort. The search process had widespread support of faculty throughout the University.

In the spring of 1993 a new search was commenced, this time with the support of professional consultants for the search committee. Disappointed in the candidates turned up by the second search -- and in recognition that the impending retirement of the University's president had a detrimental effect on the search for a provost -- the University terminated the search and obtained the provost's agreement to stay on for another three years.

2. *The president search, 1994.* As he had indicated some years earlier, President Hughes announced his retirement in mid-1993, to become effective June 30, 1995. In late 1993 the Board of Trustees created a search process, which would involve a twelve-member search committee and a seven-member selection committee. The President Selection Committee was composed solely of trustees; the chair of that committee was also the chair of the Search Committee, and two other members of the selection committee also were members of the search committee. The Board proposed that the search committee have, in addition to the three trustee members, three faculty members selected by the University Senate, three administrators chosen by the president, one student member, one alumni/ae member, and one staff member. The Board also retained a professional consultant, specializing in searches for college and university presidents, to assist the search committee and the search process generally. The University Senate entertained a motion to request expansion of faculty membership on the search committee, but instead ratified the Board of Trustees' proposal.

The president search process came under significant and varied faculty criticism. Some faculty were content with the decisions made by the Board; but many others were highly critical of the "top-down" way the process was structured by the Board, of the composition of the search committee and/or of the employment of professional consultants. The criticisms were intensified when, in structuring the two-day campus visits, only three hours -- one for the University Senate, one hour for department heads and program directors, and one hour for all faculty -- were provided for meetings with faculty.

The campus weathered these criticisms, and learned from them. President-elect Hayes, upon learning of faculty discontent over the process leading to her selection, came back to the campus in February 1995 to meet and develop lines of communication with
faculty. Indeed, President Hayes has proven to be a catalyst for improvement in the climate of faculty governance and administration-faculty communication since coming to campus in the summer of 1995.

3. The second provost search, 1995. Armed with lessons learned from two previous search processes, the University Senate took the lead in the second provost search. The Senate proposed a 15-member provost search committee to President Hughes in February 1995: The Senate's Chair, to be chair of the committee; three faculty members from Arts and Sciences; one faculty member from each of the professional schools; the deans of Business, Education, and Graduate and Continuing Education; the Vice President of Student Affairs; and three students (one selected by Associated Students, one by Student Bar Association, and one by the Graduate Students Association). Faculty members were to be elected by the entire faculties of the respective academic units. President Hughes accepted the Senate's proposal after consultation with President-Elect Hayes, with the exception that student membership was reduced to two and an administrator from Academic Services was added. Though questioned by the Staff Employees Association, the search committee's composition was widely applauded by faculty and students. The Executive Assistant to the Provost provided staff support to the committee, and took part in the process. No outside consultants were employed to assist the committee.

During the late spring, the search committee prepared a draft statement of Provost Qualities and Qualifications and circulated it to the entire University community. Then it held a series of meetings with all segments of the campus community -- faculty, staff, administrators, and students -- to get feedback on the statement, to listen and respond to concerns about the process, and to obtain suggestions for how to proceed. At these meetings the committee distributed forms for the nomination of provost prospects to be contacted by the committee, and also distributed nomination forms widely to the campus community. The search committee kept the campus generally apprised of the progress of the search through the summer and fall of 1995. During two-day visits to campus in December 1995, the search committee provided for separate faculty meetings with provost candidates for Arts and Sciences faculty and for faculty of the professional schools, as well as for open faculty meetings, meetings with the University Senate and AAUP Chapter Executive Committee, and meetings with department heads and program directors.

The second provost search was successful: the University's current provost retired on June 30 and was replaced with a new provost on July 1, 1996. The search process, as well, was generally understood to be successful, perhaps as a result of faculty initiative (through the University Senate) and good interaction between search committee and campus community. Now that the University has successfully commenced its transition to new leadership, other issues implicating University-wide faculty/administration governance have begun to receive
attention. The University-wide budget process appears to be such an issue that will receive consideration in the near future.

Until recently, development of the University's budget for a coming academic year has begun in the early fall of the preceding year. In September, the Tuition Committee -- a large committee comprising the Vice Presidents, the deans, faculty members from each of the schools and the college, and students -- meets and proposes the tuition levels for the following year. Armed with this information, the academic units and other departments and divisions of the University propose increases to their individual budgets based on the tuition increment that is expected to be available.

In October and November, the Budget Committee -- a still larger committee, co-chaired by the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and of Finance and Administration, and including all members of the Tuition Committee -- receives these budget proposals and meets to discuss them, typically in recognition of the impossibility of accommodating all requests. The Vice Presidents then meet (after consulting with their deans and/or directors), negotiate with each other, and prepare a compromise budget, which is presented to the full Committee for ratification in November, in time for the December meeting of the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees -- which has been kept informally apprised of the process during the Budget Committee's activity -- reviews the compromise budget and either approves or rejects the tuition levels on which the proposed budget was based. If the Board approves the budget and tuition, the budget process terminates; if it rejects them, the process resumes before the Budget Committee until finally the budget and tuition are acceptable to the Board.

Faculty members on past Budget Committees have expressed frustration about the process. They are not alone in doing so. The general consensus seems to be that the former ways of setting the budget, which were satisfactory when the University was small, no longer work as the University has grown and matured; that the Committee needs to meet more regularly during the year; that it needs to develop a more formal methodology for dealing with tuition increases and the integration of budget requests; that the budget and budget processes should be tied more explicitly and closely to the University's long range plan; that methods should be explored to review and evaluate the allocation of resources University-wide that are more extensive than the current incremental budgeting; that more information, in a more timely fashion, needs to be provided to Budget Committee members; and that more communication with the University community is needed about the budget process and its progress. In early 1996 the Budget Committee decided to begin its role in the process earlier, by meeting once in the spring before the fall-semester negotiations. Also in 1996, a motion was made before the University Senate to study the budget process and to recommend ways in which it might be improved. The engines of reform thus having been started, some progress on this important area of University-wide governance may be expected in coming years.
The University Senate

The University Senate remains the main vehicle for University-wide faculty governance on campus. Its manner of composition and its jurisdiction have not changed since the time of their description in the 1992 Self Study. The Senate continues to meet 10 or 11 times a year -- about twice a month during the academic year -- and its meetings last for an hour and a half.

The 1992 WASC Report and related University-generated materials singled out the University Senate for special criticism. For example, the 1992 Report states [page 34]:

The University Senate is seen by some as a black hole for decision making, and as a roadblock to faculty input on important issues. There seems to be general agreement, reflected both in the Self Study and in conversations on the campus, that the Senate must move toward greater clarity and capacity for deliberation and decision.

The University's Self-Study documents furnish some support for the 1992 Report's statement. The Self-Study recognized that the Senate frequently took several months to reach a final decision on proposals that came before it. This problem was explored more fully in the University's 1992 response to the 1987 WASC Report, in its observations that the Senate might need to meet more frequently, to use its committee structure more effectively, or to give more cogent priority to issues that came before it for deliberation and resolution.

On the basis provided by this criticism, Recommendation 3.3 of the 1992 Report states:

The administration and, in particular, the faculty should review the structure and functioning of the University Senate with a view toward identifying the means of strengthening its role and effectiveness.

Although as previously noted the Senate's structure has not been altered since the 1992 Report, its functioning has been widely understood to have improved considerably between 1992 and 1996. Indeed, in the last four years the Senate's credibility as "the voice of the faculty" on campus has become well established. Unlike the situation in previous years, Senate meetings since 1992 have never failed for lack of a quorum. A brief recitation of the Senate's main activities since 1992 demonstrates its new strength as a faculty-controlled, University-wide decision making body.

In its 1992-1993 term the Senate broke through the morass it had encountered in dealing with a proposed faculty appointments, reappointment, rank and tenure policy. Discovering that the proposed policy attempted to cover too many subjects, it broke the policy into its main components: faculty appointments; rank, tenure, and promotion; appeals from adverse rank and tenure decisions; dismissal for serious cause; and faculty retrenchment. By the end of its term the 1992-93 Senate
approved a Rank and Tenure Policy for the College of Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Business, Education, and Nursing (approved 1993 by the Board of Trustees);

approved a policy and procedure governing appeals from reappointment, promotion, and tenure (approved 1993 by the University Cabinet);

recommended that policies and procedures governing faculty appointments be developed by the individual schools and the college, subject to review and approval by the Senate.

Also in 1993 the Senate approved a policy and procedure for dealing with allegations of misconduct in externally-funded research (approved 1993 by the President's Advisory Council).

The 1993-94 Senate concluded its work on components of the rank and tenure policies:

approved a policy on dismissal for serious cause (approved 1993 by the Board of Trustees);

approved a policy on faculty retrenchment (approved 1994 by the Board of Trustees).

