

APPENDIX A

RESPONSE TO 1987 VISITING TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1987 accreditation visiting team made 16 major recommendations grouped under four headings: Planning Recommendations, Administrative Recommendations, Rank and Tenure Process Recommendations, and General Institutional Recommendations. Santa Clara's response to these recommendations is presented below.

A. PLANNING RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1.a (Academic Planning): The visiting team recommends that the University design and implement a curricular process that enables long range academic planning on a continuing and participatory basis.

Since the last accreditation visit, considerable attention has been paid to improving academic and curricular planning processes. Planning in the academic area in the mid-1990s focused on the development of a new Undergraduate Core Curriculum and the creation of a permanent University committee to oversee it (see below). Significant academic planning occurred within the College of Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Business, Engineering, and Law in conjunction with the development and implementation of the "Plan for 1990-95." The Academic Affairs Committee is the University policy committee charged with reviewing and evaluating proposals for new academic programs, for substantive restructuring of academic programs or departments, and for changes in the academic calendar. The Academic Affairs Committee has been active in evaluating proposals for and recommending several new programs, including an M.S. in Software Engineering, an LL.M. degree, and interdisciplinary minors in Asian Studies, Catholic Studies, Medieval and Renaissance Studies, and Information Technology and Society—the latter being the first example of a minor proposed by one of the centers of distinction. As one element of the current strategic planning efforts of the University, each school has developed a strategic plan outlining its mission and goals and its planning efforts related to curriculum development, scholarship, faculty affairs, and related issues within the school (Exhibit I.3.11).

Recommendation 1.b (Academic Planning): The visiting team recommends that the University consider establishing a structure representing all academic constituencies that considers specifically the course offerings and syllabi related to the University Curriculum.

The President appointed a Core Curriculum Committee in the summer of 1992 to review the University's general education requirements and recommend a new Core Curriculum that would address the knowledge, skills, and sensitivities Santa Clara graduates need to be contributing members of a global society in the 21st century. Based on extensive consultation with faculty, students, staff, and alumni, the Core Curriculum Committee designed a new set of general education requirements and proposed creation of a permanent University committee to oversee implementation and revision of those requirements. Faculty elected representatives to the newly constituted University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC) in the 1993–94 academic year. The UCCC appointed 13 subcommittees to set criteria and develop student outcomes for the various Core requirements. Chapter II highlights the transition from the former University Curriculum to the new University Core Curriculum and describes the relationship of the Core to the overall learning goals and outcomes for undergraduate education at Santa Clara. Exhibit II.2.1 is a complete description of the University Core Curriculum, Exhibit III.1.15 has a list of the current members of the UCCC, and Exhibit II.2.3 contains examples of assessment projects undertaken by the UCCC and its subcommittees to evaluate the ongoing success of the Core and to identify areas of needed improvement.

Recommendation 2 (Institutional Planning): The visiting team recommends that the University design and implement an institutional planning program which addresses institutional priorities and academic planning as well as physical resources and the long range development plan within the boundary conditions of realistic financial projections.

Since the last accreditation, Santa Clara has moved steadily toward a more coherent and strategic approach to planning. A brief history of those efforts is presented in Chapter I.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 (Institutional Research): The visiting team recommends that consideration should be given to the development of priorities for data production by the Office of Institutional Research which will be the most useful to academic and institutional planning.

In making this recommendation, the team commented that the Institutional Research Office “appears to be primarily reactive” and “operates without a clear set of priorities to govern the allocation of scarce human resources.”

Steps taken to clarify responsibilities include the documentation of all reports and data available from Institutional Research (March 1993); the development of guidelines on how to make a request to Institutional Research, how requests will be evaluated, and what turnaround times can be expected (January 1994); the development of a mission statement and goals for Institutional Research (January 1996); and the development of annual “action agendas” since 1996. The most recent versions of these documents appear in Exhibit I.3.13.

Steps taken to provide needed resources to Institutional Research and use them more effectively include the addition of a second Research Analyst II position in 1995 to provide greater support for survey research and analytical reports; the appointment of a Research Analyst I for a two-year fixed term in 1997; and increased use of desk-top technology and PC programming skills to become more independent of batch reports generated by Information Technology.

