

1999-2000
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, December 9, 1999
Foothill Suite, University Union
3:00-4:00 p.m.

Introduction of Faculty Merit Scholars
4:00-5:00 p.m.



1999-2000 Merit Scholars

Undergraduates: Benjamin Etgen, Mathematics and Statistics
Sean Dean, Biological Sciences/Chemistry

Graduate: Marisa Avendano, Health and Physical Education



Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

Bob Buckley, Computer Science
Marilyn Kent, Social Work
Susanne Lindgren, Committee Chair, Biological Sciences
Shirley Thornton, Educational Administration and Policy Studies
Charles Varano, Sociology
Alan Wade, Social Work Emeritus

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 99-93/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS—UNDERGRADUATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the program changes shown in Attachment A.

FS 99-94CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS—GRADUATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the program changes shown in Attachment B.

FS 99-95/CPC, Ex. CERTIFICATES OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the certificates of academic achievement shown in Attachment B.

FS 99-96/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW—DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment C) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of Economics and recommends conditional approval of the Bachelor of Arts Degree in Economics, the minor in Economics, and the Certificate of Economic Education for a period of two years.

FS 99-97/CPC, Ex. DEGREE PROGRAMS--COMMON CORE, UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE [See Attachment D for background.]

The Faculty Senate recommends the the policy on degree programs (AS 83-85) be amended as follows [underscore = addition]:

Undergraduate degree programs are expected to include at least five courses with no fewer than fifteen units that are common to the degree program. The requirement should be the same for B.A. and B.S. degrees. Graduate degree programs are expected to include at last three courses with no fewer than nine units, excluding independent study, field work, and the culminating experience, that are common to the degree program. Exceptions for 1) inclusion of courses outside the discipline in the core units, or 2) fewer than 15/9 units common to the degree program shall be requested through the usual University approval process.

In addition, the Senate recommends that forms for new programs/program change proposals include questions that ask the unit to identify the core units and direct the need for requesting an exception if there are less than 15/9 common units.

FS 99-98/Ex. CENTERS AND INSTITUTES [Amends PM 96-06; AS 96-42]

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the university policy on "Procedures for Reviewing of Centers and Institutes" (PM 96-06) as shown in Attachment E [a synopsis of proposed changes is shown in Attachment E-1 and background provided in Attachment E-2].

REGULAR AGENDAFS 99-92/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of November 18 (#6), 1999.

Approved

FIRST READING

[Discussion only—10 minute limit, unless extended by majority vote; no action.]

FS 99-99/FPC, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP DOCUMENT—ADD SECTION 6.10.E, OPEN RECRUITING

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the University ARTP document as shown in Attachment F [see Attachment F-1 for background information]:

INFORMATION

1. CSUS and Executive Order 665 “Determination of Competence in English and Mathematics”
- Provost Jolene Koester
2. Report from Statewide Senators
3. Tentative Fall 1999 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
December 16 Senate Meeting
4. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Administration *then* Faculty Senate) - Senator Arthur Jensen

Happy 2000!!

Program Changes – Undergraduate:

College of Arts and Letters

- a. Department of Theatre Arts, Theatre Concentration: Creates common core of courses for upcoming merger between Theatre and Dance.
- b. Department of Design, Graphic Design B.S.: Adds GPHD 10 as lower division course requirement; GPHD 101 and 102, new titles and modified course descriptions become part of the required upper division core classes in both Interior Design and Photography; GPHD 103B, new title and change in course description to include computer use; and requires INTD 129 Design Portfolio as core class.
- c. Department of Design, Interior Design B.S.: ^ADeletes FACS 31, Textiles, and six units of lower division art electives; deletes two Interior Design courses, and creates three new courses.

College of Engineering and Computer Science

- d. Computer Engineering Program, B.S.: Replaces two currently required courses with two new required courses (CSC 28, Discrete Structures for Computer Sciences replaces Math 101 and EEE 102, Analog/Digital Electronics, replaces EEE/BME 120, Electronic Instrumentation. Changes decrease total number of units from 137 to 13.
- e. Department of Computer Science, B.S.: Math elective is replaced with CSC 28. Existing required course CSC 60 is renamed to reflect revised content. A new, required course, CSC 133, is added. Existing elective CSC 175 is renumbered to CSC 138, renamed, and made a requirement. Existing required course CSC 135 is renumbered to CSC 145, is renamed, and becomes an elective. Existing elective CSC 161 is deleted. Elective structure is modified from four restricted electives to three free electives.

College of Health and Human Services

- f. Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, Minor: Reduces number of required RLS units from 21 to 18 and increases the number of required RLS upper division units from 9 to 12.

Re: FS 99-94

Attachment B
Faculty Senate Agenda
December 9, 1999

Program Changes – Graduate:

College of Engineering and Computer Science

Department of Computer Science, M.S.: Area Requirements (the selection of five courses from one of six areas) will be replaced with a Breadth Requirement: the selection of one course from three of six areas, plus two restricted electives.

