

A C A D E M I C     S E N A T E  
O F  
C A L I F O R N I A     S T A T E     U N I V E R S I T Y  
S A C R A M E N T O

Minutes

Issue #11

November 29, 1990

ROLL CALL

Present: Bach, Barnes, Barrena, Bauerly, Blake, Bourg, Brackmann, Brown, Burris, Carlson, Cook, de Haas, Decious, Elfenbaum, Freund, Fryer, Goldfried, Gonzalez, Harriman, Hayashigatani, Hernandez, Holl, Huff, Jakob, Kenny, Kornweibel, Low, D. Martin, L. Martin, Mattos, Maxwell, McClure, Meier, Michael, Miller, Mrowka, Muller, Navari, Pacholke, Palmer, Quade, Reinelt, Serrano, Shannon, Shek, Steward, Straukamp, Sullivan, Toder, Wade, Weissman, White, Winters, Yousif

Absent: Amos, Curry, Glovinsky, Johnson, Kando, Moore, Novosel, Olson, Pyne, Schuster, Summers, Tooker, Tzakiri, Whitesel, Wright

ACTION ITEMS

AS 90-95/UARTP, Flr.     UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION  
5.05.B

The Academic Senate refers the following proposed amendment [underscore=addition] of Section 5.05.B of the University ARTP policy to the University ARTP Committee for perfection of the wording and resubmission to the Senate for action:

5.05     Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

A.     ...

B.     The following criteria are the minimum 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 the approval of each department in the secondary unit) and published its own values. The approval of each department must be obtained by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty of the department acting in their own right in an election held for that purpose.

C. ...

Carried.

\*AS 90-96/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION  
9.01.H

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.

Carried.

\*AS 90-97/UARTP, FA, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--ADD SECTION  
6.08

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.]

Carried.

\*AS 90-98/FA, Ex. DEPARTMENT CHAIR, ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE--Amends PM 89-14

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

...

Carried.

\*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. ...

Carried unanimously.

\*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, as follows (underscore=addition; strikeover=deletion):

Credit ~~is~~ may be granted from recognized overseas institutions. Awarding of letter grade credit or advanced standing varies depending on the educational system of the country and will be based on information obtained by the International Admissions Office and the Office of International Programs 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 International Admissions Office and the Office of International Programs, 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 International Admissions Office prior to departure<sup>1</sup>.

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

If a student fails to request prior approval, 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 International Admissions 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 Office of International Programs 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 Office of International Programs for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. 5) Approval/disapproval by the Academic Standards Committee shall constitute the final action.

Carried.

AS 90-106/Flr. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of August 28 (#3) and September 13 (#4), 1990, are approved with the following correction to both: M. Gelus is on sabbatical leave and should not have been recorded as absent.

Carried.

\*AS 90-112/Ex. UNIVERSITY-WIDE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS (Amends AS 89-123)

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends the following substantive amendment of the policy on "University-Wide Academic Program Reviews." The recommended location of the amendment and other editorial amendments are shown in the Attachment.

"It is the responsibility of the Review Team Chair to confer with as many team members as possible and to discuss the contents of the report with team members and the academic program faculty prior to final editing and subsequent submission of the draft report..."

Carried.

\*AS 90-114/Ex. FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP, ESTABLISH AD HOC COMMITTEE ON

The Executive Committee, in response to recommendations in the section on Research and Faculty Development of the 1990 Report of the WASC Visiting Team (excerpt provided in Attachment F, November 29, 1990, Academic Senate Agenda) and the President's request in his Fall 1990 Address to the Faculty that the Academic Senate formulate and recommend a definition of scholarship and statement of University expectations for faculty in the realm of scholarship that reflect the collective view of the faculty on these matters, does hereby establish, on

behalf of the Academic Senate, an ad hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship with the following charge and membership.