A few examples of steps taken to anticipate needs for planning and decision-making include development of the following:

- *Revenue/Expenditure Model (1990)*. This report (Exhibit V.4.26) presents key ratios related to the financial effectiveness of schools and departments and has been used to make decisions about allocating resources, hiring new faculty, and increasing or decreasing course offerings and class sizes. Because of demand for other reports, the number of manual adjustments required to assure validity, and the stability of the data, the Revenue/Expenditure Model has been changed from an annual report to one prepared every five years.
- *Course Demand Analysis (1995)*. To assist the Core Curriculum Committee in its planning, Institutional Research performed a three-year analysis of demand for Core Curriculum courses. To assist the College of Arts and Sciences with monitoring demand for Core courses, it developed a menu-driven macro program to allow the College to evaluate the number of courses and sections offered, the number of students taught, course capacities, and percentages of courses taught by full-time faculty.
- *Institutional Research Web Site (1995)*. This site provides a standard set of data to the University community as well as anyone with Internet access. It is found at <http://www.scu.edu/ir.htm>.
- *Retention Database (1996)*. This database makes it possible to calculate retention and

graduation rates, predict demand for Core Curriculum courses, and construct the Enrollment Projection Model described below.

- *Enrollment Projection Model (1997)*. This report (Exhibit III.3.6) projects matriculation and transition rates, total undergraduate enrollment, and the number of incoming freshmen and transfer students needed to meet budget targets.
- *Strategic Planning Database (1997)*. This database organizes existing data collected through about 40 survey instruments in terms of *Strategic Plan* themes, making it possible to track changes over time and differences among various populations. It is found at <http://www.scu.edu/SCU/Departments/InstitutionalResearch/scusurveys.htm>. Results of surveys conducted specifically for this self-study are separately available at <http://www.scu.edu/SCU/Departments/InstitutionalResearch/scuonly/wasc/WascSurv/wascseIf.htm>.

These and other new reports and databases reflect an increasingly proactive approach to the data needs of the campus since 1987. They have also allowed Institutional Research to focus its resources more effectively than would otherwise be possible.

Despite efforts to increase staffing, take advantage of new technology, clarify priorities, and anticipate data needs, Institutional Research continues to be hard pressed. Reasons include a gradual expansion of its scope of responsibilities; a significant increase in the use of data for decision making, along with a concomitant increase in the number of special research requests; the impact of developing and implementing new enterprise-wide administrative software systems; and a continuing lack of clarity about the locus of responsibility for gathering, maintaining, reporting, and assuring the accuracy of certain types of institutional data.

Recommendation 2 (Student Services): The visiting team recommends that the University effect a more complete integration of faculty, academic staff and programs in the academic area with those in student services.

Collaboration, synergy, and functional coordination between academic affairs and student affairs to support more integrated student learning has been a major focus of administrative examination since the last accreditation visit. In 1994 the Planning Action Team (PAT), in its “Report on Administrative Reorganization” (Exhibit I.3.2), recommended that the President change the vice presidential structure by consolidating the responsibilities of the vice presidents for academic affairs and student development under a provost. In response to that

recommendation, the President charged those two vice presidents with pursuing systematic change that would result in a cultural shift away from territoriality and possessiveness and toward a sense of partnership and shared responsibility for the educational mission of the University. They convened a group of campus leaders from both Academic Affairs and Student Development to address questions about collaborative learning themes, improved communication, and administrative consolidation or restructuring. After several months of work, the group identified areas of collaboration and ways to improve communication within existing structures and concluded that structural reorganization should not be undertaken at that time. In spring 1996 Scott Hughes and Associates, a professional consulting firm, studied the effectiveness of the University's organizational structure and also recommended that the President reorganize and move to a provost model.

After reviewing these earlier efforts at collaboration and recommendations for administrative restructuring, the University Planning Council recommended in December 1996 that the President change to a provostial structure and reduce the number of direct reports to him. In January 1997, following a two-month period of campus review and comment on the Planning Council recommendation, the President initiated a reorganization of the administrative structure of the University resulting in the creation of the position of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The goal of the reorganization was to strengthen the institution's ability to realize its mission as "a Catholic and Jesuit institution that makes student learning its central focus" and to promote the two major strategic initiatives of the University's *Strategic Plan* ("Building a Community of Scholars" and "Providing an Integrated Education").

Father Locatelli appointed then Vice President for Academic Affairs Stephen A. Privett, S.J., as Provost and asked him to engage in a process of evaluating the organizational structure aimed initially at integrating academic affairs and student affairs. The process was guided by four core principles: (1) improving coordination and synergy among different organizational functions and units, (2) using resources more strategically to advance core educational programs, (3) increasing effectiveness and efficiency in support of educational programs, and (4) improving responsiveness and productivity in providing services. Based on these principles, a transitional organizational structure was created until a more permanent arrangement could emerge from ongoing discussions with faculty and staff most directly affected by the changes. As examination of the reorganization unfolded over a two-year period of review and comment, it

became apparent that a central focus on integrated education that included curricular, co-curricular, and experiential learning made it desirable to fold the functions of Student Affairs fully into the provost model. The resulting structure, implemented in July 1999, includes three vice provosts (Academic Affairs, Undergraduate Learning, and Multicultural Education), the four academic deans, and an associate provost reporting to the Provost. The intent of the new structure is to leverage the organization more effectively and efficiently

