

1990-91  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 13, 1990  
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.  
Forest Suite, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence

FANNIE CANSON  
PROF. OF EDUC. EMERITUS  
CSUS 1969-1984

CAROLYN J. HADLEY  
Assistant Professor of Women's Studies, 1989-90  
Lecturer, Women's Studies and Humanities, 1983-1989

ELEANOR R. KIRKLAND  
Professor of Education Emeritus  
CSUS 1967-1983

DOUGLAS MICHELL  
Professor of Psychology Emeritus  
CSUS 1955-1983

J. PAUL WALSMAN  
Professor of Social Work  
CSUS 1978-1990

2. Academic Senate Meetings, Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m.:
- September 27, Forest Suite, UU (G.E. Second Reading)
  - October 4, To Be Announced (G.E. Second Reading continued)
  - October 11, Forest Suite, UU (Regular Agenda)
  - October 18, TBA (G.E. Second Reading, if necessary)
  - October 25, University Theater, LIVINGSTON LECTURE
  - November 1, Forest Suite, UU (G.E. Action)
  - November 8, Forest Suite, UU (G.E. Action continued)
  - November 15, Forest Suite, UU (Regular Agenda)
  - November 22 HAPPY THANKSGIVING!!
  - November 29, Forest Suite, UU (G.E. Action, if necessary)
  - December 6, Forest Suite, UU (Discuss WASC recommendations)
  - December 13, Forest Suite, UU (Regular Agenda)

3. Catastrophic Leave Donation Program

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 90-90/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--SENATE

Academic Policies Committee:  
JOAN MAXWELL, Senator, 1992

Curriculum Committee--Program Review Team Pool:

TIM HALLINAN, At-large, 1990-91  
ERNIE HILLS, At-large, 1990-91  
DENNIS HUFF, At-large, 1990-91  
CARLOS PLUMMER, At-large, 1990-91

Faculty Professional Development Committee:

JEANNE PFEIFER, Education, 1993

Fiscal Affairs Committee:

ANE QUADE, Senator, 1992

Graduate Policies and Programs Committee--Program Review Team Pool:

ALLAN GORDON, At-large, 1990-91  
CAROLE MAYER, At-large, 1990-91  
THOMAS PHELPS, At-large, 1990-91

AS 90-91/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITY

Alumni Board:

SHIRLEY BIAGI, Faculty Alumnus, 1991

Athletic Advisory Board:

ROSE LEIGH VINES, At-large, 1992

Campus Educational Equity Committee:

CHIANG WANG, SBA, 1993  
DAN DECIOUS, Senator, 1991

Committee on Administrative Review:

P. MICHAEL SPARKS, At-large, 1993

Committee for University Program Review:

JAMES HILL, At-large, (term to be established)  
MARGARET GOODART, At-large, (term to be established)

Council for University Planning:

JUANITA BARRENA, Executive Committee Member, 1991

Hornet Foundation Board of Directors:

RICHARD DICKINSON, At-large, 1993  
TERRY THOMAS, At-large, 1994

AS 90-92/CC, Ex. GRADES (JOURNALISM MAJORS)

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the Department of Journalism's proposal to require that all courses included in the Journalism major be passed with a minimum grade of C-.

AS 90-93/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--SECTION 9.01.S

The Academic Senate receives the University ARTP Committee's report of April 4, 1990 (Attachment A), with regard to the need for clarification of University ARTP policy Section 9.01.S proposed in AS 90-44B.

AS 90-94/Ex. UNIVERSITY ALCOHOL AND DRUG STEERING COMMITTEE, ESTABLISH

The Academic Senate endorses the establishment of a University Alcohol and Drug Steering Committee with the membership and charge described in the May 14, 1990, memorandum from Dean of Student Affairs George Wayne to Academic Senate Chair Juanita Barrera (Attachment B), subject to the following revisions:

1. Include the full title of the Director of Educational Programs in the Student Health Center, to avoid confusion with other positions on campus.
2. Include an additional item "D. To comply with and effect the 'CSU Action Plan on Substance Abuse' approved in principle by the CSU Executive Council on November 28, 1989." in the Committee's charge, and include a statement of the CSU Plan's recommendations (Attachment C) as an attachment to the University statement of the charge to the Committee.