Re: FS 99-95

Certificates of Academic Achievement:

- a. Department of Computer Science--Certificates of Advanced Studies in Computer Science: Available only for MS Computer Science matriculated students, the certificates (Artificial Intelligence, Computer Architecture, Computer Engineering, Computer Networks and Communications, Software Engineering, Systems Software, and Data Management Systems) are designed to recognize students who have completed core graduate courses CSC 201, 204, 205 and 206 plus additional advanced course work in a specialty area.
- b. Counselor Education—Dropout Prevention Specialist Certificate Program: Provides core body of knowledge and practice for new and continuing outreach consultants, principals, district administrators and others who work with at-risk students in schools.
- c. Music—Performer's Certificate: Allows advanced, post-master's study in musical performance for highly qualified instrumentalists, vocalists, and conductors.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 27, 1999
TO: Professor Dennis Huff, Chair
FROM: Brad Nystrom, Ken Debow, Susie McKee
RE: Economics Program Review

The Panel for the Evaluation of the Department of Economics Program Review has approved the review team's report and its recommendations. However, the Panel also wishes to make the following comments:

With respect to recommendation 2, the Panel notes that in recent years internship programs in other departments have found it difficult to attract students (many of whom explain that they cannot afford to work without pay, arrange transportation, etc.). While the Panel agrees that advising the Department to "take steps to institute a more aggressive internship program" makes good sense, it recognizes that some factors contributing to the overall condition of the program may be beyond the Department's control.

The Panel acknowledges the responses of the Department and Dean Sheley to recommendation 5. Clearly, there is considerable confusion concerning the matter of funds for travel and research. The Panel strongly endorses the review team's suggestion that the Department and the Dean meet to review the College's policies regarding such funds and to discuss their availability.

The Panel acknowledges the Department's response to recommendation 9 and encourages it to review carefully both the nature and operation of its governance system.

**SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE ACADEMIC
PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS**

Summary of Commendations to the Department

1. The Department is commended for its difficult decision to place the Graduate Program on hold.
2. The Review Team is particularly appreciative to the members of the department who met personally with them and offered such a frank assessment of the challenges facing the department.
3. The Department is commended for what appears by all accounts to be an excellent relationship with its students.

Summary of Recommendations to the Department

Student Services

1. The Department should examine its advising policy to provide greater direction and increased contact with students throughout their undergraduate careers. (p. 3)
2. The Department should take steps to institute a more aggressive internship program. (p. 4)
3. The Department should provide additional opportunities for increasing contact between its undergraduate students and its alumni. (p. 5)

Faculty Development

4. The Department should institute a student-faculty colloquium in which faculty members present their current research efforts or pedagogical innovations for comment and review. (p. 6)
5. The Department should, in consultation with the Dean of the College, implement a restatement and review of the College's policies regarding the provision of travel funds and monies available for supporting research available both through the College and the University. (p. 7)

Curriculum Development

6. The Department should undertake a comprehensive planning exercise that establishes the department's curricular strengths and weaknesses in light of present faculty staffing and predicted changes in staffing over the next three to five years. The goal of such an effort should be to proactively plan the Department's way into future areas of excellence. (p. 8)
7. The Department should give serious consideration to establishing a cluster of "applied" or "social issues" General Education courses. (p. 9)
8. The Department should review, on a continuing basis, all of the department's General Education course offerings and consider, in particular, the possibility of submitting ECON 104-- Introduction to the United States Economy as a GE course. (p. 9)

Departmental Governance

9. The Department should revisit its committee structure to institute appropriate changes that ensure that all faculty members have a chance to contribute to departmental governance in a meaningful way. (p. 10)

Outreach

10. The Department should increase its commitment to and investment in the Center for Economic Education. (p. 11)
11. The Department should initiate discussions with appropriate members of the College of Business Administration to repair past differences and plan for areas of common concern in the future. (p. 12)
12. The Department should undertake discussions with other departments, particularly Government and the Masters Program in Public Administration, to investigate possible joint and expanded offerings. (p. 13)

General

13. The Review Team recommends that at the end of two years, the Department should submit to the Dean of the College of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Studies a report addressing the progress being made on the recommendations contained in this report.

Recommendation to the Faculty Senate

The Review Team recommends the conditional approval of the Bachelor of Arts Degree in Economics, the minor in Economics, and the Certificate of Economic Education for a period of two years. (p. 13)



NOV 30 1999

Faculty Senate Received
413

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
Faculty Senate
Curriculum Policies Committee

MEMORANDUM

November 29, 1999

To: Bob Buckley ✓
cc: Cecilia Gray

From: Ann Haffer *Ann Haffer*

Re: Exemptions to Program Core Requirements

Issue: Proposed change to Degree Programs policy, AS 83-85 regarding program core requirements

Background: Cecilia Gray, Associate Vice President Undergraduate Programs, requested the Curriculum Policy Committee review core curriculum requirements. Specifically, the request asked the committee to consider if courses outside the discipline itself should be included as part of the "core", if the requirements should be the same for BA and BS, and if the 15 unit for the undergraduate degrees, and the 9 unit requirement for the Master's degree were appropriate.

Curriculum Policy Committee Review of Issue: The committee reviewed the University Catalog, section XI in the "Bluebook", Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs (Attachment A), and the University Manual Degree Programs policy, AS 83-85(Attachment B) and the CSU Executive Order 602 (Attachment C).