- to position the Provost and his staff to support the college and schools in their efforts to strengthen the community of scholars and offer more integrated educational experiences;
- to focus the Provost and his staff on areas most critical to strengthening the community of scholars and offering more integrated educational experiences;
- to promote greater collaboration among faculty, staff, and students around core academic programs of the University at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;
- to promote closer connection of co-curricular programs and experiential learning with core academic programs of the University at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;
- to provide clearer lines of accountability and responsibility for key action priorities to advance the strategic initiatives; and
- to improve communication about key action priorities with important internal and external constituencies.

More detailed discussion of the history, evolution, and rationale for the current organizational structure is included in Chapter IV, the Student Affairs self-study (Exhibit I.4.8), and the reports cited above.

C. RANK AND TENURE PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 (Defined Criteria): The visiting team recommends that the institution establish clearer expectations for promotion and tenure and that further efforts be made to clarify the grounds for an appeal.

The University responded to this recommendation in four phases. In the first phase, which began in 1990–91, the Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs charged each academic dean with engaging the faculty in an effort to clarify how the standards for promotion and tenure appearing in the *Faculty Handbook* should be interpreted for their college, school, or division. The intent was to provide guidelines consistent with the handbook but true to the distinctive

cultures of the different academic units and their constitutive disciplines. The charge to the deans noted that a faculty committee would be appointed later to develop an integrative University-wide statement based in part on the separate school statements. After several iterations, faculty committees completed statements during the 1995–96 academic year for the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, the School of Engineering, and the School of Law (Exhibit III.2.5). The Division of Counseling Psychology and Education drafted a statement several years earlier but did not complete it, choosing instead to follow the statement of the College of Arts and Sciences.

After initial drafts of the school-level documents became available, the second phase in the clarification of standards and procedures for promotion and tenure began in 1993–94 with the appointment of a faculty committee to draft a statement of common University-wide standards. The statement drafted by this committee was revised by the Faculty Personnel Committee, with further revisions by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate Council, before it was approved by the Faculty Senate in April 1994. The Board of Trustees approved the statement in May 1994. The final document, “University Standards for Tenure and Promotion” (Exhibit III.2.4), was issued in August 1994. This document noted that because “teaching, scholarship or artistic creativity, and service differ in some respects among academic disciplines,” candidates for tenure or promotion should refer to the school documents “for a detailed explanation of the standards and procedures by which they will be evaluated.”

The third phase of clarification began in January 1995 when the President appointed a task force to “recommend improvements to current procedures for tenure and promotion, an appeals procedure, and a procedure for reviewing allegations of denial of tenure or promotion on grounds of unfair discrimination.” The report of this task force, “Statement of University Policy: Uniform Procedures for Tenure and Promotion” (Exhibit III.2.6), was submitted in December 1995, discussed at a general meeting of the Faculty Senate in May 1996, and approved the same month by the Board of Trustees

The “Uniform Procedures” included 25 provisions, including a clarification of “grounds for appeal,” as called for by the 1987 visiting team. Requests for reconsideration of a denial of tenure or promotion were restricted to the following causes: *either* “the existence of significant and relevant new material that has become available since the appellant’s petition was considered by the rank and tenure committees and other evaluators” *or* “significant inconsistency

in the application of standards or procedures between the appellant's evaluation and others of the same year." The "Uniform Procedures" also stated that "Allegations of denial of promotion or tenure because of illegal or unfair discrimination will be judged by the Grievance Procedures of the *Faculty Handbook*." Other procedural reforms are described in the next section under "Due Process."

The fourth phase in the clarification of standards and procedures focused on attempts to resolve a continuing controversy over whether "collegiality" should be a consideration in the review of petitions for promotion or tenure. In a section on "Purposes and Principles" in its 1992 draft document on "Standards and Procedures for Faculty Promotion and Tenure," the College of Arts and Sciences discussed collegiality as a consideration in promotion and tenure decisions. The current version of these standards states:

To improve the overall quality and academic culture of learning of the department, the College and the University, the College places great value on collegiality, the mutually respectful sharing of intellectual authority and professional responsibility for the quality of our curriculum, our instruction, our scholarly/creative work, and our campus culture of learning. Collegiality contributes to the effectiveness of other teachers, the scholarly and creative productivity and accomplishment of one's colleagues, and the long term well-being and the common good of the department, the College, and the University. Those in the review process shall take into consideration the impact of the candidate's contributions and presence not just on students or others in the same field of scholarly research or creative performance, but on the overall effectiveness and academic quality of the department, the College, and the University. Evaluators at all stages are reminded that collegiality is not the same as popularity and that the thoughtful and professional articulation of divergent views and the considered expression of constructive criticism, even if unwelcome to many, can be evaluated as positive collegial contributions.

