

1993-94  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, February 24, 1994  
Forest Suite, University Union  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

**INFORMATION**

1. Spring Schedule of Meetings (tentative):  
March 10, 24 [*Spring Recess: March 28-April 1*]  
April 14, 21, 28 (2:30-3:00, 1994-95 Organizational Meeting #1)  
May 12 ( (2:30-3:00, 1994-95 Organizational Meeting #2), 19
2. Report on Faculty Endowment Fund -- Professor Jean Torcom

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

AS 94-09/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

Curriculum Committee:

NANCY TOOKER, Senator, 1995 (repl. J. Mrowka)  
JACK MROWKA, At-large, 1996 (repl. N. Tooker)

Fiscal Affairs Committee:

JAMES HILL, A&S, 1995 (repl. S. Buss)  
MARY ANN REIHMAN, At-large, 1994 (repl. H. Gustafson)

Library Committee:

JAMES KHO, E&CS, 1994 (repl. C. Aryani)

Research and Creative Activity Committee:

CRAIG KELLEY, SBA, 1995 (S'94 repl.)

University Writing Committee:

JOAN BAUERLY, English Faculty, 1996 (S'94 repl. J. Yen)

**REGULAR AGENDA**

AS 94-08/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting February 10 (#15), 1994.

Old Business

AS 93-79/Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMENDMENTS (IMPLEMENTATION)  
["Catalog rights"]

*Referred  
134 16-77*

The Academic Senate recommends that when changes to existing RTP documents occur either at the primary or secondary level, those changes will become effective only after the unit documents have been approved by the President and will affect only those unit faculty hired after the effective date of unit document approval (i.e., changes to RTP criteria will not be applied to any unit faculty member already in the RTP cycle at the time the changes occurred unless the faculty member chooses to be reviewed under the new criteria).

*[Note: On November 11, 1993, with Dillon/Ostiguy proposed substitute amendment to AS 93-79 (below) being discussed, action was postponed to the end of debate on University ARTP Policy revisions.]*

**Proposed substitution to AS 93-79/Ex.:**

If the Academic Senate recommends the changes to Section 5.05 of University ARTP policy specified in AS 93-77 and AS 93-77A-E, Section 5.05 as it stood prior to those changes will remain in the University ARTP document and will be prefaced by the following language:

*Approved  
as  
subst*

Faculty unit employees appointed before (date) to full-time permanent positions or to full-time temporary positions convertible to full-time permanent positions without an intervening search shall continue to be subject to the performance requirements of unit policies and procedures approved before 31 August 1993 as being consistent with the provisions of Section 5.05 of University ARTP policy published August 1991 as follows:

Section 5.05 as amended by Senate action on AS 93-77 and AS 93-77A-E shall be added to the statement of University ARTP policy immediately below the currently approved Section 5.05 and will be introduced by the following language:

Faculty unit employees appointed after (same date as above) to full-time permanent positions or to full-time temporary positions convertible to full-time permanent positions without an intervening search shall be subject to the performance requirements of unit policies and procedures approved after 31 August 1993 as being consistent with the provisions of Section 5.05 of University policy as set forth below. Faculty unit employees appointed before (same date) may choose to comply with the performance requirements of unit policies and procedures approved as consistent with Section 5.05 as set forth below.

The date specified in each instance above shall be a suitable date following submission of units documents and their approval by the President, as determined by the President or the President's designee on the recommendation of the Senate.

AS 93-77/Flr. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTIONS 5.05

[Refer to Attachment A.]

**FIRST READING**

AS 94-10/Ex. STANDING RULES--Changes to Existing Rules

The Academic Senate approves the changes to the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate [for clarity and by way of explanation the changes are noted as major--the creation or merging of committees, and minor--reorganization of committee structure/reporting relationships. Also, please note that the use of the word "faculty", in the existing Standing Rules, unless otherwise specified, means probationary or tenured faculty whose regular assignment is to teach].

**MAJOR CHANGES:**

AS 94-10A CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, CREATE

To approve the creation of a Curriculum Committee (by way of merging the existing Fiscal Affairs Committee and the course review functions of the Senate's existing committees known as the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee).

Charge: The Curriculum Committee shall have as its charge the review and recommendation of all proposals for new academic programs and course change proposals in their entirety (both curricular and fiscal impacts of changes).

who makes policy?