In addition, the 1993-94 Senate dealt with the following matters:

approved the proposal of Arts and Sciences to change a General Education requirement from "critical reasoning" to "logic";

approved a University policy on intellectual creativity (approved 1993 by the University Cabinet; approved 1994 by the Board of Trustees);

approved the Board of Trustees' proposal for composition of the President Search Committee;

approved a University-wide policy on guest speakers (a matter taken up again in the Senate's 1994-95 term);

approved a faculty medical, maternity and family leave policy (approved 1994 by the President's Advisory Council);

approved a University-wide "drug free environment" policy (accepted 1994 by the President);
• approved a policy on faculty leave without pay (approved 1994 by the University Cabinet);

• approved an amendment to include "sexual orientation" in the University's anti-discrimination policy (refused 1994 by the Board of Trustees).

During its 1994-95 term the Senate was extensively involved in the University's search for its next president. The Senate interviewed each of the finalists for the position, and presented faculty views on the candidates to the President Selection Committee at the request of the Board of Trustees. In addition, the Senate completed the following matters:

• recommended the composition of the 1995 Provost Search Committee to President Hughes (discussed in connection with "Faculty Governance and the University as a Whole" in this report, above);

• approved a faculty grievance policy (approved 1995 by the Board of Trustees);

• approved a University-wide Guest Speakers Policy (nearly the same as had been recommended by the 1993-94 Senate) after negotiation with the President's Advisory Council (approved 1995 by the Board of Trustees);

• approved a University-wide policy for recommending candidates for honorary degrees to the Board of Trustees (approved 1995 by the Board of Trustees);

• on behalf of the University faculty, recommended and sponsored the funding of the Hughes Annual Lecture Series in commemoration of President and Mrs. Hughes upon the former's retirement in 1995.

During its 1995-96 term the Senate played an active role in the provost search, meeting with and evaluating each of the finalists for the position. The Senate also became involved in negotiations regarding the campus parking situation and in the interpretation of the University-wide Guest Speakers Policy as it applied to candidates for nationwide political office. The Senate completed its revision of its by-laws and policies governing the recommendation of University honorary-degree candidates and approved a University-wide policy governing use of the University's name and logo. In addition, the Senate began its processes of review and recommendation with respect to two University-wide policies, one governing sponsored programs and the other governing acceptable use of electronic communications.

So far as concerns the question of the Senate's structure and composition, the question has been broached informally from time to time during the past four years but has not been the subject of Senate deliberation. In part this is so because of the recognition that a new president and provost may wish to have input in dealing with this question; in part, because the subject is both controversial and constitutional, in the sense that it would require significant amendments to the Senate's constitution; and in part, because of the press of other business.
Graduate Programs

In the WASC Commission's 1993 letter reaffirming USD's accreditation, the graduate programs were mentioned as one of the areas of particular concern. The Commission recommended "strengthening the role of the dean and the graduate council, providing oversight of graduate programs beyond the departmental or school level, and increasing the level of support for graduate programs, especially library support."

The Commission's 1993 recommendations echoed the general recommendation made earlier in the 1987 WASC interim report that USD "continue its evaluation of graduate education with the aim of clarifying its role and purpose at USD and of insuring that advanced programs are adequately supported in terms of teaching load, support for research, library support and other resources." (This 1987 statement, in turn, echoed a similar recommendation in the 1982 WASC report.)

While most faculty and administrators agree that the university's mission regarding undergraduate education is clear, many express a concern that, except with regard to its law programs, USD has yet to define its mission as a graduate-level institution. (The programs of the Law School are administered separately from those of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Business Administration, Education, and Nursing, and are not included in references to "graduate programs" in the following discussion.)

Oversight of Graduate Programs and
The Role of the Graduate School and Graduate Council

Oversight and review of USD's master's and doctoral programs have historically been carried out by and within the individual academic departments and schools offering the programs. Admission standards, program requirements, curricular evaluation, faculty review, and fellowship disbursement have all been established and administered separately within the schools, while the admissions and record-keeping functions have been centralized under the School of Graduate and Continuing Education. There is a strong sense, particularly in the professional areas of business and nursing and, to some extent, in education that, although admissions processing and record-keeping are best handled centrally, the evaluation and oversight of graduate programs are more effectively handled within the respective schools, in conjunction with accreditation reviews by their respective professional groups. Faculty and administrators in these areas point to the specialized nature of their curricula and the professional nature of their programs as reasons why standards should be set locally and curricular and program oversight should remain school-specific. They suggest, too, that some recruitment functions -- and, in the case of business, some development functions -- are also better carried out in a decentralized fashion.

Thus, while the increased consistency resulting from centralized record-keeping and monitoring of university-wide policies and students' progress-towards-degree is acknowledged to be
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advantageous, curricular oversight and the establishment of program standards continue to be held as prerogatives of the individual schools. The 1993 WASC recommendation that there be "oversight of graduate programs beyond the departmental or school level" and that the graduate council might usefully play a role in such oversight has, thus, not been implemented, primarily because the current decentralized organization of the graduate programs is preferred by the academic areas offering those programs.

Although a graduate council was established in 1991 (following a recommendation included in the 1987 WASC interim report), the group has not been given a policy-making or program oversight role. In 1991, the Provost and deans of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education, and Nursing approved the formation of a council consisting of the Graduate Dean, one of the academic deans, and a faculty member teaching at the graduate level from each of the four schools. This council, chaired by and advisory to the Graduate Dean, was established as a forum for the sharing of information about graduate programs. In order to better fulfill this informational function, the group has been expanded since 1992 to include all the graduate program directors, the University Librarian, and the directors of Sponsored Programs and Graduate Admissions. The directors of Financial Aid and International Resources are frequent visitors to the council meetings.

Because of the continuing preference for a decentralized approach to graduate education, the roles of the graduate council and the graduate school remain limited: the graduate council serves as a forum for communication between graduate program directors and administrators involved in admissions, record-keeping, financial aid and other graduate procedures, and the graduate school functions as a service unit to the four academic schools, who independently set academic standards and oversight procedures for their masters, doctoral, certificate, and credential programs.

Support for Graduate Programs
The 1992 Visiting Team report, again echoing the 1987 interim report, identified several areas in which USD's graduate programs would benefit from greater support: teaching load reduction for faculty in graduate programs; increased support and accommodation of faculty research; improved library resources and services; improved support services for graduate students. In the preparation of the present discussion, information was sought from graduate program directors, some faculty, and relevant administrative departments regarding changes in support for graduate programs since 1992. Responses are summarized here.

Faculty teaching load

Faculty who teach in the graduate programs continue to voice concern regarding teaching load, especially as they become increasingly involved in research. Currently, faculty typically teach both undergraduate and graduate courses. A few faculty members have suggested that there should be a specifically designated "graduate faculty," with an associated modification in teaching load and expectation of research activity. So far,
however, there is no move to establish a graduate faculty or to designate specific status or 
requirements for faculty who teach graduate courses. The teaching load for all faculty 
varies from school to school, depending on how the dean and his or her faculty have 
chosen to manage and maintain the appropriate student/faculty ratios. Currently, Arts and 
Sciences has a 9/12 (or 12/9) credit-hour teaching load, Business Administration and 
Nursing have a 9/9 load, and Education continues with a 12/12 load.

**Support for research**

Respondents in most areas emphasized the "solid" and "improved" support for faculty 
research, particularly in terms of the university's Faculty Research Grants; these are 
administered within each school and serve, in part, as a vehicle for reducing an individual 
faculty member's teaching load based on research activity. The assistance provided to 
faculty by the Sponsored Programs Office has been acknowledged and praised.

**Library resources**

Both faculty and administrators in graduate programs note "significant improvement" in 
the library resources and services in recent years, especially in terms of increased journal 
collections, on-line data retrieval, and the library's continuing responsiveness to 
acquisitions requests by faculty. In terms of process, however, there is still no 
requirement that a formal assessment of what additional library and informational 
resources will be needed as new graduate programs come on-line; the inclusion of such a 
"library impact statement" in every program proposal would assist the library in 
responding to graduate program needs. (See section on Library for a more complete 
discussion.)

**Graduate Student Support services**

In several areas, the support services for graduate students have been strengthened, 
although most respondents acknowledge that much still remains to be done. Examples 
of some of the new or increased services:

- The **Graduate Office** has funded a half-time graduate tutor position in the Writing 
  Center on a two-year pilot basis, in response to the increasing number of graduate 
  students seeking assistance there, particularly international students experiencing 
  difficulties writing papers in English.

- **Academic Computing** has extended its laboratory hours until 11 p.m. to 
  accommodate graduate student schedules.