Curriculum Policy Committee Recommendations: The committee recommends continuation of current policy which requires 15 units in undergraduate programs (9units in Graduate Programs) that are common to the degree program. The requirement should be the same for BA and BS degrees. The committee further decided that there could be valid reasons for courses outside the discipline in the core units, but that when this occurs or if there are fewer than 15/9 units common to the degree program approval for exceptions should be requested through the usual University approval processes. It further recommended that the forms for new programs/program change proposals include

questions that ask the unit to identify the core units and direct the need for requesting an exception if there were less than 15/9 common units.

Arguments In Favor: The CSU EO 602 recognizes that exemptions are acceptable and recommends that exceptions be addressed locally. If programs/units provide evidence that they are providing for sufficient depth and breadth requirements to achieve degree objectives the intent of the core policy would be met.

Arguments Against: Academic councils may not give sufficient attention to core requirements; however, the Curriculum Committee should identify potential problems.

XI: Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs

The University structures its academic degree programs in such a way that sufficient breadth and depth experiences are required to ensure maintenance of degree objectives. In the Bachelor of Arts programs, primary degree objectives are

1. to provide the student with a balanced and coherent liberal arts education that expands one's knowledge and appreciation of the world and enhances his or her ability to deal constructively with life's experiences;
2. to provide the student with appropriate content, methodology, applications in a recognized discipline sufficient to support entry into related vocations or advanced study, or to enhance one's own personal knowledge or skill. The liberal arts function is provided through the University's general education program and related liberal arts electives. The second function is provided by academic major and minor requirements.

Bachelor of Arts Degree majors (124 units) require a minimum of 24 upper division units and are limited to 48 units in the major field, including lower division prerequisites. The comprehensive liberal studies degree program which includes both major and general education requirements is currently exempt from the 48 unit limitation. Exemptions to the unit limitation are granted only upon the recommendation of the Academic Senate and approval of the College Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Bachelor of Science Degree (124-132 units, except engineering up to 140 units) has the same primary objectives as the Bachelor of Arts Degree but is grounded in scientific methodology and emphasizes applications in a wide range of technical and professional fields. Bachelor of Science majors require a minimum of 36 upper division units, and are limited to no more than one half the total degree unit requirements in the major field, inclusive of both lower and upper division units, but exclusive of prerequisites outside the major. Exemptions to the unit limitation of Bachelor of Science programs are made in the same fashion indicated for Bachelor of Arts programs.

The Bachelor of Music carries the same primary objectives as the other baccalaureate degrees, but is more structured and prescribed in major content in order to meet specific professional goals. The Bachelor of Music degree requires 132 units. The total number of units required for the major (including all prerequisites and corequisites not including the General Education program) may not exceed the difference between 132 and the number of units specified in the General Education program.

Undergraduate degree programs are expected to include at least five courses with no fewer than fifteen units that are common to the degree program.

Graduate study is designed to advance knowledge and competencies in specific content areas of individuals holding baccalaureate degrees. It is presumed those engaging in graduate education possess the requisite undergraduate preparation in the liberal arts and appropriate discipline areas to support scholarly discourse and activity. Students found deficient in undergraduate foundation preparation may be denied graduate admission or required to take additional undergraduate work to qualify for classified graduate standing.

The Master of Arts Degree, an extension of the Bachelor of Arts Degree, is grounded in liberal traditions and directed toward the mastery or application of specific content material. Degree programs are designed to prepare individuals for entering related career fields, doctoral programs or other professional areas of study. Master of Arts programs are limited to a 30-unit requirement, exclusive of qualifying undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

The Master of Science Degree, an extension of the Bachelor of Science Degree, is grounded in liberal traditions, scientific methodology, and is directed toward the mastery or application of scientific or technological principles in specific content areas. Degree programs are designed to prepare individuals for entering related career fields, doctoral programs or other professional areas of study. Master of Science programs are limited to a 30-unit requirement, exclusive of undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

Master's degrees in designated professional fields such as Business Administration (MBA), and Social Work (MSW) are designed to prepare individuals to enter specific career fields. These degree programs commonly considered training for practitioners in the field are grounded in liberal traditions, with appropriate foundation study in related arts and science curricula necessary to support the acquisition of professional knowledge and skill in the specific content area. Master's programs in designated professional areas are limited to a 60-unit requirement, exclusive of undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

Exemption from the unit limitation for Master's Degrees are made only upon the recommendation of the appropriate College, College Dean, university review bodies, Vice President for Academic Affairs, approval of the President with the concurrence of the Chancellor. Current exceptions are the interdisciplinary Master of Arts program in International Affairs with a limitation of 48 units, the Master of Science program in Counselor Education with a limitation of 60 units, and the Master of Arts program in Speech Pathology and Audiology which exceeds the maximum by 1-3 units.

All graduate majors or programs within a major must have a core curriculum requirement which emphasizes integration of knowledge and preparation of specialization and which is designed to assure mastery of requisite knowledge and skills. The core, which is a common body of knowledge specific to a discipline, will consist of minimum of nine units. Excluded are independent study, field work, internships and thesis units. At least six of the required units must be common to all programs within the major. The remaining three units must be describable as meeting a particular education objective within the major.

Exceptions to this nine-unit core requirement will be considered on a program by program basis. Exceptions will only be made under extraordinary circumstances and must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Requests for exceptions must be made to the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies and the appropriate senate curriculum committee.