**Membership:**

- Five Graduate Coordinators or faculty who teach in graduate programs
- Five Undergraduate Coordinators or faculty who teach in undergraduate programs
- Chair (or faculty designee) of each the Curriculum Committee's Standing Subcommittees
- Chair (or faculty designee) of the General Education Course Review Committee

Library Prof Serv.?

**Standing Subcommittees:**

University Teacher Education Council [Note: placing UTEC as a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee insures that courses do not fall through the cracks as has occurred in the past.]

Extended Learning Programs Subcommittee

Interdisciplinary Subcommittee

**AS 94-10B ACADEMIC PROGRAMS REVIEW COMMITTEE, CREATE**

To approve the creation of an Academic Programs Review Committee (by way of merging the review and academic planning functions of the existing Senate committees known as Curriculum and Graduate Policies and Programs).

Charge: The Academic Programs Review Committee shall develop and recommend policy and procedures concerning academic program reviews and shall review and make recommendations on all proposals for the development of the University Academic Plan and any other curricular plans or policies that might affect the instructional program of CSUS.

**Standing Subcommittees:**

International Programs Committee

Military Studies Advisory Board

Membership: Follows existing pattern for standing committees (*refer to Attachment B*), except to 1) increase the at-large faculty from four to six faculty, at least three of whom teach in graduate programs, 2) add the Chair (or faculty designee) of the General Education Committee, and 3) add the Chair (or faculty designee) of each of the Academic Programs Review Committee's standing subcommittees.

**AS 94-10C ACADEMIC SUPPORT COMMITTEE, CREATE**

To approve the creation of the Academic Support Committee (by way of merging the Senate's Library Committee and the subcommittee of Academic Policies known as the "University Media Subcommittee").

Charge: Shall review and recommend policies concerning all instructional support services including the library, university media, and computing services.

**Membership:**

One faculty member from each School

Two Library Faculty

Two Student Services Professionals

One Professional from Computing Communication and Media Services

One Administrative Designee

**MINOR CHANGES****AS 94-10D STUDENT RETENTION AND EDUCATIONAL EQUITY COMMITTEE (as Standing Subcommittee of Academic Policies Committee), CREATE**

To approve a standing subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee known as "Student Retention and Educational Equity Committee" (this would be in keeping with the existing and current charge of Academic Policies to "formulate academic policies in the area of student life").

Charge: to develop and recommend to its parent committee academic policies in the area of student life.

**Membership:**

Eight faculty members appointed by the Academic Policies Committee for two-year, staggered terms: 3 from Arts and Sciences, 1 from Business Administration, 1 from Education, 1 from Engineering and Computer Sciences, and 2 from Health and Human Services

One Academic Policies Committee member as liaison

One Support Staff member

No more than two ex-officio members

One student appointed by A.S.I.

**AS 94-10E FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

To approve the following changes to the charge and membership of the existing Faculty Affairs Committee and to add as its standing subcommittees the Research and Creative Activity Committee and the Faculty Professional Development Committee.

Charge: The Faculty Affairs Committee shall plan, review, and recommend policies concerning faculty professional matters in the general areas described below:

1. Policies concerning programs that benefit the professional lives of the faculty (~~other than faculty development programs which are currently the responsibility of the Faculty Professional Development Committee and the Research and Creative Activity Committee~~). These include but are not limited to:

~~Endowed professorships~~ Faculty Endowment Fund

Faculty awards/recognition programs

Sabbatical and difference in pay leaves

2. Policies concerning matters of professional ethics, professional responsibilities, and academic freedom, including but not limited to:
  - Faculty professional ethics
  - Issues of academic freedom
  - Faculty responsibilities
  - Role and responsibilities of department chairs
  
3. Personnel policies and procedures, including but not limited to:
  - Periodic review of tenured faculty
  - Procedures for administrative searches
  - Procedures for selection of department chairs

**Standing Subcommittees:**

- Research and Creativity Activities Committee
- Faculty Professional Development Committee

**Membership:**

**Five Seven voting members:** two faculty members from the School of Arts and Sciences, two faculty members from professional schools, and one Library or Academically Related Student Services Professional faculty member; Chair/Designee, Faculty Professional Development Committee; Chair/Designee, Research and Creative Activity Committee

Administrative designee (non-voting)

**AS 94-10F UNIVERSITY WRITING COMMITTEE--Standing Subcommittee of General Education Committee**

To approve the University Writing Committee as a standing subcommittee of the General Education Committee (no changes to its current charge or membership are recommended).