- Graduate students are now represented on committees of the University's **Board of 
  Trustees**.
The Counseling Center has initiated a thesis and dissertation support group; the Center reports an increase in personal counseling appointments by graduate students; test administrations for the MAT (required for admission to the Ed.D. program) and MMPI (required for admission to the MFCC program) are now more frequent; and some hours have been extended.

The Office of Career Services has initiated a number of services for graduate students, including a Graduate Career Night, programming and publicity efforts targeted at graduate students, and a comprehensive survey of the previous year's graduates.

The Financial Aid Office has directed attention to graduate students' needs, especially regarding assistance with outside resources and with student loans.

Based on input from graduate student leaders (primarily at the regular meetings of the Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees), the Student Affairs unit expresses a sense that more should be done by their area for graduate students. Both Student Activities and the Graduate Office have found, however, that students in the graduate and professional programs tend not to attend social, cultural, or informational events planned for the whole graduate population, but are more likely to participate, if at all, in student activities within their own discipline areas. Perhaps related to this, the "inter-government board," established in 1994-95 with the goal of fostering better communication among the various graduate organizations and the undergraduate Associated Students, has not been active this past year. Given the increasing size of the graduate student population, it may be appropriate for Student Affairs to consider offering specific leadership training, advising services, and programming support to each graduate association.

A strong link has developed between Student Affairs and the graduate students in Education: fourteen graduate assistantships are available within the various departments of Student Affairs, employing graduate students on a half-time basis to assist in such areas as Community Service Learning, Alcohol and Drug Education, Leadership Development, and Orientation. These positions have drawn applicants from among the masters students in Education, many of whom are planning careers in student services.

International Student Services. Respondents from both the academic and student affairs areas expressed concern regarding international graduate students, whose numbers at USD have grown steadily over the past ten years. Many respondents indicate that the services provided by the university have not met the needs of this population. For example, the University provides no English-language training
for international students, even though many, including graduate students, have required substantial assistance with their English writing skills. The International Resources Office points in particular to the need for more mentoring programs for international students and accompanying spouses. In the spring of 1996, the outgoing Provost called a meeting of the deans and the Director of International Resources to discuss the growth in USD’s international student population. The increasing internationalization of the university, in terms of both curriculum and student demographics, has the strong support of faculty and administrators, but many feel that the university must take a closer look at both its goals and its responsibilities in this regard.

Conclusion
Discussion among university groups will continue regarding the general graduate concerns identified in the 1992 WASC visiting team report -- the issue of work-load for faculty who teach graduate students, the institutional culture for graduate study, graduate financial aid, and the changing demographics of the graduate student population. Similarly, the organizational questions raised in the report will also be explored further: whether there should be centralized oversight of graduate programs, whether the graduate council should be reconstituted and given a role in that oversight, what the role of the graduate school should be in the administration of graduate programs, and what the organizational relationship between the academic deans and the dean of Graduate and Continuing Education should be.

Other related issues, though not articulated in the WASC team report, will enter the conversation as well: what role should the graduate school take in helping to develop and administer programs, such as a masters in liberal studies, that, if offered, would cross discipline or school lines? what role could the graduate school usefully play in encouraging graduate offerings in one area (such as Arts and Sciences) that would benefit the graduate program in another area (such as Nursing)? And, if the role of the graduate school is to change in relation to the graduate programs, then, from an institutional point of view, is the current combination of the graduate school in a single unit with continuing education and special sessions the most effective organizational plan? These are among the questions to be explored over the next few years, as the direction of the university is established under the leadership of a new Provost and President.
COPLEY LIBRARY AND MEDIA SERVICES

The librarians in Copley Library have presided over strong and steady growth of collections, personnel, services, automation and floorspace since the merger forming the university in 1972. The WASC visiting team in 1982 recognized the steady growth that had been made up till that time. For the past two and one half decades, the university administration has made funds available for each primary area of growth without detriment to the others. In some areas of collection development such as business reference, education, and humanities, genuine strengths have become evident. The library faculty has high morale and is noted on campus for its proactive teaching role.

On the other hand, Copley Library as it appears to the faculty and independent observers is still weak in its support of some academic areas, especially graduate programs, when actual needs are taken into account. This is reflected in the report of the 1992 WASC visitation committee and also in a 1996 faculty survey sent out to assess progress since the 1992 visit.

A primary measure of library growth has been the acquisitions budget which, as seen on the accompanying table, has grown steadily over the past decades. This growth has enabled the library to carry out an annual book buying program of 10,000 titles and also to increase the periodicals subscription list each year by an average of just under one hundred titles. In the 1992 WASC Self Study, Copley Library reported owning 215,000 book titles and 1,700 current periodical subscriptions. By mid-1996 this has increased to 261,000 titles and 2,000 subscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Acquisitions Budget History of Copley Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Acquisitions Budget History of Copley Library (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>$354,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/83</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981/82</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>$185,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79</td>
<td>$165,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977/78</td>
<td>$137,000 (Approx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976/77</td>
<td>$108,500 (Approx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975/76</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974/75</td>
<td>$66,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973/74</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in the 1992 Self Study, two librarian positions were added to the faculty in 1991, bringing the total professional staff to eight librarians and three administrative appointments.

The implementation of an integrated automation system, which came online in 1991, was funded entirely with money from bond issues and special funds set aside for such purposes as retrospective conversion of non-electronic records. Modules enhancing the capabilities of the system have been bought and added to it each year. Other advances such as lighting improvements have also been implemented in recent years.

Any evaluation of library resources on the USD campus must take into account the Legal Research Center, whose growth has paralleled that of Copley Library. With a collection roughly equal in size to Copley Library's, it serves the broad needs of the entire university's academic program.
Table 2: USD Library Holdings, July 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copley Library</td>
<td>261,365</td>
<td>330,000 (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Research Center</td>
<td>174,793</td>
<td>391,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (rounded)</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>721,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, Copley Library as it appears to students, faculty, and independent observers is still weak in its support of academic programs, especially graduate programs, when actual needs are taken into account. This is reflected in the 1992 report of the WASC visitation committee and also in a spring 1996 survey of faculty sent out to ascertain progress since the visit. The report from the 1992 WASC visit identified seven areas where library growth might be enhanced so that academic programs might be more fully supported.

Responses to WASC recommendations
The report from the 1992 WASC visit identified seven areas where library growth might be enhanced so that all academic programs might be more fully supported.

Collection Development Model

The 1992 WASC team recommended the implementation a collection development model that relies less heavily on faculty selection of materials. The library faculty and the university academic administration respectfully disagree with this recommendation. It is not feasible for the library to field professional bibliographers for the multitude of disciplines taught at the university. Instead the library has long practiced a model in which collection development is shared by both librarians and faculty. Each librarian accepts responsibility as a liaison to a professional school or academic departments. Recommendations for new books and journal subscriptions are made by faculty and filtered through the librarian liaison before going on to the Acquisitions Department. The librarian liaison keeps his or her school or departments informed of current publishing and monitors the book notification slip programs. In addition, each librarian liaison has control over separate funds to build the collection in the areas he or she oversees. Since faculty tend to recommend book and journal acquisitions to support the areas they teach, it can be assumed that there is a close fit between the growing library collection and academic program needs. In a recent faculty survey, reported in more detail below, the vast majority of respondents indicated they had adequate, good or excellent input into collection development.
In its report for WASC on assessment the library noted its ability to generate enormous amounts of statistics. However, the same report notes that traditional measures, such as circulation statistics, do not necessarily measure fulfillment of library research, that is, whether the persons who use the library, be they undergraduates, graduate students or faculty, have been successful in finding what they actually need to complete their projects. Consequently, the library has embarked on a series of surveys to measure user satisfaction.

A student user survey conducted in November 1995 elicited 264 responses. In answering a question on whether the collection filled their research needs, 148 students stated that they were satisfied or very satisfied; 57 that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

A detailed survey was mailed to 500 full- and part-time faculty in the spring semester of 1996 and 92 responses were received. This survey covered the adequacy of book, periodical, and electronic collections; collection development techniques; reference, instruction, Internet, circulation and reserve services; and use of other San Diego libraries. It offered respondents the opportunity to comment on the funding mix of book, journal, and electronic resources. The vast majority of respondents also commented on what they liked most and least about the library and its services and what specifically can be done to improve the library. On the whole, responses indicate that faculty feel the book collections serve the students well and the faculty itself adequately. The journal collection is felt to be adequate for most student needs, and a majority feel it adequate for their own needs. Nevertheless, a higher number of faculty question the adequacy of the journal collection than any other facet of the collection.

In addition to these library surveys, other campus questionnaires such as the annual survey by the Budget Preparation Committee in the College of Arts and Sciences contain questions about library resources, and the responses are passed on to the library administration. In the past several years, respondents to this questionnaire have indicated they feel the book collection is adequate but the journal subscription list needs to be augmented.