The statement continues with another paragraph elaborating on the last sentence above, noting that collegiality is not the same as conformity and that it should "never be interpreted to mean anything counter to normal principles of academic freedom."

The preamble to the 1994 statement on "University Standards for Tenure and Promotion," which the Faculty Senate approved in May 1994, echoed the College of Arts and Sciences statement in a single sentence: "Collaboration with colleagues—that is, collegiality—is implicit in the idea of a college and is especially important in realizing the University's goal of 'nurturing a diverse community rooted in mutual understanding and respect.'"

Both the college and the University documents separated the discussion of collegiality from

the discussion of the three traditional criteria for promotion and tenure: teaching, scholarship, and service. Yet both documents raised concerns among some faculty that collegiality would constitute a fourth criterion and that, whether or not it constituted a formal criterion, it could be used to punish unpopular or nonconforming faculty.

In its report on “Uniform Procedures for Tenure and Promotion” in December 1995, the Promotion and Tenure Task Force commented that, although collegiality is not mentioned in the *Faculty Handbook*, “It has in fact...always been a criterion, usually as an aspect of service....There is considerable ambiguity, however, concerning both the meaning of the term and its importance in evaluations.” Noting that supporters of referencing collegiality in the *Faculty Handbook* differed as to whether it should be included as an aspect of service or as an aspect of all three criteria, the task force recommended that some committee should be charged with defining collegiality and deciding how it should be included in the criteria for promotion and tenure.

The Faculty Senate Council (FSC) voted on May 8, 1996 to oppose collegiality as a criterion for tenure and promotion. Apparently unaware of this vote, the Board of Trustees approved the “Uniform Procedures for Tenure and Promotion” two days later.

The issue of collegiality continued to occupy a major place on the agenda of the FSC during the next two academic years. In Spring 1997, the FSC asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to act upon the issue. The Faculty Affairs Committee recommended that the language in the College of Arts and Sciences document be adopted for the University as a whole, but the FSC did not endorse this recommendation.

During the 1997–98 academic year, the FSC sponsored two faculty ballots on whether or not collegiality should be a consideration in promotion and tenure. After the first ballot was challenged because non-tenure-track faculty were allowed to vote, a second ballot limited to tenure-track and tenured faculty was held. Both ballots resulted in majorities in favor of including collegiality as a consideration. The FSC then appointed a committee to define the term and recommend how it should be included in the *Faculty Handbook*.

After much further discussion, the committee recommended and the FSC in January 1999 approved the following wording to be submitted to the Faculty Affairs Committee for action: “Collegiality is part of the ‘service’ component of evaluation in promotion and tenure decisions.

Collegiality means that faculty members can be counted on to discharge all their professional responsibilities as teaching scholars in a conscientious and civil manner. Collegiality is not the same as conformity and should not be interpreted in a way that violates principles of academic freedom.” Because of other business, the Faculty Affairs Committee has not yet acted on this recommendation, which is on its agenda for 1999–00.

The issue of collegiality is important in the context not only of clarifying standards for promotion and tenure, but also of defining what it means to be a “community of scholars.” As originally framed by the College of Arts and Sciences document, collegiality is both a manifestation and a prerequisite for a community of scholars. The concept of a community of scholars is addressed in Chapter III of this self-study.

One measure of the success of efforts since the 1987 accreditation visit to clarify standards and procedures is provided by a comparison of responses to faculty surveys conducted in 1989 and 1998. Positive responses to two questions about the clarity of criteria used to judge teaching and research quality increased sharply from 1989 to 1998. While only 22.6 percent of faculty in 1989 thought that criteria for teaching were clear and explicit, 52.5 percent thought this was true in 1998. And while only 22.3 percent of faculty in 1989 thought that criteria for research were clear and explicit, 57.7 percent thought this was true in 1998.

Recommendation 2.a (Due Process): The visiting team recommends establishment of a faculty board or committee to review appeals of presidential decisions on tenure or promotion. The review body would conduct its own hearings and advise the president.

Although the 1987 team specifically recommended establishment of a faculty board or committee to review appeals, the “Uniform Procedures” described in the previous section provided for a different approach:

Upon receiving a valid request to reconsider a denial of tenure or promotion, the President will ask for recommendations on whether to reverse or reaffirm the decision from:

- a. The candidate’s College or School Committee,
- b. The University Committee,
- c. The candidate’s dean,
- d. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, and
- e. Two senior Santa Clara University professors who are not members of the candidate’s department and have not been members of any committee that evaluated the candidate.