**AS 94-10G VISITING SCHOLARS COMMITTEE--Subcommittee of Faculty Professional Development Committee**

To approve the Visiting Scholars Committee as a subcommittee of the Faculty Professional Development Committee (its membership and charge would not be altered)

[Note: AS 93-78, adopted November 4, 1993, states "The Academic Senate refers the proposed amendments to Section 5.05 of the University ARTP policy adopted in AS 93-77 (UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05) to the faculty in a referendum.]

Amendments in AS 93-77, below, reflect Senate actions adopted at meetings of October 21, 1993, through February 10, 1994.

AS 93-77/Flr. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of amendments to Sections 5.05 of the statement of University ARTP policy as follows [underscore = addition; strikeover = deletion] :

5.05 Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

A. A unit shall exercise the discretion conferred by this section in a manner consistent with the mission of the University as a regional comprehensive university that places primary emphasis on teaching performance in the evaluation of faculty unit employees for retention, tenure or promotion.

B. Purpose of Evaluation for Retention, Tenure or Promotion

Evaluation is the act of ascertaining in each faculty unit employee seeking retention, tenure or promotion the presence to an acceptable extent of certain qualities and capacities. Generally speaking, these are: 1. breadth and depth of knowledge, 2. invention or creativity, and 3. an ability to investigate primary sources of understanding, to make and defend judgments and to articulate or otherwise present and apply them in an appropriate context.

AC. Although evaluative criteria are the same for retention and tenure, the evidence to support a recommendation to grant tenure shall be considerably more substantial than that to support a recommendation to retain a probationary employee. If a faculty unit employee is not likely to be awarded tenure, then he/she should not be reappointed. If he/she does not have the potential for promotion to associate professor or beyond, he/she should not be awarded tenure. However, the granting of tenure does not guarantee future promotion.

BD. The criteria set forth below have been adopted by the university to govern 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 a quantitative statement. The first criterion, "Competent Teaching Performance," shall be the primary



E. No requirement not clearly and specifically stated and described in the discussion of Competent Teaching Performance, Scholarly or Creative Achievements, Contributions to the University or Contributions to the Community in a unit's ARTP document shall be applied to a faculty unit employee seeking retention, tenure or promotion.

CF. Competent Teaching Performance

...

DG. Scholarly or Creative Achievements

~~Evidence may include, but not be limited to:~~

- ~~1. accomplishments in research and/or creative projects.~~
- ~~2. publication of articles, books, reviews, music, script, software, and research papers consistent with the mission of the university. Publication of instructionally related research (the category of research specifically authorized for the CSU in the Master Plan for Higher Education) shall be weighted as heavily as any other type of research at all levels of evaluation.~~
- ~~3. an active program of scholarly or creative work in progress, appropriate to the discipline.~~
- ~~4. membership and appropriate participation in activities of professional organizations.~~
- ~~5. presentation of professional lectures.~~
- ~~6. creative activity culminative in a professionally evaluated public display or performance such as might occur in music, art, drama, poetry, reading, etc.~~
- ~~7. the products of consultantships, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature related to the individual faculty member's area of academic expertise.~~
- ~~8. a statement describing the support, or lack of it (released time and/or funding) for the reported scholarly or creative achievements.~~

1. Definition of Scholarly or Creative Activity:

Scholarship is an effort both to practice one's discipline and to share the work with one's peers. Practicing the discipline may be understood as creating, expanding, revising, refining, interpreting, synthesizing, evaluating



or applying knowledge--or creating works of art in disciplines that encompass both art and the study of art. Such work can and should be manifested in all areas of a professor's activities--teaching, service, consultation--but not all worthwhile and necessary professional activities are scholarly. In practice, scholarship can take many forms, such as attendance at local, national and international conferences, creative achievement in the arts, presenting papers, seeking peer feedback on projects, reading current books and professional journals, participation in colloquia, reviewing, collaborative and independent research projects, and writing for publication. What marks it as scholarly is the degree to which it results in substantive interaction with one's peers in the practice of the discipline. Some level of scholarly activity is essential for maintaining the currency that is indispensable to effective teaching.