- 1- E. Kelly - CSU Senate
- 2- Resources for Faculty Allocations for Spring '91 AS 90-102
- 3- General Process for Faculty Allocations at CSUS AS 90-103

**REGULAR AGENDA**

AS 90-89/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of the meetings of May 10 (#23), May 17 (#24), 1989-90 Academic Senate and May 3 (#1) and May 17 (#2), 1990-91 Academic Senate.

AS 90-95/UARTP UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05.B [refer to Attachments D-1 and D-2]

The Academic Senate recommends amending Section 5.05.B of the University ARTP policy as follows [underscore=addition; bolded=Executive Committee amendment]:

5.05 Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

- A. ...
- B. The following criteria are set by the university for retention, tenure, and promotion. Each primary evaluation level shall, and each secondary evaluation level may,

establish a value for each criterion in relation to the values it establishes for the other criteria. It may do so by means of a qualitative or a quantitative statement. The first criterion, "Competent Teaching Performance," shall be the primary and essential, but not sufficient, criterion in the evaluation process at each review level.

When making its substantive evaluation and final recommendation in a particular case, each secondary evaluation level shall apply the relative values established by the primary unit in which that case has arisen unless it has previously established (by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty of the secondary unit acting in their own right in an election held for that purpose) and published its own values as provided above.

C. ...

AS 90-96/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 9.01.H  
[refer to Attachment E]

The Academic Senate recommends amending Section 9.01.H of the University ARTP policy, as follows [underscore=addition]:

9.00 EVALUATION

9.01 In General

...

H. Written criteria, policies and procedures may incorporate other documents which have originated within the CSU system (e.g., collective bargaining agreements, university-wide policy documents) by reference. Documents from outside the CSU system or excerpted sections thereof (e.g., standards of professional organizations or accrediting agencies, or selected portions thereof), that are specifically referenced in a department's or a school's ARTP policy statement shall be applicable only if these same documents, or specifically referenced sections thereof, are reproduced verbatim in or appended to the ARTP policy statement of that academic unit. In any instance of conflict or contradiction between the provisions of department or school ARTP documents and those parts of documents from outside the CSU system incorporated verbatim or by reference into department or school ARTP documents, the provisions of the department or school document shall govern.

AS 90-97/UARTP, FA, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--ADD SECTION 6.08  
[refer to Attachment F]

The Academic Senate recommends amendment of the University ARTP document by adding a new section as follows:

6.00 APPOINTMENT

6.08 Appointment to a Faculty Position with the Duties of  
Department Chair

A department may decide to recommend to the School Dean the appointment of a department chair from outside of the University. The department shall decide whether to recommend a search outside for a chair by a vote of the probationary and tenured members of the department, including those on the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) and those on leave.

For the purpose of searching for a chair outside of the University and recommending whom to appoint, a department may constitute itself a peer review committee of the whole in a manner consistent with University ARTP policy pertaining to such committees. (Please see the Note appended to Section 6.06.B.2 of this document.) If a department has not provided for doing so in its currently approved ARTP document, it shall ask the University ARTP Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs in writing to approve that departure from its ARTP policy. Its written request shall contain a description of its procedures for constituting a peer review committee of the whole and its screening committee, if any. The request shall be approved if the described procedures are consistent with the provisions of this document.

After screening applications initially for consistency with the department's published vacancy announcement, the department peer review committee shall make available to every probationary and tenured member of the department in or near the department office each qualified applicant's resume and the materials which the committee is not required to keep confidential. It shall then invite those members to submit written, signed statements of evaluation based on those materials to the applicants' files before determining whom to interview.

The department peer review committee shall also invite every probationary member and those tenured faculty members, if any, who are ineligible to serve on the peer review committee to attend any classroom presentation or other event scheduled in connection with the committee's interview

of each applicant selected for an interview. After the peer review committee has conducted its interviews and held events scheduled in connection with them, it shall invite each probationary and tenured member of the department, including those members on FERP or on leave, to submit to the file of the applicants interviewed written, signed statements of evaluation based on the portion of the file available to him or her for review and the events in which he or she and the subject of the statement have participated.

After permitting a suitable interval for the preparation and submission of these statements, the peer review committee shall review the files of the applicants interviewed, conduct its deliberations and make its recommendation to the appropriate administrator. The recommendation may take the form of a ranked list.