CSUS graduate programs shall normally require that a minimum of 18 units in a 30-40 unit degree program and 36 units in a 60 unit degree program be earned in regularly scheduled 200-level courses requiring student participation (e.g., discussion) as the primary

instructional method, and seminar courses requiring formal presentations by students and student responses to presentations as well as formal evaluation by the instructor.

Seminar 200-level enrollments should, whenever possible, be limited to 15. All 200-level courses shall require students to demonstrate writing and/or presentation abilities appropriate for thesis/project and professional work and provide opportunities for interaction among students and between students and the instructor.

To maintain program viability, graduate programs are to be scheduled so that enough courses are offered to insure completion of a 30-unit program within two academic years. As a standard, graduate programs shall offer each year the nine units common to the degree program and at least nine units of degree applicable course work. Over a two year period, 18 units of 200 level courses shall be offered, exclusive of supervisory units, and these units shall not include repeated offerings of the same course. The offerings should be varied enough to allow, and the scheduling pattern should permit, students to take at least 27 units of degree applicable course work, exclusive of supervisory units, over a two year period. Consideration shall be given to the diverse nature of programs and courses when evaluating program and enrollment viability. Graduate programs whose enrollments do not support consistently the offering of this scheduling pattern may be discontinued or admission to the program may be suspended upon the recommendation of the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee after a formal review of the program. Such program reviews, unless otherwise scheduled, normally take place every six years.

Developed by University Planning Committee: Spring, 1980

Approved by President: Summer, 1980

Approved by Chancellor's Office: 12-2-80

Revised and Approved by GPPC: 10-11-82; 1991

Revision Approved by Academic Senate: 11-10-82; 1991

Revised and Approved by Academic Senate Curriculum Committee: 11-21-83

Policy Approved by Academic Senate: 12-14-83

Return to [CSUS Home Page](#), [Academic Affairs](#), [Bluebook Index](#).



University Manual

California State University, Sacramento

Policy Name: Degree Programs

Ref: AS 83-85

Effective:

Last Revision Date: July 1, 1987

Policy Administrator: Vice President, Academic Affairs

Index cross-references:

Policy File Number: UMD03050

The university structures its academic degree programs in such a way that sufficient breadth and depth experiences are required to ensure maintenance of degree objectives. In the Bachelor of Arts programs, primary degree objectives are:

1. to provide the student with a balanced and coherent liberal arts education that expands one's knowledge and appreciation of the world and enhances his or her ability to deal constructively with life's experiences; and
2. to provide the student with appropriate content, methodology and applications in a recognized discipline sufficient to support entry into related vocations or advanced study, or to enhance one's own personal knowledge or skill.

The liberal arts function is provided through the university's general education program and related liberal arts electives. The second function is provided by academic major and minor requirements.

Bachelor of Arts Degree majors require a minimum of 24 upper division units and are limited to 48 units in the major field, including lower division prerequisites. The comprehensive liberal studies degree program which includes both major and general education requirements is currently exempt from the 48 unit limitation. Exemptions to the unit limitation are granted only upon the recommendation of the Academic Senate's Curriculum Committee and approval of the school dean and the Vice President, Academic Affairs.

The Bachelor of Science Degree has the same primary objectives as the Bachelor of Arts Degree but is grounded in scientific methodology and emphasizes applications in a wide range of technical and professional fields. Bachelor of Science majors require a minimum of 36 upper division units, and are limited to no more than one half the total degree unit requirements in the major field, inclusive of both lower and upper division units, but exclusive of co-requisite requirements. Exemptions to the unit limitation of Bachelor of Science programs are made in the same fashion indicated for Bachelor of Arts programs.

Bachelor's degrees in designated disciplines such as Bachelor of Music or Bachelor of Vocational Education carry the same primary objectives as the other baccalaureate degrees, but are more structured and prescribed in major content in order to meet specific vocational or professional goals. Major requirements including all prerequisites and co-requisites may not exceed the difference between the units specified in the general education program, other all-university requirements, and the total number of units required for the Bachelor's degree.

Graduate study is designed to advance knowledge and competencies in specific content areas of individuals holding baccalaureate degrees. It is presumed that those engaging in graduate education possess the requisite undergraduate preparation in the liberal arts and appropriate discipline areas to support scholarly discourse and activity. Students found deficient in undergraduate foundation preparation may be denied graduate admission or required to take additional undergraduate work to qualify for classified graduate standing.