A further important assessment resource is comparison with the libraries of benchmark universities. In gathering statistics from such institutions as Loyola Marymount, the University of San Francisco, Santa Clara University, and Pepperdine University, for example, the need for more periodical subscriptions is further evident.

The library will continue to develop surveys and other types of assessment tools to determine whether needs are actually being met by library development and how such development should proceed.
**Book collection development**

Evaluation of the book collection is an ongoing and permanent procedure. Because of the steady growth in the book collection since the merger of the two colleges in 1972, the attention given the book collection by librarian liaisons, and special funding for new programs coming online such as engineering, no significant lacunae have been left unattended. Standard bibliographic sources such as Choice "Outstanding Academic Books," Books for College Libraries, and citations to important titles in the review literature are checked regularly, and missing books are bought promptly. In developing the collection, a number of book selection devices are used, the most prominent of which is an approval notification slip program with a major academic vendor. In 1994 this notification slip program was completely restudied when the library switched its accounts to a vendor primarily servicing academic institutions. Approval notification slips, Choice cards, and publishers' catalogues are regularly routed to schools and departments on campus; faculty choose from among these and return them to librarian liaisons. Faculty also frequently make title recommendations directly from their own literature reviews.

**Periodical collection development**

As noted above, the journal subscription list has grown from 1,700 to 2,000 titles since the 1992 WASC team's visit to campus. A procedure for regular periodical review was instituted in the early 1990s by which the journal list for each school and department is reviewed every two or three years. By this procedure during the spring semester of 1996, 14 titles were added for the School of Education, 19 for Nursing, and 57 for ten departments in Arts and Sciences. Ten subscriptions were dropped after being deemed no longer relevant to current academic programs.

It should be noted that the titles thus added are current subscriptions and that no provision has been made, despite frequent requests from faculty, for back runs of these titles. The library has to explore the possibility of one-time funding for such back runs.

**Electronic Collection Development**

Copley Library's provision of electronic library services has been enhanced considerably since the 1992 Self Study. Librarians have added twenty-eight new electronic databases on CD-ROM stations, have implemented patron access to the Internet, and have established end-user searching on major online databases such as DataTimes, FirstSearch, Grateful Med, STN, DataStream, and ICPSR. Plans for the immediate future include networking CD-ROM stations along with the provision of networked searching capabilities inside and outside the building by the campus community.
Document Delivery and Interlibrary Cooperation

The library has provided for increased use of the interlibrary loan operation and has included with this the delivery of documents from commercial services such as CARL UnCover and University Microfilms (UMI). The library's policy is to absorb the cost of 25 documents provided from off campus sources to each faculty member and graduate student per year. A library task force is currently examining interlibrary loan operations and the feasibility of increased use of commercial delivery, supported for all students, so that weaknesses in the periodicals collections can be offset.

Until recently the library administration at the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), the city's major research institution, was reluctant to enter into reciprocal exchange agreements with smaller libraries in the community, feeling that UCSD needs were best met within the University of California system as well as the Association of Research Libraries. With new leadership UCSD's stance has changed radically within the past three years. The library directors of UCSD, USD's Copley Library, USD's Legal Research Center, San Diego State University, California State University at San Marcos, and the San Diego Public Library now meet quarterly to develop enhanced agreements. At the most recent meeting of this group the library director from UCSD proposed development of an online catalog for the San Diego region similar to the OHIO LINK project, by which any book in the city would be available to any university student needing it.

In addition, the State Library of California is coordinating the development of a resource sharing plan in which San Diego County will be part of a large, multi-type cooperative schema.

The libraries of ten California private colleges and universities which share the same software system have developed a cooperative buying program with the software producer, Innovative Interfaces, Inc. This cooperative venture has led to discussion of resource sharing as well.

To sum up, the atmosphere for and movement toward library cooperation and resource sharing has developed significantly since the 1992 WASC Self Study.

Collection development policy

The 1992 WASC Report noted the need for a written collection development policy. Rough outlines of such a policy are in place. As noted above, the library has implemented the practice of surveying user satisfaction. With the information and insight gained from these surveys, from the liaison connections of librarians to schools and departments, and from a campus-wide dialogue on the library, a collection development policy will be completed during the 1996-97 academic year.
Librarians have felt the need to engage the faculty and deans in a dialogue on the basic purposes of the library; the nature of its collections and policies; its mix of books, journals, electronic resources, and document delivery services; and its relation to computing operations on campus. The new university academic administration can promote such a dialogue.

**General notes on recent library/media services development.**

In addition to development along the lines of the 1992 WASC visiting team's recommendations, other developments have taken place in the past four years for library and media services.

**Strategic Long Range Plan**

Copley Library took part in the development of a Strategic Long Range Plan for the university during the 1994-95 academic year and produced five- and ten-year plans for growth in the areas of human resources, information resources, technologies of access, facilities, and services both to the campus and to the greater community.

The ten-year plan, including the university's master plan for its construction, calls for a high-tech building addition to the library after the year 2000.

The more detailed five-year plan is the most pertinent to this interim WASC reporting period. This includes the written collection development policy, a disaster preparedness plan (in concert with other libraries in San Diego), the networking of bibliographic and full text databases both within the building and over the campus network system, implementation of new models of public services including enhanced programs of information literacy, physically restructuring the public services areas of the library, and a materials preservation policy.

**Library Committee**

The campus Library Committee has become an effective communicator of campus needs to the library. The committee's membership includes faculty from three professional schools and the College as well as representatives from the School of Graduate and Continuing Education, the library faculty, and Media Services. Graduate and undergraduate student representatives also hold seats but tend not to be active. The chair of the committee is elected from the non-librarian membership. This committee sponsored the faculty survey mentioned above.

**Library faculty**

Librarians hold faculty appointments, progress through the rank and tenure process, and share in university governance as members of the Academic Assembly within the College of Arts and Sciences. Since the 1992 WASC visit, the library director has gained tenure
on the library faculty and three early-career librarians have received promotions from Instructor to Assistant Professor.

Media Services

A new director was appointed to Media Services in the summer of 1995 and he has reviewed public services policies with a view to creating a more user-friendly atmosphere. Software such as CDs and VHS tapes, formerly in closed collections, are now available for student borrowing. The new policies are reflected in the name change of this division from Media Center to Media Services.

Campus automation

The linking of all buildings on campus by a new fiber optic networking system, currently in progress and expected to be completed in 1997, will be a major development for the delivery of library services to students and faculty. The catalog of holdings in Copley Library, the Legal Research Center and Media Services will be available to students in dorm rooms and to all faculty offices. Dial-in capabilities from off campus, currently possible, will be enhanced. In addition, major periodical indexes will be similarly available.

To sum up, since the merger of two colleges in 1972 by which the university was created, there has been a continued trajectory of library growth and development. In his response to the report following the 1992 visit, then President Author Hughes noted that between the 1982 and 1992 visits, 85,000 book titles had been added to Copley's collection, a new building was put up, and the library automation system came online. During the same period a major building addition was provided for the Legal Research Center, which also had significant collection development. Since 1992 there has been additional continued develop of library resources and services on campus.
The 1992 WASC Visiting Team recognized that USD was involved in substantial assessment but indicated that the quantity of assessment data exceeded the quality, that evidence indicating that USD administrators used assessment to shape planning was lacking and that assessment of learning did not show that students developed skills and competencies based on their learning experiences. The Team recommended that USD focus on qualitative assessment and engage in systematic program review. Their four major recommendations were as follows:

- **Recommendation 2.1** - The Campus should plan and coordinate all campus assessment efforts to assure quality, effectiveness, and usefulness.

- **Recommendation 2.2** - The Campus should build regular campus assessment of educational outcomes into general education and departmental programs.

- **Recommendation 2.3** - The Campus should encourage and assist faculty to build ongoing assessments of teaching and learning effectiveness into the fabric of their courses.

- **Recommendation 2.4** - The Campus should connect assessments of co-curricular activities and programs more closely to assessments of curricular outcomes.

For the academic year 1993-94 a University-wide Assessment Committee was formed as an *ad hoc* group. In the summer of 1994 the group became a regular ongoing committee. This University-wide committee consists of thirteen members - faculty and administrators - and is chaired by the Associate Provost-Director of Institutional Research. The specific purposes of the Committee are as follows:

- to recommend policies and establish standards regarding assessment efforts within the University;

- to serve as a resource in assisting and coordinating assessment efforts;

- to serve as the communication link for assessment matters at the University;

- to serve as a liaison with colleges, universities, and external agencies involved in assessment matters.
To respond to Recommendation 2.1 the Committee collected materials on assessment activities and plans that were developed by several universities and members of the Committee attended meetings on Assessment which were sponsored by the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE). After the Committee examined ideas from other universities and the suggestions made at AAHE meetings, the group concluded that USD needed to experiment with its own institution-specific and program-specific methods for finding out what its students are learning.

