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INTRODUCTION

The University

Gonzaga University was founded by missionaries of the Roman Catholic Society of Jesus (“the Jesuits”) in 1887. The institution, known at its beginning as Gonzaga College, opened its doors that first year with a class of seven boys. One hundred and seventeen years later, Gonzaga is a comprehensive liberal arts university offering degrees in 49 undergraduate majors, 7 graduate degrees (including the Juris Doctor and Ph.D. in Leadership Studies), and two of its own Junior-year study-abroad programs in Europe (one in Florence, Italy, the other in Paris, France).

In Fall 2003, Gonzaga’s total enrollment reached a historic high of 3,746 undergraduates, 627 law students, 1098 graduate students (including those pursuing coursework at distance sites throughout the Northwest and western Canada), and 116 doctoral students. The number of those living on campus had increased from 1400 in Fall 1994 to nearly 2300 in Fall 2003, reflective not only of a dramatic increase in undergraduates, but requiring the addition of eleven new campus residence facilities, expanded foodservice capability, increased course offerings, and five new parking areas. The number of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty increased from 219 in Fall 1992 to 287 in Fall 2003. Since Fall 1993, the institution’s endowment has increased from $42 million to nearly $100 million.

Enrollment Trends, Fall 1994 to Fall 2003
Gonzaga is governed by an independent board of trustees. After successfully navigating a period of severe fiscal stress in the early-to-mid 1970’s, the University enjoyed growth and stability under the Board’s guidance and leadership, and that of President Bernard J. Coughlin, S.J. (who served as president from 1974 to 1996). Since the last full-scale visit, the institution has undergone a series of changes in leadership. Having faithfully served the University as its President for twenty-two years, Father Coughlin was appointed Chancellor and a successor President, Edward Glynn, S.J., named. Although Fr. Glynn was very popular with certain members of the faculty, tensions between Fr. Glynn and the Board of Trustees led to Fr. Glynn’s resignation in May, 1997, less than one year after his appointment. During the search for a new President, Mr. Harry Sladich, then Vice President for Administration and Planning, served as acting President. In July, 1998, the current President, Robert J. Spitzer, S.J., was appointed.

Within three years of the last full-scale visit (1994), the institution found itself facing serious enrollment challenges. Ultimately, these challenges, and the attendant fiscal crisis, resulted in a full-blown institutional review of fiscal practices, known as the Special Budget Review and Reallocation Process (BRRP) of 1998. The BRRP process for the first time made available to faculty and non-faculty committee members information about departmental budgets, salary information, and operating costs (see the Report of the Special Budget Review and Reallocation Process, Exhibit A). Although the process resulted in a number of recommendations, it was widely perceived as a negative one, with only modest tangible benefits. Without question, the BRRP made clear the imminent fiscal exigency with which the University would shortly be faced, if the revenue/expenditure relationship were not addressed.

The current president, Father Robert Spitzer, arrived just as the BRRP process was reaching its conclusion; in addition to acknowledging those aspects of the process that could serve beneficial purpose, the President immediately recognized the need to increase enrollments to bring the institution back from the financial precipice upon which it was precariously perched. By enlisting the assistance of a financial aid consultant, making certain changes in enrollment management, and investing in new marketing materials and services, the institution immediately started to see meaningful increases in undergraduate enrollments. These efforts were enhanced by the unprecedented success of the men’s basketball team, which during the 1998-99 season saw its second-ever entry into the NCAA tournament and its first trip to the NCAA “Final Eight.” Continued support of growth-directed enrollment strategy, coupled with growing national recognition of Gonzaga’s name and identity, has resulted in successively larger admission application numbers. For this reason, the President and Trustees approved a shift in admission process from “rolling” to the more selective “pooling” admission process for the class entering in Fall 2003. Acknowledging the increased prominence and popularity of Gonzaga’s basketball teams, and a desire to more fully participate in West Coast Conference (WCC) tournament activity, the University is currently constructing a 6,000 seat arena adjacent to its primary athletic facility, the Charlotte Y. Martin Centre.
Nearly every key indicator over the past five years reflects the continued growth and stability of the University (see Institutional Snapshot at the end of this Introduction). This growth, though perceived as necessary for the long-term fiscal health of the institution, has come at some cost: class sizes, particularly at the introductory course level, have grown, and workloads for faculty and staff have meaningfully increased. The stresses associated with the rate of growth have become a focus of faculty concern and administrative attention (see Standards Three and Four). Yet this growth, while stressful, has been perceived as absolutely necessary by both the President and the Board of Trustees as a means of “growing the institution” out of imminent financial peril. Concurrent to the growth in enrollment has been a steady increase in the quality of our incoming student population, a renewed commitment to funding need-based financial aid, and the development of new Mission-driven initiatives and programs (see Standards One and Three). Further, our six-year undergraduate graduation rate has increased from 63% (for the class entering in 1993) to 75% (for the class entering in 1997), while faculty retention has remained stable over the past five years (see Standard Four). The institution is currently in the final phase of a $119 million capital campaign, the theme of which is Educating People the World Needs Most. The campaign has been so successful that it is expected to reach its goal two years earlier than planned.

The ten years since our last full-scale visit have seen a great deal of change in the campus infrastructure as well. The physical plant has been meaningfully expanded and upgraded, with renovations and additions currently underway at Hughes Science Building and the Jepson Center for Business. A major expansion of the Cataldo Dining Facility was completed in December 2003, and the new Gonzaga Arena is scheduled to be completed in time for the 2004-05 basketball season. The Administration Building, which is the oldest and most prominent on campus, is undergoing classroom and office renovation as part of a multi-year improvement program. Immediately after the last full-scale visit, the University broke ground on the first of two new residential complexes (Dussault, 1995; Burch, 1996) and in subsequent years numerous University-owned houses were cleared away for new parking lots (Sharp Avenue; Boone Avenue) and new residence halls (Corkery, 2000; Dillon, 2001; Goller, 2001). The construction of a new Law School on a site purchased from the US Postal Service (2000) allowed for the removal of the old Law School buildings on Sharp Avenue, and the construction of the Corkery Apartments (opened 2001). The past five years has seen a major upgrade and addition to the Herak Center for Engineering (2000), and the creation of the brand-new Kermit Rudolf Fitness Center (part of the existing Martin Centre, in 2002). The University has continued to purchase commercial and residential property adjacent to the campus as it works towards the fulfillment of a campus master plan.

The arrival of our new Academic Vice President, Dr. Stephen Freedman, in June 2002 has opened a new chapter in the academic story of the institution. In his first two years, Dr. Freedman has worked together with Fr. Spitzer, the Deans, and the leadership of the Faculty Senate towards a more collaborative approach to addressing the needs of faculty and students. Through the reorganization of his administrative staff, he has been working towards remediation and improvement in a number of areas, including intra-
campus communication, academic strategic planning, program and faculty assessment, and program development.

The Self-Study process has indeed been of tremendous value to the University and its leadership. It permitted us, five years after the appointment of a new President, to re-examine the institution from many different angles and to identify both our strengths as well as our weaknesses. Throughout the self-study report, most areas identified concerns or areas for improvement. Though they are identified in greater detail in relevant Standard sections, there are four areas of particular gravity with which we are currently concerned.

1) Shortly after his arrival, the President articulated a plan for the University, known as Momentum 2007 that had as its specific intention the lifting of the institution out of the financial exigency into which it was fast falling (see Figure 1: Momentum 2007 Plan and Figure 2: Momentum 2007 Goals, page 4). Though not a full-blown strategic plan, it was nonetheless intended to provide specific guidance and was widely circulated within the University community at the time of its unveiling. As a plan of action, it was quite successful and one can see the direct effects of Momentum 2007 upon the institution and.

Figure 1: Momentum 2007 Plan

Figure 2: Momentum 2007 Goals
1. TO PROVIDE ONE OF THE VERY BEST PROGRAMS IN LEADERSHIP, FAITH, SERVICE, AND JUSTICE/ETHICS IN THE UNITED STATES.

2. TO BECOME A TOP-DECILE NATIONALLY RANKED UNIVERSITY USING NET REVENUE INCREASES AND CAPITAL CAMPAIGN FUNDS TO BUILD QUALITY IN THE STUDENT BODY, FACULTY, STAFF, PROGRAMS, TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES.

3. TO ALLOW OUR STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN ONE OF THE MOST INTEGRATED EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES (INCLUDING PEER EDUCATION, DIVERSITY EDUCATION) AVAILABLE IN THE UNITED STATES.

4. TO INCREASE ENROLLMENT FROM 4,400 TO 6,000 (800 UNDERGRADUATES AND 700-800 GRADUATE STUDENTS)

5. CAPITAL CAMPAIGN TO FUND ENDOWMENT, TECHNOLOGY, MISSION, RENOVATION, NEW FACILITIES, AND ATHLETICS (119 MILLION DOLLARS)

its priorities. Now that the institution has achieved a reliable level of stability, the President has asked the community to become engaged in a comprehensive strategic planning process, the structure of which was announced to the faculty at its Fall Faculty Conference in August, 2003, and to the Board of Trustees in September 2003 (see Strategic Plan, Appendix B). The President is keenly aware for the need to develop a comprehensive plan, one which allows for the assessment of integrated institutional effectiveness.

2) Faculty and, to some extent, staff morale is inconsistent between institutional areas, a concern that underscores the extent to which the institution is still “coming to grips” with the relationship between institutional mission, optimal enrollments, optimal resources, appropriate/adequate communication, and adequate human resource management. Much has changed at our institution since 1993. Gonzaga today is too large and complex to operate as it once did: a small, intimate community of faculty and staff, engaged in common enterprise and frequent dialogue. Yet it is not so large as to be incapable of preserving some of that intimacy, even as the institution finds itself challenged with complex issues. Gonzaga University’s faculty and staff are extremely devoted, and this becomes very clear as one reads through the Self-Study report. Since the BRRP process, there has been an active effort to ensure that institutional costs are monitored and carefully controlled.

In view of this issue, the President, his Cabinet, and the Trustees are working together in an intentional and concerted manner to achieve better communication between and within areas, in an effort to better respond to issues
and concerns. As Standards Four and Six both indicate, from the perspective of some, this is not happening in an expeditious nor effective fashion; others feel that a real effort has been made to respond to issues identified by both faculty and staff. Improving community morale is, and will continue to be, a priority for the administration and governing Board.

3) The Self-Study has been only the most recent endeavor which points to the need for a formalized office of Institutional Research (IR). Over time, our IR efforts have been ad hoc and loosely coordinated either by the Academic Vice President’s office or – especially for surveys – the Registrar’s Office. As noted in Standard One, research and assessment does occur, and research-based decision making also takes place, but it is often not coordinated and the advantages of institutional coordination therefore cannot be realized. Especially in the academic area, the institution’s ability to make decisions about hiring, resource allocation, or programs has been hampered by a lack of reliable data.

In the Fall of 2003, the Academic Vice President expanded the responsibilities of our current Registrar, Ms. Jolanta Kozyra, and appointed her “Director of Institutional Research.” In this capacity, the Director is currently engaged in a study of both research scope and optimal organizational design for the establishment of the enterprise. It is our intention that by Fall of 2004, specific objectives related to program development will be in place and under pursuit by this office.

4) Closely related to the third issue is an identified concern over institutional effectiveness in educational programs. While certain areas of the institution have good mechanisms in place for demonstrating achievement of stated objectives – notably in the professional schools – others are wanting in this respect. In response to this, the Academic Vice President has tasked an associate academic vice president with responsibility for working together with the academic deans on the development and implementation of a comprehensive institutional assessment plan, a copy of which is at Exhibit C.

Throughout this Report, a number of issues were identified by the Self-Study Steering Committee. In some cases, these issues translated into “Next Steps,” or suggestions for improvement or courses of action. Though these do not bind the institution in any way (and in some cases, may be difficult to achieve) they are intended to point the way for future improvement.

We look forward to the evaluation team’s assessment of Gonzaga University, its programs, and its people at this phase the institution’s history. We appreciate the opportunity that this visit affords us to reflect further upon areas and issues that require examination, and to celebrate the many things that Gonzaga does so well.
The Self-Study

This Self-Study has been the product of many individuals’ efforts over many months. The members of the Committee, of which there have been twenty-two, have worked individually, as “subcommittees,” and as a “committee of the whole” to develop, review, revise, and share multiple versions of this document with the Gonzaga Community. The Community itself has been involved in virtually every aspect of its composition as well. Out of the Steering Committee were formed thirteen (13) subcommittees, the members of which are identified at Appendix A. The 2002-2003 academic year constituted our “self-study year;” therefore, most of the information reported here reflects that timeframe. Where possible (and reliable), information from the Fall of 2003 has been included.

The Timeline

April, 2002
Self-Study Steering Committee (SSSC).

April – August, 2002
The SSSC holds preliminary discussions regarding the plan and logistics, as well as timeline development, for the self-study process. Creation and adoption of information-gathering templates for Standards Two, Three, and Four.

September, 2002
Preliminary visit by Dr. Sandra Elman, Executive Director of the Commission on Colleges, to meet with the President, Academic Vice President, and the SSSC.

September 2002 – April 2003
The campus is engaged, through departmental and sub-committee work, in information-gathering, assessment, self-study, and report-writing. Steering committee members coordinate the composition of self-study narrative sections. The Steering committee meets monthly to discuss process, progress, and problems. Creation of the accreditation website.

February – June 2003
Standard Subcommittee draft reports submitted to Chair for initial editing.

May – September 2003
Editing of narrative sections into rough standard and steering committee members.

July, 2003
Initial presentation of findings by the Chair of the SSSC to the Cabinet at its summer retreat; Presentation to the Board.
of Trustees by Dr. Sandra Elman, Executive Director of the NW Commission on Colleges and Universities.

August, 2003
Key Steering Committee all-day Planning Retreat; Presentation to the Fall Faculty Conference regarding the fall process and timeline.

September 30, 2003
Deadline for the completion of edits/revisions to standard sections by the Steering Committee members.

October - University
November, 2003
Revised draft standard sections made available to the community via the institution’s Accreditation web-site.

November, 2003
Issues raised by the campus community, in response to draft section posting, are reviewed by the SSSC; necessary changes are made and issues addressed. Copies of the revised sections are provided to the President and the Vice Presidents for final review at this time. Completion of exhibits begins.

December, 2003
The SSSC makes available a final draft of the entire self-study report to faculty, students, staff, and Trustees; specific chapters to targeted stakeholders; holds open meetings and collects feedback.

January, 2004
The final self-study report is edited by a sub-committee, reviewed by a team of editors, and approved by the President. Announcement of accreditation visit, already in the class schedule and academic calendar, is placed in the Spokane newspaper. Institutional snapshot is completed, and any 2003 updates certified.

February, 2004
The final self-study report is printed for the Evaluators, the Commission, and the University Community.

March 1, 2004
Copies of the self-study report, the 2003-05 Academic Catalogues, 2003-04 class schedules, brochures, and related information are mailed to evaluation team members; copies of the final self-study are circulated to trustees, staff, faculty, and students on campus.
April, 2004  The room for the on-site evaluation team is readied with supporting reports, studies, documents, and data. Part of the Board of Trustees’ April meeting focuses on the upcoming evaluation visit. Reminder of upcoming visit sent to campus constituencies.

April 18-21, 2004  Evaluation site visit. Team visit to begin with a brief tour, continental breakfast, welcome from the President, introduction of the evaluation team and key University personnel. Visit concludes with a public (April 21, 11:00/11:30am) presentation from the chair of the evaluation team citing commendations and recommendations.

May, 2004  President to receive a draft copy of the evaluation committee’s report to be checked for factual errors or misinterpretation of data.


Self-Study Steering Committee Membership

John Caputo, Professor of Communication Arts
John has been at the University for fourteen years, served as Chair of Communication Arts for six years, and is a past-President of the Faculty Assembly. He has been involved in curriculum matters here at Gonzaga and served as an external consultant to several other universities through the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities Communication Conference of which he recently stepped down from the role of President. He holds a doctorate in language and communication from the Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, California.

Kay Carnes, Professor of Accounting
Kay has taught various accounting courses at Gonzaga since 1978. She currently concentrates teaching and research in the areas of auditing, ethics, and fraud prevention. During her 25-year tenure, she has served as division chair as well as a member of many University and School of Business committees. She has also taught several times in the Gonzaga-in-Florence program. Kay is past-chair of the Washington State Board of Accountancy and currently serves as a member of the International Qualifications Appraisal Board, a national task force. Such positions keep her at the forefront of current issues faced by graduating accounting majors.
Steve Doolittle, Director of Human Resources
Steve has been the Director of Human Resources at Gonzaga for fifteen years. At different times he also had responsibility for the Bookstore and Faculty Services in addition to HR. For the past five years he has also supervised the Environmental Health and Safety function. Steve is currently a member of our Board of Regents representing the professional non-faculty employees. He has a BA in Business from the University of Puget Sound and an MBA from the University of Washington.

Beth Hellwig-Olson, Dean of Student Services
Beth has worked in the field of Student Affairs and higher education for the past 28 years, serving the last three at Gonzaga University. She works on a day to day basis with students, serves as the student government advisor, is the Coordinator of New Student Orientation, and supervises a number of campus departments at GU. Beth is active in the regional advisory board for the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and also coordinates the National Resident Assistant Exchange program through the National Student Exchange. Beth received her doctorate from the University of Northern Colorado, (Greeley) in College Student Personnel Administration.

Dennis Horn, Dean of the School of Engineering
Dennis came to Gonzaga in 1997 as engineering dean, leaving a similar position at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. He holds a doctorate in environmental engineering from The Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, and has had a 30-year career spanning academic and corporate engineering positions. His recent (2002) accreditation experience consists of guiding four Gonzaga engineering programs through a successful evaluation visit by the Engineering Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology.

Rick Jones, University Controller
Rick has been with the University for 25 years, the last 18 in his present position as Controller. Rick’s tenure in the Finance area makes him very qualified to speak to the many financial issues that confront the University and are addressed and discussed within the Self-Study.

Amy Kelley, Professor of Law, Associate Dean of the Law School (through June 2003)
Amy has been at the University for twenty-four years and served as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the Law School for the academic years 1999-2000 through 2002-2003, as well as Acting Dean for several months in 2000. She has chaired several Law School and University committees, as well as serving as President of the Faculty. She is especially involved in matters concerning Admissions and the Office of the Law School Registrar.

Jolanta Kozyra, University Registrar and Director of Institutional Research
Jolanta has been at the University for sixteen years and has served as the University Registrar for four years. She started her university employment with the Office of Undergraduate Admission. In addition to her duties as the Registrar, she has taught
undergraduate and graduate courses as adjunct faculty. She holds a Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology degree and expects to complete her Ph.D. in Leadership Studies in May 2004.

Mary McFarland, Dean of the School of Professional Studies
Mary has been at the University for nearly six years as Dean of the School of Professional Studies. The School of Professional Studies has a designated focus on program offerings related to health, leadership and service. With a master’s degree in nursing from the University of Portland and a doctorate in educational leadership from Gonzaga University, Mary teaches in the master’s and doctoral leadership programs and in the nursing program. Mary is a Fellow with Robert Wood Johnson and has just completed a funded three year project on organizational health.

Thayne McCulloh, Associate Academic Vice President & Dean of Student Financial Services; Chair of the Self-Study Steering Committee
Thayne McCulloh is the associate academic vice president responsible for academic administration. He is the institution’s accreditation liaison officer and an accredditor for the NW Commission on Colleges and Universities. He has been employed at Gonzaga since 1990, and has served during that time in a number of administrative positions. He has been a ranked member of the Psychology faculty since 1998.

Colleen McMahon, Associate Professor of Communication Arts, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences
Colleen McMahon has been at Gonzaga for 17 years. She is a tenured member of the Communication Arts Department, but has been serving as Associate Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences for the past 8 years. She is knowledgeable about issues regarding students, faculty, and advising in the College of Arts & Sciences. She received her graduate degree from Washington State University.

Kathleen O’Connor, Assistant Dean for Library Systems
Kathleen has been at the University for seventeen years and has served as Assistant Dean for the past four years. As Assistant Dean, her work is primary with the Washington—Idaho Network, a consortium of more than seventy libraries in eastern Washington and north central Idaho. Previously, she was a member of the Foley Center Public Services Department as a reference librarian and instructor for library research. She received her BA in History from Gonzaga University and a Masters in Library and Information Science from the University of Washington.

Wayne Powel, Associate Academic Vice President & Chief Information Officer
Wayne Powel has been at Gonzaga University since 1989. He has taught research methods and statistics in addition to his classes in his specialty area, cognitive psychology. He has worked as an associate academic vice president since 1999, and currently serves as Chief Information Officer (CIO), an appointment he holds concurrent to the associate vice presidency.
Mike Roth, Director of Athletics
Mike has been at Gonzaga University for 17 years and has been the Director of Athletics since 1997. Mike oversees all aspects of the University’s athletic programs along with intramurals and the new fitness center. Mike has been a member of the last two NCAA self-studies on Gonzaga University athletics from which the University received certification without conditions.

Ken Sammons, Director of Plant & Construction Services
Ken will have just celebrated 35 years of service at Gonzaga as of the evaluation team visit. For twenty-eight of those years, he has served in progressively more senior management level positions and has been the University’s representative on each major construction project that has occurred during that time. He currently serves as Director of Plant and Construction Services, a major division including the departments of Planning & Design; Telecommunications & Customer Service; Purchasing, Warehousing & Mail Services; Grounds, Maintenance, and Custodial.

Harry Sladich, University Vice President & Trustee Emeritus
Harry has been at the University since January 1962, where he has served in numerous capacities. Most recently, he served 18 years as Vice President for Administration and Planning. Harry retired from full-time service in May 2001, but continues as Vice President and Secretary to the Board of Trustees. He has been involved in several previous accreditation self-studies.

Nancy Staub, Professor of Biology
Nancy has been at Gonzaga for twelve years. She teaches courses such as the Diversity of Life and Genetics and Evolution for majors, and Biology of Medicine for non-science majors. She works extensively with undergraduates in her research lab, studying the evolutionary biology of salamanders. She holds a doctorate in Zoology from the University of California at Berkeley.

Bill Watson, S.J., Vice President for Mission
Fr. Watson is beginning his fifth year at Gonzaga as VP for Mission. As a member of the Society of Jesus for 30 years and having worked in Jesuit universities for close to 20 years in mission and chaplaincy related fields, Fr. Watson has extensive experience with program development related to Jesuit/Catholic identity and the Ignatian spiritual tradition from which Jesuit universities take their direction. Fr. Watson has undergraduate degrees in philosophy from Gonzaga and a double MA in Theology from Weston Jesuit School of Theology, Cambridge MA

Shirley Williams, Dean of the School of Education
Shirley is in her second year at Gonzaga University as Dean. For the previous 16 years she served in multiple faculty and administrative roles in Illinois and Hawai‘i, including department chair, dean and academic vice president at the University of St. Francis in Joliet, Illinois. She has served on numerous NCATE/state accreditation teams for teacher education and North Central Accreditation. For the past 12 years she has implemented numerous assessment processes and has presented programs and
workshops in the area of assessment at national and state meetings. She holds a
doctorate from Northern Illinois University in the area of Leadership and Educational
Policy Studies.

Former Members of the Steering Committee:

Joan Allbery, Director of Central Computing

Deborah McDonald, Associate Academic Vice President
Accreditation Overview

Below is a summary of planned accreditation activity at the University for the next three years (i.e., Spring 2004 to Spring 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Visit (Planned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 – 2004</td>
<td>Association of Theology Schools NCATE</td>
<td>March, 2004 November, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 – 2005</td>
<td>No anticipated activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 – 2007</td>
<td>Commission on English Language Program (CEA) American Association of College Schools of Business (AACSB)</td>
<td>Spring/Summer, 2007 Academic Year 2006-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligibility Requirements (Revised, December 2000)

1. Authority

Gonzaga University operates as a higher education institution under the laws of the State of Washington and is governed by an independent Board of Trustees. The University is owned by a seven-person Board of Members, all of whom are members of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits). Please see the Gonzaga University Articles of Incorporation, the Bylaws of the Corporation, and the University’s response to Standard Six.

2. Mission and Goals

Gonzaga’s Mission Statement was last edited and approved by the Board of Trustees in 1984. The mission statement describes a Catholic, Jesuit and humanistic institution, with a liberal arts emphasis, that offers a variety of academic programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral level. The undergraduate and graduate programs lead to formal degrees. See the University’s response to Standard One as well as the introduction to Standard Two and the individual School introductions within Standard Two. The institution operates solely to support the educational mission and
strategic goals of the University, and all of its income is applied to these same ends (see the institution’s response to Standard Seven).

3. Institutional Integrity

Published policies in the Faculty Handbook (Section 417.00, p. 4-52), the University’s Personnel Manual (First page), the Student Handbook (pp. 124-127), the University Catalogue (p. 9), the Graduate Catalogue (p. 4), and notices in advertisements for faculty and staff positions prohibit discrimination in education or employment at Gonzaga University. The work and educational environment at Gonzaga strives to be one that is free of discriminatory practice or intent.

4. Governing Board

The governing board of Gonzaga University (its Trustees) is made up of 31 members, all of whom are involved in the oversight, strategic planning, and financial well-being of the institution. Four of them (including the President who by virtue of his office sits as a board member) are members of the Society of Jesus and employed by the institution. No other members have an employment or financial relationship to the institution. Each year, every Board member signs a conflict of interest statement and discloses the appearance of any potential conflict of interest, should one exist.

5. Chief Executive Officer

Robert J. Spitzer, S.J., Ph.D., a Roman Catholic priest and member of the Society of Jesus (“the Jesuits”), is the chief executive officer of the institution. He was appointed by the Board of Trustees in 1998 for an indefinite period, and is evaluated on an annual basis by the Board. He serves fulltime as President of the University.

6. Administration

Gonzaga University provides administrative and support services necessary to achieve its mission and meet its goals. The University is divided into seven formal “divisions” (Academic Affairs; Finance, Plant & Athletics; Student Life; University Relations; Corporation Counsel; Board Liaison; Presidential Programs), each led by a Vice President, Corporation Counsel, or the President himself. The executive body, known as the President’s “Cabinet,” meets bi-monthly or more frequently as needed. Within each division, various administrative leadership groups meet on a regular basis. See the institution’s response to Standard Six.

7. Faculty

Gonzaga University employed a total of 297 full and half-time teaching faculty and 195 adjunct instructors (as of Fall 2003). As detailed in Standards Four and Six, faculty are involved with the development of academic and institutional policy, academic programs, curriculum and student advising, shared governance, and are evaluated periodically
through student and departmental evaluation processes. Gonzaga’s emphasis on teaching creates a workload of ten to twelve semester credit hours per semester, on average, for fulltime faculty, although variation within and between the five Schools and College of Arts and Sciences does occur. The institution’s faculty are extremely loyal and very devoted both to their students and the welfare of the University.

8. Educational Program

Gonzaga offers undergraduate majors in 49 areas, minors in 44, four undergraduate concentrations, and 23 graduate programs in recognized areas of professional study (including the Juris Doctor and the Ph.D. in Professional Leadership). The Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, or Bachelor of General Studies designation is determined by each major and approved by the Academic Vice President on the advice of the Academic Council. All undergraduates complete a core set of liberal education requirements (“the University Core”) as well as specific requirements of their College or School, and department. (See Standard Two.)

9. General Education and Related Instruction

All undergraduate students complete the same core set of liberal education requirements (general education) that, depending on prior skill levels and AP test scores, total between 40-45 semester hours. Transfer students with associate of arts degrees have certain of the University core requirements waived, but they must meet the requirements of the College or School “core” either through testing or coursework. In addition to core curriculum requirements, undergraduate students complete a major that ranges between 32-50 semester hours. Many of these hours include related work in major or academic areas other than the student’s primary major. (See also the institution’s response to Standard Two.)

10. Library and Learning Resources

The Foley Library and the Information Technology Support and Services (ITSS) provide a full range of services, support, information and access to information for Gonzaga students and the community. See Standard Five for a full description of services and results. For distance education programs, and for off-campus use, occasional on-line and hybrid courses, remote access to the library’s services and databases and access to the College’s website, files and information technology services are readily available. See the institution’s response to Standard Five.

11. Academic Freedom

Gonzaga maintains and fosters an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom and independence are valued by subscribing to the principle of academic freedom, by our status as an independent institution, through our faculty policies and contractual arrangements, and by supporting free and far-ranging inquiry and dialogue. The institution attempts to balance its devotion to academic freedom with a respect for its
obligations as a Roman Catholic institution. See the University’s response to Standards Four and Nine.

12. Student Achievement

See the University Catalogues, program brochures, transcripts, and the University’s response to Standard Two for separate major and minor program learning goals and objectives as well as evidence of student achievement. The response to Standard One details evidence that the University assesses its progress in achieving institutional and core liberal education learning goals, and that the effort involved with doing so is ongoing.

13. Admissions

The University has published admissions policies (see Undergraduate Catalog, p. 13-15 and Graduate Catalogue, p. 8), and monitors the carrying out of those policies by the Dean of Admission (for undergraduates), the Law Admissions Committee (for Law students), and the Deans of the College or Schools where graduate programs are housed (for Graduate programs). See Standards Two and Three.

14. Public Information

The University’s Admission materials, Catalogues, main and program websites, the Student Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, the Personnel Manual and related documents all provide current and accurate information regarding the University’s purpose, admissions requirements, programs, courses, faculty, grievance procedures and other policies. See also Standard Nine.

15. Financial Resources

Using generally accepted accounting principles and independent audit, at both the Trustees’ Finance and Audit Committee, and twice-annual community meetings of the President and Financial Vice President, the institution verifies its resources, funding base and plans for meeting its goals within an annual operating budget and manageable debt. See response to Standard Seven.

16. Financial Accountability

Moss Adams LLP provide an annual financial audit and report the results of it to the full Board at each October meeting. See response to Standard Seven and independent financial audits (provided in the Committee Workroom in Exhibits for Standard Seven).

17. Institutional Effectiveness

The University plans and evaluates its effectiveness on an ongoing basis through a series of qualitative and quantitative assessment measures detailed in the response to Standard One and in the educational programs’ response to Standard Two. The institution is
currently in the process of constructing a strategic plan which will create a comprehensive plan for the integration of data and its employment in planning.

18. Operational Status

The University was founded as Gonzaga College in 1887, was first accredited by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges in 1927, and most recently had its regional accreditation reaffirmed by the Commission of Colleges and Universities of the Northwest Association based on a full-scale evaluation in 1994 and a regular interim evaluation in 1999. There have been no negative actions relating to the institution’s accreditation status during the past twenty years.

19. Disclosure

Gonzaga is in regular mail, e-mail, and telephone contact with the Commission regarding developments or changes at the institution that may affect its accreditation status. Please refer to Commission correspondence in the Exhibit Room and response to Standards One and Nine.

20. Relationship with the Accreditation Commission

Gonzaga University accepts and agrees to comply with the standards and related policies of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities as they currently exist and as they may be modified. Gonzaga agrees that the Commission may make known to agencies or the public, at its discretion, information related to Gonzaga’s accreditation status with the Commission. In accordance with Commission policy, Gonzaga did release the general Commendations and Recommendations, exactly as they were written, to the public following the 1994 self-study, evaluation visit, report and subsequent Commission action.

Clarification

The data represented in this Self-Study is primarily reflective of the 2002-03 academic year, which was the official “self-study year” for Gonzaga University. However, where possible, updated information reflective of Fall 2003 has been included.
# Standard Committee Members

**I – Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard IV - Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Caputo (Co-Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Staub (Co-Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dacquisto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Dorsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Hedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McBride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Pierce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard V – Library &amp; Info Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Powel (Chair-Info Tech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen O’Connor (Foley Library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Stewart (Chastek Library)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Resources/Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Chambers, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Jenks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Okert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Plowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Warrington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities and Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Potter, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Kitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Prendergast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ruhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Scarpelli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Spencer, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly McFadden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Spidahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Wayman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II – Educational Program & Its Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shirley Williams (Chair) [Education Library]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kay Carnes [Business Library]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Horn [Engineering]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Kelley [Law]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharon Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Georgia Dunham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McFarland [Professional Studies]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen McMahon [Arts &amp; Sciences]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III – Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beth Hellwig-Olson (Chair, Committee A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bartlett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ritter Heitkemper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Leveque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lindsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Orie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Van Pelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carie Schwede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Siemion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolanta Kozyra (Chair, Committee B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Balzarini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Coombes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Holsinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie McCulloh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kelsey Posedel  
*Management*

Mike Roth (Chair, Committee C)  
Heather Gores

**STANDARD COMMITTEE MEMBERS, Continued**

**Standard VI – Governance and Administration**

Harry Sladich (Chair)  
Carol Bonino  
Keith Gauthier  
Peggy Sue Loroz  
Bob Lyons, S.J.  
Pat McCormick  
Heather Murray  
Wayne Powel  
Jill Strait

**Standard VII – Finance**

Rick Jones (Co-Chair)  
Kay Carnes (Co-Chair)  
Steve Carrozzo  
Roxy Kasman

**Standard VIII – Physical Resources**

Ken Sammons (Chair)  
Dennis Hansen  
Kathy Shearer  
Chris Gill  
Joan Allbery  
Keith Gauthier  
Dennis Colestock  
Jeff Hart  
Lindsey Ray  
Dale deViveiros  
Steve Lunden  
Mac McCandless

**Standard IX – Institutional Integrity**
Steve Doolittle (Chair)
Heather Gores
Dale Goodwin
Roxy Kasman
Victoria Loveland
Wayne Powel
Ken Williams

Special Thanks to: Annette Barta, Gina Bowman, Janice Carruthers, Fr. Tim Clancy, S.J. and the Faculty Senate, Terry Coombes, Tana Dugan, Heather Gores, Robin Guevara, Jeani Joyce (student), Susie Prusch, Stephen Sepinuck and the leadership of the Faculty Assembly, Kelsey Simmons (student), Fr. Del Skillingsstad, S.J., Katy Sparks (student), Maggie Toth (student), and Kathleen Wood (student).

EXHIBITS FOR INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

Exhibit A: Report of the Special Budget Review and Reallocation Process
Exhibit B: Gonzaga University Strategic Plan Process, 2003-04
Exhibit C: Gonzaga University Academic Assessment Plan, 2004 – 2007
## INSTITUTIONAL SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Fall 1998</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total headcount</td>
<td>4511</td>
<td>5589</td>
<td>5826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate FTE</td>
<td>2832</td>
<td>3987</td>
<td>4185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate headcount</td>
<td>1047 (G), 94 (D); 490 (L)</td>
<td>1039 (G); 105 (D); 570 (L)</td>
<td>1098 (G); 116 (D); 627 (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate programs enrollment (credits)</td>
<td>See attached report</td>
<td>See attached report</td>
<td>See attached report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate residential (% of undergraduate total)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate commuters (% of undergraduate total)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New undergraduates (total)</td>
<td>566 (new) + 241 (transfers)</td>
<td>904 (new) + 193 (transfers)</td>
<td>908 (new) + 185 (transfers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New undergraduate transfer (% of total new undergraduate)</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average high school gpa/ACTION full-time, first time students</td>
<td>3.54/26</td>
<td>3.63/26</td>
<td>3.66/26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage undergraduates from Washington</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of new first year undergraduates from Washington</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number (undergraduate and grad) minority students (%)</td>
<td>262 (9.5%) – UG 76 (7%) -- GR</td>
<td>430 (11.3%) – UG 47 (4.8%) -- GR</td>
<td>411 (10.3%) – UG 70 (6.6%) -- GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number (graduate and undergraduate) international students (%)</td>
<td>147 (5.4%) – UG 234 (25%) -- GR</td>
<td>58 (1.5%) – UG 345 (35%) -- GR</td>
<td>49 (1.2%) – UG 283 (26.9%) – GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time/Part-time undergraduates (%)</td>
<td>90% FT 10% PT</td>
<td>94% FT 6% PT</td>
<td>95% FT 5% PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention rate (excluding allowable exceptions), first year to second year</td>
<td>88% (1997 cohort)</td>
<td>90% (2001 cohort)</td>
<td>90% (2002 cohort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average class size</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67985283</td>
<td>95311216</td>
<td>120267078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction (%)</td>
<td>33.47</td>
<td>30.59</td>
<td>29.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support (%)</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support (%)</td>
<td>39.19</td>
<td>42.03</td>
<td>43.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant (%)</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services (%)</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt/Bonds (%)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of staff (FTE)</strong></td>
<td>529</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tuition</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate, year plus fees</td>
<td>15,985</td>
<td>19,495</td>
<td>20,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate, year plus fees and room/board</td>
<td>18,585</td>
<td>22,235</td>
<td>23,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate, per credit hour</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate, per credit hour</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net tuition as percentage of total revenue</strong></td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Financial Aid</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total financial aid as percentage of gross tuition</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average undergraduate total financial aid award (federal, institutional, loans)</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>12525</td>
<td>13271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average undergraduate discount rate (institutional aid)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Faculty</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># full-time teaching</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># half-time</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># adjuncts</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average salary/full-time/9 months</strong></td>
<td>$51,272</td>
<td>$61,081</td>
<td>$63,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>$68,313</td>
<td>$81,095</td>
<td>$86,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$48,175</td>
<td>$56,899</td>
<td>$59,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$39,253</td>
<td>$46,618</td>
<td>$50,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct wage per credit hour</td>
<td>$709 to $2,000</td>
<td>$809 to $2,000</td>
<td>$809 to $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course sections taught by adjuncts (% of total)</strong></td>
<td>17.44%</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
<td>23.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Majors/Programs</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Largest academic programs (number of majors enrolled, Fall semester) | 1. Business Admin—210  
2. Psychology — 142  
3. Biology — 141  
4. Political Science — 120  
5. Special Education-115 | 1. Business Admin—303  
2. Biology — 225  
3. Psychology — 193  
4. Political Science — 175  
2. Biology — 231  
3. Psychology — 206  
4. Political Science—199  
5. Mech. Engnr.—136 |
| Students graduating (degrees awarded as of 12/18/03 for the given semester’s majors) | 1. Business Admin — 192  
2. Psychology – 96  
3. Biology – 96  
4. Political Science – 93  
5. Special Education — 90 | 1. Business Admin — 141  
2. Psychology – 37  
3. Biology – 36  
4. Political Science – 33  
5. Mechanical Enginr. — 16 | N/A |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating undergraduate students who were transfers (%)</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating undergraduate students indicating intent to continue education</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate graduation rate (six-year)</td>
<td>63% (fall 1993 cohort)</td>
<td>76% (fall 1996)</td>
<td>79% (fall 1997 cohort)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Average GPA of graduating students | Undergrad: 3.22  
Graduate: 3.81 | Undergrad: 3.29  
Graduate: 3.84 | Undergraduate: 3.30  
Graduate: 3.86 |
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STANDARD ONE: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND GOALS, PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS

Mission and Goals

Gonzaga University’s Mission Statement has been the source for defining the institution’s character and preparing its goals ever since it was approved by the Board of Trustees during the presidency of Rev. Bernard Coughlin, S.J. in the spring of 1979 (see Exhibit 1.A.1, Mission Statement). The document has been studied and evaluated by the campus community throughout the ensuing years, with the most recent formal review in 1996-97 as part of an institutional strategic planning process. The Mission Statement is widely disseminated and frequently referenced, appearing at the front of each Catalogue among other prominent publications (see Standard 3, Exhibits 3.4-3.6). Over the years, some members of the community have found the length and breadth of the Mission Statement to be problematic. It is lengthy, and it is abstract; the realization of the many goals contained within it is a challenge for the community working as a collective – much less any one individual or constituency. Nonetheless, the Steering Committee perceives that the Mission Statement itself appears widely known and understood, and there is great commitment to it. Certainly there is a great deal of passion for the Mission Statement on the part of many in the community, including the Board of Trustees.

During the past several years, Gonzaga has found itself engaged in a dialogue about the meaning of its Mission in view of emerging issues in the Catholic Church and the Society of Jesus, the interpretation of these by its leadership, and the reactions to this on the part of the campus community. A survey conducted by the Self-Study Steering Committee’s “Standard One Subcommittee” in the fall of 2002 indicates that the Mission Statement has had a more thorough reading in recent years than it had ten years ago (see Exhibit 1.B.7). The dialogue itself has revealed some divergence of opinions on the campus, and there are signs of greater activism around Mission-related issues than has been seen for a long time.

During the tenure of the current president, Rev. Robert Spitzer, S.J., five distinct “Mission Areas,” rooted in the Mission Statement have been articulated, specified for annual budget support, and focused upon as goals for the current Capital Campaign, which is to be completed by 2007 (see Exhibits 1.A.2 – 1.A.3). Those five distinct areas are faith, ethics, service, leadership and justice (see Exhibits 1.B.1-1.B.5). In addition, in 1998 a new position, Vice President for Mission, was created and an individual hired to fill this position. Some members of the faculty have expressed concern over the emphasis on these five mission areas: the choice of these particular areas (and the absence of “education” or “academics” from them); the lack of a clearly articulated relationship between the Mission and the five Mission Areas; and the manner in which these areas have shaped fundraising and/or resource allocation in view of academic resource needs. According to feedback from the Faculty Senate, many faculty do not accept that

1 The initials “S.J.” signify one who is a member of the Society of Jesus (also known as “the Jesuits”), the founding order of Gonzaga University. The founding Jesuit President was Fr. Joseph Cataldo, S.J.
the five Mission areas articulated by the President are a full characterization of the University’s Mission. For his part, the President has stated that the five mission areas are not intended to supplant the Mission Statement, and that the Trustees’ commitment to the current Mission Statement is clear and unambiguous. Progress reports on achieving goals related to each of these areas have been made to the Board of Trustees and the Gonzaga Community, by the President, for each of the past three years. A statement regarding the significance of the five distinct Mission areas – as well as an explanation of how these relate to the University Mission – was recently approved by the Board of Trustees (Exhibit 1.B.24). The Mission areas played a key role in the Board’s consideration of goals for the current Capital Campaign as well. It is not clear to the Steering Committee, however, that the Mission Areas (and the role they play in the conversation regarding institutional Mission) are well understood within the University community. The Steering Committee perceives these to have broad community support amongst staff and administrators, and less support from members of the faculty in view of other mission-related, and institutional, concerns (e.g., academic support, educational resources).

Publication of the Mission

The principal publication site of Gonzaga University’s Mission Statement is the University’s Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogues, where it appears as those publications’ first item (see Standard Three). The Mission is also published in the Student and Employee Handbooks (see Standard Nine). The Mission Statement is also printed separately on a single page for distribution to various Gonzaga constituencies (e.g., Residence Hall Staff). It is customary for the University’s academic deans to send copies of the Mission Statement to finalists for faculty positions, and the deans may ask candidates to articulate a response to the document.

Documented Progress in Mission Accomplishment

While differences of opinion exist regarding interpretation of the various dimensions of the mission statement (e.g., humanistic, Catholic and Jesuit; an emphasis on Western culture), the centrality of the Mission Statement is often referenced in University activities such as strategic planning, budgeting, faculty hiring, curriculum development, student life, fundraising, and athletics. With recent efforts by the President to define the primary mission elements in terms of faith, ethics, leadership, justice, and service, the University has emphasized existing programs (e.g., support for the Institute for Action Against Hate; programs in Leadership Studies; Service Learning), and developed new initiatives (e.g., the Ethics Institute; Ignatian Leaders), in these areas. Annual Reports of the President, the Gonzaga Quarterly alumni newsletter, and the Capital Campaign (launched in 2002), as well as periodic in-person updates to the Community by the President, highlight the University’s plans and progress and keep constituents informed of progress in accomplishing mission-driven goals.

---

2 Cabinet Retreat, July 2003.
Determination of Mission-consistent Goals

The University’s goals – as defined by the President in the Momentum 2007 capital campaign and the Goals for 2007 document – are consistent with the Gonzaga Mission and the resources available—human, physical, and financial. In the Momentum 2007 document (see Exhibit 1.A.3), growth in undergraduate enrollment received high priority because meaningful growth held the only potential for a meaningful increase in net revenue. The difficulties faced by institutions of higher education regarding the human, physical, and financial aspects of operating have received consistent and disciplined focus in the last five years at Gonzaga University, resulting in movement toward greater consistency, growth, and stability. Across academic programs there are increased efforts to create human, physical, and financial pathways to both identify with, and further understand, the Mission. There has always been occasional disagreement among faculty, staff, and administration regarding the appropriate ways to define, implement, and assess institutional goals. Despite such disagreements the University continues to experience growth in its academic programs, student body, and physical plant and financial assets.

Mission-driven Institutional Activities

The institution’s goals, defined by the President in conjunction with senior administration, are articulated as an expression of the Mission (see Exhibit 1.A.4). Planning is therefore seen as emerging from the Mission, and decision-making resulting from this planning is therefore also tied to the Mission. When dramatic increases in enrollment did occur, the faculty became concerned that current staffing levels were insufficient to appropriately respond to the needs of the students and faculty. The level of faculty dissatisfaction around this issue was substantial, resulting in a public petition on the part of both faculty members and students for additional tenure-track faculty positions in high-need areas (in December 2002). The administration did respond to faculty (and administrators’) concerns by authorizing the hiring of eleven new faculty positions during, and at the end, of academic year 2002-03. Other funding, especially through significant progress in the Capital Campaign, have supported new campus facilities and deepened both educational and co-curricular programs. New residence halls, new student athletic facilities, new academic facilities, and recently funded innovative programs, are all oriented toward educating the whole person and leading to the formation of students who are “people for others.”

Public Service

Service marks an essential component of Gonzaga’s Mission. “As Jesuit we are inspired by the vision of Christ at work in the world, transforming it by His love, and calling men and women to work with Him in loving service of the human community” (Gonzaga Mission Statement, Exhibit 1.A.1). CCASL (the Center for Community Action and Service-Learning) provides the primary leadership for implementation of this standard. Programs include both volunteer activities and service learning. Volunteer opportunities include Campus Kids and Shaw Connection, Community Actions projects such as April’s Angels and Way of the Heart Retreat. Mission
Possible provides a service alternative to Spring Break and involves many students and faculty. Service learning, integrated into the curriculum, includes courses in eleven academic departments and the Law School (Exhibit 1.B.3). Many examples of faculty involvement in service to the community can be found; a few include many voluntary consultancies, the Law Clinic (University Legal Assistance) operated by the School of Law, and the Gonzaga Indian Education Outreach Program (GIEOP).

Gonzaga also offers a consistent program of lectures and workshops for and in cooperation with the larger Spokane community. Arts and Sciences provide the Davis Lecture, the Arnold Lecture, and the Flannery Lecture. Education, Business, Professional Studies and Engineering likewise offer regular professional and enrichment opportunities for the public. Performing arts offer music and dramatic performances. The Jundt Art Museum is noted for its exhibits and educational programs. Gonzaga athletics provides numerous opportunities for local and visiting athletic competition. The University also provides its facilities for use by outside groups with the intent of serving a common mission of education and service.

Commission Review of Proposed Changes

It is the current practice of Gonzaga University to insure that relevant changes to Mission Statement, autonomy, ownership, or program alterations are communicated to the Commission in a clear, appropriate, and timely fashion. According to University policy, the Academic Vice President reserves the right to approve, modify, or discontinue programs; the Academic Vice President may, and conventionally does, invoke the advice and consent of the Academic Council in certain of these actions.

A review of Annual Reports and University correspondence indicates that, while most program changes have been appropriately made and communicated to the NW Commission on Colleges, the process by which academic programs were externally approved was not always well understood within the community. Subsequent to the appointment of the current accreditation liaison officer (ALO) in 2001, all new programs have been audited for substantive change compliance, and communication with the Commission has been frequent. It is our belief that all programs currently offered by the institution are in full compliance with Commission policy.

A new academic program review process was adopted by the Academic Council on January 27th, 2003, with the specific purpose of evaluating a program for effectiveness in view of Commission standards. This process has been incorporated into a broader process of Academic Council bylaws development and restructuring. It is the University’s intention to standardize the program review procedure for both new and existing University programs (see also Standard Two).

The Academic Vice President also announced a Catalogue policy change on March 28th, 2003 (see Exhibit 1.B.25). The University Registrar has the responsibility for maintaining master copies of both the undergraduate and graduate catalogues – a responsibility previously held by the Academic Vice President’s Office. Under the new policy, the Registrar will require that any Catalogue amendments conform to proper processes and exhibit appropriate types of
Verification of internal and external approval of program changes, as well as the appropriate Commission reporting, fall within the scope of this policy. Attention to these matters should help to ensure program integrity as well as continued compliance with Commission guidelines.

**Planning and Effectiveness**

**Definition of Evaluation and Planning Processes**

Strategic planning processes since the Mission Statement’s adoption have given reference to the Mission while at the same time advancing the professional competencies required for on-going program and departmental accreditation processes. The Momentum 2007 goals, followed by the strategic planning process currently underway, seek to establish a planning process that objectively connects institutional goals with the stated Mission of the University. General processes to assess the extent of successful achievement were established at the time of Momentum 2007’s introduction, but as the comprehensive strategic planning process goes forward, achievable and measurable outcomes for each division and area will be established.

**Systematic Planning**

To assess progress in accomplishing the institution’s mission and goals, the Standard One Committee asked the director of every organizational unit to provide the committee with the following information:

- Mission statement
- Executive summary of strategic plans
- Executive summary of how resource allocation supports unit’s mission
- Executive summary of unit’s latest assessment/outcomes report
- Executive summary of mission-related outcome measures
- Executive summary of unit-level accreditation efforts

Nearly every department responded to this request, although departments varied considerably in the amount and completeness of the information provided. A sub-committee of the Standard One committee then divided up and analyzed the information by department.

The analysis of this information is summarized in exhibits 1.B.6 – 1.B.9. It must be noted that different departments use different definitions of vision, mission, goals, strategies, etc., suggesting that a systematic approach to planning is not in existence at the institution.

Of the 30 departments/units that provided information, 28 (93%) had a mission or goals statement. Of those units with a mission/goals statement, 24 (86%) were clearly consistent with the University’s Mission Statement; four mission/goals statements were not specifically related to the University’s Mission Statement. Of the 28 departments with mission/goals statements, 18 (64%) had a strategic plan for implementing the mission; the other departments did not submit this information or the strategic plan was unclear or incomplete. With respect to outcome measures, 12 (43%) of the departments responding had some outcome measures related to the
mission. In the majority of departments, either outcome measures were not provided or they were not clearly or specifically related to the mission.

In summary, virtually every major department or unit has a mission/goals statement and most of those are directly related to the University’s Mission Statement. A majority of departments have a strategic plan or other action plan to implement its mission and goals. Most departments, however, do not have defined, measurable outcomes that clearly demonstrate a relationship to the University’s Mission. As a general observation, academic and non-academic units that have some type of formal accreditation process (e.g., business, engineering, library, athletics) appeared to have more complete strategic plans and outcome measures. In general, however, outcome measures in these units tend to consist of discipline-related performance outcomes without a clear acknowledgment of the significance of the University’s Mission, or Mission-related outcome measures.

With Gonzaga’s rapid growth and success in student quality, fundraising, facilities expansion, and reputation in the last four years, the need to coordinate more effectively between the program/department level and the institutional level is recognized by the President and the Cabinet as significant and important. In the fall of 2003, Fr. Spitzer announced the initiation of an institution-wide strategic planning process, the design and scope of which is presented as Exhibit B (see Introduction). It is expected that the Strategic Plan, once established and adopted by the Community, will more clearly articulate the relationship of each department to the University’s Mission.

**Participatory Planning Process**

The president has worked toward more open and inclusive planning processes regarding institutional planning and goals since his arrival five years ago. In preparation for the current capital campaign, the president presented to both boards (Trustees and Regents), as well as to his Cabinet and Academic Deans, the outline for Momentum 2007. Deans and VPs were requested to take the draft documents and share them with their own constituents for feedback/response. The process to approve a “Mission-Centered Hiring” policy (MCH) involved 18 listening sessions with faculty (see Exhibit 1.B.10 – 1.B.11).

While effort has been made to insure that processes are open and inclusive, evidence still suggests that some internal constituents don’t always feel fully apprised of, or included in, the planning processes of the University (see Exhibit 1.B.12, items 21-22). For this reason, the President has asked the Vice Presidents to insure that opportunities for appropriate constituent involvement at all levels of the Strategic Planning process are in place for those who will be required to understand the goals, implement the plan and assess its effectiveness once the plan is in place.

**Integration of Evaluation and Planning Processes**

Gonzaga University has many areas where systematic evaluation and planning work quite effectively. Individual departments employ their own internal processes to assess program
effectiveness and compliance with academic requirements necessary for institutional accreditation. Each Vice President must submit annual reports for planning and goals to the President. The growth in Cabinet cohesiveness in the last five years due to new structures in meetings and reporting have also ensured increased communication between Vice Presidents; thus, common understanding about Mission and goals can be shared and applied in the areas of academics, finance, student services, mission, institutional planning and fundraising. During the past five years, the Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents have developed sophisticated governance and committee structures in order to address their responsibilities to the institution. The Board of Trustees, in conjunction with the Board of Members, has published a new document on Governance that specifically addresses its (Trustees’) Mission-related responsibilities to the University, its relationship to both the Board of Members, and its relationship to the various constituent groups in the University (Cabinet, Faculty, etc., see Exhibit 6.13, Standard VI.)

The undergraduate and Law Admission offices, and the Office of Financial Aid, employ precise processes for attracting qualified students to the University. The appointment of a Vice President for Mission (see Exhibit 1.B.13), as well as Directors to guide the five mission areas of faith, ethics, service, leadership, and justice is further evidence that the University is marshaling its energies to support key mission components.

However, there is less evidence that the University overall has integrated planning and evaluation processes that enable it to assess compliance with institutional mission and goals. With the growth and promise signified by the very successful current Capital Campaign, intra-VP level planning, and the new Mission-based initiatives, there is the need now to apply data-driven evaluation measures to ensure continued success programmatically, as well as success in future fundraising efforts for sustained growth in all areas that define Gonzaga’s mission. Also, more clearly articulated institutional planning processes would as enable the institution to have a comprehensive understanding of how best to apply resources to strengthen those areas that excel in mission effectiveness for academic, student services, faith and mission programming, and all activities the Gonzaga’s mission state are distinctive of its character.

**Resources for Planning**

Gonzaga provides the necessary resources for compliance for all required academic accreditation processes and planning. Most of this support is embedded in individual departments, programs areas, and service groups and comprise administrators, support staff, faculty heads as well as the funds that support these personnel and their departments. It is an expectation of the President that each Vice Presidential area will develop planning appropriate to her/his respective division’s needs.

In the fall of 2003, a Director of Institutional Research was appointed to begin the process of developing a plan for institutional research and assessment activities. The Associate Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the University Registrar, has begun to give shape to this function.
Communication of Institutional Effectiveness

There are many ways the University is using planning and evaluation to communicate Gonzaga University to its public including its internal constituents.

- The University has six Board meetings per year with its Trustees at which all areas of planning and evaluation are discussed at length. Four of these meetings include the Regents as well; two are dedicated to the Trustees’ work exclusively.
- Gonzaga University is part of the Oregon Province Higher Education Commission. The Commission meets twice yearly and seeks to find common ground in planning and evaluation for the Jesuit mission of the University, as well as sharing successes and challenges in planning and evaluation processes specific to the advancement of Jesuit mission in higher education.
- The Board of Members meets once yearly with the Board of Trustees and twice yearly with the Committee on Trustees to assess the state of the University, planning and evaluation activities to ensure the on-going success of the institution, and the strengthening of links between the lay (non-religious) Board and the Society of Jesus.
- The President’s office issues its Annual Report to alumni, trustees, regents, and the public.
- Four times a year, evidence of Gonzaga’s successes in institutional mission and goals are presented in the Gonzaga Quarterly.
- The new University web site has updated capabilities for communicating to the public the news and mission of the institution to both internal and external constituents.
- The office of undergraduate admissions excels in publications and news information to prospective students interested in the University, and the University has an award winning television advertising campaign on its nationally broadcast basketball games.
- Dozens of press releases on departmental successes, faculty honors, new University programs and initiatives and public events hosted by and in support of the University’s mission are issued from the University’s public relations every month.
- The President issues an annual report to board of trustees on planning and evaluation measures for the institution.

Analysis and Appraisal

The 1994 Self-Study described Gonzaga as being balanced on a past rich in tradition and a future of increasing secularization. This is true for all Jesuit and Catholic universities, as the report states. There are historical reasons for these trends and tensions that present both challenge and opportunity for institutions like Gonzaga. Gonzaga is still coming to terms with the fact that the Jesuit community, and its involvement in teaching and administration, is decreasing. Efforts of the past (such as the Council for Partnership for Mission), and new programs (like the Ignatian Colleagues program [see Exhibit 1.B.14]), are ways that the Gonzaga Jesuit Community seeks to share and shape its humanistic, Catholic and Jesuit heritage with non-religious staff, faculty,
students and alumni. The current faculty and staff comprise a richness of diversity in faith, culture, gender and race unprecedented in the institution’s history and methodologies for creating unity of purpose and vision in the Mission with this new diversity are essential. Times have changed sufficiently that even the Jesuit Community at the University has found it helpful and necessary to write a statement for this study defining how they view their corporate relationship and responsibilities to the institution they founded (see Exhibit 1.B.15).

Gonzaga also has a positive opportunity, from a Mission viewpoint, to sharpen its perspective and take advantage of many trends that have helped the Society of Jesus look anew at the purpose and focus of Jesuit Higher education. (see Exhibits 1.B.16 & 1.B.17). A large delegation from Gonzaga attended the meeting in Santa Clara University where the Jesuit General (superior of all Jesuits) met with representatives of all 28 colleges and universities in America to present his reflections on faith and justice in Jesuit higher education. Out of this meeting, two important events were planned for the wider Gonzaga community to reflect on these new trends in our mission. The Jesuit document on the Mission of Faith and Justice in Jesuit Higher Education was the focus of a Board of Trustee Retreat as well as a campus wide day of reflection (see Exhibits 1.B.18 & 1.B.19).

There are also new trends in the international focus of Jesuit higher education that need to be considered as Gonzaga advances its educational mission with programs in China, South Africa, Italy, and those planned in conjunction with Colombia. (see Exhibit 1.B.20). The last twenty years have also given the Catholic Church time to reflect on the institutional connection between the Church's mission and the mission of a University that calls itself Catholic (see Exhibit 1.B.21). The Jesuit order through its superior general has also taken steps in the last ten years to clarify the relatedness between the institutional mission of the Jesuits and those universities that call themselves Jesuit (see Exhibit 1.B.22). This latter document has been given added focus in the Oregon Province in Provincial John Whitney’s draft application on how it applies to Gonzaga University (see Exhibit 1.B.23). There is tremendous opportunity at this juncture to renew/refocus our institutional mission and goals based on the historical moment where we see ever clearer calls and more focused guidelines by both the Church and the Society of Jesus on how to advance a unique and signature quality of education that is humanistic, Catholic and Jesuit.

A way to begin this process in earnest would be in reviewing the ways in which the current mission statement are made objectively manifest in the work of the community. The mission statement appears widely distributed among all the members of the University community and is a source of lively debate. With regards to planning and assessment outcomes, it appears less widely used. There is debate, as the mission survey discussed above, over the relative value different members of the community place on the terms, “humanistic, Catholic, and Jesuit.” While the original drafter of the document had clear ideas on how these terms applied to Gonzaga’s education (see Exhibit 1.B.6) it may be time to facilitate a University wide process that will lead eventually to a supplementary “vision statement” so that all members of the community have a clear understanding of how to apply the values-based sections of the mission more effectively for purposes of both planning and outcomes assessment. When this process takes
place, recent documents mentioned above should be thoroughly mined for the insights and guidance they can bring to this on-going renewal of our institutional mission and goals.

Also, while planning for the University’s future has taken on a more focused mission-based perspective, there are still many opportunities for Gonzaga to unite longer range University-wide planning processes relative to its institutional mission and goals in an integrated fashion that more effectively allows programs, departments, and extra-curricular activities to find common methodologies for planning and assessment germane to this goal. One such effort at weaving a common theme descriptive of Gonzaga’s mission for future planning is in the motto for the current capital campaign: “Educating People the World Needs Most.” The early success of this campaign, announced in the spring of 2002 (as of Fall 2003, nearly 100 million dollars of a total 119 million dollar total goal had already been collected) suggests that Gonzaga’s humanistic, Catholic, Jesuit mission captured in this campaign motto has strong resonance with the financial, alumni, and benefactor communities we rely on for resources to grow our programs and facilities. It is precisely because of Gonzaga’s successes in increased student quality, reputation, facilities, and program complexity, that we need to find a more effective way to conduct overall planning and assessment to ensure on-going future success in these growth areas even while we continue to sharpen our Mission. Heretofore, planning and assessment has been conducted in a haphazard and dis-integrated fashion. The centralization of institutional research could allow for the potential of a coordinated assessment plan.

**Next Steps:**

- A process should be enacted that leads to a clarification of the University’s Mission Statement, especially as it relates to Jesuit, Catholic, humanistic identity and the work of Gonzaga as a university.

- Under the leadership of the president, an inclusive committee should be created, the task of which is to clarify the University’s Mission Statement in relation to the institution’s planning and outcomes assessment processes. This committee should be comprised of Faculty, staff, students, administrators, and governing board members. This should occur in conjunction with the institution’s Strategic Planning effort, currently underway.

- A central office of institutional planning and research should be established in order to aid Gonzaga in planning and assessing its institutional mission and goals via a vis program development and resource allocation in a uniform, data-driven, and University-wide manner. The results of these analyses should then inform future planning at the institution.

*(Note: A Director of Institutional Research, charged with the task of scoping and establishing an Office of Institutional Research, was appointed in September, 2003. She is Jolanta Kozyra, University Registrar).*
Exhibit 1.A.1 - Gonzaga University Mission Statement

Gonzaga University belongs to a long and distinguished tradition of humanistic, Catholic, and Jesuit education. We, the trustees and regents, faculty, administration and staff of Gonzaga, are committed to preserving and developing that tradition and communicating it to our students and alumni.

As humanistic, we recognize the essential role of human creativity, intelligence, and initiative in the construction of society and culture.

As Catholic, we affirm the heritage which has developed through two thousand years of Christian living, theological reflection, and authentic interpretation.

As Jesuit, we are inspired by the vision of Christ at work in the world, transforming it by His love, and calling men and women to work with Him in loving service of the human community.

All these elements of our tradition come together within the sphere of free intellectual inquiry characteristic of a University. At Gonzaga, this inquiry is primarily focused on Western culture, within which our tradition has developed.

We also believe that a knowledge of traditions and cultures different from our own draws us closer to the human family of which we are a part and makes us more aware of both the possibilities and limitations of our own heritage. Therefore, in addition to our primary emphasis on Western culture, we seek to provide for our students some opportunity to become familiar with a variety of human cultures.

In the light of our own tradition and the variety of human societies, we seek to understand the world we live in. It is a world of great technological progress, scientific complexity and competing ideologies. It offers great possibilities for cooperation and interdependence, but at the same time presents us with the fact of widespread poverty, hunger, injustice, and the prospect of degeneration and destruction.

We seek to provide for our students some understanding of contemporary civilization; and we invite them to reflect with us on the problems and possibilities of a scientific age, the ideological differences that separate the peoples of the world, and the rights and responsibilities that come from commitment to a free society. In this way we hope to prepare our students for an enlightened dedication to the Christian ideals of justice and peace.

Our students cannot assimilate the tradition of which Gonzaga is a part nor the variety of human culture, nor can they understand the problems of the world, without the development and discipline of their imagination, intelligence, and moral judgment. Consequently, we are committed at Gonzaga to developing these faculties. And since what is assimilated needs to be communicated if it is to make a difference, we also seek to develop in our students the skills of
effective writing and speaking.

We believe that our students, while they are developing general knowledge and skills during their years at Gonzaga, should also attain more specialized competence in at least one discipline or profession.

We hope that the integration of liberal humanistic learning and skills with a specialized competence will enable our graduates to enter creatively, intelligently, and with deep moral conviction into a variety of endeavors, and provide leadership in the arts, the professions, business, and public service.

Through its academic and student life programs, the Gonzaga community encourages its students to develop certain personal qualities: self-knowledge, self-acceptance, a restless curiosity, a desire for truth, a mature concern for others, and a thirst for justice.

Many of our students will find the basis for these qualities in a dynamic Christian faith. Gonzaga tries to provide opportunities for these students to express their faith in a deepening life of prayer, participation, in liturgical worship and fidelity to the teachings of the Gospel. Other students will proceed from a non-Christian religious background or from secular philosophic and moral principles.

We hope that all our graduates will live creative, productive, and moral lives, seeking to fulfill their own aspirations and at the same time, actively supporting the aspirations of others by a generous sharing of their gifts.
## STANDARD ONE EXHIBITS

1.A.1  Gonzaga University Mission Statement
1.A.2  Five Defining “Mission Values”
1.A.3  Momentum 2007: Goals Explained
1.A.4  Current (2002-03) Institutional Goals
1.B.1  Mission Area: Faith
1.B.2  Mission Area: Ethics
1.B.3  Mission Area: Service
1.B.4  Mission Area: Leadership
1.B.5  Mission Area: Justice
1.B.6  Mission Statement History
1.B.7  Mission Report
1.B.8  Mission Survey
1.B.9  Group Statistics
1.B.10 Mission Centered Faculty Hiring Proposal
1.B.11 Mission Centered Hiring Process
1.B.12 Mission Survey Data
1.B.13 VP for Mission
1.B.14 Ignatian Programs
1.B.15 Jesuit Community Mission Statement
1.B.16 Jesuit Ignatian Charism
1.B.17 Service of Faith and Promotion of Justice
1.B.18 Service of Faith and Promotion of Justice Executive Summary
1.B.19 University Convocation of Faith and Justice
1.B.20 Report on Regional Priorities
1.B.21 Ex Corde Ecclesiae
1.B.22 Jesuit University Relatedness Letter
1.B.23 Oregon Jesuit University Structure
1.B.24 Trustee Statement of Governance Principles
1.B.25 Memorandum re: University Catalogue
STANDARD TWO: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS

Overview

Gonzaga College became Gonzaga University with the opening of the School of Law in 1912. In 1916 the School of Philosophy and Letters for Jesuit Scholastics became part of the University. In 1921 the University opened the School of Business Administration and in 1928 the School of Education. The Graduate School was established in 1931, and the School of Engineering in 1940. The University opened a site in Florence, Italy in 1963, which enabled undergraduate juniors to spend a year of study abroad. Studies abroad later expanded to include England, France, Spain, China, Japan, and the Soviet Union. In 1975 the University established the School of Continuing Education, its tenth academic division. The School’s name was later changed to the School of Professional Studies. The University is currently composed of one college and five professional schools that have unique roles in supporting Gonzaga’s mission. In addition there are a number of non-credit and study abroad programs that provide additional educational experiences related to the university’s curriculum. Today the University offers programs leading to degrees as follows:

The College of Arts and Sciences (referred to as “the College”) confers the degrees of
- Bachelor of Arts (Classical, Honors, and General);
- Bachelor of Science (Honors and General);
- Master of Arts degrees in Pastoral Ministry, Philosophy, Religious Studies, Spirituality, and Divinity.

The School of Business Administration confers the degree of
- Bachelor of Business Administration (Honors and General);
- Master’s degrees in Business Administration, Business Administration/Juris Doctor, Accountancy, and Accountancy/Juris Doctor.

The School of Education confers the degree of
- Bachelor of Education degrees in Physical Education, Sport Management and Special Education;
- Initial and professional teacher certification in elementary and secondary education, in conjunction with the B.A. or B.S. degree;
- Master of Arts degrees in Administration and Supervision; Educational Administration, Curriculum and Instruction; Sport and Athletic Administration; Counseling (Canada only); Counseling/Psychology, and Teaching;
- Master of Education in Special Education; Initial Teaching, and Anesthesiology Education.

The School of Engineering confers the degree of Bachelor of Science (Honors and General) in Civil, Electrical, and Mechanical Engineering.
The School of Law confers the degree of Juris Doctor. In cooperation with the School of Business, a combined program is offered for the M.B.A./J.D.

The School of Professional Studies confers the degrees of

- Bachelor of General Studies
- Bachelor of Science in Nursing
- Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership
- Master of Arts in Communication and Leadership Studies
- Master of Science in Nursing
- Doctor of Philosophy in Professional Leadership

All masters’ programs, the Juris Doctorate, and the Ph.D program are professional degree programs, as defined by the Commission on Colleges and Universities. For detailed information on all academic programs, see the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogues, Exhibits 2.1 and 2.2, respectively.

The Academic Vice President (AVP) is the chief academic officer of the University. The Dean of each College/School is appointed by the President with the approval of the University Board of Trustees and reports to the AVP. The Dean is the normal channel of communication for all official business of the College/School. The Dean advises the AVP on matters of appointments, reappointments, promotion, tenure, salaries, and budgets. The Dean has responsibility for the integrity of academic programs and matters of curriculum, including faculty qualifications, teaching responsibilities, and meeting the needs of students who are served. The Faculty members of each College/School are responsible to the Dean through their Department Chairs or other governance structure; the Department Chairs report to the Dean.

Educational programs may originate from a number of individuals or units, but ultimately these structures provide for faculty control of curriculum and change. Proposals for new program development and program/course change originate from faculty within academic departments. Curriculum committees make recommendations to the Academic Council, an institution-wide committee that is comprised of students, faculty and administrators from across the institution (See Exhibit 2.3). The Academic Council, through its Curriculum Committee, approves all changes, additions and deletions to undergraduate academic programs, academic policies and graduation requirements. The Academic Council is authorized to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees. In addition, there has been a Graduate Council that serves in an advisory capacity to the Academic Vice President with the responsibility for screening new graduate programs and reviewing existing ones. This governance structure is under examination currently by the Academic Council and the Academic Vice President. The Academic Council has recently reviewed its program review process in order to accommodate for changes in the Graduate School decentralization process (See Exhibit 2.4). In addition, it is reviewing the relationship between the Academics and Graduate Councils.

To facilitate coordination and communication, the academic deans and the Academic Vice President meet monthly as the Council of Deans, and informally on an ongoing basis (See Exhibit 2.5). The Faculty Senate meets monthly (and more often in committees), and the faculty meet periodically in their separate schools (see also Standard Four). The graduate program
Graduate School Decentralization

Gonzaga University first established a separate school for Graduate Studies in 1931. Over the years, the University has seen many changes in its graduate programs, as well as the manner in which programs have been organized and administered. The retirement of the Dean of the Graduate School in 2002 served as a catalyst for review of the functions and effectiveness of the system. The Academic Vice President asked the Deans to analyze several models for graduate operations. A decentralization model received positive feedback from the deans of the School of Professional Studies, the School of Business, and the School of Education and the Director of the International Studies Program. The College of Arts and Sciences houses graduate programs in two departments, Philosophy and Religious Studies. Although the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences does not view graduate studies as an area of focus, he agreed to the decentralization as long as it did not impact the College’s current resources.

The decision to decentralize the Graduate School followed an examination of the needs and capabilities of each School/College by its respective Dean and conversations with the Graduate Program Directors, the Office of the Registrar, the Office of (Undergraduate) Admission, the Student Accounts Office and the Office of International Student Programs. The information culminated in a process analysis diagram that allowed for identification of functions performed and a set of conclusions derived from the process review (See Exhibit 2.5).

The final plan regarding the organization of Graduate Studies administration was reviewed by the Graduate Council and deliberated with the academic deans, program administrators, and various administrative departments. The Academic Vice President concluded that the new organizational structure would provide certain advantages to departments and their students, and serve to underscore the significance of graduate studies at Gonzaga. Historically the Graduate Council has functioned to create uniform standards and policies and review and approve changes to graduate programs. The decentralization of the Graduate School has brought the relationship of the Academic and Graduate Council to individual school/college governance under re-examination.

General Requirements

All undergraduate students must complete a 31-hour University Core Curriculum in addition to a specialized major of their own choosing. The University core requirements are grouped into five areas:

- Thought and Expression (7 credits)
- Philosophy (9 credits)
• Religious Studies (9 credits)
• Mathematics (3 credits)
• English Literature (3 credits)

Gonzaga’s Strategic Plan of 1992 affirmed the institution’s continued goal to promote and enhance its role as a comprehensive University, firmly grounded in the Jesuit liberal arts, offering instruction in the humanities, the social and natural sciences, the professional disciplines, and graduate programs (see Exhibit 2.9). A University Committee was formed in 1998 to revisit the goals and objectives of the University Core Curriculum. The results of that committee were not implemented, and a committee has been formulated once again to revisit the goals and student outcomes related to the Core Curriculum (See Exhibit 2.10).

Completion of an undergraduate major (32-70 semester hours) includes a number of College or School-based requirements and a minimum of 128 semester hours to graduate. Students must maintain a 2.0 cumulative GPA, a 2.0 minimum GPA in major coursework, and must meet the minimum requirements of their respective College or School to be eligible to graduate, as outlined in the University Undergraduate Catalogue (See Exhibit 2.1).

All undergraduate majors, minors, concentrations, and programs are developed, approved, offered, and assessed in one of the Schools or the College of Arts and Sciences, with the exception of the Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language (MA/TESL). MA/TESL at this time has a dual reporting relationship with the Director of International Student Programs and the Dean of the School of Education (See Exhibit 2.11).

A complete list of degrees conferred and substantive program additions or deletions from University offerings during the last five years are summarized in two tables at the end of this Standard section and are found in exhibits 2.12 and 2.13

Physical resources to support educational programs have improved over the last ten years with the opening of the Rosauer Center for Education (1994), the renovation of the Herak School of Engineering (1994 and 2001), the renovation of the Schoenberg Center for the School of Professional Studies (1998) and the renovation and expansion of the Hughes Building (Biology and Chemistry, 2003 and continuing). Deficiencies in office space still exist and were the focus of some discussion in the Faculty Assembly in spring, 2003 (see Exhibit 2.14). Detailed information is provided further by each school and the college.

Gonzaga strives to encourage the integration of theory and research with “real world” practical experience. Examples include required practica, internships, teaching, clinical and community experiences; portfolios, public exhibitions; service learning opportunities, and study abroad opportunities across the curriculum.

Educational Program Planning and Assessment

Gonzaga’s plan for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and mission, individual academic program goals, and student achievement of learning outcomes is an outgrowth of a system that
has been in place for more than ten years. Educational assessment includes a range of external and internal assessment instruments and processes that include student outcomes, program outcomes, and faculty effectiveness (See Exhibit 2.15). Program planning and assessment is evident across all academic programs within the university. Some planning and assessment processes are more formal than others. Many professional programs have achieved specialized accreditation by outside accrediting associations including:

AACSB International - Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology
American Association of Law Schools
American Bar Association
American Chemical Society
Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
Commission on English Language Program Accreditation
Council on Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs and Schools
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
Washington Board of Education

These accreditation organizations require a systematic process of program development, review and assessment in the professional schools whose programs they accredit (See Exhibit 2.16).

Other programs have been less formal about the review process. While Gonzaga has lacked a systematic process of formal assessment across the institution, it has used the governance structures of the institution to assess academic needs to implement change. However, educational assessment begins at the level of individual courses through a system of student course ratings administered for every course every fall and spring semester for every faculty member, no matter what their contract status or experience. Students are provided with an opportunity to evaluate faculty teaching using both a fixed-scoring as well as a free-form qualitative form. (See Exhibit 2.17). Course ratings are supplemented by peer and administrative classroom visits (See Exhibit 2.18 and 2.19), usually related to the faculty contract review, promotion, and tenure processes and described in detail in Standard Four. All fixed-score student course rating results are reviewed by department chairs and deans, and returned to the faculty who are invited each semester to discuss the results with program chairs, colleagues and their dean. Freeform responses are returned directly to the faculty member.

Specific academic program initiatives result in a more focused review of student course evaluations. For example, faculty of the “linked” Thought-and-Expression Block deliberately developed interrelated curriculum objectives for their courses and then reviewed student evaluations of these courses (See Exhibits 2.20 and 2.17). This review includes discussing outcomes with the students who took the courses as well as discussions among the faculty teaching them in order to make recommendations about the future objectives of the “linked” curriculum.

If students in any course are found not to be meeting the stated learning goals or the course is not fulfilling its role in a program’s learning goals and objectives as determined by course and program faculty, chairs and the dean, adjustments are made to the syllabus, the scheduling, the
examinations, the papers, the evaluation system, the readings, or the curriculum. At Gonzaga, each academic program is responsible for reviewing its learning goals and documenting student achievement. Annual informal program reviews, usually related to budget preparation and position requests in the fall semester (See Exhibit 2.21) are augmented by more formal reviews every five years (See Exhibit 2.22), professional or specialized programs accrediting organization review coincides with accreditation cycle.

The newly-created Academic Assessment Plan (See Exhibit 2.23) outlines a cycle of reviews that will take place on a five-year cycle or, on a cycle that reflects sensitivity to the specialized process (See Exhibit 2.24). Although comprehensive program reviews have not recently occurred in the College of Arts and Sciences, student learning outcomes are assessed nonetheless through a variety of means, usually aligned with the particular program discipline and learning goals, and conducted primarily by the faculty in the area. Also programs that are approved for teaching underwent review in Academic Year 2003-2004. See individual program reports for the self-study in the Team Room and summarized approaches and results for each academic program area (See Exhibit 2.25).

Until the appointment of a Core Curriculum Review Committee in Fall 2003, there was no faculty group that took program-wide responsibility for assessing liberal education learning goals or reviewing available assessment data (see Standard One discussion of institutional effectiveness and mission). By default this responsibility fell to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Academic Vice President. Because the Core Curriculum is required by all majors, each academic program is responsible for incorporating, integrating and assessing the learning of students in the core liberal education program as it related to their major.

As the institution moves from assessment of individual courses through individual academic programs to institutional effectiveness, it relies on many sources of data. The National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE) (See Exhibit 2.26), periodic undergraduate Student Satisfaction Surveys (See Exhibit 2.27), alumni surveys measuring learning outcomes (See Exhibit 2.28), and the annual Graduating Student Survey (See Exhibit 2.29) are examples of assessment instruments used periodically to collect information. Because these surveys have been conducted by different departments to serve widely varying purposes, however, they have not always been integrated into the programmatic assessment efforts of the Schools/College, programs, or individual faculty. It is the intention of the Academic Vice President that, through the recent creation of the Director of Institutional Research position, the development of an Academic Assessment Plan, and a focused effort by the Academic Council to enhance curriculum approval and review processes, the University will begin to deliberately integrate such data into a formalized cycle comprehensive and effective assessment process.

Perhaps the most unique assessment of educational effectiveness and achievement of learning outcomes is measured one student at a time. Performance is seen by the student whose internship lands them a fulltime position at the Department of Transportation, by the pre-med graduate whose career takes him to the Jesuit Volunteer Corps and then to medical school, by the Hogan Entrepreneurial student who wins the Northwest entrepreneurship challenge and $10,000. It is further demonstrated by the education student who becomes a mentor teacher, principal, counselor, or superintendent, the nursing student who becomes a health professional in a walk-in
clinic serving the homeless, by the political science major who does an internship at the White House and today serves as a senator's chief of staff, and by the psychology student who completes a Ph.D. and returns to Gonzaga as a full-time faculty member. When taken together with other information, these individual stories serve as evidence of the overall effectiveness of the educational program at Gonzaga.

Educational Effectiveness – Institutional Summary

Educational effectiveness within academic programs is defined by a range of factors that support academic programs throughout the institution. Resource allocations fund curriculum, faculty, administrative and staff positions and operating budgets. Such factors as curriculum quality, student/faculty ratios, academic space, and library and technology resources are key components that reflect support for academic program effectiveness. The charts below reflect changes in academic budget allocations from 1993 to the present (Table 1); Changes in enrollment from 1993 to 2003 (Table 2); and Changes in Per Student Expenditures.

Table 2.1: Change in Academic Budget Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>1993 Allocation</th>
<th>2003 Allocation</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>$5,318,355</td>
<td>$9,552,707</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>$1,516,185</td>
<td>$2,596,430</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>$3,370,128</td>
<td>$2,699,082</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>$1,458,797</td>
<td>$1,848,262</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>$3,639,411</td>
<td>$8,508,116</td>
<td>134.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>$970,831</td>
<td>$2,524,842</td>
<td>160.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Academic Divisions</th>
<th>1993 Allocation</th>
<th>2003 Allocation</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foley Library</td>
<td>$1,787,930</td>
<td>$1,934,396</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Library</td>
<td>$1,038,736</td>
<td>$1,454,951</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education</td>
<td>$419,669</td>
<td>$580,260</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Change in Academic Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>1993 Enrollment</th>
<th>2003 Enrollment</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>2356</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>(44.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Change in Academic Expenditures per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>1993 Expenditures per student</th>
<th>2003 Expenditures per student</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>$3,046</td>
<td>$4,054</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>$2,574</td>
<td>$2,596</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>$2,818</td>
<td>$4,083</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>$3,702</td>
<td>$4,422</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>$6,665</td>
<td>$13,570</td>
<td>103.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>$2,268</td>
<td>$4,316</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource allocation provides a very generalized picture about how the institution supports various programs, but funding is not the only factor in academic effectiveness of the various units. Each college and professional school has unique needs based on student populations, curriculum requirements and operating resources. The academic programs are articulated in the following sections. The following academic summaries are based on full reports, submitted to their deans or to the Self-Study Steering Committee. The complete collection of academic reports is in the Exhibit Room (See Exhibit 2.25).

Gonzaga does not grant credit for prior experiential learning. Courses are offered in a variety of formats reflecting a range of contact hours and credits, including on line and distance delivery. The College of Arts and Sciences and each professional school will address resources such as building and specialized resource needs, library, advising and technology as appropriate to their schools. Some academic student supports will be addressed in Standard 3.

Note: In order to meet the unique needs of the College of Arts and Sciences and the individual professional schools the following sets of documents are organized as follows for each school (and department or program) within the institution:

2.20 Course Syllabi
2.30 Program Outcomes (as provided in marketing or student materials)
2.31 Departmental Budgets
2.32 Assessment Instruments
THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
Robert D. Prusch, Dean

Mission/Objectives

These statements are only the introduction to the mission Statement for the College of Arts and Sciences:

The dual mission of the College of Arts and Sciences is to provide general education for all undergraduate students of the University, and particular education in a variety of disciplines to students pursuing degrees in the humanities and the social and physical sciences. A basic aim of the College is to educate students in the spirit of Christian humanism.

The College has developed a core curriculum to provide that general culture which distinguishes the educated person. This curriculum challenges each student to read, write, analyze, reflect, discuss and persuade; to evaluate learning with discernment and compassionate understanding; to explore the past for the light it casts on the present and future; to create works of the imagination; to practice ethical decision making; and to develop a foundation for fashioning a career.

The student’s major field of concentration offers an opportunity for specialized exercises and original investigation. This development allows the student to encounter methods of research and creative scholarship and to undertake original work in the laboratory, studio, or library of the university. Under the guidance of a skilled professor, the student’s exploration in the library and lab is the crown of a liberal education and the foundation for graduate or professional study.

The statement expands further to explain the objectives of the College.

Description of the Programs

The College of Arts and Sciences [the College] offers a Bachelor of Arts, Honors; Bachelor of Arts, General; Bachelor of Science, Honors; and a Bachelor of Science, General. The College offers forty majors and thirty-nine minors and has concentrations in Catholic Studies and Women’s Studies. Individual department/program summaries follow the general description of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Organizational Structure and Governance

All regular full-time faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences serve as academic advisors. Advising is one of the four areas of assessment as described in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty in their first year are not required to advise. The first year gives them time to become acquainted with university and departmental requirements. The College provides training for all its new
advisors prior to the semester in which they begin advising. The College’s Executive Council set the maximum number of advisees per faculty member at 25, with a reduction to a load of 15 for department chairs.

Ideally faculty within the student’s own major interest area serve their own, but that is not always possible with the increase in our student population. While some students may have an advisor outside of their major, the College makes a concerted effort to make sure the faculty are prepared to advise outside of their own department.

The College has its own internal advisor assignment procedures. The Associate Dean is responsible for signing the Change of Advisor form and processing the form. If a change involves a new advisor within Arts & Sciences, both the former and the new advisor must sign the form before it can be processed. Typically, a student has already talked with a faculty member who has agreed to be the new advisor before initiating the process. A student who does not have a new advisor in mind will be instructed to contact the department chair for an advisor assignment.

The dean’s philosophy of advising suggests that the primary goal for advisors is to establish a relationship with the student to discuss career alternatives and academic goals more than simply plotting course schedules and keeping a student on track toward graduation.

Currently there are 117 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members in the College, 41 non-tenure-track teachers, and approximately 95 part-time adjuncts. Of the 117 full-time faculty, 106 hold doctoral degrees and 5 hold terminal masters degrees. Most full time faculty teach from 9-12 credits per semester, with a 3 credit reduction in load allowed for department chairs. All full-time faculty have individual offices, half-time faculty often share offices, and adjunct faculty have a variety of program-specific arrangements. A planned renovation of the main Administration building is aimed, in large part, at addressing some of the needs of the College of Arts and Sciences with respect to modernization of faculty offices.

**Budgets**

While the individual department/program reports that follow address their own budget concerns, in general, the College of Arts and Sciences budget is the resources made available to the College are to the load/credit generation. Outside of the money generated from lab and general fees, the College receives no other support. Furthermore, there is no funding available for professional and curriculum development.

**Requirements**

The increase in enrollment that the College has experienced comes not only from the College’s own students, but from students in other programs/Colleges in the University. Students from all undergraduate programs across the University have course requirements taught in the College. In addition all elementary and secondary teacher preparation candidates require majors in the College of Arts and Sciences. Between 80 and 100 students have been certified each year as teachers, who are majors in the College and programs in the School of Education.
Assessment

Many of the College's departments and programs have assessment tools already in place, and some have had to revise their assessment approaches to accommodate the increase in students. (See the individual department reports in Exhibit 2.25). For example, the English Department no longer uses an Exit Exam for freshmen because it was simply too cumbersome with the larger classes. In order to be able to maintain and develop adequate means of assessing outcomes, faculty perceive that they need more resources. The College has approached the administration addressing this need and there has been no response.

Department of Art 3

Curriculum and Objectives

The visual arts provide a means by which people can better understand themselves and their society, as well as allowing one to gain insight into the qualities and aspects of other cultures. Art students are urged to explore not only the artistic elements in presenting form, but also consider the means by which these elements aid in the expression of content. All majors are required, in part, to balance studio course work with classes in art history in order to gain a greater understanding of art as a reflection of the society in which it has been produced. The Art Department strives to give students the necessary tools to gain success in their respective areas of study.

The department offers a Bachelor of Arts in Art in all studio areas, as well as minors. All 100-level studio and art history classes as well as the upper division art history classes fulfill the art core requirement for graduation. There is currently no major in Art History, but an emphasis in this area may be achieved by individual students. The studio areas include painting, printmaking, drawing, design, and ceramics on the Spokane campus. Classes in sculpture and fresco production are offered in Florence.

The studio program has been significant for many years. The requirements for graduation with an Art major or minor have been increased to be more reflective of the University mission. Ten years ago students could, in effect, take nothing but a single studio area and still receive a degree in art. Students now must experience classes in every studio area available and then engage in at least one area of concentration for the Senior Exhibit course.

Coursework is being developed in art survey and topics in art history. This requirement is in line with virtually every other undergraduate program in art and is included in the guidelines of the College Art Association. The art history program offerings will be fine-tuned over the next several years as the needs of the department are determined.

3 This departmental section constitutes a summary of a full report, submitted to the Self-Study Steering Committee by the Art Department, which appears as Exhibit 2.46.
Faculty

The Art Department strives to give students the necessary tools to gain success in their respective areas of study. Currently, there are four (4) full-time faculty members and currently two (2) adjuncts. All of the studio faculty are artist-teachers who maintain a studio schedule in addition to a heavy teaching load. The greatest teaching tool in the classroom is the faculty member who is first a practicing artist. Every studio faculty member is dedicated to research and production as artists who teach, not as teachers who have to rely on memory.

There was a notice in the 1994 report stating that the University pays little to no attention to faculty development. “Teaching loads are so heavy in some cases that involvement in scholarly or professional work is almost impossible.” There is no recognition for the quality of professionalism the Art Department faculty bring to the university. There has been more than one instance in which a professor consistently teaches an excessive number of courses without a reduction in the load or an overload stipend. There has been no support from the upper administration to address this concern from the report of ten years past.

In spite of virtually no support for professional development, the studio art faculty have thrived. Their academic credentials rival those at many research institutions where teaching loads are half of that at Gonzaga and fully equipped studios are provided as the norm.

Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment

Assessment and change in curriculum, procedures, and facilities come from discussion among faculty and administration with relation and reflection on current guidelines by the College Art Association (CAA), comparison with peer institutions and similar programs, and by input by students. Most evaluation reviews of the art department revolve around what can be done to bring the program up to the minimum standards suggested by the CAA for the B.A. programs and at the same time look to the future possibility of offering a B.F.A. degree at Gonzaga.

The major weakness of the department is being addressed with the addition of a full-time faculty member in the area of art history. The lack of slide library in the art department is another weakness. It would be appropriate for an undergraduate program to have at least 100,000 slides. Building such a library, at $3-4 per slide, will be a long process. Faculty members have built individual slide libraries. Modest startup funds have been secured in order to create a slide library for the department.
Resources

The Jundt Art Center and Museum was completed eight years ago. In Jundt there are separate studios for lower and upper division painting and a drawing studio on the second floor which also includes a student lounge and two faculty offices. The main floor includes the administration office, three faculty offices, an 84-seat auditorium, and studios for design and printmaking. The lower level houses the ceramics studio and shop. The facilities are basically state-of-the-art in terms of environmental quality and safety. Each studio has general ventilation and chemical storage cabinets in applicable areas.

When the studios were designed, faculty indicated that a minimum of 4,000 square feet was needed for each of the studio areas to allow for growth within the university. Less than 3,000 square feet was provided, which has resulted in several areas reaching and/or exceeding capacity within a few years of its completion.

All of the beginning drawing, basic design, art appreciation, and ceramics classes are now at capacity for the studio and lecture facilities. All beginning and intermediate painting classes are at capacity. Advanced ceramics is over capacity and upper division painting is at capacity. The Art Department closes nearly every lower division course before the registration process is half over. Without additional studio space and the faculty to support it, the department simply cannot serve more students than it already does. If it could offer more lower division courses, there would be no space to support those students as they move on to upper division coursework.

The budget for the Art Department is primarily self-generated. Every studio collects a lab fee that is used for expendable materials as well as any minor equipment replacement. The current Dean of Arts and Sciences is the first in the last twenty years to provide any financial assistance for major equipment replacement. The Art Department has had to rely on donors or department sales to replace or add equipment. Every equipment request prior to five years ago was denied.

Department of Biology

Curriculum and Objectives

The Biology Department seeks to develop in all students an appreciation for science as a way of knowing – a formalized method of asking and evaluating answers about natural patterns and processes. The curriculum is designed to provide students with a strong, broad background in biology.

The department offers two undergraduate degrees -- a Bachelor of Science and a Bachelor of Arts -- as well as a minor, in Biology. The department also offers a selection of courses to meet the needs of students majoring in other disciplines, including 4-credit laboratory courses and 3-credit courses fulfilling the “Math and Science” requirement of the College of Arts and Sciences. The department also offers a microbiology course required in the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) program.

4 This departmental section constitutes a summary of a full report, submitted to the Self-Study Steering Committee by the Biology Department, which appears as Exhibit 2.46.
The curriculum was reorganized in 1995, replacing a two-semester general biology sequence with a four-semester biology core. This curriculum change also instituted a requirement for a 2-credit advanced topics course, that is a discussion-based seminar class to introduce primary literature. These changes mirror recommendations made by the National Research Council. The department is evaluating non-major offerings and is developing courses for specific audiences, such as Science and Religion, Biology of Medicine, and Inquiry for Teachers.

The department is affiliated with the School for Field Studies (SFS), a scientific study-abroad opportunity allowing students to receive Gonzaga University credit for SFS courses. Interest in the School for Field Studies program has been strong. In addition, three years ago the department started the Gonzaga Indian Education Outreach Program (GIEOP), which has formed a partnership with two regional public schools to improve science education in schools and to facilitate the transition of Native American students to institutions of higher education. Due to its growth, the program is currently administered by Sima Thorpe in the Center for Community Action and Service Learning (CCASL).

The department is currently in the process of piloting a digital portfolio project, with a full portfolio requirement to be put in place in the next three to five years.

**Faculty**

The department currently has nine (9) full-time tenure track teaching positions, compare to 6.5 FTE in 1994. The department also has two (2) full-time laboratory coordinators and a part-time secretary. Both the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Academic Vice President hold appointments as professors in the department, although the AVP is not expected to teach. Even though all eligible members of the department carry full advising loads (25), some majors do not get an advisor in the department until their junior year.

All department faculty hold Ph.D.’s. Coverage of the field has improved, with an increased emphasis on ecology and environmental sciences made possible by new faculty. The department now offers a much better balance between courses emphasizing the molecular and cellular level, and those examining higher levels of organization. Research continues to be a priority for the department. Despite having less time for research due to increased sections of classes, all faculty have significant research interests, and most supervise student research during the summer, and to a limited extent, during the school year.

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall enrollment, measured in credit hours, was up about 14% in Fall 2002 compared to Fall 1992. However, enrollment in BIOL 101 and the number of declared majors are both 70% higher in Fall 2002 compared to Fall 1992. Students in the Nursing and Exercise Science departments are required to take BIOL 101, which has also increased the demand for this course. In addition, students in the School of Business must complete a 3-credit science class. Elementary teaching candidates must also complete a life science requirement.

There has been a substantial decline in numbers of students served in non-majors courses. The department projects that the number of non-majors courses will need to be doubled in the next three to five years.

**Assessment**

Smaller class sizes in the introductory courses, which are limited now to 50 students compared to 140 in 1994, has had a positive impact overall, increasing the connection between students and faculty, increasing opportunities for class discussion and allowing the use of a variety of testing methods. Non-biology majors are being increasingly forced, due to large waiting lists, to fulfill their science requirements at other institutions during the summer. The smaller class sizes do, however, call for more sections to be offered, which has had a negative impact on research activities by faculty.

Majors are now required to take the Educational Testing Services (ETS) Major Field Test. The mean score for students taking the ETS Major Field Test has improved from 75th percentile to 94th percentile over the last three semesters. Subtest scores have identified areas of weakness (relative) in curricula, and the department is examining ways to augment organismal topics and physiology based on these results. Formal student assessment will also include evaluation of each student's digital portfolio. These portfolios will become part of each student's permanent departmental record and will also inform future program development.

**Resources**

The department is housed in Hughes Hall. Two cycles of renovation have improved facilities in the department. While half of the second floor of Hughes was renovated recently to provide research-training space, the remaining 80% of the facility is 40 years old and inadequate for teaching and research activities. Planning for the renovation of the remaining space is complete, and renovation is in progress. A modern greenhouse and new laboratories for the core biology classes will be complete by January 2004.

The department has a good collection of binocular phase contrast microscopes, UV/Vis spectrophotometers, incubators, autoclaves, and miscellaneous equipment for molecular biology. Equipment for teaching is provided through lab fees, which have been increased from $25 in 1994 to $85 currently, as well as by University funds and extramural research and teaching grants.

Newer research programs in the department are in environmental/ecological areas that do not require large budgets for supplies and equipment. Research is supported by extramural funding as well as by the Gonzaga Science Research Program (GSRP). Two additional research laboratories
will be completed on the second floor of the south wing of Hughes Hall in the final phase of renovation. The new North wing already houses a lab for the newest faculty member who started this fall (2003).

**Department of Catholic Studies**

**Curriculum and Objectives**

Catholic Studies offers only one program, called a “concentration.” Gonzaga’s “Catholic Studies Concentration” was approved by the Academic Council in November 1997 and by the Board of Trustees in early 1998. This was preceded by three years of discussion and planning by interested faculty members. A more complete history of the inception of the program and its goals is contained in the proposal that was approved in 1998. (See Exhibit 2.15)

Briefly, the purpose of the program is to provide a multi-disciplinary approach to understanding the Catholic expression of Christianity and its cultural contributions. The program has four goals. First, it gives students an opportunity to identify Catholicism’s heritage in various disciplines across the curriculum. Second, it gives students an opportunity to integrate their understanding of these contributions into an appreciation of the richness of Catholic culture. Third, the program supports the idea that Catholicism is not something limited to a particular department or to a particular segment of a person’s life; Catholicism involves the total person and is thus appropriately addressed throughout the entire curriculum of a Catholic university. Finally, the program seeks to encourage faculty to be aware of and reflective on the other goals outlined above. As such, it seeks to foster reflection on Catholicism throughout the University.