[Renumber existing sections: 6.09 - 6.11 as 6.10 - 6.12.]

AS 90-98/FA, Ex. DEPARTMENT CHAIR, ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE--Amends PM 89-14 [refer to Attachment F]

The Academic Senate recommends amendment of the policy on "Role and Responsibilities of Department Chair" (PM 89-14) by addition of a new section on "Outside Searches for Department Chairs," as follows:

NOMINATION PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

...

OUTSIDE SEARCHES FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

In order to recommend the appointment of a Chair from outside of the University, a department shall proceed as directed by Section 6.08 of the University ARTP Policy.

VACANCY

...

AS 90-99/FA, Ex. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS, POLICY ON ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF [Amends PM 89-14]

In response to the Forum on Racism Panel's Recommendation 1.C ["We recommend to the President that the Academic Senate consider amending PM 89-14 to include the responsibility for implementing University educational equity programs, within the department, fostering the development of departmental educational equity programs, and coordinating department programs with school and University programs to the roles and responsibilities of Department Chairs."], the Academic Senate recommends amending PM 89-14 "Policy on Role and Responsibilities of Department Chairs" in the

"Responsibilities" section as follows [strikeover=deletion; underscore=addition]:

12. Initiate and provide for the ongoing effectiveness of a departmental educational equity program, and undertake to insure that this program is always consistent with, and coordinated with, the educational equity programs of both the department's school and of the University.

123. ...

AS 90-100/AP, Ex. GRADE CREDIT FROM FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS, POLICY ON

The Academic Senate recommends revision of the policy on grade credit from Foreign Institutions (page 52, 1990-92 Catalog) for implementation in 1990.

Credit is may be granted from recognized overseas institutions. Awarding of letter grade credit or advanced standing varies dependings on the educational system of the country and will be based on information obtained by the Evaluations Office and the International Center about standards at the specific institution. CSU students planning to attend overseas institutions should check acceptance of credit prior to departure. Letter grade credit for college level courses taken at overseas institutions will be awarded if the student receives prior approval from the Evaluations Office and the International Center, with the concurrence of the Academic Standards Committee. If the courses are to be applied toward the major, approval of the major department is also required. A student who is interested in obtaining letter grade credit for overseas courses should obtain and file the appropriate form with the Evaluations Office prior to departure<sup>1</sup>.

Upon completion of the course, certified copies of transcripts, in English translation, and degrees must be submitted in English translation to the Evaluations Office.

If a student fails to request prior approval, or if a student initially enrolls at CSUS after attending a foreign institution, then the student may petition and may receive letter grade credit if retroactive approval (as described above) is obtained.

<sup>1</sup>Implementation Note: The Academic Senate recommends internal routing of the petition form (rather than student trekking) as follows: 1) The form is submitted by the student to the Evaluations Office. 2) The Evaluator will note his/her approval/disapproval and forward the petition to the

International Center for consideration. 3) The director/designee of the International Center will note his/her approval and forward the petition to the academic department (if the course is to be applied to the major) or to the Academic Standards Committee. 4) The academic department will note its approval/disapproval and return the form to the International Center for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. 5) Approval/disapproval by the Academic Standards Committee shall constitute the final action.

AS 90-101/AP, Ex. DROP POLICY

The Academic Senate recommends revision of the drop policy (page 60, 1988-90 Catalog) for implementation in 1992:

No change in a student's original class registration will be recognized unless it is made on an official form and accepted by the Registrar's Office. ~~Forms should not be left in academic department offices.~~ Students who are absent from class may be replaced on class rolls by students from a waiting list in accordance with individual instructor's policy. However, ~~students~~ students will not always be "automatically" dropped if they do not attend a class for which they register. Add/drop practice varies among instructors, departments, and schools. You should inquire about the practice in each of your courses. Failure to drop a course according to University policy as stated below is likely to result in the assignment of a penalty grade of "U" in that course.