A report on the findings of the Assessment Committee was sent to the Vice Presidents and Deans in the summer of 1995. (See Appendix I ) It included the ideas which representatives of the academic and student affairs units suggested to the Committee as appropriate assessment efforts to insure quality, effectiveness, and usefulness. In order to get a sense of what kind of assessments were occurring throughout the campus, the Committee, in the summer of 1995, also asked the five Vice Presidents to provide information on what significant assessments were taking place in their units and to indicate if changes and improvements resulted from the assessments. The responses indicated that most units were involved in assessments and used results of their evaluations to improve performance. (See Assessment Responses in Appendix II )

The assessment strategies used in the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools vary and a few examples of how assessment is carried out in the academic units are included. (See Assessment Projects Appendix III )

All areas of the University are engaged in Assessment, including the academic and academic-related units as well as Student Affairs, University Relations, Mission and Ministry, and Finance and Administration. Assessment strategies used in the libraries, the Graduate School, and for promotion of diversity will be considered in other parts of this report. This assessment section will focus on the units which are affected by Recommendations 2.2 and 2.3.

The academic units also all engage in evaluation of faculty, merit reviews, curriculum reviews, and similar activities. However, the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional school often emphasize different aspects of assessment as the following paragraphs indicate.

**College of Arts and Sciences**

In the summer of 1993 four faculty members and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences participated in a workshop sponsored by the Lilly Foundation at Colorado Springs, Colorado. The USD team presented a paper entitled Assessment and Capstone Experiences which outlined how the Arts and Sciences will deal with Assessment issues by using Capstone experiences for their majors. (See Appendix IV ) The natural science areas offer undergraduate research and senior seminars while some departments make extensive use of internships. Faculty-student interaction in undergraduate research experiences is increasing.
In 1994 the Arts and Sciences departments were asked to formulate assessment plans during the period that the Strategic Long-Rang-Plan for 1995-2005 was being developed. By Spring of 1996 all of the departments had completed plans which are available in the Dean's office. Use of capstone courses, portfolios, standardized tests, pre- and post-testing, exit interviews, tracking of alumni, and development of department quarterly newsletters to provide feedback to students are some of the strategies employed. Departments will fully implement the plans in 1996-97. Assessment of general education and some comparative data and analysis on similar plans at other colleges and universities will be part of each document. The plans will clarify goals and expected learning outcomes in areas (e.g., thinking critically, communicating effectively, and solving problems). The plans must indicate if faculty are accomplishing what they say they are accomplishing.

The Academic Affairs Planning Committee of the Academic Assembly in the College of Arts and Sciences has been involved in assessment matters which are central to the planning process.

Efforts to make connections with alumni, who can evaluate their USD education, have been strengthened in the last three years. Curricular revisions have taken place in several areas in a manner that has increased the coherence of given curricula. Chairs of departments have considered ways to improve syllabi construction and the rebuilding of the teacher-course evaluation instrument and process.

Certain limitations in assessment activities were noted. It is recognized that the issue of using objective and quantifiable data versus impressionistic and reflective assessments needs to be addressed more methodically by the departments. Values-based education and ways of assessing it need to be addressed more explicitly given USD's mission statement, and the public posture of the University. The Honors program requires development of an explicit assessment plan which should be set up through collaboration of the Honors Director and the Dean's office. The writing, logic, and mathematics centers must be assessed in relationship to general education electives.

The Dean's office in Arts and Sciences publishes a pamphlet called The First Criterion which has stimulated greater faculty reflection and discussion of learning environments. This document, which has been published every year in October since 1991, chronicles various kinds of pedagogical efforts and describes how faculty are committed to engaging students in their education. (See Appendix V)

The October 1994 edition of the First Criterion examined, in one of its articles, how students have reacted to preceptorials. The preceptorial program has been improved recently. Academic components have been added to orientation and common readings have been sent to all incoming Freshmen. Focus groups of Freshmen probed the experience with their preceptors. Preceptors agreed in-class activities, developmental advising, registration activities, and academic social contact outside the classroom are very important. The focus groups revealed that preceptors usually serve as the first contact point when students had academic or non-academic questions.
Positive preceptorial experiences are primary determinants of student success. Negative experiences make it difficult for students to choose a major and lead them to give serious thought to transferring. As part of a grant from the Irvine Foundation, USD selected fifteen preceptors to receive additional training, compensation, and resources to assist them in working with students.

School of Business Administration

In the School of Business Administration students work to solve real-life business problems using the latest computer software models to help analyze and compile data. Fifteen percent of the faculty are teaching by experiential learning methods or hands-on approaches. In marketing courses students meet with clients, discuss and develop plans, implement them, and present results. Beginning in 1996, the School of Business Administration plans to participate in a three-year benchmarking study to provide a thorough assessment of its MBA program. This study, sponsored by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, will help USD to compare its program to those of peer and competitive institutions.

Teaching evaluations are collected in every class every semester and peer visitations are made in classes of untenured faculty. The Associate Dean meets with each tenured faculty member to review performance and discuss plans for the next year. Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committees continually review the curriculum and all new courses are examined to determine their value. ETS tests have been used to compare learning of students against national norms and they will be repeated periodically. Each faculty member assesses the learning of their students. Courses are redesigned, new materials added, and texts are changed on a regular basis. A Teaching Excellence Committee (TEC) and brown bag seminars provide forums to review teaching techniques.

School of Nursing

The School of Nursing (SON) has a master plan for program evaluation and assessments are ongoing while entire program reviews are carried out by level every four years. The plan provides for follow-up. Once evaluations are completed, action is taken by individuals or committees. SON uses a self-assessment service provided by Educational Testing Service (ETS) to evaluate its programs by level. Another survey instrument also has been developed and sent to alumni/ae to give to their employers. The purpose of this is to learn from employers how they evaluate the performance of USD’s nursing graduates. Nursing (SON), following its Master Plan, is conducting an evaluation of the RN-MSN program and has solicited evaluative input from employers of graduates at both graduate (MSN and DNS) and undergraduate levels. Information from focus group sessions with current and potential graduates has resulted in curriculum changes in the core component of the Master in Science of Nursing (MSN) program.

Within SON, a Curriculum Committee also deals with evaluative findings from the yearly ETS assessments of the curriculum. A more systematic evaluation process is needed for support staff and this assessment will be conducted by administrators with input from faculty.
School of Education
The School of Education has a framework for assessment. On a yearly basis the School conducts reviews, including those of faculty, staff, supervising teachers, and student teachers. Practicum sites are also evaluated. Graduates are followed up every three years to assess his or her progress and program reviews occur every five years. Inventories of teaching methods/strategies of assessment methods and of assignments are made at regular intervals. As a result of the accreditation of the Marriage, Family and Child Counseling (MFCC) Program, two additional full-time faculty members were added and the number of units required was increased from 30 to 40.

School of Law
The School of Law (SOL) engages in the following significant assessment activities. It develops reports for accreditation by ABA, AALS and the Order of COIF. It prepares students for the California Bar examinations and analyzes the results. The Dean of the Law School and the ABA closely scrutinize retention rates and both believe USD’s rates are quite good. The school conducts faculty reviews of curriculum and grading. The Student Bar Association (SBA) conducts surveys regarding student services. Personnel committees carry out reviews of faculty and students evaluate faculty teaching. The Dean conducts annual merit reviews of faculty, and assessment activities are ongoing. Administrative restructuring is also being carried out.

Recent National Association for Law Placement (NALP) surveys reveal that 89% of USD’s law graduates are employed six months after graduation. Many USD graduates pursue traditional careers in private practice with specialized or full-service law firms; others find satisfying employment in government, business, academia, high technology, computer law, medicine, and non-traditional careers. Starting salaries in the private sector range from $42,000 to $72,000 and from $36,000 to $42,000 in the government sector.

Student Affairs
The Student Affairs division is engaged in many assessment activities including use of surveys and focus groups, evaluation of Associated Student Programs and events, and development of reports on student withdrawals. Examples of some of the programs evaluated by Student Affairs include: Concerts, film forums, athletic events, homecoming, retreats, and Greek System Events. Student Affairs also works on special projects such as student development transcripts and mentor workshops. Many programs are offered for those who are residents and residence directors meet weekly for goal setting and performance discussions. Events also are planned to serve commuter students and a special handbook is designed for commuters. The methods used are outlined in a chart which indicates the program, type of evaluation, frequency and person responsible for conducting the assessment. (See Appendix VI)

Academic Services and Academic Related Programs
The Academic Related and Academic Services offices, which assist the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools, regularly assess their activities with a view to improving quality and making changes to provide more efficient operations. A few examples will indicate
how assessments are carried out in these areas. In the Counseling Center each professional’s work is evaluated regularly by the Director and student input is considered in such evaluations. Undergraduate Admissions reviews sources, contacts, and yield rates, and also gets feedback from students who visit campus, attend programs, or apply for admissions. Graduate Admissions uses focus groups in recruitment efforts. The Continuing Education unit changes courses, content, and program objectives after receiving suggestions from program participants. The office of Sponsored Research provides an important service to faculty by critiquing proposal drafts and, in cases of unsuccessful proposals, assisting the proposal writer in obtaining and interpreting reviewer comments.