This program of studies consists of an interdisciplinary linking of designated courses offered by regular departments in the University. Students take seven courses, which are distributed as follows:

- RELI 220: Catholicism
- A course relating to Catholic church history
- Four elective courses offered in different disciplines, but approved for the concentration, no more than two of which may be taken in the same department
- CATH 499: a capstone seminar course

The students served in this program are usually pursuing majors in the College of Arts and Sciences, although students from other schools in the University may complete the concentration. The students are interested in Catholic intellectual life and in Catholic culture in all its forms. The concentration provides a way for these students to link their interests in completing their core curriculum requirements and in completing the requirements for their major programs of study.

---

5 This departmental section constitutes a summary of a full report, submitted to the Self-Study Steering Committee by the Catholic Studies Department, which appears as Exhibit 2.46.
Faculty

The Catholic Studies Concentration (CSC) has no regular faculty. It has a director only, who is a tenured member of the Philosophy department and who takes care of the various administrative tasks of the concentration. Also, the director is assisted by one work-study student.

Students

Graduates per year (with the Concentration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since students at Gonzaga do not need to declare their minors or concentration until they actually apply for graduation, it is hard to know precisely how many students are pursuing the Catholic studies concentration. However, in the fall of 2000, there were no known students pursuing the concentration. Now there are at least 10 to 12. Five seniors are taking the capstone course this year. The director anticipates more than that number for next Spring of 2004. Only one student completed the program in the two previous years. Thus, the trend is clearly up, but the program is still very small.

Assessment

The concentration serves, in its own small way, to foster the Catholic intellectual life at Gonzaga University. To some extent, its goals are being met. Of course, much more could be done if the program had more resources, more courses, more students, and faculty dedicated to it on a fulltime basis.

The courses that count as credit for fulfilling the concentration are taught by faculty in the disciplines. The courses are evaluated by those departments. The director provides the needed advising for students completing the concentration. Since the concentration has no faculty of its own, it has no evaluation policies outside those provided. The director is evaluated by his or her home department according to the home department’s criteria.

One weakness for an interdisciplinary program is the absence of Catholic studies courses offered by the Department of English. Outside of the philosophy and religious studies departments, few departments have more than one or two faculty members who seem to be very interested in fostering the Catholic studies concentration. Dr. Robert Hauck has recently been hired in the Department of Religious Studies. He is a church historian and may develop courses in Catholic church history that will significantly improve the program. Despite Dr. Hauck’s anticipated contributions, the concentration still needs more courses in Catholic church history.

The music department has developed a course very valuable to the concentration called “Music of the Catholic Church.” Also, the philosophy department has developed a course entitled “Faith and Reason” that has proven very useful to the program. Fr. Spitzer assists in the teaching of this course. The concentration has worked with the Classical Civilizations major to foster the
study of biblical and ecclesiastical languages at Gonzaga. Students completing the program have usually done work in Latin and/or Greek.

So far, the handful of students completing the program has been successful. Most of the students completing the program apply to graduate or professional schools. The students in the senior seminar (CATH 499) will edit and publish a journal this spring. The publication of this journal may help raise the visibility of the concentration on campus and perhaps even generate more faculty interest in the concentration.

Resources

The concentration has a modest budget used to cover the administrative costs of running the concentration. This is for photocopying, mailing, and the like. There is also a small speaker’s budget.

At present, the work-study student works at a small desk in the corner of the director’s office. It would be helpful to have better office space and a reception area.

Department of Chemistry

Curriculum and Objectives

The department seeks to 1) provide courses for non-majors that are stimulating and broad in scope but with sufficient detail to make students appreciate the beauty as well as the complexity of the subject; 2) offer curricula for majors that fully prepare them for graduate or professional training, or sufficient technical knowledge to enter the field at the bachelor’s level; and 3) provide courses in support of the Biology Department, Department of Nursing, School of Engineering, and pre-professional programs.

The department offers two types of Bachelor of Science degrees, (a thesis and non-thesis option), a Bachelor of Arts degree, and a minor. The B.S. in chemistry degree can be supplemented with a biochemistry option. The American Chemical Society has approved the curriculum for the thesis B.S. degree including a program with a biochemistry option. For those interested in teaching chemistry at the secondary level, the teacher certification program of the School of Education is required. For those interested in environmental science, a B.A. in Chemistry combined with supporting courses from Biology, Civil Engineering and Law is recommended.

A strong weekly seminar program is offered throughout the academic year. An online course has been added. The department may begin offering significantly more courses for non-science majors, depending on staffing levels and needs of the School of Education. The curriculum for the B.S. degree is strong, as evidenced by the continued approval of the Committee on Professional Training of the American Chemical Society.

Faculty

---
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The department currently has seven (7) tenure track faculty, two (2) non-tenure track faculty, two (2) professional staff, and two (2) staff. Five major divisions within chemistry are covered by the department. All faculty hold Ph.D.’s. All faculty share in the teaching of general chemistry and offer assistance in areas outside their formal background. Faculty are conscientious advisors and take their advising roles seriously. They have made effective use of year-long sabbaticals. All faculty are active in engaging undergraduates in on-going research projects. Most progress is made during the summer. Scholarly activity is considered by the department when matters of promotion and tenure are being discussed. Chemistry faculty members serve routinely on important university-wide committees such as rank and tenure, budget, and academic council.

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the last five years, 35.2% of the incoming freshmen class has enrolled in general chemistry.

The percentage of chemistry majors could increase with the new facility (see Resources section). Thesis B.S. degree candidates are required to submit a senior thesis based on their individual research projects. Other degree candidates complete a senior literature review. All summer research students are required to present their results at the Annual Murdock Undergraduate Research Conference. Our graduates are readily accepted into, and do well at, top-rated graduate schools (See Exhibit 2.28)

**Assessment**

The department’s effectiveness is measured in five ways: 1) by meeting the standards of the Committee on Professional Training of the American Chemical Society, 2) course evaluations, 3) grant proposals which are almost always subjected to peer review, 4) publication in peer-reviewed journals, 5) success of chemistry majors in top-rated graduate and professional schools.

The department stresses formative measures of evaluation, using its own course evaluation, which includes a written portion. (See Exhibit 2.17) A significant amount of time is allotted to department discussions of the various aspects of the curricula, especially those that are undergoing changes. There is a reappointment committee for junior faculty; departmental recommendations are used when promotion or tenure is considered. Tenured faculty are not formally evaluated, however, the department expects to institute a formal review of tenure track faculty sometime during the next ten years.

Weaknesses of the department include: lack of offerings for non-science majors; the bifurcation of the department into a tenure-track and a non-tenure-track faculty; lack of stability for General
Chemistry courses; lack of time for faculty research during the academic year; and high advising loads.

Resources

The department will move from Hughes Hall to a new building in Fall 2003. The new building was designed for 700 students. No revision took place with the decision to expand enrollment to over 900. Therefore, not all courses available can be scheduled in this facility. During Fall 2003, three (3) courses are scheduled in other facilities. In addition, if the number of chemistry majors rises with the new facilities, it will be difficult for the chemistry faculty to direct undergraduate thesis research.

There have been no significant changes to the budget since the last self-study report. Faculty work cooperatively and are active in pursuing funding opportunities for equipment and research. With the implementation of successful grant proposals, the department is well equipped with major instrumentation.

In accordance to a recommendation in the last accreditation report, funding for the Scholl chair has been completed and Professor Nakamaye appointed to it. The O'Leary chair, however, has yet to be completed. The 10/31/02 book balance on the O'Leary chair is $537,091.74. There is a quasi-endowment with a book balance of $76,665.74 and a Fr. O'Leary scholarship with a book balance of $42,966.78.

The use of undergraduate teaching assistants in General Chemistry has been phased out and the mentoring of a post-doctoral associate has begun due to a grant by the Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation.

Department of Classical Civilizations

Curriculum and Objectives

The Department of Classical Civilizations is the oldest department in the University and is central to the humanistic, Catholic and Jesuit tradition that Gonzaga University professes in its Mission Statement. A major and minor in Classical Civilizations is available. The department also offers courses to fulfill the foreign language and culture requirement of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The aim of the major is to provide the necessary critical tools that will give graduates entry into any postgraduate program in the nation. For those pursuing a minor in Classical Civilizations the intended outcome is to provide students with necessary language skills and abilities that will enhance the study and critical investigation of another discipline within the University. For those who wish to fulfill the core requirement of the College of Arts and Sciences, it is the purpose of the department to provide students with the opportunity to study a classical language that lies at

7 This departmental section constitutes a summary of a full report, submitted to the Self-Study Steering Committee by the Department of Classical Civilizations, which appears as Exhibit 2.46.
the root of western civilization and broadens the horizons of students through the eyes of another language.

A cross-disciplinary interchange is encouraged. The department contributes to the effective teaching of other departments such as Philosophy, Religious Studies and History by providing students with the abilities to study texts in their original languages. Students in the Classical Civilizations department are encouraged to take courses from other departments and disciplines to broaden their expertise in the field of classical studies.

Lower-level language courses have seen a significant increase in the last few years due to an increase in student enrollment in courses at the 200 level. There has also been an increase in enrollment in Latin 101, causing another section to be added. All upper-level language courses are taught by the Emeritus Professor.

Faculty

Quite possibly the smallest department in the University, Classical Civilizations is comprised of one (1) full-time instructor, two (2) adjunct instructors and its Emeritus Professor. The chair of the department is a professor from the Department of Religious Studies. Faculty are highly trained and offer the University invaluable expertise in their area. Faculty are very generous with their time and knowledge and are willing to accommodate the needs of students at every level, by tutoring in and out of class time and administering directed readings. The faculty are becoming drained and overloaded in regard to academic advising.

Students

Majors per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highly motivated students come to the department for specific reasons and, therefore, make clear choices for their respective courses. While the numbers remain small, those who have graduated from the program have truly distinguished themselves. (See department report, Exhibit 2.25, page 4.)

Assessment

The department uses University course evaluation by the students. The Chair discusses results with the faculty. Instructional approaches, methodology, and other elements related to the delivery of instruction are not regularly and formally evaluated. Instructors have the freedom to select their own texts. Teaching effectiveness of is illustrated by both the student evaluations administered each semester and by the success and dedication of the program’s students.
The recommendation was made in the last accreditation evaluation that the University “will need to reassess its commitment to the program,” upon the retirement of Fr. Schlatter, S.J., then endowed chair holder. Professor Kugler took leadership of the department, renaming it from Department of Classical Languages to Classical Civilizations, and revised the program requirements with an eye toward increasing enrollments in language courses and boosting the number of majors and minors. Patrick Hartin was appointed to the position in June 2002 when Professor Kugler left University.

The major challenge facing the department is providing students with the ability to pursue courses in Greek and Latin on the advanced level. Other weaknesses of the department include: excessive demands on faculty; inadequate attempts to increase the department’s visibility; a need to pursue greater cooperation with high schools through double-enrollment programs; a need to be more active in professional societies; and a need to explore advertising course offerings among prospective students to the University.

**Resources**

No area or place within the University is designated as the Department of Classical Civilizations. It does not have its own office, facilities, or classrooms. Instead, two faculty offices housed in the lower level of Robinson House make up the department.

The Foley Library has a remarkable selection of classical writings of which Gonzaga is proud. Students and faculty are able to access almost any ancient author in their original language through this collection.

Faculty to teach at the upper-levels is essential to the vitality of the department. A trained Classicist needs to be hired.

**Department of Communication Arts**

**Curriculum and Objectives**

The Department of Communication Arts seeks to develop students who are effective, creative and ethically responsible communicators who can understand theoretical choices, and design, express, interpret and critically evaluate oral, written, nonverbal and electronically mediated messages. The curriculum is both conceptual and applied.

The department offers five undergraduate majors and minors: Applied Communication Studies, Broadcast and Electronic Media Studies, Journalism, Public Relations, and Theatre Arts. It also offers, in conjunction with the School of Business, a minor in Marketing. The debate program resides in the department. The department also offers a two-credit course, Introduction to Speech, as part of the University Core Curriculum.

---
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In 1999, the department established a campus chapter of Lambda Pi Eta, the national communication honor society for outstanding students in the communication arts. Membership in Iota Rho, the campus chapter, is limited to third- and fourth-year students who have demonstrated high academic achievement, leadership, service, and a commitment to the discipline of communication. The department is examining possibilities for closer integration of its academic components.

**Faculty**

The department has nine (9) full-time tenure track teaching positions, one of which is occupied by a non-tenure track instructor. Permission has been given to fill that position for the 2004-2005 academic year. The department also has three (3) full-time fixed term positions. In addition, there is a full-time secretary who doubles as secretary to another department. Two staff positions, one full time and one part time, support the engineering and other technical needs of Broadcast and Electronic Media Studies. One full-time staff position supports costuming in Theatre Arts. Four of the full-time faculty hold doctoral degrees. Others have terminal degrees in their fields and/or substantial professional experience and advanced degrees.

**Students**

**Applied Communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Broadcast Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Journalism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Relations

Majors per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theater

Majors per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment

Most of the department’s substantial growth in majors -- from 194 in 1992 to 287 in spring 2003 -- has occurred in the last three years. The number of majors in spring 2000 was 208. The past three years have been marked by handling growth resulting in additional sections of classes.

Strong ties to the community -- through program reputation, faculty consulting, prior and current work experience of faculty, adjunct faculty connections, and past students’ performance -- enable numerous internships. This is important to students given the applied nature of the discipline.

Resources

The department is housed in the Administration Building. A Communication Arts Lab serves courses in Journalism, Broadcast and Electronic Media Studies, and Public Relations. The weekly student newspaper, The Gonzaga Bulletin, which is not officially affiliated with the department, also utilizes the lab. Russell Theatre, an old gymnasium renovated decades ago, serves Theatre Arts. A new performing arts complex is part of the current capital campaign. A TV studio on the fourth floor serves Broadcast and Electronic Media Studies. Relocation of that studio is under study.

Computer equipment in the Communication Arts Lab is current. It is on a three-year cycle for updating. Theatre Arts faculty have made strides with Russell Theatre equipment, despite the physical limitations there. Should the studio for Broadcast and Electronic Media Studies relocate, the equipment is current enough to migrate with it.
Department of English

Curriculum and Objectives

The English program trains students through reading, critical thinking, verbal discourse, and writing to be clear and thorough in speaking and writing. By studying language and literature, students are better able to live the examined life spiritually, imaginatively, and intellectually. The English Department sees virtually every new freshman, thereby making the department's contribution to the University Mission integral and essential.

The department offers a major and minor in English, teaching ten courses as part of the University Core Curriculum and 34 courses as part of the major. The upper division courses are not sequenced; however, a course in each historical period of British and American literature is offered every semester. The department also teaches six (6) courses as a service to majors from other disciplines, 36 courses as electives to majors and non-majors, and five (5) courses that fulfill the College's Social Justice core curriculum requirement.

In January 2001 admission to the M.A. in English Program was suspended as the first step toward closing the program because the administration failed to provide support in terms of faculty and resources. Increased undergraduate enrollment and a decrease in the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty strained faculty resources. (See department report, Exhibit 2.25, page 7.)

Faculty

The department currently has eleven (11) full-time tenured or tenure-track members, seven (7) term faculty members, four (4) adjunct instructors, and a full-time department secretary. All ranked faculty hold doctorate degrees. Most are active in professional associations and conferences, and several publish and present their scholarly and creative work.

In Fall 2002 the course load for tenure and tenure-track faculty was reduced from 4-4 to 3-3. Although the reduction provides some energy to devote to revising and developing courses, planning community events, and professional development, faculty members are still teaching more credit hours and more students than any other department (with the exception of the Department of Philosophy). In addition, the department advised 145 students during 2002-2003 from various departments within the College of Arts and Sciences.

The replacement of tenure-track faculty since 1995 has helped the department maintain coverage and brought fresh scholarship to the department and its students. However, since 1998-99 the department has increasingly relied upon non-tenure-track instructors, because university enrollment has increased without an increase in hiring tenure-track faculty. Most semesters, composition courses are taught 100% by term and adjunct instructors. Turnover has been high among adjunct faculty. Additionally, a higher teaching load, relatively low salary, and the marked

---
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division in the way office space is allocated to ranked, term, and adjunct faculty, have contributed to making term and adjunct faculty feel undervalued.

The increased reliance on term and adjunct faculty, especially in the core classes, means many first- and second-year students do not have contact with the more experienced Ph.D. English faculty. Thus, there exists a discrepancy between the image that the university advertises and the reality experienced by many first-year students in their core classes. In addition, students are being consistently turned away from core courses because of the lack of faculty hiring to meet the upsurge of enrollment since 1999. It is likely that three (3) tenured faculty members will retire in the next five (5) years. The trend to hire non-tenure-track faculty to fill a vacant tenure-track position must be reversed to ensure academic freedom and the quality of faculty being hired.

Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates pursue many paths: teaching, law, medicine, library science, public service work, advertising, public relations, and social and volunteer work.

Assessment

From 1994-2001 departmentally constructed student evaluations were used to assess the faculty’s teaching effectiveness. These evaluations were administered to more than 9,000 students, 90% of whom consistently regarded their English professors as “Good” or “Excellent.” Since the standard university evaluations were implemented in Fall 2001, students have given English faculty across the board the two highest scores 70% of the time. Graduating seniors also complete an exit survey.

Tenure-track faculty members are evaluated following the department’s “Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.” The Departmental Evaluation Committee, composed of three (3) elected members and the department Chair, conducts faculty/peer evaluations with an emphasis on the evaluations as developmental, not summative. For adjunct, term, and tenure-track faculty teaching composition, student evaluations, classroom observations, and reports by the Director of Composition and the Chair constitute assessment.

The department’s comprehensive exam for majors was changed in 1994 from a multiple-choice test to a three-part essay exam to better assess the skills taught in the courses. In 2001, the Franz and Anne Schneider Essay Contest was established to recognize the best student essays written in English 101 and 102 classes. The same year, the English 101 Exit Exam was eliminated due to inadequate support of the assessment and because the exam results were questionable. (See department report, Exhibit 2.25, page 6.)
Resources

The administration’s decision to admit increasing numbers of students without providing adequate facilities for faculty and classes has negatively affected the Department of English. The Administration Building classrooms and windowless classrooms in the Schoenberg Center serve their purpose, though they are uncomfortable and spatially inadequate. More faculty would use the media classrooms in the Administration building if more were available. An appropriate meeting space for the entire department is lacking.

Department offices were moved in 1994 from the Administration Building basement to second floor Robinson. This is agreeable for tenured and tenure-track faculty; however, term faculty offices are spread throughout three buildings, and three adjunct faculty share one office in the Administration building. The latter, especially adjuncts, feel disconnected from the rest of the department and discouraged from spending extra time on campus to work with students.

Currently there is inadequate support for professional development. Support for writing and research through course reductions or grants, and travel funds are insufficient.

The Writing Lab, managed by the Department of English, since 1994, has expanded to include 21 networked computers. It serves students constantly throughout the day, is used as a classroom by several instructors each week, and is a popular computer lab, with students printing an average of 300 pages per day. Most tutors are federal work-study students, but a few well-qualified junior and senior English majors are paid through College of Arts and Sciences institutional funding and the McDonald’s Work Award Grant, which was secured by a faculty member.

Department of History

Curriculum and Objectives

The mission of the Department of History is to explain the historical development of present civilizations and contribute to an understanding of the world. The study of history helps students realize that the political, social, cultural, economic, and intellectual institutions of today can be fully understood only in the context of the experience, changes, and conflicts of the past. The purpose of history courses is not merely to convey knowledge about past events, but also to introduce students to the process of history, to give them a critical appreciation of how to gain, evaluate, and interpret knowledge and understanding of the past, and, by extension, the present.

The department trains students in thinking, writing, researching, and speaking skills. The History major is designed to prepare students for a variety of careers in business, education, government, social services, and law. Course offerings fulfill core requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences and offer courses to ten individual departments. Electives and transfer credit are also offered.
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Offerings in Latin American and Women’s History have been expanded. Other courses, including African- and Asian-American history and social and cultural American courses have been added. The department cooperates in a number of interdisciplinary programs and has significantly increased the number of cross-listed courses. A number of courses satisfy the diversity requirement and many satisfy the Social Justice requirement newly implemented.

The department distributes a newsletter each semester. The History Honor Society has expanded to include a general History Club, an expansion which has proven worthwhile with increased participation and attendance at events.

**Faculty**

The department consists of nine full-time faculty, one half-time faculty appointment, and two adjunct faculty members. The full-time faculty includes 3 professors, 2 associate professors, 3 assistant professors and one instructor. The department has been able to maintain, with some effort, the number of faculty members over the past five years. The faculty is relatively diverse, based on a number of criteria. There are two women and ten men of various faiths with differing ideologies. All principal members of the department have a Ph.D. in History; all adjunct members of the department have at least an M.A. in History. There is good coverage of the field.

There is growing dissatisfaction expressed by many junior faculty that high student loads and advising duties leave them little time or energy to fulfill the professional development expectations for tenure and promotion. Senior faculty concur.

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollments have been rising in the department and have been consistently among the strongest in the College. Fall enrollments for 2002 were nearly double that of fall 1998 at 1045 seats filled. Because of this, average class size is increasing.

The number of cases of academic dishonesty increased dramatically in 2001-2002, a trend which the department believes is tied into use of the Internet.

**Assessment**

Teaching is the greatest strength of the department, as indicated by high enrollments and strong student evaluations. Several members of the history department have received Gonzaga teaching awards.
The department is anticipating the following changes: 1) a physical move might isolate faculty from the rest of the College; 2) changes to History 398; 3) retirements of two or three senior faculty members; 4) revisions to the distribution requirement for 300-level history courses for majors; 5) appointment of a part-time secretary; 6) internet delivery of courses. (See department report, Exhibit 2.28, sections 3.4 and 4.4.)

There is a lack of overall and long-term administrative consultation and planning. The department strongly recommends a more consultative policy be established.

**Resources**

The department is housed on the third floor of the Administration Building. All faculty have recent computer hardware and software in their offices; the department shares a common printer.

The department budget has increased over the last ten years. For the past two years the department has requested a part-time secretary, but while this request was supported by the Dean it did not survive the final budget approval process. The only other accounts over which the department has much control is postage ($600/year) and meetings ($100/year). The Supplies account has increased to $3950, and is meant to cover all photocopying, instructional supplies, printer paper, etc. Paper and ink cartridge costs for a department printer put the department over budget last year. The department has no budgetary input.

Professional development is limited and the department has two endowment funds for library acquisitions: the Bischoff and Steel-Reese allotment from Foley Library. The combination of $2000 or more per full-time faculty member to order materials and a policy change that allows less expensive paperback editions of books to be purchased, has allowed for an enormous increase in the number of items available.

Classroom and physical facilities have improved. The number of faculty using multimedia materials has increased dramatically with the improvement in classroom technology resources in the last 7-8 years. Classroom instruction is supplemented by the use of Blackboard Course Management System.

**Department of Mathematics and Computer Science**

**Curriculum and Objectives**

The Department of Mathematics and Computer Science occupies a unique position in the traditional liberal arts setting of the College of Arts and Sciences. Mathematics is one of the oldest disciplines while conversely, Computer Science is one of the newest. Both are vital to students’ development of quantitative skills so necessary in today’s technologically advanced society. In core courses logical and quantitative skills are developed, giving students practice in abstraction, presentation, and appreciation. For majors, materials and experience are provided to enable the student to succeed in industry, graduate studies, or education.

---

11 This departmental section constitutes a summary of a full report, submitted to the Self-Study Steering Committee by the Department of Math and Computer Science, which appears as Exhibit 2.46.
The department offers four degree programs: B.A. or B.S. in Mathematics, a B.S. in Computer Science, and a B.S. in Mathematics and Computer Science. There are also separate minors available in both areas. Some courses serve to fulfill the university core requirement, the College of Arts and Sciences core requirement, as well as requirements of individual schools, colleges, and majors within the university. (See department report, Exhibit 2.25, pages 1-2). Service to the University is important. Liaison committees are in place to keep dialogue flowing between the department and the areas of the University that the department serves.

There have been changes to the requirements for graduation with regard to all majors offered. (See department report, Appendix 2.B.7, pages 4-5). Computer science majors are required to participate in a year-long course in software engineering and systems design that authenticate the work of students upon graduation.

**Faculty**

The department currently has 15.25 full-time equivalent faculty, 12.5 of whom are tenured or tenure-track, and two (2) are term appointments. The department shares a technical secretary with the Department of Physics. The total credit hours taught by this department in the fall semester of each year has increased 62% in the past five (5) years. (See department report, Exhibit 2.25, page 3)

Faculty are part of liaison committees with the School of Engineering, School of Education, School of Business and representatives from the social sciences within the College of Arts and Science. Faculty also have a high level of visibility in the Faculty Assembly. The department is active professionally and the level of professional development is consistent with that of departments in our disciplines at comparable institutions.

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduates per year (Math/Computer Science)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every incoming student is required to fulfill a mathematics requirement. Current administrative policies have resulted in an increasingly large number of students admitted, but the university has not compensated for this with an increase in tenure-track faculty. This impacts both the level of service with regard to class sizes and the quality of education the department is able to offer.

Students who graduate from the Computer Science program usually go on to careers in the computer industry where they build commercial software. Hence, a year-long course in software engineering and systems design was introduced. Student achievement can be measured by both standardized test scores and by success upon graduation, often placing students in the graduate schools of their choice, or in competitive jobs in industry.

**Assessment**

Tenure-track faculty members are currently evaluated according to the processes in the departments. Advising is somewhat more difficult to assess as the University has no formal mechanism by which advising is evaluated.

Several important policy changes have been made in the area of Computer Science, including: each course follows the object-oriented paradigm that appears to have helped students learn to design more robust software; the requirement of a course in computational theory; and, the requirement that all graduating seniors take the ETS major Field Test in computer science instead of the GRE Advanced Exam.

No major changes in math curriculum are expected. However, changes in the computer science curriculum will occur to reflect changes in the industry. Additional staffing is of paramount concern.

**Resources**

The department utilizes ample office space, a departmental office/reception area, a mathematics tutorial lab, and a computer lab. The computer lab has four main components, all of which are connected to the campus-wide network: 1) a single processor, multi-user machine that handles most of our first three (3) computer science courses; 2) a large, fully equipped lab of PC’s running Windows 2000; 3) a smaller lab of PC’s running Linux; and 4) a smaller lab of PC’s running Windows 2000 for the exclusive use of senior software engineering teams. As student enrollment increases, it is becoming clear that the space for the computer lab may no longer be sufficient.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to find adequate classroom space. The department is now in a position where class sizes are limited, not by what is instructionally sound, but by room availability.

The department’s budget is satisfactory. The replacement budget remains sufficient to maintain a quality computer lab. Roughly 98% of the remaining budget is faculty salaries, with the other 2%
used for general administrative costs. Funds used for faculty development and other activities come singly from gifts to the department. Mathematics and computer science holdings at the library are added on an annual basis.

**Department of Modern Languages**

**Curriculum and Objectives**

The Department of Modern Languages has the unique role of helping students understand cultures through the study of language, literature, films and societies. A country's values, culture and tradition are encased in language in the form of idioms, proverbs, and vocabulary. They are found in its fiction, essays, and poetry. The examination and discussion of these values as they are encountered in literature and language is the core of the department.

The department offers majors in French and Spanish and minors in French, German, Italian, Italian Studies, and Spanish. It works in collaboration with the Art, History and Political Science departments to offer five other majors in International Relations and Italian, Latin American, European and Asian Studies. All majors are required to take a senior comprehensive exam or write a thesis and need a minimum of 19 credits at the 300 level or above. The College of Arts and Sciences requires that students fulfill only three (3) credits of foreign language/foreign culture for their core curriculum. The program offers various courses at all levels of study to help students meet this requirement.

A three-year language program is offered in Japanese and a two-year program in Chinese with a study-abroad option. Almost 20 new courses have been added in the past 10 years. The Italian Studies program has introduced a 12-credit, three-class block of intensive Italian, for majors and minors who take their junior year at the Gonzaga-in-Florence campus. The program has improved communication and collaboration among faculty in Spokane and Florence. The refusal of administration in Florence to place Italian majors in family housing continues to be a program. The Department of Modern Languages offers study abroad programs in Spain, Mexico, Japan, China, Italy and France. Additional programs are available through the Studies Abroad Office. Study in Germany is available in the summer with the Goethe Institute.

**Faculty**

The department currently has nine (9) full-time faculty, six (6) tenured and three (3) on a full-time renewable yearly contract. It also employs one (1) three-quarter time contract faculty in German, one (1) half-time contract faculty in French, and adjunct faculty in the areas of Italian, Chinese and German as needed.

With the change to four-credit and four-hour per week language classes in all first-year and most second-year language courses, some faculty are teaching three as opposed to four classes per...
semester. Teaching two sections of the same course has allowed faculty to devote additional time to research related to classes and to professional development. Faculty development is steady, with members publishing articles, books, translations, and presentations. Faculty members participate in up to two (2) conferences per year.

Students

Majors per year (French)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majors per year (Italian Studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majors per year (Spanish)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates per year (French)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates per year (Italian Studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates per year (Spanish)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With only a three (3) credit language requirement Gonzaga University does not emphasize the study of languages. Traditionally, students study languages to complement another major. Course enrollment has remained steady, and minors have increased noticeably. (See department report, Exhibit 2.25, section 2)

Assessment

Guidelines written by the Modern Language faculty are used by the Admissions Office to place incoming students at the appropriate learning level. Each language program has specific grammar objectives that it pursues for first and second levels of language instruction. Each language has a third-year grammar course that reviews the most significant and complex structures of the language. Language majors must pass a comprehensive exit exam in order to graduate.

In the next 3-5 years the department intends to: provide additional cross-listed courses taught in English to supplement the International Studies program; offer more courses that focus on linguistic and cultural competence; make the lab technologically up-to-date; add a course on French cinema; and add a service-learning course in Florence. There is also expected to be an increase in Spanish majors and minors.
Resources

The department’s budget has remained constant over the past several years, except for a small increase in funding for the purchase of new audio and video materials for various languages. Funds allotted by internal sources for professional development have increased slightly. All faculty have computers in their offices with programs capable of serving pedagogic/academic needs.

The Department of Modern Languages has a language lab with 25 stations, 20 of which are connected to the main console. They are used for individual or collective work with the student manual. The lab is not large enough, and the equipment is not technologically up-to-date. However, “smart” classrooms are used as much as possible to compensate for the shortfalls of the lab. The University is connected via satellite to several foreign television stations and to radio through the Internet. These resources are available to students through their dorm room Internet and cable connections.

Undergraduate library collections are sufficient with the addition of more reference books and books on literature and culture, due to the Steel Reese Fund. The department continues to build a video library with library and departmental funds. (The Japanese program has increased considerably its holdings through a special grant.)

Department of Music

Curriculum and Objectives

“The Music program at Gonzaga integrates liberal arts learning with a specialized competence in music,” reads the department’s mission statement. The department’s goal is “to develop competent leaders in music, music education, and the arts.” The department commits to preparing students to pursue music as a profession and also believe that all students, while they are developing general knowledge and skills during their years at Gonzaga, will be more effective leaders in their communities and professions when enriched with the opportunity to explore and develop their creative musical talents and imagination.

The department offers a Bachelor of Arts in Music, in Music Education, a minor in each Music Performance and Jazz Studies, as well as the opportunity to participate in ensembles, applied lessons, and academic courses. Two additional degree emphases have been added, Music Literature and Liturgical Music. The number of performance requirements for all majors has been increased, a recital attendance requirement for sophomore and junior majors instituted, and the history requirement decreased.

The ensemble program is strong and diverse, offering interaction between professional musicians and students, as well as cultural opportunities to the University and greater Spokane community. It represents students from across the curriculum. In Fall 2002 it included 175 performers, only
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15% of whom were music majors. There are eight (8) ensembles available to the student body, up from five (5) in 1993. (See departmental report, Exhibit 2.25, section 2IIB.) The Choir, Wind Ensemble, and Orchestra are the “major” ensembles in which music majors must participate. These are only 1-credit courses.

The department offers five (5) courses which fulfill the College of Arts and Sciences core requirement in fine arts; one also fulfills the social justice requirement. (See departmental report, Exhibit 2.25, section 2IID.)

**Faculty**

The department currently has five (5) full-time, tenured faculty and 21 adjunct instructors. Because of their large numbers, adjuncts are grouped into eight (8) divisions (piano, strings, guitar, harp, winds, brass, percussion, and, voice). They are supervised by an assigned full-time faculty member. The department also has an office secretary. All adjunct instructors, with two full-time instructors, provide instrumental and vocal applied instruction/private lessons on all traditional instruments and voice.

Many faculty have made significant contributions to their fields through performances and scholarship; they have used their sabbaticals effectively. The university has been very supportive in granting faculty sabbaticals and in granting tenure to a number of professors.

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many students served by the Music program are not music majors. For example, during Fall 2002, 88% of the students enrolled in applied lessons were not music majors.

**Assessment**

Assessment and change in curriculum, procedures, and facilities come from discussion among faculty and administration, comparison with peer institutions and similar programs, and input from students. The major need of the department is a performing arts hall for the music building. This has been the greatest stumbling block in the progression and development of the music program at GU. Therefore, there are basically two options. If a performing arts facility is built to accommodate the department’s needs, the department could recruit a large number of talented music majors, who have been lost to competing schools. As a university that is growing at a healthy pace, the department would be able to position Gonzaga as one of the more sought after music programs in the Pacific Northwest. Certainly it would be considered one of the most respected Jesuit institutions with regard to its music program.
Without a performance facility, the goal for the next 3 to 5 years would be to maintain current standards and enrollment, and, continue to search for talented music students. Improvements can be made in the curriculum to allow more students to participate in the program and graduate with a higher level of proficiency. Faculty should strive to be better educators and advisors, and, meet the needs of the students.

**Resources**

The department is located in the Monaghan House and the Music Annex. Neither facility was designed for teaching, particularly music. They each have many drawbacks. There is limited storage space available. The House contains offices, a computer lab, a piano lab, practice rooms, and one large class/rehearsal room. The annex has a large class/rehearsal room, small storage room for instruments and equipment, a 15-student classroom, a piano studio, two offices, as well as a voice studio and guitar studio.

The University has no performance facilities for music, however, the department successfully presents an average of 25 public performances per semester. There is an immediate need for two areas of performance, a concert hall and a recital hall. (See department report, Exhibit 2.46, section 2III.) A Performing Arts Center is part of the current capital campaign, but there has been no clear indication how this facility will accommodate the needs of Gonzaga’s music students.

A state-of-the-art computer lab has served the students well. The university’s commitment to investing in technology has been much more apparent than their commitment to funding any other component of the program.

An inadequate budget has continued since the 1994 report. (See department report, Exhibit 2.46, section 3III.F.) With consistent growth, shortages have had a more drastic and impending effect on the department’s operations. The music faculty believes that many basic needs of the department are being ignored.

Students pay for applied lessons and for participation in ensembles. Students in these courses fully fund the instructor wages, meaning they pay for the credit associated with the course and the time of the instructor. The University only provides a classroom. The lab fees are vital to the operation and survival of these areas of the department. According to a survey by the Washington University Music Administrators, Gonzaga ranks at the very bottom of the pay scale in the state for private lesson instruction.

---
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Curriculum and Objectives

The Department of Philosophy seeks to communicate to students an appreciation for the values of the philosophical life, a life focused on the love and pursuit of wisdom, the wider academic community, and extra-academic communities. In courses, in interaction with students, and in presentations to academic and non-academic audiences, members of the department promote this appreciation for philosophy by examining and teaching the thought and works of those thinkers who shaped the rich Western tradition, major movements in non-Western philosophical thought, and current work in the many disciplines that characterize contemporary philosophy. Members of the philosophy faculty seek to cultivate in themselves and in others habits of critical thinking and reflection on the concrete problems and issues involved in a fully human life.

The department offers a 37-credit major for undergraduates, which recently underwent a reorganization, as well as a 21-credit minor program. The department recently finished a reorganization of the major program, which resulted in the current 37-credit requirement. The department offers a 30-credit M.A. program, which includes a thesis, comprehensive exams, and a language requirement. This program serves those wishing to prepare for entry into a doctoral program in philosophy or teach at the community college level.

The largest program of the department is its four course sequence in the required core curriculum, consisting of Critical Thinking (101), Philosophy of Human Nature (201), Ethics (301) and a 400-level course elective.

Faculty

The department currently has twelve (12) tenured faculty, three (3) tenure-track faculty, four (4) fixed-term faculty and seven (7) adjunct faculty, as well as one (1) emeritus professor, and a part-time secretary. The President of the University is also a faculty member and helps teach PHIL 467 during spring semesters, although he does not participate in the regular activities of the department. All faculty, except for one of the fixed-term faculty and some of the adjunct faculty, have Ph.D’s.

The core sequence is required of all students in the University. The department’s teaching load has increased in direct proportion to the increase in the overall University enrollment. As a result, the Department of Philosophy teaches more credit hours than any other department in the College of Arts and Sciences. The department is now using far more adjuncts than 5 or 10 years ago.

The activities of faculty members who were, before its closure, highly involved with the Jesuit Scholastic housed at Gonzaga, have been impacted by this change. The quantity of academic publishing by the department has increased dramatically over the past 10 years, and it is now quite common for members of the department to publish essays, book reviews, book chapters, anthologies, and textbooks. Part of this increase can be attributed to the Evaluation Policy. (See by the Philosophy Department, which appears as Exhibit 2.46.)
Assessment) Also, a change in teaching load has helped faculty find more time for scholarly activity.

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major and minor programs are usually pursued by undergrads who seek admission to graduate programs in philosophy, to law schools, or who simply pursue a comprehensive liberal arts education. The “majors only” courses that were once under-enrolled are now fully enrolled or even over-enrolled.

Though a relatively small program, compared to larger private and public universities, the M.A. program has maintained an average of five (5) new students per year for the past six years. The quality of new graduate students has increased over those years, and the M.A. Program has been successful in sending some of its graduates to top-tier doctoral programs.

**Assessment**

Connected with the department’s self-study in 1999, was the creation of an evaluation policy. This policy has been especially helpful to members of the department. In addition, M.A. students must pass both a set of written and oral comprehensive exams as well as complete a thesis. These assessment tools allow us to judge the extent to which our program curricular objectives are being met on a student-by-student basis. The success over the past six years in sending graduates of the M.A. Program to top-tier doctoral programs is evidence that broader program objectives are being met.

**Resources**

Most of the departmental offices are on the fourth floor of the Administration Building. However, there are three offices on the first floor of Rosauer Education Center. Faculty members have their own offices and computers, except for adjunct faculty who all share an office. The secretary has an office that doubles as a reception area. The office of the emeritus professor doubles as the departmental lounge. Most courses are offered in the Administration Building, however, some are offered in other buildings, like the Schoenberg Center.

The department’s budget has increased little over the years; most of the budget is allotted for instructional materials, especially photocopying. The M.A. program continues to be under supported, especially in the area of financial aid. This hinders the program’s ability to compete effectively for students with other programs.
Department of Political Science

Curriculum and Objectives

The Department of Political Science aims to teach students about politics, helps them become involved in them, and prepares some of them for further study in political science, law, and other advanced disciplines. All members of the department, in their individual ways, believe political science is one of the humanities: that is, that the teaching of politics must be integrated with values and good judgment.

The department offers a major and minor in political science. The courses serve students from freshman to senior levels from many disciplines across the University - Business, Civil Engineering, Criminal Justice, Education, and International Studies; College of Arts and Sciences requirements can be met through courses offered by the department. Students also take political science courses for general electives. Seven (7) new courses have been added and ongoing since 1994. In addition, a Public Affairs Internship Program and a Washington D.C. Semester Program with American University are offered.

Faculty

The department currently has six (6) tenure track faculty and four (4) adjuncts. The department shares a half-time secretary with Psychology and Sociology. All regular faculty teach three courses per semester; each is a separate preparation. The average class size in Academic Year 02-03 was 33 students. Faculty have three preparations per semester. Political science is divided into three areas: American Politics; Political Philosophy; and Comparative and International Politics. The courses offered in each group are designed to cover the area as appropriately as possible; hence the department emphasizes broad coverage rather than narrowly specialized expertise. The courses are rigorous but not highly specialized. The one obvious gap at the moment is the absence of a Middle East politics class. The number of advisees has grown to thirty or more, until two years ago when the load was “equalized” among the school’s faculty to a maximum of 25.

During the next 3 to 5 years, there will be an increased demand for 300-level courses, with anticipated number of majors increasing to 185 by Fall 2004. The Washington D.C. Semester program has stabilized and attracts three to five students per year.

Research highlights of the past year are noted in faculty vita (See Exhibit 2.35). Substantial research but not publication is done with an intradisciplinary focus. The discipline does not have a series of sequenced introductory courses common to all the areas, as do most disciplines. Each Political Science faculty member has chosen to teach classes in two or all three of the areas. Most research is devoted to three areas of scholarship done by others at large research universities, rather than to publishing in a narrower specialization in one of the areas. That formula has encouraged well-rounded political science teachers who earn excellent ratings on the student evaluations. Its drawback is few publications.
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Students

Majors per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment

As a result of growth in the University’s student population and consequently in the department, students who entered a major in Political Science in Fall 2001 or later may be unable to graduate on time without the addition of a new faculty position beginning Fall 2003 and an additional position for Fall 2004.

Resources

Each tenure track faculty member has an office, two share a larger office space in the Administration Building; adjuncts share a small office and one desk with most of the adjuncts from Psychology and Sociology. The budget now accommodates the addition of a sixth tenure track faculty member and several adjunct contracts. The department has no money for professional development. Each faculty member is given yearly funds to order five new books for Foley Library. The department has no discretionary money in its budget and no funds to sponsor on-campus events.

Department of Psychology

Curriculum and Objectives

The mission of the Department of Psychology is to train and instruct students in the discipline of psychology. The department also seeks to expand the student’s world view and to enhance their sense of social justice. Faculty challenge students to become creative and critical thinkers and to develop effective communication skills in both writing and speaking. The psychology curriculum provides a balance between rigorous scientific training and breadth of content area.

Students can earn a major or minor in Psychology. The courses required for such a degree cover a wide area of applied, clinical, and philosophical interests. A number of new upper-division elective courses have been developed, while other have been eliminated. These changes reflect the expertise, interest, and resources of faculty, the evolving discipline of psychology and the needs and interests of students. The department offers courses that may be taken to fulfill a portion of the social science core requirement, as well. The Department of Psychology is
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connected to several other schools and programs within the University through use of faculty, cross-listed coursework, and/or major requirements.

In addition to in-class coursework, two faculty members have developed service-learning components as part of their courses. These service experiences enhance students learning, and their developing expertise enhances their contributions to the agencies they work within.

Faculty

The department has five (5) tenured members and two (2) tenure-track faculty one beginning in Fall 2003. Two (2) full-time administrators also maintain their affiliations with the department. Adjunct instructors are hired regularly. The department shares a half-time administrative assistant.

The current faculty provide adequate coverage of the discipline, although the resources of the faculty are stretched very thin in trying to serve a ratio of 38:1. Faculty members also maintain active programs of research and professional presentation and publication. Faculty who attend professional meetings must cover a substantial portion of the cost.

Faculty members also serve as advisors and mentors to students with regard to coursework, work on independent research projects, supervising student honors theses, directing independent readings, supervising practicum experiences and involving students on their research teams. However, because of a large increase in majors with no complementary increase in faculty, the department is unable to advise over one-third of its majors. Students have been referred to the Math department for their required statistics course. In the past few years seven (7) faculty members outside of the Department of Psychology have been designated to advise lower division students. Despite stretched resources, faculty maintain a high level of performance, as indicated by consistently strong teaching evaluations.

Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department was affected by the unusually low number of freshmen who entered with a declared major. The composition of students enrolled in courses in the fall of 2002 revealed a range of 7%–46% non-psychology majors in our upper-division courses and 22%–100% of non-psychology majors in lower-division courses.
Assessment

Assessment and change in curriculum, procedures, and facilities come from discussion among faculty and administration, comparison with peer institutions and similar programs, and by input from students. Assessment of teaching effectiveness is provided by student, self- and department-evaluations, class visitation, and, review of course material for tenure-track faculty.

The departmental comprehensive exam is the Graduate Record Exam Advanced Test in Psychology. To accommodate students who are unable to pass this exam, an old policy has been re-instituted: Students must take the GRE Psychology test once. If they do not pass they can either repeat the GRE until they do pass or repeat Psychology 101 and earn a grade of B or better.

Faculty believe they are merely surviving and their not thriving. They are very concerned about their abilities to maintain a quality educational experience for students. However, they are hopeful that the new faculty member will help to alleviate some of this strain.

There has been little progress in addressing the budget process, which remains elusive; and, although there has been some discussion about generating funds for faculty development, the resources continue to be inadequate.

Resources

All faculty offices are located in the Administration Building. Each faculty member has been provided with a computer, which are upgraded on a regular basis. All share a common printer that was donated to the department.

The laboratory space on the fourth floor is used for both laboratory classes and faculty research. It consists of eight (8) small rooms and a larger central meeting/classroom. The lab equipment is minimal and much of it outdated. Two faculty members have made use of personal funds and a small research grant to furnish two small lab rooms with necessary equipment and software for a “hand-me-down” computer. Another faculty member obtained $10,000 in start-up funds from the Academic Vice President’s office to set-up a research lab.

Changes in the budget primarily reflect changes in faculty composition and rank. The Department of Psychology also relies upon student laboratory fees to make up the departmental expenses such as copying, mailroom fees, and class project expenses in the budget. The increase in majors has generated additional funds.
Department of Religious Studies

Curriculum and Objectives

The Department of Religious Studies focuses the academic study of religion within the Christian faith-tradition, with special emphasis on Catholic Christianity. From the perspective of the Catholic intellectual tradition of faith seeking understanding, the discipline assists all students in exploring ultimate questions regarding meaning and value. It helps them develop a critical and articulate understanding of their own developing faith, and/or the faith of others, by studying the biblical and theological heritage of Christian faith in dialogue with the contemporary world. It seeks to form leaders who will transform the world into a more just, compassionate, and peaceful global community.

The department offers an undergraduate major, a minor, and a Certificate of Ministry, as well as four (4) different master's degree programs: Master of Arts in Religious Studies, Spirituality, Pastoral Ministry, and a Master of Divinity program. It also offers courses at the 100, 200, and 300 levels fulfill University core requirements. These courses are in the areas of scripture, systematic theology and applied theology. The department also offers special sections of core courses for the Honors Program and Women’s Studies Program and upper-division electives for both the Women’s Studies Program and the International Studies Program.

In 1994 the Senior Symposium was extended to two (2) semesters, and requirements were altered to include a thesis in the fall term. In 1999, major requirements were changed requiring that students take one course about a religion different from their own. In the summer of 1999 the department received accreditation as a member of the Association of Theological Schools.

Faculty

The department currently has 16 full-time faculty, seven (7) adjunct faculty, one (1) fixed-term faculty member, and a full-time administrative assistant. All faculty have earned doctorates. Faculty are involved in University activities, committees, and governance, are committed to professional development, and are pastorally involved. To meet the needs of student population growth, faculty have taken on extended duties in leadership roles in various departments. (See department report, Exhibit 2.25, page 7e.)

An undergraduate committee of departmental faculty teaching in the core curriculum is responsible all undergraduate coursework. A faculty member serves as Director of Undergraduate Programs and reports to the department chair. A Graduate Committee, comprised of advisors of each of the M.A. programs, the Director of Ministry Institute, and the Director of Clinical Pastoral Education, is responsible for the programs.

A significant amount of energy has been taken away from the important and regular work of the faculty because of three main factors: 1) an increase in classroom size and the subsequent reliance on term and adjunct faculty; 2) the need for faculty to assume extended duties as directors and
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chairs of various programs; 3) an increasing need for faculty to respond to concerns about questions regarding the University’s mission and Catholic identity. Consequently, these have had a negative impact on faculty morale. In Fall 2002 when the University closed its graduate school office and assigned full responsibility of all department graduate programs to Religious Studies faculty and staff greater concerns emerged.

In 1997 the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences assigned the Flannery Chair for an indefinite period of time to a member of the department, replacing the professorship with an annual lecture.

In the next 3 to 5 years a number of tenured faculty will approach or reach retirement age, requiring decisions about their replacement and the future direction of the department. It will be necessary to identify and recruit faculty to take on the direction of the graduate and undergraduate committees.

### Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students come to the department with a wide variety of backgrounds regarding religion. To accommodate this diversity, the department offers a range of courses at each level of the core and on the 400-level.

In 1998 the chapter of Theta Alpha Kappa was revived.

### Assessment

Full-time faculty members supervise and exercise control over the academic quality of all programs. They meet regularly and determine policies and procedures by collegial consensus. Standing committees, Program Directors, and ad hoc groups have areas of responsibility. Changes in programs are made only with faculty approval. Full-time faculty members also evaluate the Chair annually.

In Fall 1999, the department developed and accepted candidacy procedures for graduate students. Course requirements for MDiv and MAPM were increased by 7 credits. A Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) program was established and accredited in 2001 as a satellite center of Tri-Cities Chaplaincy. During AY 1999-2000, two MAPM programs were established in each Montana and Oregon.
Resources

The department and faculty offices are located on two levels of Robinson House. There is also a classroom with basic audio-visual facilities, a seminar room, a student lounge, and a kitchen/faculty dining room.

The department budget needs significant increases in funding in order to purchase adequate library resources to support undergraduate and graduate theological education. There is also a need for a larger marketing budget to attract majors and graduate students.

Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice

Curriculum and Objectives

The study of sociology helps the student to develop an awareness of the connections between one’s individual experiences and the groups to which they belong.

The Department offers a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology and a Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice, as well as minors in both areas. The Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice is connected to several other programs within the University through use of faculty and/or cross-listed coursework or ideals. The College of Arts and Sciences requires that students fulfill a social science requirement, a foreign cultures requirement, as well as a diversity requirement. Our programs offer various courses at all levels of study to help students meet these requirements in a timely manner.

Over the past several years 10 new courses have been added to the Sociology and Criminal Justice Programs. An Honor’s Thesis in Criminal Justice has been implemented, and Corrections is no longer a required course.

Faculty

The department currently has six (6) person tenure and tenure-track department with an additional term appointment position. The department also employs 3 to 4 adjuncts per year to teach in the Criminal Justice Program. It shares a part-time secretary with the Departments of Political Science and Psychology.

Departmental weaknesses are a result of the inability to hire enough staff. Due to limitations in faculty and a growth in student population, more sections of existing courses are added to ensure students graduate on time. Since the department is at maximum enrollments for a quality program, simply packing more students into existing sections is not an alternative.
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Over the past ten years the faculty have produced publications, secured grants, either organized, chaired, or presented papers at professional conferences, and are involved with the Spokane community in various capacities (See Exhibit 2.35). Faculty has access to a wide range of materials on teaching published by the American Sociological Association.

The department does not have a formal measurement of advising effectiveness, but, some informal and crude data exist, including office hour attendance and faculty case loads. Faculty works closely with the Office of Academic Services to insure student success.

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department expects its number of majors to increase with the increased enrollments predicted for the next few years. Graduates pursue a variety of careers. However, the most frequently cited over the past several years are those that could be classified as human services: law, law enforcement, teaching, counseling and social work/justice. No single choice predominates.

**Assessment**

Evidence of teaching effectiveness is provided by student evaluations, faculty observations and student enrollment data. Standardized evaluation scores teaching as very high, with most members of the faculty receiving average scores of 6 and 7 on a seven-point scale.

The previous accreditation report suggested that the department institute an outcomes instrument or procedure to evaluate the department’s effectiveness. During the Spring of 1998, senior Sociology and Criminal Justice students in the 499 courses were tested using the Major Field Test in Sociology and ACAT. Both tests have been developed to test undergraduates in their fourth year and results allow for the comparison of major’s average scores to those of students from other institutions. Students did very well on the Major Field Test, placing in the top ranks on all but one Assessment Indicator. There is no way that a small department can provide courses in all of the substantive areas of sociology. The Major Field Test in Sociology results helps to identify needed areas of teaching expertise for recruitment of new faculty.
On the ACAT, criminal justice majors’ average scores are lower than those achieved by sociology majors. There are many problems with this test, including the fact that many areas covered in the program were not tested. In short, the test does not appear to be suitable for evaluating a liberal arts multi-disciplinary program such as Gonzaga’s. (See departmental report, Exhibit 2.25.)

On the whole, the department is not satisfied with these standardized assessments given their limitations and the small size of the department. To let these tests “drive the curriculum” would probably be a mistake.

The past two year’s increase in student population is an indicator of future trends and anticipate a dramatic rise in enrollment. The only way to expand enrollments and maintain a small student/teacher ratio is to add more courses. To meet the demands of increased student enrollments the department may be forced to modify program requirements.

In addition, even though more courses are now than in the past, the department still cannot meet the demand for more upper division offerings, nor can it offer complete coverage of the fields. The substantive areas within the fields are growing significantly, and the department does not have the personnel to teach the newer areas.

**Resources**

Most of the courses are taught in the Administration Building – where the classrooms are among the least adequate in the University. There are no adequate seminar rooms, and small group instruction as well as cooperative learning is impossible in many classrooms due to lack of space. Students also have limited access to computer labs, library journal holdings are lacking, and the budget for sociology and criminal justice acquisitions is inadequate.

The department lacks some of the most basic statistical programs and software programs; these are essential for students who are enrolled in required research-oriented courses. The impact of technology and its subsequent changes in social science computing threaten to leave instruction at Gonzaga behind.

The department budget is extremely limited, essentially covering clerical assistance, limited equipment purchases and supplies. There is no line item set aside for faculty development in neither the department or the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Women’s Studies Program**

**Curriculum and Objectives**

The Women’s Studies Program provides students with the tools they need to participate competently in society’s current conversation about gender, class, and race. This multi-

---
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disciplinary program examines the historical and contemporary circumstances that have shaped the relationships between men and women. It raises fundamental questions about gender relations, explores philosophical assumptions about human nature, and considers the possibility of new social practices that will bring about greater equality and mutual understanding.

Women’s Studies is neither a department nor a major; it is a program that offers students a 21-credit concentration in Women’s Studies. There are three (3) required courses (WOMS 201, 401, 409) that introduce students to the methods and theories of the discipline. Students also select four (4) electives from courses in 10 other disciplines in the College of Arts and Sciences. All but two (2) courses within the program are cross-listed with other disciplines.

Faculty

Twenty (20) faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences are also members of the Women’s Studies Program. They come from the departments of: Political Science, English, History, Religious Studies, MA/TESL Program, Philosophy, Modern Languages, Sociology, Biology, as well as the School of Law.

All faculty members teaching in the program are, in varying ways, using collaborative or dialogical pedagogies. To continue as a quality academic program, Women’s Studies would be best served by a director, who is tenured or in a tenure-track position in one of the departments of the College of Arts and Sciences. During the last four years there has been a high degree of faculty burnout among the program’s faculty and director due to unrealistic workloads, a consistent lack of institutional support and outright hostility from higher administration. The result has been an inability to function creatively and to offer faculty seminars, colloquia, and workshops.

Students

Concentrations per year

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

Graduates with concentrations per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment

Students enrolled in Women’s Studies courses have frequent and serious opportunities to evaluate how the courses are going and to make suggestions for improvement. Some of the Women’s Studies faculty conduct formal mid-term evaluations for their classes. The department was developed its own qualitative student evaluations for Women’s Studies classes, and faculty self-evaluations. The information on these forms is reviewed with each faculty member. These meetings have a developmental focus and serve to identify strengths and weaknesses and make plans for improvement.
The large increase in undergraduate population challenges the program in significant ways: 1) it creates difficulty in offering an adequate number of courses required for a concentration; 2) it impedes collaborative and dialogical instruction; 3) it hurts the opportunity to increase the number of cross-listed courses; 4) the Women’s Studies Symposium is becoming more difficult to teach on a rotating basis by faculty within a variety of departments.

The current climate in the University, continues to work at significantly weakening the Women’s Studies Program. Many students who stay at Gonzaga because of the program will be forced to leave the University if administrative decisions continue to attack and threaten the program.

**Resources**

The program office is located in the Administration Building and includes the Director’s office and an outer space used by a work study student. The program also has access to a bulletin board on the fourth floor of the Administration Building.

There has been a slight increase in the budget for meetings and travel. The program also receives a small budget for library and video resources. However, the intellectual and educational quality of the program will significantly decline unless the program receives money for programming and faculty development.

**Summary of Substantive Program Changes in the College of Arts and Sciences since last NWCCU visit:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Masters of Arts in English discontinued</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>Exercise Science moved from School of Education to College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>Exercise Science moved from College of Arts &amp; Sciences to School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages and Literature</td>
<td>German Studies Major was discontinued</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Clarence H. Barnes, Dean

Mission

The School of Business Administration (SBA) "strives to develop professionally competent graduates who exemplify the humanistic, ethical, and moral values in the Jesuit tradition." The School's mission and objectives are linked with the University's mission in aiming to provide a personal learning environment, quality students, and a faculty dedicated to teaching, advising, scholarship, and service.

Undergraduate Program

Goals/Objectives

In fall 2002, the SBA faculty identified the following learning objectives of its undergraduate programs. Programs are aimed to prepare students to:

- Apply fundamental business functions and processes to any organization;
- Analyze challenges and opportunities critically and arrive at a best solution;
- Understand diverse perspectives and the global reach of business decisions;
- Communicate ideas and information effectively;
- Approach decision-making from an ethical framework and with a commitment to the common good; and
- Adapt readily to the needs of a high technology market.

Description of the Programs

The School of Business Administration (SBA) offers a Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) and two master's degrees - Master of Business Administration (MBA) and Master of Accountancy (MAcc). The School has been accredited since 1990 by AACSB International - The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. Two undergraduate majors are available, Accounting and Business Administration. In the Business Administration major, the following concentrations are offered: economics, finance, human resource management, management information systems, marketing, and operations/supply chain management. Interdisciplinary concentrations are also offered in international business and law and public policy. An individually designed concentration is available to the student whose interests are less structured than a specific concentration.

Non-business students may minor in the following: advertising, promotion, economics, analytical finance, and general business. School of Business economics faculty, in cooperation with the College of Arts and Sciences, participate in a Bachelor of Arts in Economics degree.

The BBA degree requirements include University core requirements, the business core and foundation courses, and specific major requirements. The requirements are outlined in the
Undergraduate Catalogue, including guidelines for transfer students. Transfer equivalency guidelines from Washington community colleges and other universities are now published on the University’s web site.

In Fall 2002, the SBA enrolled 800 undergraduate students. The number of declared majors and minors were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Number of Students (including those doing a double major)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Information Systems</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Supply Chain Mgmt</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; Public Policy</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Concentration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minors for non-business students

- General Business: 69
- Economics: 9
- Analytical Finance: 1
- Promotion: 18
- Advertising (this minor is for students majoring in Communications): 52

In Fall 2002, the faculty’s undergraduate credit hour load was 8,311; the undergraduate student credit hours were 12,438.

Faculty

The SBA has 27 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty, and one visiting professor, the John L. Aram Chair in Business Ethics. Two faculty expect to complete their doctoral programs during the 2003-2004 academic year. In Fall 2002, sixteen adjunct faculty were hired. In Spring 2003, 20 adjunct faculty are teaching undergraduate and graduate classes.

Faculty teach 9 semester hours with two preparations per semester. In 2001-03, adjunct faculty taught about 33% of the undergraduate credit hours. These credit hours are mostly in the lower division service courses such as BUSN 101, BUSN 111, and BUSN 283.

The chief administrator of the SBA is the Dean. An Assistant Dean serves as the School’s graduate director. Other personnel include:
2 faculty secretaries
1 Freshman advisor/outcomes assessment coordinator
1 Assistant to the dean/transfer advisor
1 Graduate program coordinator (recruitment/advisor)
1 Graduate program coordinator (admissions, special programs)
1 Manager, Computer Lab
1 Desk top support specialist

Governance in the SBA is not by department but by function. Each faculty member serves on at least one of the following school-wide committees:

Strategic Initiatives
Planning and Outcomes Assessment
Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure
Faculty Development
Technology Planning
Student Services
Undergraduate
Graduate

Through regular meetings of these committees and reports at monthly SBA general meetings, faculty has ongoing participation in academic planning, curriculum development, and governance of the school. In addition, individual concentration areas meet, when necessary, to review various assessment documents and to evaluate the content, relevancy and rigor of their programs. Changes to individual programs are made on a continual basis, usually in tangent with the biannual revision of the Undergraduate Catalogue. Changes affecting core requirements or new programs are voted upon by all business faculty. One or two half-day retreats are held each year to deal with topics of long term strategic importance.

Teaching evaluations are conducted each fall and spring semester for all faculty, full-time and adjunct. Until Spring 2002, students used a standard questionnaire to evaluate the faculty’s teaching effectiveness. Beginning Fall 2002, on-line teaching evaluations became an option. Results of these evaluations are provided to each faculty and to the Dean. However, there is no benchmark across the University to make useful comparisons with other academic units of the university.

The Dean’s Office performs a ranking process using the mean and median for Questions 9 and 10. In combination with self-evaluations and self-assigned weights from each faculty on their teaching, advising, professional development and service activities submitted in early spring, the dean determines appropriate merit increases for the next academic year.

Peer evaluations are also conducted by members of the SBA Committee on Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure. (See Exhibit 2.18.) Such evaluations are used in the committee’s recommendation in the reappointment, promotion or tenure process during the academic year.
Facilities

The SBA is housed in a 34,000-square feet building, Jepson Center. It contains seven medium-large classrooms, two seminar rooms, and a 179-seat auditorium. Four of these rooms are equipped with multi-media equipment. In addition, the center houses two computer labs, one with 42 computers and the second with 26 computers. Both labs are also equipped with multi-media equipment. Both labs are reserved for approximately 20 hours of class time. One or the other is always open for student use from 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. on weeknights. Over the weekend the bigger lab is open 13 hours. The labs are staffed by two full-time personnel: a manager and a desk top support specialist.

All full-time faculty have private offices and computer equipment. Software is provided to support teaching and research needs.

Construction is underway to expand the building by 32,000 square feet. The expansion will add ten large to medium sized classrooms, a seminar room, a computer lab, and 10 faculty offices and offices for special programs (Gonzaga Institute of Ethics, Hogan Entrepreneurial Leadership Program). An office suite for the Graduate School of Business will also be located on the addition’s main and upper levels.

Significant Changes

The School of Business Administration has experienced growth in its undergraduate enrollment commensurate with the growth in enrollment University-wide. As the number of freshmen admitted to the University has increased, so has the number of new students in business. Year-to-year, it can be expected that about nineteen to twenty percent of the freshman class will designate business as the academic program in which they wish to study. From 1998 to 2002 business freshmen numbers were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Freshmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A strategic decision was made by the University to cap the freshman class enrollment at approximately 930 in the 2002-03 academic year. Of that number, 178 students enrolled in the School of Business Administration or nineteen percent of the class total. It is expected that new student enrollments in the coming years will remain consistent with this number.

Total enrollment in the School of Business Administration has grown in proportion to the growth in the University and as reflected in the numbers of newly admitted students. Student headcount from 1998-2002 are as follows:
Instructionally, the most significant change within the School of Business Administration during the past 10 years has been the change from designated major programs to concentrations within the Business Administration major. The change allowed for greater integration of various business functions in the concentration. This is achieved by requiring six semester credit hours in an integrative or international course or an experiential class in small business consulting or internship. By so doing, students receive a broader overview of business functions and practices beyond their chosen field of concentration.

Concurrently, the Accounting major has been adapted in response to the state-mandated requirement that, beginning in May 2000, candidates for the CPA examination must have completed 150 semester hours of university study. Accounting majors not desiring to take the examination may graduate in four years with a BBA after completing the SBA curriculum and 24 semester hours of accounting courses. Those intending to take the examination may, during the spring semester of their junior year, apply for acceptance into the Masters of Accountancy (MAcc) program. Those accepted enroll in their senior year in a combination of undergraduate and graduate courses and are able to graduate at the end of the fifth year with both BBA and MAcc credentials. The number of students choosing this combined program has increased from 6 in 2001 to 25 in 2002. The total number of students enrolled in the MAcc Program increased to 45 in 2003.

**Educational Assessment**

The primary purpose of the outcomes assessment program is to ascertain the degree to which students have developed the skills and knowledge that are essential to success in today's complex and dynamic society. The School of Business uses various measures to evaluate the effectiveness of its educational programs:

1. For the past three years, the school has administered an exit/comprehensive exam developed by the Educational Testing Services (ETS) for graduating seniors. The ETS exam is a standardized test administered to business students across the United States. In the April 2000 exam, Gonzaga students placed in the 98th percentile nationally, the exam having been given electively to students in 424 schools. Ninety-eight students took the April 2001 exam, and students scored in the 96th percentile, with the same number of schools participating. In April 2002, the graduating class scored in the 96th percentile once again. The ETS exam is a valid and reliable assessment of the quality of undergraduate business programs.
ETS allows participating universities to create an additional component to the senior exam specific to a concentration or a major. These additional components are analyzed by School faculty and the results then direct faculty efforts for increasing course emphasis on concepts in which students performed below expectations.

The exam, in addition to addressing course content, poses a number of questions to the graduating students about the quality of education they received at Gonzaga. A strong majority (67.3%) expressed satisfaction or strong satisfaction with the quality of the university core curriculum; over two-thirds were satisfied or highly satisfied with the quality of education in the junior and senior business classes, while over half (54%) found the learning opportunities obtained from completing the upper division business core to be satisfactory or highly satisfactory.

2. For accounting majors, CPA examination pass rates serve as an independent appraisal of the knowledge accounting majors possess upon graduation. The pass rates of Gonzaga graduates continue to exceed both national and Washington state pass rates. In 2000 the first-time pass rate for undergraduates was 7th in the nation among over 1,000 universities. In three of the past four years either one or two Gonzaga students placed among the top ten of more than 1,000 candidates annually in Washington.

3. The School conducts an annual survey of alumni to determine their level of satisfaction with the education they received at Gonzaga. Results of the most recent survey show Gonzaga graduates are very positive about their education. Respondents to the survey, sent to members of the classes of 1962, 1967, 1972, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1997, reveal that 75% were employed less than four months after graduation. More than 80% indicated they were either satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with the extent to which their degree prepared them for their professional activities.

4. The Dean's Roundtable, Dean's Business Forum and Accounting Advisory Board provide regular input concerning business trends, changes in technology, and skills necessary for success in employment.

5. The success of students in obtaining internships and employment upon graduation, and the repeat visits of recruiters to campus is, in itself, an indication that those graduating from Gonzaga have the attributes desired by employers. Over the last several years, 84% of business graduates are employed within six months of graduation. Employers of graduates include: Campbell Soup Co.; US West; Boeing; CompUSA; Transamerica; Johnson & Johnson; Pfizer; AVISTA; Microsoft; Premix; Alaska Airlines; KPMG; Merrill Lynch; Stanford Medical Center; Adidas America; Nordstrom; United Airlines; Tidymans; Target Stores; Farmers Insurance; Portland Teachers Credit Union; Lehman Brothers; Accenture; and Cisco Systems.
Analysis and Appraisal

Strengths

1. Faculty

Students in the School of Business are taught by twenty-seven (27), PhD qualified, full-time tenure or tenure track faculty. Continuing professional development and consulting work among the faculty give students the benefits of course relevancy and real world perspective. Additionally, each year several faculty take the opportunity to teach abroad, either in Gonzaga's Florence campus, or at other universities in the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Beijing, France and Finland. This global perspective gives students the added advantage of understanding global business operations. In research, the faculty has maintained a consistent stream of research activity in their respective disciplines and service activities continue to be a significant component of the faculty’s responsibilities and outreach to the community.

2. Integrative curriculum

The change from major programs to concentrations in the Business major allows for a broader integration of various business disciplines and functions which comparable institutions leaning more toward the traditional approach do not offer. Similarly, reorganization of the Accounting major has allowed the addition of courses in professional ethics, fraud prevention and detection, and professional practices. These seminar courses give majors increased opportunities for research, communication, and problem analysis.

3. Ethics curriculum

Ethics is central to the School's mission, and the faculty is committed to teaching the importance of ethical practices and their significance across the business curriculum. The faculty also offers annual continuing education seminars in business ethics for the accounting and law professions.

4. Interaction with the greater regional community

Through lecture series programs such as the Dean’s Business Forum, the Economics Symposium, the Aram Business Ethics Lecture, the Puget Sound Business Forum, and the Dean's Roundtable, the quality factor of the business programs is enhanced and mutual benefits are derived by the university and the business community.

5. Students of high promise

Gonzaga's School of Business continues to raise its requirements for admission to undergraduate and graduate studies in business. By accepting promising students as measured by their academic performance, faculty are able to allocate more classroom time to cover greater depth of the subject, allocate more learning responsibility to the students, and raise the overall level of learning across the business curriculum.
Weaknesses

Enrollment growth is expected to continue. Increased student numbers have led to larger than desired class sizes, multiple course preparations, and little free time for faculty to devote to long term planning, curricular development, or intellectual development. The need for additional faculty in each field is vital to maintain the quality of education. A teaching institution should demonstrate its commitment to teaching excellence by reducing class sizes to more traditional numbers. Student needs would receive greater personal attention, and faculty would be more innovative and have the opportunity to generate and implement new instruction more quickly and effectively.

Because of the dynamics of business information and telecommunication, faculty are increasingly in need of renewal in their academic fields and related disciplines. Thus, it is of growing importance to provide faculty with more opportunities to participate in state-of-the-art advances in business and business education, to become familiar with the tools and use of technology in order to deliver course content more effectively and assist them to attain improved communication and other professional advances in their disciplines. A "faculty helping faculty" approach is used to help faculty become more knowledgeable about new advances in technology. Active scholars, by definition, make better teachers. Therefore, when quality improvements are at issue, research/scholarship must be of primary importance. Support for faculty travel to professional meetings and conferences is also vital to the faculty’s professional growth and development. Sufficient support is lacking and hinders faculty’s ability to participate in these conferences, meet colleagues from other institutions and learn about current research and initiatives in their disciplines.

There is continuing concern with the number of credit hours taught by adjunct faculty. Because most graduate courses (where numbers are also growing rapidly) are staffed with full-time faculty, undergraduates may increasingly be penalized by large numbers of sections staffed by adjuncts.

Classrooms large enough to hold the increased class sizes, particularly those with multi-media support, are in short supply, leading to scheduling problems which affect both faculty and students. The expansion of the building by an additional 32,000 square feet will alleviate this problem.

Graduate Program

Goals/Objectives

In conformance with the Mission of the University and the School of Business Administration, the objectives of the Graduate School of Business are to develop in graduates:

1. Ability to use practice and theory to effectively solve problems faced by managers and other professionals in a dynamic business environment;
2. Skills necessary to develop and implement organizational strategies and to effectively manage change;
3. Understanding of the ethical implications of management decisions on all stakeholders of an organization;
4. Oral and written communication skills expected of upper-level managers and business owners;
5. Technical skills and knowledge of modern technology required by upper level managers; and
6. Appreciation for the benefits of diversity within the business environment and an understanding of the impact of the continued globalization of the economy.

Description of the Programs

The School of Business Administration offers Master of Business Administration (MBA) and Master of Accountancy (MAcc) degrees. In addition combined MBA/JD, MAcc/JD, and MBA/MAcc degrees are available.

In 2001 the university was asked by the Johnson Foundation to offer an MBA in American Indian Entrepreneurship to a carefully selected group of faculty from tribal colleges in the Western United States. This three-year program is organized on a six-student cohort basis and combines on-campus and distance education methodologies.

Organizational structure and governance

Graduate studies in the School of Business are directed by the Assistant Dean. His responsibilities are to:

- Administer the recruitment activities and admission of applicants;
- Serve as academic advisor;
- Select graduate assistants to work with business faculty;
- Coordinate class scheduling with the Dean's office;
- Chair the Graduate Curriculum Committee; and
- Serve as the SBA representative to the University Graduate Council.

The Assistant Dean is assisted by two program coordinators. Curriculum changes within programs are faculty driven and respond to student demand, advice from advisory boards, and market conditions. Just as with the undergraduate programs, such changes are considered first by the Graduate Curriculum Committee and then by SBA faculty vote. Major program changes, such as additions of new programs or deletions of those offered in the past, must be approved by the University Graduate Council and the Academic Council. New programs must be approved by the Board of Trustees. Since the past accreditation visit, only the MBA in American Indian Entrepreneurship has been added and no programs have been deleted.

Most graduate courses are taught by full time, doctorally qualified, tenured faculty whose training and research is in the discipline in which they teach. Adjuncts are used only in the event of unavailability of regular faculty due to sabbaticals, international teaching opportunities, or faculty turnover. Adjuncts are carefully chosen for expertise in their fields and must interview with the Dean or Associate Dean.
Graduate courses are totally separate from undergraduate offerings and offer greater depth of study while placing greater demands on students' intellectual and creative capacities. Currently, the only exceptions to separate graduate classes are found in the MAcc 3-2 program where some 4th and 5th year accounting majors study together. Of the 4 courses where this is allowed, graduate students are expected either to complete additional coursework or are given fewer credits for the course.

Applicants must submit formal applications and transcripts for acceptance into the graduate program. The admission decision is based on evaluation of the following: overall GPA, Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT) score, recommendations, and relevant work experience. International students must submit an official TOEFL score of at least 550.

**Significant Changes**

Enrollment trends have provided the greatest catalyst for change in the School of Business Administration. Graduate headcount between 1997 and 2002 increased from 73 to 194. Graduate enrollment is expected to experience significant growth as more undergraduate accounting majors enroll in the Master of Accountancy to meet the 150-hour credit requirement for CPA certification. In 2002 full-time students comprise 29% and part-time students, 71%. Early morning classes (6:45-8 am) have been added to better accommodate those with full-time employment.

In the fall of 2002, the Graduate School at Gonzaga was closed, thereby transferring administrative responsibilities for all graduate programs to the individual schools. In the School of Business, the main impact was to provide for better coordination of all admissions processes. In addition, the School has been given greater latitude in marketing programs and is more intimately involved in the degree evaluation process at the end of students’ programs.

The decentralization has had a very positive impact on graduate programs in the School of Business. The increase in both the quantity of marketing and the ability to do more targeted marketing has resulted in growth in the program in spite of the economic downturn. While many graduate business programs are shrinking, our enrollment for spring, summer, and fall semesters in 2003 was up approximately 17% from 2002 (an increase from 2,667 credit hours to 3,135).

Much of this increase was due to improvements to the application process. First, the turnaround time from completion of the application package to the admission decision was reduced from two weeks to 24-48 hours. Thus, students typically learn of their admission decision within a week of completing their application package. In the competitive world of MBA programs, this “first response” is critical to our success. Second, the School has instituted a correspondence plan that targets students with incomplete applications in order to prompt them as to the status of their package and to encourage them to complete the application process. Lastly, controls and procedures have been instituted to ensure that each file document is properly handled so as to minimize lost or misplaced application documents. As a result, there have not been any complaints regarding lost documents from applicants.
While graduate programs have grown, the quality has not suffered. The mean GMAT score for students entering our programs is now a 542, compared to a 530 for the same period last year.

Lastly, the degree evaluation process is now much more defined and specific. The graduate advisor reviews each file against degree requirements. Only upon advisor approval is a degree granted.

In summary, the decentralization has had many positive impacts on the graduate programs in the School of Business, and allowed it to be more successful in the recruitment of “students of promise”.

**Significant Changes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBA and MACC</td>
<td>Added a MIS specialization</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>MACC’s accounting track renamed Professional Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration (undergraduate)</td>
<td>E commerce concentration</td>
<td>Added in 2001; dropped in 2003;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration in Operations Management renamed Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration in Supply Chain Management changed to Supply Chain and Operations Management</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission

The mission of the School of Education is to prepare socially responsive and discerning practitioners to serve their community and profession.

- We model and promote leadership, scholarship and professional competence in multiple specializations
- We support an environment that is challenging, inclusive, reflective, and collegial.
- We foster inquiry, intellectual creativity, and evidence-based decision making to accept the challenges facing a global society.
- We provide academic excellence in teaching, advising, service, and scholarship. We promote, support and respect diversity.

The School of Education upholds the tradition of humanistic, Catholic, and Jesuit education.

The missions of the University and the School of Education emphasize a number of common areas including academic scholarship, professional and specialized competence, and service to others; qualities necessary to provide a foundation for leadership in any field. Academic scholarship requires knowledge of theories and philosophies concerning education, ability to think creatively and independently, a desire to seek new ideas, ability to communicating ideas effectively, and continued growth from professional reflection. Professional competence develops through application of knowledge, demonstrated professional skill in methods and strategies, and the ability to solve practical problems. Service helps to promote the dispositions and attitudes necessary to develop caring and respect for diversity in needs, ideas, and values that others may hold to be important.

Goals/Objectives

The qualities of the mission are to be actualized in each of the individual programs through school-wide goals established by the faculty and then implemented specifically through specialized program competencies. During the 2002-2003 Academic year, the School of Education wrote a series of goals from which it bases its strategic planning. These goals reflect the overall vision of the School of Education and its intent to develop faculty and students who:

- Develop transformational leaders who serve and influence their communities.
- Create an environment where diverse individual contributions are valued.
- Understand and adhere to ethical standards and guidelines of professional practice.
- Understand the consequences of technology and harness its possibilities to positively impact humanity.
- Pursue meaningful research.
• Nurture a lifelong commitment to self-assessment and growth.
• Develop critically-thinking and collaborative problem-solvers with the courage to contribute to society.
• Provide a strong, working knowledge base from which practice flows
• Serve the underserved.

**Description of the Programs**

The School of Education serves 500-600 students being certified in the School of Education, with majors in the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Professional Studies. The School serves approximately 600 graduate students in both campus and site-based programs in the Inland Northwest and in the Canadian provinces of Alberta and British Columbia. Teacher certification for the State of Washington is offered for elementary and secondary teachers, K-12 specialists, counselors, principals, and superintendents.

The most significant change over the past ten years was the dissolution of the department structure in Fall of 1997 and the department structure returned to in Fall 2000. While programs stayed constant, the governance and organizational guidelines changed several times. Within the past five years there have been two deans, an Acting Dean and the Council of Department Chairs serving as Dean. A new dean was hired in June 2002 following two national searches.

In recent years a self-study unit was created. Based on the information gained, faculty of the School of Education voted to reorganize the six departments into five departments in spring, 2003.

• Department of Counselor Education
• Department of Leadership and Administration
• Department of Special Education
• Department of Sport and Physical Education
• Department of Teacher Education.

Two main objectives served by the reorganization:

1. The previous Leadership Formation Department (serving graduate administration students seeking certification in Washington) has combined with administration and supervision programs (serving students in Canada) to form one department. The newly organized Department of Leadership Administration, will expand the pool of faculty expertise necessary to better serve program needs in Canada and the Spokane regions.

2. The graduate curriculum and instruction programs and Master of Arts in Teaching programs have been moved into the Department of Teacher Education. This provides seamless preparation of teachers in initial and advanced programs.

Although many aspects of the programs were served by the Graduate School, the role of the Off-Campus Office of the School of Education was to support departments in carrying programs
into Canada and throughout the Inland Northwest. With the decentralization of the Graduate School, the School of Education dissolved the off campus Office; the School of Education Office of Graduate Admissions now supports all graduate programs in the School of Education.

A number of administrative offices support the School of Education. A full time certification officer is the dean’s designee to recommend candidates for certification through the State of Washington; two full time administrators place students in field experiences and student teaching. In addition, the School of Education is supported by: one assessment coordinator, one program assistant in charge of graduate admissions, one computer technician, one assistant to the dean, one administrative secretary, and three FTE support personnel for the five departments. As a result of the reorganization there are additional positions being implemented during the transition until an assessment for long term need can be determined. (See Exhibit 2.33)

During the 2002-2003 Academic Year the faculty developed and revised a number of governance documents that address various organizational, operational, and protocol issues for faculty and programs. (See Exhibit 2.34) These documents include:

- School of Education Bylaws (See Exhibit 2.3)
- School of Education Faculty Procedures Manual (See Exhibit 2.3)
- School of Education Fair Practice Manual (See Exhibit 2.37)

In addition administrators, department chairs, and program directors have revisited job descriptions of administrative responsibilities, accountability, consultation, and information (RACI) to set the stage for the development of new communication plans in the School of Education during 2003-2004.

**Gonzaga Artificial Intelligence Laboratory (G.A.I.L.)**

A current project is being developed through a partnership with the School of Education and Next IT, a private software corporation, to establish an artificial intelligence laboratory focused on a mathematics learning. Through a financial gift, the partnership has been formed to develop intelligent instructional software. The goal is to develop intelligent computer assisted instruction (ICAI) that utilizes pre-assessment strategies, and guides students through learning activities, assists in mathematics and reading instruction. The software will use artificial intelligence to integrate math curriculum, research-based instructional strategies and best practices of experienced teachers to develop teaching “bots” or Artificial Intelligence Developmental Educators (A.I.D.E.s) to facilitate student learning.

The vision of G.A.I.L. is to create opportunities that enhance student learning, faculty mentoring and school partnerships. A goal of the laboratory is to develop a web-based environment for learning that enhances access to problem solving skills through improved mathematics, including reading instruction while building on strong community relationships with the P-12 school systems. The planning team includes educators from a broad geographic region of the state from the public, private, university and corporate sectors.
By data collection and analysis completed by the A.I.D.E., simultaneous research on student learning and individual student progress and achievement can be conducted with no extra demands on the teacher or district. Thus enabling the intent of legislation such as No Child Left Behind

School districts and teachers will to able to:

- identify research based methods to develop standards based improvement and the role of assessment and data in fostering improvement;
- develop assessment systems that provide ongoing information to improve instruction for each student and what that students needs to improve;
- develop high-quality, aligned assessments that can be used to improve instruction based on students areas of weakness;
- foster partnerships and collaborations to support learning and improvement so that school districts, communities, regions, and states can pool resources and expertise and draw from the best available evidence of what works to improve education; and
- to intensify efforts to build the capacity to assist low performing students and schools and provide technical assistance.

Gates Grant/Yakima Partnership

In October of 2003, the School of Education received formal notification from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation that it had been funded for the development of a university partnership with the Catholic Schools in the Yakima Diocese. The $150,000 grant over a three-year period will fund the development of a partnership that supports teacher and principal professional development and collaboration between Gonzaga faculty and diocesan faculty. (Details of this partnership are outlined in Standard 5 under technology planning.)

The School of Education will develop a support model in which faculty at both the university and in the Yakima Diocese will advance an enhanced model of communication, collaboration, and simultaneous renewal made possible through technology. The use of a course management system and shared staff development procedures will help to remove the geographic barriers that exist between the campus and the schools of the diocese, and will make possible the immediate exchange of materials and ideas essential for collaboration.

Faculty Organizational Structure

Twenty-three full time faculty and 1.5 fixed term faculty serve the departments in the School of Education. The faculty also includes highly qualified school professionals who provide adjunct instruction in their disciplines. In 2002-2003, adjunct faculty were hired to teach approximately 150 classes in Washington and Canadian based programs.

Faculty in the departments of Special Education, Sport and Physical Education and Teacher Education teach both undergraduate and undergraduate students. Faculty in the Departments of
Counselor Education and Leadership and Administration teach only graduate students. Graduate programs are primarily 12 month programs, and most faculty teach overloads in the summer to serve student needs.

Facilities

The School of Education houses most of its programs in Rosauer Center for Education, a new facility built in 1993. In addition to classrooms and conference rooms, all faculty and staff members have private offices with office provided for graduate assistants. All classrooms are equipped with overhead projectors, VCR’s, cable television and white boards. All faculty and staff have computers that are systematically upgraded, having opportunities for software training and technical support. In 2002-2003 three classrooms were converted to media presentation classrooms. The Counselor Education facility has specially wired rooms for videotaping counseling sessions; these rooms are also equipped with one-way viewing glass. The Rosauer Center houses an early childhood center for preschool children with special needs assessment to house special grant programs for area children.

Foley Center provides library support for faculty and students whether in on-campus or site-based programs. Included in Foley Center is the Franklin D. Love Curriculum Center. The Love Center’s primary mission is to support programs of Gonzaga University which are concerned with pre-school through 12th grade teacher preparation and/or research concerning preschool through 12th grade curriculum. The collection is developed in support of the primary mission. A secondary mission is to serve the broader educational community by allowing access to the collection by school personnel and interested citizens. Collection in the Love Curriculum Center include K-12 textbooks; curriculum guides from national, regional, state and local agencies and organizations; juvenile literature; professional books for the practicing or in-training pre-K-12 teacher; and other materials including kits; games; and computer software.

Gonzaga University supports site based programs by renting facilities in local schools and hotels. Faculty and students have the opportunity to indicate their classroom needs and every attempt is made to accommodate them.
**Education Assessment**

The School of Education has an assessment system collecting and analyzing data on an applicant's qualifications, candidate and graduate performance. The assessment also includes unit operations. It supports ongoing assessment of programs instituting a rotating schedule by which all of the graduate and undergraduate programs are formally evaluated. (See Exhibit 2.24) The School of Education recognizes programs should be evaluated in the spirit and intent of NCATE. The School developed an initial assessment system to be comprehensive, and ensured would meet the goals of its programs, the standards of NCATE, OSPI (the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction). The School of Education continues to be actively engaged in the development of a comprehensive system by building on its present system and expanding to meet the additional challenges of assessment the School of Education continues to face.

The assessment plan has been developed informally. (See Exhibit 2.23) The departments have participated in a number of assessment related activities and have identified a range of assessment strategies that are used in academic programs. A proposal for a formal assessment plan was developed during the 2002-2003 academic year with a school-wide assessment committee. The assessment plan being developed follows its candidates from the time of admission through their work as professional educators. Multiple pieces of data are gathered from the candidates, the faculty in the program, its colleagues in the public schools and the employers of its program alumni. The assessment plan includes procedures for disseminating information, built into the assessment plan is the assessment of itself on a systematic basis to ensure that it is a workable and informative process.

The comprehensive nature of the plan allows for the generation of information upon which very difficult policy decisions can be based. The newly revised Fair Process Manual for the School of Education is a policy document identifying assessment stages for candidates in all programs. [The major elements of the assessment plan include (1) the assessment system; (2) data collection, analysis and evaluation; and (3) the use of data for program improvement.]

Assessment governs all standards of the NCATE process, including:

- Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions;
- Field Experiences including practica and internships;
- Diversity of curriculum, experiences, candidates, faculty, and students/clients;
- Faculty qualification, performances, and development, and
- The governance structure and resources of the School of Education.

Assessment is both formative and summative. It is understood by the faculty that the elements of the assessment plan may change as the School of Education works its way through the processes. The plan has been developed based on practices that faculty in the School of Education know are effective for its program planning and that have been in place for some time. In addition, through reflection on the strengths of its programs, the faculty are proposing additional elements be included in the process to expand its database. It is anticipated that the assessment plan will provide a strong foundation on which programs and improve the preparation of future educators.
The elements are understood to be flexible and may change as the School of Education refines the processes. Currently the plan is based on practices known to be effective. In this evolution, the School of Education is proposing additional elements to be included to expand its database.

In Fall, 2002 the School of Education was able to add a full time assessment coordinator to input data and to create reports by which faculty and administrators can analyze the overall assessment process.

Assessment in the School of Education includes two primary components: external and internal. Each of those components has elements of objective, product and performance assessment.

Objective assessment includes tests or other artifacts, which can be evaluated mechanically or by non-professional judgment. These would include any tests, which are multiple choice, true false, or short answer in which only one answer is acceptable. Such artifacts are normally machine scored, or have answer keys that would allow scoring to occur in an “objective” or non-judgmental format. This includes both those items prepared by the instructor (internal) and standardized tests such as the WEST– B, WEST – E for the State of Washington (external).

Product assessment includes artifacts which have criteria developed for scoring. These include those having specific scoring rubrics and those that receive more holistic, yet not clearly explicit scoring. These would include, but not be limited to essays, reports, research projects, written lesson and unit plans, instructional tools, portfolios and a variety of other assignments in which the product is assessed after its completion. This area of assessment is part of performance outcomes, yet the difference between it and performance assessment for purposes of teacher education occur at the time that the assessment occurs. Product assessment occurs upon completion.

Performance assessment refers to those activities that are evaluated during the time that the activity is occurring. The Pedagogy Assessment Test is a state-required performance instrument for certification in the State of Washington. It was field tested in 2002-2003. Washington is the only state to have a state required certification instrument administered during the student teaching experience. (See Exhibit 2.32) These include such examples as professional performance, interactive assessment of such activities as collaboration or working in cooperative groups, role playing, and other types of activity-based or oral performances.

In keeping with the philosophy of assessment in the educational community, it is the expectation of the faculty model criterion maintain with clearly developed scoring rubrics for students. These may or may not be given to the students in advance, depending on the intent of the lesson. A file of rubrics, which have been established by faculty for assessment of various projects is included in Exhibit 2.32.


Department of Counselor Education

Purposes and Outcomes

Counseling is a profession that demands ethical, moral and professional leadership of its practitioners. They are aware of their own personal strengths and limitations and their impact on others. Counseling graduates model qualities that encourage trust, and they develop skillful interaction that helps clients make difficult decisions. Essential to effective counseling is the commitment to ethical moral standards, moral judgment, a grounding in the counseling research base, and sensitivity when dealing with varied, specialized populations. Cooperation and interdependence, fostered throughout the program, promote life-affirming service needed in the populations that counselors serve and growth in these essential areas.

Current objectives of the programs are reflected in the core requirements as dictated by national accreditation standards and licensure requirements. Through coursework, practicum, internship, and successful completion of the comprehensive examination, students are expected to satisfy the following program objectives:

- To develop a theoretical and psychological base with a rationale for counseling.
- To understand professional problems, issues, and ethical concerns.
- To develop individual counseling skills, techniques and strategies.
- To understand group behavior and learn group facilitation skills.
- To understand career development and the psychology of careers.
- To be skilled at assessment procedures.
- To develop professional counseling expertise under supervision.
- To respect cultural differences and interact with children and adults accordingly.

Description of the Department

The following programs are offered in the Department of Counselor Education:

- Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology: Two 53-hour program tracks are offered on campus only
  1. School Counseling Track: The School Counseling program has undergone major adjustments in protocol and certification practices. A new competency notebook was written to meet current State of Washington Administrative Code.
  2. Community Counseling Track: The Community Counseling program has undergone examination by the faculty to prepare for and work toward the completion of the requirements of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), application submitted in Fall, 2003 for accreditation consideration. (See Exhibit 2.16)
• Master of Arts in Counseling: A 36-hour program is offered at site-based Canadian centers.

There are usually six active groups of full time students enrolled in any calendar year. There are currently programs in Spokane, Alberta, and British Columbia. Each class is designed to accommodate a cohort of 20 full time graduate students.

Faculty Organizational Structure

The Department of Counselor Education is comprised of one tenured associate professor, and two tenure track assistant professors. A half-time contract faculty position has been added. Counselor Education has been able to contract with a strong leader in the school counseling community. This position is responsible for the direction of the core school counseling coursework. In addition to the core faculty, the Counselor Education Department contracts with adjunct faculty, who bring in added expertise and diversity to the faculty. The current adjunct faculty includes six adjunct faculty at Gonzaga and four adjunct faculty for the Canadian programs.

In addition to legal and ethical parameters that guide the behavior of practitioners, counselor educators and supervisors are further bound by the ethical guidelines of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). Five areas of responsibility are outlined. This is provided to assist students in understanding the factors that have shaped the policies and procedures adhered to by Gonzaga’s Counseling Program with regard to student remediation, retention, and due process. These include:

• An ethical responsibility to accept only those students who meet requirements for admission into the training program or applied counseling setting;
• Responsibility for assessing each student’s skills and experience and selection of those activities commensurate with the student’s level of competence;
• Remediation when deficits exist which impede the student’s professional functioning;
• Screening from the program, applied counseling setting, or state licensure if students demonstrate that they are unable to provide competent and ethical professional services; and
• Responsibility for providing the student with information concerning due process appeal.

Facilities

Most on-campus Counselor Education faculty and classes are located in the Rosauer Center for Education. Site-based locations are selected based upon the interest shown within various communities and in accordance to the Gonzaga University, School of Education, and Departmental missions. Site-based cohorts hold classes in a facility within that designated community. The department chooses these facilities with every effort given to secure a central, learning-conducive environment. Frequently, local schools and community centers serve this purpose sufficiently. Summer courses for students are held on the Gonzaga University campus and are usually in the Rosauer Center.
Significant Changes

Enrollment Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community Counseling Track</th>
<th>School Counseling Track</th>
<th>British Columbia</th>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Total grads per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># grads</td>
<td># grads</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td># grads</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td># grads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kelowna</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Calgary 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Calgary 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Calgary 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Calgary 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Calgary 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There have been a number of recent changes that will impact the next 3 to 5 years.

- Assessment processes have been revised. Revisions include step-by-step directions for completing the students' portfolios, and updated rubric for evaluation of portfolios. Additionally, by-laws for the Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB) have been thoroughly reviewed and updated to meet state standards and to better serve the students. (See Exhibit 2.32)

- A peer review course/workshop has been developed for approval and incorporation into the curriculum.

- With the intention of replacing the existing "gate-keeping" protocols of Counselor Education. Being implemented are a revised means of monitoring progress and assuring competence in practice, application of ethics, and emotional intelligence of each student throughout their graduate process is.

Department of Leadership and Administration

Purposes and Outcomes

The Department of Leadership and Administration is a new department following the Spring 2003 reorganization. It is a combination of the former Department of Leadership Formation and part of the Department of Administration, Curriculum and Instruction. The purpose of the department is to facilitate the empowerment of educators with the necessary knowledge, skills, performance, and attitudes to become courageous leaders of learning in a global society. The central aims of the department are to provide advanced educational opportunities for teacher and administrator leaders in support of the improvement of the quality of learning and the quality of their educational settings. This mission requires the modeling of excellence in scholarship and practice; the ethical integration of values and behavior; the building of collegial communities; the active engagement with cultural, intellectual and developmental diversity as opportunity for
personal and professional enrichment; and, the continuing selective reform of educational settings.

The department contributes to the University mission through its emphasis in all of its programs on the development of knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for effective educational leadership, ethical practice, and professional expertise which is sensitive to human diversity in all of its forms.

Description of the Department

The department programs include the following:

- **Master of Arts in Administration and Supervision (MAAS)** is a non-certification degree program that provides graduate administrative candidates the opportunity to develop and deepen their leadership competencies by focusing on the needed knowledge, skills, and dispositions for the practice of educational leadership in educational agencies or programs. Currently, programs are offered in the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta. The need for regional programs in Washington is being pursued.

- **Master of Anesthesiology Education (MAE)** is a program designed for highly skilled registered nurses who wish to assume a leadership role within the profession of nurse anesthesia. In addition to preparing students to be skilled nurse anesthesia practitioners, it is the goal of the program to nurture and develop innovative, creative professional leaders who are prepared to design and teach in preparatory and continuing educational programs. This program is a partnership with Sacred Heart Hospital in Spokane.

- **Master of Arts in Educational Administration (MAEA)** is a program designed to prepare program administrators (30 hours) or principals (36 hours) in the necessary coursework to meet requirements for the State of Washington. Superintendent Program is a (23-hour) program to fulfill State of Washington certification requirements. Candidates may also combine the certificate portion of the coursework with the requirements for the Master of Arts in Educational Administration or the Ph.D. in Leadership Studies.

Leadership Formation Program

The Leadership Formation Program is an innovative program committed to the development of future school principals, program administrators, and superintendents. Previously, a separate department, the Leadership Formation program became part of the newly organized Department of Leadership and Administration. Initial program planning began in 1996 with principal certification faculty, in the department of Administration/ Curriculum and Instruction, coming together to consider the new, state-mandated principal standards.

The program outcomes are designed to:

- articulate the fundamental purposes of education;
- organize institutions to meet these goals;
- acquire an appreciation of the complexity of educational issues; and
• develop a disciplined capacity to formulate alternative courses of action in response to these issues.

The Leadership Formation Program is designed for working professionals. Candidates generally complete the program on a part-time basis over two years. The program begins with a cohort-building summer experience. All subsequent coursework required for the program is scheduled on weekends (Friday and Saturday) plus selected single evenings throughout the fall and spring semesters to accommodate the constraints of working professionals. Up to 18 candidates are selected each year to participate in the Leadership Formation Program. The group size is purposely limited to ensure the quality of candidate/faculty interaction. The cohort is divided into simulated “administrative teams” of five to six candidates each, who interact around a series of case studies and issues in a mythical school district.