~~Within the first two weeks of instruction, students may submit a drop form signed by the instructor or department office. Unless approved drop forms are submitted to the Registrar's Office, students will receive a final grade of U or F in the course(s).~~ During the first two weeks of the semester, a student may drop a course by filing a drop form at the Registrar's Office. Dropping a course during the first two weeks does not require the approval or acknowledgment signature of the instructor or the department. During the third and fourth weeks of the semester, students must inform the course instructor or the department of their intention to drop a course, and must obtain the instructor or department's acknowledgment signature on the drop form. Students are responsible for submitting drop forms to the Registrar. Forms should not be left in academic department offices.

All drops after the ~~second~~ fourth week and prior to the end of the twelfth week must have the approval of the instructor and Department Chair and are allowed only for "serious and compelling reasons." ~~(usually illness, change in employment schedule, etc.)~~. "Serious and compelling" reasons include (but are not limited to) the following:



- a) illness or other medical or emotional problem,
- b) change in employment schedule (including the addition of job due to a significant change in financial situation),
- c) family problems, and
- d) situations that could have serious consequences for the eventual success of the student.

Poor academic performance, in and of itself, is not an acceptable reason for dropping. The instructor may require that the student obtain official written verification (e.g., physician's note) and/or the recommendation of the student's academic or major advisor. In addition to the drop form, the student must submit (to the Registrar's Office) a drop petition which includes a statement of the "serious and compelling reasons" and the necessary approvals.

Drops shall not be permitted during the final three weeks of instruction except in cases, such as accident or serious illness, where the cause of withdrawal is due to circumstances clearly beyond the student's control and the assignment of an Incomplete is not practicable. Ordinarily, drops of this sort will involve total withdrawal from the University, except that credit, or an Incomplete may be assigned for courses in which sufficient work has been completed to permit an evaluation to be made. All drops during the final three weeks of instruction must have the approval of the instructor, the Department Chair and School-~~or Division~~ Dean and are allowed only in extenuating circumstances.

Courses officially dropped during the first four weeks of instruction will not be recorded on the student's permanent record. A grade of W will be recorded for courses in which a drop has been authorized after the fourth week of instruction.

The Schedule of Classes list deadlines, dates, and procedures for each semester.



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

APR 6 1990

Academic Senate Received  
413

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 4, 1990

TO: Juanita Barrera, Chair  
Academic Senate  
*William A. Dillon*  
FROM: William Dillon  
Presiding Member  
University ARTP Committee

SUBJECT: AS 90-44B



In connection with the adoption of AS 90-44B, I assured the Senate that I would ask the University ARTP Committee to consider language to specify the content of the question to be decided at a 9.01.S (proposed) meeting. The Committee has considered the problem and language to solve it and has decided to make no recommendation at this time. The Committee believes that Sections 9.07.P, Q, and R as currently approved when read in connection with 9.01.S as proposed make clear that an evaluation committee has not completed action in any case until it has adopted the text of an evaluation report and recommendation in a meeting for that purpose. Ordinarily, in such a meeting, any motions about the substance and form of a report and recommendation adopted in a previous meeting are subject to a motion to reconsider or rescind and are therefore vulnerable to anyone who wants to reopen the matter entirely provided he or she has the votes to do it. Of course, the Senate might preclude the motion to reconsider or rescind a substantive decision in a 9.01.S (proposed) meeting but the Committee is not prepared to intervene so deeply by regulation into a unit's affairs as to make a recommendation that the Senate do so. The Committee thinks, therefore, that a rule in this case can be no adequate substitute for a stable majority able to maintain its decision about the substance and form of an evaluation report and recommendation until it has finally adopted a text embodying them.

WD:dp

## University ARTP Policy

### 9.07 Recommendation Process for Performance Review

- ...
- P. "Each peer review committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee." (M.O.U. 15.38)
- Q. "The end product of each level of a Performance Review shall be a written recommendation. Such recommendation(s) shall be placed in the Working Personnel Action File of the candidate." (M.O.U. 15.39) (See Sections 9.01.T and 9.01.U of this document.)
- R. "If any stage of a Performance Review has not been completed within the specified period of time, the Performance Review(s) shall be automatically transferred to the next level of review or appropriate administrator and the faculty unit employee shall be so notified." (M.O.U. 15.40)

### AS 90-44B/UARTP UNIVERSITY ARTP DOCUMENT--AMEND SECTION 9.01

The Academic Senate recommends amending Section 9.01 of the University ARTP policy document, by adding:

- 9.01.S In any instance of evaluation, the written text of the committee's evaluation report and recommendation as it will appear in the candidate's file shall be approved by a simple majority of the evaluation committee in a meeting called for that purpose. (See Section 9.07.P of this document.)