#### Charge

The ad hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship shall develop and submit to the Senate by May 15, 1991, recommendations that address the following questions:

1. How should scholarship be defined (what is its scope)? How does it relate to the mission of the institution?
2. What are the University's expectations for faculty in the realm of scholarship? Should there be university-wide weights and specified standards for evaluating scholarship for RTP purposes?
3. How should the University recognize, support, and reward faculty scholarship to ensure that expectations for faculty scholarship can be realized?
4. If expectations for faculty scholarship are changed, how will it affect the appointment of new faculty, workload assignments, retention and promotion of continuing faculty?

In developing its recommendations, the ad hoc Committee shall consult broadly with the faculty, and shall solicit faculty participation through such means as questionnaires and open meetings on the subject.

#### Membership

The ad hoc Committee shall consist of the following membership.

- One instructional faculty member from each of the following committees:

Faculty Affairs, Faculty Professional Development, Research and Creative Activity, University ARTP, Graduate Policies and Programs, and the Executive Committee (appointed by the Executive Committee)

- Two at-large faculty, appointed by the Executive Committee
- Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee.

The Committee shall elect its own chair.

Carried.

AS 90-115/Flr. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of September 27 (#5), October 4 (#6), October 18 (#8), November 1 (#9) and November 8 (#10), 1990, are approved as published. The October 11 (#7), 1990, Minutes are approved with the following correction: T. Bourg should be recorded as present.

Carried.

AS 90-116/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--SENATEAffirmative Action Committee:

AJIT VIRDEE, E&CS, 1992 (repl. K. Ferrara)

Faculty Affairs Committee:

EDDIE CAJUCOM, A&S, 1992 (repl. G. Ramachandran)  
CHARLOTTE COOK, At-large, 1991 (repl. H. Neal)  
EDITH LEFEBVRE, At-large, 1991 (repl. S. Swanson)

General Education Committee:

ED CHRISTENSON, SBA, 1991

Graduate Policies and Programs Committee:

JAMES STRAUKAMP, Senator, 1991

Livingston Lecture Committee:

WILMA KREBS, At-large, 1992  
JEAN TORCOM, At-large, 1992

Scholarship, ad hoc Committee on:

JEAN-PIERRE BAYARD, Member, Faculty Professional Development Committee (E&CS)  
THERESA ROBERTS, Member, Research and Creative Activity Committee (Educ)  
ROBERT JOHNSON, Members, Faculty Affairs Committee (A&S)  
MALCOLM WHITE, Member, University ARTP Committee (SBA)  
ROBERT CURRY, Member, Executive Committee (A&S)  
CRISTY JENSEN, Member, Graduate Policies and Programs Committee (A&S)  
PHYLLIS MILLS, At-large (H&HS)  
RICHARD CRABLE, At-large (A&S)

University Writing Committee:

JOAN BAUERLY, English Department Faculty, 1993  
STEPHANIE TUCKER, English Department Faculty, 1992  
GARY SHANNON, At-large, 1991  
JOAN AL-KAZILY, At-large, 1992  
PRISCILLA ALEXANDER, At-large, 1993

Carried unanimously.



\*AS 90-117/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITY

A.S.I. Appellate Council:

WALLACE ETTERBEEK, At-large, 1991

Campus Educational Equity Committee:

ROBERT BUCKLEY, E&CS, 1993 (repl. I. Ghansah)

Diversity Awards Programs, Committee for:

JEAN-PIERRE BAYARD, FPDC Member, 1991

MINA ROBBINS, GPPC Member, 1991

JOHN MAXWELL, CEEC Member, 1991

CHRIS HASEGAWA, AA Member, 1991

ESTELA SERRANO, At-large, 1993

MARJORIE LEE, At-large, 1992

CLOTEAL ISAAC, At-large--Student Service Prof., 1991

Energy Management Committee:

HOMER IBSER, At-large, 1992

Faculty Representative to A.S.I.:

SUE HOLL, At-large, 1991

Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Board:

WILLIAM DILLON, At-large, 1991

ANN HARRIMAN, At-large, 1991

LUCIEN AGOSTA, At-large, 1991

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

FREDERICK BLACKWELL, E&CS, 1993

VIVIAN MILLER, Student Affairs, 1993

Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards Committee:

JOHN CONEY, Unit 3 Faculty, 1991

ESTELA SERRANO, Unit 3 Faculty, 1991

JEAN TORCOM, Unit 3 Faculty, 1991

Persons with Disabilities, University Committee for:

FRED BALDINI, Instructional Faculty, 1993 (repl. A. Graves)

Student Academic Development Committee:

DAVID RASKE, At-large, 1991

JESUS TARANGO, At-large, 1991

NANCY TOOKER, At-large, 1991

MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 1991

Student Disciplinary Hearing Officers:

EDWARD BRADLEY, At-large, 1991  
ROLAND DART, At-large, 1991  
PAUL FALZONE, At-large, 1991  
SUSAN GERINGER, At-large, 1991  
ERWIN KELLY, At-large, 1991  
PETER SHATTUCK, At-large, 1991

Student Economic Support, University Committee for:

CHARLOTTE COOK, Education, 1993  
DAEHEE LEE, E&CS, 1993

University Alcohol and Drug Steering Committee:

CHRIS HASEGAWA, At-large, 1992  
MARTIN ROGERS, At-large, 1991  
JOEY ANDERS, At-large, 1992  
EILEEN HEASER, Professional Services, 1991

University Center Board:

SUZANNE OGILBY, At-large, 1993

University Trust Foundation Board:

JUANITA BARRENA, At-large, 1993

University Union Board of Directors:

JOHN MCCLURE, At-large, 1991

Carried unanimously.

AS 90-118/FPDC, Ex. FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE,  
MEMBERSHIP (Revises AS 88-41B)

The Academic Senate approves expansion of the membership of the Faculty Professional Development Committee to include one senator and two at-large faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate. Further, the Academic Senate stipulates that no more than three of the faculty members serving on the committee, whether appointed, ex-officio, or liaison, shall be from the same school.

Carried unanimously.

\*AS 90-119/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF  
MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee on the program review for the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and recommends that:

1. the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Mathematics be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. the Master of Arts degree program in Mathematics be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

Carried unanimously.

\*AS 90-120/CC, GPPC, EX. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee on the program review for the Department of Biological Sciences and recommends that:

1. the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. the Bachelor of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
3. the Master of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

Further, the Academic Senate notes that several of the recommendations contained in the Biological Sciences program review pertain to issues of universitywide concern. The Academic Senate notes, in particular, that recommendations 1 and 2 to the School of Arts and Sciences ["It is recommended that the School of Arts and Sciences: 1. and Academic Affairs consult about (a) formulating a more precise definition of academic currency and devising ways of measuring currency; (b) finding ways of promoting academic currency; (c) establishing common qualifications for faculty teaching graduate courses. 2. specifically affirm its commitment to the principle of 'full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants' for faculty positions, and explain how hiring departments can pursue affirmative action goals in a manner consistent with the commitment to the full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty positions."], the recommendation to Academic Affairs ["It is recommended that Academic Affairs and the School of Arts and Sciences consult about (a) formulating a more precise definition of academic currency and devising ways of measuring currency; (b) finding ways of promoting academic currency; (c) establishing common qualifications for faculty teaching graduate courses."], and the recommendation to the President ["It is recommended that the president dispel the present confusion concerning affirmative action and hiring by personally providing an interpretation of the University's commitment to the principle of full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty and staff positions, and explain how hiring departments and other units can pursue affirmative action goals in a manner consistent with the principle of full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty and staff positions."] do not pertain to the program in Biological Sciences but to issues of universitywide concern. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that the issues addressed in recommendation 1 to the

School of Arts and Sciences and the recommendation to Academic Affairs be addressed within the context of the Senate's ad hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship and that the issues raised in recommendation 2 to the School of Arts and Sciences and the recommendation to the President be considered by the Affirmative Action Committee.