Community Service Learning which works closely with Student Affairs and faculty groups has engaged in an extensive assessment process. The Faculty Experiential Education Committee initiated a grant from the Corporation for National Service in 1994-95 and the USD Community Service Learning project became a National Demonstration Project for continuous improvement. From Fall 1994 through Spring 1996 approximately 1,000 students participated in community service learning through 41 courses. (See Appendix VII)

**Institutional Assessment**

Recommendation 2.4 suggested that assessments of co-curricular activities should be connected more closely to assessments of curricular outcomes. Several units collaborate in projects which have both curricular and co-curricular outcomes. For example, the Student Affairs Office cooperates with the Office of Institutional Research and the Alumni Office in the development, analysis and distribution of student surveys. The Institutional Research Office works with academic deans and faculty in the development, analysis, and distribution of faculty surveys. The University Relations department provides information to faculty and deans on impressions, concerns, accolades, perceptions, and in some cases fears on the part of parent, student and friend constituencies.

The Assessment Committee decided, in 1995, that institutional goals and objectives, which are identified in the Strategic Long-Range Plan designed to cover from 1995 - 2005, should be assessed to insure that they are being implemented.

Currently the University's commitment to values in its undergraduate and professional academic programs is being reviewed. There is great interest in how a USD education affects students in terms of values. Faculty have incorporated ethical content in the majority of courses that the University offers. The Philosophy Department has offered a very successful workshop on Ethics-Across-the-Curriculum. The University now has applied for a grant from the E. L. Wiegand Foundation to support a University-wide project in Ethics-Across-the-Curriculum. The purpose will be to have a philosopher, who is an established scholar, come to campus for a

---

1 Since this report was developed, the Wiegand Foundation has provided a two-year grant of $138,000 to USD to pursue its Ethics-Across-the-Curriculum Project. The Assessment Committee will be involved in assuring that the appropriate instruments to assess the project are used.
week of lectures and discussions. The Philosophy Department will offer across disciplinary workshops open to all faculty during the scholar’s visit to campus. The University will follow up on the scholar’s visit by 1) developing ethical issues components in existing courses; 2) bringing in local guest speakers; and 3) acquiring ethics-related materials such as video tapes, and CD-Rom interactive programs for classroom use. In addition, Professor John Wilcox from Manhattan College in New York will be on the USD campus from November 6-9, 1996 to conduct values audits of faculty, students, administration, and staff.

The Assessment Committee has established a sub-committee to develop assessment instruments which can be used to evaluate the outcomes of the ethics project. In September 1996, the sub-committee will, as a first step, conduct a poll to determine how much interest there is among faculty in serving on committees to evaluate the ethics project.

Retention

In Summer of 1995, the Assessment Committee recommended to the Provost that a University-wide Committee be set up to determine if students at USD are having a good educational experience and to examine both why students stay and why they leave the University.

The Retention Committee, which includes faculty and administrators, meets once a month during Fall and Spring semesters. It has interviewed many individuals in units dealing with retention issues and will bring recommendations to the administration in a short time. Issues which are being considered include 1) where more resources in terms of money and personnel are needed to improve retention; and 2) whether one individual or a number of lead units (e.g., Admissions, Counseling Center, Registrar, Student Services) which interact frequently should ensure that actions are carried out to make sure students are having a good educational experience at USD. There is also concern that too many students remain undeclared about their majors for too long. A study of the reasons for lack of declaration will be undertaken. There is a recognition that students who are having difficulty need to be identified and helped as soon as possible.

The office of Institutional Research has developed an assessment bibliography which will be published in Faculty Newsnotes in September 1996. New books are added to the list on a continuing basis. The books are available to all campus constituencies and they can be checked out at the office of Institutional Research.

The use of surveys helps USD to determine attitudes, and to identify positive and negative aspects of programs. Three recent surveys which were distributed and analyzed included a Student Survey (1994), a Career Services Survey (1995) and a Faculty Survey (1996).
USD participated in a 1994 College Student Survey which was administered by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. Seven hundred and twenty-five USD seniors participated. Responses from USD students were compared with those in the following private universities: Catholic University of America, Creighton University, Emory University, Fordham University, Marquette University, Northeastern University, University of Notre Dame, and University of Portland.

The report showed that USD students have goals and aspirations similar to those of the respondents from the above-mentioned private universities. Some differences also were noted. The following information shows how USD’s students compared with the others in certain categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Compared</th>
<th>USD Students</th>
<th>Students in Other Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Internship Programs</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored another student</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did volunteer work</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended religious services/meetings</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialized with different ethnic groups</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a personal computer</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majored in business</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked for environmental cleanup</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted racial understanding</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt bored in class</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with relevance of course work to life</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had opportunities to talk with professors</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with academic advising</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with career counseling and advising</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Compared, Con’t.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Compared</th>
<th>USD Students</th>
<th>Students in Other Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with overall college experience</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with ethnic diversity of faculty</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would enroll in this college again (yes or probably yes)</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish to influence political structure</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish to influence social values</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Services Surveys
The Career Services Office, for the first time, surveyed all 1994 USD graduates on their endeavors during the year following completion of their studies. The survey sought feedback on their employment status and on graduate school enrollment. It also asked about the type and extent of career-related preparation in which the students participated while they were enrolled at USD. Surveys were returned by 32% of the 1,116 who received them. More than 97% of the 356 respondents identified career related experiences in which they participated at USD. Such experiences included:

- Full-time employment 27.5%
- Part-time summer employment 66%
- Internship 41%
- Community Service 37%
- Class assigned projects 36%
- Research laboratory experience 13%
- Student/Professional organization 29%
- Intercollegiate sports 9%

Approximately 30% of undergraduates applied for graduate schools immediately after graduation. Others found employment in the following sectors:

- Business 48%
- Educational institutions 19.5%
- Government/Military 6.5%
- Non-profit organizations 5%
- Other 7%
Faculty Survey
USD’s undergraduate faculty participated in a 1995 survey sponsored by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles. Seventy-five faculty members, one-third of the group who were solicited, responded. Of the respondents 74% indicated their primary interest was teaching and 26% reported that research was their primary interest. Although extensive lecturing is employed as an instruction method, other techniques used include class discussion, computer instruction, cooperative learning, experiential learning and field studies, group projects, independent projects, and community service as an optional part of a course. Ninety-three percent devoted time to research and scholarly writing. Over 79% of the respondents also committed time to community or public service. Professional writings or performances were published or presented by 81% of the respondents in the last two years.

Other survey findings indicated that: 1) Faculty are interested in students' problems (85%); 2) Faculty want to help students understand values (68%); 3) Faculty want to facilitate student involvement in community service (70%); 4) The overall job satisfaction of faculty was at (77%); 5) Faculty were satisfied with their undergraduate course assignments (88%) and their job security (95%).

On the negative side, faculty cited reasons for stress as time pressures (91%), lack of personal time (82%), and teaching load (77%). Thirty-seven percent indicated that social activities were over-emphasized at USD and only 21% believed students were well prepared academically.

National Collegiate Athletic Association Certification
The University is engaged in a campus-wide review of its athletic programs and is preparing a self-study to be submitted to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The purpose of the study is to ensure that the quality and integrity of USD’s intercollegiate athletic programs is being maintained. A steering Committee is overseeing the work of four subcommittees on governance, academic integrity, fiscal integrity, and commitment to equity. By February, 1997 a final self-study will be submitted to the NCAA. This will be followed by a peer-review team evaluation visit. By May, 1997 the University will be informed if it will receive certification for its Division I Athletic Programs.

Conclusion
Since the last team visit, as this report demonstrates, USD departments and units have made serious efforts in ongoing assessment in order to improve their performance so they can operate more efficiently. Academic departments have given considerable attention to the assessment of student learning and use a variety of techniques to evaluate student competencies. The College of Arts and Sciences, for example, now has assessment plans for each of its departments available in the Dean’s office. The professional schools also have improved their assessment plans. The campus is more aware of the importance and value of efforts at evaluation now than it was in 1992.
Although much improvement has taken place since 1992, the Assessment Committee recognizes that more studies which will require collaboration of all units across the campus will be needed to address issues that have an impact on USD as a whole. The Committee, in 1996-97, will devote time to evaluating and deciding what steps should be taken to ensure that implementation of the institutional mission and goals statements presented in the University’s Long-Range Plan are being carried out.
MAJOR CHANGES

The campus remains in transition as adjustments are made to the appointment of a new President in 1995 and the appointment of a new Provost in 1996. In addition, the USD community undertook the development of a new Strategic Long Range Plan in 1994-95 to guide the development of the campus into the next century. Simultaneously, the campus has undertaken the approval process with the City of San Diego of a Master Plan for future capital expansion of the campus, a lengthy process which is now partially complete. It is difficult to imagine changes and processes which would impact the campus climate and structure as profoundly as these four. The Strategic Long Range Plan is covered in detail in another chapter of this report. The other major changes, in personnel and capital facilities, as well as changes within specific units of the University, will be enumerated here.