The collaborative nature of the Leadership Formation Program requires frequent communication among all planning groups. Faculty includes Gonzaga University faculty, adjunct faculty from the field, and carefully selected principals, program administrators, and superintendent mentors for interns. Faculty also include resource persons such as lawyers or other outside specialists in the delivery of instruction.

The Leadership Formation Program is a six-semester (summer, fall, spring, summer, fall, spring) 23-credit hour, intensive experience. Curriculum is organized from a problem-based perspective founded on broad themes that are stated as working assumptions. Problems encountered are those of individuals within educational organizations. Problem situations presented to the candidates and teams take the form of a complex case study. In this way the learning is highly relevant and similar to the method by which many administrators learn in real life. Integrative experiences help link working assumptions that connect theory and practice.

Curriculum content and simulations in the case study are sequenced to coincide as much as possible with the actual experiences of school district administrators during a calendar year. The program features an integrative course series, a seminar retreat and an internship experience. Upon completion of the internship, candidates are required to make a final presentation of a professional portfolio to members of the Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB). A complete program review is included in Exhibit Room (See Exhibit 2.22.)

The Leadership Formation Institute

The Leadership Formation Institute was initiated in the Spring of 2001 at the request of graduates, a superintendent and a faculty tutor in the Leadership Formation Program. Graduates believed that some organization was necessary so that the knowledge, skills, and values articulated in the program could be developed in a deeper fashion. An institute format where graduates could come together for intensive seminars and workshops was suggested. The program director took responsibility for directing the Institute by selecting participants and organizing curricula.

The mission of the Institute was to empower P-12 administrators and teachers deeply committed to developing the skills and capacities of a learning organization. This cadre of leaders work to carry out the vision of creating a learning organization in their own work environments. The
Institute is completely funded by participants and designed for school and university leaders committed to developing learning organizations. Participants include educators from P-12 schools who work to achieve the following goals:

- Develop a deeper understanding and capacity to practice the five disciplines of a learning organization.
- Become role models in their institutions.
- Collaborate with Leadership Formation faculty in the creation of cases highlighting critical issues in school leadership.
- Contribute to the agenda of creating learning organizations by recruiting others.

A new addition to the Institute is the Professional Certification program. The School of Education has been approved by the State of Washington to provide a 10-hour required graduate sequence for teachers. During 2002-2003 the enrollment was 2; in the summer of 2003 the enrollment grew to more than 40. Due to the broadened nature of this program to serve teachers as well as administrators, the Leadership Institute is no longer under the direction of one department, but instead is a School of Education structure with school-wide participation in working to serve the community.

Faculty Organizational Structure

The department is served by five, full-time faculty with support of about 10 adjunct faculty. Of five full-time faculty, all have doctoral degrees, three are tenured (two associate and one assistant professor) and two are tenure track assistant professors. Another seven adjunct faculty serve the MAE program for the didactic courses with numerous physicians, anesthesiologists and certified registered nurse anesthetist from Sacred Heart Medical Center serving as clinical supervisors.

Each program has a program director with full-time faculty assigned as academic advisors to the various cohorts. Sacred Heart Medical Center supports an on site program director and assistant director. One part time secretary is assigned to the department. Additional clerical services are available to faculty through the office of Faculty Services. Sacred Heart Medical Center supports a three quarter time secretary to support the MAE program’s on-site needs. Graduate assistantships also support department needs.

Significant Changes

Below are tables reflecting enrollment patterns for graduate programs in the Department of Leadership and Administration. Enrollment for the MAEA (Leadership Formation) is for the first five years of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>98/99</th>
<th>99/00</th>
<th>00/01</th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>Fall 02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAA (on)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAA (off)</td>
<td>2718</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in the past ten years has come about for a variety of reasons. Programmatic changes have occurred primarily as a result of feedback from faculty and students regarding ways to respond to the changing needs of teachers and administrators in contemporary schools, both in Canada and the United States. Many changes and adaptations have occurred as the profession indicates: greater use of cooperative learning strategies, more attention to the concept of multiple intelligences, blended online course offerings, increased use of technology to support coursework and advising, increasing attention given to assessing performance outcomes, and responding to community needs through professional outreach in the form of non-degree courses and workshops. Major changes include:

- The Master of Arts in Administration and Curriculum program that had one strand for administration (which could lead to Washington State Principal Certification) and one strand for Curriculum and Instruction, was changed to a non-certification program only.
- The Principal Certification Program was redesigned into the Leadership Formation program, moved to its own department and then back to the newly reorganized Department of Leadership and Administration.
- The Master of Arts in Administration (MAA) program retained two strands Two separate degrees were formed from the MAA program: the Master of Arts in Administration and Supervision (MAAS) and the Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction (MACI). The MAAS was restructured to serve Canadian populations so that it would not be competitive with the campus-based Leadership Formation program. That restriction was lifted and the directors of the two programs are working together to develop a more collaborative approach to serving educators needs.
- The MAAS program has developed courses in two cognate leadership areas: school administration and staff development and mentoring.
- Technology will provide even greater support for programs and students, as parts of courses (or entire courses) are offered on-line.
- Enrollments will be examined closely during the next several years to determine changing political and economic realities.
- The MAE program will increase the number of students it can enroll from 7 to 8 and there will be an increase in credits to more adequately represent the hours the students are currently in class. (See Exhibit 2.34.)
- The department continues to establish a relationship with the local schools and districts to develop needed regional programs.
The Department of Special Education

Purpose and Outcomes

The Special Education programs prepare undergraduate students to work effectively with infants, children, and youth (birth - 21 years) who have mild to severe disabilities in a wide-variety of educational settings.

The Department of Special Education is a synthesis of a positive, progressive empirical approach to instruction with Catholic, Jesuit values of community, scholarship, social justice, and service at the heart of the Special Education programs at Gonzaga University. The values emphasized in the University's Mission and the importance of a well rounded liberal arts education emanate throughout the Special Education program. Through a progressive and humanistic perspective, the Department of Special Education has sought to develop a community atmosphere based upon respect for the uniqueness and diversity of each individual student. This holistic vision of the human, within a caring and supportive community, seeks to transform the students, staff, and faculty into the educational leaders of tomorrow. The importance of providing service and stewardship for individuals either less fortunate or less able to care for themselves is an integral factor to the development of competent and humanistic practitioners.

Description of the Department

The Bachelor of Education in Special Education is earned by completing a major consisting of 44 credits of Special Education coursework, the University Common Core, and the School of Education Core. The State of Washington further requires teacher candidates majoring in Special Education to acquire 20 hours of coursework concentration outside of education. Most students elect to complete an endorsement in Special Education and an endorsement in Elementary Education. In addition, many complete the endorsement in Early Childhood Special Education.

The Master of Education in Special Education is earned by completing a program of 32 credits including core courses and specialty courses in one of three possible tracks: 1) Functional Analysis, 2) Early Childhood Special Education, and 3) General Special Education. The program requires the production of a major research paper and oral presentation. (See Exhibit 2.32.) Gonzaga's Special Education Department offers endorsements in Special Education and Early Childhood Special Education Endorsement. The Early Childhood Special Education (p-3) prepares teachers and therapists to work with infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities and their families. The goal of this program is to prepare personnel for the implementation of Public Law 99-457, which went into effect in 1991.

The Special Education programs emphasize data-based approaches for the instruction of individuals with disabilities. The major curriculum concentrates on principles of learning, data-based effective teaching procedures and instructional materials, continuous evaluation of child progress, critical analysis of current educational research, basic academics, special education laws and regulations, and child and family advocacy. An extensive database in special education supports Gonzaga's focus on four major methodologies: (1) Applied Behavior Analysis, (2)
Direct Instruction of basic skills, (3) Precision Teaching, and (4) Personalized Systems of Instruction.

Student research is a major focus of the Special Education programs. A majority of students in Special Education carry out at least three applied research studies in the classroom or other settings, a major assessment of a child, and one literature review paper. Both undergraduate and graduate students can be expected to master Behavior Analysis concepts, to evaluate and carry out applied research, to prepare and present professional-quality manuscripts, and to effectively implement data-based procedures in applied settings. In the 25 years since Gonzaga's Special Education program was initiated, extensive research articles by students have been published in refereed professional journals. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

There are five full-time faculty who teach in the undergraduate and graduate programs: two tenured professors, one tenured associate professor, one tenure-track associate professor, and one tenure-track assistant professor.

**Significant Changes:**

Since the last Northwest Accreditation visit a number of program changes have occurred within the Department of Special Education in the School of Education. These include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Special Education</td>
<td>New division structure instituted – Special Education became a program in the Division of Physical Education &amp; Special Education</td>
<td>Spring 1998 - 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Special Education</td>
<td>MIT Leeward, Oahu, Hawaii - Dean/AVP required Special Education to teach 4 courses in special education</td>
<td>Spring 1998 - 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Special Education</td>
<td>Mark Derby gets AmeriCorps Grant funded – “Garfield and Friends”</td>
<td>Fall 1998 – Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Special Education</td>
<td>MIT Grant – 3 cohorts (2 on Oahu and 1 on Kauai) The Dean/AVP required Special Education to teach 4 courses in special education.</td>
<td>Spring 1999 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Special Education</td>
<td>AmeriCorps Grant “Reading for Desert” (reading grant with focus on reading with elementary aged students) Kimberly Weber takes over grant for 2 years</td>
<td>1999 – 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Special Education</td>
<td>Reinstitution of Departmental Structure by Dick Wolfe, Interim Dean Endorsements for 1) Special Education and 2) Early Childhood Special Education become primary endorsements only</td>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Special Education</td>
<td>AmeriCorps Grant – “Adventures in Reading” – Kimberly Weber</td>
<td>2000 - 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department of Special Education | Final Approval Special Education only Primary Endorsement with certificate | May 2001
---|---|---
Department of Special Education | National Behavior Analysis Certification – Approval for the M.Ed. in Special Education Functional Analysis Track | Fall 2001
Department of Special Education | Gonzaga Northwest Behavior Analysis Clinic becomes formally established | 2002
Department of Special Education | AmeriCorps Grant – “Positive Behavioral Support,” (Clinic Grant) – Anjali Barretto | 2002 - 2003
Department of Special Education | Revised Special Education endorsement to meet new State competencies for primary endorsements in 1) Special Education and 2) Early Childhood Special Education | Spring 2003
Department of Special Education | AmeriCorps Grant- “Adventures in Reading” Ended | Fall 2003
Department of Special Education | AmeriCorps Grant- “Positive Behavioral Support,” (Clinic Grant) – Ended | Fall 2003

### Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>On-Campus UnderGraduate Credit Hours</th>
<th>On-Campus Graduate Credit Hours</th>
<th>On-Campus Total Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>2213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of strengths mark the Special Education programs.

- The programs prepare professionals who have a firm foundation in research and evaluation, numerous experiences in the application of skills to special education populations, and knowledge of current best practices in special education.
- The graduates and faculty publish research in peer-reviewed journals and write chapters for edited books in the field, and present numerous research studies at regional and national conferences.
- The faculty is judged to be outstanding, effective, and caring. The reputation of the program within the University and outside the University is one of quality and rigor.
- The program has developed a very good set of working relationships with the various local school districts.
Department of Sports and Physical Education

Purposes and Outcomes

The Department of Sport and Physical Education views competence as the quality of leadership in its graduates. Competence, confidence, knowledge, and practical ability are necessary for survival, growth, and leadership in the professional setting. Competence is acquired through a developmental progression, beginning with the mastery of fundamentals, and culminating with the integration of this knowledge with the reality of the professional world. The student moves from learning, to performance, to analysis and evaluation, and finally to the teaching and leading of others.

The central aims of this statement coincide with what the department wishes to accomplish for its students and the university. These are to prepare students who:

- demonstrate knowledge of the social, scientific, research, leaders, and pedagogical content related to the study of sport, health, fitness, and physical education;
- exhibit eagerness to pursue professional careers and know the organizations related to their choice of career path;
- integrate theory into practical application and evaluate the effectiveness of their performance;
- demonstrate qualities of self-acceptance and self-knowledge that allow them to assume leadership roles in their professions;
- understand the importance of, and practice, service to others; and
- adapt to changing professional technologies and progress as practitioners or leaders.

Students who exhibit the above qualities and all other expectations of the department will have "attained more specialized competence in at least one discipline or profession.” The phenomena of human movement, either as necessary for physiological and psychological health and fitness, or in the social-economic complexities of sport and athletics is the specialized content area through which the department makes its unique contribution to the tradition of liberal arts education and the Mission of Gonzaga University.

Description of the Department

Programs are offered at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The undergraduate level has the following programs:

- Bachelor of Education in Physical Education (academic major and minor)
- Bachelor of Education in Sport Management (academic major and minor)
- General Activities Program: a service program offering health, fitness, and recreational activities to students, faculty and staff of the University.
- Master of Arts in the Administration of Sports and Athletics.
Undergraduate students in both bachelors degree programs tend to be traditional in demographic make-up as indicated by these data:

**Enrollment Patterns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.Ed Physical Education</th>
<th>B.Ed Sport Management</th>
<th>M.A. Sport Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>11 (30.5%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>11 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>15 (69.5%)</td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>11 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>18-24 yrs</td>
<td>19-22 yrs</td>
<td>22-38 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>6 (16.6%)</td>
<td>4 (28.5%)</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-caucasian</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Physical Education majors are also seeking teaching certification at either the secondary or elementary levels through the department of Teacher Education.

**Faculty Organization Structure**

Three full-time faculty serve the department. Two are tenured associate professors; one is a tenure track assistant professor. In addition adjuncts are hired to teach some major course, and the department employs 20-30 adjuncts per semester to teach in the Activities Program. The department shares secretarial support with another department in the School of Education.

**Facilities**

Full-time faculty have offices in Rosauer Education Center. Adjuncts share one office in Martin Centre with several other personnel. Full-time faculty have individual computers, while all adjuncts and graduate assistants share one older computer in Martin Centre. The majority of classes are taught in Martin Centre in one classroom, the gymnasium spaces, or a laboratory shared with the Department of Exercise Science. The Department has a substantial amount of physical education/sport equipment used and stored in Martin Centre.

**Significant Changes**

**Enrollment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-00</th>
<th>00-01</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>670*</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Mgmt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad MA in Sport Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18**</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>1157***</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1999-00 was the first academic year after the split of the department into Physical Education, which remained in the School of Education, and Exercise Science which moved to the College of Arts & Sciences. It was also the first year for the new undergraduate degree in Sport Management.
** In 1997-98 the Graduate degree program was put on hiatus while being restructured into the current Master of Arts in Sport and Athletic Administration.

*** The AVP Office no longer allowed the department credit generation for varsity athletic courses.

** Significant changes**

- **1995:** A new Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science was developed within the department.
- **1996:** Bachelor Science in Exercise Science was approved and offered by the Physical Education Department.
- **1997:** The Master of Arts in Physical Education program was reviewed and no new students were accepted while the program was revised to meet the needs of students interested in Sport and Athletic Administration rather than pedagogy.
- **1998:** The Master of Arts in Sport and Athletic Administration was approved and began accepting students into the new degree program. Three faculty in Physical Education proposed to move the Bachelors in Exercise Science to the College of Arts & Sciences in Academic year 1999-2000. Based upon the success of the MA in Sport & Athletic Administration a new undergraduate degree in Sport Management was approved to begin in Academic year 1999-00. The Department (and Special Education) designated a history course as required to fulfill the core social science requirement.
- **1999:** Exercise Science and Sport & Physical Education became two separate departments. The Bachelors of Education in Sport Management began.
- **2002:** The Bachelor of Education in Physical Education was slightly revised to meet Washington State OSPI endorsement standards in Health/Fitness, the new name for Physical Education in the State.

**Other policy changes occurred as well.**

- The department decided to return to formal written comprehensive exit exams for all undergraduate and graduate students in 2003-04.
- In all undergraduate and graduate degree courses, at least 10% of a final grade will be based upon "professionalism" as exemplified by specific expected behaviors appropriate to the profession.
- The department is moving toward more team-taught courses to take advantage of faculty expertise in related content areas.
- Undergraduate Physical Education practica meet certification outcomes in-school experiences.
- Undergraduate students are evaluated by the department faculty after completion of their first 12 credit hours in the major. Those with low GPA (below a B- average in the major) or problems meeting the "professionalism" standards will be notified of their deficiencies by their advisor and a remediation plan will be designed.

The department needs greater budget revenues for the equipment and supplies lines. A recent analysis indicates that equipment support for the majors courses and the activities program cost
the department in excess of $3000- $5000 per academic year above allocated monies. Continued challenges occur within the department. There is continued growth in the undergraduate Sport Management program. Nationally Sport Management is one of the fastest growing programs of study in American Universities at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This is reflected in the relatively quick selection of the Sport Management major or minor by Gonzaga students. The credit generation trend since the introduction of this area of study is anticipated to continue to grow. Should this growth occur, there will be the need for another full-time faculty member with expertise in Sport Promotion, Sport Law, and the ability to develop and supervise practica. The General Activities Program will continue to grow as the overall university enrollment increases and the demand for additional sections of health/fitness activities such as yoga, aerobics, and alternative forms of conditioning such as Tai Chi increases. The completion of the new Martin Centre Fitness facility will increase the interest of the general student body as well as faculty and staff in instruction and dedicated time in the new facility. All sections of these courses currently fill to maximum enrollment and enrollment trends for the last three years are consistent upward. This growth will necessitate the hiring of a permanent Activities Coordinator to act as an on-site manager of all these courses. A growth in the number of students interested in a "wellness" concept track or concentration in the sport management degree. Several students currently in the program have expressed interest in this area and there is continued professional employment growth and need for people with this type educational background, particularly with the aging population.

**Department of Teacher Education**

**Purposes and Outcomes**

The mission of the Department of Teacher Education is to prepare beginning teachers at the undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate levels. The department offers programs that meet the needs of beginning and veteran teachers for today’s classrooms and use current research to improve learning. The departmental mission and goals are clearly linked with the missions of the School of Education and of the University.

**Description of the Department**

The majority of undergraduate students are traditional-age college students who complete initial certification simultaneously with another major. There is a large population of non-traditional undergraduate students, and a smaller group of students come to the department for certification only, having already completed their undergraduate degrees. Undergraduate students complete a major in an academic discipline, the core curriculum, and the teacher certification program. The Masters of Initial Teaching program (MIT) is designed to meet the needs of adults who have a degree, are seeking a career change and wish to become teachers.

In addition to the MIT for initial preparation at the graduate level, there are two master's programs designed for the advanced preparation of teachers which have been moved to the teacher education department as a result of the Spring 2003 reorganization.
• Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction (MACI) is a non-certification degree program intended for educators and other professionals who want to more deeply understand the teaching and learning process. The program is designed for classroom teachers and provides coursework that stimulates and challenges candidates personally and professionally to qualify them as true master teachers. The MACI program serves educators in the state of Washington, and the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta.

• Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) is a graduate program designed for teachers or others who desire advanced study in both professional education and an academic concentration. Currently, two academic concentrations are offered; Teaching At-Risk Students and Reading (which may lead to a state endorsement). A third MAT, offered with the English Language Center, is English as a Second Language.

Six faculty members are certified teachers with classroom experience and advanced degrees, one faculty member is a certified school counselor and psychologist whose primary experience is working with at risk populations. Two are tenured professors; one is a tenured associate professor; one is a tenure-track associate professor; three are tenure track assistant professors. One assistant professor is a nationally board certified teacher. There is currently one fixed term position filled with a science educator. All tenured and tenure-track faculty (five) have doctorates; adjunct faculty have considerable experience in school districts and hold masters level degrees. The department has one full-time secretary.

Departmental and faculty offices are located in Rosauer Center and the vast majority of courses are taught in the building. Some MACI and MAT classes are taught in Canada.

**Significant Changes**

Enrollment in the undergraduate programs has fluctuated since 1997, but has not changed significantly. Enrollments reflect the university’s overall enrollment and particularly on the enrollments within the Special Education major. There is no cap on the number of students in the programs, all students who meet the admissions requirements of the program are accepted. Students enrolled in introductory courses often use those courses as the way to explore the idea of a career in teaching and choose not to pursue it further.

Enrollment in the MIT program has increased significantly. The enrollment has grown from approximately 15 students in one cohort group to 25 students. In Fall 2002 two cohort groups enrolled, in order to best accommodate the number of students that were accepted.

Enrollment in the MACI and MAT programs is reflected below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>98/99</th>
<th>99/00</th>
<th>00/01</th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>Fall 02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACI (on)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1004 63 477 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACI (off)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1004 63 477 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The undergraduate certification program has undergone significant changes since the last accreditation report.

- Faculty revised all endorsement programs to meet new state and national standards and to better address the needs of beginning teachers in today’s classrooms, including increasing the number of content related courses elementary teacher candidates must take, re-designing the elementary and secondary programs in terms of content, pedagogical knowledge and skills, strengthening the field experiences component of the programs, and increasing student teaching placements from beyond twelve weeks.
- The department requires that students pass all three sections of the WEST-B (statewide assessment of basic skills) for admissions.
- The advising process has been restructured.
- All subject matter endorsement programs (offered by the College of Arts and Sciences) were revised twice since the last accreditation visit in order to meet changes in state standards.

The MIT program has also undergone significant changes in the past few years. The department reviewed the program on a regular basis and reconfigured the courses in order to better prepare teacher candidates and provide a more reasonable schedule for students. The third field experience placement is linked with student teaching placement and can provide students with a full academic year’s experience within the same setting.

In order to improve all programs, the department strengthened partnerships with local schools and implemented better communications procedures to gather feedback on teacher candidates while they are out in the field. Significant policy revisions were implemented, including the Yellow Lights policy (an early warning system to alert us to students experiencing difficulties) and the Student Teaching Handbook. Students are advised to participate in a variety of service learning activities in order to broaden their experiences and understanding of diversity. Faculty members also continue to participate in their work and service to the local community.

The number of full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty in the department has decreased in the past few years. Fixed term annual contract faculty and capable adjunct faculty are hired, but there is a need for at least two more full-time tenure track faculty in order to teach the key courses in programs. Faculty members continue to present a spectrum of teaching styles, philosophies of education, and expertise to students.

Changes in administrative structure increased the levels of responsibility within the roles of the department’s program coordinators. When the School returned to its original structure, there was someone new in the role of department chair, and the department had three faculty retirements. The following year the department chair also served as Acting Dean and the department had
three new faculty members, one new faculty member on a one year contract, and a new department secretary. In 2002-2003, two faculty members shared the chair's position as an interim measure. These shifts have taken considerable time and attention and the faculty and staff welcome the opportunity to focus on the students and programs and not so much on issues related to the structure of the School.

The performance, productivity, and efficiency outcomes continue to be more than satisfactory. The department has a high placement rate among program completers and a positive reputation with the local school districts. The data gathered from program completers and their employers has continued to be very positive. (See Exhibit 2.32)

Programs will continue to change in the next few years as the department implements the requirements of the new statewide teacher assessment mandates. Teacher candidates will be assessed in three areas: basic skills (already implemented), content area testing (will be implemented in 2003-2005), and pedagogy assessment (piloted in 2003 and fully implemented in 2003-2004). The new competencies requirements will be implemented for all subject matter endorsements. The faculty continues dialog with the faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences about their roles in teacher preparation.

Changes in the undergraduate program were implemented in Fall 2003. That will strengthen the program and better meet the needs of teacher candidates. Changes are designed to assist teacher candidates as they prepare to teach in highly diverse classrooms and help them to close the achievement gap that K-12 students are facing.

The MIT program continues to evolve and grow stronger. The MIT Advisory Board has worked on a program redesign for the past two years and has implemented changes in the courses, in the fieldwork component, and in the research strand in order to better prepare teacher candidates for the classroom environments in which they will work. The department is in the process of identifying a cadre of master teachers with whom MIT teacher candidates would be placed for their field experiences. These teachers will also serve as key advisors to the program.

(Report continues on following page.)
**Analysis and Appraisal of the School of Education**

Since the last Northwest Accreditation visit a number of program changes have occurred within the School of Education. These include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Leadership Formation Program developed for certification of administrators in the State of Washington</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bifurcation of the Master of Administration into the Master of Administration and Supervision and Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Functional Analysis Track added to Master of Education degree</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT offered through grant in Oahu, Hawai‘i with coursework in special education</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education only primary endorsement offered</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral Analysis Approval for Functional Analysis Track</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Physical Education</td>
<td>Bachelor Science in Exercise Science was approved and offered</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts in Sport &amp; Athletic Administration is approved and began accepting students into the new degree program</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise Science and Sport &amp; Physical Education become two separate departments; Bachelors in Exercise Science to the College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Bachelors of Education in Sport Management begins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>MIT becomes a 2-year, part time program</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT offered on Leeward Oahu, Hawai‘i</td>
<td>1998-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT offered through grant in Oahu, Hawai‘i</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All departments with certification requirements for teachers</td>
<td>Revised programs to meet Washington State OSPI endorsement standards</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate in Leadership Studies</td>
<td>Moved to School of Professional Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of changes will continue to impact needs in the School of Education. The graduate school has been decentralized and its responsibilities have been absorbed, primarily, by the academic schools. The School of Education is using this opportunity to develop and rethink its policies, requirements, and procedures. Special attention has been given to graduate marketing, recruiting and graduate program design. Just as the Professional Certification program is requiring the School of Education to design courses to meet the needs of area teachers, so will departments need to look to changing needs of educators to design graduate programs that focus on student learning school improvement for the K-12 system.

Within the past ten years, the MAT program has reduced the concentrations it once offered to two. One concentration, Teaching Students at Risk was begun in 1996 in response to the needs of teachers to be more effective with children in their classrooms and schools who were at risk in a variety of ways. The second concentration is in Reading (that can lead to a Washington State endorsement in reading). Changes to the reading concentration are necessary to meet changes in the endorsement requirements. As the new state requirements for endorsements move into place in the next year, the department is exploring other opportunities to develop additional concentrations in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Within the past ten years, the School of Education has moved into a new building with comfortable, efficient office space and classroom accommodations. Technology support has increased considerably and is serving department faculty and students very well. Although the physical facilities on the campus are more than adequate, increased enrollment means greater need for classroom space. As undergraduate enrollment has grown, there is a need for more classrooms that would seat 20-30 students. Classrooms need to be redesigned to allow teachers to model best practices and more student centered activities. Classrooms designed for teacher-centered lecture are no longer acceptable under new teaching and assessment requirements. The other area of need is in additional technology. The teaching area of the current technology lab is not large enough to accommodate some of the larger classes, and the School has a shortage of lab assistants available to help students in the open area of the lab. One full-time technician serves the building. The building has wireless capabilities, and new computer carts with wireless technology have been implemented for Academic year 2003-2004. This increased technology use increases the workload on the current technician.

Over the course of ten years, the demand for on-campus programs has diminished and the demand for site-based programs has become dominant. This has provided the faculty opportunity and experience in teaching diverse populations in Hawaii, and in Canadian First Nations Reserves in Alberta.

With the increasing support of the University for technology and the increasing ability of the faculty to use it for coursework and advising, it is much easier for students to access professional literature via internet and to communicate with faculty, advisors and other students who may be spread quite far distant from each other. The nature of coursework has expanded far beyond previous limitations of texts and available library resources. It is also much easier to provide support to the students and advisees through email.

Recent legislation in the State of Washington regarding initial continuing teacher certification has led to additional changes in the School of Education, including:
• Revision of all state competencies impacting coursework and programs for teacher preparation, approved in June 2003 in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction;
• Development of a new graduate professional certification program required by all teachers in the State of Washington. This program is a 10-hour post-graduate program, which may or not be matriculated into a graduate program. The enrollment goal for the program is 250 by 2005; enrollment in 2003-2004 is approximately 40.
• New accreditation standards for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); and
• Implementation of Title II reporting processes for the state and federal government.

A major concern in the School of Education is the shortage of professional development funds. In addition to research and conferences, there is increased professional development necessary because of changes in the state requirements. The pedagogy assessment process, for example, is placing the need for assessment training to enhance rater reliability. This is required for full time faculty and adjuncts who supervise student teachers. While fees have been placed on internships and practica, it is increasingly difficult to find student placements in local schools. This is causing the School of Education to rethink practica and stipends for teachers who work with students.

Academic Year 2003-2004 will be a major year for implementation of new committee structures and school-wide strategic planning, and working to implement new curriculum and advisement procedures. At the same time new community partnerships to enhance staff development and graduate programs for teachers, counselors and administrators will be important to growth of programs in the region and Canada.
THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

Dennis R. Horn, Dean

Mission

While the School of Engineering shares with the rest of the University a responsibility for every aspect of the University Mission, as a professional program it finds the source of its charge to be the following paragraph of the University Mission Statement:

We believe that our students, while they are developing general knowledge and skills during their years at Gonzaga, should also attain more specialized competence in at least one discipline or profession.

Consistent with that Mission, the School has maintained and published in every catalogue a general set of goals and objectives.

Goals/Objectives

The goal of the undergraduate programs in the School of Engineering is to provide an engineering education that prepares the student with a baccalaureate degree to be a professional engineer. In addition, the programs provide a base both for graduate study and for lifelong learning in support of evolving career objectives, which include being informed, effective, and responsible participants in the engineering profession and society. The objectives include:

1. strong background in the fundamentals of the basic sciences, mathematics, and engineering science;
2. a structured program in theology, philosophy, thought and expression, with emphasis on the development of moral values, high ethical standards, and effective oral and written communication;
3. the development of problem-solving skills, especially those that are necessary for the practice of engineering design, and the ability to think critically and creatively.
4. laboratory experiences that introduce the students to state-of-the-art experimental techniques and equipment; and
5. the emphasis of the computer as a problem-solving tool.

Each department has developed for its degree program(s) its own set of educational objectives and desired program outcomes, with associated evaluation and assessment processes. (See Exhibit 2.15 and 2.23.) These are consistent with two of the accreditation criteria adopted by the Engineering Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (EAC/ABET), under which the School's degree programs are reviewed. (See Exhibit 2.16) Because of the important influence of ABET's accreditation on all aspects of the School's programs, these two essential criteria are cited here (from “Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs” (2002), EAC/ABET):
“Criterion 2. Program Educational Objectives”

Each engineering program for which an institution seeks accreditation or reaccreditation must have in place:

- detailed published educational objectives that are consistent with the mission of the institution and these criteria;
- a process based on the needs of the program’s various constituencies in which the objectives are determined and periodically evaluated;
- a curriculum and processes that ensure the achievement of these objectives; and
- a system of ongoing evaluation that demonstrates achievement of these objectives and uses the results to improve the effectiveness of the program.

“Criterion 3. Program Outcomes and Assessment”

Engineering programs must demonstrate that their graduates have:

- an ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering;
- an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data;
- an ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs;
- an ability to function on multi-disciplinary teams;
- an ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems;
- an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility;
- an ability to communicate effectively;
- the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context;
- a recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in life-long learning.
- a knowledge of contemporary issues; and
- an ability to use the techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice.

Each program must have an assessment process with documented results. Evidence must be given that the results are applied to the further development and improvement of the program. The assessment process must demonstrate that the outcomes important to the mission of the institution and the objectives of the program, including those listed above, are being measured. Evidence that may be used includes, but is not limited to the following: student portfolios, including design projects; nationally-normed subject content examination; alumni surveys that document professional accomplishments and career development activities; employer surveys; and placement data of graduates. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

Description of the Programs

The School of Engineering has grown steadily since the 1970's to its fall 2002 record enrollment of 434 students in three departments and five degree programs. With programs initially
accredited in 1985 by the EAC/ABET, the School has developed a regional and national reputation for high-quality engineering instruction coupled with the many other elements of a Jesuit education.

The peer recognition of its quality and stature has resulted in a top-30 ranking by *U.S. News and World Report* each of the last four years in the category of non-doctoral engineering programs. In 2002, the Mechanical Engineering program achieved a 17th place ranking in this same category. Coincident with these rankings are the national awards won by student papers and projects, and the achievements of its faculty in scholarly activities.

The School of Engineering consists of three departments: Civil Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering. In addition to these three departments, the School operates the Center for Engineering Design (CED), the Herak Engineering Computer Center (HECC), and the Fabrication Facility. The School offers four-year Bachelor of Science degrees in civil engineering (BSCE), computer engineering (BSCpE), electrical engineering (BSEE), general engineering (BSGE), and mechanical engineering (BSME). The general engineering program is offered in conjunction with the School of Business, and provides students with a business minor and the opportunity for a 5th year MBA degree.

The School of Engineering and each of its departments are housed in the Herak Center for Engineering. The Herak building is shared with the Department of Math and Computer Science and the Department of Physics. In addition to the shared engineering facilities, each department has its own laboratories for which it is responsible.

The academic units outside the School of Engineering that provide the required non-engineering portion of the instruction for most engineering students include the departments of Chemistry, Communication Arts, English, Mathematics and Computer Science, Philosophy, Physics, and Religious Studies.

**Faculty Organizational Structure**

Within the School of Engineering, educational support is provided to all of the departments and degree programs by the HECC, the Fabrication Facility, and the CED. In addition, the Engineering Advisory Council (EAC) serves in an advisory capacity to the Dean and to each academic department, and provides assistance in various functions such as student recruiting and fundraising. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

Based on Fall 2002 enrollment data, the School of Engineering had 434 students distributed in the following engineering programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs:</th>
<th>Students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil (CE)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (EE)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (CpE)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical (ME)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (GE)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are a total of 18 full-time faculty members (7 in EE/CpE, 6 in ME, and 5 in CE), plus approximately 2.5 FTE’s of adjunct faculty support. The School also has a full-time mechanical technician, a full-time electrical technician, two full-time HECC staff assigned to the School, and the Dean’s Office with the Dean, the Assistant to the Dean, and a secretary.

Significant Changes

After experiencing in 1997 its lowest enrollment (278 students) since 1980, the School has seen a steady increase in numbers, reaching an all-time high enrollment (434 students) in the Fall of 2002. This growth surge seems to mirror the overall university increase in undergraduate enrollment.

During the same period, the School eliminated its one remaining graduate program in Electrical Engineering due to low enrollment and began two new undergraduate degree programs: Computer and General Engineering. In the Fall, 2002 ABET accreditation visit, re-accreditation was sought for the Electrical, Civil, and Mechanical programs, and Computer Engineering was submitted for its initial accreditation. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

Shortly before the last NWCCU visit the School of Engineering implemented a senior year design course common to all of its degree programs and created the Center for Engineering Design (CED) to oversee the design projects. The projects are solicited from industry by the CED Director and the teams are supervised by a faculty member and a liaison engineer from the sponsoring agency. The Director is advised by the Design Advisory Board, a group of professional engineers from industry and the public sector. Since 1992, the CED experience has had a major impact on the Department’s program and has been an excellent vehicle for implementing the faculty’s belief in the importance of engaging in real world projects.

Following several years of budget cuts, the University has recently provided additional faculty funding, both as a full-time appointment and additional adjunct FTE’s in response to the additional instructional needs created by the rapid growth in enrollment. Other areas of the operating budget have been recently expanded as well. For the first time, the 2003-2004 budget will directly include student engineering fee revenues, and these funds (estimated to be approximately $75,000) will be allocated to the three departmental equipment budgets. This will result in a nearly 70 percent increase in total funds available for department laboratory and miscellaneous supplies. The new funding will be placed into restricted accounts so that any unexpended monies can be rolled over into the next fiscal year.

From a programmatic perspective, perhaps the single most significant change since the last NWCCU visit was the shift by ABET to a radically different set of accreditation criteria, focused around outcomes-based assessment. Initially proposed in the early 1990’s, “ABET Criteria 2000” were first applied in the late 90’s, and became mandatory after 2000. The School’s entire faculty began work in 1998 to develop the processes and plans consistent with the new criteria. In the years between 1998 and the ABET visit in 2002, these efforts resulted in numerous course and curriculum changes reflecting adopted program objectives and outcomes. The processes of evaluation and assessment remain on-going.
Other major changes for the School include significant facility renovation and major grant funding for laboratory equipment and classroom improvement. During the summer and fall of 2002, Phase I of a $4.6 million Herak renovation project was completed at a total cost of about $2.4 million. It constructed new building entries and exits; created new classrooms, offices, and student project areas; improved laboratory configuration; expanded floor space; and upgraded the building’s infrastructure. In the five-year time frame from 1997 to 2002, the School has also benefited from new multi-media classrooms, a new Manufacturing Systems Lab, and equipment additions to other labs, all primarily funded by nearly $900,000 in grants and gifts.

Over the next few years, it is anticipated that enrollment should stabilize at 450-475 students, and that continued University and outside funding will enable the School to meet its budgeting and facility needs, including Phase II of the Herak renovation project.

Analysis and Appraisal

All detailed discussions of the departments and programs within the School of Engineering are included in the following separate department appraisals. Each department has its own perception of its strengths and weaknesses, as well as its assets and achievements. Perhaps the best summary statement would be that all departments are proud of their faculty and students, are generally pleased with their facilities, but are concerned about a future with high enrollments without a corresponding increase in resources.

For details about the School and its programs beyond the brief descriptions included in this self-study, the back-up materials include the 2002 ABET Self-Studies for Computer, Civil, Electrical and Mechanical Engineering. These are lengthy, comprehensive statements that are available in the Team Room (See Exhibit 2.16.)

Department Of Civil Engineering

(Much of this information references the Self-Study Report for Civil Engineering submitted in July of 2002 to the EAC/ABET. [See Exhibit 2.16])

Purposes and Outcomes

The Department of Civil Engineering is committed to develop and produce highly trained, technically knowledgeable and ethical engineering graduates through the successful completion of requirements in a four-year curriculum which also includes the integration of liberal humanistic learning. The Department’s commitment to student education is commensurate with the Gonzaga University Mission Statement.

The Department strives to produce graduates who are in possession of two broad and essential educational elements, namely (a) technical and professional competency and (b) an awareness and sensitivity towards societal and cultural needs and responsibilities. Faculty have concluded that the best and most efficient mechanism for meeting most educational requirements is through allowing and placing careful and appropriate changes in the curriculum as the need arises. By
introducing such elasticity in the curriculum, through course replacement and changes in course content, the departments believe they can effectively preserve control over the program outcomes and assessment processes.

Consistent with ABET accreditation Criterion 2, the Department is committed to the following program objectives:

- To produce graduates with a strong background in mathematics, basic sciences and modern computation methods.
- To produce graduates who are trained to think logically in terms of understanding the physics of an engineering problem. Such an approach will naturally guide them to a correct, feasible and an effective solution.
- To produce graduates who are technically competent at solving engineering problems in the areas of Structures, Geotechnical Engineering, Water Resources and Environmental Engineering so that they will be able to effectively participate in the practice of civil engineering. (This ability will allow graduates to join the national institutions as productive professionals).
- To produce graduates with the ability to successfully carry a project from conception to completion. This ability includes: the formulation of the problem definition, the characterization of the key project requirements and their solutions, the dynamics of the work environment, team work, oral and written communication and ethical considerations.
- To produce graduates with an understanding of the importance of their ethical responsibility both to the profession and the society and their moral obligation to function in an ethical manner.

To help achieve these objectives, the Civil Engineering program has adopted the same list of outcomes required in Criterion 3 of the ABET General Criteria.

**Description of the Department**

The Civil Engineering program is a day program for which all courses are offered on campus. In the fall of 2002 there were 123 students enrolled in the program and 23 BSCE degrees were conferred for the 2000-2001 class.

The Department has five full-time faculty, all of whom are in tenure-track positions. These include three with the rank of Professor and two Assistant Professors. In addition, there are currently three adjunct faculty who teach courses related to their professional qualifications and experience. Detailed information about faculty competencies and experience is included in the Civil Engineering ABET Self-Study. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

The full-time faculty has expertise in four major special areas of Civil Engineering, including structural, geotechnical, environmental and water resources engineering. All faculty hold Ph.D. degrees in engineering and have either past industrial experience through actual industrial work or consulting. Every effort is made to bring that experience into the classroom as an integral part of
teaching in an attempt to teach students to understand the connection between theory and practice.

The Department of Civil Engineering is housed in the Herak Center for Engineering. Four facilities are dedicated for use by the Department including the geotechnical, environmental, water resources, and structures laboratories. During Phase I of the Herak renovation project, the new water resources laboratory was created, permitting the consolidation of equipment that had previously been scattered in several different locations. The structures laboratory was reconfigured, and major equipment upgrades were performed in this lab, as well as in the environmental lab.

The Department’s budget includes a direct operational line for laboratory supplies and minor equipment purchases, and an allocation from the Dean’s Office for capital equipment purchases. This allocation has averaged between $20,000 and $25,000 for the past three years, and has enabled the laboratories to periodically replace and upgrade the instructional equipment. Faculty travel and professional development expenses are also paid from a pooled fund maintained in the Dean’s Office, along with funding for student graders.

**Significant Changes**

Enrollment in Civil Engineering has fluctuated over the past seven years, ranging from a low of 73 students in the fall of 1997 to a near-record high of 123 students in 2002. The average number during this period has been 95.

The full-time undergraduate enrollment statistics for the Department for the last seven years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to the requirements of the new ABET accreditation criteria and the associated processes of curriculum evaluation and outcomes assessment, numerous changes have occurred in the program during the past few years. Assessment data were analyzed to find any shortcomings and weaknesses in the Civil Engineering program. The analysis from the data and the reviews by the various constituencies provide a basis for instituting remedies, if needed, to make continuous improvements. The most recent data, although very positive, did indicate a need to improve: (1) an awareness of the impact that engineering solutions can have on global issues and society; (2) an awareness of contemporary issues in the practice of engineering; and (3) classroom facilities. In order to address issues (1) and (2), many courses in the Civil Engineering
area have recently incorporated more content associated with current engineering issues. Classroom improvements were a major focus of recent engineering building renovations to address facilities issues.

Several other changes in the curriculum have also been incorporated in response to the assessment studies. For example, in order to meet Criterion 3(b), which pertains to the ability of students to design and conduct experiments, the department has incorporated two new required courses taught by the Mechanical Engineering Department: one in measurements, followed by another that concentrates on the design of experiments. These new course requirements not only strengthen students’ abilities in experimental work, but they also provide an opportunity for them to study in a multi-disciplinary environment.

Another curriculum change consists of introducing a two-credit course, which places emphasis on understanding professional practice issues, i.e. contracts, specifications, bidding versus qualifications-based selection processes and the interaction between the design professionals and construction professional. A third change requires juniors to complete a two-credit course of technical writing. This change was made in response to the expressed concerns of the department’s constituencies who felt that Gonzaga graduates, although technically competent, needed more formal training in technical writing. Still another change requires all graduating seniors to appear for the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) examination. This requirement places emphasis on the importance of professional license for professional practice.

As previously described, the recently-completed Phase I of the Herak renovation project has brought much-needed improvements to the Department’s laboratory facilities and instructional classrooms. These improvements have included significant equipment acquisitions and upgrades, in addition to the physical facility and building infrastructure.

**Analysis and Appraisal**

The Civil Engineering program is accredited and has gone through an October 2002 review under the new ABET outcome-based criteria. In an exit interview, the program evaluator did not cite any weakness or deficiency, and, therefore the program is expected to be re-accredited.

The quality of teaching and student advising is considered excellent in the Department of Civil Engineering. The formal teaching evaluation of each faculty member by the students, every semester in every course, provides a dependable means of assessing, monitoring, and maintaining teaching quality. The senior and experienced faculty members are committed to provide assistance to junior faculty members by visiting and listening to the classroom lectures. Past experience has clearly indicated that this is indeed an effective and practical method for maintaining teaching quality and the Department has used this method successfully for many years. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

The required teaching load for each full-time faculty member is nine credit hours per week, which generally results in teaching three courses or a combination of two courses and one or more laboratory session(s). The Department Chair receives one course reduction in the teaching load for administrative duties. Faculty members are also expected to engage in professional
development and/or scholarly activity, and are required to serve as academic advisors. In addition, they are expected to participate in the administration of their Department, the School, and the University.

The Civil Engineering faculty members are responsible for advising all the students in the program through a variety of methods. Each first-year student is advised by a freshman advisor, however, in their second year, some of the students are assigned to other civil engineering faculty members including transfers from other institutions.

In addition to new freshman students each year, the Department of Civil Engineering has also attracted internal transfer students from other departments and transfers from community colleges and other universities. The Department currently has a relatively large junior class of approximately 30 and a senior class of about 20 students. For the past four years, more than 85% of Civil Engineering students consistently pass the FE examination. This compares to an average pass rate within the state of 70%. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

Almost all of the graduates find employment either with the public sector or private companies. Some of them have excelled to become managers and supervising engineers. Several graduates have pursued advanced studies in engineering from reputable national institutions and have successfully completed their degrees. Several have gone to join universities to pursue a career in teaching and research.

Facilities

The current facilities are marginally adequate for the present upper-division student population in the Department of Civil Engineering. However, Phase II of the Herak renovation project, which is partly associated with the expansion of the Geotechnical Laboratory, must be completed soon in order to provide adequate work stations for the higher number of lower-division students enrolling in Civil Engineering. The equipment in the Geotechnical and Environmental Laboratories are adequate especially after new equipment was recently added. The available equipment in the Water Resources and Material Testing Laboratories falls short both in terms of the number of units and age of the different machines. These two laboratories therefore must receive attention when future equipment funding becomes available. Computing facilities in the School of Engineering are well furnished both for students and faculty. Every year, new equipment is purchased to keep these facilities in a state of the art condition.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The major strength of the Department of Civil Engineering lies in the academic qualifications and experience of the faculty. The faculty is able and committed to provide first-class classroom instruction and guidance to the students throughout their study at this institution. A major improvement has taken place in the environmental area which is a relatively new area that has been added to our traditional Civil Engineering program. After a long and careful search the department hired a highly qualified and competent faculty member who has the sole responsibility for the environmental area.
There is a general feeling among the faculty members that the students’ quality in terms of their academic perseverance is on the decline nationally. This fact is worrisome simply because the long term adverse consequences to the profession would be serious. In defense of the students, however, it must be said that the current requirements in Civil Engineering programs nationally are demanding in a four-year curriculum, because the technology has expanded the academic material, warranting a fifth year.

Department of Electrical/Computer Engineering

(Much of this information is taken from the Self-Study Reports for Electrical and Computer Engineering, submitted in July, 2002, to EAC/ABET. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

Purposes and Outcomes

The mission of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering is to develop knowledgeable and competent engineering professionals who exemplify the humanistic, Catholic, and Jesuit tradition of education and who are committed to social justice, service to others, life-long learning, ethical and moral responsibility, and concern for the environment.

The Department has detailed educational objectives for its programs that are published in the Gonzaga University Undergraduate Catalogue and are listed on the Department web page. These program educational objectives are derived from and are consistent with the mission statements of the Department, the School of Engineering and Gonzaga University, as well as the ABET Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs. The Department has a process in place for the determination of and periodic review of the objectives, based on the needs of the program’s constituencies. Significant constituencies include students, faculty, administrative officials, the Engineering Advisory Council and the Design Advisory Board.

The Department has also established a list of program outcomes that describe knowledge and abilities that the electrical engineering graduate is expected to attain from the EE or CpE program. These program outcomes were produced by a committee of the faculty and are based on the program educational objectives and on the ABET General Criterion 3. They are also consistent with the curriculum of the department for the electrical and computer engineering degrees.

To assess these outcomes the Department has established a program outcome assessment plan that has two parallel and complementary paths. The assessment process includes activities and resources used to ensure attainment of the program outcomes, as well as regular monitoring and review of the success in attaining the program outcomes. The results of the assessment are used for continuous improvement for the quality of the programs and the effectiveness of the educational operations of the department. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

Description of the Department
The Department offers two undergraduate degree programs: the BSEE in electrical engineering and the BSCpE in computer engineering. Both are day programs for which all courses are offered on campus. During the 2001-2002 academic year there were 55 students enrolled in the EE program and 43 in the CpE program. There were 9 BSEE degrees and 4 BSCpE degrees conferred for the 2001-2002 class. Typically 5-10 transfer students are admitted to electrical/computer engineering programs annually. Transfer students typically come from community colleges in the State of Washington, neighboring states, other USA institutions, and foreign institutions.

**Faculty Organizational Structure**

There are seven full-time faculty dedicated to teaching in the EE/CpE program—four having primary responsibility for EE courses, and three whose primary responsibility is in the CpE program. These include four with the rank of Professor, one Associate Professor, and two Assistant Professors. The faculty has expertise that covers all core competencies in electrical engineering, as well as many specialties. The teaching experience of the current faculty varies from 5 to 38 years with an average of 23 years. All faculty have industrial experience, ranging from 3 to 12 years with an average of 6.5 years. All are members of at least one professional society, half are members of two or more societies, and two faculty members are registered professional engineers. In addition to regular faculty, there are usually at least two part-time adjunct faculty who teach the service courses and an occasional technical elective. These people are drawn from local industry and/or local engineering programs and are carefully screened as to technical expertise and teaching ability.

**Facilities**

In addition to shared engineering space in the Herak building, seven well-equipped laboratories are dedicated for use by the Department. These include the Circuits, Electronics, Communications/Controls and Computer Analysis laboratories, each containing ten student stations. The Power Laboratory with six student stations, Microprocessor Laboratory with eighteen stations, and the Automation and Embedded Systems Laboratory with ten stations complete the laboratory complement. The laboratory associated with the digital logic course utilizes portable equipment and shares time slots with the circuits or communications/controls laboratories. Each EE/CpE laboratory contains modern equipment appropriate to the function of the laboratory. Equipment is well maintained by the staff electronics technician who utilizes a planned maintenance schedule.

**Significant Changes**

Two major changes since the last accreditation self study include the discontinuation of the MSEE degree program and the establishment of a program in computer engineering. While some worthwhile benefits for the department were gained from the MSEE program, the main source of students was from outside of the United States, and when that source dwindled, it was no longer financially feasible to maintain the program. On the other hand, the industrial contacts and employment trends were pointing to the need to provide a program in computer engineering. Thus, planning began and the program was announced in the 1997-1999 Gonzaga University
Catalogue, and the name of the Department of Electrical Engineering was changed to the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. ABET accreditation for the computer engineering program was sought, and the program was evaluated in October 2002 by an ABET visiting team.

Enrollment Trends:

The enrollment for the EE program declined from a high of 114 in 1990-1991 to 77 in 1996-1997, which followed the national trends of declining enrollments in electrical engineering. The enrollment in the EE program declined further when the computer engineering (CpE) program was initiated in the 1997-1998 academic year. In the past two years, however, freshmen enrollments in the University have been breaking records, and it appears that the decline has bottomed out. Fall 2002 enrollments in the EE and CpE programs are 63 and 53, respectively. It has been projected that the enrollments will stabilize at 76 and 79 students for the EE and CpE programs, respectively, during the next five years.

Assessment and Program Improvement:

In accord with the requirements of the ABET criteria, the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering has established a program outcome assessment plan, and has used the assessment process to make necessary course and curriculum changes. Some examples of changes that have been implemented based on feedback from students and other constituencies include:

1. a new course, EENG 102 “Introduction to Electrical and Computer Engineering Applications” was added to the curriculum;
2. a new senior design laboratory was established for senior projects;
3. a laboratory section was established for the CPEN 231 Microcomputer course; and
4. additional topics covering engineering standards are being incorporated into several courses.

Infrastructure Improvements:

The current Herak building renovation, of which Phase I was completed in October 2002, has been an enhancement to the EE/CpE program. Laboratory space has been increased, and classrooms have been added and improved.

Continual improvements have been made to computer and network resources over the past several years. We have greatly benefited from new management of the Engineering Computer Center. The Computer Center, laboratories, and faculty offices are now equipped with late model personal computers and high speed networking plus a wide variety of engineering design and general office software. Printing facilities are readily available and reliable.

Laboratory improvements:

Donations of new laboratory equipment from manufacturers have continued on a regular basis. Equipment received includes oscilloscopes, multimeters, and frequency counters. The School of
Engineering equipment endowment funds, along with University funding, have allowed us to provide additional equipment in the digital, microcomputer, and controls areas. The department maintains a prioritized list of desired new equipment acquisitions and equipment is purchased as needs arise and funds are available. Laboratory facilities are currently considered to be adequate for our curriculum.

**Analysis and Appraisal**

The EE program has been accredited by the EAC/ABET since 1985, and the CpE program applied for initial accreditation in 2002. The School of Engineering was visited by an ABET accreditation team in October 2002, during which time they returned a report of “no deficiencies and no weaknesses” for both programs. This should result in re-accreditation for the EE program and initial accreditation for the CpE program.

**Faculty**

Teaching, advising, and general interaction with students is considered the primary duty of faculty within the Department. All faculty members serve as academic advisors to students and the majority of the faculty also are advisors to one of the student organizations. Normally, all of the faculty members also serve as advisor to a student senior design team which is also linked to a local industry.

The basic teaching load for full-time faculty members in the School is three lecture courses (3 credits each) or two lectures and two laboratories. Faculty members are also expected to spend one day per week on professional development and/or scholarly activity, and they are required to serve as academic advisers of students in the department. In addition, they are expected to participate in the administration of the Department, the School, and the University.

Faculty competence is generally maintained by research, consulting, sabbatical leave, and professional conference participation. In the School of Engineering, faculty interaction with industry is strongly recommended, and a number of faculty members are involved in consulting services for the area industries. This has improved the quality of education that students receive resulting from the increased number of classroom examples of real and practical nature.

The Department advises its majors using a variety of mechanisms. Incoming first-year students are advised in groups and/or individually. After their first year at Gonzaga, students are reassigned to other faculty members of the Department. Transfer students are distributed among the faculty members of the Department for advising.

**Students**

Gonzaga University admits students on a competitive basis after a careful review of an applicant’s academic achievement, scholastic aptitude, and personal characteristics. From 1996 to 2001 the average composite SAT score of incoming engineering students has risen slowly from 1211 to 1221. Their high school standing has remained around the top 18 to 20%.
Every year a number of students take the Fundamentals of Engineering Exam which is a prelude to professional licensing. The pass rate for EE students was 80% in 1998, 86% in 1999, and 100% in 2000 and 2001. That compares to an average state-wide pass rate of 76% for all engineering schools over that time span.

**Strengths and Weaknesses**

**Strengths**

A major strength of the Department is small class sizes and low student/faculty ratio. Being an undergraduate-only program, faculty concentrate on involvement with students, both in instruction and advising. Major improvements occurred in 1983 and 2002 with renovations to facilities. Thus, the Department has been able to maintain a modern infrastructure and excellent laboratory facilities. Growth in both students and faculty has been constant over the past ten years, and there has been continual modernization and fine tuning of the curriculum.

**Weaknesses**

A problem, especially in the area of electrical/computer engineering, is the relentless and constantly accelerating advance in technology. This has placed a heavy burden on faculty and the planning process for curriculum and laboratory facilities. The department’s interaction with industry has weakened somewhat because of the “time-to-market” stress on engineers, but it maintains contact through the Engineering Advisory Council and cooperative senior design projects.

**Challenges**

Engineering education is currently in a state of flux. Many new innovations are being tried by various universities, and different models are being proposed for the engineering education process. Wisdom and careful analysis of methods being tried by others will be required in order to pilot the course successfully.

**Planned Improvements**

A considerable effort was expended over the past few years in developing evaluation and self-improvement processes required by the new outcomes-based accreditation requirement. While the ABET visit team was pleased with the process that is in place, there is more work to be done in increasing the efficiency of data collection and analysis so that it can be maintained with a reasonable and non-disruptive amount of effort on the part of the faculty. There is also a plan to work on improving long-range planning including maintaining a prioritized plan for laboratory update. This will have to be coordinated with investigation of anticipated future curriculum changes.

**Department of Mechanical Engineering**
(Much of this information is taken from the Self-Study Report for Mechanical Engineering submitted in July of 2002 to the EAC/ABET. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

**Purposes and Outcomes**

The mission of the Gonzaga University Mechanical Engineering Degree Program is stated in two goals that are rooted in the University Mission Statement:

We believe that our students, while they are developing general knowledge and skills during their years at Gonzaga, should also attain more specialized competence in at least one discipline or profession.

We hope that the integration of liberal humanistic learning and skills with a specialized competence will enable our graduates to enter creatively, intelligently, and with deep moral conviction into a variety of endeavors, and provide leadership in the arts, the professions, business, and public service.

These goals give rise to the Mechanical Engineering Program Educational Objectives, which are defined as broad statements of general qualities that the graduates are to possess and demonstrate during the first few years after graduation. First articulated in 1997, they consist of the following four imperatives:

- The Mechanical Engineering Program will develop engineers who understand the fundamental principles of mathematics, science, and engineering science, and who can apply them to the identification, formulation, analysis, and solution of engineering problems.
- The Mechanical Engineering Program will develop engineers who understand and can perform effectively within the context of engineering practice.
- The Mechanical Engineering Program will develop engineers who understand and are able to apply the techniques of experimental design and data collection.
- The Mechanical Engineering Program will develop engineers who are able to synthesize viable engineering design solutions.

The Program Educational Objectives are a decomposition of the twofold goal of the Mechanical Engineering Program, to produce graduates who are educated and responsible human beings and competent engineers. The Program Objectives are in turn decomposed into twenty-seven Program Outcomes which are measurable statements specifying the knowledge and abilities possessed by the graduates upon completion of the curriculum. (The detailed discussion of the Outcomes and the methods used for their assessment are to be found in the ABET Self-Study.)

**Description of the Department**

The Department offers a full-time, day, on-campus undergraduate degree program leading to the Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering (BSME). In addition to courses for its majors, it also offers several courses as a service for undergraduates in the degree programs in Civil
Engineering and Electrical Engineering. Around 85% of the majors enter as freshmen; the remaining 15% enter as transfer students, primarily from Northwest community colleges.

The Department has six full time faculty, five of whom are in tenure track positions: three as Professors and two Associate Professors. The remaining faculty member holds a one-year term appointment and serves as the Director of the School’s Center for Engineering Design (CED). During the 2002-2003 academic year, the Department employed six adjuncts. The fixed term position will be replaced in 2002-2004 by a tenure track position, with the intent to hire a faculty member with primary expertise in manufacturing, and, ideally, with secondary expertise in materials.

All of the classrooms, laboratories, and other facilities used by the Mechanical Engineering Program are located in the Herak Center for Engineering. The facilities available to the Department include: Mechanical Engineering Laboratory, Materials Laboratory, Manufacturing Processes and Systems Laboratory, and Mechanical Engineering Design Laboratory, plus shared facilities such as the School Fabrication Facility, Student Projects/Fabrication Laboratory, and Herak Engineering Computer Center (HECC).

In a School of Engineering as small as Gonzaga’s, the administration of the budgets is necessarily very centralized. The Department has direct control over two budgets: operating (allocations for the past several years have been $6,750) and equipment. The costs for other than minor items of equipment and repair come from the Department’s share of the endowment yield from the Herak Engineering Equipment Fund. In recent years, the Department’s share of this endowment has been $20,000 to $25,000. The addition of some annual and one-time gifts has resulted in an annual equipment budget of $25,000-$30,000. In recent years, almost the entire budget has been spent on the Department’s laboratories, with a small portion going to office computers and software. It is obvious that other funding sources must be found for single items that require very large expenditures—$50,000 and above.

**Significant Changes**

The curriculum for the Department’s degree program has been changed in important ways during the past few years. These stem primarily from changes in professional accreditation requirements and from lessons learned through the assessment of the Department’s twenty-seven program outcomes. Two major changes have involved the Department’s approach to engineering design courses and the attention given to education in ethics.

Mechanical Engineering enrollment has recently undergone a substantial increase, from 71 students in the Fall of 1997 to 127 in the Fall of 2002. In recent years there has also been a considerable increase in the average SAT scores of entering freshman. The enrollment increase is beginning to be felt at the upper division level, and when coupled with some recent curricular changes in Civil Engineering and an impending round of sabbatical leaves, is certain to result in the need for an additional faculty position.

In the recent past there were significant reductions in some of the Department’s budgets, including the loss of a full-time tenure track faculty position that has reduced expertise in
manufacturing and materials. Fortunately, the effects of some of these cuts have been neutralized by growth in the Herak Equipment Endowment, stabilization of the annual HECC budget, and the recent imposition of a student engineering fee. Furthermore, these new budget mechanisms provide considerably more permanency and a greater potential for growth. Two recent actions engender further optimism: the $340,000 Murdock grant for the new Manufacturing Processes and Systems Laboratory, and the completion of Phase I of the $4.6 million renovation and expansion of the Herak Center.

A strong positive factor has been the renovation and expansion of Herak. The Department's laboratories have been affected in a very positive way, maybe more by reorganization of space than by any increase. Especially important to the program are the rebuilt and newly equipped Manufacturing Processes and Systems Laboratory, the renovated and reconfigured Mechanical Engineering Laboratory, and the creation of the Student Projects/Fabrication Laboratory. No less important has been the impact of the new equipment resulting from the Murdock and Boeing grants.

Analysis and Appraisal

Program Evaluation

The Department has an elaborate system of Program Goal, Educational Objectives and Program Outcomes, expressing twenty-seven attributes in an expansion of the minimum list of outcomes specified by ABET Criterion 3.

The Educational Objectives are formally evaluated by five methods: 1) written review by junior Mechanical Engineering Majors; 2) review by and survey of alumni members of the School’s Engineering Advisory Council (EAC); 3) written survey of alumni; 4) written survey of employers of alumni; 5) and review by and survey of non-alumni members of the EAC. In addition, the faculty review the Objectives often, normally in the context of considering reports on the results of the various surveys and Program Outcome assessment processes. These methods involve representatives of all of the program’s constituencies.

The Program Outcomes are assessed by ten processes: 1) Subject matter scores on the Fundamentals of Engineering Examination; 2) Scores for relevant questions from the Engineering Exit Survey administered by Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI); 3) Scores for institutional-specific questions (particular to the Mechanical Engineering Program) from the EBI Survey; 4) Review of student graded materials and syllabi for required courses; 5) Success in national design competitions; 6) Success in regional and national speaking and writing competitions; 7) Review by third-year Mechanical Engineering majors of the program’s success in achieving outcome target values for the required courses; 8) Scores for relevant questions from the College Student Survey administered by the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute; 9) Scores for institutional-specific questions (particular to Gonzaga) from the UCLA Survey; 10) Scores for relevant questions from the student evaluations of the CED design projects. The metrics for all ten assessment processes have been assigned quantitative targets.

Students:
The Mechanical Engineering Department is committed to close and congenial contact with its students. This begins with the classroom. Section sizes are kept small; the School’s internal policy is to split classes that reach thirty-six, when possible. This enables faculty to become familiar with the students in their classes and allows time for seeing and working with students outside of classes.

The other formal form of contact all faculty have with students is advising. All faculty are involved in advising, resulting in an average advisee load of fifteen to twenty students. All of the faculty are experienced and competent advisors. Five of the six have advised student society sections. One was awarded ASME’s national Advisor of the Year in 2002.

The Department has created three assessment processes as an additional means for examining the overall quality of our program, one of which is the pass rate on the nationally administered Fundamentals of Engineering Examination (FE). Our target for this metric is to exceed ninety percent and our students have done so for the last four years. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

Each year the Department Chair meets with the graduating seniors to determine their success in job applications and graduate school admission. In recent years all of our students wishing to attend graduate school have been able to obtain stipends and full tuition waivers to prominent schools. Our students’ starting salaries always match or exceed the national averages for mechanical engineers.

Faculty:

The usual semester teaching load in the School is considered to be three lecture courses or two lecture courses with laboratories. The faculty teaching laboratory courses are expected to develop the laboratories and pursue equipment funding opportunities. The teaching and advising loads allow for the level of professional activity that is reasonable in an undergraduate teaching institution. Consequently, faculty are expected to engage in professional activities, and in Mechanical Engineering, this takes on a variety of forms. Three of the faculty have authored books; three have authored chapters in well known handbooks; all have published and presented papers, reviewed manuscripts, contributed to books, or made other similar professional contributions; four have significant full time industrial experience and the remaining two, consulting experience; and all have attended professional and scholarly conferences, seminars, or workshops. (See Exhibit 2.16.)

The Department has long had close ties with the industrial community. For many years its faculty have been active in organizing conferences and workshops, and consulting for local firms and organizations. One faculty member has served for several years on the School’s Engineering Advisory Council and is the current chairperson. He, along with two other faculty members who have long been active in the local professional community, provide us relationships with virtually every corporation and government agency in the region.

The Department has two faculty members with doctorates in the area of mechanics. One faculty member has written a text that is used in one of the courses he teaches, has written chapters in
handbooks, has several years of industrial experience, and is licensed. The other consults in solid mechanics. Both have published in mechanics.

Three of the Department’s faculty members have expertise in thermal systems, two of whom hold doctorates in that area. One faculty member has written a text and edited a handbook in the thermal sciences. A second has written a text that is used in one of the courses he teaches. The third has written chapters in handbooks in mechanical engineering and in the thermal sciences. Two have full time experience in industry. One is licensed. All have published in the thermal sciences.

The sixth faculty member (one-year term appointment) brings almost thirty years of full time employment and consulting in manufacturing, plus over ten years of teaching, to his courses. He is licensed.

Facilities:

Facilities and other resources have already been discussed. In summary, some classrooms are excellent and some are too small and otherwise inadequate. Laboratories with the completion of Phase II of the Herak renovation are very good; computer facilities are excellent; offices are excellent and well-equipped. Library book holdings are adequate and periodical holdings are excellent, although in a state of some degradation. Computer support and student services is very good. Funding operations is inadequate, equipment is adequate for the near term, but large items will only come through grants. Travel and other professional development funding is inadequate but the Department has made up the shortfall by outside funding of travel.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The Department has an active and technically competent faculty with a strong commitment to teaching. This is borne out by the work they produce, the generally high teaching evaluations, and the student input from the EBI and UCLA surveys. All of the faculty possessed considerable teaching and/or industrial experience when hired, and most were hired in the early 1980s. Consequently, the average age of the faculty is quite old and over the next decade most reach retirement age. The Department feels strongly that the replacements must be at the assistant professor level if at all possible.

The Department possesses considerable expertise in its two core areas of solid mechanics and thermal sciences. However, it lacks strength in manufacturing and materials. Furthermore, its current allocation of positions is not sufficient to meet the growing teaching load that is being driven by increasing enrollments and service to the other departments. It will be able to meet its commitments only by taking on an excessively large number of adjuncts.

With the completion of Phase II of the Herak renovation, a Departmental strength will be its laboratories and computer facilities. One weakness is the Mechanical Engineering Design Laboratory. Although excellently equipped, the laboratory is too small; it will become critically so as the enrollment grows. Similarly, without increased staffing in the Engineering Fabrication
2004 NWCCU Self-Study – Standard Two
Facility, enrollment pressures will force us to increase to unaffordable levels the outsourcing of fabrication that is already siphoning off part of our equipment budget.

Summary of Program Changes since last NWCCU visit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Engineering</td>
<td>BS in General Engineering added</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>BS in Computer Engineering added</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>MS in Mechanical Engineering eliminated</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>MS in Electrical Engineering eliminated</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission

Pursuant to recommendations from its Ad Hoc Committee on Mission, the Gonzaga University School of Law formally adopted its own Mission Statement in Spring, 1996. While consistent with the University Mission, the School of Law Mission further emphasizes the “exploration of the concepts of law and justice” and promotes the acquisition of the “ethical values, substantive knowledge and practical skills” that are specifically necessary for entry into the legal profession. The School of Law aspires to do so not only through a program of “rigorous instruction, but also a personalized education for our students, both in and out of class.”

The Mission also involves a commitment to help its students develop the qualities needed to become leaders in society, and to encourage “a desire to engage in public service and to further social justice during law school and after graduation.” Due to its emphasis on recognition of the inalienable natural rights of all human beings, the School of Law Mission includes the following non-discrimination policy:

“Since every person enjoys equal dignity under the law, we are committed to a full and rigorous policy of non-discrimination without regard to race, color, national origin, heritage, sex, age, sexual orientation, marital or veteran status, a physical or mental impairment that limits a major life activity, or any other non-merit factor, or religion, both within the School of Law as well as throughout society at large.”

Although there is some disagreement within the School, as in the University at large, as to the meaning and appropriate observation of certain Mission areas, the School of Law supports all of the central missions of the University – ethics, faith, justice, leadership and service. It is the School’s belief that the nature of the legal profession within society is such that the School, especially through its Center for Law and Justice, the Thomas More Program, and the recently adopted public service requirement, is a particularly strong contributor in the areas of justice and service.

Overview of Programs and Objectives

The School offers the Juris Doctor (J.D.) degree and, in cooperation with the School of Business, two joint degrees: J.D./M.B.A. (Masters of Business Administration) and J.D./M.A.C. (Masters of Accounting). The Law and Education course offered by the School of Law has been offered to graduate students in the School of Education on a student by student basis. The majority of the J.D. students take a 90 credit general course of study, but the School does offer three concentrations: Business Law (23 of the 90 credits in the concentration), Environmental/Natural Resources Law (18 credits in the concentration) and Public Interest Law (18 credits in the concentration).
The School curriculum offers all courses required by the American Bar Association (ABA), all courses tested by the majority of state bar associations, and several dozen electives. Elective offerings are particularly numerous in the areas of Business Law, including Tax Law, and are substantial in the areas of Environmental/Natural Resources Law and Public Interest law. Since the last accreditation visit, the School has substantially increased its offerings in the areas of International Law, Intellectual Property, and in Health Law.

Over the last ten years, the class size the number of J.D. degrees granted has varied dramatically. The number of joint degrees awarded has been approximately one half dozen per year. Traditionally, the most popular concentration has been the Business Law concentration, with two or three students each year completing the Environmental/Natural Resources Law concentration and about a half dozen completing the Public Interest law concentration, although this number is on the rise.

The School of Law is, committed to meeting all standards and requirements of its accrediting organizations, the ABA (American Bar Association) and AALS (American Association of Law Schools). Consistent with the School Mission, we are also committed to going beyond such standards and strive to “educate the whole person.” To do so, the curriculum identifies essential skills and values for the students in addition to the traditional content components expected at any accredited law school. Gonzaga School of Law places a particular emphasis on social justice/public interest issues by awarding service and leadership scholarships, highlighting those issues in our catalogue, supporting the Thomas More Program, requiring community service of students and faculty, and offering a Public Interest Law concentration.

Faculty and Other Personnel

After some depletion of teaching faculty positions during the period of decreased enrollment in the late 1990s, the School saw a return to previous teaching faculty strength in the 2002-2003 Academic Years. There has, however, been an erosion of faculty strength in 2003-2004 due to a nearly ten percent increase in students with no net faculty gain.

In 1992-1993, with an enrollment of 568 students, there was a Dean and Associate Academic Dean (1/2 time) and 17.5 full time tenured or tenure-track faculty with substantive classroom teaching duties. One half of the 18th position was dedicated to administrative duties; two tenured faculty had half time substantive teaching duties and half time clinical supervision duties; and there were three clinical supervising attorneys and four legal writing instructors.

In 2002-2003, with an enrollment of 575 students, after five new hires to meet unfilled positions, there was a Dean, Associate Academic Dean (1/2 time) and Dean of Students (1/2 time including other administrative duties); 17 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty with substantive classroom teaching duties. One half of one position was dedicated to administrative duties; one quarter of another position was dedicated to Directorship of the Institute for Law Teaching; one tenured faculty member carried a half time load; and two tenured faculty had half time substantive teaching duties and half time clinical supervision duties. In addition, there were four clinical supervising attorneys (one funded off budget through a grant) and five legal writing instructors (a total of .75 of two positions were dedicated to administrative duties).
The enrollment increased to 627 in 2003-2004, and there were two full-time hires. A visiting professor was also hired to replace a tenured professor who is on disability leave. Another tenured professor, however, is taking two to three year leave of absence to work at the United Nations, and one of the tenured professors with clinical supervision duties has retired. The School consistently employs approximately 20 adjunct professors, predominantly for upper class elective offerings.

The Law Library faculty added the position of Associate Director since the last accreditation visit, and that position has recently been staffed after remaining unfilled for two years; a second library faculty position has been unfilled for a year, but will likely be filled in the near future.

School staff has remained largely stable or has grown, with the exception of the position of faculty assistants for teaching faculty, where there has been an attrition from five to three positions. One of the two positions has been converted to duties involving support of the Externship and Exam Soft programs. This person also manages the computer scheduling of all rooms in the School and coordinates the Continuing Legal Education programs. The other position has been converted to duties involving support of the Institute for Law Teaching; this person is also the assistant for one tenured faculty member.

In addition to the position conversions mentioned above, the former combined duties of admissions, recruiting and placement have been separated. There is now a position dedicated to admissions and recruiting, with an assistant and two support staff. There is an additional position dedicated to Career Services with one support staff. The arrangement for provision of financial aid services has been formalized, with an on-site dedicated financial aid officer in the School of Law. This is the only staff member paid from the University budget, rather than the School budget. Two information technology (IT) support positions have been created within the Law Library. The Development Office has added one professional staff member, as well as a support staff member. The School also has a two-person Registrar’s Office, a budget officer, an executive assistant for the deans and staff support within the Law Library and Law Clinic (University Legal Assistance).

Facilities and Other Resources

The School of Law opened a new facility in a new location on campus in the fall of 2000. The 17.5 million dollar School of Law was completed on time and under budget. The Campaign for the School raised nearly 6 million dollars in contributions and pledges; an additional 6 million dollars is also expected to be realized through bequests and planned giving. The School has provided $239,000 from operating surpluses from several years in the mid-1990s. The University has financed the remainder. The facility is designed for a top enrollment of 600 students with two large classrooms, two medium classrooms, three seminar rooms and a large courtroom. All rooms, except two seminar rooms, are equipped with advanced audio visual equipment and are wired for student computer use. The Law Library is also equipped with state-of-the-art technology, including two computer labs dedicated to student use. In recent years, however, acquisitions have deteriorated in the face of budgets that have not kept pace with inflation and demand. The Center for Law and Justice is housed prominently on two floors at the front of the
building. The new building, unlike its predecessor, offers limited food service, and also houses the Student Bar Association and Law Review offices on-site. All other services (e.g. Registrar’s Office, Career Services) continue to be on-site as well.

Accreditation

The School of Law went through the sabbatical inspection process of the American Bar Association (ABA) and American Association of Law Schools (AALS) in March, 1999. There were some follow-up concerns regarding the facility (the new building was not open until mid 2000) and the need to convert the externship program to all non-paid placements; these concerns have been satisfactorily addressed. There has been continuing AALS review concerning publications; the School is to report back to them in February, 2004. (See Exhibit 2.16)

Significant Changes

Enrollment

Although the total 1992-1993 (568) and 2002-2003 (573) enrollment numbers were very similar, the changes over the decade were dramatic. Consistent with nationwide demographics and statistics, the School of Law witnessed a serious downturn in enrollment commencing in 1996-1997 (533) and bottoming out 1999-2000 (458) and 2000 – 2001 (469). These downturns were accompanied by budget discomfort and tuition raises, as well as an alarming decrease in entry qualifications. In 1992-1993, 368 of 568 students were male, 200 were female, and 41 reported an ethnicity other than white/Caucasian. In 2002-2003, 308 students were male, 265 were female, and 82 reported a non-white/Caucasian ethnicity. In 1992-1993, 186 undergraduate institutions and 41 states (the most ever) were represented among our students. In 2002-2003, students come from 235 undergraduate schools in 34 states. (See Exhibit 2.44.)

Accreditation Recommendations and Institutional Response

In its 1994 accreditation report, the evaluation committee recommended under Standard III (Physical Plant) that the University needed “to continue its effort to find appropriate funding” for several facility needs, including construction of a new law school. This has been accomplished with the new facility.

Although there were no specific recommendations in the report on Standard XI (Graduate Program), both the physical facility and low publication rates were noted by the evaluation committee. The most notable development in the latter arena was the hiring of a new dean in 2001, who, recognizes Gonzaga’s traditional commitment to teaching, but has clearly indicated that publications are an extremely high priority. To underscore this priority, the dean procured a $90,000 unrestricted gift in 2001-2002 to be used at the Dean’s discretion. The Dean used this gift in 2002 for summer scholarship stipends. The gift, when added to $50,000 from the School of Law Foundation (a non-profit organization) allowed the granting of numerous $10,000 stipends in 2002, the bulk of which have already resulted in published, or in publication, works. The Dean acquired additional funding of $65,000 for 2003, and has made it very clear that any sabbaticals approved during his tenure must result in publications. Due to increased enrollments
and diminished faculty numbers during the period of enrollment downturn, it has not proved feasible to provide reduced course loads to support scholarship.

**Curriculum and Academic Programs**

Slightly preceding the 1996 adoption of the School of Law Mission Statement, the faculty engaged in a comprehensive review of what it believed to be the “Essential Content, Skills, and Values” that should be provided to students within the curriculum. Each “Essential” is assigned to one or more courses. (See Exhibit 2.22.)

Initially, all courses containing “Essentials” were designated as required courses, but as complexities of the law and the realities of what could be covered in any given course became apparent, required credits grew to 59 out of the 90 credits required for graduation, or, effectively, two full years of a three year program. Due to the conviction that graduate students should be allowed more control of their education, especially when training for a profession as diverse as the law, and consistent with the trend in the vast majority of law schools, the faculty reduced the required curriculum to 43 credits, effective in 2002-2003. The prior required courses that are no longer required are still highly recommended, still offered in multiple sections, and still carry high enrollments.

Gonzaga was a pioneer in the 1980s of a two versus one year legal writing program, an approach which has now become popular nationally. One of the realizations that struck the faculty during the period of curriculum review was that while skills training is a very important aspect of legal training, the small student-teacher ratio needed for effective skills training was beyond the ability of the internal clinical and legal writing faculty to provide exclusively through their own efforts.

In 1993, the School of Law created the position of Director of Externship Programs. The Director has also consistently taught several sections of a Trial Advocacy course. From Fall 1993 until Spring 2002, this position was filled through a one-year contract appointment to the faculty. In 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, the position is being funded through the adjunct budget. Permitted by the ABA and AALS accrediting entities as field placements, externships are comprised of a classroom component, along with supervised non-paid work experience in the legal community. Extensive record keeping is required by both supervisors and students, twenty to forty students participate each semester.

During the period of significant downturn in enrollment from 1996-2000, there was still pressure to meet budget demands. This was also a time with a serious erosion in admission statistics, both with regard to undergraduate GPA’s and the LSAT (Law School Admission Test). The School, even before the downward trend became apparent, realized its obligation to maximize educational opportunities for students with less than spectacular entry statistics. This reflected its Mission’s commitment to ethics and justice and to “personalized education” for students. In 1996 the school instituted a trial Academic Resources Program (ARP) for first year students identified as “possibly at risk” during the Fall semester based on entry statistics and/or during the Spring semester based on Fall grades. At the same time that the ARP program was revamped, renewed emphasis was also placed on Orientation for First Year Students, the assignment of faculty advisors and upper-class student mentors for every entering student. Although the
program proceeded on a largely case by case basis in its initial years, it became a high priority with the appointment of a new ARP director in 1999, who also serves as the Dean of Students - a position created in 1994.

Commencing in 1999, the ARP program has become very structured, with approximately six tutors who meet frequently with the ARP students on an individual basis. In 2000, a formal ARP component was also added to the mandatory summer entry program, which is required of approximately 40 incoming students every year. This reflects the lower quartile or quintile of entering students. The program involves tutorials and regular writing classes. In addition to the mandatory summer program, in 2001 the School began an “Early Start” summer program. This program is available on a voluntary basis to any accepted student (other than those in the mandatory program), who wishes to take a full law course prior to the fall of the first year.

Prior to the late 1990s, students were forbidden to use computers or other word processing technology to take exams. This was due to concerns about access to memory. In 1997 a new technology (then called Examinator, subsequently ExamSoft, now SofTest) became available that operated to block memory access during exams. The School of Law approved a trial use of the program and has now embraced it enthusiastically. The vast majority of the faculty allow use of the technology in their courses, and in 2001-2002 over fifty percent of the student body used SofTest; over seventy percent of the first year students did so.

In the fall of 2002, the School received approval from the American Bar Association (ABA) to institute an international summer program, “Gonzaga in Florence.” The program emphasizes international human rights and public interest courses and commenced operations in May 2003 with four courses offered over a six-week program to 45 students.

Public Service Requirements

In 1999, the School adopted a Public Service Requirement for students; thirty hours is required for graduation. A similar requirement was approved in principle for the faculty. A 10-hour per year formal requirement for law faculty was adopted in 2001.

Admissions and Bar Passage

Enrollments began to drop in Academic Year 1996 - 1997 (down from 587 to 533), and the number of applications dropped even more precipitously. For the entering Class of 1994 there were 1943 applicants, for 1996 there were 1195, by 1999 there were only 826 applicants. For a brief period of time during the campaign to build the new law school and while the University administration was in transition, considerable pressure was placed on the School to manage admissions for budget purposes, and the quality indices of the entering classes plummeted. In 1994 the median LSAT score of entering students was 155 (67th percentile); in 1997 it was 151; by 1998 and 1999 it had fallen to 149 (43rd percentile). Each LSAT point represents approximately a 4% differential. The lowest quartile deterioration was more troubling. It dropped from 152 in 1994 to 148 in 1997, but all the way down to 145 in 1998.
This in turn led to a lower ranking in national reports and, according to internal analyses in 1999 and 2002, there was also some correlation between lower entry stats, diminished first year law GPA’s and, ultimately, a slump in first time Washington bar pass rates. Until 1998, Gonzaga had the highest first time pass rate in the state seven out of nine times; since 1998 Gonzaga has had the lowest first time Washington bar pass rate all but one time. All of these developments appeared to further negatively impact the admissions pool.

During the 1998-1999 admissions’ season for the entering class of 1999, a conscious decision was made to halt any further decline in entry statistics. The average LSAT score for the lowest quartile of the entering class was raised from 145 to 146, although some of the other indicators continued to dip, slightly. This conscious decision to halt quality erosion resulted in the smallest entering class (152) since 1987-1988. During the admissions season for the class entering in 2000, a decision was made to improve all quality indicators, a process which is still ongoing. The plan has involved vigorous scrutiny of all applications, a total revamping of scholarships and grants under the guidance of an external consultant (1999-2002), complete rewriting of all recruiting literature (catalogues, etc.) and increased staffing in the Admissions Office to allow a heavy emphasis on personalized recruiting. Quality indices have steadily improved; LSAT scores starting with the entering class of 2000 and undergraduate GPA’s in 2002. These changes are reflected in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% LSAT</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% LSAT</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% LSAT</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median GPA</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application numbers are beginning to rise (826 in 1999; 1232 in 2002; 1596 in 2003). Although the School has become more selective, the application yield rate has improved rapidly, resulting in a dramatic increase in first year enrollments (152 in 1999; 237 in 2002; 233 in 2003). This, however, has placed a strain on the physical plant and on the student-faculty ratio. Furthermore, in order to increase enrollments and increase quality indices at the same time, the scholarship discount rate has risen substantially compared to the 1990s.

In early 2004, the faculty adopted a financial long-range plan for the School of Law that was approved by the University’s central administration. It was based on first year entering classes of 200 for the next four years. In two years that would stabilize the total enrollment at approximately 560. The plan also projected balanced budgets during that period after giving of the net tuition revenue to the University for overhead.

Due to a continuing strong applicant pool, the School of Law projects that it will be able to improve its median LSAT scores in the coming 2004-05 year by one point in each category. There has also been a strong correlation between media LSAT scores and bar pass rates here at Gonzaga, so this continued statistical improvement in student quality bodes well for our results on future bar exams.
Washington bar pass rates have not yet recovered from the slump, although the pass rate on the substantive portion alone (all subjects other than Professional Responsibility) improved from 67% in 2001 to 77.7% in 2002. It is hoped that the improved statistics for students entering in 2000 and thereafter, coupled with a much more aggressive Academic Resources Program (ARP) and improved opportunities for Bar Review Courses will result in better bar pass results commencing in 2003. Gonzaga has successfully lobbied for live versus taped lectures and intensive writing workshops over the last two years.

**Institute for Law Teaching**

Soon after the last accreditation visit, Gonzaga University School of Law founded the Institute for Law Teaching, which has become one of the most prominent features in forging the School’s national reputation. The premier annual program is a three-day institute offering lectures, workshops and discussion groups exclusively for law professors. Dozens of professors from law schools all across the nation attend. In 2002, the Institute was held in New Hampshire in cooperation with the Franklin Pierce School of Law. In 2003, the Institute offered two summer programs; one in the State of Washington and one in Chicago. The Institute also publishes a newsletter three times a year. The authors are drawn from across the country, and the Newsletter is distributed to every law professor in the nation as well as to numerous professors in Canada and to some international supporters.

**Placement/Career Services**

Average placement statistics since 1992-2001 indicate that nine months after graduation, 89.6% of Gonzaga students are employed or in pursuit of further graduate education. There is an upward trend in placement in prestigious judicial clerkships, up to 8.1% of the 2001 graduates. The average salary in 2001 was $43,333; there has been an average trend of an approximately 4% increase per year.

**Center for Law and Justice**

The School of Law has had a “live client” internal clinic, University Legal Assistance, since 1975. In the late 1990s, it became part of a larger entity within the School, the Center for Law and Justice. One of the other organizations is the Gonzaga Institute for Action Against Hate, formed in response to hate incidents in 1995 and 1996. The Institute commenced publication of a journal in 2001, and has hosted programs promoting tolerance for several years (e.g., the Spokane exhibition of the Anne Frank exhibit).

**Outcomes Assessment**

The School of Law has not had a consistent, formalized assessment process, other than faculty evaluations in all academic courses. (See Exhibit 2.17.) The Dean of the School of Law engaged in an annual assessment of faculty performance for all faculty throughout the late 1990s, but assessments were not formally pursued in 2001 due to a transition in the School Administration. Pursuant to the University *Faculty Handbook*, formal review of tenured faculty commenced on a
triennial basis in Academic Year 2002-2003. All non-tenured faculty are peer-reviewed annually through the Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT) process. All faculty undergo an annual salary review by the Dean. Both the review of tenured faculty and the PRT process evaluate teaching, professional development, advising and academic citizenship. All staff are subject to annual performance reviews under University processes. Bar pass rates and studies, and Placement/Career Services statistics may also appropriately be viewed as a type of outcomes assessment, as can the fall semester reviews of first year students for placement into the Academic Resources Program.

Budget and Tuition

Beginning in 1992-1993, when the School budget was 5.4 million dollars its tuition was $380/credit hour, the majority of the Clinic budget was drawn “off budget” from grants. In 2002-2003, the School budget was 8.4 million dollars. The budget included an 18% overhead. The tuition rate was $720/credit hour, and almost the entire clinic budget was “on budget” due to the disappearance of federal grants. Enormous changes have occurred. The 2003-2004 projected expenses are 9.1 million dollars, and tuition is $765/credit.

Until 1995-1996, School enrollments were very stable. A tuition increase (from $380 to $520) and an account receivable owed by the University to the School of Law resulted in surpluses and the creation of an “Unfunded Reserve”. Enrollment dipped in 1996 – 1997 and continued downward for years with a turnaround finally starting in 2001. All of the down years resulted in deficit operating budgets, where expenses were covered by use of the “Unfunded Reserve.” The University, however, has received its 18% of net tuition revenues every year.

A new capital campaign is underway, with the objective of funding endowments for student scholarships and several professorships. Discount rates have reached the level of around 30%, due to pressures to improve quality indices. Should these efforts be realized, some pressure will be removed from the operating budget. In the meantime, a small deficit is projected for 2003-2004, that will deplete the entire remaining Unfunded Reserve, while a balanced budget is expected by the University in 2004-2005.

Projection of Significant Changes and Challenges

Enrollment and Budget

The law building is designed for 600 students. Due to expectations that only a small deficit would be allowed in 2003-2004, the projected enrollment is over capacity. Actual enrollment is 627. Increasing enrollment above that level in future years is unrealistic; there are insufficient classrooms in the building to absorb the additional students.

1. Additional challenges that accompany the enrollment increases are a deteriorating student/faculty ratio, less flexibility in both time and money to support scholarship, and enormous strain on Career Services, which has only two staff members to work with more than 600 students for both internships during law school and job placement upon graduation.
2. A further challenge will be to bring the Law Library back to adequate levels, both with regard to staffing and volumes, which increases in importance as student use numbers rise.

Although a tuition increase of 6.2% was levied in 2003-2004, continued increases of that magnitude are problematic. The current average student debt load upon graduation is $70,000, yet federal loans available for law students have not increased since 1992, nor are starting law salaries significantly on the rise in the areas where the majority of students enter practice.

Expenses must be reduced, either through reduction of the discount rate and/or increased endowments. If the discount rate is reduced, strategies must be developed to maintain quality indices without the inducement of large scholarships. Demographics are favorable until about 2013, but demographics alone will probably not be sufficient.

In early 2004, the faculty adopted a financial long-range plan for the School of Law that was approved by the University’s central administration. It was based on first year entering classes of 200 for the next four years. In two years that would stabilize the total enrollment at approximately 560. The plan also projected balanced budgets during that period after giving of the net tuition revenue to the University for overhead.

Technology

The vast majority of students are “techno savvy,” as indicated by the enormous usage of computer programs for exams and the widespread use of laptops in class. The faculty is somewhat less so, but most existing faculty have undergone some training (provided in-house by two IT staff persons), and many of the most recent hires demonstrate superior technological skills. Increased training for the remainder of the faculty is needed, and continued emphasis on keeping abreast of technology is also imperative. The single most significant technology change may come in the area of distance learning. Although the ABA still does not sanction the prevalent use of distance learning, revisions to its standards in 2001 allow limited use. It is expected that significant student demand will develop, at least for summer offerings, in the near future.

Bar Pass

The students who entered in the fall of 2000 were the first class to have improved entry qualification statistics since the severe decline started in 1996. A majority of the lower quartile of that entering class was also the first group to be trained in the mandatory summer ARP program. The majority of these students have graduated, and took the bar exam in 2003. Internal studies indicate some correlation between entry LSAT scores, law school GPA’s, and bar pass rates. It is hoped the combination of raising entry LSAT scores and providing intensive academic support for those who have the lowest scores among enrollees will result in an improved first time Washington bar pass rate. If these efforts do not result in perceptible and steady score improvements, the School will need to design and implement other remedial measures.
Due to a continuing strong applicant pool, the School of Law projects that it will be able to improve its median LSAT scores in the coming 2004-05 year by one point in each category. There has also been a strong correlation between mean LSAT scores and bar pass rates here at Gonzaga, so this continued statistical improvement in student quality bodes well for our results on future bar exams.

Curriculum

Interest in the Gonzaga in Florence program is high among students and applicants, which is indicative of a heightened interest in International Law. Several new courses are expected to be developed within a year or two; first as offerings in Florence and then possibly as regular course offerings. Some increase in Public Interest Law offerings is also expected in response to student demand; Immigration Law has already been approved, and the Health Law area is likely the next area to be expanded.

Outcomes Assessment

In many ways, the School of Law has recently been focused on creating a new facility, settling into the facility and responding to a rapid increase in enrollment. Change is good, but it also always brings unintended consequences to the planned results. As discussed above, the School does not have a consistent, formalized assessment process. Although it appears that the School is set to continue in a dynamic development phase, it needs to find the time and resources for comprehensive evaluation. This makes good institutional sense. It is also necessary because there is a “report back” to the AALS in 2004, and because the School will ultimately undergo a full accreditation review in the not too distant future.
Mission

The School of Professional Studies strives to create, educate, and support leaders; contribute to the health of people, communities, and organizations; and to be of service in meeting the learning needs of a complex society.

Our programs embody the University’s Mission and the Ignatian spirit on which Gonzaga University is founded. Ethics, excellence, spirit, and community are guiding values for all aspects of the School. Faculty scholarship and research contribute positively to the professions, the global community, and the classroom.

Through a spirit of inquiry and lifelong learning, our students expand their capacity to transform thinking, and engage in ethical problem solving and decision making. New knowledge is acquired in a learning environment of respect and high standards. Our teaching strategies meet the needs of diverse student groups by utilizing dynamic program delivery formats, including technology and flexible scheduling. Traditional-age undergraduate students, as well as adults returning to complete graduate and undergraduate degrees, enrich our learning environment. Non-credit offerings complement the goals of life-long learners.

Description of Programs

The School of Professional Studies (SPS) provides quality education for traditional and nontraditional students. Academic programs focus on the areas of health and leadership and consist of the following: PhD in Leadership Studies, Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership, Master of Arts in Communication and Leadership, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Pre-nursing Master of Science in Nursing, Post-Master’s Certificate in Nursing, Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science, Bachelor of General Studies, and Accelerated Bachelor of General Studies. The School also serves the University by administering many programs in continuing education, summer school sessions, distance learning, and the academic component of the Comprehensive Leadership Program. The planned and strategic growth that the School has experienced since 1998 is outlined in Exhibit 2.12.

Other changes for the School have occurred as well.

- Teaching excellence with technology and distance delivery has increased in importance to the programs and students in the School. Programs within the School are considered leaders in these endeavors across campus. Examples of curricular planning and specifics related to distance delivery are provided in the Team Room.
- A structural reorganization of the School was implemented in Fall 2003. A chart depicting this reorganization and descriptions of the two new Associate Dean positions are available for review in the team rooms. (See Exhibit 2.9.)
Bachelor of General Studies

Purpose and Outcomes

The Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) program exists in the tradition of Saint Ignatius of Loyola, who himself was a nontraditional student. The BGS program was created in 1975, specifically for adult students 25 years of age and older. Its aim is to help adult non-traditional students attain a bachelor’s degree in a customized and flexible format. Almost all potential students arrange a confidential consultation with an advisor before entering the program. There are currently two tracks in the BGS program: the Regular track and the Accelerated BGS track. The Accelerated BGS program received full approval from the Academic Vice president in the Spring, 2004 following the recommendation from the Academic Council for full approval.

Program Description

BGS students are expected to meet all Gonzaga requirements and policies for a bachelor’s degree, with the exceptions of a separate core (see Undergraduate Catalogue, p. 157) and the substitution of an area of concentration (see undergraduate catalogue pp. 157-158) for a major field. The concentrations are self-designed by students with the help of an advisor. Concentrations may be interdisciplinary in nature. Student must complete at least 21 credits in their area of concentration, but exceeding that number is highly recommended.

The accelerated option was implemented to provide an option for adult students to complete their bachelor’s degree in a timely manner and to deal with the limited course offerings suitable to the BGS student schedule in the regular track. The Accelerated BGS program currently offers only one concentration, Organizational Leadership. This concentration was chosen because it is particularly effective in meeting adult students’ needs for professional advancement and career marketability.

In addition to meeting the regular BGS degree requirements, Accelerated BGS students enter the program with at least 50 semester credits from an accredited college or university. In some cases, students receive permission from the Dean of the School of Professional Studies to enter the program with fewer than 50 credits. A student entering with 50 credits can complete this accelerated BGS program in two to two-and-a-half years. There are two 8-week sessions each term (Fall, Spring, Summer), with a one week break between sessions. Classes take place on Saturdays, or via the internet. In addition to class attendance, students participate in an on-line discussion group for 1.5 hours per class per week.

Students

Students entering the regular BGS program must meet all regular requirements for admission to the University. Students entering the Accelerated BGS program must meet standard admission requirements and enter with at least 50 transferable college credits. The University grants a scholarship in the form of reduced tuition to students in both BGS tracks. In Fall 2003, this
scholarship was equivalent to a 47% tuition reduction for Regular-track BGS student enrolled for 1-12 credits and a 30% tuition scholarship for students in the Accelerated BGS program. The Accelerated BGS scholarship is less than that for the traditional program because this program incurs separate faculty and operational costs that must be covered by tuition revenues. Resources have been adequate to offer the program. Students in both BGS tracks, are eligible to receive state, federal, or other external financial aid, however, since the University grants a tuition scholarship to all BGS students, other forms of Gonzaga-based financial aid are not available to them.

**Faculty**

The traditional BGS program has no faculty of its own. Students in the program enroll in regular Gonzaga University classes. Courses in the Accelerated BGS program are taught by regular Gonzaga faculty who teach these courses on an overload basis, as well as by adjunct faculty. All adjunct faculty hold at least a master’s degree and have expertise and experience in their content area. Many are recognized community leaders.

**Facilities**

Students enrolled in the regular BGS program take their courses in a variety of classrooms around campus. Accelerated BGS courses are held in the classrooms in Schoenberg Center. These classrooms are fully-equipped for multi-media presentations.

**Significant Changes**

A BGS director was hired spring 2004 to oversee the program and to implement the strategic marketing plan. The regular BGS program has averaged 125 students each year over the past few years. The Accelerated BGS program has averaged about 20 students. Enrollment data are summarized below. As described above, the major change in the BGS program has been the addition of the accelerated track.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment data for regular BGS program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment data for BGS-X program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes Assessment

The average GPA for students in the regular BGS track is 3.59; it is 3.69 for Accelerated BGS students. Student retention is also monitored and has been in the 90% range for the Accelerated BGS program. Exit interviews are conducted with students completing both BGS programs. These occur in person or via the completion of a questionnaire. In addition, focus group sessions are held with alumni and current students. Results indicate a high level of satisfaction with the program. (See Exhibit 2.28.)