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

## DEAN OF STUDENT AFFAIRS


May 14, 1990

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

MAY 14 1990

TO: Juanita Barrena, Chair  
Academic Senate

Academic Senate Received  
413

FROM:  George H. Wayne, Dean  
Student Affairs

RE: University Alcohol & Drug Steering Committee

This memorandum provides a revised outline for the University Alcohol & Drug Steering Committee. I believe this format will facilitate an effective working group. Kindly contact me once the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate has reviewed this information.

- I. Title: UNIVERSITY ALCOHOL & DRUG STEERING COMMITTEE
- II. Committee Charge:
  - A. To coordinate and plan a comprehensive alcohol and drug education program for the CSUS community.
  - B. To develop administrative procedures and policies relative to alcohol and drug abuse problems.
  - C. To recommend to the President the necessary mechanisms to implement item 3A. and 3B.
- III. Committee Meeting Schedule:
  - A. On a monthly basis
- IV. Committee Structure:

Committee structure will include a parent committee as well as three subcommittees.

A. Parent Committee

1. Members:

Dean of Students or designee  
Director of Educational Programs  
Three faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate  
One Professional Services Faculty, e.g. library, coach, etc.  
One representative from Public Safety  
Representative from Student Activities  
ASI President or designee  
Two students-at-large  
One representative from Faculty & Staff Affairs  
One representative from University Staff Assembly

2. Chair

- a. Appointed to this position for the 1990-1991 academic year, Director of Educational Programs.
- b. This position will convene and preside at committee meetings, and report committee activities on a bimonthly basis to the Dean of Student Affairs.

C. Subcommittees

1. Subcommittees shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
  - a. Policy
  - b. Education Programs
  - c. Employee Programs
2. The parent committee shall define the charge and membership of each subcommittee.
3. Each subcommittee shall include at least one member from the parent committee.

Recommendations from  
CSU ACTION PLAN ON SUBSTANCE ABUSE  
(Executive Council approved in principle 11/28/89)

1. Each campus should establish and maintain a steering committee to:
  - 1) develop and coordinate campus plans for a comprehensive educational program concerning alcohol and substance abuse;
  - 2) develop campus policies and procedures related to the treatment of alcohol and drug abuse problems; and,
  - 3) monitor and ensure compliance with campus, system, state and federal policies and guidelines for dealing with issues related to alcohol and substance use and abuse.

The committee should be broadly representative of the campus community in order to address medical, personal, administrative and legal issues.

2. Each campus should develop and implement on-going comprehensive alcohol and drug abuse educational programs for students and employees. Particular attention should be given to tailoring programs to meet the needs of specific groups, i.e., employees, dormitory residents, fraternity and sorority members, and student athletes.
3. Each campus should analyze the individual circumstances and respond to persons with substance abuse problems on a case-by-case basis. Flexibility is necessary in order to evaluate each case based upon the specific problem, available assistance and alternatives, and the personal and legal obligations that may be involved. Each campus should establish mechanisms to ensure appropriate, consistent and reasonable analyses and recommendations regarding each case.
4. Campus educational and assistance programs should focus on helping individuals to:
  - 1) avoid the use of harmful substances,
  - 2) recognize the symptoms of abuse and addiction, and
  - 3) foster an understanding of the treatable nature of abuse and addiction, rather than on punitive action.
5. Each campus should review personnel and student policies and practices on the treatment of substance abuse issues to be sure that they address individual rights and responsibilities, appropriate laws, and available assistance relative to alcohol and substance abuse.
6. Each campus steering committee should develop and periodically update lists of community agencies acceptable for referral. These lists should be available to all employees and students.
7. Each campus should develop functioning and effective Employee Assistance Programs. Consideration should be given to obtaining General Fund support to provide for appropriate and trained staff. (Note: Previous CSU attempts to obtain General Fund support for such programs were unsuccessful. Because of collective bargaining implications, this recommendation may need to be considered by the Trustees' Committee on Collective Bargaining.)
8. In-service training programs should be required for supervisors, residence hall staff and other appropriate employees regarding the identification and treatment of substance abuse problems.
9. Increased efforts should be made to include appropriate information about substance abuse in new student and employee orientation, campus publications and, as appropriate, the curriculum.
10. Each campus should take the initiative to establish community links with local agencies, elementary schools, secondary schools and community colleges in order to develop effective, complementary and on-going educational and referral programs.