The Master of Arts Degree, an extension of the Bachelor of Arts Degree, is grounded in liberal traditions and directed toward the mastery or application of specific content material. Degree programs are designed to prepare individuals for entering related career fields, doctoral programs or other professional areas of study. Master of Arts programs are limited to a 30-unit requirement, exclusive of qualifying undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

The Master of Science Degree, an extension of the Bachelor of Science Degree, is grounded in liberal traditions, scientific methodology, and is directed toward the mastery or application of scientific or technological principles in specific content areas. Degree programs are designed to prepare individuals for entering related career fields, doctoral programs or other professional areas of study. Master of Science programs are limited to a 30-unit requirement, exclusive of undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

Master's degrees in designated professional fields such as Business Administration (MBA), and Social Work (MSW) are designed to prepare individuals to enter specific career fields. These degree programs commonly considered training for practitioners in the field are grounded in liberal traditions, with appropriate foundation study in related arts and science curricula necessary to support the acquisition of professional knowledge and skill in the specific content area. Master's programs in designated professional areas are limited to a 60-unit requirement, exclusive of undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

Exemption from the unit limitation for Master's Degree are made only upon the recommendation of the appropriate school/division, university review bodies, school dean/division chair, Vice President, Academic Affairs, approval of the President with the concurrence by the Chancellor. Current exceptions are the interdisciplinary Master of Arts program in International Affairs with a limitation of 48 units, the Master of Science program in Counselor Education with a limitation of 60 units, and the Master of Arts program in Speech Pathology and Audiology which exceeds the maximum by 1-3 units.

Students seeking a second master's degree must offer at least 51 units total for both degrees when each degree is a 30-unit program. Comparable totals may apply proportionately when degrees of more than 30 units are involved. Basic requirements for level of courses, culminating requirements, residency, and other university rules apply to all second master's students.

Undergraduate degree programs are expected to include at least five courses with no fewer than fifteen units that are common to the degree program. Graduate degree programs are expected to include at least three courses with no fewer than nine units, excluding independent study, field work, and the culminating experience, that are common to the degree programs.

To maintain program viability, graduate programs are to be scheduled so that enough courses are offered to insure completion of a 30-unit program within two academic years. As a standard, graduate programs shall offer each year the nine units common to the degree program and at least nine units of degree applicable course work. Over a two year period, 18 units of 200 level courses shall be offered, exclusive of supervisory units, and these units shall not include repeated offerings of the same course. The offerings should be varied enough to allow, and the scheduling pattern should permit, students to take at least 27 units of degree applicable course work, exclusive of supervisory units, over a two year period. Consideration shall be given to the diverse nature of programs and courses when evaluating program and enrollment viability. Graduate programs whose enrollments do not support consistently the offering of this scheduling pattern may be discontinued or admission to the program may be suspended upon the recommendation of the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee after a formal review of the program. Such program reviews, unless otherwise scheduled, normally take place every five years.



Return to [University Manual Index](#), [CSUS Home Page](#).

9

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

Attachment C

(310) 985-2800



Date: July 15, 1993

To: Presidents

From: Barry Muniz
 Chancellor

Post-it* Fax Note	7671	Date	8/29	# of pages	5
To	Ann Haffer	From	Cecilia		
Co./Dept.	Nursing	Co.	Academic Affairs		
Phone #	8-4663	Phone #	8-5933		
Fax #	8-6311	Fax #			

Subject: Delegation of Authority - Authority to Approve Options, Concentrations, Special Emphases, and Minors in Designated Academic Subject Categories - Executive Order No. 602

This Executive Order, superseding Executive Order 283, expands the authority of campus presidents to approve minors and most options, concentrations, and special emphases. Presidents may approve (1) a minor in any subject category and (2) an option, concentration, or special emphasis that is in the same discipline division as the existing degree program within which it is established. The option, concentration, or special emphasis need no longer share a common core requirement of five courses (for undergraduate programs) or three courses (for graduate programs) with other options, concentrations, and special emphases in the degree program to be approved under this delegation of authority. Campuses are nevertheless encouraged to provide that all students who complete a particular degree program share some common educational experiences and meet some common academic expectations.

In accordance with the policy of The California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing Executive Orders, where applicable, and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all Executive Orders.

BM/rp

Attachment

Distribution: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
 Deans of Undergraduate Studies
 Deans of Graduate Studies
 Chairs, Campus Academic Senates
 Chancellor's Office Staff

XC: RIGGS
 JOLENE

RESEARCH CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

(changes - ~~deletions~~)

Purpose

University-endorsed centers and institutes are approved by the President and formally reviewed by the University to ensure that they serve some or all of the following purposes:

1. enhance the conduct of faculty research and scholarship;
2. enhance and support the instructional programs of the university;
3. enhance the university's ability to obtain external funding; and
4. provide for and coordinate public service programs.

Endorsed centers and institutes do not have a primary purpose of offering instruction, although their activities may be related to the instructional program.

They differ in purpose, organization, reporting lines and formal review requirements from centers which support academic programs, faculty research and development in general, provide student services, or offer academic programs.

The Associate Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended Programs has primary administrative responsibilities for Centers and Institutes.

Procedures for the Establishment of a Center or Institute

Each center/institute shall:

1. have a clearly stated set of objectives;
2. have a clear relationship to the mission of an existing university program or of the university as a whole; and,
3. have a clear administrative reporting line.

Support

The amount, duration, and source(s) of funding required to establish and maintain a center or institute shall be included in the proposal for approval at the time of establishment and reviewed annually by the unit(s) which supplies support.

Types of Centers and Institutes

There are three types of university-endorsed centers and institutes: departmental, college/school and university. The three types differ in a) the criteria and procedures for their establishment and disestablishment; b) their reporting lines and the policies and procedures which govern their

organization; c) requirements for fiscal support and the disposition of Research Incentive funds; d) the procedures for their formal, periodic review; and e) the scope of the academic discipline relevant to their activities.