Major Personnel Changes
As mentioned above, the University of San Diego has selected two new administrators to fill the vacancies created by the retirement of the President and the Academic Vice President and Provost. The search processes for these two positions are covered in some detail in another section of this report. After so many years of unchanging leadership which established an excellent foundation, the University of San Diego is poised on the brink of exciting changes and growth in the immediate future.

President

In July, 1995, Dr. Alice B. Hayes assumed the leadership position vacated with the retirement of Dr. Author Hughes, who had served as President of the University of San Diego since 1971. Dr. Hayes' official inauguration took place on November 12, 1995.

Dr. Hayes came to USD from Saint Louis University, where she had served as Executive Vice President, Provost and Professor of Biology since 1989. Prior to assuming that post, she had spent 27 years at Loyola University of Chicago, where she served as Vice President for Academic Affairs (1987-1989), Associate Academic Vice President (1980-1987), Dean for the Natural Sciences (1977-1987) and Chairperson of the Department of Natural Science (1969-1977). From 1960 to 1962, she conducted mycology research for the Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium.

Dr. Hayes has served on the Boards of Trustees of the Pulitzer Publishing Company, St. Louis Science Center, The Urban League of Metropolitan St. Louis, and Catholic Charities. She has been a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Space Biology Program and has served on Advisory Panels of the National Science Foundation.

Dr. Hayes has won an Award for Leadership and Service from both the National Multiple Sclerosis Society and the Holocaust Memorial Foundation, among others. A biologist
with a Ph.D. in Biological Sciences from Northwestern University, where she was a National Science Foundation Fellow, she has published numerous books and articles on the natural sciences and on Catholic higher education. As part of the People-to-People Citizen Ambassador Program, she participated in Botanical Delegations to South Africa, the People's Republic of China, and the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Another long-time administrator, USD Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Sister Sally Furay, retired in July, 1996, after devoting 44 years to teaching and administrative work at the San Diego College for Women and the University of San Diego. USD's new Vice President and Provost is Dr. Francis Lazarus, who has held the position of Vice President for Academic Affairs at Marquette University in Wisconsin since 1988. Before that, Dr. Lazarus spent eight years at the University of Dayton in Ohio, where he served as the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Prior to joining Dayton, he was Associate Academic Dean at Salem College in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. During his seven years at Salem College, he was Chairman of Classics and Director of the Honors Program.

Dr. Lazarus was named an Administrative Fellow of the American Council on Education in 1978, serving for one year as Special Assistant to the President of Memphis State University. Before joining the University of Dayton faculty, he was an Assistant Professor at the United States Military Academy at West Point from 1970 to 1973.

Dr. Lazarus has participated as a professional archaeologist in excavations in Nemea, Greece, as part of a 1977 University of California expedition and in Tel Beer Sheba, Israel, as part of a 1972 Tel Aviv University/University of North Carolina joint expedition. In 1993, he was a consultant to a University Feasibility Study at the Port Authority of Freeport, Bahamas.

Lazarus holds an A.B. degree (with concentrations in classical languages and philosophy) from Canisius College in Buffalo, New York, and an M.A. and a Ph.D. in Classical Languages from Cornell University. He is the editor of Discovery, Faith, Service: Perspectives on Jesuit Education (Marquette University Press, 1992).

Vice President of Mission and Ministry

In 1993, the Division of Mission and Ministry was created and Msgr. I. Brent Eagen was appointed Vice President of Mission and Ministry. Msgr. Eagen has a long history of involvement with the University of San Diego and the greater San Diego community.

Educated at Loyola Marymount University, the University of California Los Angeles, and North American College in Rome, Monsignor Eagen has held many important posts and
memberships. He has, among other church activities, served as chancellor of the Diocese of San Diego, Member of USD's Board of Trustees, and as National Trustee for the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Today, he holds membership on the Board of Directors of the Foundation for the Children of the Americas. The following are among the many honors he has received: National Conference of Christians and Jews Regional Brotherhood Award, Doctor of Humane Letters from USD, Good Samaritan Award from the First United Methodist Church, and A Man For All Seasons Award from the Saint Vincent De Paul/Joan Kroc Center.

Dean of the School of Business Administration

A search committee has been established to select a Dean of the School of Business Administration, to replace Dr. James M. Burns, who will retire at the end of the 1996-97 academic year.

Capital Improvements and Master Plan

The University of San Diego has undertaken several major capital improvements in the past four years. The former Diocesan Office was acquired by USD in 1995, renovated and dedicated as the Hughes Administration Building. Fulfilling a long-time goal of bringing together services frequently used by students, the Career Center, Financial Aid, Loan Counseling, and Cashier's offices have been moved to this building. The Hughes Center also houses the President, Vice President of Finance and Administration, Vice President of University Relations, Academic Vice President and Provost, and other administrative offices. An information desk in the lobby of the building helps to direct students and visitors with information about the campus. The relocation of these services and offices has freed up much-needed space in Maher Hall for the expansion and relocation of other administrative and student services offices as well. The additional space also includes four new classrooms, including one fully devoted to teaching with computer technology.

In 1994, the USD Bookstore was remodeled to more than double its former size. The new facility includes an extensive computer store, additional textbook display and storage space, additional sundry retail space and a small convenience market. The new addition to Loma Hall also houses the Post Office in a new state-of-the-art facility. On the floors above the bookstore, new classrooms and faculty offices were constructed.

Strong interest in science majors has increased demand in Biology, Chemistry, and Marine/Environmental Studies and has put exceptional pressure on laboratory facilities, in particular. A temporary solution was introduced in 1996 with the construction of a warehouse which has made possible the doubling of General Chemistry lab space and the relocation of Marine/Environmental Studies labs from what was clearly an outdated facility. The temporary space can alleviate certain bottlenecks; a faculty science facility task force has been meeting over the last year to design the functional aspects of needed science facilities that will more closely
align the location of the sciences at USD. The time line to configuring and constructing such facilities is estimated at eight years.

In 1996, a central fountain was constructed which will anchor the pedestrian mall at the center of campus. Further plans for additional buildings, including a much-needed parking structure and sports/recreation facility, await the final approval of USD's Master Plan by the City of San Diego. In the appendix of this report is a copy of the USD Plan for Campus Development and Community Investment for the 21st Century, a brochure which shows existing buildings and planned improvements (Appendix I). The lengthy city approval process is in its final stages, and some new facilities are expected to be constructed before the next full WASC review.

**Technological Changes**
The university invested in several major technical improvements and upgraded its information management infrastructure during the past four years. Major additions or improvements include the following:

- Installation of a fiber optic network backbone to all buildings on the main campus
- Wiring for network/internet access of all student housing on the upper campus with plans to complete the rest of student housing within 3 years
- T-1 connection to the internet
- Commitment of an additional $500,000 per year from the president for improvement of information technology
- Expanded and upgraded laboratory facilities in the School of Business Administration and the Legal Research Center
- Creation of a new Faculty/Administrative/Staff computer training facility
- Satellite down-link capability
- Installation of local area networks/file servers in the schools of Law, Business and Nursing
- Two-thirds of Arts and Science faculty now have computer access from their desktop and nearly all faculty in the schools of Law, Business, Nursing and Education have a computer on their desktop
- Installation of dedicated e-mail and world-wide-web servers
Major Changes in Units of the University

All units, both academic and non-academic, were asked to inform the Fourth Year Report Committee about significant changes or new programs which have been introduced since the 1992 WASC team visit. Common threads throughout their responses reflect the emphases in the Strategic Long Range Plan on technological development, cooperative programs between the curricular and co-curricular, commitment to diversity and community outreach.