2. To prepare to evaluate scholarly or creative activity each primary unit shall specify in its ARTP document:
  - a. the evidence of an acceptable level of scholarly or creative activity which faculty unit employees seeking retention, tenure and promotion may offer or must offer or both to the primary level peer evaluation committee and the department chair as a basis for their recommendation.
  - b. a requirement that the faculty unit employee submit to the file sent to the committee a statement describing the support for scholarly or creative achievements (e.g., released time or funding or both) which the faculty unit employee has received during the period of activity being evaluated.
  - c. the relative value of scholarly or creative activity in every comprehensive evaluation of performance. However, in no case shall scholarly or creative activity be regarded as more important than teaching performance or less important than either service to the University or service to the community.

Note: The value given to the category of Contributions to the Community or the category Contributions to the Institution, taken separately, may be equal to or less than the value given to the category of Scholarly or Creative Achievements. But in no case can the value given to either category of service be greater than the value given to the category of Scholarly or Creative Achievements.

3. Notwithstanding any other provision of the University ARTP policy, a secondary unit shall not be permitted to 1) determine for itself the means or evidence by which faculty unit employees seeking retention, tenure or

promotion may demonstrate an acceptable level of scholarly or creative activity, or 2) establish its own relative value of scholarly or creative activity. Rather, secondary units and administrators at all levels of review shall make their evaluations and their recommendations or decisions in a way that reflects in substance the means and evidence for demonstrating scholarly or creative activity, and the relative values of the criteria which the primary units have specified.

4. Evidence of scholarly and creative activity, including evidence of how such activity resulted in substantive interaction with peers in the practice of the discipline, shall be a condition precedent to retention, tenure or promotion.
  - a. A primary unit may specify in its ARTP document a requirement that the product of the scholarly or creative activity of faculty unit employees seeking retention, tenure or promotion shall be presented to an appropriate critical public within the University or beyond its confines as a condition precedent to retention, tenure or promotion.
  - b. In the absence of a primary unit's requirement for presentation permitted in subsection a. of this section, the faculty unit employee may decide to include presentations of the type described in subsection a. of this section for consideration in the category of Scholarly or Creative Achievements. The act of such presentations shall always be accorded positive value in the category of Scholarly or Creative Achievements.
  - c. In any case of required presentation permitted by subsection a. of this section, the faculty unit employee shall identify a critical public to which to make the presentation. The faculty unit employee shall state in writing the choice and the reasons for regarding the chosen public as sufficiently critical and appropriate and shall submit the statement to the primary unit.
  - d. The primary unit, acting by its peer review committee or another means specified in its ARTP document, shall review the faculty unit employee's choice of public and shall decide in each case of required presentation whether the public chosen by the faculty unit employee is sufficiently appropriate and critical to function as an audience for the product of the faculty unit employee's scholarly or creative activity. The primary unit shall make its decision known to the faculty unit employee in time to permit the faculty unit employee to complete a presentation to a sufficiently appropriate and critical public before the beginning of the evaluation cycle in which the faculty unit employee's retention, tenure or promotion will be determined.

evaluation cycle in which the faculty unit employee's retention, tenure or promotion will be determined.

e. Notwithstanding any provision of University ARTP policy, a secondary unit shall not adopt for itself presentation requirements that differ from those established by the primary unit.

f. The secondary committee shall not determine for itself whether a chosen public within or beyond the confines of the University is sufficiently appropriate and critical to serve as an audience for the product of scholarly or creative activity in any case of the required presentation permitted under subsection a. of this section.

EH. Contributions to the Community

...

FI. Contributions to the Institution

...

GJ. Possession of Appropriate Academic Preparation

...



6.06 Probationary Appointments

A-F.

...

G. Each primary unit shall make clear to each applicant for a probationary appointment at the time of interview the performance requirements for retention, tenure and promotion specified in the currently approved ARTP document of the unit, the secondary unit which evaluates the faculty unit employees in the primary unit, and the University.

H. Each primary unit shall provide to each applicant who is appointed to that unit a copy of the currently approved ARTP policies and procedures of: 1) the unit; 2) the secondary unit which evaluates the faculty unit employees in the primary unit; and 3) the University. The primary unit shall provide these copies before the end of the faculty unit employee's first pay period and shall expressly draw the attention of the faculty unit employee to their contents and significance in general and particularly with respect to the performance requirements for retention, tenure or promotion.