Departmental Centers and Institutes

- a) Departmental centers and institutes may be proposed by one or more faculty or by a department. Faculty members' proposals require approval of the department faculty. Centers and institutes approved at the departmental level then require the college school dean's approval, after consultation with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President's approval. Through the Associate Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended programs, the dean submits approved proposals to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs who recommends approval or disapproval to the President.
- b) Departmental centers and institutes report to the department that approved them. The director is appointed by the department for a term not to exceed three years and is subject to departmental college/school and university centers and institutes policies and procedures. The department in turn reports at least annually on the center or institute to its Dean, who reports on the center or institute to the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. Departmental centers and institutes are encouraged, but not required, to have a board or advisory committee.
- c) Departmental centers and institutes are self-supporting, but external funding is not required. Any earmarked research incentive funds go to the center or institute.
- d) Departmental centers and institutes undergo formal university review at the time of the program review of the department to which it reports.
- e) Departmental centers and institutes normally promote research or support academic programs in one academic discipline (or department) or use the expertise of one academic discipline (or department) for public service.

College/School Centers and Institutes

- a) College/School centers and institutes are proposed by faculty members or by a department directly to the dean of a college school. The dean consults with affected departments and with the college/school faculty or appropriate college/school governance before approving (or disapproving) the proposal for the center or institute. Through the Associate Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended programs, the dean submits approved proposals to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs who recommends approval or disapproval to the President.

- b) College/school centers and institutes report to the college school dean, who appoints the director with the consultation of the college/school faculty (or appropriate college/school governance) to serve at the dean's pleasure. The director is subject to college/school and university center and institute policies and procedures. College/school centers and institutes undergo formal university review by at the discretion of the President, but at least every six years. The school dean annually evaluates college/school centers and institutes for the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. The school dean will report the results of the annual evaluation to the school faculty (or appropriate school governance). College/school centers and institutes may report to more than one school college dean but one school dean must have final supervisory authority.

College/School centers and institutes must have an advisory committee comprising at least college/school and other on-campus members and also such off-campus members as the dean directs with consultation of the college/school faculty (or appropriate college/school governance). All off-campus advisory committee members are formally appointed by the President in consultation with the Dean.

- c) College/School centers and institutes normally receive a combination of school-generated and external funds. Earmarked research incentive funds go to the center or institute.
- d) College/School centers and institutes undergo formal university review by the Dean at least once every six years. The dean reports the results to the Associate Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended Programs. The Associate Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended Programs may accept and transmit the report to the President and Provost or may direct an additional formal review.
- e) College/School centers and institutes must support research and other academic activities in more than one academic area (or department) and must be involved in service to a regional area.

University Centers and Institutes

- a) University centers and institutes are established by the President after consultation with appropriate deans, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Academic Senate.
- b) University centers and institutes report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Directors serve at the pleasure of the President and are subject to university center and institute policies and procedures. University centers and institutes must have an advisory committee appointed by the President (with consultation with the Academic Faculty Senate on faculty appointments) and including off-campus members as the President may direct.
- c) University centers and institutes may be supported by the University and shall have a significant share of external funding.

- d) University centers and institutes undergo formal university review by the Associate Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended Programs at the discretion of the President, but at least every six years.
- e) University centers and institutes sponsor research and service activities which are important to more than one school, serve the mission of the University and involve activities at the regional, statewide, national or international levels.

Administrative Responsibilities

The handling of funds, conduct of conferences, workshops, seminars, etc. and activity related to grants and contracts shall follow all normal University guidelines. For department and college/school centers and institutes, the college dean has responsibility for approving all activities. For University centers and institutes, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs has such responsibility.

Review of Centers and Institutes

All endorsed centers and institutes shall, in addition to reports that may be required by deans, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President, annually submit a "short-form" report to the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Graduate and Extended Programs who will alert the President, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and, when appropriate, the deans and departments to any deficiencies indicated by the report filed.

All periodic, six-year formal reviews of college/school and university centers and institutes and any special reviews ordered by the President shall use the following procedures:

Following the guidelines established for non-academic program reviews and management audits, the formal reviews of centers and institutes shall consist of:

- A. a self-study;
- B. a review team consisting of 1 administrator and 1 faculty member (appointed by the appropriate administrator of the college or university); and
- C. as deemed necessary by the appropriate administrator, an outside consultant with expertise in the area of activity of the center or institute.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs will appoint up to two additional members for each review team from among administrators, staff, students, alumni, or community members as appropriate. The chair of the team shall be selected by and from the team.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the director of the center or institute and the review team, will designate an individual from beyond the campus. This

individual, normally from another university or comparable institute, would be one whose competence is in the field of the center or institute being reviewed, and who is associated with a unit having similar purposes. The individual can function as an adjunct member of the team or as a consultant.

The self-study prepared by the director of the center or institute will comprise a response to the following:

1. Describe the activities of the center or institute since the last review.
2. If the center or institute is associated with a department or departments, describe the distinction between departmental activities and the center or institute activities.
3. What have been the successes and failures of the center or institute in meeting the goals of the last six-year plan?
4. By what criteria should the center or institute be judged in its success over the next six years vis-a-vis the next six-year plan?