All of these persons and committees will make their recommendations directly to the President, who, at his discretion, may discuss the case with any or all of them or with anyone else, including the appellant. The President will then form and announce his decision, which shall be final.

Of the 19 requests for reconsideration using this process in the past four years, three resulted in reversals of negative decisions.

Recommendation 2.b (Due Process): The visiting team recommends [the] practice of double voting be reviewed.

The visiting team expressed concern about the practice of “double voting,” by which a member of a rank and tenure committee could vote on the petition of a departmental colleague at both the department and the committee level. In response to significant differences of opinion voiced in a Faculty Senate discussion of this issue, the 1996 “Uniform Procedures” stated that “for a trial period of two academic years, 1996–97 and 1997–98, all members of every committee, including department colleagues or candidates and chairs of departments with candidates being evaluated, will participate fully in the discussion of all candidates, but will abstain from voting on candidates from their own departments. This issue will be permanently decided at the end of the two-year trial.” Although no formal action to extend this trial period has been taken yet, the provision on double voting in the “Uniform Procedures” was followed in 1998–99 and is on the agenda of the Faculty Affairs Committee in 1999–00.

Recommendation 3 (Lecturers): The visiting team recommends a review of the duties performed in these titles and an adjudication of any personnel cases which have been compromised by past lack of clarity.

This recommendation was based on the visiting team’s concern about “the large number of part-time faculty employed by Santa Clara University” and its observation that Santa Clara had made “initial efforts to review and clarify their status with particular emphasis on their role and responsibilities and their ‘quasi-faculty’ status.” The team urged the University to “reach closure on this issue as soon as possible” and commended it for its “efforts to stay on top of this situation.”

The visiting team conflated two separate issues: (1) the number of part-time lecturers and (2) the roles and responsibilities of full-time lecturers. Santa Clara’s response to both issues has been ongoing since 1987. The focus of campus debate on lecturer positions in the late 1980s was not the number of part-time lecturers but whether scholarship should be criterion for initial appointment or subsequent evaluations of full-time lecturers. If scholarship was an expectation

for full-time lecturers, then was there any meaningful distinction between non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty? Were non-tenure-track faculty being treated unfairly in comparison with tenure-track faculty? Concerns about “de facto tenure” for full-time lecturers who had been at Santa Clara for many years were also raised.

Following the leadership of the Academic Vice President, the Faculty Personnel Committee in 1988–89 proposed permitting lecturers who met certain criteria to apply once for promotion to regular faculty rank and for tenure. This proposal was approved by the Faculty Senate and promulgated by the Academic Vice President on November 17, 1989 (Exhibit III.2.3). Eligible lecturers were invited to decide whether or not they wished to convert their positions to tenure-track appointments as assistant professors. A majority of those invited accepted, and all who did so were subsequently promoted and tenured. In recent years, all new full-time lecturers have been hired on fixed-term rather than continuing appointments. Guidelines for all non-tenure-track appointments were approved in 1999 after a two-year study by a joint task force of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee (Exhibit III.2.8).

The issue of non-tenure-track faculty is discussed in greater detail in Chapter III.

D. GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 (Affirmative Action): The visiting team recommends that the University translate its stated commitment to affirmative action from passive into positive efforts at all levels and for all constituencies within the University, including trustees, regents, administration, faculty, staff and students.

At the time of the last accreditation visit, it became apparent that underutilization of both women and ethnic minorities was a concern for the administration and the visiting team. Since that time, the University has made some progress in addressing this issue at all levels and for all constituencies of the University. The President, working closely with the Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents, has made increasing the mix and balance of competencies on the board a high priority. In pursuing this goal, the University sees diversity as a constitutive element of quality. Since 1988, of the 25 lay members of the Board of Trustees, people of color have increased from none to five currently, women from three (one of whom was a faculty member) to four, and non-U.S. born trustees from none to two. Over the same time period, the Board of Regents has increased its ethnic minority membership from three to five members and its female

membership from six to ten.

Diversity in administrative leadership groups continues to be a problem. Both the President's Cabinet and the Provost's Council have been expanded in the past two years to increase diversity. The seven members of the former group include one woman and one person of color; the 12 members of the latter group include three women and one person of color.

Efforts to increase the representation of ethnic minorities and women in the faculty and among the ranks of administration and staff, as well as an analysis of our success, are discussed in Chapter III under the challenge of increasing the quality and diversity of the community of scholars. Exhibit III.3.10 summarizes the analysis of utilization of ethnic minorities and women in accordance with affirmative action guidelines. Although that analysis suggests that the University has attained a strong record of utilization of ethnic minorities and women in relation to the available workforce, our goal of enriching the community of scholars with a more diverse faculty and staff still challenges us.