3.06.00 Academic Senate Committees

B. Standing Committees

The following provisions shall apply to Senate standing committees unless otherwise specified:

1. Membership

- a. One student member
- b. One staff member
- c. One faculty member from the School of Arts and Sciences
- d. One faculty member from the professional schools and divisions (Education, Business and ~~Public Administration~~, Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Services)
- e. One faculty member from the professional services (Library and Student Affairs)
- f. Ex officio (non-voting) membership from the administrative staff, not to exceed two. The appointment shall depend on the area of committee concern and shall be confirmed annually with the Executive Committee. (AS 83-29)
- g. Faculty members at-large, a number, not to exceed four, to be determined by the Committee on Committees
- h. Two faculty members of the Academic Senate
- i. The Chair of the Academic Senate is an ex officio member of all faculty committees
- j. At no time shall any standing committee have more than two faculty members holding a full-time appointment in the same department  
(FS 76-75)



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6018

Distributed at  
2/24/94  
Senate mtg

## OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES

(916) 278-6402 Associate Vice President  
(916) 278-7381 Research  
(916) 278-6470 Graduate Studies  
(916) 278-6163 FAX

2/24/94

TO : MEMBERS, ACADEMIC SENATE  
FROM : MAHLON HELLER, CHAIR, GRADUATE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS  
COMMITTEE

Please read the attached commentary, unanimously approved by both the Curriculum Committee and GPPC, on proposed changes in the Senate's committee system.

Although Executive Committee responses to earlier committee critiques of reorganization proposals have somewhat altered the plan which our commentary addresses, we submit our 11/2 commentary because our two committees formally approved it and because most of its comments remain relevant to the proposal now before the Senate.

Our special concern is the proposal to combine the Curriculum and Graduate Policies and Programs Committees. We recommend that the Senate keep the two committees separate, because:

---- The two committees are already pressed to complete the considerable and vital work given to them separately. A combined committee will, we think, be unable to do the work assigned to it unless it effectively leaves that work to a series of subcommittees -- thus defeating the very effort at integration which the proposed reorganization seeks. It will also be extremely difficult to convince a faculty member to serve as the chair of such a combined committee.

---- Two separate committees are necessary to give our undergraduate and graduate programs the qualified Senate and University representation which they need.  
[ To emphasize the parallel indispensable work of the two Committees we do recommend that the Curriculum Committee be renamed as the Undergraduate Policies and Programs Committee.]

---- The two committees have worked well together in joint sessions on such common questions as program reviews.

We also emphasize that both the Curriculum and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committees deal continually with policy rather than primarily with implementation, and streamlining measures such as our improved course changes system increase the time which they can devote to a thorough consideration of policy issues. That time for thorough consideration will, however, be lost if the two Committees are combined.

Finally we question the wisdom of excluding the two current Committees from an important role in the program review process. Our Committees are, we suggest, exactly the assemblies of experienced judges of curriculum necessary for a sound program review process.



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6018

## OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES

(916) 278-6402 Associate Vice President  
(916) 278-7381 Research  
(916) 278-6470 Graduate Studies  
(916) 278-6163 FAX

## MEMORANDUM

November 2, 1993

TO: Sylvia Narvari, Chair  
Academic Senate

FR: Mahlon Heller, Chair  
Graduate Programs and Policies Committee *M. H.*

## RESPONSE TO SENATE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION PROPOSAL

### I. The important responsibilities of GPPC are:

1. To review and make recommendations to the Senate regarding graduate curricular policies;
2. To review and make recommendations to the Senate regarding proposed changes in the graduate curriculum;
3. To review and make recommendations to the Senate regarding proposed graduate program changes;
4. In cooperation with the Curriculum Committee to conduct program reviews;
5. To maintain effective faculty liaison with the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and with the Graduate Center;
6. To develop effective liaison with campus graduate coordinators.



- II. The Committee applauds the efforts of the Senate to increase the efficiency of the Senate committee system. The Committee has, however, a number of concerns about the proposal submitted to it for evaluation.

The proposed reform would merge the current Curriculum and Graduate Policies and Programs Committees into a Curriculum Policy Committee. We fear that such a new and all-encompassing committee would have to, if only for a lack of time, concentrate on undergraduate issues and so reduce the attention given to our graduate programs.

We believe that is essential for CSUS graduate programs to have continual representation at the highest committee level. If the new committee delegates graduate issues to a subcommittee, the effect will be to add another layer of committees to the Senate system. The need for such a subcommittee to educate the full committee regarding each important issue would alone consume considerable valuable time. The committee's use of subcommittees might also require much time-consuming sending of proposals back and forth between the different committee levels. The current division between undergraduate and graduate committees functions well because the two committees deal with questions of common interest in joint meetings. (See below for a suggestion regarding program review procedures.)