Analysis and Appraisal

The BGS program recognizes the need to address the following areas:

- Articulate specific outcome objectives for the BGS program and include these in promotional materials.
- Explore additional ways of gathering, analyzing and utilizing outcome assessment data.
- Consider a new title for the Accelerated BGS program that will reflect its emphasis on organizational leadership. This comes from a suggestion by program graduates and could increase the marketability of the program.
- Implement delivery options for the Accelerated BGS program that include more on-line course offerings and intensive weekends.
- Complete a market analysis in at least two additional communities as part of program growth plan
- While resources have been adequate to offer the BGS programs, a new marketing plan is being implemented that would benefit from increased funding.

Department of Exercise Science

Purpose and Outcomes

The mission of the Department of Exercise Science is to provide students with a major field of study that offers an opportunity for specialized work and original investigation of human physiological responses and adaptations to physical activity and exercise. The degree provides preparation for graduate or professional study in a variety of areas, including the allied health professions, corporate fitness, business careers in health, fitness, and human performance, research and teaching. Laboratory experiences introduce students to the methods of investigation, evaluation, and remediation of human function. Major coursework is complemented by the core curriculum, which provides a culture that distinguishes the educated person and develops a foundation for fashioning a career.

Program Description

The foundation of the curriculum is the discipline of exercise science. Students complete University core coursework, as well as 83 credits of upper and lower division coursework devoted specifically to the major (see Undergraduate Catalogue, p. 159). The program is congruent with
the University’s mission to provide an opportunity for students to “attain more specialized competence” in a discipline or profession. The curriculum also fosters students’ understanding of the technological progress and scientific complexity of their world. As evidenced by course syllabi, the curriculum also aims to develop the important skills of effective writing and speaking. (See Exhibit 2.20)

The department’s success in accomplishing its purpose is evidenced by an increase in both number of majors and credit generation. The number of majors has increased from 22 in 1996 to over 103 in Fall 2003. The following chart reflects those changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit generation has increased from 1167 in 1998 to 1479 for 2003-04. Students are involved extensively in research, international study, conference participation, and professional activities. Details of these student activities are available as an exhibit. (See Exhibit 2.32)

**Faculty and Staff**

The Department consists of three full-time doctorally-prepared faculty, two of whom are tenured associate professors. The third faculty member is tenure-track. Adjunct faculty have been used to teach selected courses. Adjunct salaries have been set at $809 per credit hour, a pay scale generally inadequate to attract adjuncts from the profession.

Evaluation of the quality of the faculty in the department is an ongoing process, which is dictated by the Faculty Handbook and conducted by the SPS Reappointment and Review Committee. A strength of the Department is its faculty, who are active in professional development and scholarship. (See Exhibit 2.5)

There is no dedicated staff support for the Department of Exercise Science. There is, however, support provided by work-study students.

**Facilities**

Faculty offices are located in Foley Center and are adequate. Exercise Science is the only science program on campus without dedicated laboratory facilities. It shares facilities in Martin Center with the Department of Sports and Physical Education and shares a laboratory with the Department of Biology for the Human Anatomy and Physiology I and II labs. These facilities have been inadequate and room scheduling has become a problem. Likewise, there is no
dedicated laboratory equipment. In 2003, a one-time expenditure of $20,000 was allocated for equipment. A listing of equipment used by the Department of Exercise Science is available in the Team Room. (See Exhibit 2.25.)

Resources

The department is allotted approximately $1000 per year to expand its library holdings. Individual faculty forward their requests to the library liaison in the fall semester. The library also budgets approximately $1500 per year for journal subscriptions related to exercise science. Faculty feel this budget is inadequate to support upper division courses in the major and faculty research purposes.

Fiscal Resources

The Department has little in the way of external resources. Discretionary funds amount to about $1200 per year. These funds are designated for instructional purposes and office supplies and are available to faculty as needed. There is no dedicated budget for professional memberships or professional development. Faculty must request travel funds from the Dean.

The Department generates about $10,000 per year in laboratory fees. These fees are spent on laboratory equipment and supplies for lab classes. Generally, the fees generated by a specific class are spent for that class. On occasion, fees are pooled for the purchase of lab equipment. In this instance, an individual faculty member makes a proposal for the use of the funds. The entire faculty discusses the proposal and sets priorities. Funds are allotted for such purchases only with consent of the entire faculty. Smaller requests may be funded on an as needed basis by the Department Chair.

Significant Changes

An effort was made to provide dedicated office and lab space for the Department in 1998 as a part of the Hughes Life Science Building renovation. However, new dean leadership in the College of Arts and Science removed the Department from inclusion in this project because the program was not included as part of the grant proposal put forth by the administration for the Inland Northwest Natural Resources Research Center. Consequently, the Department was moved from the College of Arts and Science to the School of Professional Studies in June 2003. A major reason for this move was the lack of resources within the College of Arts and Sciences. However, there have been no guarantees of any actual increase in resources with the move to the School of Professional Studies.

Other major changes in the Department and its programs since the last accreditation visit have been revising the curriculum from a Bachelor of Arts degree to a Bachelor of Science degree and developing a new core curriculum. The new core curriculum has an increase emphasis on science as the foundation for the degree. These changes are reflected in the current University Catalogue. (See Exhibit 2.1.)
Outcomes Assessment

Students who complete a major in Exercise Science are not tracked in any formal way after they leave Gonzaga. Informal contact with graduates indicates that approximately 25% enter graduate and professional schools. Four students have completed their doctoral degrees in physical therapy. In addition, five graduates are known to be working in the health/fitness industry or allied health sciences. Currently, eight graduates are pursuing Doctorates in Physical therapy. Four of five students who applied to graduate programs last year were accepted for Fall 2003 admission. (See Exhibit 2.28.)

Analysis and Appraisal

The major strength of the Department is its faculty, who are active in professional development and scholarship. An additional strength is the Department’s curriculum and its ability to attract students and prepare them for a variety of career opportunities. The major weaknesses of the Department are (1) the limited number of tenure-track faculty positions, (2) the lack of facilities, and (3) resources for teaching, professional development, and scholarly work. The Department recognizes that it needs to articulate specific program outcomes, develop a systematic means of gathering information to determine the extent to which outcomes are actually accomplished, and use this information to inform program decision. This work is currently underway. Following are the most pressing current challenges facing the Department:

- full implementation of the Bachelor of Science curriculum, which will take through 2005-06. This will require the addition of another full-time tenure-track faculty position, which was a condition of the curriculum revision approval in April 2003 by the Academic Council; and
- development of strategies for acquiring resources for dedicated teaching and laboratory research facilities.

Department of Doctoral Studies

Purpose and Outcomes

The mission of the School of Professional Studies, the University mission, and the presidential goals all reflect a significant focus on leadership. The specific mission and goals of the Doctoral Program in Leadership Studies are articulated in the program’s conceptual framework, a document formed by the program faculty during the 1997-98 academic year and further honed during the last five years. (See www.gonzaga.edu/doctoral for the program mission and conceptual framework.) The goals reflect an emphasis on leadership theory, research, and application, and attention to local, regional, national, and international community concerns. As such, they are congruent with the overall mission of the University. The goals of a Gonzaga University mission-based doctoral education are as follows.
As part of the doctoral program learning community, students will:

- use multiple theoretical frameworks to better understand themselves and to facilitate their personal development. Self-knowledge is the first requirement of leadership;
- become fluent in several mental models or theoretical frameworks and know how each enriches their understanding of social systems;
- understand the change process at the individual, organizational, and global levels;
- understand and prize the need for increasing diversity and for global approaches to issues, with special attention to the implications of this diversity for individuals, organizations, and societies;
- become continually more reflective as ethical human beings and ethical leaders;
- become increasingly committed to social justice, and through their participation in community activities, refine the skills relevant to bringing about more humane social institutions;
- develop research competencies that are founded on practices of rigorous scholarship and based on the “habit of truth”; and
- inspire, create, and lead through a system based on respect for and accountability to others, their organizations, and the planet.

Description of Department and Program

The Doctor of Philosophy in Leadership Studies, founded in 1980, is based on the Jesuit tradition of educating the whole person. The program is interdisciplinary and designed to develop scholarship and professional competencies while encouraging self-reflection and strengthening a commitment of service to others. A specific program focus is leadership during times of rapid change. The 60-credit program curriculum is detailed on pages 76-78 of the current Graduate Catalogue. Program admission requirements are described on pages 73-74.

The program attracts individuals from a range of professions, including K-12 education, higher education, the liberal arts, health care, social services, theology, engineering, government, law enforcement, and business. Students are working professionals and are often raising their families while pursuing the PhD. Their average age is between 40 and 55, and they enter the program often already established in leadership positions across the disciplines. The program is instrumental in the development of the student’s leadership potential and the student’s depth of scholarship. With nearly three hundred graduates over its 22-year history, the program continues to develop international reach and national leadership significance. Among other professional roles, graduates are CEOs of major corporations, professors throughout the world, international leadership consultants, members of research think tanks, directors of organizations, university presidents, and entrepreneurs in various disciplines.

Faculty

The Department has 5 full time faculty lines that are filled by 3 tenured faculty (one professor and two associate professors), one term contract Assistant Professor (this will become a tenure-track line next year), and one visiting Assistant Professor (a national search is underway to fill this
tenure-track line). Department faculty have the academic and experiential qualifications, as well as the regional, national, and international reach to deliver program excellence. All faculty, including adjuncts, hold an earned doctorate. Core faculty hold degrees in varied fields, deepening the interdisciplinary focus of programs shown in current leadership theory and research. All tenured doctoral faculty have 7 or more years of teaching experience, multiple publications in peer-reviewed journals, evidence of ongoing scholarly writing and research, and presentations of scholarly work in regional, national, and international scholarly venues in leadership and across disciplines of faculty expertise. In the last two academic years the four tenured faculty have generated 12 articles in high-level peer reviewed journals, 3 pieces of literary fiction in fine arts publications, 1 book, a Fulbright award, a Murdock award, 8 presentations of scholarly work in regional, national and international venues, and an international grant (approx. $200,000) for connection between the Doctoral Program in Leadership Studies at Gonzaga University and the Doctoral Program in Public Policy at the University of Pretoria in South Africa. Faculty vitae provide evidence of faculty depth in scholarship and are available for review in the exhibit room. Additional exhibits summarize faculty qualifications, scholarship, and service activities. (See Exhibit 2.35)

Faculty are evaluated in accordance with processes outlined in the University’s Faculty Handbook and the policy of the School of Professional Studies. In addition, the department chairperson conducts an independent review of each faculty member’s performance. Faculty are generally satisfied with these reappointment procedures and feel they provide helpful feedback.

Teaching is evaluated through the standardized university forms administered at the end of each course and reviewed by the faculty member, chairperson, dean, and reappointment committee; course-specific evaluations developed by each faculty member for his or her own courses; and peer review of teaching. Faculty in the Doctoral program demonstrate exceptional teaching effectiveness, with median ratings of 6.0-7.0 (on a 7-point scale) across all courses and all faculty. As another indication of teaching effectiveness in the department, two professors have received the University’s top award for teaching excellence. The data from the two-year program self-study also showed very high ratings of teaching effectiveness in all relevant categories of the quantitative and qualitative data. (See Exhibit 2.22.)

Advising effectiveness is measured by formal evaluations that are mailed to students, and through the results of the two-year self-study. In formal evaluations, all doctoral faculty received median ratings of 4.0-5.0 (on a 5-point scale) for their advising effectiveness. In both quantitative and qualitative evaluations from the two-year self-study regarding advising effectiveness, faculty were consistently rated as highly effective as advisors. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

In summary, faculty demonstrate commitment to University and program goals for teaching, advising, and scholarly excellence. The primary threat to faculty commitment and program quality is faculty workload. Faculty resources budgeted positions and especially dissertation workloads are a significant stressor to both faculty and program.

Facilities
Facilities in the Rosauer Center (where the doctoral program is currently housed) are in good condition and the program is well-equipped to support delivery of doctoral level education. All full-time faculty and staff use university-provided computers, software, and network connections. Faculty receive support from university computer services, and enjoy the expertise of one of the current faculty members in web design and web management.

The doctoral program’s students report only limited use of other university services and facilities. The University’s web page facilitates the most needed services – access to the bookstore, registrar’s office, student accounts, and financial aid.

Resources.

Library holdings in Foley Center are appropriate in number and content to support the doctoral program in its many facets of leadership theory and research. The program would do well to augment in-house holdings in order to maintain a current and in-depth library of leadership scholarship. Research librarians in Foley provide great service to doctoral students in search techniques regarding doctoral research. The department chairperson leads the faculty in monitoring adequacy of resource allocation. Discussions are documented in minutes of departmental meetings, which available for review from the department administrative assistant. (See Exhibit 2.38.) Program needs are typically attended to through the department’s budget. If necessary, additional resources are solicited from and usually granted by the Dean of the School. In general, departmental resources are sufficient for achieving program goals, but financial and physical time restraints often prevent a certain amount of faculty development, program marketing, and release time to pursue new initiatives.

Significant Changes

Enrollment patterns in the doctoral program have remained stable during the program’s 22-year history, with the program generating a running 3-year average of approximately 1400 credits per year. Some fluctuation can be noted in during various times of change in the program, such as the years following a time when the program carried only two faculty due to varied personnel disruptions (1996 and 1997). The most recent three years of the program represent some of the strongest in program history regarding credit generation. (See Exhibit 2.40.)

Recent trends have shown a shift in student body from approximately 60% education students, 20% higher education (interdisciplinary), and 20% interdisciplinary to only 20% education students, 20% higher education (interdisciplinary), and now approximately 60% interdisciplinary. Program changes reflect the student body change, the program’s 21-year celebration, the recent two-year program review (self-study), and ongoing attempts to maintain a high quality, relevant, contemporary, and rigorous program of studies.

The Certificate in Advanced Leadership Studies was approved by the Graduate Council in Spring 2003. The complete proposal for this program is on file. (See Exhibit 2.15.) Students who enter this program work with the department chairperson to develop a plan of studies prior to their admission to the program. (See Exhibit 2.42.)
Outcomes Assessment

The doctoral program employs systematic and ongoing review of its resources, policies, objectives, curriculum, and student performance/outcomes. The recent two-year program review, minutes of departmental meetings and student forums provide evidence of assessment of program goals and use of evaluation data for program improvement.

Alumni data reveal regional, national, and international successes of students and graduates. Evidence of such can be found in the archives of the doctoral program listserv and on file in the team room. Notably, in the last three years two student dissertations were awarded Dissertation of the Year by national organizations, and one student received a NIDA grant (one of the most highly coveted governmental grants for dissertation work) for dissertation work. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

Ongoing program evaluation is a part of a healthy curricular, instructional, and overall departmental focus. As an example of this, an extensive two-year program review was completed in February of 2003. As part of this review, University administration, program founders, and program faculty, students, and alumni participated in a comprehensive quantitative and qualitative data-gathering process. The program review was used to assess, among other things, how resource allocations were related to individual faculty, departmental, and university goals. Both quantitative survey data and qualitative interview and focus group data consistently indicated a high level of perceived accomplishment of program objectives. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

Data from the department’s assessment processes are used to inform program decisions. Examples of program changes in the last seven years that were solely or in part due to ongoing program review data are:

- the program mission was revised to be a deeper reflection of the university mission, program direction, and formation of doctoral-prepared leaders;
- the program conceptual framework and goals were refined in order to more clearly indicate desired mission objectives;
- the program’s name was changed from a PhD in Educational Leadership to a PhD in Leadership Studies to reflect shift in student body and theory and research in leadership to a more interdisciplinary focus;
- the program was moved from the School of Education to the School of Professional Studies as a more appropriate home for the program; and
- program revision work is in progress (in curriculum, dissertation work, and other aspects of the program), based on the recent two-year self-study. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

Analysis and Appraisal

The doctoral program values the quality of its faculty, its goals, the implementation of its goals, and especially the accomplishments of its graduates. The faculty of the program is responsive to student feedback, social/market forces, and professional trends. The two factors that currently are of greatest concern to the program are faculty workload and tight faculty resources. Evidence
of these concerns can be seen as a common thread in the data that resulted from the recent two-year program review. Resource constraints are being addressed through creative use of faculty time and talents and creative engagement among University and School administration, program faculty, and students. To date, these constraints have not compromised program delivery, ongoing evaluation, or program quality.

A thorough investigation of the major current strengths and improvements in the program, as well as weaknesses and areas of failed improvement, are clearly delineated in the recent two-year program review. In line with the program review findings, the program expects to: continue its excellence with regard to program mission and goals that are congruent with University and School missions and goals; plan and implement programmatic changes in delivery of courses and adjustments in curriculum in line with data gathered from students as well as national benchmarks; maintain three-year averages of credit generation; and pursue appropriate avenues of program growth such as additional post-masters certificate programs.

**Department of Organizational Leadership**

**Purpose and Outcomes**

The mission of the Department of Organizational Leadership is congruent with and contributes to the University mission by integrating a liberal arts education with specialized competency in the area of leadership. The program is committed to the leadership development of students and to connecting the program and the University to the greater community. Specific student outcomes for graduates in the Masters of Organizational Leadership are to:

- Understand the relationship of the liberal arts to leadership
- Develop effective strategies to be social change agents
- Develop a leadership approach that acknowledges values and incorporates differences
- Develop and utilize an integrated vision as a leader
- Understand and analyze organizations from multiple frameworks and be an agent for productive change
- Be knowledgeable consumers and effective practitioners of organizational research
- Understand how to form and apply ethical systems within organizational settings

**Program Description**

The Masters of Arts in Organizational Leadership was established in 1986. The present curriculum is revised based on program feedback, advisory board input, and advances in the discipline of leadership. The MOL curriculum consists of 21 credits of required coursework in leadership and organizational theory, ethics, diversity, and research, and 12 elective credits. The current curriculum is detailed on pages 71-73 of the 2003-2005 Graduate Catalogue.

What seems most evident in the program is the community presence that has emerged in the past five years. Through faculty efforts and support from the Dean of the School of Professional
Studies, the Department has emerged as a center for information and resources in the area of leadership. As a result of these efforts, enrollment has grown. Additionally, because of the visibility of the chairperson in the corporate community, the program is emerging as a resource to the profit and nonprofit communities.

Distance learning technologies are increasingly important to the program and the efforts of the have been instrumental in incorporating these technologies into the delivery of the program.

Admission criteria for the program are described on page 71 of the Graduate Catalogue. Nearly 70% of the enrolled students are women; the average student age is 39 years. A majority of the students report their current occupation as middle management; average income is $51,000. While no similar data are available from 6-10 years ago, data from this past five years appear to indicate a trend of increasing numbers of women in managerial positions, the value of a degree in leadership for those in mid-level managerial positions, and an age range indicative of work and life experience of students. Measures of student quality include GPA, admission profile available from student applications, and results of standardized test scores. An analysis of these measures offers evidence that the quality of students in the masters program has remained consistent with past years. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

Faculty

The department has 3.25 FTE faculty (2 full-time, one .75 FTE, and one .5 FTE); adjunct instructors are drawn from across the University and from the community. Faculty possess doctoral degrees in leadership or in an appropriate and related discipline. Faculty are active in presenting papers and are frequently invited to engage in corporate leadership development. Faculty members are actively involved in Gonzaga faculty assembly efforts, provide leadership development for other department and schools, and offer consulting and facilitation to non-profit community groups. One faculty member serves as a state senator and has chaired the Ways and Means committee of the Senate and is currently the Minority Leader. Vitae and summary tables of faculty scholarship and service activities are available in the Team Room. (See Exhibit 2.35)

Evaluation of the quality of the teaching and advising in the department is an ongoing process, which is dictated by the Faculty Handbook and the School of Professional Studies policy for evaluating faculty for rank and tenure. This process offers faculty the adequate support and resources needed to maintain the high quality of teaching maintained in the department.

The Department of Organizational Leadership is proud of the exceptional quality of teaching that is offered. Each student is assigned to a faculty advisor. Additionally, the faculty of the department meets with each student prior to admission to the program. The department chairperson regularly reviews all student evaluations. Scores are consistently in the six and seven range for all faculty. Program reputation is central to recruitment.

Facilities
Faculty offices and classroom space are located in the Schoenberg Center. Both are adequate. Faculty have upgraded computers and ready access to copy and fax equipment. Classroom space and technology supports are good. Three rooms are multimedia-equipped, including one room with compressed video technology to support distance learning. The building offers a kitchen lounge on the ground floor and the lobby is an open area for students.

The department is allotted approximately $1000 per year to expand library holdings in leadership and related areas. Individual faculty can forward their requests during the fall semester to the library liaison, who submits the requests to the library. The collection of journal publications and other leadership related materials are adequate. Students also access on-line databases to expand what is available locally.

**Significant Changes**

Numerous requests for leadership development from the local business community lead to the design and implementation of the Renaissance Center for Leadership in 1999. The Center exists to 1) meet learning and networking needs identified by CEO’s in Spokane and 2) meet corporate leadership development needs identified by businesses. A listing a specific offerings that have been provided by the Center is available. (See Exhibit 2.34.) Renaissance Center offerings are closely coordinated with the Department of CE.

In spring semester 2002, Gonzaga University (for the first time) admitted undergraduate students to a formal, for-credit academic leadership program. The Comprehensive Leadership Program (CLP) is not constructed as a major or minor; rather, it is intended to complement students’ existing academic goals. The CLP consists of a set of 6 academic courses (8 credits) and a series of co-curricular leadership opportunities, activities, and experiences. The courses and activities are organized around three distinct themes or phases: leadership in the context of self-identity, relational leadership, and leadership in action. Participation in the CLP is limited to 30 students per academic year; admission is gained through a formal application process. Students may either request an application or be nominated to receive one by any faculty, staff, or administrator of the University. Upon completion of their undergraduate degree, students who complete the CLP receive a certificate of program completion, a transcript indicating the work completed under the CLP, and notation on their official University transcript.

During spring 2003 and fall 2004, a proposal to implement a new Master of Arts in Communication and Leadership was approved by the Graduate Council, Academic Vice President, and Board of Trustees. The substantive change request was approved by Northwest Commission. The program will be implemented in fall, 2004. The program proposal is viewed as a model by other Jesuit institutions and the program will be a significant step in growing high quality graduate and leadership programs to meet student and community needs.

Following approval from Gonzaga University and acceptance of the substantive change proposal by Northwest Commission (December, 2003) the Organizational Leadership program began offering 30 credit hours of the required 33 credit hours required for the Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership on January 12, 2004. To ensure success with on-line delivery the University has contracted with Collegis to provide marketing and help desk support. A grant was
secured from JesuitNet to support production and development of the first twelve credits. This course development model will continue with the remaining credits. The first two courses are ORGL 500 (Organizational Leadership) and ORGL 503 (Organizational Ethics) and have 8 students and 13 students enrolled respectively. On March 8th the next two courses will begin, ORGL 506 (Leadership and Diversity) and ORGL 530 (Servant Leadership). Additional new students are already enrolling for the sessions that begin in March and in summer 2004.

Online library resources are adequate and are available to all enrolled students through Gonzaga University’s Foley Center web site located at http://www.gonzaga.edu/Academics/Libraries/ and special assistance is available from Gonzaga University’s Distance Education Librarian (800-498-5941). Current and future students have adequate online technical support both from the regular University "help desk" (800-498-5941 x5550) and through a special 24/7 help desk (866-748-1155). The 24/7 help desk is made possible through a contract with Collegis.

All faculty currently teaching the online courses have received training in electronic course development and delivery through a comprehensive CADE course offered through JesuitNET. The course was developed by instructional design experts. Faculty for future course offerings will also complete the CADE course before teaching online. Additionally, most of the faculty who teach in the program have also completed the year long ‘Go the Distance’ teaching with technology faculty development program offered through an internal grant at Gonzaga. Faculty are paid a stipend for participation in these faculty development offerings.

As with the on-campus offering, all applicants have access to adequate student services on-line. These services include library, financial aid information, academic advising, application assistance, bookstore access, and on-line registration.

Student outcome measures are in place for the program and include, retention rates, graduation rates, GPA, exit interviews during the final course, and a post graduation survey will be implemented. Because there is one MA Organizational Leadership program that is offered via two delivery formats, both delivery formats have same program outcome objectives. In addition, each on-line course has an assessment plan developed during the CADE JesuitNET training that is based on evidence which shows mastery of stated competencies.

Gonzaga University is presently developing an intellectual property policy through a committee that includes faculty and the University Counsel. While the policy is being developed, the following guidelines have been accepted by the faculty teaching in this program: Faculty are paid a stipend for the development of the on-line course; faculty are paid for the delivery of the course; one faculty member may develop the course and then mentor another qualified faculty member to teach the course. The faculty member teaching the course is paid to teach the course. In the interim of policy development, faculty has agreed that the course belongs to the University. The University Corporation Counsel has been asked to chair the development of a University wide policy and is in the process of beginning that work.

Student satisfaction with the program is monitored through unsolicited informal comments about the first few weeks of the online courses. Comments have been very favorable. A formal,
detailed survey of student satisfaction with the program and with the online delivery format is planned at the end of each session (available in the Team room). Findings will inform future program and delivery revisions. Additionally, each time a student utilizes the 24/7 help desk a quality evaluation is sent on-line to the student immediately after the call. Analysis of this evaluation will be shared intermittently with the program.

At the very preliminary stages of discussion are possible program expansions in the areas of human resources, civic/public leadership, and organizational development. Faculty believe that these areas would meet identified student needs. Finally, the department, in partnership with Continuing Education, has been active in exploring non-credit leadership training needs of the corporate sector.

Outcomes Assessment

The Department monitors achievement of these goals through a variety of means that are conducted on a regular and simultaneous basis. These include:

- Survey and student interviews. These take place in ORGL 680: Leadership Seminar, which is the capstone experience of the masters program. (See Exhibit 2.20.)
- Input from the Advisory Board for Department of Organizational Leadership. This group of over twenty business/community leaders meets three times a year to provide input, feedback and reaction to department curriculum, marketing and other program issues. The board connects the program to the regional community. (See Exhibit 2.36.)

Program growth provides evidence of meeting continued needs. Program enrollment since 1998 is detailed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Credit Load</th>
<th>Increase A</th>
<th>Increase B</th>
<th>Increase C</th>
<th>Increase D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21.35%</td>
<td>21.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-1.07%</td>
<td>-1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-10.20%</td>
<td>-12.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>20.97%</td>
<td>27.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>5.83%</td>
<td>9.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-20.11%</td>
<td>-20.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>105.04%</td>
<td>83.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase A refers to credit load increase over the previous semester.
Increase B refers to credit load increase since Fall of 1998.
Increase C refers to percentage increase over the previous semester.
Increase D refers to percentage increase since Fall of 1998.
8.82% growth each year over the past five years

Analysis and Appraisal

In general, adequate support is provided for achievement of departmental and faculty needs. When additional resources are required, the department chairperson and the Dean of the School of Professional Studies work collaboratively to acquire the necessary support.

Major program weaknesses are the scope of responsibility around program growth and connecting the program to organizations in the community. These connections are critical to maintaining a cutting-edge curriculum and attracting students. Because of the many demands placed on the two full-time faculty – i.e., teaching and advising in a moderately-sized program; an off-campus distance education program in Boise, Idaho; numerous community-based offerings in leadership; undergraduate initiatives in leadership; and providing consultation and facilitation as mentioned above – there is difficulty maintaining an active professional development and scholarship focus.

It is becoming a challenge to continue to offer a high-quality graduate program with only 2.5 FTE faculty. With increased enrollment, there is a need for improved resources. In order for the number of full-time faculty to increase, enrollment numbers must continue to grow. To accomplish this, more resources must be made available for program marketing, as well as for auxiliary programs that provide outreach into the community and can generate increased department revenue.

Department of Nursing

Purpose and Outcomes

In Academic Year 2001-2002, the Department of Nursing engaged in discussions regarding its mission, philosophy, and desired program outcomes. The Faculty identified the Department’s mission as follows:

The specific mission of the Department of Nursing is to offer a liberal, humanistic, and professional education that prepares nurses to meet the challenges of today’s health care system and society.

This same year, the Department confirmed the following program goals:

Registered nurses who have earned the Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree through Gonzaga University are able to:
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- Use knowledge derived from theory and current research from nursing and other disciplines to guide nursing practice.

- Develop and/or provide humanistic and holistic plans of nursing care for individuals, groups, communities, and populations.

- Incorporate professional and Jesuit values, with an appreciation for human diversity, and ethical, spiritual, political, financial, and legal considerations into nursing practice.

- Enhance the quality of nursing and health care delivery within diverse practice settings through the use of leadership skills and knowledge systems.

- Assume responsibility and accountability for evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of nursing practice.

- Advance the profession of nursing through a commitment to lifelong learning and participation in professional and political activities.

- Promote the well-being of people in a changing society by collaborating with other health care providers and members of the general public.

Registered nurses who have earned an Integrated BSN/MSN degree, a Master of Science in Nursing degree or a Post-Master’s Certificate in nursing through Gonzaga University are able to:

- Critically examine and deliberatively incorporate theories, advanced knowledge and current research findings from nursing and other disciplines to advance nursing practice.

- Deliberatively incorporate and model professional and Jesuit values, with an appreciation for human diversity, and ethical, spiritual, political, financial, and legal considerations into advanced nursing practice.

- Develop and articulate a personal model of advanced nursing practice.

- Conduct research studies in nursing, health, and health care delivery.

- Develop, direct, and/or implement individualized, humanistic and holistic plans of health care in collaboration with individuals, groups, communities and populations.

- Influence nursing practice and the delivery of health care in diverse settings.

- Advance the profession of nursing by assuming leadership roles and responsibilities in the delivery of health care.

- Improve the delivery of nursing and health care by influencing social and health policy.
The mission and program objectives of the Department of Nursing are congruent with the Mission of the University. The nursing programs particularly exemplify the following values and expectations articulated in the University’s Mission statement:

- effective writing and speaking.
- integration of liberal humanistic learning and skills with a specialized competence.
- leadership in...the professions, business, and public service.
- certain personal qualities: self-knowledge, self-acceptance, a restless curiosity, a desire for truth, a mature concern for others, and a thirst for justice.
- supporting the aspirations of others by a generous sharing of gifts.

Description of Department and Programs

The Department of Nursing offers programs designed to meet the needs of undergraduate and graduate students who are seeking to expand their knowledge of the nursing profession and their nursing practice. Students in the Department’s programs prepare at the undergraduate or graduate level to practice with diverse populations in a variety of settings. Pre-nursing students take advantage of academic advising and pre-nursing courses through the Department before pursuing a bachelor’s degree in nursing at a partner university (see Undergraduate Catalogue, pp 161-162; partnership agreement with the Intercollegiate College of Nursing, (ICN) and Seattle University are available for review in the Team Room). (See Exhibit 2.34.) Registered nurses can obtain the Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree by pursuing a program of study that provides a solid generalist education while encouraging application of concepts and processes in areas of specific and individual interest. (See Undergraduate Catalogue, p. 163).

The RN-to-MSN program allows RNs who have been prepared in diploma or associate degree programs to obtain the MSN degree in a streamlined manner. (See Undergraduate Catalogue, pp 163-165). Graduate students can earn the Master of Science in Nursing degree or a Post-Master’s Certificate in Nursing, both of which emphasize advanced nursing roles in a variety of specialty areas. (See Graduate Catalogue, pp 62-64).

The Department’s programs for registered nurses are offered in both on-campus and distance learning formats. Both formats are designed to accommodate working adult learners who have multiple competing responsibilities. On-campus or local students benefit from block scheduling. Classes meet once weekly and are scheduled so that students need to attend class only one day per week. The distance delivery format involves a variety of strategies, including DVDs or videotapes of current class sessions, web-based course support and learning activities, periodic scheduled on-campus visits, and supervised clinical experiences arranged in a student’s home community. The Department’s programs are known throughout the region for their quality, flexibility, and innovativeness.

The majority of students are female; the student body tends to be about 10% male. The average age is about 40. Most students have responsibilities caring for children and/or aging parents. Most semesters, the student body represents 7-8 different states. Students tend to pay for their
education with federally-insured or private loans. Some students receive tuition assistance from their place of employment and each year the Department is able to award Federal Nurse Traineeships and graduate assistantships to a limited number of students.

The Department of Nursing and the Dean of the School of Professional Studies continue to explore with the University where the University’s program to prepare nurse anesthetists (CRNAs) should be housed. Currently this program is located in the Department of Leadership and Administration in the School of Education. Washington State Law relating to Nursing Care and Regulation of Health Professions—Uniform disciplinary Act states, however, The college or university graduate education program which prepares the registered nurse for eventual licensure as an ARNP [CRNAs are ARNPs in Washington State] shall have as its primary purpose the preparation of advanced practice nurses(d) After January 1995, content that culminates in a graduate degree with a concentration in advanced nursing practice.” (WAC 246-840-305) With this mind, it may become essential to locate the CRNA program within the Department of Nursing so that graduates are assured of their eligibility for advanced licensure in Washington State.

Faculty

The Department has six full-time faculty (5.0 FTE since the Department Chairperson’s is 50% administrative and another faculty member holds a .5 FTE position as Associate Dean), six continuing contract part-time faculty (2.25 FTE), and five adjunct faculty (1.0 FTE). There are currently two vacant faculty positions. Three full-time faculty are doctorally-prepared and three are enrolled in doctoral studies. All faculty have a master’s degree in nursing and 11 hold current nurse practitioner licensure. The Dean of the School holds a Master’s degree in Nursing and RN license.

In aggregate, the faculty of the Department of Nursing has the academic and experiential qualifications necessary for the delivery of its current programs. Faculty vitae and a summary of faculty qualifications are available for review in the Team Room. (See Exhibit 2.35.) Faculty are also strong in terms of experiential qualifications and in terms of involvement in professional development and scholarly activities that serve to enhance their teaching effectiveness. (See Exhibit 2.35.)

The Department also has 3.0 FTE support staff: one full-time and two part-time Program Assistants and a half-time Community Liaison. Faculty in the Department of Nursing are evaluated in accordance with processes outlined in the University’s Faculty Handbook. The Department Chairperson appoints a reappointment committee to conduct annual performance reviews of non-tenure track faculty. The Department Chairperson conducts an independent review of each faculty member’s performance. Faculty are generally satisfied with these reappointment procedures and feel they provide helpful feedback.

Faculty have an exceptionally high level of commitment to the Department, its programs, and its students. A threat, however, to faculty commitment, morale, and program quality is faculty workloads. In other words, faculty resources (i.e., budgeted positions) are deemed barely sufficient. The standard faculty workload is twelve credits, which typically translates to two
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theory courses plus a clinical section and a seminar class each semester. Thesis advising is not “counted” in workload. The range of thesis advisees per semester is from two to fifteen. This workload, while the norm for undergraduate faculty at Gonzaga, is not the norm for faculty with graduate teaching responsibilities in other nursing programs and makes it difficult to recruit, attract, and retain qualified faculty for vacant positions. Each semester for the past three years, one or more departmental faculty have carried a teaching overload. This is compensated either by a lighter load for the other semester of the academic year or by overload pay. (See Exhibit 2.39)

Facilities

The Department of Nursing is located in the lower level of Schoenberg Center on the western edge of the Gonzaga campus. The Department’s facilities include private offices for each full-time faculty member and support staff, one classroom, one seminar room, a small learning resource lab, a workroom, a videotape library/shipping room, and storage areas. All full-time faculty and staff are provided with a computer and adequate software and network connections. Faculty receive support from Informational Technology Services to equip their computers for video-streaming and the development and delivery of on-line courses.

Most of the Department’s classes are held in the television classroom in Herak Center. The Department also has access to a multi-media classroom on the second floor of Schoenberg Center. Additionally, the Department has contracts with approximately 200 different clinical agencies where students engage in practicum experiences. Facilities are in good condition and equipped in such a way to support delivery of the nursing programs. Size and numbers of classrooms and office rooms, however, pose barriers to program growth. Specifically,

- while all full-time faculty have a private office, two part-time faculty share an office in a hallway that is removed from other faculty office space. If the Department’s two faculty vacancies are filled, a seminar room will likely need to be converted into shared office space;
- Schoenberg Center is scheduled for use by other departments on campus, there is often a shortage of rooms for nursing classes during the weeks that distance learners are on campus; and
- the television classroom (Herak 106) comfortably accommodates only 20-22 students.

Library Resources

Library holdings in Foley Center are appropriate in number and content to support the current nursing programs. In-house holdings are augmented by holdings at other regional institutions that are available through consortium agreements and interlibrary loan arrangements. Most students in the nursing programs also have access to library facilities at educational or health care institutions in their home community. One librarian position at Foley Center is specifically devoted to providing services to distance learners. Department of Nursing Graduate Survey data have indicated a consistent high level of satisfaction with library services and accessibility to library resources at Foley Center. The nursing library budget has been impacted by increased
costs resulting from increased access to full-text versions of current journal articles through various Internet servers.

Other Student Resources

The Department of Nursing’s students use other University services and resources (e.g., Martin Center, food services, etc.) on a very limited basis. Access to the Bookstore, Registrar’s Office, Student Accounts, and Financial Aid via the University’s web page facilitates needed use of these services.

Fiscal Resources

The Department Chairperson, in conjunction with the faculty, monitors adequacy of resource allocation on an ongoing basis. These discussions are documented in minutes of departmental meetings. (See Exhibit 2.38.) In general, when a need is identified, the Chairperson attempts to cover the need through the Department’s budgetary resources. When needed, additional resources are solicited and usually secured from the Dean of the School of Professional Studies. Departmental resources are generally sufficient for achieving program goals, but both human and fiscal resources provide little margin for faculty development, aggressive marketing of programs, and release time to pursue new program initiatives.

Significant Changes

The Department of Nursing’s programs were accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education for the maximum period of 10 years in November 1999. The site visitors had several commendations but no recommendations for the programs. The next accreditation site visit will be November 2009.

Since Academic Year 1998-1999, pre-nursing credit generation has increased, BSN level credit generation has declined, and MSN level credit generation has initially increased and then declined. The number of applicants to the Department of Nursing’s programs has declined over the past five years. Data from the American Association of Colleges of Nursing indicate that this is consistent with national enrollment trends for RN to BSN and MSN programs. Although it has not been formally documented, the sense is that applicants’ GPAs have dropped some over this same period of time. Nonetheless, student quality is high. During the past five years, no more than five students have been unable to continue in one of the nursing programs because of unsatisfactory academic performance. Surveys of incoming students indicate a slight decline in the mean age (38.3) and years of experience as a registered nurse (17.2). Graduate survey responses indicate that graduates achieve advanced positions, are involved in community and professional activities, and pursue additional formal education. Reports from national certifying organizations indicate an 85-90% first time pass rate for graduates seeking national certification as a family nurse practitioner; the national average is 89%. (See Exhibit 2.32.)
The following table details enrollment and credit generation, excluding summer session, since 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Nursing</th>
<th>BSN-level</th>
<th>MSN-Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr. Head ct</td>
<td>Cr. Head ct</td>
<td>Cr. Head ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>387 39</td>
<td>1616 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>319 34</td>
<td>1692 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>178 8</td>
<td>1858 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>303 26</td>
<td>1415 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03 est</td>
<td>206 68</td>
<td>256 24</td>
<td>1490 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum

The major programs/curriculum changes that have occurred in the Department of Nursing since the last Northwest accreditation site visit include the following:

- development of pre-nursing and partnership with ICN and Seattle University for general BSN major;
- development and implementation of the integrated BSN/MSN program (now referred to as the RN-to-MSN program) for registered nurses;
- addition of the following new practice core options in the MSN program: Psychiatric-Mental Health Nurse Practitioner/Clinical Nurse Specialist, Nurse Educator, Nurse Administrator, and Physiological Clinical Nurse Specialist;
- revision of Leadership Core courses in the MSN program;
- revision of Family Nurse Practitioner Option in the MSN program to include separate and distinct 3-credit courses in Advanced Pathophysiology (NURS 523) and Advanced Pharmacology (NURS 524). Revision of Advanced Health Assessment (NURS 600) from 3 to 4 credits and addition of a 60-hour clinical component; and
- addition of presentation and research project options to fulfill the research requirement in the MSN program. These options were later discontinued and thesis requirement was re-instituted.

Outcomes Assessment

The Department of Nursing has a comprehensive plan for the systematic and ongoing review of its resources, policies, objectives, curriculum, and student performance/outcomes. (See Exhibit 2.23.) Minutes of departmental meetings provide evidence of implementation of this plan and use of evaluation data for program improvement. (See Exhibit 2.38.)

The Department monitors accomplishment of its objectives by collecting data from several sources, including program graduates. Graduate surveys are mailed each summer to BSN and
MSN program graduates of the previous 12 – 18 months. Data are compiled in the fall, distributed to faculty, discussed at a departmental meeting, and used to inform curricular and policy decisions. Survey data have consistently indicated a high level of perceived accomplishment of program objectives. (See Exhibit 2.28.) Representative findings for Graduate Surveys conducted over the past 5 years include:

- approximately 25% of respondents each year plan to pursue additional graduate nursing work in the future;
- approximately 75% of respondents each year are involved in community activities (political organizations, health related groups, community agency boards, church groups);
- nearly 20% of respondents report being involved in research, having delivered a professional presentation, or having published in a professional journal;
- respondents rate the degree to which the program helped them acquire or strengthen communication skills, critical thinking skills, and therapeutic nursing intervention skills as overwhelmingly “good” to “excellent”;
- respondents believe they have “good” to “excellent” abilities to incorporate professional values and ethical/moral principles into practice, assume leadership responsibilities for advancing the nursing profession and influencing social and health policy, and use research and clinical competencies to influence nursing practice in diverse settings; and
- respondents rate the overall education they received at Gonzaga as “good” to “excellent;” the average final grade assigned to the program is “A.”

The Department also collects employment data from graduates of the most recent two years on a yearly basis. (See Exhibit 2.41.) The primary purpose of these data is to obtain “special consideration” for Federal Nurse Traineeship funds. These data show the following trends:

- graduates secure positions that provide advancement, increased recognition, increased salary, new experience, and increased job satisfaction; these new positions are overwhelmingly congruent with respondents’ goals in nursing; and
- each year, nearly two-thirds of respondents report working in a setting that receives some sort of federal designation for providing services to underserved populations.

Teaching effectiveness is monitored through the standardized University forms that are administered at the end of each course and reviewed by the faculty member, Chairperson, Dean, and Reappointment Committee. (See Exhibit 2.17.) Effectiveness is also evaluated through course specific evaluations developed by each faculty member for his or her own courses and peer review of teaching. Faculty in the Department of Nursing demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness, with median ratings of 6.0 – 7.0 (on a 7 point scale) across all courses and all faculty. As another indication of teaching effectiveness in the Department of Nursing, one professor has received the University’s Award for Excellence in Teaching in both 1996 and 2002. Finally, responses to selected items on the Graduate Survey also provide evidence of perceptions of teaching effectiveness:

- respondents describe faculty feedback timely and helpful “to a great extent;”
course assignments, activities, and readings are meaningful and helpful “to a great extent;” and
• faculty are perceived as being fair in their evaluations of students.

Advising effectiveness in the Department of Nursing is monitored through formal evaluations that are mailed to students and through anecdotal comments. All evidence points to a high level of student satisfaction with this important faculty role. Selected items on the Graduate Survey also solicit perceptions of advising effectiveness. Responses over time to these items indicate:

• faculty are accessible “to a great extent” to answer students’ questions;
• faculty support students’ program completion “to a great extent;”
• faculty are considered a best feature of the nursing program; and
• faculty are perceived as treating students with respect.

The Department of Nursing recognizes that evaluation data are meaningless unless they are used to inform program decisions. Following are examples of how evaluation data from graduate surveys and other assessment processes have resulted in program changes over the past 5 years:

• leveling off of interest in the MSN program’s Family Nurse Practitioner option and awareness of competition and market forces triggered the development of additional program options (i.e., Nurse Educator, Nursing Administration, Psychiatric-Mental Health Nursing, and Physiological Nursing);
• changes in eligibility requirements for state licensure and national certification examination, as well as student feedback, led to a change in the structuring of the advanced pathophysiology and pharmacology content;
• observations of student readiness for their first clinical course in the FNP option resulted in the addition of a clinical component to the advanced health assessment course; and
• declining enrollment in the RN-to-MSN program has prompted faculty to change program delivery format for this program. As of Fall 2003, BSN-level courses are not videotaped on a weekly basis. Instead, they are taught as web-based courses or in a workshop format that meets three times over the course of the semester.

Analysis and Appraisal

The Department of Nursing takes pride in the quality of its programs and the accomplishments of its graduates. The Department believes it is responsive to student feedback, social/market forces, and professional trends. Curricular changes that were described earlier in this report and continued exploration/discussion of the best ways to deliver its programs provide evidence of this responsiveness.

The two factors that currently are of greatest concern to the Department are declining enrollments and tight faculty and space resources. These factors are, interrelated: Declining enrollments mean less revenue, which makes it difficult to argue for more resources. The Department continues to respond to its enrollment problems by reviewing and refining its
marketing and recruiting plans. Curriculum changes, development of new areas of specialization, and continued discussion of program delivery format (including on-line delivery of selected courses) are other strategies being used to bolster enrollment. Resource constraints are addressed through creative use of faculty time and talents and creative use of physical space. To date, these constraints have not compromised program quality.

**Summer Sessions**

The purpose of Summer Sessions is to administer comprehensive course offerings to meet the diverse needs of Gonzaga’s students during the summer. As such, the mission and program objectives of Summer Session are congruent with the Mission of the University. Course offerings include undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and continuing education credit options. An increasing number of summer courses are being taught on-line or in innovative scheduling formats such as intensives and workshops. The Summer Sessions Coordinator is responsible for coordination of the summer session offerings, except those offered by the School of Education, School of Law, and Studies Abroad. This half-time position is housed with the School of Professional Studies.

Summer session students include Gonzaga undergraduate and graduate students, as well as students who are attending other universities during the academic year. Admission to or attendance at a summer session neither presupposes nor implies acceptance into a degree program at the University. However, students who wish to attend a graduate-level summer session need permission from the appropriate department chairperson to do so if they have not been accepted into a degree program at Gonzaga. A summary of summer session enrollment patterns and course offerings is available in the Team Room. (See Exhibits 2.40.)

**Faculty**

Most summer session courses are taught by full-time Gonzaga faculty or adjunct faculty who are also employed by the University during the academic year. Summer Sessions does not hire adjunct faculty for any department without prior approval from that department. A listing of faculty who have taught summer courses for the past several years is available. Faculty are subject to their department and university standards for teaching and outcomes. Evaluation of the quality of the teaching and advising in the department is dictated by the *Faculty Handbook*. All on-line courses are evaluated using the on-line faculty evaluation tool. (See Exhibits 2.35.)

**Facilities**

Summer session courses are taught in regular University classrooms. The Coordinator’s office is located in Schoenberg Center and is equipped with computer, printer, telephone, and easy access to fax and copy machines. Work study students provide assistance to the coordinator.

**Significant Changes**

- A new faculty pay model was developed in 2000; a description of this model is available for review in the Team Room. (See Exhibits 2.31) Faculty response to this model was initially negative, but an evaluation done after the first summer found the concerns that
faculty held did not materialize. (See Exhibits 2.32) The majority of faculty were very positive about the new model after they experienced it. As a result of implementing this model, summer courses have seen an increase in student enrollment, which helps to insure that needed courses will be offered. The new model provides incentives for faculty who choose different enrollment models. A survey of faculty satisfaction with this model was conducted in Fall 2003; (survey results are available for review in the Team Room and on the website) and findings were very positive.

- Summer session initiated a summer experience in Florence, Italy for graduate students in Summer 2003. A course in Leadership Studies was offered during the inaugural session. Fifteen students participated. Two courses will be offered during Summer 2004, and a third course will be offered during Summer 2005. Each course involves 2 weeks of intensive class sessions held at Gonzaga’s Florence campus. Pre- and post-Florence discussion forums and class activities are conducted using the Blackboard Course Management System. Logistics are coordinated with the Florence Gonzaga office.

**Outcomes Assessment**

Outcome measures utilized by Summer Session include feedback from faculty and students including a survey of all summer sessions’ students. (See Exhibits 2.32) A staff person distributes the survey in each class, resulting in a 100% return rate. The results of the survey are shared with the Dean of the School of Professional Studies. Survey results are used to improve quality of services, curricular offerings, and marketing strategies for the following summer. During Fall 2003, Summer Session conducted a survey of faculty to determine their satisfaction with teaching during summer. Summer Sessions is accomplishing its purpose, as demonstrated by the increase of courses number of students, credit generation, and budget and by its contribution to the attainment of university-wide fiscal and curricular goals.

As a means of ongoing quality assurance, Summer Sessions plans the following:

- the organizational structure for Summer Sessions will be assessed during the 2003-2004 year to determine if a new organizational model would better serve the University; and
- the new pay model, which has been in place for four years will be formally evaluated in Fall 2003.

**Analysis and Appraisal**

Summer sessions reflects the following strengths:

- Summer Sessions serves a special need to the University and its students.
- The Summer Sessions office promotes the interdisciplinary nature of summer coursework and recognizes the need for positive relationships among faculty, staff and departments. The model encourages new opportunities for course delivery that may not be available during the regular academic year due to scheduling constraints and provides a venue for experimental design.
In spite of strengths, Summer Sessions face a number of continuing challenges:

- Tuition cost is a primary obstacle for Summer Session attendance. Students do not have access to financial aid in the summer. Summer undergraduate tuition is offered at a discount, but remains high compared to summer sessions offered by state and community colleges in the area;
- While the majority of faculty are pleased with the pay model, some faculty are opposed.
- The summer marketing plan seeks to reach current and prospective students and to enroll students who do not attend Gonzaga during the regular academic year (e.g., students who return home to Spokane from other universities). Minimal success has been achieved in enrolling high quality students who are not otherwise attending or planning to attend Gonzaga.
- A new organizational structure for Summer Session is currently being explored. Some of the academic deans have expressed a desire to have Summer Session decentralized to ensure each School has more control over its offerings. A centralized model for all summer offerings is also being explored.

Department of Continuing Education

Purposes and Outcomes

The Continuing Education Department strives to provide dynamic, high-quality learning opportunities that create pathways for enlightenment of the mind and spirit, and celebrate personal development. These principles are consistent with the University mission to seek understanding of the world and provide for human creativity and intelligence. The Department of Continuing Education has the following specific goals:

- provide unique, non-credit programs that benefit the regional community and could be offered nationally to serve alumni and constituents;
- identify opportunities to provide offerings for individual professional development and corporate training;
- develop strategies for reaching new audiences in the region;
- capitalize on the interests of faculty to reach beyond their classroom teaching to positively impact the regional community;
- become nationally recognized for continuing education in the field of ethics; and
- contribute financially to the University within three years.

Description of the Department

Continuing Education is housed in the School of Professional Studies and has its offices in Schoenberg Center. This proximity to the Dean of the School of Professional Studies assists with initiating and fostering relationships throughout the University for delivering programs in other content areas for specialized audiences. Current major endeavors of the Department of Continuing Education are listed below. (See Exhibit 2.42.)
• Ethics and Social Responsibility in Engineering and Technology. This annual conference targets engineering professionals and academicians and served about 50 regional attendees in 2001 and 2002 at The Coeur d’Alene Resort. The 2003 event was hosted by Gonzaga University in New Orleans, with significant contributions by Louisiana State University, and served approximately 200 participants. Primary personnel and operational resources are provided by Gonzaga.

• Cataldo Language Institute. This is a summer intensive course that focuses on Latin, Greek, or Hebrew and is offered in conjunction with faculty from Philosophy and Religious Studies who have expertise in these languages.

• Ethics for CPAs in Washington. This is a non-credit workshop course valued at four Continuing Professional Education credits by the Washington State Board of Accountancy and taught by Gonzaga faculty, Dr. Kay Carnes. The offering was designed to serve regional participants with two live seminar offerings and international constituents with an on-line offering. Both versions have been well-received, with the on-line version exceeding initial enrollment expectations. Dr. Carnes is committed to offering the workshops twice annually, and providing the on-line course continually with semi-annual updates as needed. This offering is being used as a pilot for partnering with other faculty for on-line offerings targeting any profession and content.

• Presidential Leadership Institute. This day-long seminar for business executives focuses on ethical decision-making. It is hosted and keynoted by the University President. The pilot event was held in Seattle, April 2003. It is anticipated that this event will be repeated for each of the next three years in areas where the University has a significant constituency/presence.

• Non-Profit Leadership. A partnership with community agencies over the past two years led to the design of a program targeting board members for non-profit organizations or potential board members. Eight morning sessions on topics identified as important for board members are offered over the course of a semester. These are taught by credible individuals in the community and are complimented by on-line discussions between participants and the instructor.

• Work closely with the Renaissance Center for Leadership

Resources

The Department of Continuing Education (CE) has an office suite on the first floor of Schoenberg Center. In addition to the Director, the Department is staffed by a .5 FTE secretary. Additional assistance is provided by work-study students and graduate assistants.

Significant Changes

There were no significant recommendations for the Department of Continuing Education in the 1994 and 1999 NWCCU reports. Significant changes in the Department for the past 5 years are summarized below.
In 1998, CE was initiated as a formal department and housed in the Graduate School in an attempt to identify and offer community-based non-credit activities and seed the ground for revenue potential.

In January, 2002, the Dean of the Graduate School retired and the department transitioned to the School of Professional Studies. The initial months were focused on carrying out current program commitments and making linkages with the Spokane community.

In April 2002, a new Director was hired with the intent to streamline departmental operations, analyze offerings for growth potential, and establish a fit within the School of Professional Studies in order to maximize community relationships. New relationships have been formalized with the Registrar and the Controller to create efficient registration, records, and budget processes. Year 2000 and 2001 program offerings were analyzed for appropriate placement in the University, and fiscal soundness. The Director became a member of the International Association of Continuing Education and Training (IACET) and established a process for reviewing and providing programs, even if not being valued with Continuing Education Credit.

Current energies are focused on developing a business plan for Continuing Education in order to become a financial contributor to the University. The plan will include identifying resource needs for success, and establishing performance, productivity, and efficiency outcomes.

Analysis and Appraisal

The Department of Continuing Education (CE) has lived a sporadic life at the University for over 20 years; being sparked over time by interests of various administrators and faculty in particular areas for narrow target audiences. Non-credit offerings continue to be provided by several individual departments, based on the interest of a faculty or dean to serve a particular constituency. Significant changes will likely be affected by the Department’s ability to:

- foster understanding of the educational value of non-credit activities and systematizing the administration of offerings for the entire university;
- obtain resources to complete a business plan and for establishing a significant presence in the regional marketplace;
- expand current networks for identifying potential offerings;
- capitalize on the interest of University faculty to provide CE offerings;
- successfully evaluate market potential of program ideas;
- obtain increased staff support for market research, sales activity and event management; and
- partner with University Relations to provide offerings to alumni constituencies by region in conjunction with capital campaign efforts.

Distance Learning
Purpose and Outcomes

Distance learning is congruent with the University mission and Ignatian and Jesuit values. Just as St. Ignatius of Loyola sent the founding Jesuits out to many lands, distance learning takes Gonzaga out to students and communities who would not otherwise have access to its programs and courses.

Program Description

At Gonzaga University, distance learning is defined as learning that occurs in a format whereby the majority of instruction is other than face to face. Technological tools to support distance learning include on-line, compressed video, CD/DVD and video tape (VHS). Prior to the on-line initiative, the Department of Nursing led the way with technology-based distance delivery, utilizing VHS tapes. Since 1998, compressed video and on-line delivery options have been added as University-wide delivery strategies. Additionally, distributive learning occurs in many courses with utilization of Blackboard Course Management System to support learning between classes. The Dean of the School of Professional Studies facilitates much of the on-line initiative that is led by an interdisciplinary group of faculty and Instructional Technology staff.

Programs offered via distance include Nursing (both BSN and MSN by DVD and VHS), Organizational Leadership (MA by compressed video and on-line), and Business (VHS). On-line offerings are primarily discreet courses that are offered during the summer session. The decision to utilize summer for on-line undergraduate courses was made in respect of the University commitment to provide formation experiences for undergraduates that occur as part of the academic year on-campus experience. During the summer, however, many students leave Spokane to go home and many who stay have work commitments. The on-line initiative has allowed students to continue their Gonzaga coursework regardless of competing life commitments. With the exception of the BSN program for RNs, degree programs offered via distance are all at the graduate level and utilize a blended approach of some time on-campus and distance delivery.

Policies for distance students are the same as on-campus students. Distance students are provided information and access related to admissions, financial aid, academic advising, delivery of course materials, and have equal access to clinical and internship opportunities.

Facilities

The facilities used by the Departments of Nursing and Organizational Leadership for the distance delivery of their respective programs are described in the departmental sections of the self study report. (See Exhibit 2.25.)

The University has invested in a quality compressed video room in Schoenberg Center for delivery of compressed video courses. At the delivery site, contracts have been established with a college or with a business for use of a compressed video classroom. Faculty deliver course content from the distant site at least twice per semester. Instructional Technology staff is knowledgeable and supportive of compressed video delivery. As bandwidth availability improves
at the students’ locations, reliance on compressed video will decrease and on-line delivery will increase. All distance programs ensure that enrolled students will be allowed to complete the program of study should the program need to close or move to another location.

**Significant Changes**

In 1998, further development of distance learning was identified as a goal in the President’s multi-year plan. In 1999, the Early Innovators group was formed. Faculty and staff interested in distance and on-line learning were invited to participate. This interdisciplinary group of faculty and staff meets two to three times per year to learn together about best practices and also to identify challenges of distance learning. An Early Innovator’s listserv helps to provide a forum for announcements, information, and learning.

In 2000, the President allocated a fund to support new initiatives. A process was established to apply for funding and the “Go the Distance” faculty development venture has been funded for the past three years. (See Exhibit 2.15.) This faculty development program helps to ensure the entry-level quality of on-line courses. Three to four faculty serve as facilitators of learning for ten faculty members. The year-long program teaches faculty to design and implement quality on-line courses. Faculty and facilitators receive a stipend for their work. Each spring, a showcasing of select courses is offered to the University community. The University appointed a Chief Information Officer in 2002. This position is essential to the ongoing budgetary and fiscal commitments needed for distance delivery.

The Intellectual Property Committee was organized by the Office of the Corporation Counsel. Each school of the University and administration named committee members whose focus is on the entire University for intellectual property assets covering trademark, patent and copyright. The Committee will propose steps to manage and utilize the assets for the academic and financial benefit of Gonzaga and its employees. The IT and library staff working with distance delivery help faculty to ensure copyright laws are enforced. A librarian is designated to support the distance learning initiative.

**Outcomes Assessment**

The distance delivery initiative employs outcome assessment strategies to ensure course quality. Students who enroll in distance and on-line courses meet the same performance requirements as on-campus students. Course objectives and learning projects are consistent with standards of on-site courses. Students enrolled in on-line courses also complete on-line evaluations of teaching effectiveness. Quality improvement efforts for on-line courses include: participation in the “Go the Distance” faculty development program and/or completion of the 12-week long, on-line JesuitNet Competency Assessment in Distance Education course; and a faculty luncheon each April to answer questions and share best practices; and showcase courses they have developed. Each fall, faculty who taught an on-line course in the summer are again invited to a luncheon to provide qualitative information related to the on-line teaching and learning experience and to
make recommendations for improving quality for the following summer. Beginning Summer 2003, end-of-course student evaluations will be done on-line and faculty will receive summary data exactly as they do for fall and spring courses. Outcome measures also include student retention in on-line courses, GPA, and quality of on-line student discussions as rated by faculty. (See Exhibit 2.32.) An interesting phenomenon is that on-line courses tend to be the first to fill when registration opens in the spring.

**Analysis and Appraisal**

On-line course popularity, technological advances, and market factors will drive the development of future distance delivery initiatives at the University.

**Summary of Program Changes in the School of Professional Studies since last NWCCU visit:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Studies</td>
<td>The degree offered by the Department of Doctoral Studies was changed from the EdD to the PhD, moved to Professional Studies in 2000</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Implemented the accelerated RN-to-MSN program</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>established a consortium agreement with the Intercollegiate College of Nursing to offer the BSN degree (for students who do not hold RN licensure)</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>Distance delivery to Lewiston, Boise (2002) and on-line program offered (2004)</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>signed a consortium agreement with Seattle University to offer the BSN degree (for students who do not hold RN licensure)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>The Bachelor of General Studies (Accelerated) program was begun</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>Department moved to School of Professional Studies, supports University wide CE</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Leadership</td>
<td>Undergraduate leadership curriculum</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>discontinued the BA degree in Exercise Science (2003); moved to professional Studies in 2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>School of Professional Studies assumes operational responsibilities of its graduate programs.</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Studies</th>
<th>Began a Certificate in Advanced Leadership Studies</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA Communication and Leadership</td>
<td>Full approval and NW substantive change approval</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Communication and Leadership</td>
<td>The Master of Arts in Communication and Leadership program will begin with its first students Fall 2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIAL PROGRAMS PROVIDING ACADEMIC CREDIT

A number of special programs have been developed by faculty and administration at Gonzaga University that not only provide academic credit in a variety of ways, but emerge from the Mission of the University and the needs of its students. These programs maintain appropriate academic standards and are provided the necessary resources to assume quality to enhance the nature of Gonzaga’s educational experience.

International Studies Program (ISP)/English Language Center (ELC)
(Raymond Fadeley, Director; James Hunter, Chair – ESL)

Mission

The mission of the English Language Center is to:

- Provide intensive English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction that offers non-native speakers the opportunity to acquire the communicative competence necessary to meet academic, professional, social, and personal goals.
- Serve as the program for satisfying the English proficiency requirements of all other departments of the university.
- Advance Gonzaga University’s reputation for academic excellence and its image as a multicultural learning community.
- Serve as a campus and community resource for information about intercultural communication and about the teaching and learning of ESL.
- Provide a model Intensive English Program (IEP) for Gonzaga University’s master’s degree program in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL).
- Provide instruction that will encourage students to gain understanding of American language and culture while encouraging them to participate actively in the learning process both in and out of the classroom.
- Encourage acceptance in the university community of each student as an individual with his or her own cultural and linguistic heritage.
- Support the profession of TESL and contribute to knowledge in the field.

To achieve this, the English Language Center will:

- employ qualified staff and faculty dedicated to fostering student learning and to building a quality ESL program, and support their professional development.
- regularly evaluate its curriculum, teaching materials, student programs, staff, and faculty, and assess and respond to student concerns in order to maintain the highest standards.
- use university and community resources to support services and facilities that enhance the learning and cultural experiences of ELC and TESL students.
- cultivate and maintain a workplace and classroom atmosphere that fosters collaboration, cultural awareness, understanding, and professionalism.
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- uphold the professional and ethical standards of Gonzaga University.
- maintain and develop strong links with Gonzaga University’s student, staff, and faculty bodies in order to promote Gonzaga’s multicultural mission.
- support the Mission Statement of Gonzaga University, especially that part of the Statement that reads:

  We also believe that a knowledge of traditions and cultures different from our own draws us closer to the human family of which we are a part, and makes us more aware of both the possibilities and limitations of our own heritage. Therefore, in addition to our primary focus on Western culture, we seek to provide for our student some opportunity to become familiar with a variety of other cultures.

Since 1978, the English Language Center has addressed this portion of the University’s Mission.

**Goals/Objectives**

Since 1978, the University’s English Language Center has addressed the needs of students whose native language is not English. In that time, Gonzaga ELC has served nearly 3000 students from other countries, introducing them to higher education in the United States, and providing Gonzaga’s American students with the opportunity to meet, live with and exchange ideas with the young people from over seventy nations who have made up the ELC student population.

The primary purpose of the Center is to allow students to:

- Acquire specific communication skills in English, which will enable them to function successfully in American colleges and universities.
- Acquire the ability to use English holistically for normal life purposes in a variety of purposeful communicativeinterchanges. They will master the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and will be able to apply these skills in situations ranging from the social to the professional.

**Description of the Center**

Instructional policies and program guidelines of the ELC are in accordance with the Commission on Accreditation of Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), which approved Gonzaga ELC accreditation in September, 2002. The ELC offers year-round intensive classes in eight levels of instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL). These courses are designed to meet the needs of foreign students seeking undergraduate and graduate admission to Gonzaga, as well as to assist international professionals in improving their English language abilities. In addition to the academic ESL Program, the ELC offers special short-term language programs for contracted groups of students and foreign visitors during the spring and summer sessions.
The average student enrollment in the ESL Program is 25-30 students per term. Special program populations vary from 15 to 30 students per summer. Geographic representation varies, with the largest groups historically coming from Japan, China, Taiwan, Korea, and Mexico. Approximately half of the students enrolled in ESL classes go on to matriculate at Gonzaga and other institutions of higher learning in the United States. The remainder return to their home countries to continue their education or seek professional employment.

Starting in 1997, the ELC has operated a Master’s degree program in teaching English as a Second Language (MATESL). The current full-time ESL faculty teaches regularly in this program, whose student audience is largely American professionals and apprentice teachers, with a small but significant non-native English speaking enrollment.

**Faculty Organizational Structure**

The ESL Program has a full-time faculty of six, including three assistant professors and three instructors. Adjunct faculty are contracted on a semester-need basis.

The English Language Center has a full-time Program Assistant, who has responsibilities in the areas of orientation, marketing, scheduling, and logistical support. The four members of the International Student Program Office staff also provide support for the ELC.

Full-time ELC faculty teach an average of fifteen hours per week, are assigned as advisors to a proportion of the students enrolled, and are responsible for maintaining a minimum of five regular office hours per week. Other full-time faculty responsibilities include attendance at faculty meetings and service on various department and University committees as required. (See Exhibit 2.35 and 2.39.)

- Part-time adjunct faculty teach a maximum of ten hours per week and are assigned some students as designated advisees, depending on enrollment. They are also required to attend some faculty meetings, and invited to participate in others on a voluntary basis.
- Currently, full-time faculty teach ten of the sixteen ELC courses. Two off-campus graduate TESOL courses are also taught by full-time faculty. Part-time adjuncts currently teach six of the sixteen IEP courses.

While participation in professional development activities is strongly encouraged for adjunct faculty, it is required for full-time faculty. Full-time ELC faculty members teach classes in the MA/TESL program as well as in the ESL program. This has raised the visibility and stature of ELC faculty in the university, so that ELC faculty members are now eligible, for the first time, for promotion through the faculty ranks. Two promotions from Instructor to Assistant Professor have been granted, and a third is pending. This offers a new incentive to individual faculty members to pursue professional development activities during non-teaching semesters.

Among professional development activities, ELC faculty participate in local, regional, and international conferences. Gonzaga University hosts the annual Eastern Washington Regional ESL Conference. This local conference is organized by faculty from Gonzaga’s ELC and other area IEPs. The one-day conference includes workshops and forums on methodology and
pedagogical issues aimed at K-12, adult IEP, and Higher Education audiences. The ELC pays all registration fees for ELC faculty members to attend.

The Washington Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (WAESOL), a TESOL affiliate, holds an annual regional conference, and every third year, TESOL affiliate organizations from Washington, Oregon and British Columbia come together at the Tri-TESOL conference. ELC faculty are encouraged to attend this conference and participate as presenters and organizers. The ELC supports this participation by defraying the costs of conference fees, travel, food, and lodging, as the departmental budget permits. Priority for funding goes to those full-time or adjunct faculty members who are giving presentations or have other official conference duties. Class coverage is arranged, as needed, by the instructors and Chair. ELC faculty are also encouraged to attend and participate in conferences of national and international professional associations such as TESOL, NAFSA, CARLA and others.

The strengths of this faculty exist in its diversity and experience on multiple levels (university, K-12, overseas). It is well-positioned and fully qualified to fill the dual roles of intensive academic ESL teaching and TESL teacher training. The wealth of overseas experience is a positive factor, since it brings the added dimension of authentic experience with a variety of cultures and learning styles.

A significant weakness might exist in the number of faculty members who have been teaching exclusively at Gonzaga University for an extended period of time. Steps have been taken to address this, especially in the creation of a rotating teaching schedule and administrative encouragement and support for overseas teaching during “off” terms.

Facilities

The ELC has facilities, equipment, and supplies that support the achievement of stated goals and objectives; are adequate in number, condition, and availability; and are accessible to students, faculty, and administrators. Faculty have private offices. They are provided with adequate computer hardware and software, and are accessed to the University’s Banner and internal e-mail system. The buildings and locations utilized by the administrative staff and faculty provide adequate confidential office space. The ELC building provides rooms adequate for testing and occasional small group instruction. The ELC Building and International Culture Center provide communal areas for students for study and conversation.

The English Language Center facilities include two buildings housing ESL faculty offices (the ELC Building and the International Cultural Center), and one building housing staff and administrative support offices (the International Student Programs Office). All buildings, former residences dating from the early 20th Century, are located in the same square block of campus. The International Cultural Center houses four faculty offices, and it also functions as a meeting place for the International Student Union, various student and faculty activities, and is a place where students can relax, study, share their culture and prepare ethnic dishes.
A reference was made in the 1994 report to the limited office facilities available to ELC faculty. That situation was addressed by relocating some full-time adjunct faculty to the facility at 311 E. Boone Avenue.

The University’s Foley Center includes an expanding collection of publications supporting Second Language acquisition pedagogy for the ESL teacher. Additionally, the library incorporated a collection of student-centered ESL reading selections in 1999 and continues to fund further acquisitions to support beginning to advanced ESL reading.

Language lab facilities include a language laboratory which was refurbished with state-of-the-art equipment in May 1994. Currently, the laboratory features 34 functional workstations for language students, including the capacity for individualized tape instructions, multi-media presentations, and satellite supported language and cultural programming. Although the language lab facility continues to be updated, the technology expands at a greater rate than budgets. Collaboration between the Director of Instructional/Media Services, Modern Languages, and the ELC remains ongoing in efforts to support and improve the language laboratory.

The equipment and supplies available to faculty and staff for teaching and learning are addressed on a regular basis with a number of budgets with sufficient funding. Both short-term and long-term goals center on the buildings, which house the faculty and staff of the program. Short-term goals include painting and maintenance of facilities. These improvements were approved to begin in the summer of 2001 and continue. Long-term goals include a regular request to the Academic Vice President for a consolidated space to house both faculty and staff in the same location within the next five years.

Assessment

- Standards for faculty performance are listed in Faculty Standards in the ELC Faculty Handbook. As reflected in the handbook, duties include teaching, advising, program development and professional development. (See Exhibit 2.43.)
- Students in ESL classes evaluate instructors at the end of each semester, using evaluation forms developed by the ELC to be comprehensible to students at all levels. The evaluation criteria are made relevant by linking the evaluation criteria to the teaching assumptions stated in the ELC curriculum, (See Exhibit 2.17.)
- Peer observations and the ensuing discussions have many benefits for the program. They make evaluation more relevant, give more experienced instructors a chance to share expertise, and encourage consistency and continuity in classes. When teachers see how colleagues teach, reflective teaching is encouraged; coordination between classes in the same level is facilitated, and teaching colleagues have an opportunity to discuss teaching issues and share teaching philosophies.
- Through the mentor system, the system of evaluation of adjunct faculty members by their faculty mentors is working effectively. Potential problems with new faculty members can be spotted early and remedied.
This system is adequate for current needs, though some modification will be needed to blend evaluations of both ESL and MATESL teaching efficacy. Comparisons to other departments at the University are problematic, since the intensive nature of the instruction and the frequency of student population change do not reflect traditional methodology or student flows.

**Strengths and weaknesses**

Major strengths of the department include an experienced and highly-qualified faculty and an established and highly respected academic ESL program that enjoys administrative and academic support from the larger University community. Major recent improvements include the creation of the MA/ TESL unit and the resulting innovative blending of an established intensive academic ESL program and a graduate program in teaching ESL. This provides a wealth of opportunities both for established faculty to engage in a variety of teaching and research and for apprentice teachers to work in an ongoing program with a well-established curriculum and goals.

This blending is the result of ESL’s long history as an autonomous academic unit. Many universities which have similar ESL and TESL programs have difficulty in integrating their functions, since they are often housed in differing academic areas (e.g., linguistics, English, one of several Education departments, cultural studies, or continuing education). The MA/TESL program is part of the planning structure of the School of Education since its mission is the preparation of teachers. The program director reports to both the Dean of the School of Education and Director of International Student Programs.

A major weakness is the necessity of depending on foreign economic and demographic trends to provide sufficient enrollment, a phenomenon exacerbated by events of the past five years. Although steps have been taken in the area of marketing and the refinement of enrollment strategies, this remains an area of continuing concern. Addressing foreign marketing concerns is always problematic, since so many factors – international politics, currency fluctuations, demographic trends – are beyond program control. Two ways to address these difficulties more effectively are to refine and broaden advertising efforts, both in US-produced publications and services, and through the use of efficient and ethical overseas recruiters.

In addition, the operation of a year-round academic program with fixed objectives and a relatively homogenous student body presents real difficulties in keeping the faculty energized and challenged.

The very success of the mix of academic programs makes maintaining the status quo at once desirable for its sound instructional and programmatic basis; yet troublesome, since it fosters resistance to change and innovative thinking. Continuing to work toward developing a variety of venues for learning and teaching in the field of intensive language acquisition would seem to provide the best avenue for maintaining a dynamic mix of stability and innovation. Among the initiatives in the area of program development that are being studied and planned are relationships with overseas institutions wishing to invite ESL faculty for in-service training and/or development of short-term institutes in TESL and other specific fields.
Historically, the ESL program has been marginalized to a degree due to the nature of its students and the specificity of its mission. This was discussed briefly in the self-study report and recommendations of 1994/95, and remains a concern, since it impacts program growth and faculty morale. The ESL faculty is working with the office of the Academic Vice President to seek ways in which they can be brought more into the mainstream of academic life at the University, in the areas of both service and governance.

In the area of marketing, the department is exploring the use of consultants and professional recruiters with experience in specific markets, always keeping in mind its commitment to the University’s Mission and traditional high academic standards. The resources available for advertising are being addressed with the positive cooperation of the Academic Vice President.

**Significant Changes**

Enrollment patterns from 1997 – 2001 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Full time enrollment</th>
<th>Top three sending countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>Japan, Taiwan, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Japan, UAE, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Japan, UAE, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Japan, UAE, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Japan, Mexico, Korea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An observation was made in the 1994 report that “…the role of the ESL program might expand…if the university were to adopt specific growth goals with respect to its international student population…As it now stands, the program operates effectively, although on the periphery of campus life.” Enrollment trends reflect international economic factors, especially the decline in Asian economies which was the strength of ESL programs on the west coast, such as Gonzaga’s. The historically high number of Japanese students has been affected by increased competition from other programs whose sources in other parts of Asia were hampered by the economic decline of 1995-96. These competitors entered the Japanese market aggressively. That factor, and the demographic of declining numbers of college-age Japanese has affected enrollment growth significantly.

Gonzaga is benefiting from the number of Hispanic seminary students seeking advanced study and ordination in the United States. The Yakima and Spokane Diocesan administration have come to rely on Gonzaga ESL as an appropriate and efficacious means to bring Mexican, Colombian and other seminarians to a level of English sufficient for them to continue their ecclesiastical training in this country.

The University is also seeing increased enrollment of Asian seminarians and senior religious administrators under the sponsorship of the Maryknoll fathers and brothers, both from their New York and Hong Kong offices. The majority of these students are from mainland China.
2004 NWCCU Self-Study – Standard Two

International student population enrollment goals are static owing to the events of 9/11/01 and the resulting reorganization of the federal agencies and procedures dealing with foreign students. Gonzaga’s International Student Programs Office has offered plans in this area as part of recent University planning and strategic growth initiatives.

Efforts by the ESL faculty and staff to integrate the program into campus life have yielded positive results. ESL faculty are active members of the faculty and have participated in cooperative efforts showcasing ongoing research efforts and other academic affairs. With the increased interest in K-12 ESL instruction, a regional leader in that field was added to the faculty in 1999, but has since returned to public education. Efforts continue to identify and employ a K-12 level faculty member. One full-time faculty person was added in 1998, bringing to six the number of full-time ESL faculty. An additional full-time faculty member was added to serve as Director of the MATESL Program. Qualifications for teaching include a Master’s degree in the field, and three years’ university-level experience.

As a result of the 2002 TESOL Accreditation self-study, a significant effort has been made to review performance assessments and codify ongoing procedures. (See Exhibit 2.32.)

ESL financial supervision is conducted by the University Controller, who has implemented appropriate policies and procedures and follows accepted accounting practices to ensure the integrity of the program’s finances. Financial reserves are adequate and available to meet its obligations to students, staff, and any contracted parties. All budgetary balances and activities are recorded and accessible online through the University’s SCT Banner information system as of 1999.

ESL policies, requirements, procedures have seen some significant changes in the past several years. Among these are:

- Requiring specific GPA for level advancements;
- Increased security for placement and materials storage and administration;
- Requiring the purchase of University accident and medical insurance as of 2001;
- Changes in programs, instruction, research, and service;
- Addition of the graduate program in teaching ESL (MADES) with a program director added to the ELC faculty; ESL faculty have been assigned to teach in that program and mentor its students and degree candidates; and
- Advanced (105-106) and University Prep (107-108) levels were approved to award undergraduate credit in 1998.

Among other changes expected within three to five years include:

- Stabilization of enrollment as international situation improves;
- Lower administrative costs as SEVIS system for issuing and tracking visa enabling documentation comes online;
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• Growth in enrollment of non-traditional students, in both ESL and MATESL programs in response to changing demographics; and
• Increased MATESL enrollment as non-native-English student enrollment continues to grow in Washington and the northwestern United States.

Analysis and Appraisal

The ESL Program maintains its focus of preparing qualified non-native-English speaking students for successful undergraduate and graduate study at the University. Instituting higher GPA requirements for level advancement and graduation from the program has resulted in better-prepared students. In addition, a higher percentage of ESL graduates enroll in Gonzaga degree programs than in the past. Statistics over the past five years indicate that more than half of ESL graduates now go onto further study at Gonzaga or other area colleges, an increase from the common proportion of about 25% throughout the program’s first twenty years (1978-98).

The program sustains its contribution to the University’s Mission that addresses the need to provide an opportunity for all students to experience and to learn about people from cultures not their own. For the ESL students, this is accomplished every day by bringing them into contact with the language and culture they have come here to study. The faculty is highly skilled at providing linguistic and cultural experiences for these students that address their social as well as academic needs. A battery of structured events, including orientation activities, group trips to open banking accounts, obtain Social Security and State of Washington ID cards, and a variety of seasonal cultural and recreational experiences, accomplish the dual purpose of providing opportunities to use their target language in meaningful ways and encouraging visiting students to interact with local people, both on and off campus.

For domestic students enrolled at Gonzaga, the ESL program provides bright, motivated, and curious contemporaries from a variety of countries and cultures, who are eager to interact and to deepen their understanding of the American language and culture. In return, they offer human examples of the world outside eastern Washington and the United States with whom to interact and form friendships and understanding.

Teaching quality is a mainstay of the department. Owing to the low turnover rate in this typically quite mobile discipline, Gonzaga benefits from an experienced and dedicated group of full-time teachers and a young and vital cadre of adjuncts and part-time instructors. The rotating system of teaching, wherein faculty members in coordination with their colleagues, elect which two of three annual trimesters they will teach, permits opportunities to engage in research, overseas travel, and related pursuits on a more flexible basis. Five of the six current full-time faculty members have overseas teaching experience, which is more important in this field than in some others, owing to the comparative linguistic and cultural nature of second-language teaching.

Academic advising is a less crucial area in ESL than in the University at large. The curriculum is highly structured, and the intensive nature of study (19 class hours per week, all conducted in a language other than the student’s primary) tends to attract highly-motivated, goal-oriented students. Teachers in the program generally address issues such as homesickness, differing
student-teacher expectations and other cultural concerns. In addition they address issues such as academic freedom and citizenship, which may be new to many students, but of which understanding is vital to success in the American system.

Due to the difficulty in obtaining and standardizing information from foreign systems and sources, evidence of the success of ESL students can only be clearly inferred by their performance at Gonzaga and at other institutions of higher learning in the United States.

At Gonzaga, it has been statistically demonstrated that ESL graduates achieve higher cumulative GPAs on the undergraduate level than foreign students whose native language is not English and who achieved admission to the University using TOEFL scores or by transferring from other domestic institutions. (See Exhibit 2.32.) There are several factors at work to account for this, including:

- The orientation to a variety of pedagogical and evaluative techniques and instruments, which approximates the approach used by a majority of American professors in contrast to the systems employed in the students’ native system of higher education;
- The gradual movement away from collective effort to individualized work, especially of the extemporaneous spoken variety, again encouraging students to succeed in a system which may be radically unlike that used in their native country; and
- the one-on-one relationship with teachers and advisors, in which informal as well as formal access to the faculty member is facilitated and encouraged.

Master of Arts/Teaching English as a Second Language
(Mary Jeannot, Director)

Students in the MA/TESL program have many opportunities to engage in a range of activities, tasks and projects that help them to develop their competence in interpreting, organizing, and communicating knowledge. Theory and practice are integrated rather than sequenced, and all courses and projects aim to provide authentic and integrated opportunities to plan, teach, evaluate, research and lead in the classroom and in the community. Consistent with Gonzaga’s Mission, the program focuses on the nature of communication in pluralistic societies and invites students to learn about and work with cultures and languages different from their own. Moreover, students investigate “current issues in contemporary civilization” and “ideological differences that separate peoples of the world” as they learn how to analyze the various underpinnings and ramifications of teaching and speaking English in an increasingly global society.

The MA/TESL program also encourages its students and faculty to engage in critical reflection and research on the form and substance of language learning and teaching in order to understand the complex factors inherent in communication and community building.

In every course, students receive a syllabus outlining all course objectives and expectations, general knowledge base for the subject and the various assessments for the course. Additionally, in each course students are expected to complete at least one full individual project (e.g., case
study, ethnography), work with other students on a collaborative project (e.g., language and culture handbook) submit several reflection papers and a final paper, and in some cases, take either an in class examination or a take-home examination. Students are also expected to conduct a literature review and a full length teacher research project in MTSL 600. MTSL 610 (practicum) requires significant time in the classroom observing, assisting and teaching.

Students receive credits for internships, practica, and professional seminar. Students also may receive graduate credit for teaching in the MA/TESL Summer Institute Language Camp. Occasionally, students arrange to conduct an independent study in which a field assignment is required. All other field experiences correspond with MA/TESL core courses. No graduate credit is granted for prior clinical experiences since the practicum is an integral and essential component to the Gonzaga MA/TESL program.

Since 1998, the MA/TESL program has received annually $4,000.00 for library acquisitions. There are several interdisciplinary journals (e.g., in Education, and English) to which students have access, but until now, the *TESOL Quarterly* is the only journal that is discipline-specific. Permissions are being sought to acquire new journals. Students receive a library orientation each year in which they are introduced to online services, interlibrary loan and other library facilities. Students are expected to use this facility regularly. Additionally, students and faculty have access to the language and computer labs and other technological facilities and support services.

Students in the program are encouraged to enroll in MTSL 516 Technology and Language Teaching, in which they learn a variety of technological skills including but not limited to language lab orientation, presentation software, continued online research, website development. For most courses, students use Blackboard to supplement and enhance in-class coursework. Faculty and students also attend regular professional conferences, serve on committees and receive training for technological support. Efforts are being made at developing some online courses.

There are currently 6 full time faculty who teach in two programs, two with doctoral degrees and four with MA degrees. Each brings a unique focus from critical applied linguistics, discourse analysis, language and culture studies, classroom based ethnographic research, language and assessment, phonology, second language acquisition, curriculum and materials development, language teaching methodologies, literacy, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, technology, history of English language, and language planning and policy. Also, faculty serve on thesis and project committees, attend and present at annual conferences in their areas of specialty and interest, organize regional conferences and team teach.

Graduate admissions, regulations, policies and graduation requirements are found in the *Graduate Catalogue*, the MA/TESL program brochure, the *Gonzaga University Graduate Student Handbook* and the *MA/TESL Handbook*.

Admission requirements for international students whose first language is not English also include:

- TOEFL score of at least 550 or a recommendation from GU ELC; and
Faculty meet on a regular basis to evaluate the program and its admission policies. As a result of the 2002 TESOL Accreditation self-study, a significant effort has been made to review performance assessments and codify ongoing procedures.

ESL financial supervision is conducted by the University Controller, who has implemented appropriate policies and procedures and follow accepted accounting practices to ensure the integrity of the program’s finances. Financial reserves are adequate and available to meet its obligations to students, staff, and any contracted parties.

The most significant changes expected within three to five years are:

- Stabilization of enrollment as international situation improves;
- Lower administrative costs as the SEVIS system for issuing and tracking visa documentation comes on-line;
- Growth in enrollment of non-traditional students, in both ESL and MATESL programs in response to changing demographics; and
- Increased MATESL enrollment as non-native-English student enrollment continues to grow in Washington state and the northwestern United States.

### Significant Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA/TESL</td>
<td>Began program</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hogan Entrepreneurial Leadership Program *(Paul Buller, Director)*

The Hogan Entrepreneurial Leadership Program was begun in 2000 through a gift from the Hogan Family Foundation. The Hogan Program is housed in the School of Business Administration but serves majors from any academic department in the University. The average entering class size is 25 students, with majors in business (37%), arts and sciences (32%), engineering (27%), and education (4%).

The Hogan Program is a four-year undergraduate concentration that immerses students in the fundamentals of creating and managing new ventures in the private and public sectors. In addition to the course requirements for their chosen major, six required courses in various areas of entrepreneurship have been designed exclusively for Hogan Program students.

The Program seeks students who have the desire and ability to be leaders in creating new ventures that make a positive difference in society. Admission to the program is competitive and is based on the student’s entrance exam scores, grade point average, demonstrated leadership, creativity, and service to others. There are currently 87 students in the program: 19 seniors, 28
juniors, 15 sophomores, and 25 freshmen. The average entering class of 25 students has an SAT score of 1306 and a GPA of 3.8. In addition, 90% of the students have held leadership positions in their school or community, nearly 45% have created or co-created a new organization in school or the community, and 80% of the students have been involved in school or community service. Students in the Program receive a $500 scholarship per year ($2000 total for four years in the Program). In addition, Hogan students do not pay for tuition fees in excess of 18 credits per semester.

Four features distinguish the Hogan program: 1) an honors program model that attracts outstanding students; 2) a rigorous concentration that can be combined with any academic major; 3) four-year immersion in entrepreneurial contexts; and 4) an education based on Jesuit educational ideals of ethical leadership and commitment to the common good.

Five-Year Goals

- Develop entrepreneurial leaders committed to the common good.
- Become a nationally recognized student-centered entrepreneurship program.
- Contribute to the academic excellence of Gonzaga University
- Achieve and maintain a program enrollment of diverse, talented students
- Contribute to the economic development of the Inland Northwest Region.
- Expand the reach of the Program to include other Gonzaga undergraduate and graduate students

The Hogan Program is staffed with a full-time Director, a full-time Program Assistant, and a Program Coordinator. Hogan Program students also provide leadership on several program initiatives. An Advisory Board of 29 entrepreneurs, educators, and students provides additional support. Six tenure track SBA faculty have taught or will teach courses in the Program; two or three adjunct instructors have taught or will teach courses in the Program.

The Honors Program20 (Tim Clancy, S.J., Director)

Curriculum and Objectives

The Honors Program has spent the last fifty years challenging and inspiring students who are academically gifted and highly motivated. These students are given the opportunity to learn more about themselves, their world, and their religious beliefs, while beginning to develop the skills necessary to pursue their calling in life. The program provides students a multi-disciplinary liberal arts education along with training in their chosen major. In short, the Honors Program seeks to educate gifted students who will be both successful in their careers and an asset to their communities.

---

20 This departmental section constitutes a summary of a full report, submitted to the Self-Study Steering Committee by the Honors Program, which appears as Exhibit 2.46.
The program has several components: academics, social/student life, and service learning. The academic portion of the program consists of annual honors colloquia and honors sections of much of the Gonzaga liberal arts core curriculum. Honors curriculum is available in most liberal arts areas, including philosophy, literature, math, science, social sciences, history, religious studies, fine arts, speech and foreign languages.

The honors colloquia are designed to introduce students to a wide-ranging interdisciplinary study of a particular topic. Freshman Colloquium introduces students to issues of class, race, gender, and sexual orientation. Sophomore Colloquium offers multi-media study of the history of American Catholicism. Junior Colloquium involves a course in literary and cultural studies. Senior Colloquium consists of students writing an interdisciplinary honors thesis of 40 pages. Students are required to present their work publicly in April of each year.

Curriculum is supplemented by the recently introduced speaker series. There are two series per year, one in fall and the other in spring. Each includes a monthly speaker on a variety of topics. The greater community is invited to attend these events.

The Honors Program strongly encourages its students to spend at least one semester abroad (typically during their junior year). Study Abroad programs cater to every possible field of interest.

Faculty

Courses in the program are normally taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty from a variety of disciplines. In any given semester the program has six to eight faculty teaching in the program. Faculty for honors seminars are chosen by a faculty honors committee from proposals submitted by interested faculty in consultation with both the director of the program and the chairs of affected departments. Every effort is made to ensure that a wide diversity of faculty enjoy the opportunity of teaching honors students in the areas about which they are most passionate.

Students

Graduates per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 20 students are admitted to the program each year. Acceptance to the program is based on test scores, high-school rank, extra-curricular interests and involvements, independent intellectual achievement, skill in effective expression, letters of recommendation, personal interview, and the quality of the essay on the Honors application.

A substantial number of students enter service programs before moving on to their graduate studies.

Assessment
While the core of the program has enjoyed substantial continuity over the years, changes have been made to enhance the resources of Hopkins House and to diversify the faculty who teach honors seminars. Changes in the curriculum are made by the director in consultation with the faculty Honors Committee and the student Honors Council. Faculty evaluation has been sporadic over the last few years. While the director has passed out two page written questionnaires at the end of each Honors colloquia, Honors seminars have not been evaluated in a manner that gets back to the program itself. In light of this, the student Honors Council plans to design an evaluative instrument to be used in all honors seminars that would be returned to the director and the council.

Discussions have arisen as to whether to invest about $10,000 to re-carpet the first floor in the next 3-5 years and finish the basement of the Hopkins House providing a fourth study room and a second recreation room. Talks have begun with the Department of Music about storing a piano for them in the basement recreation room. Hopkins House is used quite extensively for studying and socializing and with the program growing from 20 to 25, there is a need for more space. The department hopes to work with University Relations in raising scholarship funds from past Honors alumni. First priority would be scholarship money to enable students to study abroad; second priority is to meet unmet financial need of applicants and then finally to introduce more substantive merit scholarships. The Honors Program currently awards students a $500 scholarship. There are also four one year Newman scholarships worth $1,000 each for students selected to work with the freshman honors colloquium and its service learning component.

Resources

The yearly budget for the Honors Program includes a half-time salary for the director and a federal work study position for secretarial help and funds to cover basic office supplies and one major function. The bulk of discretionary funds comes from a lab fee of $100 attached to the Honors colloquia. This money funds several social and academic program functions, as well as upgrades to furnishings and equipment at Hopkins house where the program is housed. During summer 2002, $18,000 was invested in upgrading the house.

The upgrading of Hopkins in 2002 consisted in transforming the second floor seminar room into an electronic “smart classroom” with new furniture. Computers were added and upgraded. The living room, study rooms, and the recreational room were refurbished and given computers. Art in the house was also changed.

The house currently includes a living room, kitchen, director’s office, electronic seminar room, three study rooms, an entertainment center, 5 computers, a copier, scanner, and fax. Many courses are taught in the seminar room of Hopkins, which is equipped with VHS, DVD, surround sound speakers, as well as high speed internet access. Students have complete access to Hopkins 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

International Studies Program

Ted Nitz, Director

This departmental section constitutes a summary of a full report, submitted to the Self-Study Steering Committee by the International Studies Program which appears as Exhibit 2.46.
Curriculum and Objectives

The overall goal of the International Studies Program is to promote better understanding of the growing interdependence of nations and peoples, the rights and obligations that arise from those interdependencies, and significant transnational issues. The program aspires to develop an awareness of the religious, political, economic, and cultural diversity of the modern world. This program is an important component of the University’s effort to live up to its mission statement.

The Department of International Studies offers both a major and minor with concentrations in four areas: Asian Studies, European Studies, Latin American Studies, and International Relations. It also offers courses that allow students to fulfill the “Foreign Culture” core requirement. There are various program requirements, including study of a modern language, international studies core courses, international studies electives, and completion of a Senior Project. The program is supported by various departments that offer courses to make up the International Studies Program. These include Economics, History, Modern Languages, Philosophy, Political Science, Religious Studies, and Sociology.

Faculty

The program currently has one faculty member directly assigned to it. This is the Program Director who serves in that capacity on a half-time appointment held in conjunction with a half-time appointment in the Department of History. The faculty who teach the variety of courses offered as part of the program are specialists in their respective subject areas.

Students

While enrollment growth is steady, some of the program’s students are not reflected in the tables below because they signed up for courses under the cross-listing department that offered the courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment

There were no significant recommendations regarding the International Studies Program in the previous accreditation report, largely because the program did not offer majors at the time of the 1994 visit. The lack of a major was noted, and actions were taken to ensure that the program was upgraded. The four areas of concentrations have been strengthened.
The interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum is both a strength and weakness of the program. The program can be affected by shortages of faculty in any of the participating departments. When there is no faculty member to offer one of the department’s foundational courses, students find themselves unable to complete their course of study.

Frequent turnover in the position of program director before Academic Year 2000-2001 made it difficult for the program to build any consistent momentum or planning strategies. The position has been filled since Fall 2000 by the current director on a fixed-term basis. In the next five years, the University will need to address the long-term stability of this position and consider taking steps to make it tenure-track.

Resources

The program has no unique facilities or resources assigned to it. The program operates on a relatively small budget, which appears to have remained fairly stable over the past five years. Most of the budgeted funds are devoted to paying the program’s share of the director’s salary. (See department report, Exhibit 2.25.)

Military Science Department (ROTC) (Joel Armstrong, LTC, US Army)

Curriculum and Objectives

The mission of the Gonzaga University Bulldog Military Science Department is to commission the future officer leadership of the U.S. Army and motivate young people to become better citizens. The first informal Cadet Detachment at Gonzaga University was established in 1897. The modern-day program was initiated in 1947. Two Partnership Agreements exist between the Military Science Department: one with Whitworth College (WWC), and the other with the Intercollegiate College of Nursing (ICN). For numerous years we have successfully accomplished the mission and objectives, and we anticipate that we will continue to do so because of high caliber student-cadets, cadre, and alumni, and the strong University support and incentives. The student-cadets are exceptional performers in academics, leadership training and development, campus activities, and community service. Both the University and the world-class cadre are dedicated to the mission and cadets.

The Military Science program has been designed to meet the country’s requirements for officer leaders in the Army. It is therefore multifaceted with distinctive sub-elements to meet individual needs and requirements. Included are a Basic Course for freshman and sophomore students and the Advanced Course for juniors, seniors, and some graduate and law students. The department conducts a weekly leadership laboratory, physical training three times a week, and field training exercises twice a semester. The focus of the curriculum is to develop leaders of competence and character for the Army. This end is achieved by introducing leadership theory and providing ample opportunity for students to apply what they learn. Students earn 1-3 credits for class, one credit for leadership laboratory, and one for physical training.

Faculty
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The department currently has ten fulltime employees – four active duty Army officers, one retired officer, two active duty noncommissioned officers, two Department of the Army civilians, and one University employee. All officers have Bachelor degrees, three have Masters, one is working on a Masters, and one is a Doctoral student. The faculty has a wide range of experiences serving in command and staff positions around the world in peace and war during the past 28 years.

**Students**

Our 105 students are Scholar-Athlete-Leaders. They are high achievers with strong leadership potential who are well-rounded individuals that accomplish significant results in the classroom and community. Fifteen of nineteen of the Class of 2003 members who attended the National Advanced Leadership Camp in the summer of 2002 were rated in the top third of their platoons and 11 were in the top five of 45 cadets. Additionally, one of the twelve Regimental Honor Graduates (450 cadets per Regiment) was from the unit. Recent graduates were GU Chief Justice, two finalists for Student of the Year, and three Who's Who winners. Included in the ranks are present or former intercollegiate participants on the GU and WWC cross country, outdoor track, lacrosse, football, ski, rugby, and women's basketball teams. During the past year unit members played intramural sports (men’s A Squad basketball team is the defending champion), performed in plays and musicals, led student tours as Ambassadors, spearheaded the Thirst student fellowship group, and provided leadership in the dormitories as Resident Advisors and in student government. Several of the students compete on the Gonzaga University Mock Debate Team and two cadets earned All American honors. Cadets are Knights, Setons, camp counselors, and have studied abroad. Freshman SAT average is 1180 and more than 75% of the students maintain a GPA of greater than 3.0 in the more than two dozen majors in which they are pursuing degrees. In summary, Military Science students meet the criteria for the type of person we look for in future Army officers, and furthermore, are balanced individuals who are involved in numerous campus and community activities.