Recommendation 2 (Communication): The visiting team recommends that the president take steps to establish more visibility and contact with campus constituencies through both written and personal communication.

While this recommendation from the last accreditation visiting team preceded the appointment of the current President, Father Locatelli has taken a number of steps to increase visibility and personal contact. He and the Provost use electronic mail to keep the community aware of policy or personnel changes, campus controversies, or noteworthy accomplishments. He also communicates with the faculty and staff through occasional letters on topics of concern. Father Locatelli has used his annual fall convocation address as a highly public way to communicate his vision for the University and key concepts underlying its strategic direction. In his 1995 convocation address, he described Santa Clara's approach to strategic planning; in 1996 he reflected on Santa Clara as a community of scholars centered on student learning; in the 1997 convocation he explored the meaning of integrated education; and in 1998 he discussed the challenge of engaging the hearts and minds of students in a world of colliding cultures. His 1999 convocation address will focus on the Jesuit emphasis on justice as an integral part of a Santa Clara education.

In terms of visibility, he has undertaken a regular schedule of luncheon meetings primarily with academic departments to discuss their perception of the major challenges and opportunities

they face. In the past three years, he has initiated a series of “fireside chats” with students. Occurring at least twice each quarter, the chats allow students to meet for 90 minutes with the President to discuss whatever campus issues are of concern to them. He has also encouraged greater communication between the vice presidents and their direct reports and between the deans and their department chairs. In addition, he has encouraged more frequent interaction between the administration and the Faculty Senate, the Staff Assembly Council, and the Student Senate.

Recommendation 3.a (Library): The visiting team recommends, with respect to the library, that there be careful collection assessment and development by specific subject area to assure support for existing programs and before new programs are started.

The University still has no formal process to ensure an assessment of library resources before new programs are started or major changes in course offerings are made. The degree to which the library is involved prior to the inauguration of a new program or emphasis varies with both the individuals and the units involved. The library first learned about the Catholic Studies minor from minutes of a meeting. However, the University Core Curriculum Committee communicated with the library well in advance of the appointment of a new faculty member in Asian history. The lack of library representation on the Provost’s Council, the Academic Affairs Committee, or the University Core Curriculum Committee has probably contributed to the lack of consistency in this area. (The University Librarian was appointed to the Provost’s Council in summer 1999.)

The library assigns a librarian/subject specialist to each academic department and interdisciplinary program, as well as to the three University centers of distinction and the Eastside Project. Subject specialists also work with specialized centers or institutes in several areas, such as the Business School. The library has a detailed Collection Development Policy, which was recently revised. This is accessible through the library’s home page, as well as in printed format. The library uses two approval plans—Midwest Library Services for university press books and Blackwell’s for commercial publications. These plans have been in operation for more than 10 years, but the profiles have been reviewed and refined several times, with faculty input.

A number of collection evaluations have been completed since the last accreditation visit, several of which were of significance. The library’s collection was analyzed in comparison with the third edition of *Books for College Libraries* (BCL). Subject specialists then used this

information to order titles that were not in the collection. In 1992, the subject specialists reviewed all current periodical subscriptions. As a result, approximately 250 marginal titles were canceled and a number of new subscriptions were added. Periodical subscriptions that were duplicated in paper and microform were also reviewed, and 41 percent of the duplicate subscriptions were canceled. As a part of the library's automation project, subject specialists reviewed all duplicate copies of books in the collection and "deselected" several thousand duplicate copies that were no longer needed.

Several retrospective collection building efforts have also taken place since the last accreditation visit. In addition to the BCL project mentioned above, a number of journal backfiles were added in support of the graduate program in Counseling Psychology and Education; many books listed in the Mathematical Association of America's *Library Recommendations for Undergraduate Mathematics* were purchased; and a number of projects were undertaken to strengthen the library's collection in ethnic studies.

Several significant gifts have also been added since 1987–88, including the following: over 3,000 books on ancient Greek and Latin literature, philosophy, and history from the Jesuit Novitiate; a retrospective collection of the Proceedings of the IEEE Microwave Conferences; and a collection of over 600 books on Alaska and Arctic exploring expeditions, which complements the Hubbard Collection in the University Archives.

Recommendation 3.b (Library): The visiting team recommends that the extensive planning which has occurred during the past years, particularly with respect to library automation, be followed up by an action plan to prevent deterioration of morale.

At the time of the last accreditation visit, there had been extensive planning in four areas—collections, automation, staffing, and facilities.