- However internally organized, the proposed new committee would have too much work and too little time for full consideration of proposals.
- The proposed reform includes provision for some 18 units of released time for the chairs of the three policy committees -- and if our proposal (see below) for a separate graduate programs committee is accepted, the released times would presumably be 24 units. While we certainly agree that the chairs of the proposed committees would deserve (perhaps need) the released time, we question such an expenditure of faculty units under our current straightened budgets. We also point out that some implementation committees involve enough work to equally justify released time for their chairs.
- The proposed reform statement given us provides no details about the membership of the new policy committees. We point out, however, that a reduction of the number of members of policy committees will reduce faculty participation in policy decision making and will, by centralizing policy decisions, run counter to recent organization theory contentions that decision making is most efficient when decentralized. We believe that it is possible to make our Senate committee system more effective without the proposed centralization: It is possible to have consolidation of effort and responsibility without centralization. We recognize, however, that any decentralized system must meet the test of efficiency in operation if it is to continue serving as the most important part of faculty participation in academic governance.

We understand that the proposed reform would require all senators to serve on committees. We acknowledge the importance of having effective senatorial participation on Senate committees and of their serving as a link between the committees and the full Senate.

However, if all senators are required to serve on Senate committees, the consequent increased work demand on senators will discourage faculty from serving on the Senate or make them give up important committee work at the school and departmental level in order to meet those Senate responsibilities. Senate governance would then intrude on local governance.

- The proposed reform includes an ill-advised separation between policy development and implementation (adherence to University rules). We believe that policy committees need to understand the problems of implementing policies – an understanding that comes best from personal experience with implementation decisions. We also note that it is sometimes difficult to decide when an issue is primarily one of policy or implementation and that implementation commonly requires an interpretation of policies – an interpretation better done by faculty involved at both the policy and the implementation levels.

(For instance, the current GPPC agenda includes three items, Special Major requirements, Graduate Grading and Standards, and Off-Campus/External Degree programs, which inseparably combine policy and implementation questions. Each involves some interpretation of policy, if only to know whether we should recommend a clarification of policy; each requires a knowledge of implementation problems for the Committee to make reasonable recommendations.)

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

GPPC recommends that:

1. The Senate retain a decentralized committee system that combines policy and implementation responsibilities within committee charges.
2. If, however, the Senate decides to proceed with the proposed reform of its committee system, we recommend that the proposed Curriculum Policy Committee be divided into two separate committees, an Undergraduate Policy and Programs Committee and a Graduate Policies and Programs Committee.

We further recommend before full-Senate consideration of the proposed reform, the Executive Committee specify how committee members will be chosen.

3. We recommend that the proposed released time for chairs remain flexible and determined annually in light of the budget at hand.
4. Whether the Senate keeps its (perhaps modified) current committee system or adopts the proposed reform, we recommend that it modify the responsibilities of the Executive Committee.

We believe that the Executive Committee should administer the Senate but avoid substantive evaluations of committee recommendations. It should instead restrict itself to preparing the Senate agenda: to ensuring that committees have consulted all interested parties and relevant documents in devising their recommendations. If the Executive Committee finds a committee recommendation unsuitable for full Senate consideration, it should send the recommendation back to the committee for further work or clarification.

The Executive Committee should ensure that the Senate hears about all alternative measures debated at the committee level, but should leave the presentation of the pros and cons of a recommendation and of alternatives considered to the committee chairs or their designees. (Having Senate members of all committees should also help in the presentation of committee recommendations to the full Senate.) Although this proposal will increase the work of committees, we believe that committees will recognize that work as part of the increased responsibility which must accompany greater independence.

Automatic Executive Committee membership for some committee chairs should help eliminate the need for Executive Committee substantive review, and a reduction in the responsibilities of the Executive Committee should make it possible for committee chairs to serve on it while also chairing their committees.

- (5) Although GPPC opposes the proposed committee reform before the Senate, we in no way oppose efforts to improve the efficiency of the current committee system. On the contrary, we recommend that the Senate invite all of its committees to submit proposals designed to improve their own operations or to improve the entire committee system. GPPC is, for instance, interested in considering a new program review procedure, under which reviews would formally divide into undergraduate and graduate processes, reviewed respectively by the Curriculum Committee and by GPPC.

A renewed broader review of the Senate committee system might profitably begin with an investigation of the specific functions of each committee and then devise a committee structure best suited to those functions.