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

California State University, Sacramento  
6300 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 4, 1990

APR 6 1990

Academic Senate Received  
413

TO: Juanita Barrera, Chair  
Academic Senate

FROM: *William A. Dillon*  
William Dillon  
Presiding Member  
University ARTP Committee

SUBJECT: Section 5.05.B of the University ARTP Document

=====  
At its meeting of 19 September 1989, the University ARTP Committee adopted and sent to the Senate the following proposal to amend the subject section:

5.05.B ... primary evaluation level shall, and each secondary evaluation level may, establish a value for each...

When making its substantive evaluation and final recommendation in a particular case, each secondary evaluation level shall apply the relative values established by the primary unit in which that case has arisen unless it has previously established and published its own values as provided above.

That proposal reflected the wishes of the President expressed in his memorandum to you dated June 16, 1989. Pending resolution of certain ambiguities in that memorandum, the Committee's proposal was laid aside. By his memorandum dated March 8, 1990, the President has resolved those ambiguities and cleared the way for the Senate to consider the Committee's proposal.

I am writing, therefore, formally to revive the proposal and place it before the Senate for its disposition. The proposal codifies an interpretation of Section 5.05.B made several years ago to the effect that a secondary committee has power to adopt and apply its own statement of relative weights when evaluating

faculty to create a school promotion list but lacks power to require a primary committee to adopt a particular statement of relative weights.

In previous action, the Senate has denied the power of the secondary committee acknowledged in this proposal. The President has now rejected the Senate's position and confirmed Section 5.05.B as originally stated in the University document and, by implication, the interpretation the Committee is seeking to codify. The Committee hopes therefore that the Senate will adopt the codifying language to enable all candidates and evaluating units to know what a few now know because they have become aware of the interpretative memorandum.

WD:dp





# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE



## M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: October 2, 1989

TO: Donald Gerth  
President

FROM: Juanita Barrena, Chair  
Academic Senate (x6593)  
*Juanita Barrena*

SUBJECT: University ARTP Policy Section 5.05.B

---

On May 11, 1989 the Academic Senate approved AS 89-37A/Ex. which recommended that Section 5.05.B be amended as follows:

5.05 Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

- B. The following criteria are the minimum set by the university for retention, tenure, and promotion. Each primary evaluation level shall establish a value for each criterion in relation to the values it establishes for the other criteria. It may do so by means of a qualitative or quantitative statement. The first criterion, "Competent Teaching Performance," shall be the primary and essential, but not sufficient, criterion in the evaluation process at each review level.

When making its substantive evaluation and final recommendation in a particular case, each secondary evaluation level shall apply the relative values established by the primary unit in which that case has arisen.

In your June 16, 1989 memorandum responding to this Senate action, you stated the following:

"The recommendations concerning University ARTP policy are approved. However, I am adding a provision. I believe it is important that the faculty of a school have the

October 2, 1989

opportunity to set standards and, therefore, relative values concerning ARTP. In approving this recommendation, I am making a specific provision for the faculty of a school, following established procedures within that school, to recommend to the dean of a school the relative values which can be used by the school level secondary committee."

In fact, this addition would constitute disapproval of the Senate's recommendation on the matter. The question of whether secondary committees should be allowed to establish values for criteria that were different from those established by the primary committee was, in fact, the subject of debate in AS 89-37A. It was the intent of the Senate's recommendation to prohibit secondary units from establishing values different from the values established by the primary unit. Therefore, action to include provision for secondary units to establish values different from those established by the primary unit would constitute disapproval of the Senate's recommendation and establishment of a provision in the University ARTP policy to which the Senate objects.

The published revision of University ARTP policy which was distributed to all faculty in a memorandum dated August 24, 1989 did not reflect the changes indicated in your June 16, 1989 memorandum. If in fact, it was your intent to implement a policy change that differs from the Senate's recommendation, the University ARTP Committee recommends that the following language be incorporated into the document.