**Assessment**

The program undergoes a comprehensive annual program review conducted by the United States Army Cadet Command at Fort Lewis, WA and Fort Monroe, VA. All aspects of the program are evaluated and we have consistently been rated in the top 15% of the Army ROTC programs in the country. Currently we are ranked number 7 out of 272 Army ROTC programs in the United States Army Cadet Command. Additionally, in November we received the prestigious Douglas MacArthur Award presented by the Commanding General of Cadet Command for the Most Outstanding Program in the Western Region.

All of the cadre are formerly counseled and evaluated each year focusing on performance, potential, and professional development.

**Resources**
The department is housed in the Administration Building on the first floor and in the basement. The United States Army provides two GSA vehicles, uniforms, computers, furniture, books, workbooks, field manuals, and other equipment. The Army also provides funds for curriculum, leadership development and training exercises, logistics, and salaries for all personnel excluding the University-provided employee. Finally, the Army provides over a million dollars a year for scholarships, books, and monthly stipends for scholarship students. Seventy-four Gonzaga University students have earned scholarships worth about $20,000 a year each.


**Study Abroad Office (Wanda Reynolds, Director)**

The work of the Study Abroad office is grounded in the University’s Mission Statement, which articulates an institutional desire to “. . . seek to provide for our students some opportunity to become familiar with a variety of human cultures,” which in turn will make them aware of both the possibilities and limitations of their own heritage. Study abroad connects students to a variety of human cultures and traditions through direct, participatory learning. The experience of life and learning in another culture is an integral part to developing an understanding in students of what it is the “world needs most.” The international opportunities supported by Gonzaga enrich the academic offerings of the University and make a profound contribution to the total education of Gonzaga students, who must be prepared to live in a world that is more and more dependent upon the ability of individuals to successfully and peacefully interact.

The role of the Study Abroad office is that of support and facilitation, with a primary goal of supporting overseas experiences that have academic comparability to course quality on Gonzaga’s Spokane campus. This is accomplished through a department-based course approval process, placing faculty and administrators with experience on the Spokane campus at Gonzaga overseas sites (for Florence, London, Granada and Cuernavaca), and through periodic program evaluation processes (see an example at Exhibit 2.xx). The Study Abroad office distributes literature to prospective students in the form of pamphlets, informational packets and electronic publications that give detailed explanation of the programs sponsored by the University, and make students aware of conditions that may exist at, or impact their experience of, the program abroad. The Gonzaga Study Abroad office works to ensure that overseas programs mirror the values of the University, focusing on high academic standards, attentiveness to student needs, and humanistic in focus.

Financial arrangements for Gonzaga University students wishing to participate in a study abroad program are coordinated through the Gonzaga Student Accounts Office. Gonzaga-in-Florence, the Paris Program, the Oxford Program, Sophia University Exchange, The Beijing Center, the School for Field Studies, and the London and Granada ILACA consortium programs are considered by the University as “Sponsored Programs.” Students studying in one of these programs are entitled to receive their institutional financial aid (i.e., Gonzaga scholarship and grant) as part of their financial aid package for the program. Students studying in “non-
“SPONSORED” programs are automatically eligible to receive federal aid (assuming program eligibility), but a consortium agreement must be established with the school to transfer Gonzaga funding (should that be approved).

**Sponsored Programs**

Gonzaga has many opportunities for students to study abroad as an extension of their formal education on the Spokane campus. Sponsored programs are facilitated directly by the University or coordinated through a consortium arrangement. Each program differs in regards to restrictions to major, completion of language study, and grade point average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“SPONSORED” PROGRAMS</th>
<th>TERM/PERIOD</th>
<th># of STUDENTS</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga-in-Florence, Italy</td>
<td>Junior Year</td>
<td>100 Gonzaga/50 non-Gonzaga</td>
<td>A sole-ownership property was acquired in October, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga-in-Florence, Italy</td>
<td>Summer program</td>
<td>100 - all levels</td>
<td>same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga-in-London</td>
<td>semester options</td>
<td>10 - juniors</td>
<td>Consortium sponsored by AHA International – rented facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford program</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>3 Honors juniors</td>
<td>Various Oxford-based schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga-in-Paris</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>7-15 juniors per year</td>
<td>Catholic Institute or the Sorbonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granada, Spain (ILACA)</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>12 juniors Spanish fluency</td>
<td>University of Granada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School for Field Studies</td>
<td>semester or summer session</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>Field project combined with course work in British West Indies, Australia, Mexico, Costa Rica and Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Beijing Center</td>
<td>semester or year</td>
<td>5 juniors</td>
<td>Loyola Marymount University/Beijing Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Exchange</td>
<td>semester or year</td>
<td>3 juniors</td>
<td>Sophia University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of “sponsored” programs has actually decreased in the past five years, as concerns about sending institutional funding to other institutions increased. Not only are the number of programs strictly regulated, but the number of students permitted on each program is regulated as well.

**Gonzaga-in-Florence** *(Fr. Michael W. Maher, S.J., Dean and Director)*

The Gonzaga-in-Florence program was established in 1963. For 40 years of its life, the program was housed, through a long-term rental agreement, at the Palazzo Antinori, in the heart of the ancient city. In the fall of 2003, the program moved into a property recently purchased by the University (October 2002) for the purposes of providing adequate educational space for the students and faculty of the program. Prior to, and then again concurrent with this property acquisition, the program has seen changes in leadership. The current dean/director of Gonzaga-in-Florence is Fr. Michael W. Maher, S.J., who succeeds Fr. Anthony P. Via, S.J.

The Gonzaga-in-Florence program is considered to be the principal study abroad program for Gonzaga University. It is designed as a year long (two semester) program and has for the past 5 years enrolled approximately 130 students per year. Of this number, approximately 30 to 40 students in a given year are from institutions other than Gonzaga. Virtually all students who participate in the program are of junior class standing, but come from a diverse range of majors and fields of study. As a result, the course offerings available to students, though primarily liberal arts in nature, also include courses in business.

Primary authority for the Florence curriculum rests with the on-site dean/director. Arts and sciences requirements in history and social science can be met by selections from 15 courses representing four departments (economics, history, political science, sociology). Fine arts (paintings, drawing, and sculpture, art, music history), and foreign language or culture requirements (beginning through advanced Italian, courses in Italian and Renaissance culture) are offered. In addition to courses appropriate for general education components of the School of Business Administration core (history, social sciences, fine arts, and non-business elective), Florence now offers three junior-level professional core requirements (Finance 320, Management 350, Marketing 310).

Gonzaga-in-Florence candidates must, for consideration of acceptance into the program, be of sophomore standing at the time of application, present current transcripts of all college work, have a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or higher, provide two statements of recommendation and a behavior clearance. Knowledge of the Italian language is not a requirement for acceptance into the general Florence program. However, students are strongly encouraged to study Italian before going to Florence and to continue doing so while they are there. Students who do not take Italian prior to acceptance into the program will be required to
take two sequential courses of Italian language while in Florence. An intensive Italian language program is now available for Italian Studies majors consisting of twelve full hours of concentrated language instruction. Majors are required to have four semester of Italian or take an entrance test and obtain permission from the Director of Italian Studies at Gonzaga University.

The program of courses taught at Gonzaga-in-Florence has a two-fold aim. It is designed to provide a sufficiently wide range of courses, so students can integrate their year abroad with some degree programs they have been pursuing at home. At the same time, the program forms an integral unit centered on courses that provide the students with an intimate acquaintance of Italian life, culture, and politics.

Ten percent of the courses are part of the core curriculum of the University. Fifteen percent of the courses taught are part of the core curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences. All of the upper division courses offered count toward the major requirements of the degree. Many of the lower division courses are prerequisites for the upper division courses required for the major. Certain courses which are offered only in Florence are purely elective, especially those in History. A very successful course offered for either history or Italian credit is Introduction to Florence. The instructor meets with the students three times a week for lectures and then breaks up into small groups for site visits for the fourth class hour. This has been a very successful formula.

Through their exposure to the courses which the Florence program provides and through the extraordinary opportunity for travel in Italy and other European countries, students in the Gonzaga-in-Florence program acquire an intimate comprehension of their own society and a deeper knowledge of themselves by understanding the people and customs of other countries. Gonzaga-in-Florence is designed to provide a sufficiently broad-range of course offerings to allow students to integrate their core curriculum with a year of foreign experience. The course offerings form a unit to give students an intimate acquaintance with Italian life, culture, and politics.

Administration

In addition to the dean, the program is served by an assistant to the director for student affairs, Fr. Bruno Segatta; an office administrator, Dr. Alessandro Pazzaglia; and an office secretary/registrar, Ms. Francesca Galanti. The administration works effectively to oversee the operational aspects of the Gonzaga-in-Florence program to include: housing and meal arrangements, registration for classes, faculty support and scheduling, typographic services, publication production, student assistance, academic and conduct problem resolution, trip planning, and all other logistical arrangements. The administrators, except for Ms. Galanti, also teach at least one course per semester.

The Paris Program (Professor Francoise Kuester, Director)

Gonzaga University also operates a small program in Paris, France. The program was developed in 1983 to provide an immersion experience for students of the French language and has successfully operated to achieve this end since that time. On an annual basis between 5 and 12
students are studying on the program during a given academic semester. The program is co-directed; on the main campus the director is Professor Françoise Kuester who oversees the French major. The Paris on-site director is Madame Marie-Claire Babron, who is responsible for ensuring that local arrangements (such as appropriate housing and meals), academic advising, counseling, and a limited number of extra curricular activities) are appropriately arranged. Students in the Paris Program are provided with an opportunity to live in one of two housing arrangement situations: they may either stay together with French students in a dormitory-style living situation, in which they occupy a room together with a roommate; or alternatively they may live with a family in a home stay/"au pair" (nanny) situation. The “au pair” option was developed as a lower cost alternative to the dormitory living situation, but is being discontinued after the conclusion of the 2003-04 academic year.

Students on the Paris Program study at the Catholic Institute of the University of Paris, an international student division of the university. Students may take course work at the Sorbonne, depending upon their level of fluency in the language and interest in pursuing course work there. The Gonzaga main campus director works in conjunction with the University registrar to insure that appropriate articulation of credits taken either at the University of Paris or the Sorbonne occurs. Instruction in the program is in French and enrollment requires not less than two years of the appropriate foreign language and is primarily for, though not limited to, majors and minors in these areas.

**London Program (ILACA Consortium)**

The University sponsors a one-semester program in London during the fall or spring semester. This program is coordinated by ILACA, a consortium arrangement of five northwest institutions including Gonzaga and AHA International. The London program offers only a half dozen courses each semester, not necessarily on a regular basis. Applicability of courses to core requirements is determined on an individual course/student basis, usually through the course approval process or through an authorized substitution. Most courses are either used as electives or applied to majors/minors in English, political science, or history. Academic standards in London are consistent with those of the ILACA institutions.

Classes are held in the Bloomsbury area of central London close to the British Museum. Students have access to the University of London Union (ULU) for meals during the week and an opportunity to interact with other British students. Students live with a host family in greater London and take The Tube to class each day.

Carole Machin is the AHA site director for the London program. A native of Britain, Ms. Machin is responsible for all day-to-day operations of the site, including the coordination of excursions, local transportation, and class scheduling. Maggie Kovacevic, also a native of Britain, is the on-site housing coordinator for the program. Chris Owen is the program’s office assistant. All 3 are available to answer student questions about adjustment to daily life in London.

**Granada (ILACA Consortium)**
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Gonzaga University students may spend either fall or spring semester in Granada, Spain through the AHA International/ILACA consortium. This program is available for students with either four (fall) or five (spring) semesters of college-level Spanish. Classes are held at the University of Granada’s Centro de Lenguas Modernas and are taught entirely in Spanish. A Spanish placement test determines which courses students are allowed to select. The semester begins with a month of intensive Spanish, a placement exam, an orientation and then a group excursion to Madrid. Field trips complement the coursework. Students have full university privileges and access to libraries, study areas, sport, cultural and recreational services, and other activities. “Home stays” are selected from families who live on an economic level which provides a relatively comfortable standard of living and modern home facilities. All meals are provided.

The program in Granada consists of a 4-month fall semester that includes an intensive session in September, and a 5-month spring semester that includes an intensive session in January. Classes meet 3 to 4 hours per week. Fall semester students enroll in 5 classes which include the following 3 mandatory courses: Spanish Culture and Civilization; Speaking and Writing Skills; and Notions of Spanish Grammar. Spring semester students enroll in 5 classes which include the following 1 mandatory course: Speaking and Writing Skills.

Classes are held at the Centro de Lenguas Modernas (CLM), situated in the heart of the city in the ancient palace of Santa Cruz and whose restoration was completed in 1992. CLM is fully equipped with modern audiovisual aids and provides courses in Spanish for international students and foreign languages for Spanish students.

Mark Bennett is the on-site director for the Granada program. Mark is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the site, including the coordination of housing, excursions, orientations and weekly meetings, and administering the financial aspects of the program. Students will always find ready assistance with home stay, medical, and cultural issues.

**Special Note: The Impact of the Patriot Act**

The impact of recent changes in the SEVIS system, a consequence of the Patriot Act and associated legislation has been felt not only with respect to international students studying on the main campus, but also for students and faculty who work and/or participate on our study abroad programs. US Immigration has introduced a number of restrictions on foreigners, including Florence students, entering the US; in return, numerous foreign governments with whom we interact have placed restrictions upon Americans studying and working abroad as well. For example, the Italian government now has much more stringent visitor and worker visa requirements than existed prior to 2003; the French government has introduced new regulations, which govern the proportion of American students who may live within a French student housing group. These examples illustrate the changing face of study abroad and international studies and the realities with which universities and program directors are faced as a result.
STANDARD TWO: SUMMARY OF CHALLENGES AND NEXT STEPS

Gonzaga University’s program growth in recent years has not been without accompanying challenges. The University Core Curriculum continues to be a focal point of undergraduate preparation. Professional programs continue to be strong as witnessed by their continued successful accreditation processes. Graduate programs are showing signs of growth despite economic challenges. Quality preparation is evident from continued success of students in a number of areas. There are a number of concerns, however, that have surfaced from the self study process.

Curriculum Approval: Curriculum design processes are evident within individual majors and professional schools, but there lacks a systematic communication and approval process for curriculum change across the institution. The lack of a clearly defined and consistently implemented process has allowed changes to be made that have negatively impacted student programs. Changes in curriculum, especially lower division requirements that impact across Schools, have often had negative consequences on the programs and schedules of students.

- Gonzaga needs to design a clear curriculum process which provides direction for program/course approval and change. Such curriculum process should be clearly tied to the Office of the Registrar to determine course impact and catalogue requirements.

General Requirements (University Core Curriculum): There has been no comprehensive study of the effectiveness of the University Core Curriculum and its relationship to programs outside of the College of Arts and Sciences. While there is a current committee to revisit this curriculum, it is not an institution wide discussion, nor has there been assessment of the core curriculum requirements.

- Discussion of University Core Curriculum and its assessment should be an institution-wide process that examines the effectiveness of the Core for all programs.

Communication/Governance processes: With the decentralization of the Graduate School, clearly defined processes for course and program changes are even more critical. The exact roles and responsibilities of the Academic, Graduate, and Deans’ Councils are still challenges to be worked through during this transition phase.

- Development of written bylaws to govern the academic unit that include clear responsibilities of committees and required processes with respect to curriculum responsibilities is essential.

Assessment: Assessment processes are evident at the program level and across schools, especially in programs that have outside accreditation organizations. The institution, however, lacks a systematic assessment process that reviews the effectiveness of programs and the positive impact on students in the learning process. Currently, there is no central body, task force or assessment council to determine the effectiveness or relevancy of the assessment data that is collected by various groups throughout the university.
• Focused attention must be given to the policy on assessment.
• The institution needs a clearly designed university assessment plan that responds to the overall Mission and University Core Curriculum and shows coherence between institutional outcomes and specific academic programs.
• Academic programs need to create an assessment council to identify academic assessment needs and oversee the development of an institutional plan.
• Clearly articulated mid-program assessments are inconsistent.
• Program review occurs primarily at the graduate level and undergraduate programs with external accreditation processes.

Institutional Research: Another weakness related to the area of assessment has been the absence of a centralized office with the responsibility for collecting data made available on a consistent basis to the various offices of the institution. The recent assignment of the Registrar to this responsibility is the first step to support a systematized data collection and analysis process that will serve academic programs.

• The development of specific needs and reporting processes with the new Director of Institutional Research is essential to assure that assessment data is the most useful for academic improvement. The academic division needs to identify the most appropriate data reporting needed for program improvement so that appropriate and effective reporting procedures can be established.

Information Resources/Library: Increases in periodical and other information resources costs are creating demands on academic budgets. While the Foley Library staff does an excellent job of providing services to all students – including those in off-campus programs in Canada – the institution faces continued reexamination of expenditures due to increased costs, especially those due related to on-line data bases and electronic journals.

• A task force should be created to reexamine needs and costs for strategic resource development.

Technology: A systematic process, for supporting faculty needs in technology is necessary since there are greater demands for multimedia and online course delivery. Faculty are often unable to integrate needed technology into their courses because the institution cannot afford the cost of upgrading hardware and software in such a way that the academic programs demand.

• The institution must identify the financial sources necessary to increase funding support for technology facilities, curriculum and faculty needs.

Graduate Program Issues: The productivity studies of academic programs at the graduate level do not account for the range of differences that impact graduate and undergraduate programs. Many graduate programs are 12-month programs. Yet productivity studies do not account for the full fiscal year; instead they are based on the 9 month academic year. Full-time faculty who teach in these programs are considered to be “overloading” or “adjuncts.”
• Graduate academic programs must be studies for more effective productivity reporting.
• Twelve-month programs must be examined for more effective faculty assignments and workloads.

Summer School

In consideration of recent conversations amongst the Deans and Academic Vice President, the University needs to determine the best possible model for delivery of Summer Session. An optimal organizational structure for Summer Sessions is being sought and evaluated. Models under consideration include centralization for all summer session offerings, decentralization to each School, or a blend of the two options.

• Decisions must be made about the responsibility for the delivery of Summer School and the possibility for potential control of course content outside the academic unit wherein a program is housed.
• If the current system of Summer School is kept, then process and policies must be implemented to assess quality and outcomes consistent with the criteria set by the school or college wherein the program is housed.
## DEGREES CONFERRED 1993-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Year</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degrees Conferred by School/College 1993-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/S</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The total number of degrees by school/college may not match the overall number of degrees conferred for that year due to some miscellaneous degrees that were offered on a limited basis or for a limited time (i.e., graduate degrees in Engineering and undergraduate and graduate degrees in English Language Center, through the Integrated Studies program, Saint Michael’s Institute) that have been excluded from the “By School/College” table for ease of reading.
### Substantive Curriculum Changes Since Last Accreditation Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Masters of Arts in English discontinued</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>Exercise Science moved from School of Education to College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>Exercise Science moved from College of Arts &amp; Sciences to School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>German Studies Major was discontinued</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Business</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBA and MACC</td>
<td>Added a MIS specialization</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>MACC's accounting track renamed Professional Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration (undergraduate)</td>
<td>E commerce concentration</td>
<td>Added in 2001; dropped in 2003;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration in Operations Management renamed Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration in Supply Chain Management changed to Supply Chain and Operations Management</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Leadership Formation Program developed for certification of administrators in the State of Washington</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bifurcation of the Master of Administration into the Master of Administration and Supervision and Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Functional Analysis Track added to Master of Education degree</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT offered through grant in Oahu, Hawai‘i with coursework in special education</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education only primary endorsement offered</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral Analysis Approval for Functional Analysis Track</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Physical Education</td>
<td>Bachelor Science in Exercise Science was approved and offered</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts in Sport &amp; Athletic Administration is approved and began accepting students into the new degree program</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise Science and Sport &amp; Physical Education become two separate departments; Bachelors in Exercise Science to the College of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Bachelors of Education in Sport Management begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Master of Arts in Computer Education</td>
<td>Added in 1991; dropped in 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT becomes a 2-year, part time program</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT offered on Leeward Oahu, Hawai‘i</td>
<td>1998-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT offered through grant in Oahu, Hawai‘i</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All departments with certification requirements for teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised programs to meet Washington State OSPI endorsement standards</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate in Educational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moved to School of Professional Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Engineering</td>
<td>BS in General Engineering added</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>BS in Computer Engineering added</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>MS in Mechanical Engineering eliminated</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>MS in Electrical Engineering eliminated</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Program</td>
<td>The degree offered by the Department of Doctoral Studies was changed from the EdD to the PhD</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>implemented the accelerated RN-to-MSN program</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>established a consortium agreement with the Intercollegiate College of Nursing to offer the BSN degree (for students who do not hold RN licensure)</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>signed a consortium agreement with Seattle University to offer the BSN degree (for students who do not hold RN licensure)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>The Bachelor of General Studies (Accelerated) program was begun</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>discontinued the BA degree in Exercise Science and replace it with the BS degree</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Studies</td>
<td>Began a Certificate in Advanced Leadership Studies</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Master of Arts in Communication and Leadership program to admitted its first students</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/TESL</td>
<td>Began program</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STANDARD THREE: STUDENTS

Purpose and Organization

Foreword

The institution’s response to Standard Three requires an integration of numerous reports from three separate vice presidential divisions: the Division of Student Life, the Administrative Division of the Academic Vice President, and the Vice President for Finance, which includes the reporting areas of Athletics, Plant & Construction Services, and the Bookstore. The Division of Student Life is dedicated exclusively to serving students, and for that reason its organizational structure and staffing are identified first.

The Division of Student Life: An Overview
(Sue D. Weitz, Ph.D, Vice President for Student Life)

Gonzaga University takes particular pride in its wonderful students and has made a commitment to educate the “whole person” both in, and out of, the classroom. A great deal of attention is given to creating a campus climate that celebrates the unique and special attributes of each student who walks through the doors of our Jesuit, Catholic, humanistic institution. Each staff member is asked to model the qualities that the University hopes will be developed in its students during their collegiate experience. Respect for self, respect for others, and respect for the dignity of the whole person are core values and the mission areas of faith, leadership, service, ethics and justice are intentionally woven into the fabric of the student experience. The Student Life Division is committed to work in partnership with all areas of the University to best educate students.

The Student Life staff strives with special effort to work collaboratively with colleagues in the academic community. This partnership enables students to better experience a seamless education, blending together ideas and concepts gained in the classroom with applied knowledge.
drawn from their everyday lives. We believe our campus is a community where students share and experience learning, ideas, knowledge, friends, and worship. Student Life staff members are committed to helping students maneuver through challenges and take advantage of opportunities to enhance their educational experience. The Student Life Mission Statement helps to put these concepts into practice (see Exhibit 3.1).

Objectives of the Student Life Program

The objectives of the Student Life program are to:

- Provide the opportunity for students to live in community with one another.
- Provide experiences for students to serve others.
- Encourage students to integrate formal and informal learning, promoting the Jesuit philosophy of education of the “whole person.”
- Support the educational process both in and outside of the classroom.
- Promote communication and effective relationships among students, faculty and administrators as part of the educational, governance, and decision-making processes.
- Provide services, programs, and an organizational structure which promotes the involvement of student personnel and professional staff in the day-to-day co-curricular lives of students.

Organization and Staffing

The Division of Student Life is led by the Vice President for Student Life. The Vice President serves as a member of the President’s Cabinet, University Budget Committee, and interacts regularly with the other senior members of the University administration. In addition, the Dean of Student Services attends regular meetings with the academic deans
and with the academic vice president, allowing for information sharing on an ongoing basis. Many University-wide committees include representation from faculty members, staff, students and administrators allowing for a wider vision and cross-functional teamwork.

The Student Life organizational chart is presented as Exhibit 3.2. (The Student Support Services organizational chart, for departments within the Academic Vice President’s division, is presented as Exhibit 3.2b.)

**Student Conduct**

Policy statements regarding student conduct are clearly published and articulated in the Gonzaga University *Student Handbook* (Exhibit 3.3) and, in relevant part, through the Gonzaga University *Catalogues* (Exhibits 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6). The *Student Handbook* (incorporated with a student planner for the past two years), is distributed to all undergraduate and graduate students each year. All relevant policies concerning students are printed in this publication including: academic honesty, student government and organizations’ policies, and student conduct and grievance policies. Each year the policies in the *Student Handbook* are analyzed, updated and published so students can have institutional expectations and information conveyed in writing. Students are asked to offer suggestions regarding policy issues and are encouraged to engage in discussions with University administrators about how to create policies that are fair and consistent.

The Student Judicial Conduct Board provides input to the Dean of Student Services each year, prior to the publication of the new *Student Handbook*, on disciplinary policies and procedures. The Chief Justice also meets with the Dean of Student Services on a regular basis to give input on any changes he or she feels are necessary.

The Gonzaga Student Body Association (student government) representatives meet with the University Cabinet each fall to discuss policies and practices. In addition, the President and members of the Student Life administrative team meet with the student Forum and
participate in a “State of the University” address. The Residence Hall Association and the Graduate Student Advisory Council provide additional opportunities for student input into policy-making.

Strengths

The Student Life staff is fully committed to the promotion of justice, collaborative relationships, and to building a community that reflects a culture of concern for students. An “ethic of care” is demonstrated throughout the University for students in crisis and is especially evident by the work of the Case team (which confers weekly on problematic student situations). Students are provided a multitude of avenues to have a voice in their education and to take on major leadership roles on campus. Upper-class students serve as role models to the incoming students through their leadership roles in various programs such as Ambassadors, CRISP, New Student Orientation, Residence Life Staff, Student Government, Clubs and Organizations, Athletic and recreational teams, Student Publications, or The Alliance.

The residence halls and apartments built in the past seven years reflect student input. All halls are wired to meet technology needs. Positive Choice and single room options, as well as special interest housing all have been designed to meet changing student needs.

The commitment to service and service learning is evident by the high number of students who volunteer, and by the successful programs and projects implemented each year. At Gonzaga, students are encouraged to take ownership in their University and its activities. A division-wide commitment to hire quality staff from diverse backgrounds exists, and has been highly successful.

Limitations
While each Student Life division staff member strives to assist students to the best of her or his ability, some limitations have persisted or surfaced over the years. For example, a lack of facility space for meetings, work and programming, and the limited number of student gathering places is a major problem on campus. It is partially being addressed by the remodel of the Cataldo Hall, new residence halls/apartments and the new Fitness Center, but a modern Student Center is a desire and is planned as part of the upcoming 2007 Capital Campaign. There is an inadequate amount of housing to meet student demand, and there are concerns about parking and security incidents in the surrounding neighborhood.

Student Life is also hindered by the following challenges:

- Computer upgrades are needed throughout the division.
- Professional development and staffing are not adequately financially supported.
- There is a sense that Student Life is not adequately represented and included in high-level financial decision-making.

Other challenges are highlighted by department throughout the report.

Currently, the Student Life staff is often overwhelmed with the number of issues that must be addressed to adequately insure the well-being of students. The ratio of staff to students in the division has not kept pace with enrollment, thereby increasing the workload on many departments. For additional information, please see Table 3.2 (Staffing Comparison, 1993-2003).

The entire Division of Student Life meets once a month through the academic year and also meets for professional development semi-annually. These meetings are designed to provide an opportunity for learning, goal setting, education, training, development, reflection and for maintaining a sense of community within the division. The division strives to educate itself through the use of speakers, professional development, and the utilization of survey instruments to better understand the needs of students who attend GU. Student survey data is then distributed back to University department heads. The departments, in turn, meet to better determine specific changes that need to be implemented.

Many relationships between staff members and faculty do exist and are being strengthened through a number of important initiatives. The Vice President of Student Life contacts a number of different faculty members each month to join her for lunch and for conversation, in an effort
to build relationships, share concerns, and generate ideas. The faculty plays an important role in new student orientation and in their role as student advisors. The CCASL is working with an increasing number of faculty members to develop additional service learning courses. In addition, several faculty members volunteer to work with the Mission Possible trips over spring break. Our 92 clubs and organizations are advised by many faculty and staff members. An “early warning system” has been very successful in having faculty members identify students at risk so that help can be coordinated for those individuals. Several new initiatives have been proposed to provide special interest housing, such as an engineering hall, a service learning program and a potential leadership program.

Faculty advisors to clubs provide leadership in the development and updating of policies and procedures which apply to clubs. In addition, faculty members sit on the disciplinary board to advise the development of disciplinary policies. The Vice President for Student Life and the Academic Vice President meet monthly to keep channels of communication open.

Division of Student Life: Next Steps

Throughout this report, a number of needs are identified, some of which are specific to particular departments. The Division of Student Life has identified the following as key, overarching issues that need attention:

1. It is important to increase staffing to adequate levels in Student Life, particularly in the following offices:
   - The Counseling and Career Assessment Center
   - Vice President of Student Life/Dean of Student Services: An Associate Dean/Assistant Dean or other administrator to share the increasing work load of providing quality service to students.
   - Residence Life: To see a larger number professional live-in staff in the future.
   - Student Activities: As student participation in clubs, organizations and club sports increases, the demand on staff is overwhelming. It is recommended that an additional staff member be added to meet workload demands, and that Student Activities work closely with Intramurals and the Rudolf Fitness Center staff.
   - Campus Services: The demand for technology set-up support is increasing and the need for more staff is increasing. It is recommended that one or more additional staff positions be created and funded to meet the needs on campus.
   - Career Center: An internship coordinator is needed.

2. Collaboration between Study Abroad programs and Student Life is important. When one examines a student’s experience abroad, it is clear that academic needs and life outside the classroom need to be balanced. There are great opportunities for the two enterprises to work very closely in providing an optimal experience for students. It is recommended that a more formalized working relationship be developed between these areas.

3. The Student Life Division staff collects good data through a number of methods, but the data needs to be more systematically utilized to improve services and meet the needs of students.
4. The staff believes that it can’t last the next seven years without improved space.

- The VP for Student Life/Dean of Student Services space is not adequate for the student traffic it serves.
- Student Clubs and Organizations need more space.
- The Bulletin and other campus publications need improved lab space.
- Offices which are currently housed in “houses” require more appropriate, and accessible space.

It is recommended that a space analysis be conducted, and a plan created, to deal with space issues in the division of Student Life.

5. A process is underway to develop a Co-Curricular Transcript program at GU. It is recommended that a staff position be created and a budget provided to develop and maintain the transcript program.

6. Parent Programs: Several University departments are collaborating to design programs for parents of GU students. It is recommended that this program be developed for the future and that adequate staff be provided to run this program.

7. Leadership Development opportunities are being examined and offered outside the classroom. More leadership options are being explored for the future.

8. It is recommended that the development of a close relationship between academic programs and Student Life programs continue.

9. It is recommended that the University create a formal process to identify technology needs in Student Life areas, and fund those needs.

10. It is important to identify ways that the Law School and the main campus can work together to meet the needs of the students. It is recommended that a more formal working relationship be developed between the Law School and the Student Life division.

11. Learning Communities: Collaboration between Student Life and Academic Affairs is paramount in creating these important communities, and is beginning to take place. Creating a positive learning environment is a priority for the division of Student Life.

12. An examination of the Gonzaga campus climate will continue in the future, through a campus-wide collaborative Campus Culture Committee.

13. A Student Union committee is being appointed to begin the process of planning for a new Student Union at GU.

14. Cataldo Hall is currently in the process of renovation. The future plans for the building are being prepared by students, staff, and administrators working together.
15. Plans to incorporate faculty into New Student Orientation in a meaningful way are being examined.

16. Work is currently underway to pursue development of a program focusing on alcohol abuse and sexual assault through an NIAAA grant.

Table 3.1: Student Affairs Staff Profile
(This report contains information only from the Division of Student Life. These figures do not include Student Government, Orientation, Activities Board, or students paid from department’s “Restricted” funds.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>AmeriCorps Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., Ed.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD, JD, MSW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA, BS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA, AAS, Certificate, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Experience in the Field:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: STAFFING COMPARISONS FOR THE DIVISION OF STUDENT LIFE, 1993 to 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENTS AND POSITIONS</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT LIFE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+2 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Student Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reorg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Reorg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant to the V.P. for Student Life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary, V.P. for Student Life</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Counselor (10 month position)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life Specialist/Grant Director*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN OF STUDENT SERVICES/HOUSING/RESIDENCE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE/ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reorg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary, Dean of Student Services (10 month position)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary, Dean of Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Facilitator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Reorg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming Specialist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby Manager</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Reorg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Assistant I (Part-time position)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Reorg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Residence Life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Housing/Residence Life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director/Residence Life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Secretary II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Residence Life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Housing/Residence Life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director/Residence Life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Secretary II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Officer/Residence Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Coordinator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Coordinator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELING AND CAREER ASSESSMENT CENTER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor (Part-time position)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER CENTER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS MINISTRY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENTS AND POSITIONS</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS MINISTRY (CONTINUED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH CENTER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director (10 month position)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (10 month position)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse (10 month position)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse (10 month position)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Position Increases

As can be seen at the end of the attached report, it appears the Student Life Division has increased by 3 new positions and nine new programs during the past 10 years. However, that is partially the result of the department acquisitions or losses due to restructuring within the University.

### Identifying Student Educational Needs

A Graduate Student Advisory Council (GSAC) exists and works together with staff to meet some of the needs of graduate students, such as providing a new graduate student orientation program and handbook. The needs of non-traditional students are being addressed through Encore
House, representation on the Gonzaga Student Body Association (GSBA), and representation in orientation. Graduate students are full members of GSBA and can fully participate in the leadership aspects of the organization and can take advantage of all programs, events, and clubs that exist on campus. (GSAC) is advised by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Student Activities Program Coordinator.

**Student Involvement in Governance**

**IV. Gonzaga Student Body Association** *(Ryan McCauley, President)*

Student government has an important role within the campus community and helps students develop academically, spiritually, socially, professionally, and physically. The student leadership is committed to listening attentively to the student body and communicating clearly while representing the voice of students to the administration. Student government also provides the opportunity for students to gain valuable leadership skills and to contribute positively to ongoing improvements at GU. The programs and activities planned by GSBA enhance the quality of life for the community through the many educational, cultural, social and recreational offerings it provides.

The Gonzaga Student Body Association is made up of four distinct areas and serves to provide a voice for students on important issues while also providing extracurricular opportunities for the student body:

The Executive Branch consists of the President, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Finance, Vice President for Student Organizations (90+ clubs are currently in existence), Vice President for Student Relations, and the Vice President for Student Activities. The staff members include the Chief of Staff, Treasurer, Publicity Manager, Administrative Assistant and 2 Election Coordinators.

The Legislative Branch, or the Forum consists of the following members: Student Affairs Vice President, six On-Campus Representatives, six Off-Campus Representatives, four Class Vice-Presidents, four Class Representatives, two At-Large Representatives, one Nontraditional Student Representative, and one International Student Union Representative.

The Judicial Branch including the Student Judicial/Conduct Board consists of the Chief Justice, one faculty member or staff member and five student members.

The Gonzaga Activities Board is headed by the Vice President of Student Activities. It includes the organization of community outreach, concerts, lectures, special events, and the work of the class presidents.

The Student Bar Association, (SBA) works with the needs of students in the Law School. This organization encourages and enhances the academic and social environment of law students. They sponsor a variety of activities in which all law students are entitled and encouraged to participate.
Similarly, students’ interests are also represented at the Board of Trustee, Regent, and committee level by involved student leaders, the Vice President, and the Dean of Student Services (see Standard Six).

The Gonzaga Student Body Association and the Residence Hall Association also have the opportunity to engage in ongoing dialogue with members of the University administration about policies that affect students. The GSBA President meets weekly with the Dean of Student Services and monthly with the Vice President for Student Life and University President. The student regents and student body are also given an opportunity to address the Board of Trustees at least twice a year. The students’ opinions are taken seriously and are welcome.

Improvements since the last self study include: transition retreats between the outgoing student leaders and the incoming group, summer retreats designed to train the student leaders, gaining financial stability, more inclusion of graduate students, nontraditional students and international students into the student governing organizations, more advisors to assist with providing support to the student groups and a more welcoming structure in the Forum as opposed to the previous Senate structure.

GSBA is undertaking major initiatives to develop a solid core of student involvement in the governance of Gonzaga. Students continue to be major players in the way the University is shaped, and all of these new opportunities are helping to establish GSBA’s ability to influence decision making.

Student Rights, Responsibilities and Publications

Publications from the Division of Student Life include the Gonzaga University Student Handbook/Residence Life Handbook, Gonzaga University Campus Safety and Security (Exhibit 3.7), and Research Statistics (Exhibit 3.8) on students. In addition many individual departments, including CCASL, the Health Center, the Counseling Center and the Career Center, issue their own publications outlining specific information applicable to their services. Weekly updates are given via e-mail on campus security, and regarding activities and programs offered to the University community. Many departments also take full advantage of the Gonzaga website as a means to communicate with a broader audience.
Diversity & Justice Activism and Education (Raymond Reyes, Ph.D., Associate Vice President for Diversity)

The Associate Vice President for Diversity is responsible for the overall organizational development of cultural competency at Gonzaga University; and to inspire systemic change at all levels of the University, with the goal of fostering greater academic responsiveness to diversity needs. The initiatives with which the Associate Vice President is involved include the following four goals:

- **Campus Climate**: To establish and sustain a campus climate that is infused with the experience of diversity, and where the values of respect, inclusion, and compassion are kept at the core of the campus community’s consciousness;
- **Intercultural Competency and Diversity Leadership**: To recommend and assist in new course development, provide faculty and staff training programs, and other learning opportunities . . . which enhance the educational experience of our students, staff and faculty in deepening their understanding and respect for all people.
- **Recruitment and Retention**: To assist with increasing the diversity of Gonzaga’s faculty, staff and student populations by coordinating and consulting with various University constituents responsible for recruitment and retention;
- **Community Outreach and Social Justice Leadership**: To assist with regional social justice and human rights efforts through active involvement in community activities, forming collaborative partnerships with community-based organizations, and by serving as a leadership resource to the Spokane regional area.

The Associate Vice President for Diversity has worked on many different projects, ranging from research initiatives (e.g., tracking retention statistics for students of color [Exhibit 3.9]), and to create a nationally-recognized Institute for Action Against Hate (see documents at Exhibit 3.10). Specific objectives to achieve the goals listed above are generated each year and reviewed with the President (Exhibit 3.11). As part of the many initiatives with which the Vice President is involved, a major area of work involves multicultural education, which includes the work of the Director of that area, Bob Bartlett.

**Multicultural Education/Unity House Cultural Education Center (Bob Bartlett, Director)**

The purpose of the Director of Multicultural Education is to promote the Jesuit and Catholic ideals of social justice and service; and to promote cultural understanding, tolerance, and racial equity within the Gonzaga Community through education, support, and advocacy. The department provides educational opportunities such as student leadership and professional development programs, cultural events, community service and outreach initiatives for all students. It also exists:

To support students of color by working to provide a safe and equitable academic campus climate and to provide ongoing opportunities and outlets for an active and open dialogue regarding racial, cultural, and social justice issues for all members of the Gonzaga Community.
To provide educational opportunities through teaching academic courses and lecturing across disciplines, such as; pathways, teacher education, sociology and the graduate program.

To support the University Mission that states a belief in the principles of holistic education that strives to provide all community members with opportunities for a variety of experiences from which they can learn and grow.

To create a high profile and professional position, programs, and facility with a concentration on diversity education. The department reports directly to and assist the Associate Vice President for Diversity who, in turn, reports to the University President.

The programs, services and students served through this office span and include the diverse populations that exist both on and off campus. The Office helps facilitate a graduate assistant program and works to employee graduate students at both the Masters and Doctoral level as program assistants. Programs range from employee services, parents, students and resident hall staff (see the full Assessment document or our website under Academic).

Unity House Cultural Education Center (Founded in 1996)  
“Enriching Life Through Justice and Culture—Experience it”

The center provides assistance and support to all students, faculty, and staff who seek to broaden and deepen their understanding of themselves and the diverse world in which we live. The Center, its services and programs are designed to encourage open and honest communication and participation in cultural education and cross-cultural experiences.

Mission

- To promote the Jesuit and Catholic ideals of social justice and service.
- To promote cultural understanding, tolerance, and racial equity within the Gonzaga Community through education, support, and advocacy.
- To provide and promote educational opportunities, such as, student leadership and professional development programs, cultural events, and community service outreach initiatives. Our staff seeks to specifically support students of color by providing a safe, equitable, academic, and social environment and campus climate.

Unity House is an academic resource center, a drop-in place, a place to study, a place for student clubs to meet and a home away from home for students and visitors. The Center has a computer lab with 3 on-line computers, a small video and text library with research resources library. It has a large screen T.V., CD/Tape stereo system and VHS/DVD players. The Center has a full utility kitchen and dinning area, meeting space upstairs and down, and a yard for outdoor social gatherings. It publishes and circulates its own newsletter. The Center hosts various academic classes and offers and supports its own student leadership courses and scholarship program called, the Academic Cultural Excellence Program (ACE). Unity House serves as the center of operations and meeting place for several organizations, and student clubs.

The department continues to solicit feedback through informal student meetings and focus groups. Having a home in the College of Arts and Sciences with an emphasis on teaching and
instruction is a definite strength. Being somewhat removed from the main administrative offices has the student advantage of anonymity and safety.

Next Steps

- Add a fulltime assistant office/department manager
- Add an activities coordinator
- Offer ACE courses for academic credit
- Substantially increase the departments overall operating budget
- Establish funds to support the publishing and distribution of the Unity House Quarterly
- Make much needed renovations to the interior of the Center, e.g. new carpet, and replace conference table and chairs
- Develop a long range plan that includes the construction of a multi-million dollar, multi-use multicultural center in or near the heart of campus

Assessment

The Division of Student Life and other departments at Gonzaga utilize a number of instruments and techniques to collect data from students. The information is used to make important decisions regarding services and service delivery to students, and informs, evaluation of institutional effectiveness. The importance of assessment has been emphasized to the Student Life staff in several division-wide meetings. Dr. Susan Prion from the University of San Francisco and Dr. Jeremy Stringer from Seattle University, both experts in the field of Student Affairs, each presented information regarding assessment and its role on two separate occasions in 2002 and 2003. Examples of the assessment tools currently employed are presented as Exhibit 3.8.

In addition, Gonzaga was selected in 2003 for inclusion in the Documenting Effective Educational Practices (DEEP) Project, an in-depth study examining what makes colleges and universities a place where students achieve higher than would be expected on a number of important variables (See Exhibit 3.12).

Academic Credit and Records
For all academic areas except the School of Law, the University Registrar is responsible for the execution of academic policy and the custodianship of academic records. The School of Law has its own Registrar, and for that reason separate overviews are provided by each.

**University Registrar** *(Jolanta Kozyra, University Registrar)*

The primary functions of the Registrar’s Office are to assist students in achieving their academic objectives and to implement and enforce the University’s academic policies. Most of the policies and procedures informing and guiding the operations of the Registrar’s Office are published in the official *University Catalogues* and/or in the *Announcement of Course Offerings* (Exhibit 3.13) produced for the Fall and Spring semesters as well as for the Summer Sessions terms. In addition to the publications produced by the Division of Student Life, these publications also contain relevant information about the students’ rights and responsibilities. All new and/or additional academic policies are considered and approved by the Academic Vice President as recommended by the Academic and Graduate Councils, as appropriate. The Registrar is a member of each of these Councils.

Gonzaga University and the Registrar’s Office recognize and respect the importance of providing all our students with true and accurate records of their enrollment. The University follows a variety of safety, security, and regulatory measures to protect student records from inappropriate use or disclosure and any potential risk of destruction. Furthermore, the University has developed storage and archival systems to ensure these records are permanent. The vast majority of these practices are informed by the regulations of FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) and ARMA (American Records Management Association). Every type of a student record that is required to be retained indefinitely has an electronic or a microfilm/microfiche backup either on or off site, or both. In addition to the minimum standards dictated by legal requirements, Gonzaga University has implemented additional policies further protecting our students’ privacy. For example, by institutional policy the University does not release any lists of students to any entity without a specific and legitimate educational need to know, even though FERPA may allow for such release. Another example is Gonzaga’s decision not to consider student class schedules as directory information. As with all other operations, policies, and procedures, the Registrar’s Office looks to the guidelines recommended by AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) when unusual circumstances arise.

The following responsibilities and functions, pertaining to all student types and levels except for Law, are performed by the Registrar’s Office:

- Registration, drop/add, withdrawals of all students including priority registration. Although the actual registration process is done primarily by students themselves via the web (except for first semester freshmen who are registered by Student Academic Services), it is the Registrar’s responsibility to provide the overall system and to assist students with any related needs and/or issues.
- Academic advising of non-degree seeking students.
- Processing of grades (approximately 65,000 grades are processed annually) and grade changes (approximately 850 grade changes are processed annually).
- Maintenance, storage, archival, and responsibility for safety and security of academic records. All electronic records are stored on-line and also via back-up electronic storage, and all archival records are stored in the office for easy retrieval via microfilm and/or
microfiche as well as off-site for security purposes. Physical files of currently and recently enrolled students are stored in file cabinets in the Registrar's Office.

- Production of transcripts (about 12,000 annually), verifications of enrollment (8500 annually), and verifications of degrees. These processes also include coordination with the National Student Clearinghouse.
- Production of course offerings (both physical and web-based) for approximately 3600 courses annually. This responsibility also includes classroom scheduling (63 classrooms each semester) for all courses.
- Veterans’ affairs administration (about 100 veterans).
- Awarding of student-related academic honors.
- Production of the Commencement Programs (Exhibit 3.14) and coordination of all student-related functions in both commencement ceremonies.
- Production and distribution of academic and statistical reports to faculty, department chairs, and deans (Examples at Exhibit 3.15).
- Production of University-wide enrollment statistics.
- Coordination and submission of a wide variety of statistical and informational surveys.
- Coordination and administration of various special programs such as studies abroad, off-campus education, continuing education, English as Second Language program, etc.
- NCAA eligibility verification and reporting (approx. 400 student athletes).
- Implementation and enforcement of pertinent academic and University policies and procedures.
- Coordination of appeals for late adds/drops/withdrawals and tuition reimbursement requests.
- Training and enforcement of FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act).
- Administration and maintenance of student-related modules of the Integrated Student Information System (SCT’s Banner) including relevant authorization of personnel access to Banner.

The Registrar’s Office, whose job it is to be the custodian of confidential records, has not been accused of violating, or been found to have violated, any of the relevant laws relating to privacy of information. Given all the complexities of FERPA and other regulations, this is a significant accomplishment. It should also be noted that information housed and managed by the Registrar’s Office has been found in compliance with the relevant regulations when audited.

**Law School Registrar’s Office (Sharon Day, Law School Registrar)**

In June 2000, Gonzaga University’s School of Law Registrar’s Office moved into its new and current location. Located on the second floor of this state-of-the-art Law School building, the office is staffed by two full-time employees, the Registrar and a Program Assistant III. The Registrar, who reports to the Law School’s Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, has served in that capacity since 1974. The Program Assistant started in October 2003 and reports to the Registrar. The primary role and function of the Law School Registrar’s Office is to serve its students by providing administrative services as well as implementing and enforcing academic policies and procedures as established by the Law School Academic Affairs Committee. These policies are published in the *Gonzaga University School of Law Student Handbook* (Exhibit 3.3) or
The Law School Registrar’s Office strives to be prompt and professional in providing its students and faculty with prompt, professional, and equitable services with utmost attention to and regard for the unique nature of this student population.

The Law School’s Registrar’s Office is responsible for the following duties and processes, as they pertain to Law students and (where applicable) Law alumni:

- Registration, course drop/add, institutional withdrawals
- Processing of grades
- Maintenance, storage, archiving, and custodial responsibility for the safety and security of academic records
- Production of Law transcripts
- Transcription of transfer credits
- Production and distribution of academic and statistical reports
- Implementation and enforcement of pertinent academic policies and procedures
- Bar certification of all graduates
- Student Loan deferment paperwork
- Rule IX applications processing
- Evaluation of degrees; determination of academic honors and awards
- Administration of Summer school for law students
- Processing of Faculty evaluations
- Determination of residency
- Scheduling and administration of accommodated exams
- Issuance of exam numbers
- Enrollment projections; retention and attrition studies

Student records are accurate, secure, and comprehensive. In their paper and/or microfiche format, they are housed in the Law Registrar’s Office. Most of the physical records are kept in fire-proof and waterproof file cabinets. The electronic documents are backed up as appropriate on a regular basis. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 serves as the basis for all policies and operations related to protecting student privacy.

**Transfer of Credit (Law)**

According to academic policy, Law students are permitted to transfer (in) a maximum of 45 semester credits from an accredited Law School at the time of their admission. A minimum course grade of C is required and final discretion regarding transferability of credit is determined by the Admissions Committee during the admission process. Once enrolled as a matriculating Gonzaga Law School student, any request for credit transfer must be approved by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs prior to enrollment. Upon his/her approval, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs informs the Registrar of the decision via a memo. All appeals to the academic policy are submitted to and decided on by the Law School’s Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The Law School Registrar’s Office looks to the professional standards of the American Bar Association (ABA), the American Association of Law Schools (AALS), as well as the American
Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) to guide its policies and operations.

**Significant changes:**

The most significant changes for the Law School’s Registrar’s Office have been the physical relocation to the new building (2000), the implementation of an integrated Student Information System that was implemented in the Fall of 1996, and the added overall workload resulting from the recent increased enrollments.

**Next Steps:**

- Pursue electronic document storage and retrieval media
- Continue to update and formalize academic policies and procedures
- Provide on-going FERPA training for Law School personnel
- Pursue professional development opportunities for the Law School Registrar, in an effort to better serve Law students and faculty

**Evaluation of Student Performance**

- The respective University *Catalogues* clearly identify all degree requirements for all programs of study including minimum credit and grade point average requirements as well as any capstone courses, special projects, theses, dissertations, and comprehensive exam requirements. The Academic and Graduate Councils serve as mechanisms by which degree programs and/or their requirements can be revised. The Academic Council also serves as a mechanism by which the effectiveness of the various degree programs can be assessed and evaluated.
- The Credentials Evaluation Office, a part of the University Registrar's Office, is responsible for academic credentials evaluation and degree granting for all students except Law. On average, in the past five years, approximately 575 baccalaureate degrees, 350 master's degrees, and 12 doctoral degrees have been granted annually. Typically, about 85-90% of those students who apply to graduate are awarded their degree within a given cycle.
- As the following table indicates, Gonzaga’s overall graduation rates have increased significantly since 1994. 75% of the freshmen who entered Gonzaga in 1996, the most recent cohort reported to IPEDS, graduated within six years. The four-class average (1994-1997) stands at nearly 69%.

**Table 3.2 - Graduation Rates for Undergraduate Students -- 1994-1998**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of Entry to GU</th>
<th>4-Year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>5-Year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>6-Year Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information regarding undergraduate student retention and graduation rates is available at Exhibit 3.16.

Graduation Requirements

All degree and graduation requirements are clearly indicated for each program of study in the University Catalogues. In addition to specific course requirements, standard grade point averages and credit minimums must be satisfied for a degree to be awarded. There are several non-academic requirements (i.e. complete payment of indebtedness to Gonzaga) also need to be satisfied to graduate. Students must apply to graduate by submitting an Application to Graduate and the graduation application fee to the appropriate office. The application triggers a specific degree evaluation that is communicated to the student and the student’s advisor. If applicable, all deficiencies are identified so that students can take action to resolve them. Once all degree requirements have been met, the official degree is posted on the student’s transcript and a diploma is produced and sent to the student.

Continuing Education – Non Degree Credit

The University Registrar’s Office is the primary location for housing and maintaining students’ academic records (except those of the Law School). Transcription of students’ academic history is one of the most critical activities involved with that responsibility. A wide selection of enrollment and student status codes are maintained to clearly distinguish between credit-awarding and non-degree credits completed through the University. All students are categorized as either degree-seeking or as non-degree seeking (non-matriculated) students in each student level. Students in English as a Second Language, Continuing Education, Workshops, and Sabbatical programs are coded as non-degree seeking students by way of specific codes housed by the integrated student information system. All programs leading to an official University credential (degrees, majors, minors, concentrations) must be approved by the Academic Council or the Graduate Council as appropriate. Courses offered under any of the non-degree options do not need such approval and are identified in the computer system accordingly. All transcripts reflect the appropriate “student level” (i.e. undergraduate, graduate, non-matriculated, continuing education, etc.) prominently printed at the beginning of the document. Furthermore, continuing education and workshop credits do not count toward any Gonzaga credential and are coded with their own unique course numbering structure of 1000 and 900 respectively for easy identification. The Continuing Education Office is responsible for production and dissemination of recruitment materials for that student population. These documents clearly indicate that given programs and/or courses are for continuing education credit only.

Significant Changes

A number of significant changes impacting Registrar functions have taken place in the last ten years. The most notable change is Gonzaga’s purchase and implementation of an integrated Student Information System (SCT’s Banner). The system “went live” in the Registrar’s Office in
the summer of 1996. Registration for Spring 2000 marked the beginning of Web-based registration, electronic grade submission became an option for faculty in summer 2001, and summer 2002 ended the existence of the twelve-years-old touchtone registration system. Most recently, in Fall 2002, the functionality of Banner and its web interface also added an electronic degree audit system (Curriculum Advising and Program Planning (CAPP)). Since the inception of Banner, Gonzaga University has enjoyed an electronic transfer credit articulation system by which transfer credit policies and procedures have become much more streamlined and consistent. Even though we leave significant room for departmental discretion in this regard, most of the transfer credit articulation happens via this computer functionality. This has resulted in a much more efficient and consistent approach to our students’ requests in this regard. Also effective Fall 2002, faculty no longer have the option of submitting grades on paper; their only option is electronic Web-based submission.

The Registrar’s Office now enjoys a greater and more effective internet presence. In addition to all the functionality that the administrative system (“Zagweb”) has to offer, current and former students can also request transcripts via a secure server, download a variety of forms, and obtain other general information. In November of 2002, the Registrar’s Office took on responsibility for evaluating and granting of graduate degrees as a result of the closure of the Graduate School Office.

In the Summer of 1998, more than one million documents were removed from the shelves on the walls of the Registrar’s Office and converted to microfilm for secure archival of these records. The original documents remain stored off-site. The new microfilm format of all documents supplements the earlier microfiche format. In addition, all records are stored on either magnetic tapes (primarily for pre-Banner records), or on disk. Snapshots of the student information system database are made on a regular basis for added security and backup in the event of any system failure. All these backup measures contribute to an adequate recovery system for electronic data if necessary. The physical student files stored in the Registrar’s Office are kept in quality metal cabinets that are locked in the office when the office is closed. These records are no longer kept in fire-proof file cabinets as these cabinets have proven unnecessary. The information now stored in the physical files is typically limited to information that is also, with the exception of the actual admission application form, stored electronically (i.e. test scores, transcripts from other institutions, substitution forms, etc.). If these physical documents were to be destroyed in the event of a fire, most if not all of the needed information could be obtained from the respective electronic media.

As a result of all of the above changes and improvements over the past ten years, the accuracy of records has increased dramatically. Short of common data entry errors that may happen on occasion, our records are accurate and up-to-date.

**Enrollment Trends**

As Table 3.3 indicates, Gonzaga’s undergraduate enrollment has drastically increased in the last ten years, with most of the growth occurring since 1999.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Enrollment – Headcount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3811</td>
<td>3487</td>
<td>3064</td>
<td>2909</td>
<td>2812</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td>2919</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>3036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5589</strong></td>
<td><strong>5206</strong></td>
<td><strong>4765</strong></td>
<td><strong>4435</strong></td>
<td><strong>4507</strong></td>
<td><strong>4474</strong></td>
<td><strong>4632</strong></td>
<td><strong>4705</strong></td>
<td><strong>4772</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Enrollment - FTE (Full-Time-Equivalent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3987</td>
<td>3442</td>
<td>3039</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>2816</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>2902</td>
<td>3066</td>
<td>3026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5274</strong></td>
<td><strong>4668</strong></td>
<td><strong>4246</strong></td>
<td><strong>4080</strong></td>
<td><strong>4061</strong></td>
<td><strong>4050</strong></td>
<td><strong>4464</strong></td>
<td><strong>4400</strong></td>
<td><strong>4423</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Enrollment by College/School – Headcount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Along with increased general enrollments at the undergraduate level, Gonzaga has experienced increased numbers in students of color as seen below:

Table 3.4 - Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity
1996-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Non-resident</th>
<th>Black, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total Enrolled</th>
<th>Percentage, Students of Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>2919</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>2812</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>2920</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>3058</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3483</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3008</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3814</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3133</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3981</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

- Procure an electronic document storage and retrieval media system for the utmost security and efficiency of managing student records.
- Pursue professional contacts with whom Electronic Data Interchange activity may be possible.
- Continue to update and formalize the academic policy and procedure review processes of Gonzaga University and of the Registrar’s Office.
- Identify the time and other resources to train additional personnel in the Registrar’s Office to become skilled electronic report writers.
- Establish and conduct formal and comprehensive FERPA training sessions for all Gonzaga personnel.
• Strive for a process by which students in their Junior year of study can begin their degree evaluation process.

Transfer Credit

(1) Gonzaga University’s policies and procedures regarding transfer credit are described in the respective University Catalogues as well as directly on the forms that are used for approval purposes (see samples at Exhibit 3.17). Since 1994, great improvements have been made in the levels of consistency and applicability of accepting credits in transfer from a large number of institutions. Most notably, all transfer credit postings are now entered into Banner, which allows for consistency in having a given course from a given institution apply in the same way for students pursuing similar educational objectives. Instead of posting transfer credit in “blocks” of credits, each individual course accepted by Gonzaga from another institution, as allowed by institutional policies published in the catalogues, receives a specific Gonzaga equivalency that is tracked by the Transfer Credit Articulation functionality of Banner. This functionality, in turn, feeds into the degree audit system (CAPP- Curriculum Advising and Program Planning). This not only improves the overall efficiency of transfer credit postings, but also ensures an objective, consistent, and predictable academic policy in this regard.

Undergraduate Admissions and Admission Policies (Julie McCulloh, Dean)

Table 3.5: Application-to-Enrollment Activity, Fall 1999 to Fall 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRESHMEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>3713</td>
<td>3338</td>
<td>3047</td>
<td>2741</td>
<td>2069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>2846</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>2474</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six years ago the Office of Admission came together to create a mission statement that reflected the specific work of the office in light of the University Mission Statement:

The Office of Admission strives to personify the humanistic, Catholic, Jesuit nature of Gonzaga University and its Mission. We are a diverse team of professionals who appreciate and support the value of the Gonzaga Experience. As advocates for education, we enthusiastically support students as they continue on their academic journeys.

We promote and effect the spiritual, intellectual, and social growth of the Gonzaga community as it responds to the changing needs of society. In light of this, we seek students who possess a curious mind, a passion for learning, a desire for truth, a respect for diversity, and an active concern for others. By providing information and counseling with honesty and integrity, we facilitate students’ transitions into college and encourage them to fulfill their potential. We welcome all visitors and introduce them to Gonzaga’s academic environment and campus community. While developing and maintaining academic admission standards, we strive to thoroughly and fairly evaluate the potential success of students who apply for admission. In these efforts, our goal is to open the door to an education which will prepare students to live productive, creative, and moral lives.”

The six years following the statement’s inception held drastic changes in the number of students and the academic quality of students the admission team dealt with, yet the purpose motivating the work has held fast.

In the undergraduate admission area, the office works with over 55,000 inquiries, 4,000 applicants, and 2,900 admitted undergraduate students per year. (Recently, initial contact work for some graduate school inquiries and application materials became an additional responsibility.) The work of this office is handled by 11 professional-level members, 5.75 staff members, 31 students and 40 student volunteers.

To monitor the quality of work and the perception of constituents, the office uses several measurements. The Admitted Student Questionnaire allows us to monitor our own performance against competitor institutions, as well as ourselves from year-to-year. Surveys are also used to assess visits by prospective students and guests at our special events days. Finally, yearly
performance reviews allow individuals the opportunity to reflect on individual successes and opportunities for growth.

In the past four years, GU has seen significant growth in the entering classes resulting in a significantly larger student body.

### Table 3.6 – Size of Entering Freshmen Class; Percentage Change from Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Entering Freshmen</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change from previous year</td>
<td>3.4%+</td>
<td>23.2%+</td>
<td>13.55%+</td>
<td>21.98%+</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Office of Admission is now working to maintain the size of future entering classes. The implementation of a pooling admission system has allowed the University greater flexibility in controlling class size and profile. The challenge of transitioning from a rolling admissions system to a pooling admission system has gone well.

By utilizing better technology to seek out prospective students and by continuing to advocate for students from diverse backgrounds, GU hopes to increase the diversity in the undergraduate population. Another institutional goal articulated by the President is to improve the academic profile of each incoming class until the average composite SAT score reaches 1,200.

### Strengths of the department

The Office of Admission has managed huge growth while actually improving the effectiveness, quantity, and quality of work (this is particularly true in the records management area). The office’s greatest strength lies in its committed employees. The broadness and depth of experience admission personnel brings to the work serves the wider University very well and assists prospective students in a superior fashion. The service-oriented culture meshes well with the University’s welcoming environment and mission.

### Limitations of the department

There are two major areas of concern. The first centers on the team’s ability to stay on top of the multiple trends in technology, and to utilize technology to a greater extent in recruiting and enrollment work. The office is also working in cooperation with the Information Technology Services division to improve data management and review new products.

### Next Steps
The office will spend the next two years looking at better ways to utilize technology in recruiting, and in ways to improve data base management. The first Gonzaga University DVD is currently in production, as is a new View Book (see Exhibit 3.18). The admission team will continue to lobby for more scholarship and recruitment funds targeted at students-of-color and low-income students. Finally, the team will work towards managing more predictable enrollment trends and entering class profiles after experiencing a substantial period of growth.

Table 3.7a – Demographic Characteristics of the Incoming Freshman Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Male</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students – of – Color</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% From Washington St.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7b - Geographic Distribution (percentage of total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>50.11</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>49.95</td>
<td>50.88</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>20.62</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7c – Admission Application Activity, Fall 1992 to Fall 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Accepts</th>
<th>Enrolls</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate</th>
<th>Yield Rate</th>
<th>Avg GPA</th>
<th>Avg SAT</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Avg Comp ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1992</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>80.44</td>
<td>41.71</td>
<td>3.435</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>80.68</td>
<td>37.86</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1994</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>83.63</td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td>3.512</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>81.13</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>82.15</td>
<td>30.35</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>92.20</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>88.10</td>
<td>35.08</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>85.36</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>2741</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>82.52</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>3047</td>
<td>2474</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>81.19</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>3338</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>76.93</td>
<td>35.32</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>3713</td>
<td>2846</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>76.64</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2002, the University decentralized the graduate school so that individual school would be responsible for the recruitment, enrollment, and academic success of each graduate program within its area. The 2003-2004 academic year will be the first that all graduate programs, independent of a centralized entity are entirely responsible for working with students from the recruitment to the enrollment stage.

The Academic Deans, together with Graduate Program Directors, are currently reviewing graduate admission practices, including application requirements, admission criteria and application evaluation procedures under the guidance of the Academic Vice President’s office. The directors and deans are also working on reporting criteria for consistent tracking of prospective students, applicants, enrolled students and academic profiles. The outcome of these efforts will be fair and consistent review of applicants for admission and effective data in evaluating all aspects of enrollment work.

**Law Admission** *(Tamara Martinez-Anderson, Assistant Dean and Director of Admissions)*

The previous five years have seen dramatic changes in the organization, objectives, information technology, marketing, and enrollment at the School of Law Office of Admissions. In 1999, there was no formally recognized Admissions Office; no defined mission statement or objective for the office; applications and enrollment were down; and the median LSAT profile had dropped by 25 percentage points. As of the fall of 2003, the law school now houses an admissions office staffed by four full-time employees; applications are up 97%; and both the enrollment and quality of the incoming class have improved.

**Admissions Office**

Prior to the spring of 2000, three law school employees assisted in various phases of law school recruitment, admissions processing, and student counseling. Of the three, two also had responsibilities in career services and student services, leaving only one full-time admissions employee. Additionally, all three employees were housed in separate offices in two different buildings. With the move to the new law school building, and over the next three years, duties external to admissions were reassigned and the staff grew to four, full-time Law admissions employees.

The “professionalization” of the office has resulted in a more unified and goal-oriented structure and prospective students have responded well to the service-oriented approach of the office. All employees attend comprehensive training by the Law School Admissions Council and are expected to be familiar with American Bar Association guidelines, the LSAC Standards of Good Admissions Practices, and Gonzaga University School of Law internal admissions policies and procedures.

The job descriptions and workflow of the Law admissions staff has been under constant review as office policies and procedures have developed. The last review was conducted during the summer of 2003 and the resulting changes in duties and responsibilities are currently being implemented.
The Law admissions office works with approximately 10,000 prospective students, 1600 applicants, and 600 admitted students. Staff communicates with prospective students via email and telephone, along with arranging campus visits. They offer counseling about the admissions process, pre-law assistance, and general information about law school and the academic expectations. The office also assists students in acquiring housing and becoming familiar with Spokane.

To monitor the quality of service provided, questionnaires are distributed to all admitted applicants who do not choose to attend, and a separate survey is distributed to incoming law students. Surveys are sent to participants from educational programs sponsored by the office, and copies of feedback received from applicants regarding their experiences working with members of the admissions team are kept on a bulletin board and filed in a notebook.

Mission

Members of the Law Admission Office have been instrumental in keeping the mission of Gonzaga University at the forefront of the work performed. While recognition is given to the importance that the Law Admissions Office be mindful of budgetary goals, such an objective has never overshadowed the philosophy that admissions is about education and service.

Information Technology & Systems Management

One of the key factors to change in the operation of the Law Admissions Office during the last five years has been the utilization of information technology and a comprehensive overhaul of systems management.

Prior to 1999, a good amount of data was being kept but rarely analyzed. Basic reports provided the information needed to report to the ABA, to offer a basic profile of each year’s incoming class, and to compare information from year to year. With the implementation of an Access database, developed within the admissions office, additional information was input and the ability to output more specific comparative and historical data that broke information down into LSAT, GPA, and discounting grids, enabled the admissions office to better advise the dean and chair of the admissions committee on strategies for the enhancement of tuition revenue and enrollment.

This database eventually evolved to allow the office to track methods used to contact students and determine where to place resources in the future. It also enabled the downloading of the LSAT report, thus eliminating approximately 30% of staff time allocated to data entry.

In the summer of 2003, the decision was made to purchase the Admit-M software program available through the Law School Admissions Council. This system offers many of the same features of the Access database, but has the ability to import applications as well as the LSAT reports. While the importing and exporting processes are time-consuming, they have effectively eliminated another 80% of the data entry. The system enables us to capture information students provide both online and via the LSDAS report, to download information for direct mail projects, and to create cost analysis reports on our recruiting events.

Applications
Gonzaga University School of Law experienced a severe drop in applications after peaking in 1994 with 1,943 applications. By 1999, applications received were at 826, a 57% decline. With the development of an admissions office in the spring of 2000, the staff began to become more involved in creating a strategic recruiting plan and participated in conversations with consultants hired to suggest marketing and communications strategies for Gonzaga University. Jan Krukowski & Company encouraged the School of Law to recognize the importance of creating a well-defined niche to aid in attracting more applicants. As a result, Gonzaga’s goal to provide law students with a supportive and practical-based education in an environment that is committed to community service became the key message delivered using publications, during individual appointments, group presentations, at recruitment fairs, within post-admit materials, on the website, and in follow-up emails. This general message has been bolstered by an added emphasis on turning the perception that our location in Spokane as a negative, into provided information that speaks to the attractive elements of living in this region. Surveys, emails, and personal statements have illustrated that students are hearing our message about the school’s commitment to social justice and service. We have also seen a rise in applications from students from outside of the Pacific Northwest.

Since 1999, we have experienced a 97% increase in applications. While increases have occurred nationally, the overall national increase during this time was just 33%. As the applicant pool has increased, we have been able to be increasingly selective. In 1998, 83% of the students who applied were admitted. For the fall of 2003, only 38% of the total applicant pool was admitted.

Table 3.8
Law Admissions Summary, 1997-2003
Enrollment and Quality

Just as applications declined, the LSAT profiles of entering 1L Gonzaga students also dropped precipitously. The median student in 1994 scored in the 67th percentile of LSAT test takers. By 1999, the median student was scoring in the 42nd percentile. To address this issue, the University recognized that greater resources would be needed to attract applicants with stronger LSAT scores, and to enroll a larger class. A consultant was hired to assist the School of Law through an analysis of the financial aid discounting policy. Following Mr. Hall’s recommendations, the School of Law increased their discounting from approximately 26% to 33% in the fall of 2002. Since these measures occurred simultaneously with an increase in enrollment, net tuition remained strong. By the fall of 2003, enrollment was at 233 and the LSAT median had risen to the 56th percentile.

Table 3.9 – Historical Trends, Law LSAT & GPA, Entering Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The School of Law is now deciding the direction in which to take enrollment. There is concern that the LSAT profile has not risen rapidly enough. Making the profile of the incoming class a priority would likely result in a smaller class, and an increase in the discount rate. The admissions office is prepared to respond to whichever direction is decided upon. Our main concern is that regardless of where the institutional priorities are that each prospective law student is afforded our assistance, counseling, and a legitimate chance to present their Case for admission.

Strengths

The Law Admissions Office is dedicated to educating prospective law students about not only the admissions process, but also to encouraging future law students to recognize that preparation for law school does not begin during their Junior year of college. We strive to reach students as early as possible to develop relationships and provide information and counseling. With the competitive nature of admissions, we also seek to provide students with the resources they need to create a strong application and to provide encouragement for them in the process. We recognize that not all students will find Gonzaga to be the best fit for them, and so we work to
provide not only school-specific information, but also general assistance. Building relationships in this manner enables members of the admissions office to remember that they are part of an educational process and are not salespersons. We believe that there are sufficient numbers of applicants for all law schools, and our strength is that we work diligently to help students determine whether Gonzaga is the right place for their needs and personality.

The Law admissions office has taken seriously the call of the ABA, the LSAC, and our own mission statement to increase the numbers of minority groups pursuing law degrees. Key projects have been implemented to expand our outreach to members of minority groups, and a comprehensive program to involve current minority students in our efforts has been developed. We are pleased that with the increase in enrollment, we have also seen an increase in minority students. Additionally, our office has worked closely with faculty members of the admissions committee to view diversity in its broadest sense and to admit students whose life experiences will enable them to offer insights and different perspectives to their peers.

The other great strength of the admissions office is the supportive relationship among staff members. A respectful and cooperative environment prevails, and the workplace dynamics allow for a balance of flexibility, independence, and teamwork. The office is managed using a linear model and each member of the staff is considered an equal and integral contributor to the successful enrollment of a qualified law school class. Creativity, teamwork, and a service-oriented focus are valued and encouraged.

Limitations

While the Law admissions office has proven adept at creating strong, positive relationships with prospective students, the office has experienced equal difficulty in developing strong relationships with personnel within the School of Law. While our new suite of offices has offered greater unity among the admissions team, the physical separation has often caused the office to feel isolated and cut off from the rest of the school. Decisions are made, informal information is shared, and relationships are built outside of our office and it is difficult to stay abreast of the daily happenings at the law school – events that could prove important to our ability to work with prospective students. Individually, several members of the staff have good relationships with certain faculty, administrators, and staff members. But, as a whole, we are concerned that the admissions office is not more integrated. A specific area of concern is the infrequent communication or direction from the dean. While the office appreciates the trust and independence offered – there is great concern that the dean is not fully aware of the successes of the admissions office, our concerns, or areas that could use greater support. While the dean has always been available to listen, he rarely makes specific inquiries and does not appear interested in learning more about the operations or procedures of the office.

Next Steps

- Looking nationally at law school admissions, it is clear that a school’s ability to market their school and to personalize the experience will be key in achieving enrollment goals. To do so, we are creating a new, comprehensive marketing strategy and new methods for communicating with admitted students.
With the new database program alleviating much of the data entry, and the re-structuring of job descriptions, the office anticipates several key changes in our marketing plan. During the coming year, a new design company has been selected to provide consultation about created a well-defined “brand” for the School of Law. We recognize the importance that we create a niche and identity that will be easily recalled when students hear or read about us. Along with a new design of our key publications, we will develop relationships with editors of pre-law newsletters, magazines, etc. and become regular contributors for articles by enlisting the assistance of students and faculty. We also seek to create several new feeder schools by developing substantial relationships with their pre-law advisors, career services office, directors of multicultural affairs, academic advising centers, etc.

Due to limits on staff resources, we have recruited current students to assist our office. We have already created student-led committees and student ambassadors who will become extensively involved in providing information to admitted students. Beginning this year, we asked the Women’s Law Caucus to create a committee charged with working with the admissions office in our efforts to welcome and encourage women applicants to choose Gonzaga. We have also hired a work study student who is creating a coalition with minority student groups to become involved with outreach projects and to provide information to admitted students. We have also awarded ten students as Student Ambassadors to serve as tour guides, to review and suggest materials for admitted students, and to join us at various admissions events.

Probation, Dismissal and Readmission

The Academic Standing Committee, chaired by the Director of the Office of Academic Services and reporting to the Office of the Academic Vice President, places students who earn semester and/or cumulative grade point averages below 2.0 on one of several forms of academic probation, depending on the student’s past academic performance and individual circumstances. Academic probation levels provide multiple options for students, their faculty, and advisors to plan for remediation. Academic contracts and a study strategies course are two popular options that assist students in facing their individual situations with objective and realistic goals for improvement. Students on probation are referred to campus and other resources as necessary. Failure to meet basic academic standards over an extended period of time can lead to academic dismissal. Dismissed students who successfully appeal for reinstatement also will work with Academic Services to construct an individualized academic contract guiding their first semester back at Gonzaga. The following data indicate the numbers and percentages of students placed on academic probation since Fall 1997:

Table 3.10 - Academic Probation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UG-Matric Enrolled</th>
<th># on AP</th>
<th>% on AP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F ’97</td>
<td>2612</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S ’98</td>
<td>2498</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ’98</td>
<td>2593</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S ’99</td>
<td>2499</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ’99</td>
<td>2748</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S ’00</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate students who are dismissed from Gonzaga University and who wish to re-enroll at Gonzaga at a later date must go through a readmission process. They are required to provide the Admission committee with all standard admission documents as well as a letter explaining their circumstances and reasons for the readmission request.

Student Financial Services (Thayne McCulloh, Dean of Student Financial Services)

The division of Student Financial Services is a division of the Academic Vice President and reports to the Dean of Student Financial Services. It consists of the following five units: Financial Aid, Student Employment, Student Loans, Student Accounts, and Law Financial Services. The five units meet regularly to plan and define policy surrounding the servicing of students. Each department is staffed and organized to in a manner that promotes service to students.

The personnel of Student Financial Services share the following mission statement:

We are dedicated to helping students and families in the pursuit of their educational goals by providing financial information and resources in a professional and individualized manner. We recognize the unique and intrinsic value of each person and are committed to serving all in an environment of equality, responsibility, and dignity.

Each staff member has a job description that outlines, in detail, the responsibilities of the position. All staff members are evaluated annually, using a standardized, written performance evaluation tool.

Written policies and operating procedures are in place. The policies and procedures provide reliable guidance for staff to follow in completing larger annual projects as well as day-to-day operating processes. A division-wide Operations Calendar is maintained to keep each department informed of the others’ activities. It also helps remind the staff of upcoming activities.

On an annual basis, the University publishes relevant financial information by way of a “Tuition and Fees” brochure that indicates tuition and fees expenses by program as well as on-campus housing charges (Exhibit 3.19). Furthermore, the Admission and Financial Aid Offices annually publish a brochure that outlines various financial aid programs and eligibility guidelines (Exhibit 3.20). The tuition and fee refund schedule for complete withdrawals or withdrawals from individual courses is available in the Announcement of Course Offerings publication for each semester (Exhibit 3.13). Law students are notified of the tuition and fee refund schedule on a semester-by-semester basis, and receive the schedule in their registration booklet (Exhibit 3.21). The schedule is also posted on the Registrar’s Office board in the Law School building and on the Law School’s internet website.
Financial Aid Office  (*Darlene Hendrickson, Director of Operations*)

The primary mission of Gonzaga University’s Financial Aid Office is to provide resources and information to students, so that they may realize their educational goals.

Due to the implementation of the Gonzaga Guarantee Policy, an increasing number of students retain their institutional aid from year to year. This policy also makes the budgeting of aid for returning students a much more dependable process. Students are only required to maintain full-time enrollment with a 2.0 GPA in order to maintain institutional funds.

Financial aid packages are “comprehensive.” They include merit, need, and non-need based aid from a variety of sources; federal, state, institutional and private. The Federal Methodology of the Need Analysis Formula is used in determining institutional aid in combination with the student’s admission score or vote level. Gonzaga has employed the services of a Financial Aid consultant since 1998. The consultant provides advice pertaining to institutional aid awarding strategies that correspond with the institutional goals for quality, quantity and budget discount.

The primary services of The Financial Aid Office are financial counseling, financial aid packaging, loan certification/disbursement, special circumstance reviews, presentation of generic and GU-specific financial aid information, review of Satisfactory Academic Progress each term, and completion of federal, state and private reports, applications, participation agreements and surveys.

The following are statistics reflecting financial aid offers prepared during the 2002-03 school year. The offers consisted of awards to students that filed a FAFSA and students who did not file a FAFSA. All student levels are represented in this chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>2470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior &amp; 5th Year</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Transfer</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Transfer</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total financial aid award offers made in 2002-03 (all categories): 7,043

The Financial Aid Office evaluates student eligibility for all aid types by class. A “cohort” of students is assigned to each financial aid counselor. The financial aid counselor follows that cohort through the entire aid process for the year.

The University publishes and advertises available scholarships to prospective and enrolled students. The dissemination of materials in written and electronic formats is both timely and effective in notifying students about institutional scholarship opportunities. Newly admitted, prospective students are mailed applications for those scholarships for which they are eligible to apply. A comprehensive listing of scholarships is made available to the prospective student population in written brochure form (see Exhibit 3.22) and via the website. Enrolled students are notified of departmental and institutional scholarships in a variety of formats.
Table 3.11 – Financial Aid Expenditures, AY 1998-99 to 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merit Scholarships</td>
<td>$5,678,138</td>
<td>$6,806,249</td>
<td>$7,785,469</td>
<td>$10,545,093</td>
<td>$13,141,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga Funding</td>
<td>$1,684,321</td>
<td>$2,907,889</td>
<td>$4,310,882</td>
<td>$6,247,417</td>
<td>$8,059,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Institutional</td>
<td>$8,614,625</td>
<td>$9,359,815</td>
<td>$9,970,505</td>
<td>$10,442,801</td>
<td>$11,036,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships, Waivers or Discounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td>$1,671,207</td>
<td>$1,733,876</td>
<td>$1,842,605</td>
<td>$2,259,904</td>
<td>$2,598,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants</td>
<td>$797,461</td>
<td>$922,191</td>
<td>$1,114,284</td>
<td>$1,210,379</td>
<td>$1,407,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans (all types)</td>
<td>$27,330,961</td>
<td>$28,141,636</td>
<td>$29,603,048</td>
<td>$33,066,822</td>
<td>$38,988,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programs Federal and State</td>
<td>$1,289,110</td>
<td>$2,697,503</td>
<td>$2,870,115</td>
<td>$2,572,794</td>
<td>$2,775,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Totals</td>
<td>$47,065,823</td>
<td>$52,569,159</td>
<td>$57,496,908</td>
<td>$66,345,210</td>
<td>$78,007,862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, 57% of aid is awarded to females and 43% to males.

FFELP Cohort Default Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perkins Loan Cohort Default Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Financial Aid Office provides assistance to students studying abroad by completing consortium agreements and revising awards to accommodate special needs. Specific counseling is provided to these students regarding aid eligibility and available resources. Law students may take advantage of a new Florence summer program also.

Given the unique needs of law students, one financial aid counselor is responsible for providing financial aid and scholarship assistance specifically for Law students.

**Significant Changes**

There was a significant change in office structure at the beginning of the 2002-03 academic year. The sudden death of the Director of Operations required a restructuring of office personnel and their duties. Through promotion from within and new hires, the office is now staffed with a Director of Operations, an Associate Director, and an Assistant Director of Information Technology and Workflow. These three lead positions were filled with personnel already in the Financial Aid Office, who each have abundant experience.

A functional change was made approximately five years ago with regard to counselor responsibility. The primary chief was a decision to move from a “specialist” model (wherein each professional had particular program responsibilities, and shared in the responsibility for counseling and packaging students), to a “cohort counselor” model. The cohort counselor model required each professional to assume responsibility for one or more “cohorts” or groups, and be...
entirely responsible for all financial aid awarding activity that involved that student. The cohort
counselor model provided tremendous benefits to the financial aid operations. In addition,
adoption of this model required cross-training on many different aspects of the financial aid
awarding process that previously had been the province of one or two professionals. This
change improved communication, heightened understanding, and increased the consistency of
information being provided to students and families.

The updating of office policy and procedures is an on-going assignment. We realize that with the
ever-changing federal and state aid rules and regulations, the need to keep written office policy
and procedures up-to-date is very important.

Next Steps

- The Financial Aid Office is hoping to secure funds for a much needed office renovation.
- The office is continuously working on upgrading our web-based technology to be able to
  offer more on-line capabilities.

Student Accounts (Linda Murphy, Director)

As reflected in our divisional mission statement, our goal is to actively assist Gonzaga students
and their families through the financial maze and to make the financing part of their education as
painless as possible. While it is necessary to have established payment options and deadlines, we
are flexible and creative when dealing with individual students who have special circumstances.
We believe that any student, at a particular time during their education, may be in need of special
consideration.

The primary functions of the Student Accounts office are the assessment, billing and collection
of student tuition, fees, room and board, and the disbursement of financial aid refunds. In the
recent completed fiscal year (FY 02), our office was responsible for the billing and collection of
over 90 million dollars.

Several payment options are offered for convenience and affordability. Payment “in ful”l is
accepted on a semester basis. For the academic year, installment plans for a 10-month note and
an 8-month note are available for a minimal application fee. December graduates and spring-
only students can pay over one semester in either 4 or 5 monthly installments. Students in study
abroad programs have access to any of the above payment options. Students enrolled in study
abroad programs often have additional expenses, such as overseas travel; we accommodate their
specialized particular needs with a commensurate level of flexibility. We make special
arrangements for any student who has special circumstances warranting more liberal terms.
Students enrolled in the School of Education off-campus programs have payment options that
are meant to fit with their academic schedule and professional pay periods. We currently accept
cash, check, Visa, Mastercard or Discover for payment.

Our receivables have consistently declined over the last 10 years, both as a percentage of total
charges and frequently as a whole dollar amount. The most recent fiscal year, 2001/02, we
expected to see an increase in both percentage and whole dollar amounts. This was expected as a
direct result of our large jump in enrollment and increase in tuition, and indirectly as a result of
the September 11, 2001, tragedy and the subsequent universal financial downturn. However, such an increase did not materialize.

We believe that our office is serving our students well by the many indications of appreciation and low number of complaints that we receive. We listen to our students, to their suggestions or complaints, and we respond whenever possible. As an example, our recently created Statement of Account (see example, at Exhibit 3.23) is a direct reflection of student dissatisfaction with the Banner billing statement. We have a box on the Statement where we ask for comments and we try to respond to those as well.

Also mentioned in other portions of this survey is our low receivables rate. The following table shows the percentage of delinquency for currently enrolled students over the past 8 fiscal years:

Table 3.12 Student Accounts Receivables: Percentage of Delinquency (Currently Enrolled Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td>.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/2002</td>
<td>.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/2001</td>
<td>.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>.0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/1999</td>
<td>.0037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/1998</td>
<td>.0049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/1997</td>
<td>.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>.0052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>.0065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to these years, our receivable percentages were usually in the 1.5%– 2% range, still an acceptably low rate.

Next Steps

- Implement an online billing/payment process.
- Produce a more comprehensive policies and procedures manual.

Student Employment (Robin Guevara, Manager)

Student Employment became its own department in 1998. This department is responsible for coordinating part time employment opportunities which consist of Federal Work Study for eligible freshmen and sophomores, State Work Study for eligible juniors and seniors, Institutional on-campus positions for enrolled Gonzaga students, and off-campus opportunities provided by private individuals and area businesses. One factor positively impacting a student’s educational persistence is their ability to obtain on-campus employment while attending college. While part time work off-campus allows students to try out career areas that interest them, it is the on-campus University community connection that provides students with the most positive impact toward staying in school and graduating.

Using Banner, an integrated database system, Student Employment has seen a dramatic increase in efficiency in terms of processing hiring forms, running reports, and projecting student
utilization of work study funds. In addition to this, 2002 marks the first year students have been able to obtain and access general student employment information, as well as viewing FWS & SWS jobs via the student employment web site.

The Student Employment Office employs three full time staff: a Program Assistant who assists all walk-in students, staff and employers and is responsible for processing all on-campus student hiring paperwork; a State Work Study Program Specialist who administers the State Work Study program, and a Student Employment Manager who administers the Federal Work Study program.

- FWS - 350-400 students working on campus throughout the academic year and between 60-100 during the summer sessions.
- 300+ students are employed in Institutional positions on campus.
- SWS - 300-350 students employed off-campus during the academic year and between 200-250 during the summer sessions.

Policy Manuals are in place and updated routinely for Federal Work Study, State Work Study, and General Student Employment issues.

**Student Loan Office (Lettie Clark, Manager)**

The Gonzaga mission is an integral part of the Student Loan Office. Our interaction with associated stakeholders is governed by the six core principles of the University’s mission statement: dignity of the human person, pursuit of excellence, pursuit of truth, freedom, justice and service.

The primary purpose of the Institutional Loan Office at Gonzaga is to manage the disbursement and collection of the University’s five loan programs. These five loan programs are the Federal Perkins Loan Program, the Bigelow Loan Program, the Carrie Welch Loan Program and two federal nursing loan programs. The Perkins Loan Program is by far the largest of these programs, with the most stringent guidelines therefore, in most regards we collect the other loan programs using these guidelines.

It is important to the personnel in this office that every loan borrower understands the rights and responsibilities of borrowing money. We have individual conferences with students giving detailed information when they arrive at school and again when they leave. We keep up this conversation while they are attending school and later after their loans have gone into repayment. Students feel a strong obligation to repay student loan debt knowing they are, in fact, helping a current student finance their education.

Following the process of acceptance of financial aid awards we begin the application phase to loan recipients. We then begin the process of intensive loan counseling for borrowers. We release the funds each student borrows to the respective student account. We report these amounts to the Department of Education’s National Student Loan Data System add them to the database and monitor enrollment status.

The student loan program imparts service to the University and current students through loan
repayment. Loan monies are restored by preceding generations and current students receive the financial benefit from those payments in the form of new loans. This cycle of disbursement and repayment reflects the Student Loan Office’s commitment to a level of service and community among Gonzaga alumni. The Student Loan Office is committed to serving those deserving students who demonstrate exceptional financial need.

Currently we have approximately 4,500 loans in repayment in the Federal Perkins Loan Program and 1,822 borrowers in continuing deferment status. During the last academic year we collected nearly $1.9 million. This year we are lending approximately $3 million to roughly 1,000 students.

Outstanding loans from the four institutional loan programs total less than $1 million.

The Institutional Loan Program in conjunction with the Office of Financial Aid present loan counseling sessions at the time the student first enters Gonzaga and again, at the end of their enrollment status. The informational sessions are designed to instruct borrowers in the rights and responsibilities associated with Title IV loan obligation.

Success in the Institutional Loan Office is measured primarily by the number of borrowers who default on their student loans. The way in which default status on Federal Perkins Loans is calculated has changed in the past ten years. In 1992 the default rate was based on a portfolio basis. Currently the default status is based on a “cohort” of student borrowers who enter repayment in the previous fiscal year. Based on the first portfolio calculation the default status was under 5%. Using this same basis of calculation today, the portfolio default rate would be under 2%. Using the cohort calculation the default rate has traditionally been under 3% in the past five years.

Next Steps

- The possibility exists to change the entire methodology of disbursing loans. Currently we use a direct hands-on approach. We see every student, at least once every year. We maintain direct contact with students currently in school. We have been successful using this approach.
- We have some new processes coming under consideration in the future of the Federal Perkins Loan Program. E-signatures will be an issue and how they might fit into our process, if they do; the possibility of an astounding numbers of consolidations this year and the implications that bring to the program. We are concerned about the level of technical assistance available to us in making these decisions.
- Currently, in the Financial Aid community there is a big push to grant loans using web based technology. It will be a challenge for us to decide if using this new technology over the long term will be an asset, or a drawback, to our students.
- We plan to continue the implementation of the Student Financial Services website, particularly in our own area. In the near future we expect students to have the ability to look up account information and make payments on line.

New Student Orientation (Beth Hellwig-Olson, Ph.D., Dean of Student Services)
The mission of the Crossroads New Student Orientation program is to provide new students and their families information that will help them navigate the University’s many academic programs, services, spiritual opportunities, and systems. The opportunity to meet other students, academic advisors, and to experience the surrounding community is also provided throughout the orientation program. The institutional Mission, values, programs, services, traditions and academic programs are interwoven into the orientation experience in order to help students transition and to build a foundation for the student’s life at Gonzaga University.

While the majority of students participating in new student orientation are 18-19 years old, the staff pays particular attention to the needs of special populations, transfer students, and graduate students. A separate graduate orientation is planned with the assistance of the Graduate Student Advisory Council and transfer students are given the chance to meet independently as part of their orientation program.

Orientation programs are offered to new undergraduate students during summer, fall, and spring terms. Family members are invited to participate in the summer and fall sessions, with special programs offered to younger brothers and sisters. The Crossroads program represents a tremendous collaborative effort between faculty, staff, administrators, and students who plan throughout the year and implement the various programs.

Over 1,200 students participate in fall orientation along with their families. Undergraduate students arrive on campus the Friday before classes begin and are offered informational sessions and activities for the succeeding two weeks. Graduate students participate in a one-day orientation program geared at introducing them to the University and to each other.

The Crossroads New Student Orientation staff consists of both students and staff members. The Dean of Student Services serves as the coordinator of the program, and the Coordinator of Student Activities serves as assistant coordinator. Additional staff members from other key offices serve on an advisory board to help plan and implement the overall program. An orientation staff assistant has been added this year to help plan parent programs, staff the office, and ensure that correspondence with future students is timely.

Five students are selected in late fall as the “Core” members (key coordinators) and serve for a one year period, while three additional students plan an outdoor adventure pre-orientation excursion and an “urban plunge” community service program. A graduate student in Student Activities helps to plan Graduate Student Orientation and to compile information for a University mailing to incoming students. In addition, 100+ upper class students serve as mentors and small group leaders to the new students. These upper class students are the cornerstone of the orientation program and are selected through an intensive application process. The student involvement in Orientation underscores the unique nature of Gonzaga’s orientation programs: the opportunity for (unpaid) returning students to “give back” to their community by helping new students learn about the institution’s culture, traditions, and community.

**Plans for the Future**

The staff believes that there are some areas in the orientation program that can be further developed. The Orientation staff is working to improve programs designed to serve special populations such as non-traditional age students, international students and students in under-
represented populations. In addition, it would be beneficial to work more closely with Academic Deans and faculty members. Greater involvement on the part of faculty members and more of an emphasis on the academic elements of campus life would be optimal, as would opportunities to work more closely with parents. The staff is also working on increasing outdoor opportunities as part of the orientation offerings.

**Academic Advising**

Academic advising at Gonzaga University is considered an important part of each regular faculty member’s work. As part of the registration process for incoming freshmen, the Office of Academic Services assigns each student an academic advisor in her or his major or area of interest. This office also coordinates the first advisor/advisee meetings during New Student Orientation, providing educational materials in an advising packet for each student. This packet, which is distributed and explained by the faculty advisor, includes a University Catalogue, welcome letter, final exam schedule, a schedule of important academic dates for the semester, a degree guide for each School/College, a resource guide, and a CIRP survey, supplied by Student Life.

Once the student has been assigned to a faculty academic advisor, that advisor is expected to assist the student with all academic, registration, and degree-related issues. By Gonzaga policy, all undergraduate students need to see their advisor to obtain an Advisor Release Number (ARN) necessary for registration activity each semester. Students are free to drop or add their courses during the open registration periods without their advisor’s signature, although students are strongly encouraged to discuss their intent to do so with the advisor. An advisor signature is required of all undergraduate students for all course withdrawals, independent study/project applications, graduation application, academic appeals of all types, and course restriction authorizations.

The Office of Academic Services advises at-risk students, students who are either undecided or between majors, students readmitted to the University after academic dismissal, non-matriculated students, and other students in special circumstances. On average, the two professional advise approximately 100 students (total) each semester.

**Office of Academic Services (Susan Foster-Dow, Director)**

The Office of Academic Services aims to assist students in their educational goals, and to provide policy, program, and procedural recommendations to the larger University community regarding best practices for improving student retention. Academic Services promotes student persistence to graduation through targeted, theory-based programs and initiatives involving direct student intervention, parent education, and faculty assistance. The office also administers various academic policies on behalf of the Academic Vice President’s Office, and collaborates with the Vice President for Student Life, and the Dean of Student Services on programs and policies with an academic component.

The office is staffed by the following individuals: Director, Program Coordinator, full-time Administrative Secretary, and one half-time, temporary Program Coordinator/Pathways. In
addition, three part-time student personnel who work a total of 30 hours per week, during the academic year and one or two full-time student positions during the summer.

The following programs and services are offered by the Office of Academic Services:

**Academic Planning Sessions:** Approximately seven (7) planned presentations of 20 to 100 participants per session are given each academic year during the Gonzaga Experience Live weekend, Fall Family Weekend, and New Student Orientation. These presentations educate students and parents on the basic academic policies and procedures at GU. In addition to these planned presentations, Academic Services professionals also teach an academic planning session to each section of Pathways (approximately 25 total).

**Case (Case Conference):** A weekly meeting attended by division directors from areas of Student Life, as well as the Director of Academic Services. Various crises/disciplinary problems/academic situations are brought to this meeting by the parties in attendance, and a comprehensive strategy is devised for managing each Case.

**Dual Enrollment:** Dual Enrollment students are typically juniors and seniors from area high schools who are qualified through the Office of Admission for limited enrollment in up to two courses per fall or spring semester at a significantly reduced tuition rate.

**Early Warning System:** An early intervention process whereby any staff or faculty member of Gonzaga University can report to Academic Services about any students he or she notices who may be experiencing difficulty, trauma, crisis, or other distracting or dangerous events/activities. Students referred to us through EWS are typically scheduled with an Academic Services professional for an informational meeting in which we explore the nature of the individual issues with the student.

**Freshman Registration:** Academic Services handles all registration for first-term freshmen. This is accomplished through postal and electronic mailings and phone calls over the course of several months leading up to the student’s first semester at Gonzaga University. The goal is to register students in appropriate classes for their intended major, and to begin educating them on the academic rights and responsibilities of GU students.

**GUST (Gonzaga University Summer Term):** GUST is a program for interested and motivated incoming freshmen who wish to get an early start on their Gonzaga career through focused study in a fun summer session. The six-week program is offered to these students during Summer Session II (July-August). In addition to academic coursework and opportunities, students also are encouraged to participate in extra and co-curricular activities, both on- and off-campus. Academic Services directs the program and teaches the one-credit course associated with it.

**Learning Strategies Workshops:** Academic Services provides six different study/learning strategies workshops each spring and each fall semester. Flyers are posted around campus, and postcards are placed into each student’s MSC box notifying them of the workshops. Faculty members are sent an e-mail, encouraging them to send students whom they believe would benefit from the workshop(s).
Pathways: A freshman seminar course taught during fall semester for first year students. The Pathways program seeks to articulate how this Jesuit University is distinctive, where its roots are, what its resources are, and how to use them effectively. Pathways is intended to facilitate a speedy connection of students to the University, deepening students’ integration into the academic, spiritual, and social life of Gonzaga through readings and discussions of leadership, ethics, diversity and Mission. It meets for a total of ten sessions, in classes of not more than 20 students, and carries academic credit.