Carried unanimously.

\*AS 90-121/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS/PHYSICAL SCIENCE

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee on the program review for the Department of Physics/Physical Science and recommends that:

1. the Bachelor of Arts degree programs in Physics and Physical Science be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. the Bachelor of Science degree program in Physics be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.

Carried unanimously.

AS 90-122/Ex. TRUSTEES' OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARD 1990-91

The Academic Senate reaffirms AS 89-103, as follows:

Whereas, The CSUS Academic Senate views the Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award Program as an inappropriate way to recognize superior teaching; therefore be it

Resolved: The CSUS Academic Senate reaffirms the campus policy of declining to participate in the Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award Program.

Carried unanimously.

AS 90-123/Ex., Flr. MILITARY STUDIES ADVISORY BOARD

[Note: The membership and charge defined in this action replaces provisions of AS 89-14 and AS 82-27 named in those actions as the Faculty Board, Military Science Advisory Board, or Military Studies Advisory Board.]

- Whereas, Since 1980 when the first ROTC program (Army) was established on the CSUS campus, and the original courses in Military Science were approved, (AS 80-14) the number of ROTC programs and courses have increased, and
- Whereas, the programs are currently administered in the Office of Academic Affairs by the Dean of Regional and Continuing Education as opposed to the School of Arts and Sciences as recommended by the Senate in AS 82-26 in 1982, and
- Whereas, the Military Studies Advisory Board was established by the Senate in 1980 as the "Faculty Board" (AS 80-14) with membership and reporting relationship revised in 1982 (AS 82-27) for secondary level faculty review of curriculum and to ensure compliance of the program with all University policies, including affirmative action policies, ARTP policies, academic policies, and policies on academic freedom as they pertain to students and faculty, and
- Whereas, issues regarding the conflict between ROTC admissions policies and University policies have highlighted the need for a Board with a more clearly defined charge and a membership that is more closely tied to other Senate/campus bodies that develop and review University policies and procedures, therefore be it
- Resolved, The Academic Senate adopts the following revision of the membership and charge of the Military Studies Advisory Board:

Membership:

Voting:

Five at-large faculty members, appointed by the Academic Senate to serve staggered three-year terms

The Vice President for Academic Affairs/or designee  
One student, appointed for the academic year by  
A.S.I.

**Non-voting:**

One faculty representative from each authorized campus ROTC program, appointed for the academic year by each program

One student enrolled in a ROTC program (on a rotating basis from each of the campus ROTC programs), appointed for the academic year by A.S.I.

The Chair shall be elected by and from the voting membership.

**Charge:**

The Military Studies Advisory Board shall be a standing committee of the Senate with the following specific duties and responsibilities:

1. To orient ROTC faculty to the policies and procedures of the University and to assist ROTC faculty in developing ties with the campus community.
2. To function as a faculty secondary level review committee in matters of curriculum (e.g., course change proposals, new program proposals) Note: in this case as in the case of school secondary level committees, recommendations shall be made to the Dean responsible for program administration who shall forward recommendations to Academic Affairs for placement on the agenda of the appropriate Senate committee (i.e., GPPC or CC).
3. To review and monitor instructional and student support aspects of the program (e.g., student advising, grading standards, student grievances and grade appeal policies and practices).
4. To review and monitor ROTC policies and procedures (e.g., ARTP, academic policies, affirmative action, educational equity) for conformance to University policies and procedures. In cases of conflict, the Board shall recommend to the ROTC program administrator changes necessary to achieve conformance and/or recommend to the Senate actions deemed appropriate in relation to non-conformance issues.
5. To advise the Senate on matters pertaining to Department of Defense policies and procedures

that constrain the ability of ROTC programs to conform with University policy. In cases where non-conformance appears unresolvable at a local level, to recommend to the Senate actions deemed appropriate (e.g., granting a waiver, appeal to the Department of Defense, program discontinuation).