The community or off-campus advisory board or group to the center or institute will be asked to prepare a report to the review team, addressing the same questions (from the preceding paragraph) and others they may select. The director of the center or institute will have an opportunity to comment on this report.

Each review shall be made in consideration of the following:

1. the self-study,
2. the last six year plan,
3. the year-end reports submitted since the last six year review,
4. the report of the last six year review, and
5. the next six year plan.

The review team shall conduct interviews with the director of the center or institute and others, as appropriate.

The result of the review will be a report. The report will be reviewed in its proposed final draft form (it may have been previously reviewed) with the director, and others as appropriate. In addition to a response to the issues of the self-study, the report should address the appropriateness of the budget and its use, and the appropriateness of the next six year plan. The report should include specific recommendations for action by appropriate campus entities, including a recommendation to the Academic Senate, the appropriate Academic Dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for continuation or termination of the center or institute.

The report will be presented to the Faculty Senate's Curriculum Policies Committee. to be handled in the same manner as academic program reviews.

Disestablishment

Depending on type (Department, College/School or University), centers and institutes shall be disestablished by the review and approval procedures described above.

except that the process need not include outside peer review. Continuation of a center or institute beyond the three-year developmental period does not guarantee continuation of university funding

10/19/99--Approval recommended by the Curriculum Policies Committee

Proposed Changes in Procedures for Reviewing Centers and Institutes

October 19, 1999

Changes

Old	New
<u>Primary Administrative Responsibility</u> President and Formal University Review	Assoc. Vice Pres for Res, Graduate and Extended Programs has Primary Responsibility
Schools	Colleges/Schools
<u>Fiscal Support/Disposition of Research Incentive Funds</u>	Omit earmarked Research Incentive Funds go to center or institute Omitted because not seen as a part of policy. Each type of program may do this differently
Differences by Level of Center – Department, College, or University	
<u>Approval for Establishing:</u> Departments Dean approve, AVPAA, Provost and President College :Dean to Provost and AVPAA University: President, AVPAA, Academic Senate	Dean submits to Provost and AVPAA through The AVP For R, G, and EP same as Departments Provost and Faculty Senate
<u>Reporting Lines/Governance</u> Departments —annual report to Dean, Dean reports to AVP for RG&EP Colleges -- Formal University review at least every 6 years and report to faculty University –report to AVPAA	annual report to dean omitted and Dean’s report to AVP for RG &EP omitted These reports are omitted Provost and AVPAA,
<u>Formal periodic review</u> Departments — Colleges —formal University review every 6 years University —University review every 6yr	Formal university omitted (still reviewed at time of program review) Dean reviews every 6 years reports results to AVP for RG&EP Formal review by AVP for RG&EP every 6yrs
<u>Scope of Academic discipline relevant to activities</u> No changes	
Administrative Responsibilities	
No section for this	Department and College —Dean University —Provost and AVP for RG&EP
Reviews	
<u>Annual short form reviews</u>	Provost is added to the reporting process
Review teams had 2 additional members from among administrators, staff, students, alumni or community and a consultant with expertise appropriate for center	For college and university: follow guidelines for nonacademic program review and consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a self-study • a review team of 1 administrator, 1 faculty member (appointed by an administrator of the college/university) • administrator appoint an outside consultant with expertise appropriate for the center activity.

NOV 08 1999

Faculty
413

Senate Received



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
Faculty Senate
Curriculum Policies Committee

MEMORANDUM

November 8, 1999

To: Bob Buckley, Chair
Faculty Senate

From: Ann Haffer, Chair *AH*
Curriculum Policies Committee

Re: Procedures for Reviewing Centers and Institutes

Issue: Requested changes in the University policy (PM 96-06) on "Procedures for Reviewing of Centers and Institutes"

Background: Ric Brown, Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended Programs indicates that the Chancellor's Office is requesting Presidents review their campus policies with respect to centers and institutes to ensure that the policies are consistent with other campus policies in terms of faculty and administration, consultation and oversight. Since the Office of Research, Graduate and Extended Programs has responsibilities for such centers and institutes, Ric asked that we review proposed changes to the policy. The changes brought to CPC reflect two primary areas: daily oversight of activities and appropriate faculty, program, and administrative review. A different process was recommended for the three levels of centers: Department, College and University.

Curriculum Policy's Review of the Issue: CPC reviewed the original PM 96-06 and the proposed revisions (Attachment A and B) The changes in the new policy were compared to the old policy (Attachment C). Ric Brown attended the CPC meeting, addressed committee questions and made two suggested minor revisions included in attachment B.

Committee's Recommended Action: The committee recommends the proposed revisions be approved by the Senate. All revisions are in keeping with the normal University review process. Department Centers and Institutes are now clearly under the

purview of the department in terms of both daily operation and review (the University program review process). College Centers and Institutes report to and are reviewed by the Dean and university Centers and Institutes are the responsibility of the Associate Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended Programs. The college and university review process are modeled after existing guidelines on this campus.

Arguments in Favor : Changes relate primarily to approval, governance and review. Department centers tend to have an academic focus and should therefore be established and governed at the Department level and reviewed like other university programs. College and University centers are generally nonacademic in nature. The usual academic review would not be appropriate; however they should be subject to nonacademic program review as described in the policy. Their daily oversight is probably more appropriate through the office of the Vice President for Research, Graduate, and Extended Programs than through the Provost and Associate Vice President for Academic affairs.