STEP (Summer Transitional Educational Program): STEP is a six-week program offered during Summer Session II for students who have strong legacy ties to the University, or a very strong desire to be at Gonzaga versus any other school, but who are not admissible through regular admission processes (due to their academic performance in high school). The primary objective of STEP is to provide the participant with an opportunity for assessing his or her own potential for academic success as a matriculated student at Gonzaga, in a structured, supportive, on-campus setting. In addition to academic activities and support services, participants are also provided with a number of on- and off-campus recreational and social opportunities.

Withdrawal/Leave of Absence: A process focused on the research and retention of students who leave the University, either temporarily or permanently. Students considering or intending to withdraw from GU make an appointment with a professional in the Office of Academic Services prior to departure. During the individual interview we attempt to determine the circumstances which necessitate departure, to offer remedies to any situation when possible and desirable, and to smooth the exit process so that students can return to GU with ease, or move into their post-Gonzaga life with a positive last impression. This labor-intensive WD/LOA process allows the University to see what areas of student service may need improvement or attention. The following data offer specific numbers of students withdrawing and/or those placed on a leave of absence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Withdrawals</th>
<th>Total Leaves of Absence</th>
<th>Total Withdrawal Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F '97</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S '98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F '98</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S '99</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F '99</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S '00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F '00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S '01</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F '01</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S '02</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F '02</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S '03</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F '03</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see the manifestations of all academic, social and other trends affecting our student populations in the Early Warning System, academic probation, withdrawal interviews and the advising relationships we have with students. Typically, the students we serve are on the margins of the University community, either temporarily or permanently, with trouble of some sort. The
most pressing academic issues in the past two years surround the issue of course availability, access to professors, and class size, all of which are related to growing pains. This takes a great deal of individualized effort from our staff at challenging times of year.

We aspire to be highly proactive and responsive to emerging needs in the communities we serve, including students, parents, faculty and other administrative areas. Basically, if someone needs something and we can provide it, we do so.

**Plans for the future**

There are several initiatives under way in Academic Services, including the development of a blended advising model, utilizing both professional and faculty advisors, with an emphasis on the first year experience. In conjunction with the proposed changes in advising functions, significant adjustments to the Pathways freshman seminar program, to expand course availability to all incoming freshmen. Also, in collaboration with the Associate Academic Vice President, Academic Services is exploring the possibility of establishing a “clearinghouse” for tutoring services on campus, to enhance the availability and awareness of these services for our students. Finally, as is done every year, Academic Services is attempting to simplify and improve upon the process for registering incoming first-year students. The web-based registration system will provide a more “user-friendly” format for students, and a more efficient way for our office to receive and process the information.

V. **Counseling and Career Assessment Center (Maureen Sheridan, Ph.D., Director)**

The Counseling and Career Assessment Center is designed to assist students in addressing the difficulties they encounter, and to promote greater overall wellness within the student population.

The Counseling and Career Assessment Center (CCAC) has three essential roles in serving the Gonzaga University community. First, it provides counseling to students experiencing personal adjustment and/or psychological problems that require professional attention. Second, it assists students in identifying and learning skills that will assist them in effectively meeting their educational and life goals. Lastly, the Center contributes to a campus environment that facilitates the healthy intellectual, spiritual, and psychological growth and development of the whole person.

The CCAC strives to provide timely counseling services to Gonzaga students and the University community. Counseling services are an integral part of the humanistic, Catholic, Jesuit educational mission of Gonzaga University. The staff provides services to students facing psychological stress, working at decision-making, or dealing with conflicts within the campus community. Fostering the growth of students in their spiritual lives and faith traditions forms part of the work, even as the staff is involved in advocating for student needs, program development, teaching, and consultation activities that support the efforts of both faculty and staff in improving the University environment.

The CCAC offers individual counseling services on a short-term basis, where a professional counselor can see a student. The counselors are trained in brief counseling and implement this model in the center. When students have concerns that require more specialized or long-term counseling, the counselor assists in providing referrals to appropriate community professionals. Working closely with other University resources, counselors help students coordinate the counseling services with the disabilities support services office, the health center, the career
center, the alcohol and drug abuse counselor, the office of academic services, University ministry, and other University resources.

Each counselor may address a variety of student concerns from career/vocational, to support of educational goals (e.g. time management, improving study skills and dealing with test anxiety), to personal and social concerns, such as depression, grief, interpersonal conflicts, sexuality, and relationships. Counselors also participate in many outreach programs, in classrooms, in residence halls, for law students, for non-traditional students and for other campus programs such as new student orientation. The CCAC also offers some testing services, including tests for admission to graduate and professional schools, the Miller Analogies Test, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Strong Interest Inventory.

The major strength of the department is its mission. There are a number of philosophical approaches to addressing the increased demand for college counseling. Some universities have responded with a significant increase in their clinical staff that emphasizes the provision of long-term therapy for those students with serious mental illness. Such an approach allows an institution to provide comprehensive mental health services to students similar to the services available in professional mental health facilities.

While this approach offers in-depth long-term counseling for students, it has serious liabilities that make it impractical for most colleges. Due to the large cost of retaining a specialized clinical staff and reduction in the quantity of students served caused by this approach, the current staff have continued to emphasize the provision of short-term counseling. Short-term counseling requires referral of students to community agencies and professionals. Currently, when students require long-term therapy or specialized care, the staff will consult with these students and attempt to link them up with appropriate mental health professionals in the community.

Future Plans

A request for an additional counselor has been submitted for University budget approval for the 2003-2004 academic year. This plan will also involve renovation of the current facilities to provide adequate office space for an additional counselor. The CCAC and the Career Center should also examine their inter-departmental relationship.

VI. The Career Center (Marlin Clark, Director)

The Career Center’s mission is to provide students and alumni with information, training, and experiences that enable them to make informed career decisions that lead to employment opportunities consistent with their interests, abilities, and values.

The Career Center aims to counsel students and alumni on the importance of career planning, development, and alternative opportunities. It works with the employment community to develop recruitment opportunities for students and alumni on and off campus. The Center partners with faculty and student services professionals to develop and deliver career options and opportunities for students, such as internships and career fairs.

The Career Center has also revised its policies and services to ensure that these are provided in conjunction with the University’s Mission (leadership, faith, ethics, justice, and service): The
department works with students to develop the “whole person”. Career development includes providing students with leadership opportunities that encourage reflection and moral development, that lead to intentional career decisions that promote justice and service as stewards for the world.

Over the last four years, the Career Center has developed a marketing campaign to improve students’ awareness and use of The Career Center (TCC), which has included: two major advertisements in the Gonzaga Bulletin each semester, improving professional appearance of TCC bulletin boards across campus; increased TCC visibility in residence halls; and working with faculty to increase opportunities for education in the classroom.

The Career Center has also taken into account its ability to connect students with employment opportunities. To better serve the needs of students, it has changed its outreach name from Job Source in 1998 to Job Direct in 2000 to MonsterTrak in 2001.

While improving the Internship Program an Internship Coordinator was added in November 1998. The internship postings increased from 105 in 1998 to 230 in 2001. Also, student registrations increased from 45 in 1998 to 206 in 2001.

Other programs include ASK (Alumni Sharing Knowledge) and Senior Social programs, designed to connect students with business professionals, moved with GAMP. Both programs host annually approximately 300 students, alumni, and members of the business community.

The Career Center makes provisions for non-traditional students by being available in the evenings and two weekends a month. The CRISP students work open weekends.

Since 1998, an emphasis has been placed upon improving campus relationships with faculty and the administration by participating in a number of campus organizations and committees:

- Membership on the President’s Student Leadership Development Committee
- Membership on the University’s Race Relations & Cultural Understanding Committee
- Chaired Higher Education Women’s Roundtable
- Co-chaired Service Learning Committee
- Co-chaired Childcare Committee
- Co-chaired Faculty Advisory Internship Committee

To improve services provided for non-traditional undergraduates and graduate students the Career Center partnered with the Professional Studies Division to teach Career Management and Development to traditional and non-traditional students in the Bachelors of General Studies program. The semester-long class received numerous laudatory comments and was recommended to be taught on an ongoing basis to all students. Students in the Masters in Organizational Leadership program also received career training in seminars conducted on the weekends.

For the last six years The Career Center has trained a team of student leaders to become proficient paraprofessionals in providing career services to their peers. With the help and
support of CRISP (Career Representatives Involved in Student Planning) students are encouraged to utilize the services and programs of the Center. The CRISP program has significantly increased students and alumni utilization of the Center.

**Future Plans**

- Upgrade technology to support electronic file usage (Career Development Portfolios).
- Emplace interactive systems in the Foley Library to allow more independent use of career resources for students.
- Develop full-service on-line recruitment that will allow both students and employers to share information and interact with each other regarding employment opportunities.

**Health Center (Mary Jo Leveque, Director)**

“When health is absent, wisdom cannot reveal itself, art cannot be manifest, strength cannot be exerted, wealth becomes useless and reason is powerless.” Herophilus, circa 300 B.C.

The mission of the Gonzaga University Health Center is to contribute to the physical and emotional health of each student by providing quality, accessible, cost effective primary health care to return ill students to their academic life. This is consistent with the mission of the University. The staff strive to promote healthy behaviors and lifestyle choices through ongoing education, “windows of opportunity” and by outreach programs to the Undergraduate, Law, Graduate and International students. Students are encouraged to take responsibility for their own well being by living a healthy lifestyle that promotes their entire well being. Unhealthy students cannot learn to their full potential. Wellness must be a high priority in a learning environment.

An on-site physician’s office is staffed with a medical doctor, a nurse practitioner and three registered nurses and an intuitive receptionist, who have a total of 82 years of experience. The service is highly utilized on a consistent basis with a census of over 51%. The need for clinic services seems to be increasing with insurance restrictions impacting our students and the need for on-going treatments for psychotropic medications.

Three years ago the staff was able to return to the building that was built as a Health Center in 1964. The move is considered as a great achievement because it provides an opportunity to improve and expand services.

The significant changes in the next three to five years will be an increase in staff for individual care to maintain the same level of service. If staffing improves significantly hours of the clinic may increase. Without an increase in personnel, a liability exists and it is unsafe for the students and the staff.

The current trend of an increasing number of students on psychotropic medications, eating disorders and other complicated medical conditions and the reluctance of insurance companies to cover out of area care, has proved to be a challenge to the quality of care students receive. Also many providers are reluctant to bill the insurance carriers and demand payment at the time of
service. There is a need for mandatory insurance with a waiver that would provide proof that students have coverage in this region for emergencies and routine care.

The students evaluate the department randomly, but the quality assurance factor is daily. The Health Center is included in various University surveys and the American College Health Association data share survey. All of the results have been favorable.

**Future Plans**

Specific recommendations that would improve the department in the next few years include implementing a secure filing system for current charts, purchasing an AED, hiring the RNs for 12 months, moving the nurse practitioner position into the University’s budget and gradually increasing the position as the University grows, establishing a four hour a week psychiatric nurse to evaluate medications for depression, bi-polar and borderline personality Cases after a psychiatrist diagnoses the patient, continuing to improve the relationship with the psychiatrist consultant, and implementing a mandatory insurance policy with a waiver and the staffing to track the implementation.

**Disabilities Support Services (DSS) (Kathryne Shearer, Director)**

Disabilities Support Services provides access services to Gonzaga University’s programs, services, activities, and facilities for qualified students with disabilities in compliance with federal and state laws. DSS may arrange or provide academic adjustments, accommodations, auxiliary aids, adaptive technology, advocacy, and other types of assistance for students with disabilities.

Disabilities Support Services provides these services to undergraduate, graduate, doctoral program and law students who qualify for services. DSS provides support to students with disabilities who are participating in off-campus programs and those in Gonzaga University’s Study Abroad programs.

Disabilities Support Services partners with faculty members, staff and administration to provide access to a quality experience of liberal humanistic learning for persons with disabilities on the Gonzaga University campus, and in doing so, supports the aspirations of the individual students it serves. As these students graduate, they enter their professional lives with the skills necessary to achieve their vocational and personal goals.

Academic accommodations are provided after appropriate documentation is presented to DSS, the individual’s needs are assessed and it is determined how the disability might interfere with the student’s academic progress. Services may consist of one or more of the following: enrollment assistance (orientation to campus, registration assistance); classroom accommodations (Sign Language Interpreter, Note-taker, Reader); alternative media (large print materials, brailled materials, textbooks in alternative formats); assistive technology (TDD, 4 track player/recorders, closed caption decoder, CCTV, FM systems (portable)); alternative testing (extended time, distraction reduced environment, alternative answer sheet, reader, scribe, use of computer).

The Disabilities Support Services staff consists of the Director, a Program Assistant II, a receptionist, and approximately 10 student employees that assist the staff direct accommodation
provision (i.e. reading/scanning texts in alternative formats, test delivery for proctored exams, and other duties as assigned).

Gonzaga University has experienced steady growth since the last accreditation period and as a result, Disabilities Support Services has also seen an upsurge in students requesting academic adjustments and accommodations. Nationally, the trend of students with disabilities seeking out small universities has continued. Students report small class size and low faculty/student ratios are important reasons behind their choice in schools.

As shown in Table 3.x, the number of students DSS has served has shown a rapid increase:

a) Table 3.14: Students Served by Disabilities Support Services, Academic Years 1995-96 through 2001-02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-00</th>
<th>00-01</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD/HD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple¹</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Students with multiple disabilities may have a combination of learning disabilities, physical disabilities, psychological disabilities or AD/HD.

As DSS clientele has increased in number, the provision of accommodations and academic adjustments that have been provided has also grown. During the 2001-02 academic year, DSS handled over 450 accommodated exams (e.g. extended time, distraction-reduced testing environments, use of a computer, etc). Future concerns exist regarding the increasing numbers of proctored exams in relation to current staffing levels as well as physical space in the office (AD 324). As shown in the chart above, DSS has experienced a consistent and significant increase in the volume of alternative testing proctored from Spring semester, 1995 through the Spring semester, 2003.

Next Steps

- The concern regarding the process for obtaining volunteer note-takers has been a consistent topic of discussion during the past two years. Historically, finding a note-taker has been the professor’s responsibility. Many faculty members feel uncomfortable making this request and do not know what to do when no one volunteers. Students have reported increasing difficulty obtaining a volunteer to provide this service. Disabilities Support Services has concerns regarding lack of quality control as well. This situation has ramifications that include formal complaint processes. Disabilities Support Services is now revisiting this process, including the possibility of moving from a volunteer program to one that at least carries a stipend for the student note-taker. While this may increase costs in the current budget, it may be the best solution to provide consistent services to students with disabilities who require notetaking as an accommodation.
Disabilities Support Services provides accommodations to students involved with Gonzaga's distance education programs. It is the University's responsibility to provide accommodations to students, no matter where they are located, if Gonzaga will grant their degree. Increased internet course accessibility issues will need to be addressed as these features become increasingly incorporated into these programs.

The Academic Vice President's office has graciously and consistently transferred funds to allow us to meet our growing responsibilities; however, this reactive approach to resolving a significant, chronic problem has been stressful for all involved. Disabilities Support Services has seen a large increase in the number of clients, the number of accommodated exams proctored by DSS, and the number of students using textbooks on tape or other alternative formats. Even with a marked increase in the other contracted services line item of the DSS budget for Fall, 2002, it is likely that the office will be functioning in the red by the end of this coming academic year. DSS will complete its first seven-year cycle as a University entity during the 2002-2003 academic year. As the University experiences growth and change under a new Academic Vice President, the opportunity for serious discussion and strategic planning is present. The time has come to initiate a more proactive stance and to evaluate budget allocation related to the provision of academic adjustments and auxiliary aids to students with disabilities who choose Gonzaga because of its fine reputation of excellence and atmosphere of care.

B Alcohol Abuse & Sexual Assault Prevention Programs and Substance Abuse Counseling (Len Sitter, S.J., Counselor; Mary Heitkemper, Student Life Generalist)

C The central aims of this program and its foci areas include: the development of a comprehensive alcohol awareness and sexual assault prevention program, promotion of multiple prevention strategies that affect the campus environment as a whole, and creating programs that can have a large-scale impact on the entire campus community. The staff seeks to increase awareness, offer an integrated array of services, implement more prevention strategies, and increase coordinated pro-active programming to reduce problems associated with alcohol and sexual assault. These efforts will promote academic achievement as well as promote an educational dialogue about alcohol and sexual assault with all students.

D Alcohol abuse has been identified as a serious concern at Gonzaga for a number of years. Within Student Life, a fulltime position has been dedicated to improving the resources and support for alcohol abuse prevention efforts at the institution. In July, 2003, a substantial, two-year US Department of Education grant was secured which has provided resources to hire several student leaders, consultants and a professional staff member. The central aim of this project is to develop a comprehensive “social norms alcohol abuse intervention model” that integrates three levels of prevention; to implement this model in the context of a faith-based university with a social justice mission; and to evaluate the efficacy of replicating this model in other institutions similar in size, mission, and educational philosophy.

E Gonzaga offers intervention, treatment resources, and substance abuse counseling as well as prevention programs. Various educational strategies exist beginning with strong communication with parents through informational brochures and new student orientation. Alcohol education is very firmly ingrained into the residence hall environment starting with training student leaders, setting programming expectations to include an alcohol emphasis, providing consistent discipline processes and including the option for students to live in a healthy living environment.

The Gonzaga campus has been supplemented with many new programs and activities to give students healthy choices and alternatives to abusive drinking. Programs range from the “Weekend Wonders” program to “Gonzaga Outdoors” as well as the establishment of “DaPad,”
a house on campus designed to provide alternatives to drinking, and a Bacchus Chapter. Many Gonzaga University student leaders are committed to working in the area of alcohol and drug education, enforcement, and prevention. The Gonzaga Activities Board (GAB) has also identified alcohol as a major awareness focus.

**Sexual Assault Prevention**

The area of sexual assault prevention is co-coordinated between the offices of Student Life, the Center for Community Action and Service Learning (with regard to student issues) and the Security office (with regard to prevention), so it has been essential to get student groups working together and focus on making some positive changes administratively.

The Security department is very involved in a campus wide effort for the prevention of alcohol abuse and sexual assault. There is a significant amount of departmental collaboration around the prevention of alcohol abuse and education and there is a strong commitment from the leadership of Gonzaga University, which includes the President, Vice President of Student Life, the Dean of Student Services, and others within the University community.

Both the substance abuse counselor and the Student Life generalist report to the Vice President of Student Life. They each have computer access and an office located in the Administration Building (Ad). There is one front line office manager who assists with greeting guests, answering phone calls and making appointments. Three student work-studies assist, as time permits, with project work.

The budget for this area is derived from student disciplinary fines as well as a small amount from the Vice President of Student Life. In the future, the budget will be more systematically funded, as well as using money derived from student fines.

**Housing and Residence Life (Dennis Colestock, Director)**

The work of the Department of Housing and Residence Life is multifaceted and complex. As an integral and valued member of the University community, this department serves residents by providing: safe, clean and well appointed living accommodations, laboratory style learning about the complexities of community living, opportunities for self growth and values clarification, academic living/learning communities and other theme style experiences and life skill acquisition.

The University owns and operates 26 residential buildings comprising 20 distinct residential “communities.” Collectively, the University houses 2,138 residents on campus while also operating some off-campus houses and apartments, housing an additional 100+ residents. During the past five years, two new residential areas have been added to the housing inventory for students. The Corkery Apartments is an upper-division and graduate student complex, and Dillon/Goller provide suite style-housing for lower-division students. Both housing options have been positively received by students.
The department is staffed with professional staff including an Area Coordinator, a Residence Hall Director/Judicial Officer, an Associate Director of Residence Life, an Associate Director of Housing and Campus Services, a Director of Housing and Residence Life, and three full time administrative support staff. The Student staff is composed of 70 paraprofessional student leaders.

The department has both a business side and a residence life side of operation. The business side administers building repair needs, billings, room assignments, meal plan administration, and fiscal planning and projections for the University. The Residence Life side administers community development; the hiring, and training of paraprofessional student leadership staff, program development; roommate conflicts; and disciplinary interventions.

The live-in student staff team of 68 are trained for three full weeks prior to the opening of school in August each year. Training in conflict management, crisis intervention, First Aid/CPR, substance use/abuse issues, community development and leadership skills are among the many topics upon which training is focused. Collectively, these staff members provide over 1,000 organized programs to residents each year ranging from educational topics and social engagements to guest lecturers and trips off campus to points of interest.

The department works hard to provide appropriate training and experience to live in staff by requiring all such staff to be currently certified in both First Aid and CPR. In partnership with Plant Services, the department assures that each residential facility meets (and in most cases exceeds) current fire code regarding fire safety equipment. Live in staff provide regular fire safety drills in each residential community in partnership with University Security. University Security joins live-in staff in simulation style training for crisis intervention prior to arrival of students in the fall so that both departments work well as a team in responding to such. There are three full-time live in professionals jointly providing 24/7 on call response to crisis situations.

The Department has made considerable changes over the past ten years. Most of the change was necessitated by enrollment growth during the past four years. Changes have occurred in staffing, office location and size, technology acquisition, policy, facility enhancement and numbers, fiscal challenges associated with operating a business serving a larger population, performance, productivity, and efficiency. These changes have mostly occurred in the last half of the past ten years, have challenged, and stressed the department in numerous ways.

Future decreasing enrollment will provide relief in terms of space, and opportunities for quality improvement and housing for additional upper division students, providing fiscal resources are available to offer flexible rent rate structures to some portions of the student population and maintain necessary staffing levels.

The main office has acquired and continually updated and improved a residence hall room assignments management program that has standardized this labor-intensive portion of the business operation. In addition, workstation technology has kept up with market improvements well, offering full time staff the technology they need to work efficiently.

Continued enrollment growth exerts challenges on living environments; it has required placement of residents in a neighboring hotel, and bunk-style housing in what is normally residential lounge
space. Industry standards suggest that important “community space” is needed for the development and fostering of healthy communities. Gonzaga’s enrollment growth has also lowered the average age of the residents on campus population by reducing the number of beds available to upper division students. An increase in discipline and intervention levels has accompanied this age drop.

**Future Plans**

The University will be building more housing to comfortably accommodate the student population required to live on campus. This will return residential lounge space to its very important design intent, and bring a significant group of students out of a hotel and into our normal residential community.

Future planning includes initiatives such as disaster preparations, a Five Year Plan for professionalizing the department, academic theme style residential communities through collaboration with faculty, benchmarking studies, and continuing website development.

**University Dining Services** *(Gary Coyle, General Manager)*

University Dining Services is managed by Sodexho and consists of the resident dining program, retail operations and catering. The Sodexho staff is intimately involved in the University community and serves the needs of students, staff, faculty, and internal and external constituencies. There is a strong relationship between student satisfaction and the dining experience they encounter, especially for those students who live on campus and are required to purchase a meal plan.

Sodexho employs a nutritionist who constantly reviews and updates student menus to ensure the nutritional and health standards for our students are met. Sodexho also constantly reviews the health and safety standards of its facilities to ensure standards are maintained. Sodexho’s ‘solution team’ visits campus to provide an external review of operations.

Students are offered a myriad of meal plans from which they can choose ranging from an 80 meal program a semester to the unlimited “A La Carte” plan. All student meal plans also include “flex dollars” that can be spent at the retail venues across campus. There is a ‘Bulldog Bucks’ program which was established to provide students with more flexibility and offer off-campus students the convenient option of purchasing food on campus. Students and parents can add money to ID cards in order to purchase items on or off campus.

Gonzaga’s Ultimate Dining Program for resident students was ranked third nationally in comparison to similar schools served by Sodexho Campus Service in regards to the 2000/2001 academic school year. Campus retail services ranked first nationally in comparison to similar schools for the same 2000/2001 academic year.

Sodexho has created plans for the future which include revising the Resident Dining Program to better meet students needs (hours, menu, meal plans, etc.); to improve facilities in the dining
room of the Cataldo and COG; and to improve kitchen equipment and layout in the Cataldo and COG. Another is to develop a comprehensive marketing program for newly designed retail outlets and to develop a comprehensive plan to focus dining services' growth for the next 5 to 6 years, which includes meeting the challenges and opportunities of a new proposed Student Union Center. In addition, plans are currently underway to expand multi-purpose usage of the Cataldo.

**Student Activities** *(David B. Lindsay, Director)*

**Office of Student Activities**

The mission of the Office of Student Activities is to work towards encouraging the development of individual students and student groups by providing activities, programs, services, and resources that facilitate education and entertainment. The staff works to provide an environment that allows for an exchange of ideas, activities, and opinions, appreciation of our diverse society, a friendly campus environment, and a great quality of life.

Student Activities strives to compliment a student’s experience outside the classroom for the University’s five distinct Mission areas – leadership, justice, faith, service, and ethics. Student Activities connects students to resources that will enable them to create events, programs, activities, or workshops in a variety of different areas. The office encourages co-sponsorship between appropriate organizations and departments.

The Office of Student Activities contributes to Gonzaga’s mission by serving as a resource center and supports all clubs and organizations on campus. It develops programs that deal with issues related to justice, which are central to the campus community and to the world at large. Student Activities provides a supportive environment that allows students to grow as individuals, giving them challenges, responsibilities, the tools that they need to succeed (and, when appropriate, fail). It supports clubs and organizations, while they complete their service component and serves in an advisory capacity to ensure that all student-led events and programs consider the potential ethical impact the programs could have on the students. Student Activities works to connect students to various faith-based programs and organizations and works with mission areas to develop mission-related programs or activities.

(The many programs and services offered through Student Activities are listed at Exhibit 3.24.)

Activity has increased significantly over the past few years due to the establishment of the Student Activities Office in 1995 and the increase in student enrollment in the last four years. There is a greater need and a demand for more activities to accommodate the growth and the establishment of the office strives to fulfill these requests, though it can be challenging at times. Three of the greatest challenges are staffing, funding, and facilities. The growth of the student population has made it difficult to hold events larger than 500 standing; with an incoming class of 900+ coupled with the rest of the student body, the office has had to get creative or turn students away at times.)
Self-assessments are conducted via a review of events by the organizing party. The Gonzaga Activities Board (GAB) reviews its programs after each event and notebooks of events and suggestions are handed down each year to the new student government and GAB officers. GAB members conduct an evaluation of each other and the department each semester.

All programs that are offered are open to undergraduate, graduate, and non-traditional students. The majority of students that attend are undergrads. Graduate and non-traditional students tend to have other obligations such as family and jobs that can often preclude them from attending some events. The office strives to offer diverse programs that appeal to the entire student body, regardless of race, ethnicity, religious affiliation, or sexual orientation.

In the past three years, the office has made some significant improvements in recreational development, weekend programming, homecoming, and diversity.

- The “Gonzaga Outdoors” program, which facilitates student activity in nature, has grown tremendously and is becoming its own force on campus.
- The “Kaleidoscope Project” has made strides in increasing student’s awareness about multicultural and social justice issues.
- “Homecoming” was almost nonexistent on campus prior to 1998, and in the past three years, it has grown extensively.
- The system for electronic notification of events and activities has been streamlined and many student, faculty, and staff groups use it.
- The Gonzaga Activities Board has had some high quality and creative programs.
- Clubs on campus are recognizing that the activities board can be a partner in their activities and come to the board for funding and assistance in programming.

One of the greatest strengths that the office offers to students is that every staff member cares for students and their well being. Another strength is that the office has a welcoming environment; it always has snacks available, music in the background and is decorated for the season. The staff has a wealth of expertise and experience that it readily shares with any student who asks.

There are programming areas that could be expanded, such as in the area of Faith. The Graduate Student Council has struggled because of many factors and has made little progress in truly serving the needs of graduate students. This year under new leadership, things are starting to progress and it looks as if some changes will be made as long as the momentum can continue to move forward. Non-traditional students are often neglected because seldom do they come forward asking for information. The office has relied on the President of the Encore House to approach them and ask for assistance rather than going there and seeing what could be done. Club sports are a weakness that needs to be addressed. Each member fills out a liability form, though there is not much follow-up about who is the coach, what type of first aid is available during practices and games. A review of other schools policies and procedures is needed to find out what the office could do to better assist these clubs. Class officers are another area where Student Activities could do better and serve them more effectively by providing transition manuals and including them in a transition retreat. An emphasis on the class officers is taking place in the current year.
Future Plans

Throughout this report, there have been mentions of things that will be done to address areas that are not performing up to expectations, things planned, or being worked on. To reiterate there will be evaluation tools and surveys developed to address the needs of non-traditional students and evaluate programs. There is a strong movement within the Graduate Student Advisory Council to have a general orientation for all departments. The office is working in collaboration with other groups on campus to provide alternatives to partying and will continue to put on programs that give students things to do. Student Activities will work to try to incorporate faith in programming. Currently, there is a revitalization of a leadership program that will be available to all students to develop skills and abilities. The Office of Student Activities has done much in the past five years and will continue to do more as student needs become apparent.

Special Academic Events (Susie Pruscb, Coordinator)

The Office of Special Academic Events is dedicated to providing students and their families, community members, alumni, and benefactors quality University events that accurately reflect a positive image of the University. Special Academic Events puts on two events which are the “main anchors” of the academic year; namely, Fall Family Weekend and Commencement. The department is then called upon to work a variety of other events, many of which are one-time-only events for a vice-presidential, school/college, or department area.

The entire undergraduate student body is invited to participate in Fall Family Weekend, and the senior class, graduate students, and law students participate in the Commencement Weekend. Each of these events has an enormous number of invited guests who also participate. The associated events may or may not directly involve students.

Student Academic Events is comprised of one professional member and one work-study student for fall and spring terms. To carry out most events requires the work of many people from other departments plus dozens of volunteer students.

Significant Changes:

• The 2002-03 academic year represents a change as to the reporting procedure for this department. For the first time, there is a monthly reporting meeting scheduled with the Associate Academic Vice President and a request for weekly updates as to the department’s progress.
• The Fall Family Weekend event was created in 1997 to replace an unsuccessful spring Parents’ Weekend model. With a first-year tally of approximately 450 participants, we are now registering about 2,500 participants.
• We are seeing an increased number of undergraduate students who are graduating and participating in the commencement weekend events. Since 1997, we have had to hold our undergraduate Commencement ceremony in the Spokane Veterans Memorial Arena because we had outgrown the on-campus facility we had previously used. In 2003, we will no longer be able to use St. Aloysius Church for this Mass because we again have a
sizeable increase in the number of graduates. We will switch the Mass to our gymnasium and allow each graduate to have 4 guests.

- The Department has created a web page for both Fall Family Weekend and Commencement. These pages are intended to keep our students and their families, as well as our community members, well informed.
- The changes most likely to happen in Special Academic Events really depend on the numbers and types of special programs or events which will be needed in any given year and these will likely be one-time-only events.

Next Steps

Resources sufficient to adequately support the costs and complexity involved with Commencement require assessment and provision. A pending proposal advocates that the graduating School of Law students be charged a graduation fee - in keeping with every other graduating student. Another proposal requests that we study the idea of graduation fees being placed in a specific account instead of the current practice of having those funds go into the general fund.

Encore (Non-traditional Student Organization) (Fr. George Morris, S.J., Advisor)

Encore is a Gonzaga University organization that offers a support system, informational programs, volunteer services, and a social network for "non-traditional students," i.e., undergraduate students 25 years and over. In a given year, there are approximately two hundred and eighty Encore students on campus. Although Encore primarily aims at serving the non-traditional student, all students are welcome to become members and to participate in meetings, services, and activities. The organization strives to meet many of those particular needs that are not met by the most obvious orientation toward the traditional student. Encore embraces Gonzaga University's humanistic, Catholic, and Jesuit Mission.

Encore receives its financial support mainly from the Gonzaga Student Body Association (GSBA) but also indirectly from the School of Professional Studies. A number of social activities are planned each academic year. All family members, including children, are welcome at every Encore function.

A body of student officers leads Encore: it has a president, vice-president, treasurer, and secretary. The Encore organization has a house where both undergraduate and graduate non-traditional students can relax, study, meet with friends, have lunch, enjoy a cup of coffee, or just sit back and listen to some soft music as they wait for the next class. At this time, only a few students utilize the house.

The Encore Organization is primarily trying to meet the needs of those non-traditional students on campus. Encore strives to make students feel welcome at Gonzaga and specifically at Encore House especially when they first arrive on campus. The program helps the students integrate into an atmosphere that is strongly geared toward the traditional undergraduate student. A newsletter goes out to all Encore students, generally twice a semester. A few years ago, a survey revealed that although students did not have time to participate in activities, they did appreciate
receiving the newsletter. In addition, announcements go out on e-mail as well as postings around campus.

Center for Community Action and Service-Learning (CCASL)
(Sima Thorpe, Director)

“The Center for Community Action and Service-Learning empowers students, faculty and community partners to strive for justice through community involvement, education and public service. Together, with the campus community, we support and enliven the University’s mission of creating ‘men and women for others.’”

CCASL is a resource center that facilitates, directs, and supports the University’s mission-driven community outreach initiatives. The aim is to create a campus engaged for the common good, to promote an ethic of service in Gonzaga’s students, and to integrate academic service-learning and co-curricular service initiatives and activities systematically throughout the University. Service is central to the University’s educational mission, is one of the five distinct “mission areas,” and is an expressed priority of the University administration. CCASL serves as the University’s link to Spokane’s community-based organizations.

CCASL contributes to the University’s Mission by providing a resource center to students, faculty, staff and community members for community outreach activities; connecting students and faculty to volunteer and service-learning opportunities; developing and directing co-curricular and curricular service programs; and linking itself with other Mission areas to develop Mission-related initiatives. CCASL also facilitates the institutionalization of academic and co-curricular service-learning, provides a supportive environment and meeting place for students and faculty to develop service initiatives, obtains funding and resources to support service related programs, and advises and places student volunteers in local, national and international service organizations. Primary activities and accomplishments are outlined below.

- Through CCASL’s encouragement students contribute more than 30,000 service hours annually to the community and, on average, 600 students participate in academic service learning each semester.
- CCASL directs 10 special events annually, including “Service-Fest” which draws 50 non-profit organizations to campus every year. CCASL also directs seven mentoring and tutoring programs, including the nationally recognized “Campus Kids” mentoring project.
- More than 35 faculty members have developed service-learning courses (developed, managed and supported by CCASL’s Office of Academic Service-Learning). These faculty members represent 10 academic departments and the law school.
- CCASL directs nine ongoing community service outreach projects, together leveraging 300+ volunteers. For instance, The Rising Times is the only “street” newspaper produced in the area. CCASL obtains $250,000 to $500,000 in grants and other resources, annually, to support its programs, including 50 AmeriCorps education awards for students engaged in community service. Five full-time AmeriCorps members coordinate projects.
- CCASL is a founding member of the Inland Northwest Service Learning Partnership (INSLP) a consortium of regional colleges and universities dedicated to developing service-learning in the Spokane metropolitan area.
• The Gonzaga Indian Education Outreach Project (GIEOP) represents a service learning partnership between CCASL, the biology department and two local Native American tribes.
• A strong focus on combining activism with service: CCASL coordinates the “Take Back the Night,” “Take a Stand” program (to combat sexual violence), and the “Allies Project” (to combat bigotry/hate on campus).
• CCASL offers twenty-five $4,000 scholarships for juniors and seniors who demonstrate an outstanding commitment to service and social justice.
• CCASL is slated for a 2 million endowment in the current capital campaign.

CCASL offices are in two houses at a central location on campus. CCASL has more than fifty community partners and identifies “expert” partners to serve in an advisory capacity. CCASL has developed, and assists with the support of, community service/social action themed residence halls.

F University Ministry (Fr. William Watson, S.J., Vice President for Mission)

University Ministry has the specific aim, as noted in its departmental mission statement, of promoting the life of supernatural faith. In accordance with this mission, the department seeks to help “students and other interested members of the wider [University] community to become knowledgeable, committed active practitioners of their faith traditions” (see Exhibit 3.25).

University Ministry recognizes many areas of strength including a dedicated and professional staff deeply committed to the Gospel and concerned about faith life on campus, a wide range of programs appealing to people at different stages of their faith journey and a large group of student collaborators and leaders committed to helping with apostolates. University Ministry also notes the loyalty of non-Catholic student groups, such as THIRST and OASIS, and appreciates the collaboration of some Jesuits for retreat and sacramental work.

University Ministry started hosting an annual Jewish Seder for our Jewish faculty, students and staff in 1999. This is now an annual event, organized and sponsored by the Department of University Ministry, with the assistance of several Jewish faculty members. University Ministry advertises the Jewish High Holy Days and provides information on transportation to the local Temple for those services.

Last year, the Muslim Student Association decided to move under the aegis of UM. With the events of 9/11/01, the MSA has taken a low profile, in large part because most of our Muslim students from overseas were called back to their countries. Gonzaga has for years sponsored a Muslim house of prayer. We no longer have the house, but Mr. Raymond Fadeley, Director of International Student Programs, has identified a new location on campus for our Muslim students to worship and conduct daily prayers.

1. Programs and Services

• Liturgies – Daily 12 Noon & 10PM in the University Chapel
  Sunday: 8:30PM University Chapel & 10PM St. Aloysius Church
• Retreats – 5 Freshman Retreats, 4 AGAPE Retreats (open to Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors), 4 SEARCH Retreats (open to Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors),
three 5-Day Ignatian Retreats (open to Sophomores, Juniors, Seniors, faculty, staff, alumni & friends), Holy Week Retreat at Mt. Angel Abbey, Annual Fall Pilgrimage, and a Men’s Retreat

- Sacramental Preparation – Weekly classes and other seminars for RCIA (Right to Christian Initiation of Adults) and Confirmation.
- Eucharistic Prayer – Started in 2002, prayer before the Blessed Sacrament every Thursday from 12:30 – 9:30 PM.
- Non-Catholic Offerings – Hired a half-time Christian Chaplain to direct worship & prayer services, as well as maintain a list of local places to worship.
- Other Offerings – Prayer vigils (9/11 and Jesuit Martyrs), “Celebrate Life” marking the anniversary of the Supreme Court decision to legalize abortion, UM staff live-in Chaplains for the On-Campus residence halls, Campus House, a student gathering place for prayer and fellowship.

Significant Changes Since 1994

- Increasing the staff size from four to eight people, two of whom are half-time
- Increasing the salaries for director and professional staff
- Addition of four new retreat programs: AGAPE, Five-Day Ignatian, Monastic Experience and Men’s Retreat (with Women’s Retreat soon to follow)
- Addition of new retreat venues, including Immaculate Heart Retreat Center and several private estates/homes
- Major refurbishing of the University Chapel (completed 2002)
- Addition of a new Sunday Mass (10 pm at St. Aloysius)
- Addition of a new weeknight Mass (10 pm in the University Chapel)
- Hiring of a non-Catholic Chaplain
- Initiating a weekly praise and worship service for non-Catholic Christians
- Initiating an annual Seder for Jewish students, faculty and staff
- Inviting local pastors and faith leaders to take part in Student Orientation
- Reintroducing the Right of Christian Initiation for Adults program for students
- Restoring the annual Pilgrimage to an overnight event
- Introducing a weekly day of Eucharistic Prayer
- Increasing the availability of times for Sacrament of Reconciliation
- Sponsoring major campus speakers twice yearly
- Distributing free Catechisms and other literature
- Revamping the department’s website (2,611 page views since August 2002)
- Increasing the annual operating budget from 110K to 150K.

While there are many positive aspects about University Ministry, there are some aspects that are seen as weaknesses by of the department. For example, there is an inability, owing to staff size, to conduct an extensive, ongoing outreach to students who are not already attending liturgies and other events. Spotty chaplain coverage of residence halls – again, owing to personnel and time constraints, and to the decreasing number of Jesuits available for this work -- are also a problem. In addition there are insufficient operating expenses and or endowments to subsidize those who cannot otherwise afford to attend retreats and other events and insufficient office space to accommodate current and future staff.

Next Steps
While looking to the future, University Ministry hopes to increase the size and diversity of its staff, acquire additional office space, increase its operating budget, and fine-tune existing programs and create new ones that respond to specific needs. In addition, the development of additional opportunities for spiritual growth for staff, faculty and graduate students and continuation of the upgrading of the website, brochures and other promotional literature would be beneficial to the department.

VII.
VIII. **Campus Services** *(Scott Murray, Director)*

The department of Campus Services is a service-oriented department that assists the entire University community. The department manages University facilities, and offers support in the form of technical and labor services for all events, including the office of Student Activities. In addition, Campus Services offers services to students through management of Off-Campus Housing and through the department’s involvement in the University judicial process. The department also offers third party services through conference and convention activities as well as rentals of the Bozarth Conference and Retreat Center.

Campus Services follows and integrates the University Mission into its daily activities working with the University community. Feedback to this effect is generally obtained through surveys, comment cards, and telephone calls.

The University has recently experienced a substantial shortage in available facilities for extra curricular activities. Several major buildings have recently been undergoing remodels, eliminating substantial use of general-purpose facilities. It has been challenging to identify alternative venues for activities. However, Campus Services has worked together with other campus departments to make use of facilities not commonly used for activities, such as the Martin Centre. Cataldo Hall will provide a much-needed large multipurpose facility that will enhance efforts in offering additional space and upgraded equipment to the community at large.

**Future Plans**

With the shortfall in available facilities on campus for extra curricular activities, the Crosby Student Center has become an increasingly popular facility as the hub for students to socialize, study and to be entertained. This facility (although not adequate to accommodate the needs and demands placed upon it) has maintained with some 5,000 + students visiting the center daily during the regular academic semester. With the ever-increasing population of students and the demands for space to accommodate extra curricular activities, the Trustees have agreed to look at possible funding in the next Capital Campaign for a new Student Center that can accommodate such needs.

**The Bookstore** *(David Heinz, Manager)*

The Bookstore's mission is to provide the Gonzaga University community with a service-oriented campus outlet where course materials along with school spirit merchandise can be purchased at
prices reflecting the best value available. Employees of the Bookstore are committed to serving all who enter it in a manner that reflects the values conveyed by the Mission of the University.

The Bookstore provides textbooks, both new and used; classroom supplies; study aids; course materials; school supplies; and Gonzaga logo merchandise. Textbook and supplemental course materials are provided by the Bookstore for all course offerings (including Law courses). Employees provide students with two channels for obtaining course materials. They can shop in the store, or the textbook website. A special order program has been established to help students obtain academic materials that have not been requested by faculty and are not normally stocked in the Bookstore.

Orders for textbooks and other course-related materials are placed by faculty members, directly, via requisition forms provided by the Bookstore. The Bookstore is located in the lower (basement) east end of the COG building. A major remodel of the store was completed in 1995. The remodel added approximately 1,200 square feet to the store. New textbook fixtures were purchased at that time to provide easier access for students. Staff offices for the store Director and Textbook Manager were relocated to provide more exposure to, and easier access for, students and other customers. Additional storage space is currently in the construction/remodel stage which will provide much needed space and better accommodate students with mobility impairments, as well as to accommodate increased enrollment and retail sales.

The Bookstore offers a campus author section and, in addition to textbooks, stocks appropriate study aids. Books are occasionally provided at author functions on campus. Staff will help anyone in the University community find a book if it is not in stock at the Bookstore.

The Bookstore employs over 15 work study students. These students are involved in nearly every aspect of the Bookstore’s operations including stocking and re-stocking and pricing merchandise, serving as cashiers and checking inventory. Students who are employed for a greater length of time receive training in customer service and can help to answer book and product-related questions.

**Future Plans**

The Bookstore is committed to working with University administrators in solving our existing space problem. They will be working to increase storage space and increase the efficiency of processing areas. The Bookstore began new faculty training this August (2003) to help improve the understanding and cooperation of participants in the textbook department process. Through training they hope to increase awareness, improve fulfillment and reduce costs to students. The Bookstore plans to help students make better textbook purchasing decisions by writing articles, periodically, for the student newspaper, the *Bulletin*. The Bookstore will continue to work on product turns in all inventory categories. Efforts in this area will help the Bookstore contribute to the financial health of the University in general. The Bookstore will continue to survey our various customer segments to ensure that they are serving the needs of the community.
IX. **Student Media** *(Joanne Shiosake, Publication Manager)*

X.
The department of Student Media produces and distributes publications that are created by Gonzaga University students and feature the work of Gonzaga University students, alumni, faculty, and or staff.

XI.
The department of Student Media currently publishes the following publications and their online versions: *The Bulletin*, student newspaper; *Charter, Journal of Thought and Opinion; Reflection*, a journal of literary and artistic talents of students, faculty, staff and alumni; *Spires*, the pictorial yearbook, and the *Who’s Who* (the student campus directory). *(For samples of these publications, see Exhibit 3.26 in the Team Room.)* Advertising and subscriptions are sold through the Advertising Sales Office.

The department of Student Media looks to improve publication quality through training, sound management and the latest technology.

The governing committee of Student Media is the Student Publications Board. This board relies on the collective efforts of its members to oversee that operations follow the tradition of humanistic, Catholic and Jesuit elements that are the base of the Gonzaga University Mission statement. The department currently uses the Gonzaga Mission statement in its interview questioning and hiring procedures when selecting student editors and the mission statement was an instrumental document in the creation of the Advertising Policy.

The University through the department of Student Media owns and publishes five annual student produced publications and their online versions. All publications and the Advertising Sales Office are under the fiscal, editorial, and management of oversight of the Student Publications Board, the administrative representative of the Board of Trustees and the President of the University.

A **The daily operations of each publication and the Advertising Sales office are performed entirely by students under the guidance of an appointed advisor and the Student Publications Manager. All student staff positions are paid. Funding for the department comes from an annual student publication fee that is collected from all full-time undergraduate students and from advertising and subscription revenues generated by the Advertising Sales Office.**

B **Student Publications Board** *(Mary Pat Treuthart, Chair)*

The Publications Board governs the operations of Student Media. The board consists of both voting and non-voting members. The voting members of the Publications Board consist of: a Chairperson appointed by the University President, two (2) faculty members elected by the Faculty Assembly, one (1) faculty member appointed by the University President, and three (3) students appointed by the G.S.B.A. President. The non-voting members of the Student Publications Board consist of editors and advisors of each publication, the Vice President of Student Life and the Student Publications Manager. The Student Publications Manager is the only full-time administrative staff hired by the Student Publications Board.

The publications subject to the jurisdiction of the Publications Board are *The Gonzaga Bulletin, Spires, Charter, Reflection, Who’s Who*, and any other publications subsequently designated by the President of the University. Any member of the Gonzaga University community has the right to
petition the Publications Board concerning any matter relating to any publication subject to the Board's jurisdiction.

The Publications Board allocates to publications subject to its jurisdiction all funds authorized by the President and Board of Trustees for the operation and support of such publications. The Publications Board appoints a University advisor for each publication subject to its jurisdiction. The Publications Board also appoints editors, business managers and other positions as applicable for all publications subject to its jurisdiction. The Publications Board establishes and supervises the application of editorial and management policies for each publication, and endeavors to assure that the editorial and management policies set forth in the Publications Board Charter (Exhibit 3.27) and the Statement of Editorial and Management Policies (Exhibit 3.28) are faithfully executed. The board is empowered to suspend, reprimand, censure, and/or admonish persons or publications subject to the Board's jurisdiction for violations, in accordance with procedures specified in the Charter.

A Hearing Committee of the Publications Board is formed at the beginning of each academic year, and is comprised of one faculty member chosen from among the voting members of the Board who shall serve as Chair, one student chosen from among the voting members of the Board, and the University's Corporation Counsel.

The Publications Board is empowered to suspend the issuance of any publication subject to the Board's jurisdiction for a serious violation of the Statement of Editorial and Managerial policies set forth in the Publications Board Charter and/or for irresponsible fiscal policy. In the event that the Publications Board suspends a publication subject to its jurisdiction, the matter shall be referred to the President of the University through the Vice President for Administration and Planning for any action.

_The Bulletin_ serves to provide information and entertainment for the Gonzaga community in a responsible and professional manner, and to serve as a forum for discussion of ideas and issues. The publication also provides an educational experience for its staff of students. _The Bulletin_ newsroom provides a “practical” or a closer to real-life experience through the jobs of assignments, reporting, editing, design, photography and newspaper production and technology applications. The purpose of _Charter_ is to provide a forum for students to express their opinions in a scholarly fashion and to promote good scholarship and opinions. _Charter_ intends to stimulate ideas, encourage creativity and thoughtfulness. The purpose of _Reflection_ is to call attention to the Gonzaga community's best creative accomplishments. _Reflection_ is an annual publication that showcases the best literature and art of students, faculty, staff, and or alumni. The purpose of _Spires_ is to provide a permanent record of student life, people and events of the school year. _Spires_ also provides a pictorial record of the year at Gonzaga, with an emphasis on the activities, events, students, and the University community. The _Who's Who_ is a pictorial directory of undergraduate students with a listing of addresses and phone numbers. One issue of _Who's Who_ is produced each year.
All of the Student Publications are advised and run by students. The publications are reviewed before printing to ensure consistency with guidelines established in the *Statement of Editorial and Management Policies*. All of these publications became available in an online format between 1999 and 2001.

The Student Publications Board hired a part-time staff person to manage the daily operations of the department. The position of Student Publications Manager was filled in the fall of 1994. This issue of management was stated as a weakness in the 1994 Accreditation Report. The position was developed to full-time status in 1998. The Student Publications Manager also fills the role of advisor to the Advertising sales staff.

Prior to 1994, this department was operated solely by students. Currently there are four student sales positions, one sales manager, one billing clerk position, and a graphic artist position with the staff advisor. Total advertising revenues in 1994 were approximately $30,000.00 and in 2002 they were over $76,000.00. The Student Publications Board created and adopted an Advertising Policy in the spring of 2000. The policy was created to be a guideline of acceptable advertising for the Advertising Sales Staff to follow.

**XII. Campus Security (Jeffrey Hart, Director)**

The mission of the Campus Security department is focused on service rather than enforcement. Because the department is part of the Student Life Division there is a strong emphasis on education and development. Raising awareness about personal safety and security is important in creating a safe environment for all members of the campus community.

The Security department is comprised of several functions. The patrol staff checks and secures buildings and maintains high visibility in order to deter crime. The Lead Officers guide and supervise the work of the patrol officers. The Crime Prevention Coordinator works with community members as individuals and in groups to raise awareness about safety and security issues. The Parking Coordinator handles all aspects of the parking program, which stresses compliance rather than generation of revenue. The Director of Security handles administrative aspects such as budget, planning, and compliance with the federal Clery Campus Security Act. The University Switchboard is part of the Campus Security department and the operators handle radio and telephone communications for the officers.

The Crime Prevention Coordinator makes presentations to large and small groups, on security matters in general but also for specific topics. A primary tool in keeping the campus as safe as possible is awareness and education which leads to personal responsibility. She acts as a liaison for student organizations on sexual assault prevention and response and hate/bias incidents. She does regular “care and concern” follow-ups with crime victims and others who have had some type of safety or security issue.
The Crime Prevention Coordinator prepares and distributes a number of brochures on security and safety topics such as identity theft, block watch and general awareness for new students. Publications obtained from outside sources such as the Spokane Police department are also available. During the school year the Security Director prepares a weekly “Security Spotlight” email (see examples as Exhibit 3.29) to all GU addresses with a recap of incidents from the previous week. An annual publication, the Campus Security Guide (Exhibit 3.7), is prepared by the department and distributed to all students, staff and faculty. This booklet contains data and information mandated by the federal Campus Security Act and safety and security information of general applicability.

The Campus Security department works to fulfill the goals of the Mission Statement by supporting the educational and developmental mission of the Student Life Division. Members of the department can have the greatest influence by serving as positive role models to students. Keeping in mind that students are on a journey of development and realization of their obligations and potential, members of the Security department help create an environment in which inappropriate conduct is confronted with respect and caring.

The Security department has visibly contributed to the work of the Student Life Division by interacting more with students and producing more documentation. This documentation assists administrators outside the Security department in dealing with students and determining policy. The Security department’s activity has increased substantially over the past six years, but the number of officers has increased only slightly. Members of the department have learned to work smarter rather than harder and to capitalize on opportunities that the Crime Prevention Program presents.

Campus Security reports are used by our Vice President for Finance office to document incidents and potential risks. Plant Services uses reports to track fire alarm activity. The Safety Programs Manager uses the reports to assess workplace safety issues. Administrators at the Law School, Foley Library and Martin Centre keep current on incidents within their facilities via Security reports delivered to them. Security reports regarding criminal activity and threats on campus and in the neighborhood are often shared with SPD detectives working on specific Cases.

**Future Plans**

As disruptive behavior in the surrounding neighborhood is beginning to close in on the campus, an analysis of staff functions needs to occur. Some of the areas to examine for the future are use of foot patrols, shuttles, and working more closely with the Spokane Police Department.
Intercollegiate Athletics *(Mike Roth, Athletic Director)*

This institution is committed to a philosophy of unquestioned academic and financial integrity in our athletics program, and to accountability of the Athletics Department to the values and goals befitting higher education. In keeping with the University's Mission Statement, the Department of Athletics seeks to initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletic programs for our student athletes and to promote educational leadership, physical fitness and recreational pursuits. As a division within an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution, the Gonzaga University Department of Athletics is committed to supporting equitable opportunities for all students and staff, including women and minorities.

Current Situation

Table 3.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Coast Conference Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary’s College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The athletic department has an informal strategic plan in place that addresses the following areas: Continued membership in the NCAA as a Division I AAA institution and the West Coast Conference (see table 1.1 above); sport sponsorship; scholarship additions and allocation; recruiting funds; operating expenses; and gender equity and minority issues. Gonzaga University offers fourteen sports, seven for men and seven for women (see table 1.2 below). The athletic department has made a commitment to gender equity by broadening athletic opportunities for female student-athletes and has increased athletic funding, scholarships, marketing/promotions and program support (See Exhibit 3.30, 2002-2007 Gender Equity Plan).

Table 3.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men’s Sports</th>
<th>Women’s Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>Crew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country/Track</td>
<td>Cross Country/Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On April 24, 2003 Gonzaga University broke ground on a new athletic Arena which will accommodate the needs of the men’s and women’s basketball programs and serve multiple campus and Spokane community needs by attracting outstanding community-interest programming and entertainment opportunities to the Inland Northwest. The 6,000 seat Arena will fill a niche in Spokane for a medium-size facility, between the 2,500 seat Spokane Opera...
House and the 12,000-seat Spokane Arena. Construction of the new Arena is part of a $119 million Capital Campaign, which was announced April 18. The Campaign includes fund raising for construction of the new student fitness center, a performing arts project, and two new residence halls, along with expansion of buildings for the sciences, business administration, and engineering. The construction of the Arena is the largest and most exclusive project in the University’s history. Construction is expected to take between 18-20 months with a target move in date of November 1, 2004.

The Rudolf Fitness Center opened March 6, 2003, featuring a full service fitness and activity center for Gonzaga students, faculty, and staff. The purpose of the Kermit M. Rudolf Fitness Center is to provide positive recreation, fitness, and wellness programs and services for all students, faculty, and staff. The Fitness Center is focused on promoting educational leadership, physical fitness, and leadership pursuits. A main objective is to provide a variety of programs that are fun, social and that lead to the development of the total person. The new fitness center expansion will extend directly west of the Martin Centre, and provide students with the most modern amenities for strength and cardiovascular training, aerobics/dance, swimming, racquetball, volleyball and basketball. The Rudolf Fitness Center includes the following features: large lobby area with seating, juice bar, and windows opening to field house and pool; large field house with three multipurpose courts, running track, and four racquet ball courts; two fitness studios with hardwood floors, mirrors, and state of the art sound system; indoor lap pool with certified lifeguards; cardiovascular equipment area with TVs; weight training areas with machines and free weights; men's and women's locker rooms.

Intramural sports are a vital part of student life on the Gonzaga campus. Activities span the nine-month academic calendar, including such offerings as basketball, flag football, soccer, softball, volleyball, and ultimate Frisbee. All sports are offered for both men and women, or as a coed activity.

Institutional Control

During the 2001-02 academic year, a change was made in the University’s administrative reporting structure to accommodate the retirement of the Vice President for Administration and Planning. As part of the reorganization, Athletics was reassigned under the umbrella of the Vice President for Finance, who reports directly to the President. The Director of Athletics reports directly to Vice President for Finance on a regular basis and is responsible for all daily operations of the department. The Director of Athletics manages all policies, procedures and guidelines of the department, University, WCC and NCAA.

For the past two years Gonzaga University Athletics went through the second-cycle of the NCAA Division I Certification process and was deemed fully certified on December 3, 2002 (see Exhibit 3.31). This is an extremely important process to obtain our status as a Division I member institution, and receiving a full certification status, versus certified with conditions or not certified, is what we are all striving for. During this comprehensive self-study the following areas were reviewed, analyzed and updated to meet certification standards: Governance and Rules Compliance, Academic Integrity, Fiscal Integrity, and Equity, Welfare and Sportsmanship. As a result of the NCAA Certification the athletic department has put together an extensive timeline/action plan listing all the obligatory actions that are to be completed in the next five
years. A gender equity task force was created as an advisory committee to help oversee all actions on the timeline and report are forwarded to the Vice President for Finance for approval. The University is also required to submit annual reports to the NCAA for graduation rates as well as gender equity. The NCAA and WCC require regular evaluation of student-athletes academic performance by submission of eligibility reports. The Athletics Director meets with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) twice a year to hear concern or address any issue that the committee may have. The Senior Woman Administrator (SWA) oversees the committee and is present at all meetings for information resource, guidance and observation.

Goals, Policies, Expectations

The intercollegiate athletic programs goals and objectives, as well as the institutional expectations of staff members are provided in writing to candidates for all athletic staff positions. However this was not a consistent practice in the past. The Assistant Athletic Director/SWA has recently been assigned as the staff liaison to the Human Resource Department coordinating all hiring practices and procedures. The Athletic Departments’ goals, objectives and expectations are all in print within our policies and procedures manuals and are distributed to current staff members at the beginning of each academic year for review. The duties and authority of the Athletics Director, Athletic Council, Vice President for Finance, Associate Athletics Directors and Assistant Athletics Directors are all stated explicitly in writing and the respective job descriptions and the Athletic Council Bylaws (see Exhibit 3.32).

Admissions, Academic Standards, Financial Aid

Gonzaga University’s admissions requirements and procedures, academic standards and degree requirement, and financial aid awards are controlled in the same institutional agencies for all students. The University’s Committee on Admissions, headed by the Dean of Admission, has sole responsibility for the admission of students, including student-athletes. This process varies for student-athletes only to the extent that coaches make contact with them and encourage their application for admission. The Athletic Department may seek an informal evaluation from the Admissions Office concerning a student-athlete’s admissibility. However, similar information is available for any prospective student. The Committee also has exclusive responsibility to review the academic progress of all undergraduate students and to determine if students will be placed on academic probation or dismissed by the University. While Athletic Department personnel work closely with the Office of Admission and, as necessary, with the Committee on Admission and Academic Standing, they have no decision-making authority in these matters. The registrar’s office and the Faculty Athletics Representative verify all eligibility reports generated by the Athletic Department. Students can appeal such decisions to the Academic Vice President. Student-athletes are held to the same academic standards and degree requirements as all Gonzaga students, and are also responsible to meet NCAA initial and continuing eligibility standards. Student-athletes have performed very well academically as seen in the following data for 2001-02 academic year.

- 33 student-athletes were named to the Dean’s list (3.5-3.7) in Fall 2001
- 46 student-athletes were named to the President’s list (3.7-4.0) in Fall 2001
- Student-athletes cumulative Fall GPA was 3.11
- 27 student-athletes were named to the Dean’s list (3.5-3.7) in Spring 2002
- 35 student-athletes were named to the President’s list (3.7-4.0) in Spring 2002
- Student-athletes cumulative Spring GPA was 3.12
- 24 student-athletes were named to the 2002-03 WCC All-Academic Teams
- 3 student-athletes were named to the Verizon All-Academic Teams

The academic success of student-athletes is also demonstrated by the NCAA Division I Graduation-Rates Report (see Exhibit 3.33). Traditionally the student-athlete group has shown a higher graduation rate percentage than
the undergraduate student group which is a true indication of our commitment to academics as seen in Tables 3.17 and 3.18.

Table 3.17 – Athletics, NCAA Graduation Rates, 2001

| 2001 NCAA Graduation Rate |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| Freshman Cohort           | 1994-95 | 4-Class Average | Transfer 4-Class |
| All Students**            | 63%     | 64% |
| Student-Athletes*         | 73%     | 68% |
| Men’s Baseball            | 100%    | 85% | 44% |
| Men’s Basketball          | 33%     | 36% | 31% |
| Men’s CC/Track            | n/a     | 80% | 100% |
| Men’s Other Sports        | 75%     | 79% | 78% |
| Women’s Basketball        | 50%     | 65% | 0 |
| Women’s CC/Track          | n/a     | 20% | 50% |
| Women’s Other Sports      | 86%     | 72% | 60% |

Table 3.18 – Athletics, NCAA Graduation Rates, 2002

| 2002 NCAA Graduation Rate |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| Freshman Cohort           | 1995-96 | 4-Class Average | Transfer 4-Class |
| All Students**            | 68%     | 65% |
| Student-Athletes*         | 71%     | 67% |
| Men’s Baseball            | 100%    | 82% | 40% |
| Men’s Basketball          | 100%    | 44% | 40% |
| Men’s CC/Track            | 100%    | 80% | 100% |
| Men’s Other Sports        | 50%     | 77% | 77% |
| Women’s Basketball        | 50%     | 50% | 0 |
| Women’s CC/Track          | 100%    | 57% | 50% |
| Women’s Other Sports | 56% | 68% | 67% |

*Only reports student-athletes who receive athletic aid who entered as freshman & excludes transfers.
**Includes students who entered as freshman & excludes transfers. All Student-athletes go through the same procedures for University, state and federal aid as all students. Full and partial scholarship student-athletes are awarded athletic aid by the respective sports head coach and strictly tracked by the athletic department compliance officer by use of the NCAA Compliance Assistance Software, and the Associate Director for Financial Aid to meet NCAA rules.

**Athletic Budgets**

Our athletic budgeting process is the same as the rest of the University. All funds are derived from the University's unrestricted budget allocation, revenues, and donations. These funds are subject to the University's approval and accounting methods. Furthermore, these funds are subject to annual internal and external audits.

**Gender Equity**

Gonzaga University has demonstrated a commitment to fair and equitable treatment of both male and female athletes in providing opportunities for participation, financial aid, student-support services, equipment, and access to facilities. As a result of the NCAA Division I Certification self-study, the University has implemented a Gender Equity Plan for Athletics to comply with Title IX that will ensure fair and equitable treatment for both genders (see Exhibit 3.30, 2002-2007 Gender Equity Plan).

**Scheduling Policies**

The athletic department policy concerning scheduling of practices and competitions for both men’s and women’s teams were developed to help avoid or eliminate conflicts with the University’s academic calendar, including end of semester exams and commencement day. Each head coach is responsible for development of a draft team schedule. These draft schedules are forwarded to the Athletic Director for review. The Athletic Director then forwards the schedule to the Faculty Athletic Representative for review and comment prior to approval. Competition agreements or contracts may be signed only by the Athletic Director, or when authorized, by the Associate Athletic Director. The following criteria are used in developing team schedules:

- The schedule must minimize missed class time.
- Contests may not be scheduled during finals week.
- Student-athletes must not be required to miss back-to-back classes (e.g., MWF/TTH).
- Schedules must meet NCAA and WCC requirements.
- They must be competitive NCAA Division I schedules.
- Schedules should seek to maximize the number of “home” contests, or maintain an appropriate balance of home and away contests.
• The schedule should include away contests in the western region of the United States only, unless an opportunity for exceptional revenue generation and exposure is present.
• Schedules are to include competition with other Inland Northwest Division I programs.
• They must conform to the approved budget.

Conflicts between scheduling and the foregoing policies may arise. The Athletic Director must approve any policy variance following consultation with the FAR. The Vice President for Finance must also be consulted regarding variations in the policy that restricts competition during finals (see Exhibit 3.34, Athletic Department Policies and Procedures Manual [pg.23]).

A recent conflict with the scheduling policy occurred on December 16-17, 2002, when our men's basketball team made an appearance in the prestigious Jimmy V Classic in New Jersey. This competition fell on the first two day of the final exams week. Once we received the invitation to the tournament a meeting was arranged in June between the Academic Vice President, Vice President for Finance, Athletic Director, Associate Athletic Director, head coach and the Compliance/Academic Coordinator to present the conflict and discuss options. After the discussion the trip was approved and the AVP issued a memo to all department deans who were to disseminate the information to the faculty (see Exhibit 3.35). Each of the men's basketball players presented the conflict to their respective instructors to discuss final exam options. The Compliance/Academic Coordinator contacted each instructor to arrange any options if necessary. The Compliance/Academic Coordinator and a professor accompanied the team to arrange and proctor final exams. All involved parties worked together to manage the situation.

With the recent NCAA Division I Certification process, Gonzaga University Athletics had the opportunity to participate in the self-study assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the department.

Strengths
- High academic integrity and standards for student-athletes
- Increase in positive media exposure
- Increased athletic teams success
- Community relations and service involvement
- Added personnel in key areas

Weaknesses
- Lack of resources to compete with conference and regional opponents
- Facility space issue
- Reliance upon Graduate Assistant and/or workstudy students in key roles
- Providing resources equitably to all student-athletes (ie. Academic, Strength-conditioning, trainers traveling, etc).

As a result of the NCAA Division I Certification Self-Study, the athletic department has made many improvements. The following is a list of recommendations that have been put into place:
• Updated athletic Mission Statement and increased circulation process (See Exhibit 3.36, Athletic Policies and Procedures manual, and Exhibit 3.37, Student Athlete Handbook)
• Enhanced academic support by approving an academic coordinator position and graduate assistant position—*Positions Filled July 2003*
• Plans for academic center including computer lab and increase in number of laptops available for student-athlete use—*Lab constructed May 2003*
• Developed written plan for academic support services review
• Improve Champs/Lifeskills program to increase student-athlete welfare
• Enhance student-athlete welfare by approving the position of full time strength and conditioning coach—*Position filled September 2003*
• Established written policies for sportsmanship and ethical conduct (Exhibit 3.37, 2002-03 S-A Handbook pg. 11)
• Improvement of student-athlete exit interview process
• Provides diversity training for staff annually
• Development of pilot program in the sport of basketball to monitor and support incoming student-athletes
• Created a gender equity task force to review and oversee gender equity
• Increased women’s participation numbers to reach direct proportionality of Title IX
• Increase in scholarship to Olympic sports
• Approval of assistant women’s crew coach to help retention of participation numbers—*Position filled September 2003*
• Implementation of Accommodations of Interests and Abilities Survey for Title IX (Spring 2003)
• Approval of Director of Marketing position—*Position filled Sept. 2003*
• Developed a five-year marketing and promotions plan

**Next Steps**

There are a number of areas that were identified as plans for improvement during the NCAA Division I Certification Self-Study that will be addressed in the near future.

• Develop award system for coaches and student-athletes to promote sportsmanship
• Develop cultural workshops and guest speaker series for coaches and student-athletes to help foster a multicultural environment and understanding of cultural diversity
• Administer a feasibility study exploring potential sports to add for the underrepresented gender
• Develop written policy for certifying initial eligibility of freshman and transfer student-athletes
• Develop written policy for certifying continuing eligibility of student-athletes
• Develop alternate approach to document graduation rates
• Develop study workshop series for all freshman and transfer student-athletes
• Develop written policy for fifth year students

**Policy 3.1 – Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status**
Gonzaga University rigorously adheres to principles of good practice in all endeavors which relate to advertising, student recruitment, and representation of its accredited status. The University Catalogues state, without qualification, the accredited status of the institution, and the on-line Catalogue has been updated to reflect both institutional and specialized accreditation statuses in a comprehensive statement per the 2002 Commission Handbook revision.
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EXHIBIT 3.2b – STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES ORGANIZATIONAL CHART (ACADEMIC AFFAIRS)
STANDARD FOUR: FACULTY

Foreword

Gonzaga University is proud of its academic programs, the quality of its teaching faculty, and the tremendous investment that its faculty members make in the institution and in its students. Notwithstanding this, unanimity amongst faculty (or between faculty and administrators) does not exist at Gonzaga University concerning many key issues – including faculty workloads, adequacy of resources, academic freedom, and compensation. This finding is reflected in faculty members’ responses to the Standard Four Subcommittee Survey (hereafter referred to as the “Subcommittee Survey,” Exhibit 4.1), the numerous versions of the Standard Four Subcommittee’s draft reports (see Exhibit 4.2), and other documents (e.g., E-mail correspondence; report feedback) reflective of [primarily negative] faculty sentiment during the period of this self-study (see various examples at Exhibit 4.3). For this section, the institution has attempted to include not only “majority views” of faculty with respect to relevant issues, but also “minority views.” It is the sense of the Steering Committee that the tension between faculty and the institution’s leadership, and the morale of many faculty members, reached an unprecedented level of negativity during the 2002-03 academic year. This is reflected in actions taken by faculty members as individuals (e.g., petition for additional faculty positions, Exhibit 4.4), the numerous negative sentiments published in recorded notes from the Spring 2003 Faculty Listening Sessions (Exhibit 4.5), and the resolutions passed by the Faculty Assembly in May 2003 (Exhibit 4.6).

The Steering Committee also has determined that there are a number of faculty – particularly in the Schools of Engineering and Business – for whom morale is generally positive. Further, it is clear that the issues with which the faculty in a given College or School are concerned are not necessarily the same as issues that concern faculty in another. Despite the frustration felt by many faculty – particularly those in the College of Arts & Sciences, but also within the Schools of Law and Education – it is the Committee’s sense that where low morale exists, it is low precisely because faculty care deeply about their University and the education of students, but feel frustrated and helpless in view of their recent experience of the institution’s management and resource-allocation decisions, the perceived lack of faculty involvement in such decisions, and the subsequent effect this has on faculty welfare and students’ educational experience.

There is evidence too of constructive progress. During the timeframe of the Self-Study, a new Academic Vice President, Dr. Stephen Freedman, took up his position (June 2002) and immediately set about the work, together with the academic deans and faculty, of engaging in dialogue with the faculty on many issues of concern. The Chair of the Trustees and the leadership of the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee began meeting monthly, and joined in creating new policy to approve campus speakers (see Academic Freedom section, Standard Nine). The 2002-03 academic year saw the announcement of an increase in the retirement contribution level for faculty; further, six new tenure-track faculty positions were approved in December 2002. During summer 2003, nine additional new tenure-track, and nine conversions from fixed-term to tenure-track positions, were approved. A new leadership entity for faculty, the Faculty Senate, was constituted in May 2003.

These changes and ongoing evolutions make the task of responding to the standard indicators a challenging and difficult task. Of great concern to the Steering Committee is the level of distrust
that appears to exist between administrators and faculty. Thus – beyond addressing specific issues – the Steering Committee recommends the pursuit of courses of action whereby trust can be rebuilt, and collaborative direction- and decision-making can occur. This theme is therefore embedded in the proposed “Next Steps” that are included in this report.

**Overview**

In the 2002-2003 academic year Gonzaga University had 287 full-time teaching faculty (including tenured, tenure-track, and fixed-term), 10 part-time faculty, 12 academic administrators with faculty rank, and 289 adjunct faculty members (all are headcount figures). Table 4.1 shows in detail for the past five years the overall headcount, headcount by College/School, and terminal degree status of those with faculty rank.

**Table 4.1 – FACULTY**

(Full-time, and half-time, with rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998 to 2002</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(full-time and half-time)</td>
<td>243/15</td>
<td>263/12</td>
<td>266/9</td>
<td>287/10</td>
<td>287/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>172/86</td>
<td>183/92</td>
<td>180/95</td>
<td>200/97</td>
<td>200/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount by School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley Library</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>+39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with doctorate (including candidates)</td>
<td>72% 68% 68% 65% 67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with doctorate (including candidates) or professional degree</td>
<td>87% 84% 84% 83% 84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 shows in detail the headcount of academic administrators with faculty rank. Table 4.3 shows the number and percentage of courses taught by adjunct faculty in each academic program for Fall 2002 as compared to Fall 1998 (the year of our last interim visit).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headcount</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(full-time and half-time)</td>
<td>12/0</td>
<td>12/0</td>
<td>12/0</td>
<td>11/0</td>
<td>12/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>9/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headcount by School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with doctorate (including candidates)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with doctorate (including candidates) or professional terminal degree</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
concomitant rate of growth for full-time tenure-track faculty has been inadequate. The challenge of meeting large increases in enrollment growth falls heavily upon the College of Arts and Sciences, which bears the burden of courses that fulfill University Core requirements. Where increases in faculty have occurred over the past five years, they have largely been in the form of fixed-term faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, the School of Professional Studies, and the School of Law. Gender distribution and the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees in their discipline have been stable for the last five years.

Most full-time teaching faculty are on nine-month contracts for the academic year; the majority of those who have department chair or program director responsibilities are released from some portion of the teaching load, usually one course. The amount of course load reduction provided, in view of such responsibilities, varies. Course-load reductions are negotiated between the faculty member and her/his Dean. Ten (10) faculty members were on less than full-time contracts in 2002-2003. The six academic deans, the academic vice president, and the associate academic vice presidents each have faculty rank, and some teach courses on a periodic basis. Some faculty members choose to teach during summer terms (of which there are two primary six-week sessions). The Foley Center (Library) and International Studies Program and ESL faculty are on 12-month contracts and thus are expected to teach during the summer.

Faculty in the School of Education are on 9-month contracts, yet graduate programs in the School of Education are designed as 12-month programs. Thus, the faculty members in the School of Education are expected to teach during summer months and get compensated for this at School of Education adjunct pay levels. (Unlike most summer faculty, School of Education faculty [and their contracts] are not managed by the School of Professional Studies).

While most departments across the University have at least part-time secretarial support, all departments do not. All departments are able to utilize the services of Faculty Services, a department which handles clerical, photocopying, and other related tasks on behalf of faculty and staff.

Teaching Effectiveness

There is a high standard for teaching effectiveness – as outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 4.7) – that all full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty strive to meet. Ability to meet this standard is assessed by the department before the faculty member is hired. Once faculty members are hired, the teaching effectiveness of new faculty is measured through a system of student course evaluation, administered through the Academic Vice President’s office, for each course each semester, and by department chairs and colleagues who sit in on classes, review syllabi and assess student achievement during the tenure and promotion processes for full-time faculty (see below). For full-time faculty there are expectations for scholarship, and student advising, as well as service (e.g., citizenship) to the Gonzaga University community.

Gonzaga takes its faculty qualifications very seriously: of the 287 full-time faculty at Gonzaga, 84% hold the terminal degree in their respective discipline (see Table 4.1). Gonzaga’s tenured and tenure-track faculty is well-prepared and extremely dedicated to their chosen fields.

---

22 Exceptions to this process are the Philosophy, Chemistry, and Math departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Law, which administer evaluations on their own.
However, because of the high number of recently-hired fixed-term faculty and adjuncts -- relative to historic patterns -- the degree to which the teaching faculty can uniformly be said to possess a strong commitment to the institution’s Mission is of concern. Several departments have experienced a significant increase in the hiring of fixed-term or part-time faculty and adjuncts in lieu of tenure-track positions. This is a consequence of a recent change in administrative practice: the hiring of some fixed-term faculty for what many faculty think should be tenure-track positions. For example, the English Department reports that half of their faculty are non-tenure track, and that adjunct faculty teach 60% of offered courses. The Communication Arts department has the same concern: most sections of Speech 101 are taught by adjuncts. The Communication Arts, English and Philosophy Departments share a 7-credit set of courses required by all undergraduate students entitled “the Thought and Expression block.” Despite it being the heart of the institution’s program of requirements it is primarily taught by adjunct faculty. The general consensus of the faculty is that all fixed-term and adjunct faculty are professionally qualified. However, many faculty think that this growing reliance on non-tenure-track faculty threatens academic standards and the Mission of the University.

**Adjunct Faculty**

In each of the past three fall semesters, an average of 27.87% of course sections offered have been taught by adjunct faculty (Fall 2000: 27.34%; Fall 2001: 30.19%; Fall 2002: 26.09%) (see also Table 4.4). All faculty, including adjuncts, are expected to be effective teachers, up-to-date in their fields and committed to student learning.

Given the substantial increases in numbers of students over the past five years, the reliance on adjunct instructors, especially for University “Core” (required) courses, has grown (see Table 4.3). While confidence in the academic preparation of adjunct instructors remains high, there are general concerns about the availability of qualified adjuncts in the Spokane area. Chemistry, for example, usually cannot find competent adjuncts in the Spokane area. Another concern is that adjunct instructors may not be able to support the institutional mission to the degree that full-time faculty do. Adjuncts do not advise students, do not typically participate in committee work, are less available to students, do not conduct scholarly activity involving undergraduates, and are not evaluated the way full-time faculty are evaluated. Because of these differences between full-time and adjunct faculty and from experiences with adjuncts within departments, surveyed faculty members believe that, as the number of part-time and adjunct faculty continues to increase, the academic quality of the institution decreases. Thus, there is reason to be concerned whether students are getting what the institution advertises or what students and parents expect: full-time faculty with terminal degrees. This is especially relevant in some specific areas of the University (e.g., only about 5% of Gonzaga English composition classes are currently taught by full-time faculty). In the professional schools (e.g., Engineering) satisfaction with the level of adjunct support appears to be higher.

There is general concern across departments about the welfare of adjunct faculty, and a sense that more communication about, and with, adjunct faculty would be helpful. Furthermore, the compensation for adjuncts is low and most would argue, unjust. If adjuncts received pro-rated pay and benefits based on full-time faculty salaries, it might reduce the temptation – where such exists – to hire adjuncts simply to save money, rather than for genuine reasons such as specialty courses or temporary situations.
Table 4.3 - Adjuncts
1998-99 compared to 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998-99</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># undergraduate sections</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># undergraduate sections taught by adjuncts</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of undergraduate sections taught by adjuncts</td>
<td>17.13%</td>
<td>21.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># graduate sections</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># graduate sections taught by adjuncts</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of graduate sections taught by adjuncts</td>
<td>22.44%</td>
<td>24.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 (pages 7-8) presents data regarding the numbers and proportions of courses taught by adjunct faculty, by program, for each of the past three fall semesters (Fall 2000 to Fall 2002).

While the number of faculty with regular teaching appointments has increased from 258 in 1998-1999 to 297 in 2002-2003 (15%), the increase in the number of adjuncts has been significantly larger, from 220 to 289 (24%). For the past three years the number of course sections taught by adjuncts and the number of adjuncts have both increased to accommodate additional students and to prevent class size from becoming larger than is consistent with the institution’s Mission.

Though the Steering Committee perceives that while the institution periodically assesses its policies regarding the use of part-time, adjunct, and fixed-term appointments, there is no evidence the effects such appointments have on academic quality – in light of the mission and goals of the institution – have been analyzed. The concept of using fixed-term faculty, instead of regular tenure-track faculty, was specifically proposed by the Special Report of the Budget Reallocation and Reduction Process (BRRP) and has been regularly discussed at the Deans Council, Cabinet and Board of Trustees meetings. However, the use of fixed-term faculty in place of tenure-track appointments is a matter carefully articulated in the Faculty Handbook (see Exhibit 4.7, part 300.05), and some members of the faculty perceive the administration as having violated this provision. What is clear to the Steering Committee is that the nature and direction of these conversations have not been adequately communicated to the rest of the University community; over time, the communication gap has resulted in real frustration. Furthermore, the Faculty
Assembly has maintained that the faculty were not consulted during the decision making process regarding these policies. The cumulative effect is a perception by faculty that fixed-term and adjunct appointments have risen at the expense of tenure-track positions.
Table 4.4 – Adjunct Faculty by Discipline/Program, Fall 2000 to 2002
Adjuncts
(by program Fall 2000-Fall 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of</td>
<td># of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td># of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td># of</td>
<td># of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td># of</td>
<td># of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td>sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Civilization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>61.52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Computer Science</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>25.01</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>56.33</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>61.67</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS - Military Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Criminal Justice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>29.88 (on and off campus)</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Leadership Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Education Activity Courses</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>17.67</th>
<th>17.67</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Management</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>41.87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Engineering</th>
<th>15.67</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6.38</th>
<th>14.67</th>
<th>2.67</th>
<th>15.88</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>20.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accounting &amp; Finance</th>
<th>22.33</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>21.33</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4.69</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mktg/Mgmt/Oper</td>
<td>46.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.78</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Load

Most full-time faculty teach three to four courses each during fall or spring semester. There is considerable variation between departments in teaching load per faculty member due to credits per course (i.e., 1 to 4), the existence of laboratory sections, and departments’ negotiations with their Deans. Over the past decade many decisions at the School/College and department level have resulted in inconsistencies between departments regarding teaching loads.

Based on the Subcommittee survey results, nearly all faculty believe they have insufficient time for professional growth and are concerned with keeping abreast of their many responsibilities – especially given their increased workloads due to increased enrollment, which has resulted in much larger class sizes. The results of an analysis of faculty teaching loads (by department), conducted in the Summer of 2003, clearly indicates how class sizes have increased (see Exhibit 4.8).

Gonzaga’s Mission is primarily carried out through teaching; thus, **teaching well** is a top priority. The Subcommittee Survey reveals that teaching is considered primary, and scholarship is secondary; scholarship activity has been impacted considerably in the last few years as class sizes across campus have increased. The pattern of faculty support for professional development is inconsistent between the College and Schools of the University—some schools, such as Business, appear to have relatively generous support systems. Within the College of Arts and Sciences, tenured full professors are at the end of the queue for travel money, thereby making it even more difficult to maintain scholarship and making them poor models for junior faculty in terms of professional development. The increased teaching loads of the last few years do not allow sufficient time and support for professional growth and renewal.
As noted previously, teaching loads are generally divided between Fall and Spring semesters. Summer terms (of which there are two, six-weeks each) are considered and paid as separate terms and under separate contracts. Summer Session is administered under the auspices of the Dean of Professional Studies with the exception of the Schools of Education and Law.

**Salaries and Benefits**

Table 4.5 presents a comparison of faculty salary range “midpoints,” by rank and by College/School, for each of the past four years (2003-04 inclusive). The minimum, or “hiring” salary is 90% of the midpoint.

**Table 4.5 – Faculty Salary Midpoint Data, by College/School, by Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>Midpoint 00-01</th>
<th>Midpoint 01-02</th>
<th>Midpoint 02-03</th>
<th>Midpoint 03-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>$70,129</td>
<td>$71,727</td>
<td>$74,782</td>
<td>$77,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>$51,813</td>
<td>$53,620</td>
<td>$55,597</td>
<td>$57,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT</td>
<td>$42,170</td>
<td>$43,820</td>
<td>$45,751</td>
<td>$47,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>$28,217</td>
<td>$29,180</td>
<td>$30,198</td>
<td>$31,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF BUSINESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>$94,493</td>
<td>$99,939</td>
<td>$104,235</td>
<td>$110,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>$75,595</td>
<td>$78,265</td>
<td>$82,285</td>
<td>$86,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT</td>
<td>$71,216</td>
<td>$74,279</td>
<td>$78,868</td>
<td>$84,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>$45,256</td>
<td>$47,113</td>
<td>$49,211</td>
<td>$53,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>$68,421</td>
<td>$74,706</td>
<td>$76,141</td>
<td>$80,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>$53,510</td>
<td>$57,529</td>
<td>$60,371</td>
<td>$63,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT</td>
<td>$42,498</td>
<td>$49,009</td>
<td>$52,487</td>
<td>$41,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>$38,987</td>
<td>$43,631</td>
<td>$45,601</td>
<td>$43,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>$66,719</td>
<td>$70,070</td>
<td>$71,004</td>
<td>$73,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>$51,558</td>
<td>$52,354</td>
<td>$53,045</td>
<td>$55,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT</td>
<td>$42,123</td>
<td>$43,635</td>
<td>$45,422</td>
<td>$47,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>$35,304</td>
<td>$32,904</td>
<td>$34,710</td>
<td>$37,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>$95,010</td>
<td>$92,965</td>
<td>$96,391</td>
<td>$100,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>$68,708</td>
<td>$68,325</td>
<td>$70,595</td>
<td>$74,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT</td>
<td>$58,867</td>
<td>$59,468</td>
<td>$61,166</td>
<td>$63,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>$39,615</td>
<td>$39,405</td>
<td>$40,800</td>
<td>$45,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLEY CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARIANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI 20+ yrs exp</td>
<td>$48,254</td>
<td>$49,328</td>
<td>$53,503</td>
<td>$56,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 15-19 yrs</td>
<td>$46,645</td>
<td>$46,454</td>
<td>$50,709</td>
<td>$49,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 10-14 yrs</td>
<td>$40,947</td>
<td>$43,203</td>
<td>$45,687</td>
<td>$47,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 5-9 yrs</td>
<td>$37,993</td>
<td>$40,691</td>
<td>$42,379</td>
<td>$44,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Law School does not articulate its compensation within the CUPA framework. The data provided below therefore reflect the average of faculty by rank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW SCHOOL MEAN (AVERAGE) SALARY BY RANK</th>
<th>Average 00-01</th>
<th>Average 01-02</th>
<th>Average 02-03</th>
<th>Average 03-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>$89,581</td>
<td>$91,035</td>
<td>$97,454</td>
<td>$103,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>$76,657</td>
<td>$75,194</td>
<td>$82,210</td>
<td>$85,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT</td>
<td>$49,067</td>
<td>$50,100</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$65,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>$52,550</td>
<td>$53,100</td>
<td>$55,478</td>
<td>$56,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feedback solicited from faculty through the Subcommittee Survey reveals a sense among faculty – primarily in the Arts & Sciences, but also in Professional Studies and the School of Education – that salaries and benefits are not adequate to attract new faculty, and are not consistent with the Mission and goals of the institution. In reviewing the data in Table 4.5, one can clearly see that the faculty of certain Schools are significantly higher than those of others. The most-frequently cited basis for the salary differences is marketplace economics, which suggest that employment sectors in these areas allow faculty in or from higher-paid professions to demand higher salaries. (Based on this reasoning, in 1987 the Business School negotiated higher salaries than the CUPA scale for Business Schools; the School of Law salaries are not governed by CUPA.) These within-institution pay differences are not unique to Gonzaga; the large differences between Schools result in a sense of inequity amongst faculty, and the Steering Committee feels that a genuine re-analysis of faculty compensation throughout the University is warranted. The University’s policies on salaries and benefits, as stated, are prone to subjective interpretation. It is the sense of the Steering Committee that these need to be clarified.

Faculty compensation emerged early in the self-study as a critical issue for faculty. It is the sense of the Steering Committee that this issue is of such significance that to provide additional background to the evaluators would be helpful. For those whose pay is tied to the CUPA scale, the process of determining compensation is as follows. Essentially, the base salary, or “equity portion” of faculty salaries are computed based on the discipline and rank average from the year-old CUPA survey (Exhibit 4.9), an adjustment for years in rank, and an annual adjustment (sometimes erroneously referred to as "cost of living" adjustment). The annual adjustment is part of the salary agreement because the CUPA base salary is based on the previous year's data. Thus, “fully-funding” the salary agreement means meeting the equity as well as the annual adjustment agreement. For example, a starting assistant professor would start at 90% of the average that
other assistant professors (according to CUPA) made the previous year. With increased years in rank s/he would move up to earning 96% of the CUPA average prior to being eligible to apply for promotion. The annual adjustment was intended to compensate for the base salaries being determined from year-old data. The CUPA scale is an average of other salaries and, according to documents that serve as records of discussions between members of the Faculty Assembly and the Finance Vice President, the CUPA base adjustment and the annual adjustment together was perceived by faculty as a non-negotiable minimum (see Exhibit 4.11). A major implication of the current practice is that top salaries at Gonzaga would constitute only the average of salaries at other institutions.

The Vice President for Finance, Chuck Murphy, has provided the following perspective in order to clarify the administration’s perception of this issue. CUPA data, when received, is for the previous year. This data is adjusted upward by adding an increase that represents the average overall annual increase for the previous five years in an attempt to reflect an “adjusted CUPA minimum” for the current year. This adjusted minimum becomes the basis upon which the salary for each faculty member is compared in order to determine if there is an equity adjustment necessary to meet the minimum funding goal. It is this minimum funding level that became the Administration’s good faith goal to meet, subject to availability of resources.

In Mr. Murphy’s view, there has not been any agreement that the “adjusted CUPA minimum” and an across-the-board annual adjustment was to constitute the minimum annual increase. It is the case that in the early years of implementing the minimum adjustments that there was an annual cost-of-living allowance plus a CUPA adjustment.

According to data from Human Resources, the annual funding level provided to the Academic Vice President for salary increases during the past four fiscal years (beginning in AY 2000-01) is 7.03%, 3.57%, 4.58% and 5.04% of the prior year’s total salary base. This is in addition to the expenditure associated with annual medical insurance premium increases (which have been in the double digits), and the expense associated with the increase in retirement pension contribution (most recently to 8.5%). This annual increase in total compensation expenditures represents a substantial annual commitment of revenues from enrollment growth that, in the view of the administration, reflects a recognition of faculty members’ many contributions to the University.

The result of this difference in perspective is a fundamental disagreement about a matter of key significance. Because the annual adjustment has not been paid since 1997-1998, the faculty involved maintain that each faculty member’s CUPA-based salary since 1997-98 has been what it should have been the year before. Furthermore, in 1999-2000, in addition to not getting the “promised” annual adjustment, the CUPA-based minima were not met (the raise was only 1/2 of the CUPA average increase). What makes this situation more distressing to faculty is these last four years have supposedly been “good” years financially. For these reasons, it is not a surprise that compensation is an extremely sensitive issue in the College of Arts and Sciences and some other Schools on campus. It is also perceived as an issue of both ethics and justice. Most faculty members maintain that the administration hasn’t kept its agreement with the faculty; communication is profoundly poor around this issue.

The results of the Subcommittee Survey (Exhibit 4.1) indicate that many faculty maintain that salaries are not competitive with those of other institutions of higher education, and at least some job candidates at Gonzaga have been lost due to salary differences (e.g., EWU paid $4,000 more
for an equivalent English position). (It should be noted that in the professional schools, candidates may be attracted to Gonzaga because of compensation.) Mixed in with this is the perception, correct or not, that some members of the Board of Trustees believe that faculty are over-compensated. Certain members of the administration and faculty feel strongly that this perception is both inaccurate and unfair. Nonetheless, such a perception exists, and contributes to low morale. Although the stated goal of the current administration is to have Gonzaga a “top tier” University, the salaries are not in line with “top tier” institutions.

Benefits

There is a full range of benefits for full-time faculty including health insurance with co-pays and subsidized family coverage, a well-enrolled tuition waiver plan, short and long-term disability options, life insurance and retirement funds. For a complete summary listing of benefits see the Benefits Summary at Exhibit 4.10.

According to the Subcommittee survey, most faculty find their health benefits inadequate, with increasingly higher insurance costs passed on to them each year. The administration seems to be aware of the problem, but does not appear able to consider increasing certain benefits without decreasing others.

The major positive change in faculty benefits over the past five years – and it is a recent one -- has been to the University’s retirement plans. As a result of recommendations from the Benefits Office and the Faculty Assembly, an enhanced retirement plan was approved by the administration and the Board of Trustees in December 2002. In the past, retirement contributions from the University were calculated at 5%, 6%, or 7% depending upon the years of service to the University. This figure was changed to 8.5% regardless of years of service, beginning with the 2003-04 academic year.

Recruitment and Degrees

A commitment to qualified faculty, as previously noted, is of paramount concern to the University. The Faculty Handbook outlines the process for faculty recruitment and emphasizes faculty qualifications. The list of degrees held by faculty at Gonzaga reflects the institution’s commitment to attracting faculty with impressive preparation and credentials (see Table 2 at the conclusion of this report).

Evaluation and Contracts

Faculty at Gonzaga are employed on nine, ten, or twelve month contracts (see Exhibit 4.12). The contract period for a given academic year begins the 15th of the month prior to the start of the fall semester for Law School and the 1st of the month for all others. Faculty, as is the case with all employees, are paid once per month, on the last business day of each month.

The Faculty Handbook states that “tenured and fixed-term faculty . . . are evaluated regularly” (p. 3-14, Section 304.01). It further states that “. . . faculty whose departments (or divisions or schools) do not have regularly scheduled evaluations are
evaluated every three years” (p. 3-14). Handbook section 304.02 identifies the materials used in the evaluation; section 304.03 identifies the procedure for submitting such materials; and section 304.04 identifies how problems revealed in the evaluation are to be addressed.

Gonzaga does not at this time regularly and comprehensively evaluate all faculty members. Faculty teaching performance is evaluated by students in end-of-course evaluations in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional responsibilities.23 Some departments have devised their own teaching evaluation system (e.g., Chemistry). The new Academic Vice President has made clear his intent to develop, together with full faculty input, an educational assessment system that will include regular, comprehensive evaluations of faculty performance for adjunct, fixed-term, tenure-track and tenured faculty (see Exhibit A.3 – Introduction).

There is a system of regular evaluation for reappointment, promotion, and tenure that consists of evaluations by students, outside references, peers and committees at the School/College and, ultimately, University level. Tenure and promotion decisions are reserved to the President based upon the Committees’ recommendation(s). The evaluation process covers teaching, scholarship, advising, and community service. There is an evaluation procedure in place for full professors (See Faculty Handbook, Exhibit 4.7), but it is not implemented. There is no evaluation of adjunct faculty beyond evaluations by students at the course level.

Based on the Standard Four sub-committee survey, faculty members do not believe that the institution has defined an orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of full-time faculty; it varies by field/department. Some departments receive funds to attend conferences designed for interviewing candidates, while other departments receive funds for an advertisement in the Chronicle of Higher Education, when other, more expensive options, would better reach their target audience. From the perspective of the Academic Vice President’s Office, however, it is the department which initiates requests for funding, and seldom – at least in recent experience – are these requests turned down. The Faculty Handbook does include institutional personnel policies and procedures. The general perception of faculty is that there has been little or no support for finding and hiring minority candidates despite a public commitment to do so by the Human Resources office. One theme that emerged from this self-evaluation is a concern that the hiring process now involves “mission-centered hiring” – though a clear statement explicating a commitment to this concept exists, the concept itself remains murky.

Promotions

The system for faculty promotions at Gonzaga University is similar to many other institutions of its size. Individual faculty apply for promotion and are provided with instructions as to the

23 There is consensus that our current student evaluation instrument is inadequate and faculty place little stock in it. The Faculty have worked to create a better tool with no progress. An attempt to promote on-line student evaluations in 2002-03 proved problematic and yielded very low response rates, resulting in administration of a back-up paper version.
documentation required (ref. Exhibit 4.7, Faculty Handbook, pp. 3-7 through 3-14 [Sections 302 and 303). Promotional materials are reviewed by reappointment/promotion committees within the given Department. Recommendations for promotion, where made, are made to the Dean by the Reappointment Committees within each Department or School by the Department Chair to the Dean, who in turn makes recommendations to the (University) Committee on Rank and Tenure. The Committee’s recommendations are then made to the Academic Vice President (who, as Chair of the Committee, is a non-voting member) for recommendation to, and decision by, the President. The President traditionally follows the recommendations from the Committee and the Academic Vice President.

Because Academic Deans and Department or School Reappointment Committees confer with faculty eligible for promotion before applications are formally submitted, substantive or potential weakness are often addressed beforehand. The result, in some cases, may be a faculty member’s decision to wait a year or more before formally applying for promotion. Promotions to the next rank – which take effect the beginning of the subsequent academic year – include adjustments to the faculty salary that include whatever annual adjustments were provided for that rank, that year. The number of faculty promoted, and the respective ranks to which promotions were made, over the past three academic years is presented at Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 - Faculty Promotions, 2001 - 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY PROMOTIONS</th>
<th>Effective 2001</th>
<th>Effective 2002</th>
<th>Effective 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Instructor to Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Associate Professor to Full Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Development and Scholarship

While strength of teaching is perceived as the institution’s primary focus, scholarship is an important component of that goal. Gonzaga’s Mission Statement reads, in relevant part: "We believe that our students, while they are developing general knowledge and skills during their years at Gonzaga, should also attain more specialized competence in at least one discipline or profession" (Mission Statement, Exhibit 1.A.1). Many students gain a real appreciation and specialized knowledge of their chosen field through independent study or scholarship activity in their chosen field. Thus, support in this area is important not only for faculty productivity, but also for student learning.

Faculty across virtually all departments are engaged in scholarly research or artistic creation (see samples in the Team Room, and Exhibit 4.13). Many departments believe they are doing well despite rather limited resources – a testament to the dedication of the Gonzaga faculty. With the heavy teaching loads and increased class sizes that have accompanied recent enrollment increases,
many faculty think that any scholarship/creative work that gets done during the academic year is a grand accomplishment. Nonetheless, faculty do continue to mentor research students during the academic year and in the summer (if grant funds allow for support of summer student research). Again, as in other information compiled for this report, there are inconsistencies across the University regarding institutional resources for scholarship, research, and artistic creation. For example, faculty in the School of Business report satisfaction with the level of support for scholarly activity, whereas faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences do not. As teaching loads vary across departments, time available for scholarship varies as well. Across all departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, the amount of teaching during the academic year was cited in the Subcommittee Survey (Exhibit 4.1) as the main reason that research/scholarly activity suffers.