5.05.B ...primary evaluation level shall, and each secondary evaluation level may, establish a value for each...

When making its substantive evaluation and final recommendation in a particular case, each secondary evaluation level shall apply the relative values established by the primary unit in which that case has arisen unless it has previously established and published its own values as provided above.

It should be noted that providing this language does not constitute agreement with a policy revision of this nature. If it was not your intent to institute a policy change that is in direct conflict with the policy change recommended by the Senate, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter further and attempt to reach a resolution.

JB:dp

cc: Mary Burger  
William Dillon  
Sheila Orman  
David Wagner



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

## M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: May 18, 1990

TO: Juanita Barrena, Chair  
Academic Senate

FROM: *William A. Dillon*  
William A. Dillon  
Presiding Member  
University ARTP Committee

SUBJECT: Section 9.01.H of the University ARTP Document

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

MAY 21 1990

Academic Senate Received  
413

=====  
At your request, the University ARTP Committee has discussed the President's response to AS 89-119 proposing the subject section. The Committee has concluded that the President's response was not inappropriate. However, the Committee has recognized the possibility of contradictions of language that might escape the eye of a unit or a reviewer during the course of approval. It has also recognized the possibility of contradictions between local language and language from outside arising from interpretation in the course of implementation or grievance. To provide for these possibilities, the Committee recommends amendment of the subject section to include the following rule of construction:

9.01 In General

- ...  
H. ... In any instance of conflict or contradiction between the provisions of department or school ARTP documents and those parts of documents from outside the CSU system incorporated verbatim or by reference into department or school ARTP documents, the provisions of the department or school document shall govern.

The Committee believes this rule will preserve the autonomy of campus faculty in any disagreement between those who rely on the product of local majorities and those who rely on the views of more distant and less available centers of decision-making.

WD:dp

California State University  
Sacramento



The President  
Sacramento, CA 95819-27

March 16, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Juanita Barrera, Chair  
Faculty Senate

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

MAR 16 1990

FROM: Donald R. Gerth 

Academic Senate Received  
413

SUBJ: Addition to Section 9.01 of University ARTP Policy

I have approved, with one exception, the Academic Senate's proposal to add a new item H to Section 9.01 of the UARTP Policy (As 89-119). The words "do not contradict and" have been deleted from the second sentence so that the new Section 9.01.H reads as follows:

9.01 In General

- ...
- H. Written criteria, policies and procedures may incorporate other documents which have originated within the CSU system (e.g., collective bargaining agreements, university-wide policy documents) by reference. Documents from outside the CSU system, or excerpted sections thereof (e.g., standards of professional organizations or accrediting agencies, or selected portions thereof), that are specifically referenced in a department's or a school's ARTP policy statement shall be applicable only if these same documents, or specifically referenced sections thereof, are reproduced verbatim in or appended to the ARTP policy statement of that academic unit.

The deleted words are redundant since policies containing internal contradictions would not be approved by the unit. I would assume that an academic unit would resolve any possible internal conflicts before forwarding a document to the UARTP Committee for review and recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

cc: Vice President Burger  
Dean Moulds  
Ms. Orman  
Dean Wagner

3/20/90 *J. D. Wilson*



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

## M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 25, 1990

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

APR 27 1990

TO: Juanita Barrera, Chair  
Academic Senate

FROM: *William A. Dillon*  
William A. Dillon  
Presiding Member  
University ARTP Committee

Academic Senate Received  
413

SUBJECT: Outside Searches for Department Chairs

=====  
The University ARTP Committee recommends amendment of the University ARTP document by adding a new section as follows:

6.08 Appointment to a Faculty Position with the Duties of Department Chair

A department may decide to recommend to the School Dean the appointment of a department chair from outside of the University. The department shall decide whether to recommend a search outside for a chair by a vote of the probationary and tenured members of the department, including those on the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) and those on leave.

For the purpose of searching for a chair outside of the University and recommending whom to appoint, a department may constitute itself a peer review committee of the whole in a manner consistent with University ARTP policy pertaining to such committees. (Please see the Note appended to Section 6.06.B.2 of this document.) If a department has not provided for doing so in its currently approved ARTP document, it shall ask the University ARTP Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs in writing to approve that departure from its ARTP policy. Its written request shall contain a description of its procedures for constituting a peer review committee of the whole and its screening committee, if any. The request shall be approved if the described procedures are consistent with the provisions of this document.