Carried.

\*AS 90-124/Flr. RECYCLING, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CAMPUS

Whereas, California State University, Sacramento, is concerned with education not only for the present but for the next century; and

Whereas, Environmental concerns at the federal and state level will require CSUS to comply with increasingly stringent waste reduction efforts in the coming decades; and

Whereas, Recycling ought to be an important concern for every member of the campus community; therefore, be it

Resolved: That all recycling efforts on campus be encouraged and continued; and, be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate request the Campus Environment Committee report to the campus on the following:

1. CSUS recycling and waste reduction needs;
2. effectiveness of the A.S.I. recycling center with respect to: a) meeting recycling needs of the campus and surrounding community, and b) increasing student, faculty and staff awareness of waste reduction as a vital component of planetary survival; and
3. a plan for further recycling and reduction of waste on campus.

Carried.

The hour of adjournment having been reached, the following item was postponed to the December 6, 1990, Senate meeting:

AS 90-101/AP, Ex. DROP POLICY

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

---

Janice McPherson, Secretary

\*President's approval requested.



Re: AS 90-112

Attachment  
Academic Senate Minutes  
November 29, 1990

### UNIVERSITY-WIDE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

Board of Trustees regulations require that every academic unit be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. For this review each academic unit prepares a self study of its academic programs. These self studies are to conform to a common University format and utilize data supplied by the University for program planning and evaluation.

The self studies are forwarded to the School Dean who, according to school policy, examines them and, in consultation with appropriate school committees, makes recommendations concerning program offerings to both the academic unit and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs through the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

After the school has reviewed the programs, the self studies are forwarded to the Vice President's office for conveyance to the Academic Senate Curriculum and Graduate Policies and Programs Committees. These committees, through specially appointed review teams, conduct the University-wide-level academic program review.

The Team examines the unit's self study and other relevant materials, conducts interviews, gathers additional information including seeking expert opinion as necessary from outside consultants. As a result of this study, the Team prepares, originally in draft form and then in final form, a detailed substantive report reflecting both qualitative and quantitative aspects of all programs offered by the unit.

The Chair of the Review Team is responsible for the preparation, submission and interpretation of review reports, ~~together with any including~~ minority findings<sub>7</sub>. It is the responsibility of the Review Team Chair to confer with as many team members as possible and to discuss the contents of the report with team members and the academic program faculty prior to final editing and subsequent submission of the draft report to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee<sub>7</sub>. and The Chair acts as a non-voting consultant when the Review Team's report is under consideration.

At the same time as the Review Team's draft report is submitted to the committees, it is also forwarded to the unit whose program(s) is being reviewed. The unit is given two weeks to respond to the report, correct inaccuracies in fact or data, and

- over -

take reasoned exception to judgments or conclusions drawn. Likewise, the Academic Senate Curriculum and Graduate Policies and Programs Committees have the same period of time to study the report, make further investigation, and to instruct the Review Team as to suggested additions, deletions, or modifications to the draft report. After the Review Team receives the comments from the unit involved and the two committees, it prepares its final review report for resubmission to the committees.

After the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee receive the Team's final review report, each of these committees will move to adopt the report either fully or with reasoned exceptions. The committees' separate endorsement of the report will be attached to the Team's report before final distribution to the reviewed unit and others on the distribution list. Along with the Team's report, the committees' endorsement and reasoned exceptions, go the committees' commendations, recommendations and Senate action items. Departments who choose to do so, may file a response to be appended to the Review Team's final document.

Academic degree programs are scheduled for review at least once every six years, and summaries of program review findings must be forwarded annually to the Chancellor's Office. These recommendations become the basis for the preparation of the CSU Academic Master Plan which authorizes each campus to offer specific degree programs.

Revised by Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee: September 17, 1990  
Revised by Academic Senate Executive Committee: October 23, 1990