While requirements for teaching excellence are clearly communicated in the Faculty Handbook, those for advising, academic citizenship, and scholarship (in particular) are not well-defined. Faculty may have some guidelines from their specific department, but many believe that specific expectations have never been communicated clearly and that the value of scholarship activity has not been well articulated. There are recent concerns that the process for sabbaticals is changing—to become more restrictive. Faculty are now paid 75% of their salary for a full-year sabbatical—an increase from 50% that was made with the most recent Faculty Handbook revision—and one of the reasons that sabbaticals can be denied is financial. During the 2002-03 academic year, faculty were informed that sabbaticals are not guaranteed, engendering concern that sabbatical requests will be denied in the future. Notwithstanding this concern, the number of sabbaticals granted for 2002-03 was 27, compared with 24 granted five years ago (1998-99).

One important concern regarding scholarship support (and related to teaching as well) involves library resources. Some faculty, particularly in the sciences, indicate that library resources are not adequate to support competitive research. For example, while grant-writing is expected, the available literature search engines are not comprehensive and thus faculty cannot effectively write a competitive proposal. This is problematic in writing research manuscripts, as well as writing grant proposals, and is frustrating to students trying to do assigned research projects for classes. Furthermore, there is additional frustration concerning the book and monograph, versus periodicals, budgets. Some departments rely on journals rather than books but are not able to transfer money from one budget to the other. Thus book budgets are often wasted while departments are asked repeatedly to cut periodicals. In summary, many faculty believe that the budget allocation for research/scholarship and professional growth is inadequate.

Academic Freedom

Many faculty report a concern that Gonzaga is inconsistent regarding the fostering and protecting of academic freedom. Results of the Subcommittee Survey showed that faculty perceive academic freedom as being fully supported within their academic department; however, there is widespread concern about preserving academic freedom at the institutional level.

For some, there is tension on campus between the ideals of maintaining academic freedom while maintaining the “Catholic identity” of the institution. For example, in spring 1999, a speaker
from Planned Parenthood, invited by a student group to discuss women’s reproductive health, was canceled by the President. [From the President’s perspective, the speaker represented an organization that actively endorses practices that are explicitly denounced by the Catholic Church.] In 2002 and 2003, *The Vagina Monologues*, a stage play, was banned from performance on campus. Instead, the University agreed to “sponsor” it off-campus. Some faculty take these incidents as evidence that the atmosphere on campus does not support an honest, open exchange of ideas in which students can be exposed to a variety of issues and viewpoints in their struggle to develop and understand their views and beliefs. At the same time, a number of student clubs and organizations have been permitted to bring “controversial” speakers to the campus. The fundamental concern is that suppression of academic freedom may directly oppose the Mission Statement, which states (in part) that "... All these elements of our tradition [humanistic, Catholic, Jesuit] come together within the sphere of free intellectual inquiry characteristic of a University" (Exhibit 1.A.1).

A recent policy, established by a collaborative process involving faculty, the administration, and Trustees (Exhibit 4.14, Events Policy), places some restrictions on the ability of faculty to bring in speakers and to promote artistic performances that may conflict with the administration's interpretation of Catholic Church teachings. As with other areas within this Standard, a concern over academic freedom is not universally held by all faculty members, and some faculty members do not perceive the Events Policy to threaten or impinge upon the exercise of academic freedom. (See also the institution’s response to Standard Nine.)

**Self-Governance and Shared Governance**

The faculty is given primary responsibility for teaching and research by the University administration. The faculty exercises this responsibility not only through its work in classrooms and laboratories, but also through participation in the Faculty Senate, the Board of Regents, University committee work, School and department meetings, artistic expression, and scholarship.

During the 2001-2002 academic year, the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee decided to undertake a broad review of faculty governance procedures. This initiative grew out of complaints and rumors from various quarters, including the Board of Trustees, administrators, and the faculty itself. The assertion by some was that the Faculty Assembly had become a small group of discontents who did not truly represent the whole faculty, even though they were elected in an “all faculty” process. A task force was created to look at alternative models of faculty governance; in addition, the Assembly participated in a research study of the University of Southern California that looked at comparative structures. At the end of the year, the task force recommended three possible models to the Executive Committee (one of which allowed for continuation of the Assembly as constructed at that time). The Executive Committee reviewed the three models and in the Fall of 2002-03 recommended to the full Faculty Assembly that Gonzaga ought to change to the “Faculty Senate” model of representation.

The track record for the Assembly over the past five years suggests it was quite successful in conducting business of the faculty (see Exhibit 4.15, Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes.) A number of initiatives – including curriculum additions, salary and benefits proposals, Faculty Handbook amendments, and changes in academic policies were pursued and accomplished. In
addition, the Faculty Assembly sponsored the creation of a video entitled “And We Stayed,” an examination of the experiences of four students of color and the campus climate they encountered.

Despite these successes, and in an effort to meet the concerns of community critics, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly successfully recommended to its members the adoption of the Senate model. Beginning with the 2003-2004 academic year, the new Faculty Governance structure is in place and active. Early indications are that the new Faculty Senate model, combined with a greater degree of participation on the part of the Senate in regular committee meetings of the Board of Trustees, will achieve a greater degree of representation on the part of faculty to the governance structure of the institution, and a greater degree of input to decisions made by the institution.

The faculty at Gonzaga fully participate in academic planning, curriculum development and review, and academic advising within their respective department and school. Most faculty are active and committed at this level and the result is a collection of strong departments that change with changing times across campus. Four (4) members of the faculty are elected for two-year terms to the Academic Council, which is the primary body for review and approval of significant undergraduate program changes. Within the Law School, the faculty are heavily involved with policy development across a broad range of issues, including admissions, budget, and program development and review. Eight (8) members of the graduate faculty are appointed to serve on the Graduate Council as well, which oversees the development, approval, and review of new and continuing programs at the graduate level.

According to the Subcommittee’s Faculty survey, there are mixed views from most departments about whether faculty members have an appropriate amount of influence at the institutional governance level in matters of real importance. Related to this, some faculty members have concerns about the absence of seeking faculty input about major administrative decisions (that affect academic quality/programs). The faculty are aware that the administration talks of “open lines of communication” between faculty and administration, but it often appears that “communication” consists of informing faculty of decisions without receiving faculty input.

This widespread frustration led to a special meeting of the faculty assembly in May 2003 that was called by the chairs of the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences to discuss a vote of no confidence in the president (see Exhibit 4.16). The Executive Council suggested a series of resolutions be adopted at this juncture instead of proceeding with a vote. The gathered assembly whole-heartedly agreed with this plan and after long discussion passed a series of resolutions. These resolutions (Exhibit 4.17) called upon the administration to address the issues of hiring, conversions from term to tenure-track positions, office space/renovation, and governance. Evidence shows that President Spitzer takes these resolutions seriously and has responded positively (see Exhibit 4.18).

Immediately prior to this May 2003 faculty assembly meeting, the School of Engineering met and showed their unanimous support of Fr. Spitzer and the Board of Trustees. Many faculty,
however, maintain that in spite of a few concessions, the chief decision makers of the University have not welcomed or worse, ignored the faculty voice. Currently, the University Budget Committee has three faculty serving on it, each appointed to a three year term. They participate, but have no direct involvement with formulating the budget. The current Academic Vice President is beginning a new academic budget committee which will have three elected faculty members who will hopefully be able to give substantial input to this new committee. In addition, the President of the Faculty Senate will sit on the University Budget Committee. Last May (2003), the Faculty Assembly requested through the Board of Trustees that there be faculty positions on several of the Board’s committees. As of this date, the Board has denied this request. According to the Faculty Subcommittee survey, many faculty members believe that the institution’s leadership opposes meaningful faculty participation in institutional governance. It is difficult to proceed with academic planning if there is little support from the administration.

The Academic Vice President has, however, unequivocally stated his commitment to fostering faculty involvement in governance and decision-making processes. Further, he has made this commitment manifest by meeting regularly with the President and members of the Faculty Senate (formerly the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee); by including members of the faculty on a variety of working groups, including one that sought to examine course size changes over the past seven years (during Summer 2003); and by creating the opportunity for open meetings with members of the faculty during Spring 2003.

Conclusions

While the Steering Committee perceives that faculty are effective in the execution of their teaching responsibilities, it also maintains that in matters of governance, professional development, and salary, there are major challenges that negatively affect the faculty’s ability to fully serve the institution’s students. How these issues have come about is less important than taking positive steps to address them.

The University faculty has a strong commitment to excellence, but the resources made available to support excellence are inconsistent both within and between Schools. According to the Subcommittee Survey, faculty in the Professional Schools are generally more satisfied with a large range of issues including faculty selection, evaluation, roles, welfare and professional development than are their counterparts in the College of Arts and Sciences. The same is true when it comes to scholarship, research and artistic creation. Even within the College of Arts and Sciences, faculty are bothered by differing salary levels and differing levels of support for professional development.

Community feedback to the Steering Committee regarding Standard Four indicates that certain segments of the faculty – especially in the College of Arts and Sciences – believe that the academic quality of the University is in jeopardy. In fact, there has been an increased reliance on fixed-term and adjunct faculty to support educational demands. According to the Subcommittee Survey, the concern regarding academic quality in face of increasing enrollments is held across all departments and schools.

Because of the themes mentioned above, morale is low among many faculty members and there exists tension between many faculty and the University’s leadership. While there are established lines of communication between the faculty and the President, many faculty feel their concerns
go unheeded. This is of particular concern since the last accreditation visit specifically made the following recommendation: “[We encourage] cooperative efforts between administration and faculty [that] will provide greater reliance upon faculty in policy-making for the institution.” Recent efforts by the administration to remedy the situation look promising. For example, new tenure-track faculty positions were created for the College of Arts of Sciences (5), Business School (2), Law School (2), and Professional Studies (1); several conversions from fixed-term appointments to tenure-track appointments were agreed upon; and significant renovation of the Administration Building, beyond that which has already occurred, is scheduled. While this increase in faculty numbers still does not, in the view of the Faculty and some in the Administration, adequately respond to the needs generated by the significant increase in student numbers over the last four years, it is a promising start.

Next Steps

The preceding narrative suggests a number of areas for future improvement by the institution as regards faculty role and welfare. An earlier version of the following “Next Steps” were reviewed by participating faculty at the Spring 2004 Faculty Conference. The faculty there expressed support for many of these, but also underscored the importance of establishing a line of institutional accountability for their execution.

1. Faculty Involvement

1.a. The University should continue to explore and implement an active policy of shared governance at the institution. The institution must encourage all members of the community to view faculty involvement in decision-making processes as a necessary and desirable component of an excellent university.

1.b. The institution should continue to establish improved lines of communication in which faculty take an active role in developing and articulating the goals and vision of the University. Additionally, open town-hall meetings, sponsored by the Academic Vice President, should be encouraged to share a vision for, and concerns about, the University. These meetings should not be used to simply disseminate information, but should encourage active dialogue.

1.c. The University should consider re-establishing a vehicle such as the Council for Partnership in Mission to allow faculty greater involvement in understanding and promoting the Mission of the University in all its aspects.

2. Academic Freedom

2.a. The University should encourage departments to discuss issues and policies of academic freedom where appropriate. The University should continue to support the AAUP standards of Academic Freedom.

2.b. The Events committee should conduct an evaluation – including students, staff, faculty, administrators and Board members – which will evaluate the effectiveness of the new “Events Policy” at the end of each year.
3. Resources for Academic Quality

3.a. Gonzaga should institute a University-wide review of faculty hiring procedures and establish a budget to support a search system to attract larger pools of diverse candidates, particularly those from under-represented groups.

3.b. The University should establish workshops for all new and non-tenure track faculty to learn about, and incorporate, aspects of the University Mission and department Missions into their teaching. Each academic department should develop a mentoring system for all new faculty (tenure-track, fixed-term, and adjunct).

3.c. Gonzaga ought to establish an equitable budget system across the University for professional development that encourages active participation in professional societies, includes reasonable book or journal allowances, and/or provides additional technological support.

3.d. The University should review the University requirements for teaching load and establish an equitable University-wide policy. Provide flexibility, as currently exists in some departments, where appropriate for purposes of writing and research, teaching laboratories, and academic/administrative responsibilities in addition to teaching.

3.e. The University should establish clear evaluation policies and procedures for all faculty in all ranks, including fixed-term and adjunct faculty, informed by Northwest Commission policy and best practices in higher education. The institution should establish a University Academic Committee to revise the Student Course Evaluation process with the commitment to follow through with the recommendations of the committee.

3.f. The University should examine the staffing of courses in the Core Curriculum. Where the core curriculum is taught by a non-tenure track faculty member, a clear and compelling case must be approved by both the department and dean for the exception.

3.g. A system of teaching assignments should be established in order to allow regular full-time faculty the opportunity to teach courses for which they are academically qualified, before these courses are offered to fixed-term or adjunct faculty.

3.h. For disciplines that rely heavily on peer-reviewed journals for access to knowledge, a more flexible policy needs to be instituted for library support (more comprehensive search engines; lower book budgets – higher journal budgets).

3.i. Establish a comprehensive plan to upgrade a classrooms physically and technologically each year.

4. Salary and Compensation
4.a. The University should review faculty salary and benefits packages institution wide. A just and equitable compensation package should be provided.

4.b. The University should review and address the manner in which changes to salary adjustments are made (for example, the same-year versus prior-year CUPA adjustments issue).

4.c. Every attempt must always be made to maximize the quality, and to minimize the expense, for medical and other benefits.
### STANDARD FOUR - FACULTY TABLE #1. INSTITUTIONAL FACULTY PROFILE - FALL SEMESTER 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank or Class</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Dr</th>
<th>JD</th>
<th>LLM</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>License</th>
<th>Less than</th>
<th>Bach</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Total Teaching</th>
<th>Years of Experience at Institution</th>
<th>Previous fall (2002) term credit hour load</th>
<th>Previous fall (2002) number of section equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,582</td>
<td>$87,754</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,764</td>
<td>$55,274</td>
<td>$96,875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,877</td>
<td>$43,929</td>
<td>$91,945</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,320</td>
<td>$34,135</td>
<td>$76,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$65,550</td>
<td>$86,100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$51,750</td>
<td>$51,750</td>
<td>$51,750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$281,293</td>
<td>$388,392</td>
<td>$587,740</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* LLM is an advanced Law Degree--Master's of Legal Letters - It is more advanced than a JD, however it is not considered a Doctorate degree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Granting Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Number of Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDOVER NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUBURN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALL STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTON COLLEGE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAREMONT GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEMSON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNELL LAW SCHOOL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPAUL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMORY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GONZAGA UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT XU MÜNCHEN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMASTER UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONASH UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEABODY CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEKING UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE OF BUCHAREST</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURDUE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AT CARBONDALE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANFORD UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINITY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULANE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITÉ PAUL VALÉRY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF AKRON</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA-EDMONTON</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF COLOGNE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO-BOULDER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO-DENVER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF DENVER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF IOWA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT BALTIMORE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS-AMHERST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-ANN ARBOR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT COLUMBIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF OREGON</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF UTAH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF WALES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MADISON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTON SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YALE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total overall faculty</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LLM is an advanced Law Degree--Master's of Legal Letters - It is more advanced than a JD, however it is not considered a Doctorate degree.
STANDARD FOUR EXHIBITS

4.1 Self-Study Steering Committee, Standard 4 Subcommittee Faculty Survey Instrument ("Subcommittee Survey")
4.2 Standard Four Subcommittee Draft Reports
4.3 Faculty E-mail, Report Feedback
4.4 Petition for Additional Faculty Members (E-mail)
4.5 Spring 2003 Faculty Listening Sessions
4.6 Faculty Assembly Resolutions, December 2002
4.7 Gonzaga University Faculty Handbook
4.8 Analysis of Faculty Teaching Load and Class Sizes, Fall 1996 to Fall 2002
4.9 CUPA Survey, 2002 and Related Documents
4.10 Faculty Benefits Summary Table
4.11 Documents Relating to Faculty-Administration Salary Discussions
4.12 Samples of Faculty Contracts
4.13 Summary of Significant Artistic Creation, Scholarly Activity, & Research by Faculty
4.14 Events Policy
4.15 Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes, 2000-03; and Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, 2003-04
4.16 Faculty Assembly E-mail Correspondence – Vote of “No Confidence”
4.17 Faculty Assembly Resolutions of Spring, 2003
4.18 President’s Response to Faculty Resolutions (Various Documents)
4.19 Faculty Committees and Memberships Lists, 2002-03 and 2003-04
4.20 Evaluation Forms & Summary Reports of Student Evaluations
4.21 Personnel Files & Vitae (see exhibits in Team Room)
4.22 Criteria & Procedures for employing, evaluating, and compensating faculty in special programs such as off-campus, study abroad, travel/study, non-credit, or extension credit programs.
4.23 Policies governing the employment, orientation, and evaluation of part-time faculty and teaching fellows.
4.24 Summary reports of faculty involvement with public services/community services.
4.25 Institutional policies regarding scholarship and artistic creation by faculty and students.
4.26 Institutional policies regarding research activity, including sponsored research by faculty and students.
4.27 Summary of the faculty role in developing and monitoring policies and practices scholarship, artistic creation, and research.

Other Required Exhibits:

- Policy on Academic Freedom - Please refer to the Faculty Handbook, part 305.00
- Doctrinal Statements Required for Employment, Promotion, and Tenure – Not applicable.
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STANDARD FIVE: LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

Foreword

The institution’s response to Standard Five is subdivided into three sections: (1) a review of the Ralph E. and Helen Higgins Foley Center Library, which is the University’s primary library; (2) the School of Law Chastek Library and Computing Center, which primarily serves the School of Law; and (3) an overview of the University’s Information Technology & Services area.

THE RALPH E. AND HELEN HIGGINS FOLEY CENTER LIBRARY

Introduction

The Ralph E. and Helen Higgins Foley Center Library was completed in September 1992, shortly before the 1994 ten-year accreditation visit by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. One of the visiting team’s major commendations to the University was the library’s provision of “a modern, attractive and well-equipped facility combining traditional library services and technological linkages which offer students and faculty enhanced access to a variety of local and distance information resources.”

During the ten years since Gonzaga’s last full scale accreditation review, the Foley Center Library’s faculty and staff have extended library resources and services as technological enhancements such as the internet have provided us with many new tools to support the teaching, learning and research missions of the University.

In response to the pace of technological innovation and change, the University has reorganized campus technology departments, including the library, during the past decade. A brief description of these organizational configurations is instrumental in understanding the context of the library’s current information resources and services and progress towards a mature cycle of evaluation and assessment.

In 1997 Foley Center, Desktop Support Services, Central Computer Services and Instructional Technology Support Services were united to create a new department called Information and Technology Services (ITS). The Dean of Library Services became the Associate Academic Vice President (AAVP) for Technology with responsibilities for this new unit. During this time, the library struggled to cope with the loss of staff and a diminution of focus due to its integration into ITS and the attention ITS issues demanded of the library dean. In January 2000 ITS was dissolved and pre-1997 reporting structures were restored: the Dean of Library Services reports to the Academic Vice President.
a) Purpose and Scope

In 2002 the library began the process of refocusing on the library’s mission and future with the creation of a new library mission statement (See Exhibit 5.1.1). The library’s mission statement “Opening Doors to a World of Information with EASE: Environment, Access, Service, Education” is now the foundation upon which assessment, evaluation and goal setting is framed. The foci of the library’s efforts are:

**Environment:** The Foley Center Library provides a physical, intellectual, and social environment where creativity, collaboration, and scholarly pursuits can flourish.

**Access:** The Foley Center Library collects, preserves, and organizes a diverse array of information and scholarly resources to facilitate open inquiry and information retrieval.

**Service:** The Foley Center Library supports the members of the University community in their intellectual endeavors.

**Education:** The Foley Center Library equips users with the tools to locate, evaluate, and synthesize information.

In keeping with the model of inclusive participation four subcommittees of library staff drafted sections of the library’s 2004 self-study document. Except for library staff that work evenings and weekend and two librarians on sabbatical, all staff participated in one of the subcommittees, which were cross-departmental to provide a diversity of opinion and input. After the subcommittee reports were united, staff and faculty reviewed the first draft of the library Self-Study in March 2003. The extensive involvement by all staff members in this endeavor is indicative of the participatory nature of the library’s evaluation and assessment efforts.

b) Information Resources and Services
d) Selection, acquisition, organization and maintenance of holdings

Monographs in all formats are selected by the library faculty bibliographers, based on requests from classroom faculty, curricular needs and budget availability. The library is responsive to faculty requests for new materials. However, some areas or disciplines suffer from not enough involvement of the classroom faculty in the collection development process.

The 1994 NWASC team concluded that “monographic and journal holdings are not adequate in many ways.” Five years later the 1999 NWASC interim report warned that
the library is approaching a serious problem in maintaining monograph or book acquisitions. Flat line budgets in a highly inflationary area are eroding the ability of the library to acquire the same number of new volumes as just a few years ago. Attention must be paid to the acquisition rate of print monographs in order to maintain a current and balanced collection. Action now could forestall a serious problem in the near future. In reviewing budget statements for the past 5 years and as confirmed by a report from the Associate Dean Carter, the monograph acquisition budget has declined since 1994-1995 by approximately 18%; the high inflation factor for monographs has resulted in a steep decline in acquisitions by nearly 25% in the last 5 years. The decline is beginning to have an impact on the general holdings; left uncorrected another 5 years it would likely result in a significant imbalance and deficit in the holdings given the range of undergraduate and graduate programs offered by the University.

Despite these warnings, the monographic budget has continued to decrease and for the 2002-03 fiscal year was 9.4% less in real dollars than the 1999-2000 budget. Considering a typical monographic inflation rate of 4.5% per year, the real buying power of the library’s monographic budget has been declined by 27.4% since 1999. Improved control of the acquisitions process has improved the library’s ability to spend closer to the budgeted amount and thus ameliorated some of the impact of flat line budget allocations for monographs.

Table 5.1 - Monographs & Periodicals – Budgeted and Spent Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Monographs - Budgeted</th>
<th>Monographs - Spent</th>
<th>Periodicals – Budgeted</th>
<th>Periodicals - Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>$138,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>$117,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>$127,109</td>
<td>$130,511</td>
<td>$362,264</td>
<td>$352,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>$143,561</td>
<td>$105,933</td>
<td>$405,685</td>
<td>$394,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>$144,161</td>
<td>$129,053</td>
<td>$419,947</td>
<td>$410,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>$148,829</td>
<td>$123,737</td>
<td>$432,888</td>
<td>$446,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$141,029</td>
<td>$142,218</td>
<td>$457,888</td>
<td>$500,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$141,029</td>
<td>$140,599</td>
<td>$484,888</td>
<td>$532,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$141,029</td>
<td>$140,844</td>
<td>$484,888</td>
<td>$525,382*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$141,029</td>
<td></td>
<td>$515,000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures reflect a $33,000 reduction in Engineering Periodicals  
** Figure reflects an additional $60,000 cut in periodicals

As a result, the library buys fewer titles and users must increasingly rely on interlibrary loans to supplement the collection. The shrinking of the budget has also hurt the diversity of resources available to users; the library can afford some print titles, but can’t also afford some full-text databases that are needed.

The periodicals budget, which pays for all periodicals, serials and electronic databases, has not kept up with the inflationary rates of these publications since 1999. The library Dean was permitted to run a deficit in order to cover the cost of existing subscriptions. This explains the discrepancy in the budgeted and spent amounts from 1999/20000 to 2002/2003. In 2002 the
library Dean undertook an analysis of the periodical budget and discovered that over 25% of periodical expenditures were for Engineering. Accordingly, $30,000 was cut from engineering titles. At the same time the library Dean and Academic Vice President agreed that the pattern of deficit spending for periodicals was not a responsible way to budget. For 2003/2004 the library budget was increased to $515,000; however, $60,000 worth of titles was cut to enable the library to meet this budget goal.

Input received from faculty for the compilation of Standard 2 indicates sufficiency of library resources varies amongst the disciplines. The Department of Classical Civilizations notes that the library has “a remarkable selection of classical writings”, while the Department of Religious Studies states that “the department budget needs significant increases in funding in order to purchase adequate library resources to support undergraduate and graduate theological education.” Lack of adequate funds is also indicated in the narratives for Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice. Departments of Mechanical Engineering, Organizational Leadership, and Nursing indicate generally that library resources are adequate to support the Gonzaga educational program.

f) Periodical and standing order title selections are made during the Periodical Review when the bibliographers and the classroom faculty regularly re-evaluate which titles would be the best selections for each department’s curriculum.

g) One of the library’s goals is to move toward a smaller number of sub-collections. To this end, during 2001, the videos, software, audiocassettes and other non-print materials were integrated into the main stacks and feature films and musical performances were located in the new “Popular” location.

During FY 2002/2003, the library undertook an inventory of significant portions of the collection. It identified many volumes needing repair or re-labeling, titles that were withdrawn in the past and needed to be reinstated, and data errors in the library catalog. The inventory has documented an overall loss rate of approximately 1% which was much lower than expected.

Ability of patrons to use resources independently and effectively

Enabling the Gonzaga community to be independent library users requires many different approaches and methods. For many years, the library had identified the need for a faculty member to specifically focus on developing the ability of Gonzaga’s students, faculty and staff to use library resources and services independently and effectively. Finally in 2002, an instructional services librarian was hired.

A significant overall weakness in the library instruction program has been that instruction is not systematically integrated across the curriculum. Although the library is responsive to requests for instruction sessions, the library faculty is dependent upon the classroom faculty to recognize or anticipate their students’ need for instruction. Approximately 2,000 students (See Exhibit 5.1.2) a year attends instruction classes with the goal of training students in the use of the library and
Beginning in the spring of 2002, the instructional services librarian met with academic departments who share an interest in the promotion of the library instruction program. In addition, the library designed and distributed a number of handouts to educate English professors, a prime target audience, about the efficacy of library instruction, and the role of information literacy at the baccalaureate level. As a result of these efforts, statistics from March to December 2002, demonstrate a dramatic increase as the number of library instruction sessions increased 25% as compared to previous years. This figure is adjusted for the dramatic increase in enrollment since fall 2000.

The library has long acknowledged the need for an online library use tutorial and will have a comprehensive library tutorial implemented by September 2005. This development will be increasingly integral to our education efforts, particularly if the projected increase in distance education enrollment occurs. With an online tutorial the library will be able to provide asynchronous instruction to all enrolled students.

The library is currently discussing what influence the course management system Blackboard will have on future asynchronous and synchronous library instruction and how the library can utilize this to further instructional goals. The library’s plans in the immediate future center on incorporating suitable electronic library reserves into Blackboard. The University began offering its M.A. in Organizational Leadership via Internet in January 2004. As the University incorporates more internet based instruction, the instruction program must emphasize innovative technology as well as in-person teaching.

Most importantly, the library instruction program will continually revise its curriculum to meet the requirements of information literacy as described in the ACRL Handbook.

Additionally, Foley Center offers traditional services that contribute to developing the ability of students, faculty and staff to use the resources of the library independently and effectively. The Reference Services staff believes that transactions at all of our service points are opportunities for one on one teaching. The library faculty, paraprofessionals and well-trained student assistants staff the Reference Desk 97 hours out of the 102 the library is open. Additional service points include the Special Collections reference desk, staffed 35 hours per week, and the Periodicals/Microform desk and Computer Lab desk that are staffed 102 hours a week, for the most part by student assistants.

In order to facilitate independent use, librarians have created over 30 paper subject guides to assist patrons in utilizing the library’s collection and online resources (See Exhibit 5.1.3). Recognizing that Gonzaga’s students and faculty are looking for other ways to access library information, all of the subject guides, with added links to other basic reference tools on the website, are available through the Foley website. The library website is also the main access point to the online library catalog which includes numerous up-to-date help screens. An online reference chat function is available during library hours from the Foley web page. A reference email form is available to library patrons at all times from the web page.
Instructional services for distance learners are continuing to develop as the University expands its off-campus programs. Gonzaga’s distance learners in the graduate program of the School of Education meet off-site in Hawaii, British Columbia and Alberta. In the spring of 2002, there were 25 cohort groups, with an approximate enrollment of 500 students. The Nursing Department also has an off-campus option which uses a video delivery model. During the 2002/2003 academic year there were 110 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled with the video option. Distance learning nursing students visit campus several times a semester and attend library orientation sessions during their first semester in the program.

With limited funding and limited time available to send a librarian to these sites, instructional efforts are limited to web-based resources and one-on-one contact. The library provides an 800 number for off-campus students to use, and many students contact the library for assistance via the telephone or email or by using the virtual chat reference service. The information needs of distant learners are particularly critical as most of them are graduate students, many of whom are returning to higher education after many years. Their proficiency with current library resources may be somewhat limited and the need for research competency is high. During the 2001/2002 academic year, the library sent an instruction video created by the Distance Services Librarian to the distance-nursing students and received positive feedback. Improvements to the library’s web pages are also needed to assist distance learners with finding and obtaining library resources. In addition, web-based tutorials or research guides need to be developed in order to provide self-help measures to increase the research competencies of distant learners. The library also believes that these students are best served by an in-person or real time interaction with a librarian.

The library also does not provide training or instructional services to students in the Florence program. The distance from these students is significant and until recent technological infrastructure enhancements were completed in the new Florence building, limitations have precluded delivery of instruction and/or web-based tutorials and access to Gonzaga’s electronic resources. The library faculty has discussed emulating the model of classroom faculty at the Spokane campus who provide rotating coverage in Florence. The competencies the library faculty could provide for the students and library in Florence would be the development of online resources, (particularly online periodicals), working with Florence faculty to incorporate new resources into their courses and, if needed, cataloging of the Florence library’s collection into the Voyager catalog. The latter would allow Florence students, faculty and staff to search an electronic catalog for local holdings.

Additionally, one area that the library has not addressed in a comprehensive, or systematic fashion, is the need to increase the information literacy of non-library staff and faculty. Library services and resources are continually changing and many University employees could benefit by updating their information seeking skills. Without additional staffing, it is unlikely the library will be able to significantly address this need.

Policies, regulations and procedures are documented, updated and available
The library has documented policies and procedures in all major areas (See Exhibit 5.1.4). The library added pertinent policies to the library’s web pages in fall 2003 to improve access for patrons.

**Faculty, staff and students participate in planning and development**

The library uses a bibliographer/faculty department liaison model for collection development. Each University department is assigned a bibliographer, who is a library faculty member. The bibliographer coordinates with the department appointed liaison regarding their subject allocation in the library’s budget, providing new book and material information and receiving their purchase suggestions. The bibliographer orders materials to complement the current collection. Although there are varying degrees of interest and involvement on the part of the classroom faculty, generally all faculty have the opportunity to request that the library buy specific titles. The classroom faculty is also consulted through the bibliographers during the Periodical Review process. During FY 2002/2003, the library cut $60,000 from the periodical order for the FY 2003/2004. The bibliographers worked with the classroom faculty in their subject areas to determine which periodical titles to cut.

The 1994 Visiting Team recommended that “external communication channels should be strengthened so that the campus community is more aware of the services and policies of the Foley Center.” The library created the Community Relations Team (CRT) in 2000 to plan and execute activities that promote and inform the University and Spokane communities of Foley’s resources. Some of the library’s accomplishments include:

- The creation and distribution of “Foley Front & Center” (See Exhibit 5.1.5) a newsletter covering library news, policy changes and tips for library usage four times a year.
- Coordination and publicity for the traveling exhibit “Walt Whitman: Images and Insights” (See Exhibit 5.1.6). In conjunction with this five month display, Gonzaga faculty member Dr. Donna Campbell gave a lecture on Whitman’s work that was well attended by students, University staff and community members.
- In the falls of 2001, 2002 and 2003, the library sponsored the “Foley Fling” (See Exhibit 5.1.6) to introduce freshman to the library’s staff, services and resources
- Each fall a mailing is sent to all new faculty detailing the services, policies and procedures of particular interest to the faculty.
- Beginning in 2002, the library revived a past practice of publishing an Annual Report (See Exhibit 5.1.7). The report was distributed widely to University community to highlight the accomplishments of the past year, goals for the coming years and progress on reaching goals set in the past.
- “Bing Bash” May 2003. A three day celebration to honor the 100th birthday of Bing Crosby. The event included lectures, films and live entertainment which attracted over 650 attendees from around the globe (See Exhibit 5.1.6).
• “The Vietnam War Remembered: 30 Years after the fall of Saigon” October 20-24, 2003. The event featured films, photography, literary readings and discussions. All events were free and open to the public (See Exhibit 5.1.6).

Other opportunities for classroom faculty involvement are social events with an informational component hosted by the library. During the 2002/2003 academic year, the library hosted three brown bag lunch sessions, each with a different theme, such as the periodical review or library instruction programs. The library has also hosted wine and cheese events to which faculty involved in collection development were invited.

There are suggestion boxes at the Reference desk and on the Periodicals desk, into which any library user can drop a suggestion regarding any aspect of the library and its services. Suggestions are reviewed by the Reference Coordinator, Chair of Public Services and the Dean of Library Services.

In the spring of 2002, the library undertook a survey to measure library use and satisfaction with library services. Students and faculty were given the opportunity to complete the questionnaire (See Exhibits 5.1.8, 5.1.9), which was available in paper and on the library website. Library users and non-library users responded. This was the first of what are expected to be biennial surveys.

The Library Committee is an official committee of the University. It serves an advisory role to the Dean of Library Services, with particular attention to library policies that relate to faculty. The Dean of Library Services is Chair ex-officio. Of the six faculty members, three are elected by the faculty and three are appointed by the President. The Committee meets at least once a semester.

Library staff has opportunities to participate in library planning processes mainly through involvement in their departments.

Each department in the library has regular meetings on at least a monthly basis. In addition, smaller units within Departments meet as needed. Cross-departmental meetings involving staff are called to address specific issues with resources or services. A monthly library staff meeting is held (See Exhibit 5.1.10).

University staff outside of the library has limited involvement in library planning. Students could be more involved in library planning, perhaps by means of a library committee that parallels the faculty Library Committee or by appointing student representatives to the Library Committee. To date, a plan has not been formulated to address the need to expand the avenues of input from students and University staff.

The implementation of the popular books collection is a direct result of the identification of student needs via surveys and the suggestion box.

Beyond collection purchases, the equipment and technology selected for the library are decided by a collaborative effort between library staff and various departments around campus. Library staff also collaborates with various University departments to provide maintenance. Collaboration between Faculty Services and the library resulted in the move of a campus copy
center, Paw Prints, to the library in the fall of 2003. This provides more reasonable copying costs for library staff, students and faculty, as well as many other copier services previously not available.

Computing and communications services extend the boundaries of the library

The decision to change library software vendors is a momentous decision. Due to aging equipment and CARL’s focus on public libraries, Foley Center, along with its partner libraries in the INLAN Consortium, decided to purchase the Endeavor Information System’s Voyager software in 2000.

Over the course of the next two years, the library staff worked diligently to prepare data and retrain staff and patrons in the use of the new system. INLAN joined with two other library consortiums to create the WIN Consortium of 70 libraries in eastern Washington and north Idaho. Foley Center houses the consortium’s hardware and central site support team. The WIN mission statement speaks to its dedication to resource sharing beyond Foley’s library walls:

**WIN** is a cooperative multitype library consortium serving academic, public, school, and special libraries in the states of Washington and Idaho. **WIN** facilitates access to information by acquiring automated systems that serve as gateways to information beyond library walls. Additionally, the consortium will plan and implement services that promote inter-library cooperation to insure that resources are readily shared across jurisdictional boundaries. These services enable our patrons to further their education, to enhance their skills in the workplace, to fully function in today's global society, and to enrich and enjoy their daily lives.

Endeavor’s public access catalog enables the library to search all the WIN libraries catalogs simultaneously. In June 2003, an additional software module was purchased to allow patron initiated holds on any item in the collective WIN collection.

Beyond Voyager, the library has many techniques in place to allow patrons and Foley staff to reach out to access and deliver information. These include:

- **E-Books**: The library has licensed access to 1,315 NetLibrary titles in the areas of computers and web design, as well as Pacific Northwest history. This was a one-time consortial purchase through ORBIS. Bibliographic records for these titles have been integrated into the public catalog, with URLs that link to the NetLibrary site.

- **Indexes & Databases** (national and international): The library has licensed access to approximately 50 online, web-based indexes and databases. The number of full-text databases that the library can offer is severely limited by the funding available. However,
as of December 2003, through these databases library patrons have access to 7,543 full text journal titles.

- **Interlibrary Loan**: Recent initiatives in improving Interlibrary Loan services include use of ARIEL and ODDS for the electronic delivery of requests and the implementation of DirectRequest in OCLC's FirstSearch. The user survey from the spring of 2002 indicated some dissatisfaction with the speed of Interlibrary Loan.
- **Dissertations**: Library users have access to full-text electronic files of GU dissertations from 1995 to the present through the UMI website.
- 25 catalog and Internet work stations in-house
- Wireless access to the Internet within the building
- Online forms for ILL
- Online access to virtual collections
- Local courier delivery of books and documents (from other libraries/to other libraries)
- Virtual reference (e-reference/chat reference/information for phone ref)
- Patron initiated circulation requests (renew check out period/place holds)
- 36 wired ports for laptops throughout the building
- Enhanced classroom and teleconference center
- E-delivery for documents in ILL (Prospero/ODDS)
- Access to the student “H” drive both on and off campus (off campus access through ftp)
- ftp/e-delivery of digitized documents in microform area
- Bulldog Express (delivery of requested materials to faculty offices)
- Instructional videos for Distance Learners
- On-line Power Point presentation of library instruction

The Foley website was redesigned in 2001 to improve the content and utility and again in 2002 it was again redesigned to mesh with the University’s CMS software. The library recognized the primary importance of the library’s website by converting a Public Services staff position to an Administration Department position in summer 2003. The new position is Web Specialist/Graphic Designer with fulltime web responsibilities across the library.

In the past the library’s web pages have been ADA compliant and “Bobby approved”. However, with the adoption of the campus wide CMS web pages by the University, the library is no longer in control of this aspect of the library website. At present, the library has been assured that the University webmaster is making efforts to make the entire site ADA compliant and they will monitor the progress of this aspect of library service.

The staff of Foley Library has been working collaboratively with Disabilities Support Services (DSS) at Gonzaga to provide library services to students with disabilities. Additionally, the library is utilizing the University’s independent physical access compliance consultant to evaluate the library building and equipment. Currently the library can accommodate persons with visual impairment by using enlarging and scanning equipment. Media viewing rooms have closed captioning available for persons with hearing impairment. Additional software, such as a read-aloud application, is being considered to assure that printed materials and web resources can be used by visually impaired students. As needed, equipment has traveled between DSS and the library for the provision of services to students. The Public Services Department is committed
to being the liaison between the collection and those patrons who need accommodation for access.

Since 1999, there has been no librarian position with sole responsibility for the Curriculum Center. Collection development is currently done by an adjunct librarian in cooperation with the Chair of Public Services. During the 2002/2003 academic year, the entire collection was weeded and the shelving reorganized. Collection development for the Curriculum Center has focused mostly on juvenile fiction and professional materials. Textbook examples and curriculum guides for local school systems or the multi-state region are ordered on a rotating basis. In 2001/2002 up to date curriculum guides for local school districts were acquired. More active involvement in the Curriculum Center from the School of Education would be welcome to build an even stronger collection to meet the needs of their students.

Facilities and Access

Adequacy of facilities for resources, equipment and personnel

On-campus Access

The Foley Center Library is a spacious and well equipped facility consisting of a total of 137,000 square feet on four floors of library space. There are 355 individual study carrels of which 23 are wheelchair accessible. Additional disabled access to the library includes a push-button automatic door, wheelchair accessible restroom stalls, an elevator timed for wheelchair access, and Braille directional signage throughout the library. Another 13 completely enclosed faculty carrels are located on the main floor just off of the 24-hour study lounge. Group study rooms are located on two floors, 10 on the second floor and 2 on the lower level. Student surveys suggest a demand for additional group study rooms of varying sizes. The two study rooms on the lower level are restricted to A/V equipment use only.

There are 27 networked public access terminals in the library, which provide access to the Internet, the library catalog, and a total of 48 bibliographic databases which support the educational program of the University. Additionally, there are 4 public access and 2 stand-alone CD-ROM workstations which provide access to specialized databases. The library is home to a computer lab with 20 networked computers, providing access to word processing and other desktop applications as well as to the Internet, catalog and databases. Input from the spring 2002 computer lab survey was generally positive. (See Exhibit 5.1.11) As the library does not fund replacements, the currency of equipment is dependent upon ITSS’ budgets.

The Library Instruction Center (ACT Lab) houses 11 networked student workstations similar in configuration in the Foley Computer Lab, plus an instructor’s workstation and projector. The 1994 NWASC team suggested that “consideration should be given to adding computers to the classroom dedicated to library instruction so that the Center staff can further integrate, demonstrate and instruct users about the emerging network of electronic resources available via the internet and similar linkages.” In 2003 with larger classes and increasing demand for library instruction, the ACT Lab represents a weak link in the overall picture of computer access in the library, although the computers were updated in summer 2003. Students need to share computers...
during presentations and the size of the room limits classes to no more than 25 students. For classes that are larger than 25, the library can schedule sessions in the library Teleconference Center, which seats 70, but cannot provide hands-on library experience in that setting. While the library faculty members are the primary users of this classroom, funds to upgrade and expand the facility are the responsibility of the Instructional Technology Support Services department. At this time, the library Dean is working with ITS to renovate the Foley computer lab into an instructional facility.

Library personnel utilize 54 workstations located at service desks, in offices and in work areas. During the 2001/2002 academic year an Access database of all library computer equipment was created (See Exhibit 5.1.12) and is re-inventoried every spring and evaluated for needed upgrades. Generally the equipment budget has been adequate to keep these workstations at an appropriate hardware and software level.

Feedback from the 2002 surveys and comments in the suggestion boxes indicated library patrons found the Unix-based SunRay public OPAC terminals difficult and unreliable to use. In March 2003 the library purchased 16 Tele Video terminals which were installed to replace the SunRays. They are providing both speedier and more dependable access to the catalog and Internet. Like the SunRays, they also offer the advantage of being able to be updated via the server rather than individual installation, thus saving time for Help Desk personnel when setting up or updating software.

In spring semester 2003 the library expanded the number of hard wire ports available for laptop use from 2 to 36 ports, making computer access using the student’s own laptop a possibility. The library installed a wireless internet system and purchased six wireless laptop computers that are available for patron checkout (See Exhibit 5.1.13) beginning in February 2003. Students may also purchase a network card for their laptop giving them access to the web via the wireless system across campus. During spring of 2003, the network was upgraded to 100 MB from its previous bandwidth of 10 MB on most floors of the library and converted from routed to the faster switched Ethernet mode.

The main service points in the library are the Reference Desk, the Periodicals and Media desks, and Special Collections Desk. The lack of a service point on the second floor, particularly in the Curriculum Center, and limited Media Desk hours (ITSS student assistants staff this) represent possible weaknesses in library service. The current student wage budget does not make expansion of coverage to these areas feasible.

A major concern expressed in the 2002 Student Survey (See Exhibit 5.1.8) was the need for improved signage to make patrons more independent and able to find their way around the
building. Efforts are being taken to re-evaluate the library’s signage to come up with easier directions and area markers to let patrons become more independent while moving about the library.

In-library access to library resources is supplemented by a variety of audio/visual equipment in the Computer Lab and viewing rooms, two print stations, five copy machines on three floors, three microform reader/printers, two networked microform scanners capable of copying to CD or emailing digitized images of microform documents, print enlarger for the visually-impaired and software for converting text to voice.

B Off-Campus Access

The Foley Center Library provides support to distance learners and off-campus programs in Education, Nursing, Organizational Leadership, Business Administration, and Religious Studies. Off-campus access to a complete array of Foley’s catalog and bibliographic databases is made possible through web access to a proxy server system and a user-authentication mechanism that restricts access to authorized users. Library faculty provide off-campus classroom instruction, videotaped instruction modules, toll-free telephone access, email and real-time online reference assistance. Books from the Foley collection are mailed to off-campus students or delivered with instructors traveling to off-campus sites. Through the Online Document Delivery System (ODDS), journal articles and reference materials are digitized for off-campus students and placed on a server for direct online access. The distant-l email list provides a forum for Gonzaga distance learners to share information and ask questions. The Gonzaga Computer Help Desk extends hardware and software technical support to off-campus students. The most often cited technology problem for distance learners is inadequate/outdated personal computing equipment. This is particularly evident when students try to use advanced software and web technology to transfer interlibrary loan materials. One solution would be for all incoming distance learners to be advised of a minimum level of computer technology that they will need to fully utilize library technology to support their research needs.

The library’s involvement and support of the library at the Florence, Italy campus has up until recently been limited to providing book catalogs occasionally and facilitating the shipping of books chosen from the library’s discards to the Florence campus. Postal costs and delays make shipping of books and articles unfeasible.

In the summer of 2003 as planning for the Florence facility was underway, the Dean of Library Services met with the Florence Director to discuss the potential for expanding electronic access to the catalog and more importantly to the library’s collection of electronic journals. With enhanced internet capabilities being available in the Florence facility, the library is optimistic that Florence students will have access to all of Foley’s electronic resources. Increased enrollments and new program options such as the Summer Law program will require expanded library support which should be more feasible in the new Florence facility.

Cooperative arrangements with other library and information resources
The Foley Center Library has cooperative arrangements with several local, regional, and national organizations. As a founding member of the Washington-Idaho Network Consortium of Libraries, (WIN), the Foley Library has reciprocal lending and borrowing agreements with over 70 college, University, public, school, medical, and law libraries located in Eastern Washington and Northern Idaho. In 2003, the Washington Idaho Network purchased an additional module for the Voyager software called Universal Borrowing (UB). Consortium planning for UB implementation began in summer 2003 and when implemented in 2004 will automate and streamline the resource sharing process by providing patron initiated holds and a consortium wide patron database.

Through the Interlibrary Loan department, the Foley Library receives and extends no-fee reciprocal loan privileges to 171 libraries in the United States, including the 28 members of AJCU (Association of Jesuit Colleges & Universities) (See Exhibit 5.1.14). “No charge” loan agreements have also been negotiated with LVIS (Libraries Very Interested in Sharing), an organization consisting of over 1,468 libraries throughout North America. LVIS libraries must also be members of OCLC (Online Library Computer Center, Inc.), a non-profit organization serving over 41,000 libraries throughout the world. As a member of OCLC, the Foley Library has access to 6,928 libraries participating in interlibrary loan, as well access to over 41 million cataloging records utilized by the Materials Management department. In its support of nursing and health sciences oriented research at Gonzaga, the library is also a member the Docline interlibrary loan system sponsored by the National Library of Medicine. Within Docline, the library participates in FreeShare, a group of health resource libraries in North America who have agreed to offer free document delivery services on a reciprocal basis.

To route materials to various local libraries, the Foley Library has a courier arrangement with the ORBIS Library Consortium, and a city parcel arrangement with INCOL (Inland Northwest Council of Libraries). The ORBIS consortium is made up of public and private higher education institutions in the Northwest. INCOL is comprised of 18 area college, University, and public libraries in the Inland Northwest.

Consortial purchasing agreements utilized by the Foley Library include the purchase of several online databases and article indexes. The Project Muse online journals collection is purchased through MINITEX (Minitex Library Information Network), a publicly supported network of academic, public, state government and special libraries based in Minnesota. A wide array of OCLC FirstSearch databases is purchased through membership in NAPCU (Northwest Association of Private Colleges and Universities), an organization made up of four-year, accredited, non-profit, private academic institutions. The ProQuest online database is purchased through an arrangement with the Washington State Database Licensing Project. The Foley Library’s collection of netLibrary ebooks (online electronic books) was purchased from the Bibliographic Center for Research (BCR), a non-profit, multi-state library cooperative providing resource sharing services. Philosopher’s Index is purchased through an agreement with a Seattle University organized consortium of northwest libraries. In fall 2003 the library will also able to add Ebsco via a purchasing agreement with the Washington Idaho Network. Ebsco’s collection adds significant new full-text journals to the library’s collection.
Personnel and Management

Personnel: Adequacy in number and in areas of expertise

At Foley’s opening in September 1992, the library reported directly to the Academic Vice President (AVP). The library’s staff included the Dean of Library Services, the Associate Dean and the Assistant Dean for Library Systems, in addition to twelve faculty and fifteen staff members (See Exhibit 5.1.15). Library staffing levels ten years ago reflected a transition-in-progress of adding personnel to complement the new, greatly expanded facility. That process peaked in the 1994/95 academic year, and was then followed by a series of position cuts.

Since 1994, the library has lost the associate dean, four faculty and two support staff positions. Also, two externally-funded service programs, the Hanford Health Information Archives (HHIA) and Regional Information Services (RIS) have been discontinued, thus terminating another five full time positions—one administrative, two faculty and two support staff. Together, these losses represent slightly more than 25% of the current staff (27).

Table 5.2 – Foley Library Staffing, 1992-93 to 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-Time Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staffing losses have been counteracted in part by increased reliance on adjunct professionals, from two to five individuals. This trend, when combined with requisite increases in hourly compensation rates, has resulted in an annual budget for this staffing expenditure 162% higher than a decade ago. Reliance on student labor has likewise increased as the library loss staff positions. However, even though the budget line for institutional student wages has increased by 22% in the past ten years, the total number of contracted hours has actually decreased by 25%, due to raises in minimum wage requirements.

Library administration has responded in a variety of ways to reductions in staffing resources. In some cases, dedicated attention by professional librarians to specific areas has virtually ceased. Examples include management of government documents, serials and education curriculum resources (Curriculum Center). In other cases, personnel loss has simply diminished capacity and rate of production. For example, two professional catalogers worked in technical services ten years ago, whereas now there is one, who must also perform other administrative duties. An adjunct cataloger was hired in 2002 to assist with the video backlog. Also, responsibility for
essential functions has shifted throughout the workforce. Since librarians have necessarily adjusted core job descriptions and/or undertaken additional areas of oversight, many duties they once performed are now done by support staff. Responsibility for services previously performed by the staff of HHIA was added to the Special Collections department. Likewise, student workers have had to assume duties once performed by support staff.

Opportunities for professional growth for library and information resources professional staff

In recent years, the library has created a fund to support staff members’ attendance at regional library conferences. Additionally a number of library staff have attended library and staff teleconferences. Each year a staff member is chosen to attend the EndUser Conference in Chicago that focuses on Voyager. The spring 2003 employee survey (See Exhibit 5.1.16) indicates a good level of satisfaction with internal communication and opportunities for continuing education training.

Foley Center faculty members are allocated a travel budget each year to support their professional development choices. Faculty wishing to attend training beyond their budget has been supported as funds were available, as in the case of the instruction librarian attending the 2003 Information Literacy workshop. While funding is not adequate, input received via the peer evaluations indicate that faculty are optimizing the opportunities available to increase competencies.

In summary, the current staffing profile is adequate to maintain the status quo level of library service.

Staffing limitations may well prohibit desirable initiatives like collections analysis and management, cataloging of electronic materials, development of digital collections and bibliographic instruction may be difficult to sustain indefinitely. Recruitment of qualified personnel, at both the professional and paraprofessional levels has been a challenge, as well as retention of key technical support staff, largely due to low salaries.

Planning and Evaluation

Inclusive planning processes

Library planning takes place in many different forums at Gonzaga University, both within the library and at the campus level with other academic departments and the administration of the University. Through the Dean of the Library, the library is involved in many aspects of institutional planning. The Dean participates in the Academic Deans Council which meets every month during the academic year and addresses issues related to the undergraduate curriculum and budget. Librarians are eligible to serve on standing and ad hoc University committees and often serve on a wide range of committees, including the Graduate Council which is responsible for reviewing the graduate level curriculum.

Currently, library planning is formalized through an annual goal-setting process for library departments who determine goals for a three-year cycle. In addition, librarians set individual goals
for their annual review that includes evaluation of progress toward goal achievement. On a weekly basis, the Administration Team consisting of the department heads in the library meets to discuss current and planned projects. The minutes of these meetings (See Exhibit 5.1.17) are distributed to all library staff.

In January 2003 an employee satisfaction survey (See Exhibit 5.1.16) was taken of the library’s staff and faculty. Generally the results indicated positive feedback on most issues. One issue of concern that was identified was the low mark regarding recognition of staff efforts. One way the library administration has tried to improve the acknowledgment of staff efforts and accomplishments and to raise awareness of the library’s mission, is through a “Mission Moment” at the library’s monthly meeting.

Management and technical linkages

The library is housed within the Foley Center which provides space and facilities for library services as well as Instructional Technology Support Services (ITSS), Desktop Support Services (DSS) and the Washington Idaho Network (WIN). Library staff has an excellent collaborative and collegial relationship with ITSS, DSS and WIN. In 2001, University administration appointed a Chief Information Officer to coordinate all technology areas for the University. Because the office of the CIO is located in close proximity to the library dean’s office, there is easy accessibility and an open forum for discussing IT enhancements and projects. There are two academic committees, “Academic Computing” and “Desktop Support,” which ensure a free flow of ideas, suggestions and planning. A member of the library faculty serves on the Academic Computing Committee. Additionally the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) brings together technical staff members from across the University, including WIN. Both committees are chaired by technology managers, and membership consists of faculty and staff appointees. The mission of these committees is comprehensive improvement of IT and its technical support on the Gonzaga campus.

Likewise, the central site support office of the Washington Idaho Network is located on the third floor of the Foley Center. The WIN team is responsible for managing and supporting the Endeavor online system which serves over 180,000 patrons at public, academic, school and special libraries in Idaho and Eastern Washington. The Assistant Dean for Library Systems, who has primary responsibility for WIN operations, serves as a member of the library’s Administrative Team and this provides close cooperation regarding the library’s automated system, Voyager.

Regular and systematic evaluation of the quality, adequacy and utilization of resources and services

Foley Center, through its current assessment plan now “asks questions, seeks answers, analyzes itself and revises its goals, policies, procedures and resource allocation” based on the library’s mission statement. In order to address library-wide issues, a Library Assessment Committee was established to help develop ways to analyze and assess the library’s services and collections and to monitor the assessment calendar and cycle of evaluation, reflection and goal setting to realize the mission statements.
One of the roadblocks to conducting surveys has been the labor intensive work in compiling results. To this end, the library purchased “Survey Monkey” web survey software in fall 2003. This potential will be immensely helpful for the biennial survey and will also expedite desired surveying of distance learners and WIN staff members.

In March of each year, departments review their previous year’s goals and prepare new goals for the coming year. These departmental reports are considered at the Admin Team meetings and consolidated and form the foundation for the Library Annual Report. Surveys that are taken in the spring are also reviewed first at the department level and then at the administrative level for evidence of progress towards past goals and for suggestions of new goals.

Several systematic evaluation methods are used to assure that library users are able to provide feedback on a regular basis. In addition to the planned biennial student and faculty user surveys (See Exhibits 5.1.8, 5.1.9), the library has collected usage data for library periodicals. Each year the library conducts a review of 20% of the subject areas.

In order to evaluate library services, the Library's Assessment Committee developed and distributed two questionnaires, one for students and one for faculty, in the spring of 2002. Nearly 700 surveys were completed by students at Gonzaga which reflects 13.3% of the students at the University. Use of the library regularly is at the 50% level with research and study as the primary reason for 80% of the respondents. A wide range of library resources were used by students, although more clarification of which resources are used is needed. Remote use is not as prevalent as in-library use for on-campus students. Generally, students find the library easy to use and about 50% say they had a library orientation that same year. Future assessment projects may elicit a better understanding of student competencies in terms of using library resources effectively.

The faculty survey had an excellent response rate of 40% which indicates a wide range of interest in the library's services and collections by Gonzaga faculty. In fact, 50% of the sample said they use the library on a weekly basis, with 65% using the library's resources from their office and 50% visiting the library in person. Faculty rated magazines and journals as the most heavily used resources while 50% used books and 49% use electronic databases. The survey was helpful in assessing which library services are valued by faculty, and some promotion of other services will be initiated to help faculty understand what is available. Faculty had positive ratings of the library departments as a whole, but some concern was expressed by faculty on the limitations of the periodical collections in many disciplines, particularly the sciences.

The results of these two surveys (See Exhibits 5.1.8, 5.1.9) were reviewed at library staff meetings and were important considerations in setting goals for the future. The library assessment committee would like to survey students and faculty every 2-3 years, as well as conduct specialized surveys of user groups such as distance learners and students participating in library instruction to assess library services in those areas.

C “Use Statistics”
The library collects use statistics in many areas and monitors usage. Door counts (See Exhibit 3.1.18) are taken on a daily basis, as well as the number of reference desk questions (See Exhibit 5.1.19) and the actual usage of computers available to the general public (See Exhibit 5.1.20). In circulation, the number of items re-shelved (See Exhibit 5.1.21) is collected, and there is an abundance of data available through the Endeavor’s circulation module (See Exhibit 5.1.18). Library instruction classes (See Exhibit 5.1.2) are an important educational component for students in many disciplines and the number of classes and students attending are an important on-going statistic collected. In addition, there are document delivery services for off-campus students, as well as Interlibrary Loan services (See Exhibit 5.1.22) for students and faculty. The library regularly tracks usage of the library’s web pages (See Exhibit 5.1.23) and use statistics are employed to decide on the renewal of electronic databases. Occasionally, the usage of periodicals in the building is tracked on a daily basis to assess which periodicals are being used as well as the number of items reshelved. This usage study has also been very useful in making decisions regarding periodical subscription renewals or cancellations.

**Evaluation of the collection**

The library is not currently doing any systematic assessment of the collection. For several years, a new library faculty position was requested to focus on collection development, including assessment, but such a position has not been approved by the University administration. The library does not have a formal comprehensive “weeding plan,” although the Reference, Curriculum and Washington Docs collections were weeded during FY 2002/2003.

Every five years there is a review of the periodicals (See Exhibit 5.1.24) for each academic department to assess whether the collection is appropriate and meeting the needs of students and faculty. To prepare for specialized accreditation reviews, the library has been involved in reviewing the monograph and serials collections to see whether they are effective. In the past 5 years, religious studies, engineering, chemistry, business have all been through a program accreditation review.

**Foley Center Strengths, Weaknesses, and Next Steps**

**Strengths:**
- The library staff and faculty are service-oriented and dedicated to supporting the University community and its mission through its emphasis on “opening doors to a world of information with **EASE**: Environment, Access, Service, Education”.
- Foley Center is a spacious and comfortable facility that provides:
  - networked and wireless access
  - quiet study areas
  - group study rooms
  - a 24-hour student lounge
  - computer lab with Microsoft productivity software
  - special collections and rare book room
  - library instruction lab
  - teleconference center
• Adequate shelving for collection expansion

The library initiated a new biennial assessment cycle with student and faculty surveys in spring 2002. Coupled with the library’s previously ongoing annual review of goals and objectives, we have initiated the full cycle of assessment, review and new goal setting.

During FY 2002/2003, the library undertook an inventory of the collection, which may provide a foundation for a comprehensive collection assessment.

Responding to patron input the library initiated a popular books collection and moved the media collection from its previous closed stack status.

To support departmental external accreditation reviews, the library has been involved in reviewing the efficacy of the monograph and serials collections with departmental faculty. In the past 5 years program accreditation review has been completed for religious studies, engineering, chemistry and business. Each subject area’s periodical collection is reviewed once every five years.

The library has made a commitment to improving access to government documents collections by reclassifying and integrating the Washington and federal documents into the main collection.

The Library Committee provides opportunities for faculty input regarding library policies, resources and services.

Library staff participates in library planning processes through involvement in department and monthly staff meetings.

The library provides support to distance learners and off-campus programs.

Since FY2000, the library has dedicated a library faculty position to library instruction. The library’s instructional programs equip users with the tools to locate, evaluate, and synthesize information.

Weaknesses:

• The library is not currently systematically assessing the collection: the collection development policy has not been updated, collaboration with classroom faculty is uneven, the collection needs to be weeded and a comprehensive collection development plan does not exist.

• Due to the loss of three faculty and 2 staff positions in the past ten years, productivity and quality in some areas has declined, library departments have increasingly relied on student assistants to provide services and have limited the capacity to undertake new initiatives. Concomitantly, the library has seen a reduction of student hours due to minimum wage increases and a flat budget.

• Between 1998/1999 and 1999/2000 the monograph budget lines decreased 5% and then remained flat through 2003/2004 despite an annual average inflation rate of 4%. The periodical budget has been flat since 2000/2001 despite an annual inflation rate of 8%. In 2002/2003, Foley Center Library began participating in an Affinity Group benchmarking project with ten institutions of similar size and mission. For both 2002/2003 and 2003/2004, Gonzaga had the lowest per capita library acquisitions expenditures.

• The library’s culture of assessment is very young and vulnerable to disruption due to staffing shortages.
The library instruction program is not systematically integrated throughout the curriculum. Staffing and funding level limits the provision of instructional services to distance learners and University staff.

- The library has insufficient student collaborative space, especially study rooms, media rooms and area for group multimedia preparation.
- With rising student enrollment and larger class size, the current library instruction lab (Act Lab), is inadequate.
  - There are limited formalized avenues for input from students and University staff regarding policies, resources and services.
  - The library has no disaster plan.

**Next Steps**

1. Acknowledging the inconsistent collection assessment efforts current staffing allows, and desiring to evaluate and re-shape the collection to meet the changing needs of the University, the Foley Library’s goal is to develop a coordinated collection development program. Accordingly, in June 2004 the Library will make a significant reallocation of faculty resources. A senior faculty member will relinquish duties in the circulation department and begin the process of rigorous collection assessment and determination of current and projected academic departmental needs. This will be the first time that the collection will be the major focus of a faculty librarian position. The result will be a better use of limited book funds and a collection that has been shaped to meet the needs of today’s students and faculty.

2. The Library will continue to monitor staffing needs and advocate for faculty, staff and professional positions as needed.

3. The Library will continue to monitor and advocate for increased materials budget allocations. For the Fiscal Year 2004/05, the University has committed to an increase of 6% to all monographic budget lines and an 8% increase to the primary periodical budget line.

4. Web-accessible tutorials will be developed for use by both on-campus and off campus students, including distance learners. Additionally, the library will develop instructional materials in multiple formats to appeal to different kinds of learning styles.

5. The Library will identify and implement an assessment tool for student outcomes in library instruction.

6. A proposal has been submitted to have the lower level computer lab remodeled and enlarged for use as an instructional facility, while continuing to provide computer lab functions in non-scheduled periods. *(As of February 2004, this has been approved and funded.)*

7. The Library will install more public access workstations and include productivity software on all workstations. Additional laptops for student checkout will be purchased.

8. The Library will conduct student and faculty surveys in spring 2004 and have identified additional important constituencies to survey. Particular attention will be paid to methods of increasing input and participation from students and University staff.

9. The Library has identified a faculty member who will take a lead role in the development of a disaster recovery plan.
10. The Library will undertake a feasibility study to increase collaborative space.
STANDARD FIVE:
SCHOOL OF LAW CHASTEK LIBRARY AND COMPUTING CENTER

Purpose and Scope

Chastek Library’s mission is to support the educational, instructional, and research needs of Gonzaga University School of Law and Gonzaga University. The library also serves as a resource for the local Bar and Bench and the general public. The Law School has maintained its own library collection since the inception of the School in 1931, and all materials relevant to the teaching and practice of the Law are housed within it.

To support this mission, Chastek Library maintains a balanced, relevant collection of materials in a variety of formats, logically arranged and easily accessible. In developing the collection, the librarians are guided by the criteria set forth in the Library’s Collection Development Policy (See Exhibit 5.2.1). This Policy, in turn, takes into account the guidelines set forth in the American Bar Association (ABA) Accreditation Standards, and the mission and curriculum of the Law School.

The Library further supports this mission by providing reference and research support services designed to help faculty, staff, and students use the collection and to support their research and academic endeavors. Examples of services provided include reference and research support, bibliographic instruction, CALR training, and preparation of library handouts and user guides. In addition, the library is currently hiring a Faculty Services Librarian whose main focus will be on providing support for faculty scholarship.

Chastek Library also provides instructional media and computing support to the Law School community. Instructional support includes identifying, purchasing, and installing classroom technology as well as providing end user training and support. Computing support includes installing and managing the Law School network, fileservers, and desktop computers as well as providing training and desktop support.

Information Resources and Services

Chastek Library has a strong collection of print materials consisting of primary legal material including case decisions, federal and state codes, and federal and state regulations. It also contains many secondary sources ranging from legal encyclopedias to law reviews and scholarly treatises. In keeping with current trends, more and more resources are being made available electronically. The Library currently subscribes to Westlaw, Lexis/Nexis, and LoisLaw (among other electronic resources). Library materials are selected and deselected in accordance with the Library’s Collection Development Policy (See Exhibit 5.2.1), which was adopted by the Law School faculty in March 1997.

In addition to the core collection, the library has several other special collections including, a collection of documentary videos and movies with a legal theme for use in the classroom and for leisure viewing; the Harriet Clarke Memorial Collection emphasizing ethics and professionalism;
an Access to Justice collection designed to help the lay public locate materials relevant to their personal legal issues; a small collection of teaching materials designed to support the Institute on Law School Teaching (the “Institute”); and a small collection of practice materials for University Legal Assistance (the “Clinic”).

This collection of materials is significant. As reported in the 2003 ABA Annual Questionnaire, Chastek Library owns 274,172 volume and volume equivalents, and has 2,569 active serial subscriptions and 56,282 separate titles. In 2002/03, Chastek Library added 7,086 volumes and volume equivalents. The Chastek Library is a federal depository that selects 17.6% of available GPO documents. In its status as a federal depository, Chastek Library selects materials for Foley Center as well as for Chastek Library.

Between 1999/00 and 2002/03 the library’s budget was flat while inflation was rampant. During that time – because the library budget did not keep up with inflation – the library had to cancel many continuations. In 2003/04 the acquisition budget increased by $100,000. With these funds the library has been able to add new materials necessary to support new courses offered by the Law School and to maintain current subscriptions. The continuations of these monies into subsequent years will help the library to maintain its collection at a level necessary to support the Law School curriculum.

The library provides many services to help users access and use the collection. Most print items held by the library are cataloged using OCLC and arranged in the library either in alphabetical order or in Library of Congress call number order. The library catalog, which is shared with Foley Center, can be searched using the OPAC terminals in the library or from off site via the Internet. Access to electronic resources is available from the library web page. Library maps are available at every OPAC terminal and at the Circulation and Reference Desks. Reference Service is available 70 hours/week during the academic year and each Fall Semester, in conjunction with the Legal Research Writing Program, the librarians offer a basic library introduction course to all first year law students.

To help alert law faculty and students to the variety of services available, Chastek Library publishes yearly several users’ guides including, a Faculty User Guide, a Adjunct Faculty User Guide, and a Student User Guide (See Exhibits 5.2.2, 5.2.3 and 5.2.4, respectively). In addition, the library publishes a newsletter, On and Off Point, twice each semester (See Exhibit 5.2.5). This publication provides an update of current happenings in the library and is circulated to Law School faculty, staff, and students. Library policies and descriptions of services are also posted on the Library’s web site where they are easily accessible.

In developing the collection and services the Library staff is guided by feedback from faculty and students. Each year the Library surveys faculty and students to determine their satisfaction with current services and to elicit suggestions for additional services or improvements to current services (See Exhibits 5.2.6, 5.2.7). In addition, the Library maintains a Suggestion Box near the OPACs on the first floor. Results from the surveys and suggestions from patrons are used to plan future library services. Finally, the Library Committee, comprised of Law School faculty and students, offers guidance to the Director in creating library policy.
Facilities and Access

The Library’s facilities significantly improved when the Library moved into the new Law School Building in May 2000. The Library now is located on three floors in the new building. Patrons have access through the main entrance located on the first floor. All print materials, except a limited number of ready reference materials and reserve materials, are housed in open shelves located throughout the building. Reserve Materials are shelved behind the Circulation Desk. Microfilm and microfiche are housed in cabinets on the second floor. No materials are stored off-site.

The Library occupies 41,843 square feet and has 36,984 of linear feet of shelving capacity. Approximately 16,000 linear feet of shelving is unfilled. The Library has 155 carrel seats and 297 other types of seats for a total of 452 seats. This provides seating for over 70% of law students based on a student body of 630. In addition, the library also maintains a small, closed “faculty library” on the third floor. The faculty library is only available to faculty members. The library also maintains a small library of materials for the Institute and for the Clinic. The Clinic library is used by clinic faculty and students enrolled in clinic programs.

Equipment available for patron use in the Library includes four copy machines, two on the main floor and one each on the second and third floors; five OPAC terminals, two on the main floor and the second floor and one on the third floor. In addition, the Library owns two microfiche reader/printers. The Library also has tape players available for students to check out and VCR/DVD players in four study rooms. To support students’ computing needs the library has two computer labs with twenty computers in one lab and seventeen computers in the second lab. The first floor computer lab is set up to support computer training. In addition, the Law School, including the library, has numerous courtesy ports and a wireless system for students use, effectively allowing them to access the Law School network from any location in the Law School. The Library also maintains equipment to help student with visual difficulties by providing an enlarger for viewing printed materials. Various instructional media equipment, including computers, projectors, VCRs, cameras, is maintained in the classrooms (See Exhibit 5.2.8).

The library is open 110 hours/week during the academic year and 84 hours/week during interims. Reference is provided 70 hours/week during the academic year and 40 hours/week during interims. Instructional Media support is available during all hours classes are in session. Non-emergency computing support is available 54.5 hours/week during interims. Computing staff is on-call at all other times to respond to emergency situations. Library hours are extended during finals. The Library is open all days except: New Years Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day, and any other holidays that fall during an interim period, generally only Memorial Day (See Exhibit 5.2.9).

Personnel and Management
Currently the Library has four faculty librarian positions in addition to the Director. Two of these positions are now vacant. Of these two vacancies, the Library has permission to fill one. The Library is currently conducting a search to fill that position. All librarians have, as a minimum, an M.L.S. from an accredited library school. The Director, the Assistant Director of Public Services, and the successful candidate for the advertised vacant librarian position also must have a J.D. from an accredited Law School.

In addition to the librarian positions, the Library has three professional staff positions including the Circulation Supervisor, Head of Bibliographic and Collection Management, and Reference Librarian. The Library also has six paraprofessional positions, including two Circulation Assistants, two Technical Services Assistants, one Interlibrary Loan Assistant, and one Administrative Assistant to the Director.

Other Library personnel include four computing positions, Network Administrator, Computer Support Analyst, Computer Lab Technician, and Instructional Media Technologist. The Library also has one mail clerk who provides mail services to the Law School community.

All library personnel have current job descriptions that are updated on a regular basis to ensure that they accurately reflect the duties of each employee. Job descriptions contain listing of necessary competencies to adequately fill these positions (See Exhibit 5.2.10).

Different training opportunities are provided to the library staff throughout the year. Every year the library staff has a retreat that emphasizes training as well as long term planning. Each month the library staff members attend a library staff meeting which may also include some training on issues important to library operations. Outside opportunities for professional growth for librarians include: membership in AALL and WESTPAC, and funds to attend one conference/year. Opportunities for professional growth for staff include funds to attend the Washington Association of Library Employees annual meeting. Professional development opportunities for all employees include, as needed, OCLC training, Endeavor training, INCOL training, and Access training. Instructional Media and Computing staff members also receive training appropriate to their specific jobs.

The librarians participate in curriculum development at the Law School by attending faculty meetings and serving on Law School committees. Also, the Director and the Acquisitions Librarian meet with individual faculty members to determine what resources are needed to support courses taught in their subject areas. The librarians have been very active in working with the Legal Research and Writing instructors to ensure that the library has a sufficient collection to meets the needs of this program.

**Planning and Evaluation**

In 2003/04 the library is participating in the Law School’s long term planning process. The Director has been asked to provide the Dean of the Law School with information describing the present state of the library, the goals for the library over the next five to seven years, and identifying plans for achieving those goals. In addition, the library staff engages in day to day planning to insure that the Library’s resources and services meet the needs of the Law School
community. This planning takes place at several levels. The librarians and other professional staff meet weekly, and all the library staff members meet once a month to discuss library concerns. Once a year, the library staff holds a retreat. While some years the retreat focuses on training, in other years the focus is long range planning. In 2002/03 the focus of the library retreat was on the long term impact of electronic resources on acquisitions, reference, circulation, and collection maintenance. Also, as needed special committees are created to address specific issues as they arise. Two such committees were the Student Printing Committee and the Migration to Windows 2000 Committee. In addition, the Collection Development Librarian is currently updating the Collection Development Policy to reflect the impact of electronic resources on collecting library materials.

The Library’s planning process is informed by concerns of the faculty and students in several ways. All faculty librarians regularly attend Law School faculty meetings and serve on faculty committees. The Director meets with the Dean on a regular basis to discuss issues of concern to the library. The Law School’s Library Committee also meets each year. Each year the library staff surveys both the students and faculty. A suggestion box is kept in the Library and is used regularly by patrons. Information from these sources is used by the library staff when developing policies and procedures and developing services.

Next Steps

1. Continue to build and maintain a high-quality collection of legal research materials in all formats (print and electronic) adequate to serve the curricular and scholarly needs of the law school faculty and students.
2. Identify and use new cataloging standards and technologies to ensure that users can easily locate and retrieve material regardless of format.
3. Enhance the Chastek Library’s web site to make it easier for users to locate external electronic resources.
4. With the addition of the Faculty Services Librarian, identify and implement new services designed to support faculty scholarship.
5. Develop ongoing instructional programs to teach students and faculty members how to use library materials.
6. Enhance the Chastek Library’s web site so that it meets the needs of current students and faculty members and also represents the Law School well to the general public, potential students, and other law schools.
7. Identify additional resources to handle the increased demand for instructional media support from our own Law School community and from the wider community of users that now views the Law School as their venue of choice for outside events.
8. Maintain up-to-date, easy to use Audio/Visual equipment in the classroom to meet the teaching needs of the faculty.
9. Ensure that the Law School maintains an up-to-date, secure network and fast, efficient desktop computers for end users by developing and implementing plans to respond to the greater need for security as hackers and viruses become even more prevalent in the computing world.
10. Develop and implement a plan to adequately meet the growing demand for computing support as students use their own laptops at the Law School.
11. Ensure that the Chastek Library has sufficient, competent staff to adequately provide the many services offered to the Law School Community.
STANDARD FIVE: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

Purpose & Scope

Information Technology Services (ITS) imagines, guides, and maintains the technology infrastructure for Gonzaga University. The ITS division is comprised of three departments: Central Computing and Network Services (CCNS), Desktop Support Services (DSS), and Instructional Technology Service and Support (ITSS). The division provides imagination, support, and service to all areas of the institution and to all constituents: faculty, staff, students, and alumni.

The penetration of technology in higher education and the reliance of institutions on it have changed greatly since 1994. The development of Gonzaga University’s technology infrastructure and services during this period has been consistent with the scope and rate of development on other campuses. Notable are changes to the University’s information management system, the extension of its network infrastructure, and the implementation of a content management system for the University’s web site.

In April of 1995, the University reassessed its decision to develop an internal means of integrating separate [administrative] enterprise data systems, and instead purchased and implemented an off-the-shelf solution (the SCT Banner software). At about that same time, the University initiated the extension of its network to all major buildings on campus, including residence halls, a project that was completed in the summer of 1997. This was accomplished, in part, through the introduction of a technology fee that was (and is) assessed to all full-time, main campus students (with the exception of those at the School of Law).

Up until approximately four years ago, the functions of the library dean and the chief information officer were combined in a single position, the Associate Academic Vice President for Information Technology. The two functions were then separated. Various events prevented the University from immediately appointing a Chief Information Officer (CIO) when the position was created. Leadership issues were resolved in the summer of 2002. Today, both the Dean of Library Services, and the Chief Information Officer, report separately to the academic vice president.

During this interim period, the Board of Trustees, primarily through the members of the Board’s technology subcommittee, strongly and consistently urged the administration to resolve the technology leadership issue. [The development of campus-wide internet access, as well as strong leadership in the technology area, has been strongly and consistently endorsed by the University’s Board of Trustees. In addition, early in his tenure the current President constituted a “Structures, Access, and Technology Strategic Plan” subcommittee which was charged with the responsibility for prioritizing, and identifying funding for, technology needs (see Exhibit 5.3.1). This prioritization process helped to shape the direction for technology development, and several of the first level priorities were addressed by the institution.] Upon appointment of the CIO, the Board’s technology subcommittee urged the creation of a strategic plan for technology. The President has been an unguarded supporter of the CIO, the strategic plan that has emerged, and has been energetic and creative in developing funding for the plan.
Services

A core set of Gonzaga’s technologies constitute the infrastructure upon which more specific applications and services rely. These include the University’s connection to the Internet, the University’s local area network (LAN), and various hardware platforms and application servers.

The University’s Internet connection is available to all faculty, staff, and students. ITS monitors and maintains a connection of sufficient capacity to support the mission of the University. The amount and constitution of traffic in and out of campus is monitored and increases to available bandwidth are made when appropriate. ITS, by policy, respects the privacy of all constituents and does not inspect the content of network traffic or the destination of that traffic. ITS does, however, recognize that bandwidth is a limited commodity and does shape traffic to best support the University’s mission.

The University is working toward a 100 mbs switched LAN. All buildings are connected by fiber and there is Category 5e copper in most buildings. Unswitched network devices are still common, but are replaced when the network typology indicates and when funds allow. ITS directly manages or advises on all enterprise level applications. This includes the University’s business system, e-mail, web services, and library catalogue.

ITS’ services to the academic community includes management of the University’s student information system, student e-mail system, course management system, classroom presentation equipment, distance education facilities, and multimedia production facilities. In addition, the staff of ITSS, DSS, and CCNS collaborates on developing and delivering training to faculty and staff on their use.

Direct support for the end-users of these services comes through the University help desk and by service calls to users by staff technicians. The help desk serves and takes calls for all three departments of ITS and triages those calls. Many calls – close to 80% that come in to the Help Desk – do not generate a work order, but are handled over the phone. Technicians from DSS and other areas resolve the remaining end-user issues and provide on-site training when appropriate. Outside of the Help Desk, the University does not provide end-user services for student-owned computers.

Management & Planning

ITS directors are guided by a number of different committees representing different constituents and addressing various issues. The CIO is advised by an Academic Computing Committee and a Student Computing Committee. Members of the former committee are faculty members, selected by their academic deans. This committee identifies the technology issues facing faculty, makes recommendations, and helps in the assessment of the ITS division. Members of the Student Computing Committee are appointed by the Gonzaga Student Body Association (GSBA, the student government) and play a similar role.
A Web Steering Committee is chaired by the director of DSS. This committee decides policy for both the University’s Internet web site and its Intranet web site. This committee also guides web site development. An Administrative Computing Committee advises the director of CCNS on issues affecting the University’s business applications.

A committee of University vice presidents, along with a faculty representative and a student representative comprise the University’s Information Technology Council. This committee represents the broadest interests of the University and helps to guide the allocation of scarce technology resources. Last, a Regents and Trustees Technology Committee represents the interests of technology and technology development to the Board of Trustees.

The overall development of technology on the Gonzaga University campus is embodied in the Information Technology Strategic Plan (See Exhibit 5.3.2). This plan identifies critical issues and needs in the development of technology over the next 5 to 10 years.

**Resources**

Like most institutions of its size, technology resources can be found with in the ITS budget and with in the budgets of many other areas. This is a reflection of the diverse operations and unique challenges of the many departments, schools, offices, and divisions that make up Gonzaga University.

For the 2002 – 2003 academic year, Gonzaga University allocated 4.6% of its operating budget to technology. This represents all funds budgeted for technology, whether inside of ITS or in other areas of the University. The national average for Masters I institutions is 5%. This does not necessarily mean the technology is under-funded, as the level of funding for technology should reflect the University’s strategic plan and goals. Of these funds, about 1/3 are in the ITS budget and the remaining 2/3 are in the budgets of other offices (throughout the institution). In response to the recently developed strategic plan for technology and in recognition of the University’s increasing reliance on technology, the President has recommended to the Board of Trustees an increase in funds for ITS.

Forty-three people in the University have positions designated as technology positions. Thirty-six of these are within ITS. The Law School, School of Business, and the College of Arts and Sciences are amongst those areas with specialized technology needs and, therefore, with dedicated IT staff. Cooperation and collaboration amongst all staff is good. The Technical Advisors Group and the Active Directory Group are two campus wide organizations that bring technology specialists from across campus together to resolve issues of common interest.

**Assessment & Evaluation**

The assessment of the state of technology and the efforts of ITS is guided by ITS’ assessment plan. This plan calls for benchmarking of IT resources and services against appropriate peers, the regular assessment and evaluation of ITS by key constituents, and bi-annual reviews by an external evaluator.
Both the Academic Computing Committee and the Student Computing Committee have developed surveys of both the effectiveness of ITS efforts and of opinion on timely issues. Both surveys are administered annually. The results are shared with the committees for discussion and with area directors for action. Survey results inform ITS about the effectiveness of current practices and services and guides strategy and tactics.

ITS also participates in a number of national surveys of information technology departments in higher education. These surveys help inform ITS about its general level of resources and about resource allocation. It also provides important data about services offered and standard industry practices.

Last, ITS conducts an annual review by an external evaluator. This evaluator is usually the CIO of another US Jesuit University or college of a size roughly equivalent to our own. These reviews may, or may not, include a request to focus on particular areas or issues. The overall format of the review is left to the discretion of the evaluator, (See Exhibit 5.3.3).

**Next Steps**

1) The recently-proposed increase to technology funding will bring the University to a level that is about equal with spending for comparable institutions nationwide. However, the adequacy of funding for technology is more appropriately dictated by the overall strategic plan of the University and not by such benchmarks. The University needs to clearly articulate, in the institution’s Strategic Plan, the role that technology will play in its future – and fund that role accordingly.

2) Related to the first point, key questions remain in the academy that are crucial to technology development. In particular, the academy needs to engage and answer questions about its future in distance education, and in on-line courses and programs, so that appropriate planning can take place. The current technology strategic plan does not call for efforts in this area and current resources will not support significant expansion.

3) ITS must develop a year-by-year tactical plan as to how it will use newly-identified funding to achieve its strategic goals.
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STANDARD FIVE EXHIBITS- CHASTEK LIBRARY

5.2.1 Chastek Library's Collection Development Policy
5.2.2 Chastek Library Faculty User Guide
5.2.3 Chastek Library Adjunct Faculty User Guide
5.2.4 Chastek Library Student User Guide
5.2.5 On and Off Point Newsletters
5.2.6 Chastek Library Annual Student User Survey and Results
5.2.7 Chastek Library Annual Faculty User Survey and Results
5.2.8 What Have We Done for You Lately? Publication
5.2.9 Chastek Library Hours Schedule
5.2.10 Chastek Library Job Descriptions
5.2.11 Chastek Library Floor Map
5.2.12 Chastek Patron Count and Reference Statistics
5.2.13 LEXIS/NEXIS Usage Reports
5.2.14 Chastek Library ABA Statistics and Surveys
5.2.15 Chastek Library Seating Data
5.2.16 Chastek Library Shelving Capacity
5.2.17 Chastek Item Listing By Work Station
5.2.18 Chastek Library Telephone Numbers and Contact List
5.2.19 Chastek Budget Analysis
5.2.20 Chastek Faculty Vitae
5.2.21 GU Network and Computer Resource Acceptable Use Policy with School of Law Addendum
5.2.22 Chastek Library and Computing Long Range Planning
5.2.23 Moving Towards 2000 Law School Publication

STANDARD FIVE EXHIBITS- INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

5.3.1 Subcommittee on Structures, Access and Technology Strategic Plan
5.3.2 Information Technology Strategic Plan, July 2003
5.3.3 SCT/Banner Assessment Consulting Report, October 2003
5.3.4 COSTS Survey Results
STANDARD SIX: GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Governance Structure

The University is governed by a Board of Trustees, which has the responsibility of maintaining Gonzaga as an institution of higher education in the Catholic, Jesuit tradition. The Trustees have final authority for the governance of the University in all matters within the limits set forth in the University’s By-laws (Exhibit 6.12).

The Members of the Corporation are the legal owners of the University. Membership is comprised of the Rector of the Gonzaga Jesuit Community (ex officio), his four official “consultors” (ex officio), and four other Jesuits elected by the Members from among Jesuits assigned to administrative, faculty, or staff duties at the University.

The University's Board of Regents is an advisory body to the President and the Board of Trustees. Regents are nominated by the President and/or the New Regent Committee to serve three-year terms and – with the exception of Faculty, Student, and Staff Regents – are eligible for re-election. The Regents meet three times each year, normally in conjunction with Board of Trustee meetings.

The organizational structure of the University is diagrammed at Exhibit 6.1. Gonzaga University is not part of a multi-unit governance system.

The University is operated under the authority and procedures outlined in the following documents:

- The Amended and Supplemental Articles of Incorporation, which establish the organization and purpose of the University (Exhibit 6.11)
- The By-laws of the University, which give the Board of Trustees the authority and responsibility for governance, and which define the role of the University's officers (President, Vice Presidents, and the Corporation Counsel) (Exhibit 6.12)
- The Board of Trustees' Statement of Governance Principles (Exhibit 6.13)
- The Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 6.14)
- The Faculty Assembly Constitution (Exhibit 6.15)
- The Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual (Exhibit 6.16)
- The By-laws of the Staff Assembly of Gonzaga University (Exhibit 6.17)
- The Constitution of the Gonzaga Student Body Association (GSBA) (Exhibit 6.20)
- The By-laws and Constitution of the Student Bar Association (Exhibit 6.21)
- The Constitution of the Graduate Student Council (Exhibit 6.22)

Each of these documents is available as part of the Exhibits for Standard Six. The University's Trustees, officers, faculty, staff, and students understand and fulfill their roles as outlined in the foregoing governing documents.
During the past several years, the Board of Trustees has been engaged in intensive discussion and policy development regarding its role and the principles by which it governs the institution. The recently-adopted Statement of Governance Principles (Exhibit 6.13) is but one product of this ongoing process. Governance and the Board's relationships – not only to the University administration, staff, and faculty, but to the Society of Jesus and the Oregon Province – are the subject of regular and ongoing attention.

While some members of the University administration believe that the various campus constituencies are appropriately involved and consulted in key areas of decision- and policy-making; the extent to which members of these constituencies find such opportunities to be either adequate or effective is an issue that awaits resolution. Members of the Faculty Senate, in particular, are concerned about the degree to which faculty are (or are not) consulted or meaningfully involved in governance. The Faculty Senate has, in a recent set of resolutions, requested the ability to appoint faculty to specific Trustee committees – and to the Board itself – a request which has been considered but thus far not approved (see Standard Four, Exhibit 4.17).

In recognition of the unique role of the University’s faculty, the Board of Trustees has taken steps to provide opportunities for more direct faculty input, particularly into the deliberations of various Board committees through faculty liaisons. Additionally, members of the Faculty Senate are invited to meet periodically with the Board's Academic Policy Committee and the President of the Faculty Senate meets with the Trustees at the Board’s first meeting of the academic year. This is an opportunity for the President to present faculty plans, concerns and other information to the Board.

Regent members of the faculty do serve on various governance committees as well. Forums for current involvement and consultation include the following:

- The President's Cabinet (Vice Presidents and Counsel) meets approximately every two weeks.
- The President's Cabinet meets with the academic deans at least once each semester.
- The Council of Deans, which includes the Academic Vice President and the academic deans, meets monthly. Additionally, the Academic Vice President's Council, which includes the academic deans, the deans of Admission and Student Life, the Director of the International Student Programs, a faculty representative, the Associate Vice President for Diversity, and the associate academic vice presidents also meet once each month.
- The deliberations of the Academic Council, which is the principal advisory body on academic policies and procedures, programs and planning. The members of the Council include the major academic officers of the University, faculty members elected by the Faculty Assembly, and representatives of the GSBA.
- Faculty and department chair meetings in College of Arts and Sciences and similar meetings in the professional schools.
- Meetings of various University officials (primarily the Academic Vice President) and the Faculty Senate; meetings with the officers of the Staff Assembly; meetings with the entire Faculty Assembly and the Staff Assembly; and meetings with officers of the GSBA. The President also meets periodically with interested students during his "Fireside Chats."
- Faculty, staff and student members of the University's Board of Regents serve as voting
members of that body and of the standing committees of the Board of Trustees on which they serve. In addition, the Academic Policy Committee meets on a regular basis with Faculty Assembly representatives as does the Student Life Committee with representatives of the GSBA.

- The President of the Faculty Senate meets annually with the entire Board of Trustees. Faculty liaisons to the Board’s Academic Policy, Finance, Long-Term Planning and Student Life committees help assure appropriate faculty input. Additionally, luncheon meetings and social events for Trustees and faculty members are arranged by the administration and the leadership of the Board of Trustees. These efforts are intended to improve communication and understanding between the Board and the University’s faculty.

Internal communication is further facilitated by the following:

- The President and the Vice President for Finance schedule multiple meetings each semester to review financial and other information of interest to the Gonzaga community (see Exhibit 6.23).
- Spirit, the faculty/staff newsletter, is published monthly from September through May (see Exhibit 6.24).
- Various email list serves are maintained. The Academic Vice President has been encouraged by the Faculty Assembly to communicate regularly with faculty in this manner.
- Policy and informational memos are distributed by campus mail and the email system.
- The Gonzaga Quarterly, The Annual Report of the President and a variety of departmental newsletters are distributed to members of the University community (see Exhibits 6.25 and 6.26).
- Take Notice, an electronic informational bulletin, is issued weekly by the Public Relations office (see Exhibit 6.27).
- The Gonzaga News Bureau, a component of the Public Relations Office, maintains list serves by which it issues over 300 news releases on a variety of University topics each year. This service plays a rather significant role in internal and external communications.
- The Gonzaga Bulletin, the weekly student newspaper, serves to keep the entire campus informed of significant events (see examples at Exhibit 6.28).

Analysis and Appraisal

While it is clear that the University's Board of Trustees has the ultimate authority, Gonzaga's governance system provides opportunities for broad participation by various constituencies. The University is structured to facilitate communication through meetings, publications and electronic means.

In virtually every complex organization, completely effective communication is an elusive ideal. Certainly, Gonzaga's growth over the past few years has made communication more challenging. Many faculty and staff members assert they are not well-informed regarding University financial, planning, and decision-making matters, while – at the same time – key administrators lament the fact that most faculty and staff members do not avail themselves of multiple opportunities to
attend meetings where these matters are thoroughly discussed. The University community must continue to strive to improve the various communication systems and members must commit to attending and participating in informational opportunities.

Many faculty members do not feel they are adequately consulted in appropriate areas of decision and policy making, including resource allocation. The University's Academic Vice President has devoted considerable attention to improving communication with the Faculty Assembly and its elected officers relative to this and other matters of particular concern to faculty. Faculty, staff and students do serve on key committees of the University, including its Budget Committee and, as previously indicated, on the Board of Regents and on standing committees of the Board of Trustees. These Trustee committees formulate policy recommendations for Board consideration.

The effectiveness of internal written and email communications clearly needs to be improved. The monthly *Spirit* publication is widely read, but serves as a very limited source of internal information about the University. The potential of enhanced internal and external communication via the web has yet to be realized.

**Next Steps**

- The University must undertake a comprehensive assessment of its communication strategies, seeking improvement in participation and effectiveness, especially in the solicitation of student, staff, and faculty input in planning; and in dialogue about plans and decisions that are or will be implemented. The administration will give priority attention to these ongoing efforts to enhance international communication.
- The Faculty Assembly has recently revised its communication strategies to assure more effective communication among faculty and with the University administration. The Assembly will continue monitor communication effectiveness.
- The University administration will continue redevelopment of the University's Web site, enabling it to better support educational, administration, and communication strategies.

**The Governing Board**

The University's Board of Trustees is currently composed of 30 elected members and the President of the University, who is a member ex-officio. The Trustees receive no compensation for their services. With the exception of three Jesuit Trustees, who are nominated and elected by the Members of the Corporation, Board members are nominated by the Committee on Trustees and include men and women of diverse backgrounds. The By-laws require that three of the Board-elected Trustees be members of the Society of Jesus. The Trustees serve four-year terms of office. They may be elected for additional terms if nominated by the Committee on Trustees. The three Jesuit Trustees elected by the Members may also serve additional terms.

The University's By-laws establish specific policies for continuity and change of Board membership (see Exhibit 6.12).

The Board of Trustees' duties and authority are specified in the Amended and Supplemental Articles of Incorporation (Exhibit 6.11), the By-laws of the University (Exhibit 6.12), and the
Statement of Governance Principles (Exhibit 6.13). Among the Board's tasks are the following:

- To set the University’s Mission and Purpose
- To establish and periodically review/revise the institution’s Bylaws
- To select, appoint, and annually evaluate the President of the University
- To approve both the establishment and elimination of all major academic programs
- To oversee the University's endowment
- To establish policies necessary for the development and administration of the University
- To approve the annual budget and the financial audit of the University
- To ensure long-range financial planning
- To assist in obtaining capital and operating funds
- To review and approve all substantive changes in institutional policies and educational or public service programs
- To ensure that the University is organized and staffed to fulfill its Mission
- To evaluate the performance of the Board itself and monitor the effectiveness of policies
- To delegate responsibility for management to the administration
- To preserve institutional independence, to be aware of the University's accreditation status and be involved, as appropriate, in the accrediting process
- In all of its responsibilities, to observe and follow the Statement of Best Practices of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), which in particular part require the Board to:
  - Support the President
  - Insist on Strategic Planning
  - Ensure good management
  - Ensure adequate resources

Board decisions on these matters are final and not subject to review, and occur only by a majority vote of a quorum of Trustees. While the Trustee standing and ad hoc committees assist the Board in exercising its responsibilities and in policy formulation, the Board acts only as a committee of the whole. No member or committee of the Board acts in place of the Trustees except by formal delegation of authority.

The Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Assistant Secretary are elected annually by the Board of Trustees. The vice presidents of the University and other key administrators serve as staff officers for the standing and most ad hoc committees. The President of the University, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board are ex-officio members of every committee. A list and description of the standing committees is included at Exhibit 6.2. The membership of these committees can be found at Exhibit 6.3.

The Board of Trustees meets six times a year in February, April, July, September, October and December. The February session is an extended Board retreat, which encourages greater reflection on major topics of consideration. Trustee committees normally meet in conjunction with Board meetings and at other times as needed. During the general sessions of each meeting, the President of the University and the chair of each committee reports on activities and brings issues forward for Trustee consideration and action. Exhibit 6.4 provides a list of the major agenda items for each of the Board meetings. Currently, the Board is considering both the
establishment of its Governance Committee as a standing (versus ad hoc) committee, as well as
the elimination of one of its regular meetings (September).

The Board of Trustees has utilized the Association of Governing Boards’ self-assessment
questionnaire to help evaluate its performance. More recently, a Board Governance Committee
was appointed by the Chair to review Board operations and to recommend, where necessary,
adoption of AGB “best practices.” A Trustee Governance Workshop was facilitated by an AGB
representative in July 2002. The outcomes of this workshop include the adoption of the Board’s
Statement of Governance Principles (Exhibit 6.13), and the crafting and distribution of a Board
of Trustee Review and Board Member Assessment questionnaire (Exhibit 6.13a) in November
2003. The results of this self-assessment instrument will be a major focus of the Board’s
February 2004 retreat.

One of the most important responsibilities of the Board of Trustees is the hiring of the President
of the University and the Board’s ongoing relationship with him. The Chair of the Board meets
formally and privately with the President every spring relative to his performance. The Chair and
Vice Chair also meet with the President prior to each Board meeting and informally as may be
required. The Board delegates to the President the responsibility for the effective and efficient
management of the University, and for its organization and staffing.

A comprehensive Conflict of Interest Policy was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1987, and
was revised in February 2000. A copy of the current policy statement is included as Exhibit 6.5.
Trustees, senior administrators, and certain members of the Board of Regents are required to
complete an annual conflict of interest questionnaire.

Analysis and Appraisal

The Board has clear, well-developed By-laws that guide its operation and activity, and through its
committees, the Board is actively engaged in the life and affairs of the University. It delegates
authority to the President and to the other officers of the University as appropriate.

Gonzaga has attracted outstanding community leaders to its Board (Exhibit 6.6). The Trustees
contribute generously of their time, talent, and financial resources. Board members have
contributed in excess of $60 million to the University. Meetings are very well attended. Some
former Board members continue their formal affiliation with the University as Trustees Emeriti.
For the past several years, the Chair of the Board of Trustees has served two one-year terms.
Five former Board Chairs continue to serve as Trustees. There is, however, a need for additional
representation of women and ethnic minorities on the Board. Currently there are only four
women, and no members of a minority group.