As described above, significant progress has been made in reviewing collections and acquiring new resources since the last accreditation visit. Although the acquisitions budget is heavily dependent on operational funding, with endowment income supporting only acquisitions in Arts and Sciences and Counseling Psychology and Education, operating budgets have generally supported current programs at the rate of Santa Clara's materials inflation rate (about 9 percent annually in recent years). Additionally, more than \$500,000 in expendable gift funding for business and related social sciences was raised during the University's last capital campaign. Unfortunately, despite initial targets, this campaign generated no new endowment for the library,

so the plan to use new income from endowment to cover the continuing costs for resources purchased from these expendable gifts was not realized. The last of the gift funds from the campaign were exhausted in the 1998–99 fiscal year, and some cuts will probably be necessary in order to accommodate expenses within the operating budget. Since the campaign, annual gift revenues for incremental funding of library acquisitions have been flat or declining. The Development Office has generated some new gifts for the library, particularly through the Parents' Fund, but these have been budget-relieving rather than incremental.

Progress in library automation is described in the “Technology and Information Resources” section of Chapter V.

While major improvements have been made in the collections and in library automation since 1987, less progress has been made in the areas of staffing and facilities. Most position requests have not been funded, and the facility is aging and inflexible. Lack of significant progress in these areas has had a negative effect on staff morale.

Recommendation 3.c (Library): The visiting team recommends that the library's planning should move forward to broaden the collection in non-print formats so learning resources are not fragmented.

Since the last accreditation visit, significant progress has been made in expanding the availability of resources in non-print formats. The library's collections now include video, multimedia CD-ROMs, a few sound recordings, and a wide variety of electronic resources, available either through the CD-ROM network or via the World Wide Web. Due to the inflexibility of the library facilities, most videos continue to be shelved in the Ricard Observatory as a part of Media Services. Only a limited number of sound recordings have been added, most as a part of Curriculum Collection kits or other mixed-media resources.

Working in collaboration with Media Services, the library has assumed responsibility for the acquisition and cataloging of all videos. The two units also mounted a joint effort to create electronic records for all video titles acquired by Media Services before this change. This project was completed in 1996, and records for all the University's centrally owned videos are now available through OSCAR.

Most of the University's sound recordings and slide collections continue to remain under departmental control. The most comprehensive collection of sound resources is in the Music Listening Lab, which is housed in the new Performing Arts Center. Since this collection is

available for general use, the library and the Music Department cooperated on a project during 1993–95 to create electronic records for this collection and to add them to OSCAR. However, this project has not been continued, and the library is not responsible for the housing or preservation of these resources, inventory control, or hours of availability.

Recommendation 3.d (Library): The visiting team recommends that some redecorating and refurbishing of the Orradre Library should be started as soon as possible and should not await completion of the next capital campaign.

Two of the suggestions identified in the University's last self-study were to complete remodeling of the existing library by 1991 and to develop plans and complete an expansion of the library by 1995. Neither of these strategies was among those selected for funding during the last capital campaign.

Since the last accreditation, some areas of the Orradre Library have been painted and new carpet has been added in several areas. The most worn furnishings have been removed from the Boland Reading Room, but these have not been replaced. Instead, study tables have been moved to this area from other parts of the building as collections, equipment, and other space uses have reduced overall seating capacity in the building. With the exception of the removal of a wall in the reference area and some remodeling of the circulation desk and adjacent staff areas to accommodate library automation, no redecorating or refurbishing of the library has been done since the 1987–88 academic year. Public spaces continue to look dated and often shabby; professional staff and administrative offices are not conducive to either service demands or the collaborative work style espoused by the University; technical services areas have not been upgraded to support staff use of the increasing technology in this area; and requests for space reallocation or refurbishing of existing spaces have generally not been funded because of a continuing long-term plan to expand and renovate the building.

The need for both additional and more flexible space remains a serious problem for the library. With the creation of a new Information Services division in 1997, it also became clear that the physical dispersion of the three Information Services units—the University (Orradre) Library, Information Technology, and Media Services—was an obstacle to increased collaboration.

The construction of adequate facilities for Information Services, most likely involving an expansion and renovation of Orradre Library building, is one of six major projects included in

the new five-year campus improvement program to be presented to the Board of Trustees in October 1999. Concurrent with the development of the campus improvement program for 2002 to 2006, a team composed of three Information Services directors, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and University Planning, and the Director of Facilities worked with the architectural firm of NBBJ and an independent library consultant to develop a “facilities program” for Information Services, which was completed in May 1999. This 120-page program statement (Exhibit V.3.17) presents a vision for a new Information Services Center that would bring currently scattered functions together in facilities that “support information exploration, navigation, and creation.”