Academic Units

In the academic units, the following developments have occurred in the last four years or will occur in the very near future:

- The Arts and Science unit will introduce an interdisciplinary major and minor in Urban Studies in Fall, 1996.
- The John Ahlers Center for International Business was established with a five million-dollar gift.
- The Hahn Chair in Real Estate Finance was created in memory of USD Board of Trustees Chair, Ernest Hahn.
- The engineering faculty was split from the College of Arts and Sciences and now reports to the Dean of the School of Business Administration.
- A new Industrial and Systems Engineering major was created.
- A partnership with San Diego State University is developing a joint doctoral program to service San Diego County K-12 educators.
- The School of Education has undertaken a melding of the Special Education and Teacher Education programs.
- The Family Health Clinical Nurse Specialist track within the Masters of Science in Nursing program is being phased out by December, 1996.
- A new track, entitled "Case Management for Vulnerable Populations," was initiated within the MSN program in Fall 1995.
- The School of Law faculty has approved offering an LL.M. in International Law in 1996.
The School of Law received a major gift to design a new and expanded clinical experience for about 200 law students each year which will emphasize transactional skills as well as litigation skills.

Effective March, 1, 1996, the USD School of Law has been admitted as an official chapter of The Order of the Coif, a nationally-recognized and highly esteemed designation in legal education.

The university’s summer program in Guadalajara, Mexico, for many years administered independently by a faculty member in the Political Science Department, was brought under the umbrella of the Special Sessions Office as of September, 1994.

The Division of Graduate Career Programs terminated a long-standing agreement with an outside consultant in August, 1995, and began offering test preparation courses and the paralegal training program independently.

**Academic Related Units**

Since the last team visit in 1992, the following changes took place in the academic-related units:

- Copley Library has increased its book collection by 37,000 moving from 217,000 to 261,000 titles; journal subscriptions have also increased from 1,700 to 2,100.

- In 1996, the library plans to redesign the Public Services floor of the Copley building to remove the card catalog and double the size of the circulation area, while redesigning the reference area to be more approachable.

- The Legal Research Center focused on collection development with the volume count reaching 373,308 by August 31, 1995.

- All Media Center policies have been reviewed by the new Director of Media Services, and changes have been undertaken to improve user services.

- The Office of Sponsored programs has been expanded to support greater opportunities for faculty research.

- Working in conjunction with the Office of Sponsored Programs, University faculty received annual grant revenue totalling $2.379M for 1992/93, $2.561M for 1994/95, and $2.143M for 1995/96.
The Office of Undergraduate Admissions has enhanced recruiting efforts by increasing the number of quality personal contacts between prospective students and alumni and parent representatives of the University through a program called Volunteer Admissions Network (VAN).

Course-based service learning established a faculty/student leader approach to integrating service learning into academic study through a Corporation for National Service "Learn and Serve America" Higher Education grant.

Academic Services

In the several units which report to the Dean of Academic Services, major changes in the past four years have been as follows:

- Through the Career Services Offices, students seeking employment now have computerized access to an alumni database.
- A new Director of Disability Services was hired in 1996 in response to the University-wide increase in students with disabilities in the past three years.

Student Affairs

The numerous areas which report to the Vice President of Student Affairs have instituted the following changes since the last team visit:

- Football moved from Division III to Division I-AA and also became a member of the Pioneer Football League in Fall 1993.
- To recognize excellence in athletics, the USD Athletics Hall of Fame was established in Fall 1994.
- Dining needs of the USD community have been addressed by the opening of Aromas Coffeehouse in Spring, 1994, and T House (Asian foods) in 1995. Aromas, a state-of-the-art cybercafe, has been outfitted with e-mail and web browsing stations and received the Laura E. Horton award from the National Association of College and University Food Services as the outstanding college specialty shop in the nation.
- Special undergraduate, graduate & Law School orientations for international students were held for the first time.
The International Holiday Dinner, International Fashion Show, International Coffee Hour, and International Food Fair are examples of new programs created to address the needs of the growing international student body.

Cable television was installed in lounges in traditional residence halls and in each apartment unit for undergraduates.

The Residential Living Options (RLOs) were created in Fall, 1995, to provide living environments for students who share the same interests.

The Residential Hall Council (RHC) was initiated during fall semester 1995, providing residence hall student government and programming.

The United Front, a coalition of multicultural student organizations, was founded in 1993. In 1994 the group was provided with office space and a lounge, as well as computer equipment and a graduate assistant.

A Women's Center was established in the Hahn University Center. In 1995, a Director of Women's Programs position was established in Associated Students.

In Spring, 1996, the Associated Students established two directorships for Multicultural Programming and Multicultural Student Issues respectively, establishing permanent budget lines for addressing the concerns and programming needs of students from under-represented populations.

A student initiative established seats for undergraduate and graduate students representatives on nearly every committee of the Board of Trustees.

One national fraternity and one national sorority colonized in Spring 1995.

In partnership with USD's School of Education, Student Affairs will administer an internship program for the Leadership Minor beginning in Fall, 1996.

**Division of Mission and Ministry**

The following new programs have been undertaken by this new University division:

- A variety of worship opportunities are now offered, including Latin and Spanish Masses, Dorm Masses, Black History Month Mass, EOP Masses and Advent and Lenten Masses. An All Faith Service to begin the Spring semester has become a new tradition. A Navy Sabbath Prayer Service and Taizé Prayer Service have been offered.
The Division published a document entitled "Insight," which details the history, heritage, mission and goals of the University of San Diego. (Appendix II)

Programs were developed for outreach to pre-college students, in collaborations with recruitment efforts by the Admissions Office.

A variety of new projects address the needs of a diverse community and involve USD students in apostolic action.

The Division has undertaken an All People's Breakfast in observance of Martin Luther King's birthday, published an interfaith outreach brochure to incoming freshmen and transfer students and provided liaison with the Fellowship for Christian Athletes, the Christian Legal Society and the Jewish Students Legal Society.

University Relations

A number of new programs have been undertaken by the University Relations unit since the team visit in 1992. Highlights are as follows:

• There has been significant new focus on planned giving, including expansion in personnel and program to increase outreach to constituents and the community.

• The activities and scope of the Annual Fund office have been expanded with the creation of the Office of Major Gifts and a Telefunding Center. The efforts have produced a much greater level of participation by alumni.

Human Resources

In response to internal and external environmental change, the University has initiated some broad changes in how it manages its human resources:

• Extensive training has been done with supervisors and employees on effectively working in and managing a diverse work force.

• Management has been trained in effectively selecting, managing and motivating employees, and they are being held accountable for the effective utilization of human resources.

• Recognizing the need to protect University resources from litigation, the University has begun and will continue to develop standardized and consistent personnel policies and procedures for all groups of employees.
Extensive education is provided for employees on the coverage and utilization of major employee benefits.

Challenges for the Future

The University of San Diego is at an important point in its development as a University. In a very short period of time it has become a high-quality institution of higher education and now desires to move to a higher level of quality and reputation. As the University has grown and developed, so too have its vision and its understanding of its identity as a University.

Under the leadership of a new president and provost, the University is continuing this process of defining itself. The following paragraphs summarize the challenges this committee identifies as important to the University in its pursuit of increased quality and reputation.

**Academic Excellence.** Academic excellence is an integral part of the liberal arts tradition. The University commits itself to excellence in all its academic and professional pursuits. Its primary goal is to achieve a level of academic excellence in teaching and scholarship that, both in fact and in reputation, rivals the best universities.

**Catholicity.** The University must continue to work at defining how its Catholic tradition and character are to be maintained in the context of American higher education.

**Student life.** In the context of the University's commitment to holistic education, USD must continue to seek to create conditions that enhance student learning and personal development. In the next decade USD must address the needs of a student population which will be more diverse, more technologically grounded, with higher expectations for a return on its investment. Increasing collaboration between faculty and Student Affairs staff will be necessary to integrate the classroom experiences with those outside the classroom.

**Graduate programs.** The University must continue to make serious efforts to provide the academic and administrative services which are needed to advance its graduate programs. Resources must be allocated appropriate to USD's classification as a Carnegie Doctoral II institution. Consensus must be developed about the proper relationships between graduate and undergraduate education, research and teaching, and professional and liberal arts education.

**Finances.** Although USD is financially healthy, the ability of the University to build its endowment will be essential to its ability to contribute to the development of students, faculty, programs, and overall academic quality. The
need to link planning with budget determinations will require careful and ongoing attention.

*Diversity.* The University needs to continue in its effort to provide the environment and programs necessary to prepare all its students to live in a country and a world characterized by diversity of all kinds.

*Internationalization.* The University must continue to promote internationalization through all means available, to teach understanding of divergent world views in order to facilitate interaction with different cultures and to promote respect for humanity and world peace. Learning from the experiences of different cultures must be promoted as an important value of the USD community.

*Technology.* The University must find the capability to invest in the technologies and in developing the competencies necessary to providing up-to-date education and support services. In the coming years the University will need to harness the classroom to the new technologies without sacrificing the values it has fostered in the teacher/student relationship.

The above-mentioned statements are based on the goals and objectives outlined in the University’s Strategic Long-Range Plan. Success in advancing its mission, goals, and reputation will depend on the effort made by the entire USD community to implement that plan with cogency and collegiality.