Next Steps:

- The Board of Trustees recognizes that there is a need for increased diversity on the
  Board. Therefore, as new Board positions become available, the Committee on Trustees
  is committed to making its best efforts to recruit ethnic minorities (especially individuals
  who are representative of the University community), and women.
- The Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate will review the effectiveness of the liaison
relationship to key Board committees. This evaluation should be completed by July 2005.

**Leadership and Management**

The University's President, the Rev. Robert J. Spitzer, S.J., was appointed to this full-time position by the Board of Trustees in 1998.

The duties, responsibilities, and ethical conduct requirements of administrators are clearly defined and published. Brief resumes for the President, the members of his Cabinet and the academic deans are included as Exhibit 6.7. Resumes for other administrators, together with copies of annual performance reviews, are kept on file by the appropriate supervisor and Human Resources. Annual employee performance reviews are required. Human Resources is continually working to increase the level of participation across the University with regard to performance appraisals. The standardized performance appraisal portion of the Gonzaga's performance management system is relatively new to the University's culture.

The Board of Trustees has the responsibility and authority to evaluate the President. This is accomplished on an annual basis jointly by the Chair of the Board and the Committee on Trustees.

In February 1999, the University's Board of Trustees adopted a revised Conflict of Interest Policy for all employees of the University (Exhibit 6.8). The President, members of his Cabinet, the deans and other major offices of the University are required to complete a conflict of interest questionnaire each year (Exhibit 6.9). There has been no recent evidence of employee actions in conflict with these policy provisions.

The academic deans have dual roles as both administrators and as members of the faculty. The deans are responsible for the development of academic policy and its application within their academic division. They maintain communication within their division by meeting regularly with the faculty, and they assist in representing faculty views to the vice presidents and President. Due to its large size, the College of Arts and Sciences has 16 departments, each headed by a department chair. The department chairs are elected by their faculty colleagues and are appointed by the Dean. The department chairs and directors of major programs meet regularly as a group with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The University is currently engaged in a comprehensive capital campaign, “Educating People the World Needs Most,” which is directly related to the University's Mission and Goals. The $119 million campaign was announced in May 2002. The campaign goals were identified following a comprehensive, University-wide needs assessment and goal setting process in which all University constituencies were invited to participate. The Board of Trustees carefully considered the distinct Mission areas when establishing priorities for fundraising, and the final campaign goals were approved by the University's President and Board of Trustees.

The University's planning process allows for careful assessment of options, thoughtful planning, and informed and timely decision-making. One of the measures included in the annual administrative performance review process assesses decision-making effectiveness. When shortcomings are identified, appropriate action plans are developed jointly by the administrator
and his or her immediate supervisor.

The organizational structure and regularly-scheduled meetings facilitate and encourage coordination and communication among organizational units. These include the President's Cabinet (which meets every two weeks), the Academic Council (which meets monthly), the Academic Deans' Council (which meets monthly with the Academic Vice President), and the Academic Vice President's Council (which also meets on a monthly basis).

In recent years, Gonzaga University has had no organized approach to institutional research; different area directors take responsibility for the preparation and distribution of research reports. Many reports, such as those on the budget or enrollment, are routinely prepared and are distributed to all affected parties. More specialized reports are prepared on demand. In fall 2003, the University appointed a Director of Institutional Research, Ms. Jolanta Kozyra, who is currently in the process of developing an organizational model for the institutional research effort at the University.

**Appointment Policies and Salaries**

Policies, procedures, and criteria for administrative and staff appointment, evaluation, retention, promotion, and/or termination are published in the University’s Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, which is provided to each employee at the time of hire (Exhibit 6.16). Members of the faculty are provided a copy of the Faculty Handbook, which contains policies applicable to the University’s faculty. The University annually conducts a review of its salary and benefits programs to help assure they are competitive and consistent with other colleges and universities, and with compensation packages offered by other Spokane-area private employers. Annual salary adjustments are designed to advance the ability of the University to hire, retain and promote the best possible faculty, administrators and staff members. The annual salary adjustments are generally based on satisfactory employee performance, length of service at the University, and market conditions. The University is currently implementing further improvements in employee retirement benefits. Funding constraints will require a multi-year phase-in of this program.

In October 1998, the University constituted an organization whose purpose is to contribute to the success of the University through promotion of a positive and supportive work environment for its staff [i.e., non-faculty] employees. This entity, known as the Staff Assembly, has met and worked consistently since that time to facilitate communication amongst the staff, and between staff members and the administration. It periodically surveys the employee population to ascertain its perspective regarding such matters as compensation, supervision, and performance evaluation; through its liaison, these views are shared with the President’s Cabinet and, where appropriate and possible, responses are provided. Evidence of the Staff Assembly’s endeavors is available as Exhibits 6.17, 6.18 and 6.19.

**Analysis and Appraisal**

During the five years of Fr. Robert Spitzer's administration, the Board of Trustees and University's administrative team have returned Gonzaga to a solid financial footing, have expanded its regional and national visibility and increased enrollments. Entering students have
achieved consistently higher levels of educational excellence as evidenced by higher SAT/ACT scores, class standing and high school G.P.A. The University has also fared well in various national rankings, including the U.S. News & World Report annual rating of institutions.

Many faculty members perceive a need for greater opportunity for inclusion in the decision-making process. The Trustees, the President and the Academic Vice President are addressing this matter together with the deans and representatives of the Faculty Assembly. Key, from the Board's perspective, is a need for common understanding by all regarding the principles by which the Board governs the institution. Effective communication is always a challenge, and on various issues there are usually some constituencies who do not feel well represented, particularly if they disagree with the direction taken by the University leadership. Members of the Cabinet, the deans and department heads continue efforts to improve communication between divisions, departments and schools. This effort must be given a very high priority.

There has been some degree of frustration relative to the University’s decentralized approach to institutional research. For example, University fund raisers often find it necessary to initiate contacts with multiple departments in order to gather the data required for foundation grant proposals. It is clear that public relations, student recruitment, alumni relations and other functions benefit from a centralized information source. Partially in response to this need, the University has appointed a Director of Institutional Research.

Next Steps:

- Cabinet members, deans and directors will devise a specific plan to improve internal communication.
- Enhanced communication goals will be included in all departmental planning processes.
- The University administration will continue to monitor the effectiveness of institutional research.

Faculty Role in Governance

Faculty members are primarily involved in institutional governance through service on University committees. Members of the faculty also serve on various important committees within their academic units. Additionally, three members of the faculty serve as voting members of the University's Board of Regents, the primary advisory body to the President and Board of Trustees. Additionally, members of the Faculty Assembly have been appointed as liaisons to key Trustee committees and faculty representatives meet at least annually with the Academic Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees. As indicated above, the President of the Faculty Senate meets annually with the entire Board of Trustees. Luncheon meetings and social events for Trustees and faculty members are planned by the administration and the leadership of the Board of Trustees. These efforts are intended to further improve communication and understanding between the Board and the University’s faculty.

A brief description of the major standing committees of the University is included as Exhibit 6.10.
Analysis and Appraisal

Gonzaga's faculty is engaged in the University's governance primarily through the work of the University's committees. At times, there has not been agreement between faculty members and the administration about what issues, when, and how faculty should be involved. However, both are clearly willing to address both the substance of the issues and the decision making process to increase the faculty's sense of collaboration and confidence in the decisions.

Fr. Robert Spitzer's appointment as President by Gonzaga's Board of Trustees in 1998 came at a critical juncture in the University's history. Fr. Bernard Coughlin had served very ably as President for 22 years, from 1974 to 1996. However, his successor, who was selected by the Board of Trustees to replace Fr. Coughlin, resigned after only one year as President. The Trustees appointed an Acting President, who served during 1997-1998, while they searched for a leader who could address a host of serious challenges facing the University, including significant enrollment declines and operating deficits. Fr. Spitzer assumed his responsibilities with a clear mandate from the Board to provide a revitalized vision for the University, to give priority attention to financial and enrollment matters, and to enhance Gonzaga's sagging image. Under Fr. Spitzer's Leadership, enrollments have significantly increased, financial stability has been restored and Gonzaga has become well-known nationally and internationally.

Fr. Spitzer's remarkable achievements have been widely recognized and appreciated by both internal and external constituencies. Nevertheless, members of the University's faculty, particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences, have expressed concern relative to a number of specific issues. These include the faculty staffing levels required to serve higher enrollments, faculty hiring policies, the University's Speakers Policy and other matters. Fr. Spitzer, the University's Academic Vice President, Dr. Stephen Freedman, and officers of the Faculty Senate continue to meet regularly to address these and other faculty concerns. The Board of Trustees is also involved in many of these deliberations through its standing and ad hoc committee structure. While these discussions have on occasion been tense, the issues are being addressed with energetic resolve by all participants.

In conclusion, Gonzaga has been returned to a solid financial footing. The University's regional and national visibility has been expanded, undergraduate enrollments have reached record levels, and Gonzaga has achieved higher levels of educational excellence. These accomplishments would have been impossible without the extraordinary efforts of the University’s dedicated faculty and staff.

Next Steps:

- The President, Academic Vice President, other key members of the administration, members of the faculty and the Board of Trustees will continue to address areas of faculty concern.
- The Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate will review the effectiveness of the liaison relationship to key Board committees. This evaluation should be completed by July 2005.
Student Role in Governance

Students’ role in institutional governance is made manifest principally through student government. For undergraduate and non-law graduates, this organization is known as the Gonzaga Student Body Association (GSBA). The Constitution of the Gonzaga Student Body Association provides that all Gonzaga University students who have paid the current Activity Fee are members of the GSBA.

The President of the GSBA serves as the chief liaison between the GSBA and the faculty and administration of the University. The legislative power of the GSBA is vested in the Student Forum, which gives voice to student concerns. GSBA officers and Student Forum committees meet with administrators to give input on policies and procedures and to resolve issues brought to the attention of student government by its constituents.

An equally important responsibility of the student government is to allocate funds generated by the Student Life Fee. These funds are distributed each year by the GSBA, through its Budget Advisory Committee, to clubs, the student government itself, and to other projects that benefit students. (See also Standard Three.)

The Residence Hall Association of Gonzaga University (RHA) promotes the interests of students who reside in the University's residence halls. The RHA functions as a policy advisory group to the University's Office of Housing and Residence Life and it allocates funds for cultural, educational, social and community-building events. Additionally, the RHA provides direct resident student involvement in the governing of the University's residence halls.

The Student Bar Association (SBA) consists of all students who are enrolled in the University's School of Law (see Exhibit 6.21). The SBA is the student body representative organization. The purpose of the SBA is to encourage and enhance the academic and social environment for law students. The SBA sponsors a variety of activities which all students are encouraged to attend. The SBA also disperses funds to law school organizations to provide opportunities for academic and social interaction. The Student Bar Association Board is composed of five Executive Officers and nine Class Representatives. The SBA Executive Officers are the President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and the ABA/LSD Representative. The SBA President is the official representative to the administration of the School of Law and represents the SBA at law school faculty meetings, and serves on various school committees.

The Dean of the School of Law meets monthly with all law student organizations and students serve on both the Student Affairs and Academic Affairs committees.

The Graduate Student Council (GSC, see Exhibit 6.22) consists of graduate students who advise the Vice President for Student Life and the Academic Vice President on matters of graduate education. The GSC serves as a channel for student concerns regarding graduate education and graduate student life.

Four students, two of whom are undergraduates, one graduate student and one law student serve as voting members of the University’s Board of Regents, the primary advisory body to the President and the Board of Trustees. Student Regents currently serve on the Academic Policy,
Student Life, and the Finance committees of the Board of Trustees. Additionally, GSBA officers meet regularly with the Board’s Student Life Committee.

Students are also elected or appointed to many of the University Committees referenced above. These include the Academic Council, the Athletic Council, the Budget Committee, the Committee on Commencement Awards and the Publications Board.

Analysis and Appraisal:

Through the GSBA, the SBA and, to a lesser extent, through the Graduate Student Council, students have the opportunity to formulate policy views representative of the student body and to present them to the University’s administration and to the Board of Trustees. Input to the Trustees is normally made through the Student Life Committee, but also by way of the student Regents who serve on that Board and on the Trustee standing committees.

Next Steps:

- In order to support effective student participation, a special orientation for students appointed to serve on committees with faculty and staff will be devised by the Office of Student Life, in cooperation with the appropriate committee chairs.

- The University will continue to encourage appropriate consultation with students in matters of on-going decision making in those areas affecting them.

Comments

Gonzaga University has no collective bargaining agreements (ref. NW Commission Policy 6.2).

Gonzaga University has and widely publishes its policy on Affirmative Action and Non-discriminatory hiring practices. These can be found in both the Faculty and Personnel Handbooks of the University (Exhibits 6.14 and 6.16, ref. NW Commission Policy 6.3).
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## GONZAGA UNIVERSITY
Board of Trustees/Board of Regents Committee Assignments

### Academic Policy
- Joe Koterski, S.J., *Chair*
- S. McCambridge, *Vice Chair*
- Mary Shinn, *Vice Chair*
- Gene Annis
- Tony Bonanzino
- Nancy Burnett
- Mike Cook, S.J.
- Phil Egger
- Paul Fitterer, S.J.
- Zakary Kessler
- Pauline Love
- Colleen Meighan
- Scott Morris
- Jennifer Porto
- Dick Powers
- Jim Prince
- Norm Roberts
- Patricia Smith
- John Traynor
- Kevin Waters, S.J.
- Stephen Freedman, Staff

### Campaign Cabinet
- Jim Jundt, *Chair*
- Pat West, *Vice Chair*
- John Parente, *Vice Chair*
- Paul Brajich
- Walter Conn
- Bernard Coughlin, S.J.*
- Don Curran
- Jerry Greenan
- Don Herak
- Dan Hogan*
- Duff Kennedy*
- Pauline Love
- Shannon McCambridge
- Phil McCarthey
- Angelo Mozilo
- Don Nelles
- Gary Randall
- Dave Sabey
- Jerry Schwalbach
- John Stone
- Tom Tilford
- John Timm
- Fritz Wolff
- Bob LaPointe, Staff

### Committee on Trustees
- Dave Sabey, *Chair*
- Jim Jundt, *Vice Chair*
- Don Herak
- Harry Magnuson
- Robert Spitzer, S.J.
- Pat West
- Harry Sladich*, Staff

### Investment
- Jack McCann, *Chair*
- Fritz Wolff, *Vice Chair*
- Joe Gray, *Vice Chair*
- Jerry Greenan
- Don Hackney
- Duff Kennedy*
- Angelo Mozilo
- Mary Jane Patterson
- Richard Shinder
- Pat West
- Rick Jones, Staff

### Long-Term Planning
- Don Nelles, *Chair*
- Don Curran, *Vice Chair*
- Paul Brajich, *Vice Chair*
- Tim Barnard
- Judy Butler
- Gerri Graves
- Kevin Daniels
- Greg Hubert
- Joe Koterski, S.J.
- John Lugert
- Harry Magnuson
- Jack McCann
- Gary Randall
- Jerry Schwalbach
- Al Stadtmueller
- Fritz Wolff
- Chuck Murphy, Staff

### Athletic Policy
- Dave Sabey, *Chair*
- Tim Barnard
- Bob Hamacher
- Don Herak
- John Lugert
- Jack McCann
- Phil McCarthey
- Tom McCarthey
- John Stone

### Audit
- Jerry Schwalbach, *Chair*
- Walter Conn, *Vice Chair*
- Don Curran
- Jerry Greenan
- Jack McCann
- Don Nelles
- Chuck Murphy, Staff

### Finance
- Jerry Schwalbach, *Chair*
- Walter Conn, *Vice Chair*
- Wil Loeken, *Vice Chair*
- Judy Butler
- Gerard Centioli
- Tom Driscoll
- Marcus Jundt
- Brian Kittredge
- Bill Lampson
- Harry Magnuson
- Tom Martin
- Don Nelles
- Tom Parker
- Gary Randall
- Stephen Sepinuck
- Al Stadtmueller
- Dave Taylor
- Mike Tucci
- Jim Workland
- Chuck Murphy, Staff
Continued

**Physical Facilities**
Tim Barnard, *Chair*
Bill Pohlad, *Vice Chair*
Kevin Daniels, *Vice Chair*
Richard Angotti
Joe Doohan
Steve Doolittle
Bob Hamacher
Don Herak
John Holleran
Stan Hooper
Bob Lyons, S.J.
Ed Ralph
Dave Shea
Tim Welsh
Ken Sammons, Staff

**Technology**
John Luger, *Chair*
John Stone, *Vice Chair*
Mike Lucarelli, *Vice Chair*
Paul Brajcich
Fred Brown
John Caputo
Jim Day
Judy Gilmartin
Greg Green
Dan Hogan
John Moynier
Mark Ryland
Jim Thompson
Wayne Powel, Staff

**Student Life**
Gerri Craves, *Chair*
Phil McCarty, *Vice Chair*
Tom McCarty, *Vice Chair*
Liz Hanson, *Spokane Representative.*
Sharon Cade
Rebecca Cates
VaLena Curran
Angel Diez
Bill Hayes, S.J.
Mar Herche
Greg Hubert
Gail Jennings
Steve Kuder, S.J.
Lita Barnett-Luvera
Loyal Nordstrom
John Parente
Bill Quigg
Phil Raekes
Shantay Sabin
Bishop Skylstad
Ed Taylor
John Timm
Kevin West
Sue Weitz, Staff
Bishop Skylstad
Ed Taylor
John Timm
Kevin West
Sue Weitz, Staff
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Thomas B. Tilford, Spokane, Washington - Chair
Mr. Tilford is a semi-retired businessman and a Certified Public Accountant. He received his BA degree from Gonzaga University in 1966 and his JD degree from the University of Washington in 1969. Mr. Tilford has been a member of the Board of Trustees since 1995. He was elected Chair of the Board for 2003.

Michael A. Patterson, Bainbridge Island, Washington – Vice Chair
Mr. Paterson is President of Lee, Smart, Cook, Martin & Patterson, P.S., Inc., Seattle, Washington. He received a BA degree from Gonzaga in 1969, a JD from the University of Notre Dame in 1972, and an LLM from New York University in 1977. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1999. He was elected Vice Chair of the Board for 2003.

Fred A. Brown, Spokane, Washington
Mr. Brown is President of Nextit Corporation. He received his B.S. degree in Civil Engineering from Gonzaga in 1982, and his Master’s degree in Civil Engineering from Texas A&M University in 1984. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 2003.

Timothy Barnard, Bozeman, Montana
Mr. Barnard is President of Barnard Construction Company, Inc. He attended Villanova University, Gonzaga-in-Florence (Italy) and Sophia University in Tokyo, Japan. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 2000.

Walter J. Conn, San Marino, California
Mr. Conn is CEO of the Charles Dunn Company of Los Angeles, California. Mr. Conn received his BS degree from Santa Clara University in 1955. He has served on the Board of Trustees since 1993.

Geraldine Craves, Redmond, Washington
Mrs. Craves, who has been a member of the Board of Trustees since 2000, received her R.N. from the Mt. Zion Nursing School in San Francisco.

J. Donald Curran, Spokane, Washington
Mr. Curran is an Attorney at Law with Delay, Curran, Thompson & Pontarolo, P.S. He did his undergraduate studies at Gonzaga where he also received his JD degree in 1960. He joined the Board of Trustees in 1996.

L. Paul Fitterer, S.J., Seattle, Washington
Fr. Fitterer is Interim President of Seattle Preparatory School. He received his BA and MA degrees from Gonzaga University in 1958. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1996.

Elizabeth Hanson, Spokane, Washington
Mrs. Hanson attended Mills College and Gonzaga University. She was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1984.
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William E. Hayes, S.J., Portland, Oregon
Fr. Hayes is Chancellor of Jesuit High School. He received his BA degree from Gonzaga University in 1951, his MA from Santa Clara University in 1959, and a M.Ed. Degree from Gonzaga in 1963. He was elected to the Board in 1987.

Donald H. Herak, Spokane, Washington
Mr. Herak is President of Herak Enterprises, Inc. He received his BS degree in engineering from Gonzaga University in 1950. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1983. He served as Chair of the Board in 1993 and 1994.

Daniel P. Hogan, Jr., Lafayette, California
Mr. Hogan is a retired Vice President and General Manager of the ORTHO Products Division of the Chevron Chemical Company, San Francisco, California. He received his BS degree from Gonzaga University in 1950. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1985.

James R. Jundt, Wayzata, Minnesota
Mr. Jundt is Chair of Jundt Associates, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota. He received his BA degree from Gonzaga University in 1964, and did graduate studies at New York University. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1987, and served as Chair of the Board in 1997 and 1998.

Joseph W. Koterski, S.J., Bronx, New York
Fr. Koterski is Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University. He received his BA degree in 1976 from Xavier University, his MA degree in 1980 from St. Louis University and his Ph.D. from St. Louis in 1982. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1998.

Fr. Kuder is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at Gonzaga University. He received BA degree from Gonzaga University in 1966, his MA degree from Boston College in 1970, and his Ph.D. from the Graduate Theological Union in 1975. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1985.

Pauline M. Love, Kenmore, Washington
Mrs. Love retired as Executive Director, Human Resources of the Shoreline School District in Seattle. She received her BA degree from Gonzaga University in 1959 and her MA from Seattle University in 1981. She has been a member of the Board of Trustees since 1999.

John J. Luger, Bellevue, Washington
Mr. Luger is President of JDL Enterprises. He received his BBA degree from the University of Oregon in 1969. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 2000.

Robert V. Lyons, S.J., Spokane, Washington
Fr. Lyons is Associate Professor of Communication Arts at Gonzaga University. He received his BA degree from Gonzaga University in 1974 and his MA degree from San Francisco State University in 1982.
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Harry F. Magnuson, Wallace, Idaho
Mr. Magnuson, a Certified Public Accountant, is President of H.F. Magnuson Company. He received his degree in business administration from the University of Idaho and his Masters degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. Mr. Magnuson has received an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from Gonzaga University and an honorary Doctor of Administrative Sciences degree from the University of Idaho. He is a founding member of Gonzaga’s Board of Trustees, having joined the Board at its inception in 1968. He served as Board Chair from 1970 to 1975.

Shannon McCambridge, Seattle, Washington
Mrs. McCambridge received her BA degree from Gonzaga in 1981 and her JD degree from the William Mitchell College of Law in 1986. She joined the Gonzaga Board of Trustees in 1998.

Jack McCann, Kent, Washington
Mr. McCann is President of Jack McCann Company, Inc., Renton, Washington. Mr. McCann received his business administration degree from Seattle University in 1969. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1996.

Philip G. McCarthey, Salt Lake City, Utah
Mr. McCarthey, Chartered Life Underwriter, is President of Philip G. McCarthey and Associates. He is a 1974 graduate of Gonzaga University. Mr. McCarthey was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1999.

Angelo R. Mozilo, Calabasas, California
Mr. Mozilo is President and CEO of Countrywide Funding, Pasadena, California. He received his BS degree from Fordham University in 1960. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1993.

Donald P. Nelles, Bellevue, Washington
Mr. Nelles, a Certified Public Accountant, is a retired Ernst & Young Partner. He remains in private practice on a part-time basis with Curtis, Sallee & Company, Seattle, Washington. He received his BBA degree from Gonzaga University in 1959 and has done graduate studies at both Stanford University and the University of California, Los Angeles. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1996.

William M. Pohlad, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Mr. Pohlad is President of River Road Productions. He is a 1978 Gonzaga University graduate. Mr. Pohlad was elected to the Board of Trustees in December 2001.

David A. Sabey, Bellevue, Washington
Mr. Sabey is President of The Sabey Corporation, Seattle, Washington. He attended the University of Washington and received his BA degree from Eastern Washington University in 1971. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1988 and served as Chair of the Board in 2001 and 2002.

Gerald A. Schwalbach, Wayzata, Minnesota
Mr. Schwalbach is Chairman of Superior Storage LLC, Minnetonka, Minnesota. He received his BA degree from Mankato State University in 1966. He joined the Board of Trustees in 1999.
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Robert J. Spitzer, S.J., Spokane, Washington
Fr. Spitzer is President of Gonzaga University. He received his BBA degree from Gonzaga University in 1974, his MA degree from Saint Louis University in 1978, and his Ph.D. degree from The Catholic University of America in 1989. He became President of the University in 1998 and serves as a Trustee Ex-Officio.

John M. Stone, Spokane, Washington
Mr. Stone is Principal of John Stone Development, LLC. He received his BBA degree from Gonzaga University in 1966. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in October 2002.

J. Kevin Waters, S.J., Spokane, Washington
Fr. Waters is a Professor of Music at Gonzaga and former Dean of the University’s College of Arts and Sciences. He received his BA degree from Gonzaga University in 1958 and his MA degree from Santa Clara University in 1965. He also received a BA degree in Music from the University of Washington in 1964 and a DMA in 1970.

Patrick J. West, Spokane, Washington
Mr. West is Senior Vice President of Salomon Smith Barney. He received his BS degree from the University of Arizona in 1962, where he also received a MBA degree in 1963. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in 1983, and served as Chair of the Board in 1987 and 1988.

Alvin (Fritz) Wolff, Jr., Scottsdale, Arizona
Mr. Wolff is Chairman and President of Alvin J. Wolff, Inc. He received his BA degree from the University of Washington in 1971. He was elected to the Board of Trustees in October 2002.
STANDARD SEVEN: FINANCE

Mission & Purpose

The Finance area of the University, consisting primarily of the Vice President for Finance and Controller’s Office, is responsible for supporting the mission of the University with sound financial planning, timely and accurate recording of all financial transactions, as well as the day-to-day support of all University areas with their financial requirements. The Finance area is supported in this effort by the University Budget Committee (see Exhibit 7.1) as well as four governing board committees: the Trustee/Regent Long-Term Planning Committee; the Investment Committee, and both the Finance and Audit Committees (see Standard Six).

Current Situation

As evidenced by many of the Standard Seven exhibits, the University, over the last three years, has experienced an unprecedented growth in its full-time undergraduate population. In addition, last April (2002) the University announced a $119 million Capital Campaign (see Exhibit 7.2). The current challenge of the Finance area is to meet the increasing programmatic and facilities requirements of this increasing student population, helping to insure that all students receive a quality education and experience at Gonzaga.

Financial Planning

Financial Governance and Autonomy

The University’s Board of Trustees (Board) has ultimate authority for the University’s financial affairs, to include approval of the annual operating budget. The University Budget Committee, which assists the President and Vice President for Finance, and the Trustee/Regent Long-Term Planning Committee, which reviews financial plans and makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees, provide input in the budget preparation process. The President and Vice President for Finance periodically report on various financial matters and operating results not only to the aforementioned Long-Term Planning Committee, but also to the Trustee/Regent Finance and Audit Committees and Investment Committee. These committees make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on financial matters.

Strategically-Guided Financial Planning

While still in the initial stages of implementation, the University’s Multi-Year Budget Planning Model (Model) (see Exhibit 7.3), is designed to project all major components of the operating budget, to include capital requirements, for a period of four years based on assumptions developed for this purpose. The assumptions are constantly being updated and refined, and have been reviewed by the Academic Deans and the University’s Budget Committee. The Planning Model, along with the Long Range Planning document (see Exhibit 7.4), serves as one of the primary reference documents when constructing the annual budget. Strategic in nature, the Planning Model attempts to quantify such strategic goals as enrollment objectives, net revenue strategy, quality initiatives and facility/equipment requirements as well as compensation goals.
Annual Budget

The Board of Trustees requires that a balanced operating budget be presented to them for approval at their meeting in late February, for the fiscal year that begins on the following June 1st. The budget process begins in the preceding October with preparation of the current fiscal year’s financial projections. The various Vice Presidents involve their appropriate constituencies to assist in developing budget priorities for their VP areas, and all requests for funding are compiled and categorized in priority order by the finance staff and reviewed by the Budget Committee, typically beginning in November of each year. Once the following year’s student rates (tuition, fees, room & board) are approved by the Board (at their December meeting) and enrollment goals are budgeted, the revenue base for the following year is determined and the various funding requests are categorized, prioritized and funded, as revenues allow. These funding requests, as a general rule, are prioritized in conjunction with those in the Long Range Planning document.

During the fiscal year, in conjunction with each Vice President and their appropriate staff, the Controller’s Office prepares financial projections, which are reported to the Board. Depending on the results of these projections, budget components (both revenue and expense) are adjusted in an effort to insure a balanced budget at fiscal year-end (May 31st) and also to meet institutional needs and goals not in the original budget. The University’s Executive Budget Committee, consisting of the President, Academic Vice President, Vice President for Finance and Corporation Counsel meet periodically to review the ongoing financial operations of the University, to include current budget requests, financial projections, and the status of the ensuing year’s budget compilation. The Executive Budget Committee is an ad-hoc committee created by the President to advise him on fiscal matters.

In November and March of each year, meetings are held with the Gonzaga Community and both the President and Vice President for Finance distribute financial trend information, current financial projections and priorities for the following year’s budget. Budget information is also distributed in the University publication “Facts and Figures.”

Despite these efforts at disclosure and transparency, some members of the University community maintain that the budgeting process is, and remains, a mysterious one. In addition, the faculty members of the Budget Committee have expressed dissatisfaction at their perceived lack of influence on the budget process.

Debt for Capital Outlay

Any issuance of new debt must be approved by the Board of Trustees. Annual debt service requirements are projected in the Multi-Year Budget Planning Model. With regard to facilities funded via a capital campaign, the Board Policy requires that the administration have at least 80% of the total estimated project cost in cash and pledges prior to the inception of construction (as per p. 5 of the Long Range Planning document as approved by the Board on April 19, 2002).

The University will typically take a conservative approach to acquiring new debt – negotiating low fixed rates where possible and budgeting for an aggressive repayment schedule. If prudent, given the differential between investment rates and borrowing rates, the University will use its own
cash flow to finance certain acquisitions. See also selected Moody’s ratios (Exhibit 7.5) for debt ratios in comparison to Moody’s averages.

**Adequacy of Financial Resources**

**Sources of Income**

As reported in Table 7.6, the University relies on several sources of income to support the mission and goals of the University. It will come as no surprise that the primary components of the University’s revenue base are primarily student-generated revenue: net tuition, room & board. The University and its Board acknowledge a high level of dependency on this source of revenue and are constantly exploring new sources of revenues. The next capital campaign (not yet announced nor organized) is anticipated to be Endowment-oriented. See also selected Moody's ratios (Exhibit 7.5) for comparison of the University’s revenue sources compared to Moody’s averages.

The University’s net revenue strategy is to meet enrollment goals while concurrently increasing the quality of the student body. Regarding the allocation and commitment of the resources of the University during the annual budget process, the University’s financial administration relies on the priorities specified in the Long Range Planning document and by the University Vice President’s priorities. Highest priority has typically been given to the compensation area, and concurrently to growth and quality initiatives.

**Adequacy of Funding for Debt Service**

Funding for debt service is a critical part of the budget process. As indicated above, the Board must approve all new debt, and for facilities funded via a capital campaign, at least 80% of the project cost must be received via either cash or pledge prior to the inception of construction. The Vice President for Finance, together with the Board’s Finance Committee, consistently looks for ways to reduce the debt burden on the University via aggressive refinancing, early pay-off, etc. See Exhibits 7.1 for a projection of debt service payments and 7.5 for Moody's debt ratio information.

Most debt service is funded either from gifts or revenues related to those facilities. To the extent that sources are not available, operating revenues are utilized for debt service purposes. Some faculty object to the use of operating revenues for this purpose.

**Financial Stability**

Total net assets of the University have increased from $119,720,225 at May 31, 1997 to $180,671,287 at May 31, 2003, a 50.9% increase. Total Unrestricted Net Assets have increased from $51,096,527 to $62,178,471 during this same time-frame. Excluding the effect of the fluctuation in market valuations, primarily in the Long-Term Investment (Endowment Fund) component of the University, the financial statements of the University reflect a consistent increase in financial resources. See Moody’s ratios at Exhibit 7.5 for comparison information of resources available.
Interfund Transfers / Borrowings

All interfund transfers, of a non-mandatory nature (i.e.: one-time unrestricted gifts to the Endowment Fund) are approved by the Board. Transfers of a mandatory nature (debt service) are reviewed by the auditors and reported as such on the financial statements. Interfund borrowings, such as the use of operating cash for property acquisitions, are reported as such on the financial statements and analyzed and reported upon to the Finance and Audit Committees and the Board.

Adequacy of Funding

As noted in the above sections pertaining to Budgeting and Sources of Income, the programmatic requirements of the University are identified by the applicable Vice President, prioritized, and funded based upon the availability of resources. Particular attention is given, by the Academic Vice President and Deans, to such things as student/teacher ratios, faculty loads, tenure vs. non-tenure positions, etc. A review of the annual budget documents will reflect an effort to enhance the faculty component of the University, especially during this time of significant undergraduate enrollment growth. See also Moody’s ratios at Exhibit 7.5 for comparison to Moody’s averages.

Student Financial Aid

The level of unfunded student aid, which has seen a significant increase due to both an increase in headcount and student quality, is monitored on a consistent basis by the administration (see Exhibit 7.7, page 18). The Multi-year Budget Planning Model attempts to project aid requirements in great detail on a year-by-year, class-by-class level. The level of unfunded aid is reported to the Board and applicable committees on an annual basis. In addition, all sources of funded aid (endowed, restricted, state & federal) are utilized to the most complete extent possible. The University uses the services of an outside consultant in developing a net revenue strategy to meet enrollment and quality goals.

Adequate Financial Reserves

As reported on the University’s audited financial statements at May 31, 2003, Unrestricted Net Assets, excluding Plant, total $14,533,618. In addition, for fiscal year 2003-04, the budgets for contingency and reserves for various purposes total an additional $1,092,913. The enrollment budget for the Fall, 2003 freshman class is 875 students, which is very conservative given both historical and current enrollment projections. See also Moody’s ratios (Exhibit 7.5) for comparative ratios.

Auxiliary Enterprises

As reported in Table 7.3, Auxiliary Enterprises (excluding the allocation of some indirect costs) produce net revenues for the University. Primary components of this category include the housing and dining systems and the Campus Store, with the ongoing pricing philosophy of the University to keep housing and dining costs as low as possible. The revenue and expenditure components of the auxiliary enterprise area of the annual budget are addressed in the same fashion as the educational and general component during the budget process. Over the last two
years, in an effort to meeting the increasing housing demand, the University has constructed three state-of-the-art residence halls with a total capacity for 336 students. Additional studies are in process to further evaluate the need for more housing.

Financial Management

Financial Reports to the Board

The President and Vice President for Finance, in an effort to continue to promote active engagement between the administration and Board, report at each Board meeting (6 times/year) on current financial matters and progress towards institutional objectives of the University. More in-depth information and discussion is provided to the Investment, Long-Term Planning, and Finance and Audit committees. The Board and applicable committees are provided current Moody’s data as well as other comparative information that compares Gonzaga’s results to various benchmarks.

Financial Functions / Controls

The University Controller, reporting to the Vice President for Finance, is responsible for all accounting, record-keeping and general University budgeting and budget monitoring functions and activities, assisted by a staff of 12 employees (the key managers within the Controller’s Office have an average of 20 years of experience at the University). The Controller is also responsible for the cash management functions for all non-endowed gifts, as well as cash flow related to oversight of the University’s Endowment managers.

The Director of Financial Aid, reporting to the Associate Academic Vice President and assisted by a staff of 9 employees, administers all financial aid programs. (The University has, for the last several years, utilized the services of an outside consultant with regard to the tuition net revenue strategy.)

The Director of Student Accounts reports to the Associate Academic Vice President and has a staff of 6 employees.

On an annual basis, the University receives a general financial statement audit, as well as a separate audit (A-133) of all federal grant programs (see Exhibits 7.8 and 7.9). The University’s outside auditors examine the overall internal control structure of the University. In addition, each year they are engaged to do an in-depth examination of the internal controls of selected departments (i.e.: Bookstore and Campus Services) of the University. The auditors have noted no major deficiencies in the University’s accounting systems and systems of internal control.

Investments and Cash Management

The Investment Committee of the Board of Trustees is responsible for monitoring the management, performance and measurement against applicable benchmarks of the University’s Endowment Fund assets, in accordance with the Board approved University Endowment Fund Investment Policy (Policy) (Exhibit 7.10). On at least a quarterly basis, the Investment Committee reports to the Board the asset allocation and investment performance of the
professionally managed investment accounts of the Endowment Fund, and at least annually looks at rebalancing the managed Endowment accounts. The University utilizes the services of an investment consultant for performance, allocation and manager selection issues. The University has also recently hired a Chief Investment Officer whose duties include leading the investment strategy of all the University’s investments, both endowed and non-endowed.

The Board has delegated to the Vice President for Finance the authority to administer the investment of all non-endowed assets, which are invested in accordance with the aforementioned Policy. All cash from operations is invested in the COMMONFUND’s Short-Term Fund, while funds received in the deferred giving area are invested with U.S. Bank, who also manages those assets.

**Accounting Principles**

As shown in the annual audit reports (financial statement, A-133 & NCAA), the University’s financial management / accounting systems follow generally accepted principles of accounting. The University has historically received clean opinions on its financial statements and receives no formal management letter, as all management related comments have been insignificant in nature.

**Annual Audit**

The University is audited, on an annual basis, by a firm recommended by the Audit Committee and approved by the Board. The annual audit is reviewed with the auditors by the Audit committee each October. The Board is provided a copy of the audit report in October. A management letter is issued if required.

**Internal Controls**

The University’s system of internal controls is examined as part of its annual audit. In addition, each year the outside auditors are engaged to examine the internal control structure of a selected department(s) of the University. A separate report is issued upon completion of that examination.

**Management Letter Comments**

Administration responses are developed for each management letter comment, if any. These responses are reviewed with the auditors for appropriateness prior to implementation. The auditors report any findings in October to the Audit Committee as part of its annual audit of the University.

**Audit Reports**

All audit reports will be made available to the evaluation team.
Fundraising and Development

Gonzaga’s development programs are coordinated with academic planning and other institutional needs, and reflect the mission and goals of the University.

University Relations, Gonzaga’s development division, adheres to the “Standards for Annual Giving and Campaigns in Educational Fund Raising” established by (CASE (Council for Advancement and Support of Education).

Gonzaga’s Endowment and Life Income funds and their investments are administered by the Vice President for Finance and the Investment Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Controller’s Office maintains complete records concerning these funds and complies with all applicable legal requirements.

The University coordinates closely with the Gonzaga University Law School Foundation in raising funds and maintaining endowments and life income funds for the School of Law. Development staff in the School of Law has a dual reporting structure to both the dean of the School and the University’s director of development.

In Spring 2002, the University announced the launch of its current Capital Campaign, Educating People The World Needs Most. The campaign goal of $119 million was set with a specific set of institutional priorities in mind. As of the Fall of 2003, nearly $100 million of the goal has been gifted or pledged (see Exhibit 7.2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4**</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>78,404,162</td>
<td>76,166,049</td>
<td>66,933,799</td>
<td>101,830,959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>&lt;63,551,765&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;69,862,924&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;76,097,243&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;81,025,202&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers - Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Excess (Deficit)</td>
<td>14,852,397</td>
<td>6,303,125</td>
<td>&lt;9,163,444&gt;</td>
<td>20,805,757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>10,410,746</td>
<td>11,742,564</td>
<td>14,076,643</td>
<td>15,865,154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>&lt;8,722,663&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;9,687,206&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;12,615,988&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;13,885,482&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers - Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Excess (Deficit)</td>
<td>1,688,083</td>
<td>2,055,358</td>
<td>1,460,655</td>
<td>1,979,672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Excess (Deficit)&lt;1&gt;</td>
<td>16,540,480</td>
<td>8,358,483</td>
<td>&lt;7,702,789&gt;</td>
<td>22,785,429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Optional for Public Institutions

** Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

<1> Excess (Deficit)
Net of realized/unrealized gains <losses> on investments

|                                |             |             |             |             |             |
|                                | 7,368,947   | 12,924,306  | 7,747,242   | 30,936,069  |             |
### Standard Seven – Finance  Table 4  Sources of Financial Aid – Public and Private Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 2000</th>
<th>Year 2 2001</th>
<th>Year 3 2002</th>
<th>Year 4** 2003</th>
<th>Year 5 2004</th>
<th>Year 6 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Private Contributions</td>
<td>709,590</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>895,431</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>904,501</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental State Aid</td>
<td>983,342</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1,310,889</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1,589,505</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid (PELL, SEOG, WS)</td>
<td>2,301,661</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2,555,144</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2,887,116</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Earnings (Non-Foundation)</td>
<td>1,860,106</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2,119,409</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2,406,703</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Unfunded Aid</td>
<td>16,670,518</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>19,009,822</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>23,622,093</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Student Loans (if applicable)</td>
<td>28,357,298</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>29,676,797</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>32,426,350</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfederal Workstudy Aid</td>
<td>71,826</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>83,297</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>85,418</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td>50,954,341</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>55,650,789</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63,921,686</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of Total Financial Aid

**Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available
## Table 5: Undergraduate Enrollment, Tuition and Unfunded Financial Aid – Private Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 years Prior 2001</td>
<td>2 Years Prior 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Undergraduate Tuition Rate</td>
<td>17,460</td>
<td>18,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded Financial Aid (in 000’s)</td>
<td>16,060</td>
<td>20,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0005) Index*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Undergraduate Student Enrollment - Fall</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>3,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>113.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment</td>
<td>2,862</td>
<td>3,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>112.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Unfunded Student Financial Aid to Undergraduate Academic Year Tuition</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Use data of three years prior as base in development of 100

**Unfunded Student Financial Aid:** Refers to that portion of total undergraduate or graduate student financial aid that is purely institutional assistance. It is the amount of tuition scholarships that is awarded that is not covered by endowment earnings and annual contributions designated for tuition scholarships, federal, state, or local funding; or monies an outside group contributes for the tuition of students – e.g., Rotary, Elks, etc. It is the amount of the total tuition cash receipts generated from enrollments that the institution is willing to forego in order to attract and retain students.

**Example:** Assume an institution has available for scholarships $500,000 in designated endowment earnings and contributions; $900,000 in government aid; and $100,000 of tuition paid by outside groups. However, the institution realizes that in order to attract and retain students, it will have to award an additional $1.5 million in tuition scholarships even though it will mean forgoing $1.5 million in actual cash receipts from tuition. The $1.5 million is considered unfunded student financial aid.
### STANDARD SEVEN – FINANCE  TABLE 6  REVENUES – PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUITION AND FEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Scholarships and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored</td>
<td>&lt;1,001,566&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;16,082,022&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;20,743,929&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;26,048,064&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;22.1&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-sponsored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT GRANTS &amp; CONTRACTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>2,458,180</td>
<td>2,675,463</td>
<td>2,477,810</td>
<td>5,137,992</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIVATE GRANTS AND CONTRACTS (Gifts)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>2,154,526</td>
<td>1,642,440</td>
<td>2,553,996</td>
<td>4,253,854</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>6,898,518</td>
<td>11,838,639</td>
<td>5,807,883</td>
<td>21,560,994</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>2,537,479</td>
<td>4,088,411</td>
<td>3,101,651</td>
<td>3,743,767</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENDOWMENT INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>222,090</td>
<td>253,197</td>
<td>273,506</td>
<td>283,291</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>3,094,314</td>
<td>3,145,164</td>
<td>3,855,529</td>
<td>4,074,905</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>8,128</td>
<td>47,344</td>
<td>24,617</td>
<td>36,371</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALES AND SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>10,410,746</td>
<td>11,742,564</td>
<td>14,076,643</td>
<td>15,865,154</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUXILIARY FOUNDATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REALIZED/UNREALIZED NET GAINS</strong></td>
<td>9,171,533</td>
<td>&lt;4,565,823&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;15,450,031&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;8,150,640&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;6.9&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Losses on Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other (Specify) Per Financial Statements</th>
<th>3,654,530</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>4,223,683</th>
<th>4.8</th>
<th>4,608,659</th>
<th>5.7</th>
<th>4,373,709</th>
<th>3.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>88,814,908</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>87,908,613</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>81,010,442</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>117,696,113</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total Revenues  ** Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available
STANDARD SEVEN – FINANCE  TABLE 7  EXPENDITURES – PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount %</td>
<td>Amount %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction (incl. research)</td>
<td>26,673,173 36.9</td>
<td>30,294,135 38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>3,866,066 5.3</td>
<td>4,041,809 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>4,374,305 6.1</td>
<td>4,885,087 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support (incl. General Administration)</td>
<td>11,617,623 16.1</td>
<td>11,015,498 13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>3,475,022 4.8</td>
<td>4,362,786 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>3,139,300 4.3</td>
<td>3,501,477 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,074,154 2.9</td>
<td>1,963,039 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>8,108,390 11.2</td>
<td>9,108,844 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid (faculty/staff waivers etc)</td>
<td>5,430,875 7.5</td>
<td>6,161,095 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other (primarily organized activities)</td>
<td>3,515,520 4.9</td>
<td>4,216,360 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>72,274,428 100.0</td>
<td>79,550,130 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>16,540,480</td>
<td>8,358,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Assets</td>
<td>140,689,684</td>
<td>157,230,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Net Assets</td>
<td>157,230,164</td>
<td>165,588,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total Revenues
** Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS SEVEN – FINANCE</th>
<th>TABLE 8 ASSETS, LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS – PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS ONLY</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td>270,909</td>
<td>198,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,454,776</td>
<td>3,653,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories &amp; Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,877,488</td>
<td>3,558,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses, incl. above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,791,332</td>
<td>13,459,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td>113,287,271</td>
<td>114,460,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,126,381</td>
<td>76,299,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. construction in progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,794,801</td>
<td>11,685,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify) Deposits with Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,418,034</td>
<td>9,002,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>229,020,992</td>
<td>232,318,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,713,902</td>
<td>6,652,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,347,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government advances for student loans</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,595,557</td>
<td>9,838,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify) Accrued salaries &amp; benefits;</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,510,895</td>
<td>5,644,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,507,163</td>
<td>3,830,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONG-TERM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See Exhibit 7. )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td>38,515,000</td>
<td>36,355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable, inc. Capital Lease</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,273,768</td>
<td>1,801,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuity and Life Income Actual Liability</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,011,229</td>
<td>2,310,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify) Interest Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td>316,314</td>
<td>297,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,790,828</td>
<td>66,729,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,262,282</td>
<td>53,630,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,250,134</td>
<td>70,810,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,717,748</td>
<td>41,147,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>157,230,164</td>
<td>165,588,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

<1> See footnote 7.1 on Table 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS SEVEN – FINANCE</th>
<th>TABLE 9</th>
<th>OPERATING GIFTS AND ENDOWMENTS – PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS (IF APPLICABLE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PROJECTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments Exclusive of Foundation Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Annual Gifts to E &amp; G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

** Budget for Current Year

Note: If applicable, explain/describe foundation relationship and prepare separate statement for Foundation gifts to the institution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>3,639,189</td>
<td>3,654,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>3,654,189</td>
<td>3,654,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>70,154,959</td>
<td>71,245,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>1,437,988</td>
<td>17,013,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>&lt;347,069&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;2,204,902&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>71,245,878</td>
<td>88,259,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>27,010,696</td>
<td>28,008,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>1,029,839</td>
<td>2,774,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>&lt;31,699&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;43,775&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>28,008,836</td>
<td>30,739,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>6,504,560</td>
<td>16,113,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>9,608,518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>&lt;16,113,078&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>16,113,078</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service See Exhibit 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2,826,235</td>
<td>2,632,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,074,154</td>
<td>1,963,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation (Private Institutions)</td>
<td>3,139,300</td>
<td>3,501,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√ Briefly describe the nature of the projects under way and/or anticipated (e.g., dormitories, classroom facilities, auditorium). Also indicate sources of funds for the project (i.e., fund raising programs, debt).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<1> As described in section 7.D, the University is currently engaged in a capital campaign, a portion of which is directed for new facilities (Fitness Center, Sports Arena, Science Building, etc.) the timing of construction of these facilities is such that projected capitalization dates are not available.
The University has seen a significant improvement in its financial health brought about through a strategic focus on increasing the quality and quantity of its undergraduate enrollment. Consultants were hired to analyze our student market and to redesign University publications. A financial aid consultant was employed to assist the University in implementing a tuition discount strategy which brought about the desired quality and enrollment goals of the University. These actions, as well as the higher institutional profile from the success of the men’s basketball team and continued high rankings in national surveys, have resulted in a substantial increase in applications and enrollments in the undergraduate area. As a result, we have seen a significant increase in net tuition revenue.

The University also recently completed the construction of a new Law School building (2000). This new facility and a more aggressive discounting strategy have led to better Law School enrollments, and financial operations that are much closer to desired levels. Graduate enrollment trends are mixed. The graduate enrollment in the School of Business shows steady growth while enrollment in other programs have remained constant or declined. While the recent emphasis has been on undergraduate and Law School enrollment, there will be further emphasis in the future on graduate programs.

During the years of declining enrollment (1996-1998), the University eliminated or reduced funding in several areas. Budgeted funding for debt service for internally financed capital improvements, renewal and replacement reserve payments, and current renovation funding were reduced or eliminated in order to avoid substantial cuts in personnel. As enrollments have increased (1999-2003), the debt service for internally financed projects and the funding for current renovations have been funded to their previous or higher levels. The annual funding toward the Depreciation Renewal and Replacement Fund is in the process of being annually increased to return this funding to a proper level.

In the area of compensation, the University has fully funded annual compensation adjustments at a level which exceeds that of many of our competitors (i.e., 4.7% vs. 3.0% average for fall 2003). In addition, the University is phasing in an increase in pension contributions to 8.5% over a four-year period. The University has likewise maintained the self-insured medical program without significant reduction in the plan design and, as a result of good claims experience, a medical claims reserve has been established to bring more budget stability to this program.

As a result of the growth in enrollment, the University has added faculty resources and added staff to maintain the new facilities and improve student services. From fall 2000 to fall 2003, the University has added 46 regular full/part-time faculty positions and 8 regular full/part-time non-faculty positions according to Human Resources records. There are still demands for increased hiring on account of enrollment growth which are being evaluated annually as part of the budget process (see also Standard Four).

In addition to the increase in faculty resources identified above, there have also been significant improvements in academic buildings. The School of Engineering completed a $2 million expansion and renovation in the fall of 2002. There is approximately a 38,000 square foot...
addition to the science building which was completed in fall 2003. After completion of this new addition for chemistry, the existing building will go through a phased remodel for biology. The total cost for the new addition and renovation of the science building is approximately $14.5 million. Construction of an approximate $5.0 million, 31,000 square foot addition onto the School of Business building has begun with a completion date of fall 2004. Also as part of the Capital Campaign, there is planned construction of a $14.0 million Performing Arts facility. In addition, the University will be making phased capital improvements in the Administration Building for modernization of classrooms, faculty offices, and additional offices in an adjacent facility. These increases will assist in maintaining the quality of the academic environment while further providing an image of the University which greatly assists in the attraction and retention of students. These improvements are part of the strategic focus for academic, institutional, and financial success.

From a student standpoint, two additional housing complexes have been completed. One complex is apartment-style housing for juniors and seniors while the other is suite-style housing for freshmen and sophomores. A new student fitness center was completed in the spring of 2003. Construction of a 6,000-seat multi-purpose arena for basketball and other University events has begun and is scheduled for completion in fall 2004. An addition to the Cataldo Dining Hall has begun with a projected completion date of November, 2003. This will provide additional space for student activities, speakers, dances, and other events. These projects are integral parts of student attraction and retention strategies.

Summary of Challenges and Next Steps

Even though there have been substantial enrollment gains, return to financial health and stability, and significant improvement in new campus facilities, there are areas of importance which will continue to be the focus of planning efforts. These areas are as follows:

1. Fiscal 2003-04 will see the last significant cumulative net revenue increases related to the growth in undergraduate enrollment. Growth in net tuition levels will return to a much more normal level which will require a very measured approach toward controlling the rate of growth of University-wide expectations and expenditures. The University should explore other sources of funding, i.e., new and continuing graduate education programs in an effort to mitigate this decline in net revenue growth.

2. The Academic Vice President and the Academic Deans must continue to evaluate the need for additional faculty or the need to convert term appointments to tenure track positions. This will be a measured approach, recognizing the need to maintain academic quality with financial flexibility. A similar evaluation must be completed for additional non-faculty staffing requirements.

3. A process is underway to establish annual compensation funding parameters which are more closely tied to the change in net revenues. The University is currently
working with a compensation consultant to develop a strategy to continue to provide competitive compensation within the limits of available net revenues.

4. Since 1985, there has been a significant increase in the number of buildings on campus. As these buildings age, the University needs to increase the funding for facilities maintenance as well as funding for renewal and replacement. An analysis of the appropriate funding level for renewal and replacement is currently underway. (See Standard 8)

5. On a similar basis to facilities, there is a plan being developed to provide funding for technology replacement. Additional funds have been added and must continue to be added in order to fund technology replacement at an appropriate level.

6. The funding of library materials slipped to a lower priority during the time of financial challenges. Inflationary costs, particularly for periodicals, are significantly higher than normal inflation. The University must address these issues with an aggressive funding strategy.

7. The University administration, primarily the Finance staff, Vice Presidents, and Deans, need to improve communication with the University community regarding the budgeting process, to include how the University Budget Committee and Executive Budget Committee both function and influence both the current and prospective budgets. The University should ensure that all relevant areas of the institution are appropriately represented on finance committees.

8. One criticism of the budget process has been that the tuition rates for the following year are established prior to the complete analysis of projected required expenditures. The Finance staff is making a concentrated effort to accelerate the expenditure analysis process in order to answer this criticism. However, a complete analysis of all expenditure components will not be possible until after tuition rates are approved.

In view of the above, the University is making a strategic decision to increase the University’s fund-raising efforts. Two additional full-time fund-raising positions were included in the budget for Fiscal 2003-04. Growth in annual gifts and in endowed gifts are important as the growth in enrollment-related revenue moderates.

Many of the above items reflect goals and planning efforts which will be implemented over time. To assist in this linkage of the planning efforts to the operating budget, a financial planning model has been assembled and is in the initial stages of utilization. This planning model will assist the finance staff in a broader discussion of financial planning with the University’s Board of Trustees, the University Budget Committee, and the Academic Deans. This planning model should address some of the issues and concerns of various University constituencies regarding the University’s budget process. While the University administration has always been very open with the sharing of annual financial information at the community meetings in November and March of each year, the planning model will provide an additional tool to better illustrate the multi-year growth in revenues and expenditures under various assumptions.
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STANDARD EIGHT: PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Introduction

Over the past decade, major additions to the physical campus have taken place which continue to support the institution’s mission and goals. During its evaluation site visit, the team will see new construction taking place (a new Sports Arena and an addition to the original Jepson School of Business), but these are only the most recent in a series of major projects. The University has recently been involved with construction of a new Student Fitness Center (2003), an addition to the Cataldo Dining Hall (2003), completion of a new Law School building (1999), construction of new Student Housing (Dillon and Goller Halls, 2001) and additional apartments (Dussault, 1995; Burch, 1996; Corkery, 2000), the partial renovation and expansion of the Herak Engineering Building (2001), the expansion and renovation of the Biology and Chemistry Building (2003-2004), and the relocation of the School of Professional Studies to a new home in the Schoenberg Center (1999). Concurrent with these were major upgrades to computer networks, creation of technologically updated classrooms, and continued improvements to accessibility within buildings and to campus streets and sidewalks.

During this same decade, University enrollment dropped, rebounded, and stabilized at a new, higher enrollment level. This significantly increased the utilization of many of the physical facilities, including classrooms, offices, student activity space, housing and virtually all other campus resources and services. Available funding for maintenance and renovation was also affected as available revenues fluctuated.

Physical Resources: Organizational Responsibility

The creation, care and operation of University facilities is the responsibility of several University operating divisions. Primarily, the University’s built environment is the responsibility of Plant and Construction Services, while the technological and instructional operations are the responsibility of Central Computing and Network Support, Desktop Support Services, and Instructional Technology Support Services.

Responsibility for Security, Safety, and Environmental Health is the responsibility of two departments: the Security Department, a division of Student Life, and the Environmental Health and Safety Department, a division of Human Resources. Disability Support Services (a department under the Academic Vice President) and Housing and Residence Life (a department of Student Life) support the needs of the resident and the special needs of the University’s educational community. Working together, these divisions provide the physical and technological resources to support the University’s educational community.

Instructional and Support Facilities

Over the past ten years, the University has been engaged in a series of processes that have as their aim the improvement of facilities maintenance and operation. The amount of deferred maintenance accrued during the 1990’s as available revenues decreased; however, bond funds, utility savings, and more recently restored funding levels have allowed the operation to realize its primary goals. The University remains committed to improving the quality of its physical
facilities even as it builds additional ones in response to changes in institutional growth and needs. The plant operations budget has grown consistent with the rest of the budget and has averaged 6.73% of education and general expenditures (E & G) over the past seven years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of E &amp; G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>$4,895,986.00</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>$4,609,314.00</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>$4,826,871.00</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>$5,485,944.00</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>$6,313,340.00</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>$7,538,671.00</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>$8,261,873.00</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New buildings and major renovations to existing facilities are generally not funded by the annual operating budget but by major gifts, donations, and/or proceeds from bond issues.

Major strides have taken place in the area of “safety.” The Environmental Health and Safety Department, through one of its standing committees, the Lab Safety Committee, has created systems that provide for ongoing safety in the use, storage, and dispensing of chemicals across the campus, with special emphasis on lab safety at Hughes Hall (Biology and Chemistry). Plant Services has installed fire suppression systems in most campus residence halls, and several academic buildings. New buildings and major renovations now routinely include the installation of fire suppression systems. Similarly, fire alarm systems have been upgraded in all campus residence halls, and most academic buildings.

Plant Services has also worked to improve access to campus buildings and on the campus itself. While all new buildings meet current codes, additional door operators have been installed in some locations, to make wheelchair access easier. Fire alarm system upgrades have included visual alarms to alert the hearing impaired. However, more needs to be done. Better facilities, with greater access for the Office of Disability Support Services need to be provided. More and more students require distraction-free testing environments, computer-assisted learning, audio text recording and so forth. In addition, future concert halls and auditoriums should include sound reinforcement systems for the hearing impaired.

It should be noted that Gonzaga University, which has for forty years operated a program in leased space in Florence, Italy, purchased a facility in Florence in September, 2002 for the express purpose of providing more appropriate classroom, computing, library and administration space. The purchase price of this facility was $5,118,000.00. The University, through its on-site program director, has invested approximately $500,000 in renovations to the facility (which was originally constructed in the 1920’s). Students will use the new facility for the first time beginning Fall 2003, and renovation of the facility, to include installation of wireless network capability, will continue throughout the 2003-04 academic year (see Studies Abroad, Standard II).

A brief description of our major buildings, grounds and infrastructure, and acquisitions illustrates that the University is doing a good job of meeting quality and safety needs as well as working diligently to support the educational and support services of the institution within a limited budget.
Buildings

Gonzaga University’s 108 acres encompasses 87 buildings with an additional three planned for the near future. Beautiful Lake Arthur extends over three of these acres. Of the primary buildings a number have been built or substantially renovated during the past ten years.

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

The Administration Building, built in 1898, is the main administration building and the “signature” building of the University. Consisting of five stories, the “Ad Building” is home to a majority of the administrative offices on campus. The Office of the President, the Chancellor, the Vice Presidents, Corporation Counsel, and several of the key support services offices (Admission, Financial Aid, Student Employment, Registrar, and University Switchboard) and administrative offices (University Relations, Public Relations, Controller, Computer Center) are housed here. The top two stories of this five-story building house faculty offices, classrooms, and the University Chapel (which was remodeled in 2001 at the cost of $600,000.00). The Administration Building is currently the focus of a great deal of planning as renovations for the third and fourth floors are envisioned beginning in 2004. Renovations to other floors will be done in subsequent phases, as funding allows.

COG (A MEETING PLACE FOR ALL GONZAGANS)

The COG was constructed in 1953. Located in the lower level are the Campus Bookstore and Spikes and Sub-Connection, two restaurants. On the main floor is the primary student dining facility. Upstairs is home to the Dining Services department. The COG received a major addition in 1961 expanding it on the West to include the Spokane Room, a large dining area and additional renovations in several phases over the ensuing years. Renovations to increase the size of the Campus Bookstore were made during 1997.

CROSBY STUDENT CENTER

Considered by students the social hub of campus, the Crosby Student Center Building was built in 1957. It consists of three floors and provides offices for University Ministry, the Gonzaga Student Body Association (Student Government), Student Activities, and the Career Center. It also houses a branch of the Global Credit Union, the student mail room, a coffee stand, a mini-store for snacks and a set of recreation spaces.

RESIDENCE HALLS/APARTMENTS

Dispersed over the Gonzaga Campus are a variety of Residence Halls or University owned apartments for students to live in. Some of the residence halls have small capacities of 40-45 students, while larger residence halls house up to 350 residents. The oldest hall (DeSmet) was constructed in 1925, while the newest housing (Dillon and Goller Halls) were completed in 2002. The following is a list of the on-campus residences:

- Alliance Hall
- 301 E. Boone Apartments
• 801 E. Boone Apartments
• Burch Apartments
• Campion House
• Catherine/Monica
• Chardin Hall
• Corkery Apartments
• Crimont Hall
• Cushing Hall
• DeSmet Hall
• Dooley Hall
• Dussault Apartments
• Lincoln Hall
• Madonna Hall
• Rebmann House
• Roncalli Hall
• Sharp Apartments
• Sharp House
• Dillon Residence
• Goller Residence
• Welch Hall

FOLEY CENTER (LIBRARY and INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY)

Providing students with four floors of resources and study area, the Foley Center is a newer building having been finished in 1993. The Instructional Technology Support Services Office is located in the lower level. The Foley Center is known for its semblance of an open book from an aerial view and is located in the heart of the campus.

HERAK CENTER FOR ENGINEERING

This three story brick building was originally built in 1948 and expanded in 1984. In accordance with the University’s commitment to excellence, Phase I of the Herak Center renovation was completed in November of 2002. Some of these changes included two new classrooms, two new labs, and upgraded electrical and electronic infrastructure throughout the building. Phase II is being planned and will include the expansion and updating of additional labs.

HUGHES HALL

Hughes Hall’s completion in 1964 provided students a science center with classrooms, a lecture hall, and labs contained within the three floors. Renovations to the building started in 1996. Additional renovations were started in the fall of 2002 which resulted in a new three story chemistry wing, new labs, a cell and molecular biology suite, a greenhouse and an aquatics lab.
JEPSON CENTER (SCHOOL OF BUSINESS)

Originally completed in 1987, the three floor Jepson Center is home to two computer labs, classrooms, a large lecture hall, and faculty offices. The building hosts the School of Business Administration and in 2003 started undergoing a 30,000 square foot, three story addition to create space for the Hogan Entrepreneurial Leadership Program, the Institute of Ethics, the Graduate School of Business, and the New Venture Lab, as well as additional faculty offices and classrooms.

JESUIT HOUSE

Constructed in 1963, the Jesuit House is home to the local Jesuit staff. The main floor has a chapel for services and an infirmary for retired Jesuits. The second and third floor are bedrooms for the active clergymen. The basement has recreational rooms for exercise or relaxing.

JUNDT ART CENTER

One of Gonzaga’s newer buildings, the Jundt Art Center was constructed in 1994. Spread over three floors are classrooms and studios for art students. On the main floor is the museum that hosts major traveling art exhibits and pieces owned by the University.

LAW SCHOOL

The Law School building was constructed in 1999. Located on the first floor is the Moot Court Room and a large lecture hall. Over the four floors are offices, classrooms, study areas and the Chastek Law Library.

MARTIN CENTRE

Originally constructed in 1965 as the J.F. Kennedy pavilion and pool area, the Martin Centre underwent a heavy renovation and expansion in 1986 and again in 2003 when the Rudolph Fitness Center was added. The new Fitness Center provides users with state of the art equipment and an array of weight training accessories. The Martin Centre is composed of three floors and is home to the Kennel, the gymnasium used for Gonzaga’s sporting events. In addition, there is a large field house with three basketball courts, an indoor track, and racquetball rooms.

MONAGHAN MANSION/MUSIC BUILDING

The Music Building is a three floor mansion that was constructed in 1898. Acquired by the University in 1941, the third floor is used for music classes, and the remaining floors for offices and practice rooms. Additional rented and owned facilities are used for offices, practice rooms, and rehearsal space, while the University pursues other options for the construction of a Performing Arts complex and/or large concert hall.
PLANT SERVICES BUILDING

This one story building located on the western side of campus was last remodeled in 1996. It houses a multitude of offices for the Plant and Construction Services staff, as well as the Accounts Payable Division of the Controller’s Office.

O’LEARY HALL - CAMPUS SERVICES/HEALTH CENTER/RESIDENCE LIFE

Constructed in 1965 as a Health Center, for many years this building housed the administrative offices of the School of Law. With the completion of the new Law School in 1999, this two level brick building once again houses the Health Center on the main floor for the administration of student health care. The lower level serves as the home for Campus Services and the Housing/Residence Life staff.

ROBINSON HOUSE

The three floor Robinson House was built in 1963 and provides office space for faculty and administration managing the Religious Studies and English departments.

ROSAUER SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

The Rosauer School of Education was completed in 1994. It consists of two floors. The first floor has numerous classrooms, many of which are equipped with televisions, VCRs, or overhead projectors. There are also two computer labs. Located on the second floor are offices, classrooms, seminar rooms, and a lounge area.

SCHOENBERG CENTER

Home to the School of Professional Studies, the Schoenberg Center is located on the western side of the campus. Constructed in 1970 it contains a total of five floors containing classrooms, offices, a boardroom and a lobby. Labs for the Department of Nursing are located in a newly remodeled space in the lower level.

Equipment and Material

Significant changes have taken place in the use of technology. Several computer labs, including the Administration Building lab, have been refurbished and previously upgraded with new computers. Major users, such as the School of Engineering and School of Business, have seen substantial upgrades to their networks and equipment. Trial runs with wireless technology have proven successful in the Law School, School of Engineering, and the Foley Library. Standardization of machines and software packages is progressing.

Instructional Technology has similarly followed suit. Distance Education classrooms in Schoenberg were developed in the late 1990’s and are in extensive, year-round use. Several classrooms in each academic building have been updated with the latest instructional equipment, including document cameras. Faculty response has been overwhelmingly in support of the new
equipment. Fourteen additional classrooms were upgraded in 2003, and more classrooms will be so equipped in the future.

Engineering and Lab Sciences laboratories have benefited from recent grants as well. A new greenhouse, new environmental growth chambers, new rapid prototyping equipment, a new wind tunnel, and new “jet engines” are examples of equipment that has been added to these labs in recent months.

All major computer labs have technicians assigned to them. Similarly, the Engineering and Lab Sciences labs have dedicated technicians. In the case of the Lab Sciences, the technicians control the acquisition, distribution, and preparation for disposal of all hazardous wastes.

Equipment replacement cycles vary. Some divisions are able to rotate equipment, such as computers, on a reasonable cycle. Other divisions, or other types of equipment replacement, have not achieved similar, predictable cycles. Grants are still largely needed to facilitate academic lab equipment replacement. Cycles for the replacement of vehicles and installed equipment such as motors, pumps, etc. have recently gone unfunded due to budget constraints, but plans are in place to restore the funding over the next few years. Fortunately, preventive maintenance programs, coupled with large amounts of new construction and renovation, have helped to keep operating systems in good condition. However, as the systems age, additional funding will be needed to maintain them.

As part of the annual Plant Services Satisfaction Survey, a section was added to the Fall 2002 Survey, asking the faculty and staff to comment on ten of the specific issues identified in the Accreditation guidelines. While the number of people who completed the Accreditation section was lower than the number who completed all of the other sections, the positive response to the questions was dramatic (see Exhibit 8.3).

Grounds and Infrastructure

The campus grounds and infrastructure are continuously being improved. The grounds are well maintained and beautifully landscaped; flower beds are well groomed and perennials are supplemented throughout the growing season with a rotation of annuals. The University has made major investments in the campus infrastructure during this period: for example, a large amount of work in electrical power lines and transformers has taken place during the past decade. A fiber optic network has been installed throughout the campus, serving all major buildings and residence halls (see Standard Five report). Parking around the campus – always an issue with students and faculty – has been increased with the creation of six new parking lot areas, the most recent of which were installed directly north of the Administration Building.

Acquisitions

Over the past ten years, the University has acquired ten homes on the perimeter of the campus to provide additional student housing, services, or to allow new construction to take place. Substantial non-residential property acquisition (e.g., the US Postal Annex, 2000; Bowling Alley, 2001, Barstone Dry Ice Building, 2003) has also taken place, principally with the aim of fulfilling the goals of the Campus Master Plan.
Physical Resources Planning

The Campus Master Plan, conceptual in nature, has undergone periodic review (Exhibit 8.2). While updated as property has been acquired and facilities constructed/expanded, the basic concepts established in 1984 continue to guide campus projects. The inability to acquire key properties has inhibited, and to a degree modified, the implementation of the Plan. Nevertheless, the overall logic of the Plan continues to be valid today. Significant changes to the Plan have resulted from the acquisition of property south of the Centennial Trail. The purchase of this new fifteen acres has allowed the construction of the new Law School on this site adjacent to the Spokane River. The construction of a new Law School Building moved a significant volume of vehicle traffic from the residential neighborhood north of Campus, to a more accessible site on the South Campus. This property acquisition will also allow the relocation of the baseball field to a new site adjacent to Trent Avenue. Acquisition of an additional four acres south of Trent Avenue will provide more parking for the baseball field/stadium and for the Basketball Arena. These property acquisitions have also allowed the University to create the River Walk, a pedestrian trail that runs the length of the South Campus, adjacent to the Spokane River. Intersecting the Centennial Trail, the River Walk has improved a formerly blighted river bank, and restored it as an amenity both to the Campus and to the public.

The $119 million Capital Campaign, the largest in Gonzaga history, has been very successful. Significant amounts of funding for new facilities have been raised or pledged. The one disappointing note has been the lack of response to the funding needs of the Administration Building, which is in need of heating, air conditioning, and cosmetic upgrades. While some of this work has been completed, the badly-needed comprehensive upgrade must be phased in over time.

The Physical Facilities Committee of the Trustees and Regents is becoming more active in the search for adequate, sustained funding for renovations and reserves. Board policies regarding major construction projects have also ensured that major projects are not started without reasonable assurance that adequate construction funds will be available.

While many positive changes have taken place, previously defined needs still remain unfulfilled in several areas.

Housing and Support Services for Residential Students

Notwithstanding the construction of nine new buildings and the re-occupancy of a residence hall previously used for faculty offices, additional student housing is still needed, as is demonstrated by the continued rental of rooms from the River Inn. Faculty offices for new and adjunct faculty are difficult to provide, especially in the College of Arts and Sciences. The renovations of the Administration Building and DeSmet Hall are still necessary.

Nevertheless, there are hopeful signs. Allocations for renovations and for replenished reserves are again appearing in the University's operating budget. Renewed focus on funding reserves is also apparent at the Board of Trustee level. Establishing stable funding for the routine replacement of equipment, computers, and other instructional resources remains a priority.
While much has been accomplished, additional facilities and facility improvements are still needed. Besides the renovation of DeSmet Hall, which was previously noted, ongoing renovations of the other residence halls are needed. While meeting the basic expectations of “dorm living,” several of the older buildings are still in need of significant changes. New facilities for Theater and Music are also a priority. On the list for the next Capital Campaign will be, among other priorities, a new Student Center. While the COG, Cataldo, and Crosby Center support many of the needed activities, adequate space does not exist in the combined facilities to meet the desired program offerings of Student Life.

**Academic Program Needs**

Although mentioned several times before, the renovation of the Administration Building continues to be an ongoing need. Home to the executive offices, most student services, most academic services, and a large percentage of general classrooms, the Administration Building is also the headquarters of the College of Arts and Sciences. While many faculty have offices in other buildings, the Administration Building is seen as the home of the College. Because of this, coupled with the need for significant renovation, the College is concerned both for its faculty, who are housed in inadequate facilities, and for its image. The Schools of Education, Law, Engineering, and Business all have buildings, and therefore identities, that are new(er) or which have undergone significant additions or renovations. Likewise, the School of Professional Studies inherited a building that gives them a home and an identity. For the most part, the faculties of these schools have offices within these buildings. Unfortunately, that is not the case with the College of Arts and Sciences. While there are obvious reasons why some faculty (Biology and Chemistry, for example) are located in other buildings, there are also faculty from the College who are housed in the buildings of other Schools, simply because there was no other space. While not on the Capital Campaign list, there have been discussions about the need for either an additional academic building, or a new residence hall, whose purpose would be to free up an existing residence hall (like Rebmann Hall), for the use as an academic office building. In the interim, planning continues on ways to meet the needs and identity of the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Next Steps**

- Better facilities, with greater access for the Office of Disability Support Services need to be provided.
- Renovation of the Administration Building is needed not only for Administrative and Academic uses, but also for the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Predictable cycles of funding for computer, instructional media, and other equipment replacement should be the standard for all University Divisions.
- Funding sources need to be identified for the renovations of:
  - (1) The Administration Building; (2) DeSmet Hall;
  - (3) Residence Halls in general; (4) Herak Center for Engineering
- Additional residential facilities for both upper division and lower division students are needed.
- New facilities for Music and Theater Arts are on-going needs.
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Institutional Advocacy of High Ethical Standards

Gonzaga University’s current President has articulated five mission values which are, together with its Mission Statement, intended to define our institution (see Exhibits 1.A.1 and 1.A.2). They are leadership, faith, service, justice, and ethics. Therefore, conducting all of our affairs in an ethical manner is an institutional expectation. Gonzaga has worked hard to establish a culture that values ethics and integrity, and to back those values with institutional policies and procedures. These policies are designed to insure that laws are followed, legal requirements are met, fiscal policy is sound, processes are in place for open communication, that healthy debate of the issues can occur, that there is a commitment to academic freedom and the pursuit of truth, and feedback mechanisms to inform the leadership are in place.

The Gonzaga community subscribes to and advocates ethical behavior, and ethics and integrity are incorporated in institutional decision making. Management decisions are often complex with many competing objectives – sometimes with the result of being unpopular to one constituency or another. Fortunately, sound management practices are in place, and functioning, throughout the institution. Gonzaga has extensive personnel policies and procedures to insure fair and equitable treatment of employees including salary administration guidelines, disciplinary procedures, benefits eligibility, and performance evaluations. Both the faculty and the staff have organizations to present issues to the administration and provide a vehicle for communication. Information is shared with employees through a variety of publications, open meetings on the budget and finances, minutes of the Board of Trustee meetings, and the Spirit employee newsletter (examples are included as Exhibit 9.1).

Financial integrity is a priority with proper internal audit procedures, a Board of Trustee Finance and Audit Committee, and external auditors. The University Budget Committee, which serves as an advisory committee to the Vice President for Finance, has representation from the faculty, staff and student groups (see Exhibits 6.2 and 7.1).

The institution’s leadership, and the design of its organizational structure, support the pursuit of truth, value a wide range of opinions, allows for a degree of autonomy and freedom, and results in consideration of multiple perspectives in institutional decision making.

Gonzaga University is an academic community committed to the intellectual development of its students within the context of its unique Mission. There are Codes of Conduct and standards for ethical behavior in all Handbooks and policy manuals which govern relationships within and between students, faculty and staff. These include:

- Professional conduct standards in the non-faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual (Exhibit 9.2)
- Academic citizenship standards in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 9.3)
- The Ethos Statement in the Student Handbook (Exhibit 9.4)
- The Honor Code in the Law School Handbook (Exhibit 9.5)
2004 NWCCU Self-Study – Standard Nine

- Public Relations has a Code of Ethics stipulated by the Public Relations Society of America (Exhibit 9.6).
- A policy on Academic Honesty for students (Exhibit 9.19).

**Analysis and Appraisal**

A challenge that faces all complex organizations is that individual expectations of what constitutes ethical conduct in our dealings with various constituencies, is itself subject to a wide variety of individual opinion and interpretation. Gonzaga is expected to “manage to a higher standard” because of its public image as a private, religious institution with a values-based Mission Statement.

**Next Steps:**

- The University should engage in regular institutional dialogue on what it means to meet all five of our stated “mission values.”
- The University should more clearly articulate what it means to subscribe to, exemplify, and advocate high ethical standards in management, operations, and our dealings with all University and external constituencies.
- The University should evaluate the communication effectiveness and participation, input to planning and decision-making, and involvement, of all Gonzaga constituencies to ensure the integrity of these processes.
- The University should institutionalize an employee climate survey process, and conduct this at regular intervals, to provide a vehicle for employee communication and feedback.

The administration and departments are taking steps to improve communications with faculty and non-faculty employees through such vehicles as the Faculty Listening Sessions (hosted by the Academic Vice President) and the staff “Heads Up Gonzaga” day.

**Regular Evaluation and Revision of Policies, Procedures and Publications**

Gonzaga University has several policy and procedure manuals that address the nature of the relationship of its members to the institution. The Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, Faculty Handbook, Student Handbook, and Law School Handbook provide guidelines and regulations which govern the employment relationship of non-faculty, the contractual relationship of faculty, and the student relationship with the academic life of the institution. These manuals exist in part to provide, to the extent possible, standardization of policies and processes, and to insure fair and equitable treatment of individuals in their respective relationships with the University.

Policies and procedures enacted by the Controllers’ Office help insure the integrity of Gonzaga’s financial processes (see Exhibit 9.7).

The Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual (PPPM) applies to all Executive, Administrative, Professional, and Staff employees. The Manual is published and maintained by the Human Resources Department. Supervisors and managers are given broad latitude in applying policies to individual circumstances; the responsibility lies with them to insure integrity with the spirit of a respective policy. Departments may adopt additional policies unique to their respective work environments and needs. These are not to conflict with University-wide policy, but may pose additional requirements. The PPPM is continuously open for review.
and revision. Primary sources of input and revision are externally imposed legal requirements, typically changes in employment and benefits laws, and internally through the Staff Assembly. Major policy changes are approved by Corporation Counsel, the University Cabinet and the Board of Trustees. Minor policy changes, and most procedure changes, require approval by the Cabinet only. Changes to the PPPM are distributed to all regular employees as updates are approved. The PPPM is provided to all new employees, who sign an Acknowledgement Form that they have received the Manual and that they understand that its policies and procedures govern their employment relationship with the University. The Manual provides several avenues of communication as well as grievance in the event that any employee feels he or she is not being treated consistent with stated policy, or that policies or procedures and decisions made from them were improperly interpreted or applied. Major personnel decisions that flow from these policies are reviewed by Human Resources, Corporation Counsel, and the respective Vice President for fairness, equity, and consistency before being implemented. Human Resources has recently instituted a case review process to regularly examine and evaluate all employee relations situations and decisions for integrity and consistency with personnel policy and mission values.

The Faculty Handbook is amended and re-published on an as-needed basis. The most recent revision occurred in 2001, and before that underwent a major revision in 1989. Primary sources for suggested revisions are Faculty Assembly through the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly, and Academic Administration. In addition, any personnel or other University policies or procedures that also apply to faculty are included in handbook revisions or distributed to faculty separately. The contractual section of the Faculty Handbook must be approved by a faculty voting process. The Handbook is also reviewed and approved by the Cabinet and Board of Trustees.

The Student Handbook is under constant review. Throughout the year, Student Life has discussion about policies and procedures and refines these as necessary. The Student Handbook is published once annually, generally in the spring or early summer so that it can be mailed to students before fall semester begins.

The Law School Student Handbook is reviewed, revised and republished on an annual basis. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of the Law School is responsible for reviewing and approving revisions, if any are needed, to the Law School Student Handbook.

The Gonzaga Student Body Association (GSBA) has both by-laws and a constitution (see Exhibit 9.8). Both the Constitution and by-laws are reviewed on an annual basis. Any changes to the by-laws have to pass a vote of the GSBA Executive Council, and then the change has to pass a vote of the forum, which is a group of student representatives. Only after a change has passed the two-tier voting system are the GSBA By-laws updated. The constitution is also reviewed on a continual basis. Any changes have to pass a vote of the student body, which is held once per semester, to be accepted and the GSBA Constitution updated.

The Staff Assembly By-Laws are reviewed on an as-needed basis (see Exhibit 9.9). To make a change to the by-laws a proposal to amend may be initiated by an absolute majority of the Executive Council of the Staff Assembly or by an individual with 20 co-sponsors from the Staff Assembly, or by a vote of the Staff Assembly using a written ballot. The most current version of the Staff Assembly By-Laws is published on its website www.gonzaga.edu/staff and is updated as revisions are made.

In 1995 a committee was formed to amend the Faculty Constitution (see. Exhibit 9.10) and no action was taken. Again in 2002 a committee was formed to amend the constitution and the vote
that took place in February 2003 was a result of that committee’s efforts. Any Faculty member can propose a change to the constitution in writing to the Faculty Assembly Executive Council. For the amendment to be adopted it must pass a vote of the Faculty Assembly.

Gonzaga’s University financial procedures are dictated by various external sources. The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants provides various Statements on Auditing Standards that guide Gonzaga’s accounting functions as well as provide guidance to external auditors. The Standards are issued by the Auditing Standards Board and are reviewed and revised as deemed necessary by the AICPA. Governance is also provided by the Government Auditing Standards, specifically for auditing federally received funds.

Our external auditors, Moss Adams LLP, rely on AICPA standards to provide governance and procedures while conducting the annual financial audit of Gonzaga University. Moss Adams LLP also undergoes a peer review by another CPA firm to ensure proper procedures are being followed. Gonzaga’s audited financial statement was chosen as a part of their peer review last year, and no material changes were required. Moss Adams LLP provides annual audit assurance on the financial statement for the Athletic Department as well as the federally funded component of the Financial Aid program (A-133). Although The Sarbanes Oxley Act of 2002 applies specifically to companies that register securities with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), there will be an impact on higher education in that institutions’ accountability and responsibility will be increased. External auditors will be identifying additional procedures for the audit due to this enactment, and the University will continue to promote, monitor and design good financial management practices.

Gonzaga University’s internal control procedures are structured around various resources. Guides used are Internal Control Concepts & Applications, NCAA Financial Audit Guidelines, and the Guide to Internal Control and Fraud Prevention (Exhibits 9.11, 9.12, and 9.13, respectively). These are revised and updated as needed by the publishers. In addition to these safeguards, the University has a policy, set forth in the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, describing employees’ duty to report, verbally or in writing, any evidence of improper practice of which they are aware; this duty encompasses financial impropriety.

Gonzaga is also a member of the Association of College and University Auditors, which holds semi-annual seminars to provide updated material on internal control functions. Professionals and staff in the Controller’s Office are held to high ethical standards. As a licensed Certified Public Accountant, the Associate Controller is required to have continuing professional education in the area of ethics annually. The profession-wide Code of Conduct, as instituted by AICPA, sets tones for professional demeanor, public interest, integrity, objectivity and independence, due care, and scope and nature of services. These are reviewed and revised by the AICPA on an on-going basis. The Purchasing and Finance Manual which states step-by-step procedures and policies for finance and purchasing areas was co-published by the Purchasing Department and Controller’s Office (see Exhibit 9.7). The recent handbook was completed for fiscal year 02-03 and will be updated and revised on an on-going basis. The Manual is accessible on the website and in hard copy.

All of the manuals and documents described in this Standard are available for review as Standard Nine exhibits.

Next Step:

- The University should take steps to ensure that a human resources perspective is included in all corporate decisions that have an impact on the institution’s personnel.

Institutional Representation Through Publications

Gonzaga’s mission statement proclaims, “Gonzaga University belongs to a long and distinguished tradition of humanistic, Catholic, and Jesuit education. We, the trustees and regents, faculty, administration and staff of Gonzaga, are committed to preserving and developing that tradition and communicating it to our students and
Gonzaga readily presents its Mission and values in many of its publications. A reader gets an unmistakable sense of Gonzaga’s standards and values from reading virtually every University publication, or by visiting the Gonzaga web site. Athletic publications, with their emphasis on “scholar-athletes,” frequently dedicate a page to the University and its Mission (see Exhibit 9.16). The University’s Mission Statement appears in many publications, including the undergraduate Admission “Viewbook” which goes to all prospective students (see Appendices 9.14 and 9.15).

The University makes every attempt to use accurate and consistent information in all of its reports. Each year the Public Relations office publishes and disseminates a Facts & Figures brochure that gives important facts and statistical reports. Every member of the Gonzaga community is asked to use this as a reference (Exhibit 9.15). This same piece is sent to all Inland Northwest media outlets, as well.

Gonzaga maintains a high ethical standard in its representations to internal and external audiences. For example, in view of the relatively low percentages of students of color, the University is careful to portray proportions of students to their correct representation on campus (i.e. the University makes a conscious effort to include students of color in proportion to their actual percentages on campus.) Where concerns over how to present information arise, they are debated and discussed, always with an aim of authenticity and integrity.

Focus groups held with students in 2000 indicated they believed that Gonzaga should market three main points to prospective students: academic rigor, family atmosphere and fun. Gonzaga’s publications and video advertisements have effectively portrayed those three elements as ones’ central to the core of campus life, as well as the more traditional Jesuit hallmarks of education of the mind, body and spirit.

By University standard the Gonzaga logo, or the school’s athletic logo, should appear on every publication (see. Exhibit 9.17). However, after a New York consulting firm, Jan Krukowski and Company, advised Gonzaga not to use the logo on the University’s Viewbook and new Web site in 2000, but rather use the words Gonzaga University in large, bold trajean type style, that standard has been relaxed. The Gonzaga logo is a difficult one to use. The words, Gonzaga University, are small, and the ink drawing of the Administration Building and neighboring church steeples is hard to distinguish by anyone who has not been on campus to see it.

**Conflict of Interest Policies**

Gonzaga University has a University-wide Conflict of Interest policy that applies to all its governing board members, administrators, faculty and staff. It is published in the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, the Faculty Handbook and provided to Board of Trustee members. All applicable personnel must complete the Conflict of Interest Questionnaire when appropriate (see Standard Six, Exhibits 6.5, 6.8 and 6.9).

In addition, the Faculty Handbook, APPENDIX 400A has a Conflict of Interest Policy Pertaining to Sponsored Projects, that sets forth procedures to be followed to resolve actual conflicts of interest regarding sponsored projects that meet certain criteria. Faculty members
participating in a sponsored project covered by this policy are required to complete the Faculty Disclosure Statement Regarding External Affiliations (see Exhibit 9.3).

These policies, the Conflict of Interest Questionnaire and the Faculty Disclosure Statement are available for review in the Evaluation Team Workroom.

Commitment to Free Pursuit and Dissemination of Knowledge

Few issues in the recent years have occupied more of the attention of the University community than what it means to be a Catholic, Jesuit, and humanistic institution of higher education (see Mission Statement, Exhibit 1.A.1 and the Standard One report). The Gonzaga Faculty Handbook clearly states the institution’s policy on Academic Freedom (Exhibit 9.3, part 305.00). The administration has recently taken some actions it felt necessary to avoid creating the appearance that the University was somehow endorsing or sponsoring views contrary to what it sees as the values of the University, and as troubling to the views held by some of the friends of the University. There has been particular focus on whether or not being an institution that embraces its Catholic values somehow constrains academic freedom. Adding to the confusion is a lack of consensus on what being Catholic means. Mixed within the discussion are personal opinion and private taste and a discomfort of some to allow presentations and discussions on controversial topics such as abortion and sexuality.

Two recent incidents highlight this tension. First, an invitation by a student group to the president of the local chapter of Planned Parenthood to speak on campus was revoked by the University President. Second, a request by a student group to stage a performance of the Vagina Monologues on the University campus was denied by the President. In the latter case, a compromise was reached, and the students did stage the performance in a venue adjacent to, but not on, the campus. Some believe the first action is consistent with the University’s policy on guest speakers, which grants authority to the president to deny access to University facilities to any speaker or group “whose values are blatantly contrary to those of the University…” (see Exhibit 9.18). Others would argue that there is no official Catholic stricture against bringing to campus members of organizations that many Catholics find objectionable. This second element is not covered by the Speaker’s Policy.

The conversation resulting from these incidents has been lively, informative, and productive. The President, members of the Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, and students have agreed on and are currently engaged in a process to revise the University’s Guest Speakers policy. It is hoped that the process will result in a greater understanding amongst all parties of the views of others. (Note: At the beginning of fall semester 2003, the Speakers’ Policy, now renamed the Events Policy, was approved by the University.)

Also of great concern on the Gonzaga campus is the effects of the Application of Ex corde ecclesiae passed by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) in 1999. This application is in response to the promulgation of his Holiness John Paul II, Ex corde ecclesiae, and related changes in canon law. The primary thrust of Ex corde ecclesiae is to insure that Catholic institutions of higher education maintain their Catholic character. One section of the NCCB application calls for all Catholic teachers of certain specified disciplines in the field of theology and who are
employed by a Catholic institution of higher education to acquire a mandatum from the bishop of the diocese in which the institution is located. That mandatum is intended to attest that the professor is teaching “in full communion” with the church.

Most writings on the subject have been emphatic about that the acquisition of a mandatum is a private matter between the theologian and the bishop and that the mandatum should play no role in hiring, promotion, retention, or tenure decisions. No role is ascribed to the institution, its officers, or its governing board in matters relating to the mandatum. Regardless, any process by which someone outside of the normal system of peer review is asked to examine and attest to or certify the authenticity of classroom instruction will raise grave concern around issues of University governance and academic freedom.

In addition, there have been some outside of the University community who feel a stake in the mandatum and who have kept the University under close scrutiny as it has attempted to navigate these waters. These outside groups feel that the University’s instruction in Catholic theology is somehow less than genuine or authentic in its Catholicism unless the University ensures that all Catholic faculty teaching within these ascribed areas of theology have a mandatum. Some members of the University administration and the governing board have wrestled with what they see as a sense of a public, collective responsibility to these constituents.

There is a clear division on this issue within the Gonzaga community. Unfortunately, this division has been exacerbated by infrequent and often unclear communication. For the time being, the tension around the issue has abated as the attention of the US Catholic Church has been consumed by other affairs. Still, at some time, community members will need to come to an understanding and resolve their differences.

Beginning in the early 1990s, the University began a practice of gathering the entire University community, staff, faculty, and students, to discuss issues of importance to the institution and its Mission. These meetings, called “Charrettes,” were an opportunity for different constituents to share perspectives and ideas, and to share with the University administration their ideas about strategic plans as well as hopes and frustrations.

Initially well received, these events became the focus of some frustration. Many in the University community have come to question their value. Some of the most recent Charrettes seem to have been the result of little planning and have been held because they are expected rather than from a genuine desire from community input. Many members of the community complain that the administration gives no indication they have heard what is said, that no action comes from them. Charrettes have been canceled the last two years out of three and, this year, the administration decided to hold the Charrette only for staff and not for faculty or students.

Charrettes provide the opportunity for improving communication and the flow of information amongst constituents. Many members of the community feel the Charrettes have value as a forum to discuss ideas of importance in the community. The choice of topics must be made with greater care and the administration must take greater pains to insure that faculty and staff knows they have been heard and that their concerns are taken seriously. Nothing will do more to
demonstrate attentiveness then to have recommendations raised in a Charrette be integrated into the University’s strategic plans.

**Next Step:**

- The University should establish a structure for on-going dialogue with the faculty on what is meant by “a commitment to free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge,” so that academic freedom is always a focus of discussion and discernment.
STANDARD NINE EXHIBITS

1.A.2  Articulation of Five Mission Values
1.A.1  University Mission Statement
9.1   Examples of Publications and Communications to University Community
6.2   Board of Trustee Finance and Audit Committee
7.1   University Budget Committee
9.3   Faculty Handbook
9.4   Student Handbook
9.5   Law School Handbook
9.6   Code of Ethics stipulated by the Public Relations Society of America
9.7   Purchasing and Finance Manual
9.8   Gonzaga Student Body Association (GSBA) Constitution and By-laws
9.9   Staff Assembly By-Laws
9.10  Faculty Assembly Constitution
9.11  Internal Control Concepts & Applications
9.12  NCAA Financial Audit Guidelines
9.13  Guide to Internal Control and Fraud Prevention
9.14  Admission “Viewbook”
9.15  Facts & Figures brochure
9.16  Athletics, brochures and publications
9.17  University Standard Regarding the Gonzaga Logo
9.18  University’s Events Policy (revised Fall 2003)
9.19  Academic Honesty Policy

Required Exhibits

- Statements or policies on Academic Freedom (see Exhibit 9.3).
- Statements or policies on Conflict of Interest (see Standard Six, Exhibits 6.5, 6.8 and 6.9).
- Policies which guarantee fair treatment (see Exhibits 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, and 9.5).
- Codes of Conduct, statements of ethical behavior (see Exhibits 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6 and 9.19).
GLOSSARY of FREQUENTLY-USED TERMS

AACRAO – American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
AALS – American Association of Law Schools
ABA – American Bar Association
AD (or Ad) – Administration Building
AGAPE Retreats – Retreats that focus on the heart and soul of human life and the revelation of Jesus Christ to the world in the Catholic tradition
AICPA – American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
Alliance, the –
ARMA – American Records Management Association
ARN – Advisor Release Number
ASK – Alumni Sharing Knowledge
Bozarth Retreat Center – Campus owned facility located off-campus that is used for various campus related activities
Bulldog Bucks – Money on student ID cards to offer flexibility for on and off-campus food purchases
BULLETIN, the – Weekly Student-Ran Newspaper
CAPP – Curriculum Advising and Program Planning
CASE – A weekly meeting attending by division directors from areas of Student Life as well as the Director of Academic Services.
Cataldo – Dining facility on campus
CCAC – Counseling and Career Assessment Center
CCASL – Community Center for Action and Service Learning
Charter, Journal of Thought and Opinion – A journal of literary and artistic talents of students, faculty, staff, and alumni.
CIRP – Refers to a survey, administered annually to entering freshmen and graduating seniors, developed by the Center for Institutional Research Policy at UCLA
COG – The building that houses the main dining facility, meeting rooms, and the Bookstore.
CRISP – Career Representatives Involved in Student Planning
DEEP – Documenting Effective Educational Practice
DSS – Disabilities Support Services
Encore – An organization supporting undergraduate students over the age of 25.
EWS – Early Warning System
FAFSA – Free Application for Federal Student Aid
FAR – Faculty Athletic Representative
FERPA – Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
FWS – Federal Work Study
GAB – Gonzaga Activities Board
GAMP – Gonzaga Alumni Mentoring Program
GIEOP – Gonzaga Indian Education Outreach Project
GSAC – Graduate Student Advisory Council
GSBA – Gonzaga Student Body Association
GU – Gonzaga University
GUST – Gonzaga University Summer Term
INSLP – Inland Northwest Service Learning Partnership
IPEDS – Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System
LOA – Leave of Absence
LSAC – Law School Admissions Council
LSAT – Law School Entrance Exam
LSDAS – Law School Data Assembly Service, a service that collects information from prospective law students during the acceptance process.
Martin Center – Gonzaga University’s athletic and recreational facility
Mission Possible Trips – Alternative Spring Break trips that are University-sponsored and focus on community service; sites located around the nation
MSA – Muslim Student Association
MSC Box – Campus based student mail boxes
NCAA – National College Athletics Association
NCCB – National Conference of Catholic Bishops
NSLDS – National Student Loan Data System
OAS – Office of Academic Services
OASIS – A prayer group of many faiths coordinated by University Ministry
Pathways – An introductory freshman seminar
RCIA – Right to Christian Initiation of Adults
Rising Times, the – A “street” newspaper directed by CCASL
SAAC – Student Athlete Advisory Committee
SAT – College Entrance Exam
SBA – Student Bar Association
SCT’S Banner – Integrated Student Information System
SEARCH Retreats – A retreat for upperclassmen, and intended to renew their faith life
SEC – the Security and Exchange Commission
Security Spotlight – A weekly email to all GU addresses with a recap of incidents reported to Campus Security from the previous week.
Sodexho – Gonzaga University’s dining services provider
SPD – Spokane Police Department
Spires – Pictorial Yearbook
STEP – Summer Transitional Experience Program, a program for non-admitted students to attempt to become admitted freshmen
SWA – Senior Woman Administrator
SWS – State Work Study
TCC – The Career Center
THIRST – An all faith service put on by University Ministry for students to gather once a week to participate in praise and worship.
UM – University Ministry
WCC – West Coast Conference
WD – Withdraw
Who’s Who – The Student Campus Directory
ZagWeb – A website that allows students to access their grades, schedules, account summaries, as well as register for classes.