April 25, 1990

After screening applications initially for consistency with the department's published vacancy announcement, the department peer review committee shall make available to every probationary and tenured member of the department in or near the department office each qualified applicant's resume and the materials which the committee is not required to keep confidential. It shall then invite those members to submit written, signed statements of evaluation based on those materials to the applicants' files before determining whom to interview.

The department peer review committee shall also invite every probationary member and those tenured faculty members, if any, who are ineligible to serve on the peer review committee to attend any classroom presentation or other event scheduled in connection with the committee's interview of each applicant selected for an interview. After the peer review committee has conducted its interviews and held events scheduled in connection with them, it shall invite each probationary and tenured member of the department, including those members on FERP or on leave, to submit to the file of the applicants interviewed written, signed statements of evaluation based on the portion of the file available to him or her for review and the events in which he or she and the subject of the statement have participated.

After permitting a suitable interval for the preparation and submission of these statements, the peer review committee shall review the files of the applicants interviewed, conduct its deliberations and make its recommendation to the appropriate administrator. The recommendation may take the form of a ranked list.

Renumber existing sections: 6.09 - 6.11 as 6.10 - 6.12.

The proposed amendment responds to concerns raised in your memorandum, same subject, dated 26 March 1990, and attached to this report. In so far as possible, it incorporates into the selection process required by the M.O.U. the broader participation in the selection of a chair from within the University prescribed by PM 89-14, Role and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chair - Periodic Selection. The Committee hopes its proposal will supply the need of language identified in your memorandum.

Attachment

WD:dp

cc: Stoakley Swanson, Chair  
Faculty Affairs Committee



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE



## M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 26, 1990

TO: ✓ William Dillon, Chair,  
University ARTP Committee

Stoakley Swanson, Chair,  
Faculty Affairs Committee

FROM: Juanita Barrera, Chair  
Academic Senate (x6593)

A handwritten signature in cursive script, likely belonging to Juanita Barrera.

SUBJECT: Outside Searches for Department Chairs

---

Occasionally, a department may decide to conduct an outside search for a department chair. Current University policies do not contain procedures specific to these types of searches. In fact, the policy on Role and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairs which specifies that "Department Chairs shall be nominated by secret ballot by a majority vote in an election ..." and the M.O.U. which specifies that "Department Chairs shall normally be selected from the list of tenured or probationary faculty employees recommended by the department for the assignment" seem to preclude an outside search for a department chair. I suppose, however, one could argue that a department, in deciding to conduct an outside search, has nominated the unnamed person who, eventually, will become a probationary or tenured faculty member in the department.

When a department conducts an outside search for a department chair, it is, de facto conducting a search for a probationary or tenured faculty appointment. Since exceptions are not provided under University ARTP Policy, the search must be conducted under the same procedures that govern all other faculty appointments. Probationary appointment procedures in University ARTP Policy and the M.O.U. provide that "each department or equivalent unit shall elect a peer review committee of tenured employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending individuals for probationary appointments." The exclusion of probationary

March 26, 1990

faculty from the committee and the fact that many departmental appointment policies specify that the search committee shall be other than a committee of the whole are contrary to the letter and the spirit of the provision in the policy on Role and Responsibilities of Department/Division Chairs which specifies that "at least all tenured and probationary faculty members of the department, including those in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) and those on leave, are eligible to vote "(in a department chair nomination election)."

So, what needs to be done? It seems to me that both policies need to be revised to include provisions specific to outside searches for department chairs. Minimally, the policy on Role and Responsibility of the Department/Division Chairs should note that, in such instances, University ARTP procedures for appointment of probationary faculty must be followed. Although current University ARTP policy does not prohibit departments from specifying, in their appointment policies, a different appointment committee composition for searches in which the person recommended for the appointment to the faculty position is also the department's nominee for the chair. This possibility should be made explicit in University ARTP policy.

I would appreciate it if the two of you would meet to develop language for amendments to the policy documents under the jurisdiction of your respective committees that will address this matter.

JB:dp

cc: Sheila Orman  
David Wagner  
Mary Burger