After a discussion by the Provost’s Council, in which some key assumptions were questioned, the Facilities Planning Committee recommended that the basic program requirements outlined in the program statement be integrated into the campus master planning process but that the specific proposal for a consolidated facility be subject to further review. The review will center on three questions: Would a consolidated facility be too massive for the scale of this campus? Do all the functions need to be located in a single facility? And are the projections for books and other traditional media realistic in light of rapidly advancing technology?

Recommendation 4 (Continuing Education): The visiting team recommends that the University implement policy guidelines to assure that campus administrators and faculty are involved in the planning, administration, and evaluation of non-credit courses in continuing and extended education.

Because of problems resulting from inadequate management and oversight, the University closed its Center for Continuing Education in the late 1970s. The accreditation visiting team noted in 1987 that several non-credit programs continued to operate without any “direct control or supervision” and that some of these offered continuing education units, although “no evidence of problems associated with these programs was found.”

In spring 1992, the Deans Council endorsed a document on “University Continuing Education Policies and Procedures” drafted by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, but this document was never formally approved and disseminated as University policy. The University currently offers continuing education programs through five units.

School of Engineering. The Office of Continuing Education in the Engineering School coordinates specialized short courses and extension courses in information storage and

semiconductor technology, engineering management, and software engineering. It offers about 20 courses a year with an attendance of about 265 students, most of whom have M.S. degrees. Courses offer continuing education events (CEUs) but no academic credit. A faculty member serves as a half-time director and reports to the Dean of the School of Engineering, who oversees the scope and quality of the program and is counseled by an advisory board consisting of the director, another faculty member, and three corporate representatives.

School of Business. The Executive Development Center in the Business School offers about 25 to 35 programs each year, most of them taught by Santa Clara faculty members. Only one program (Electronic Data Interchange) offers CEUs, and none offers academic credit. The director of the Executive Development Center reports to the Dean of the Business School and consults with an advisory board of seven Business School faculty members.

School of Law. The California Bar requires licensed attorneys to take a certain number of continuing legal education (MCLE) hours per year and establishes the standards for allowing credit. Although the Law School does not have a formalized continuing education program, it is a licensed provider of MCLE credit. When a particular program of the Law School appears appropriate for MCLE credit, the school makes it available, keeps records, and holds the records available for bar inspection. Responsibility for coordination and oversight lies in the Dean's Office. No program carries credit toward a degree. During 1998–99, 270 people participated in four Law School programs for MCLE credit.

Ethics Center. The Markkula Center for Applied Ethics occasionally sponsors programs that offer professionally-based continuing education units. Since 1987, these have included four “Nursing Ethics” workshops (1992–95), a public deliberation on “The Care in Managed Care” (1997), a national conference on “The Courts and the Mass Media” (1997), and three “Ethics Camps” for school teachers (1997–99).

Division of Lifelong Learning. This division, the largest continuing education program at Santa Clara, was created in 1997 to provide all personal and professional development programs except for those offered by the schools of Law, Business, and Engineering. Although Lifelong Learning is structurally separate from both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Division of Counseling Psychology and Education, it reports to the Dean of the College and its director is a faculty member in CP&E. In 1998–99, the Division of Lifelong Learning offered 261 courses or workshops with 1,414 enrollments for CEUs. No courses or workshops have been offered for

academic credit since 1997–98, when controversy arose over several courses being offered for academic credit. Many faculty expressed concern over the lack of faculty involvement in approving such courses. In response to this controversy, the Dean consulted with the Council of Chairs in the College of Arts and Sciences and with faculty in the Division of Counseling Psychology and Education. He and the Director of Lifelong Learning agreed to place a moratorium on offering courses for academic credit. They also agreed that all Lifelong Learning courses would be vetted by appropriate academic departments or by a faculty advisory council if courses did not relate specifically to a particular department.

The Academic Affairs Committee also reviewed this issue. It noted that the University’s mission statement mentions that, in addition to regular academic programs, Santa Clara also provides “a variety of continuing education and professional development opportunities for non-matriculated students.” Citing relevant WASC standards, the committee requested that “the Provost’s Office present to it a proposal regarding the place of continuing education at Santa Clara and any policies and procedures that may be needed.” It asked that this proposal address the role of continuing education in Santa Clara’s educational mission; the impact of continuing education programs on Santa Clara’s reputation; the constituencies served; an appropriate organizational structure; the kinds of credit (or non-credit) offered; the role of faculty in assuring quality; resources needed; and any other relevant issues. This proposal is still pending.

In the meantime, the Dean’s Office responsible for the Division of Lifelong Learning has developed two policy statements setting forth guidelines to assure proper academic oversight of courses offered by the division. See Exhibit III.1.12 for these and other documents relating to continuing education at Santa Clara.