Arguments not in Favor: There was concern at the College/School level regarding formal review. The new policy specified a formal review by the Dean. It further stipulates that the review be submitted to the Associate Vice President for Research, Graduate and Extended Programs. CPC was concerned about the oversight here and recommended an added proviso that the VP for Research, Graduate and Extended Programs could accept and transmit the report to the President and Provost or may direct an additional formal review. Note: this was added to the proposed change in Attachment B.

6.00 APPOINTMENT

...

6.10 Vacancy Announcements

A. – D. ...

E. Open Recruiting

*see
revised
attachment 3*

1. Open recruiting is a means of eliciting applications to teach in the University from sources unanticipated in the usual course of inviting applications. It is used to encourage qualified applicants to seek employment in any campus department or program even if the department or program is not at the time of the application formally conducting a search to fill an already authorized position. Its use assumes that departments or programs continue in every case of appointment to determine the normal minimum qualifications for a full-time appointment.
2. Open recruiting advertisements developed by Academic Affairs or Faculty and Staff Affairs shall be widely disseminated. Such advertisements may be used as a supplement to other recruiting efforts.
3. Applications generated through open recruiting shall be directed initially to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs. That office shall then forward them to the College Deans shall notify and make available to all department chairs in a college, a copy of the materials.
4. If the relevant department is currently recruiting in the area of expertise of the applicant responding to open recruiting, his/her application shall be included in the applicant pool. The candidate's application shall be reviewed in due course under currently approved appointment procedures.
5. If the relevant department is not currently recruiting in the area of expertise of the applicant responding to open recruiting, the department may consider the applicant for appointment. The Department makes the determination on whether or not to pursue the hire. If a department determines that they do not want to consider the applicant for hire, the application is returned to Dean's Office who then notifies the applicant. If the department determines that they do want to consider the applicant for hire, they shall confirm with the College Dean that a position is available. Consideration shall be subject to the department's currently approved screening process and applicable university procedures and practices, such as those described in the current Guidelines for Full-Time Faculty Recruitment and Section 6.06.B of this document.

6. In any case of an application arising out of open recruiting, the department receiving the application shall consider it in light of the department's previously announced curricular needs and its previously developed hiring plans. While an appointment despite these needs and plans may on occasion be justified, a department shall usually recommend an appointment consistent with these needs and plans and not otherwise.

7. In accordance with Section 6.06.B of this document, recommendations for appointment of applicants responding to open recruiting shall originate in the department or equivalent unit.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

FACULTY SENATE

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

Date: November 3, 1999

NOV 10 1999

To: Bob Buckley, Chair
Faculty Senate

Faculty
413

Senate Received

From: Fred D. Baldini, Chair
Faculty Policies Committee

RE: Open Recruiting

Issue: Review of University Policy on Open Recruitment.

Background: The Faculty Policies Committee was asked to review the campus policy on Open Recruiting (see attachment B). This request came from William Dillon, Presiding Member of UARTP.

Faculty Policies Committee's review of the issue: A working group was formed and examine this policy, along with other documents provided by UARTP Committee (see attachment B). The working group sent their recommendation to FPC for review. Representatives from the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs were present at both the working group meeting as well as the FPC meeting.

Faculty Policies Committee's recommendation: During the November 3rd, 1999 FPC meeting, the following actions where taken.

- FPC recommends that the program of Open Recruitment should continue.
- FPC recommends that changes to the policy should be made ^{see FS 99-99} (see attachment A).

The Faculty Policies Committee is sending these recommendations to you for action or review by others as you see fit.

- a. **Arguments for:** This policy allows for the recruitment of qualified faculty, even when positions are not currently available. This process could identify potential candidates and give flexibility to departments in the hiring process. The changes to the policy gives control to the departments concerning the question of whether or not the department wishes to pursue the applicant.

- b. **Argument against:** This policy could be used to force departments to make hires they don't want to make. This policy is a way to avoid national searches for faculty.

Attachments

Cc: ✓ Ian McPherson, Faculty Senate Office
William Dillon, Presiding Member, University ARTP Committee



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

FACULTY SENATE

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 23, 1999

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

TO: Bob Buckley, Chair
Faculty Senate

SEP 24 1999

Handwritten signature of William A. Dillon in cursive.

Faculty 413 Senate Received

FROM: William A. Dillon
Presiding Member
University ARTP Committee

SUBJECT: Open Recruiting

The University ARTP Committee recommends that the subject topic be referred to the Faculty Policies Committee for disposition as it sees fit. While undoubtedly having jurisdiction of the topic of "Open Recruiting", the UARTP Committee has found itself unable to resolve the several issues of principle and language arising from it after more than a year of attempting to do so. At most, the Committee has constituted a subcommittee to produce the draft of an amendment of the UARTP document attached to this letter. But on return of the subcommittee to the full committee, the full committee found itself unwilling to continue to entertain the topic yet unwilling to consign it to parliamentary oblivion. Hence the decision to recommend that another committee make a fresh start on the matter.

I understand that Dean David Wagner sits on the Faculty Policies Committee. If so, he will be well able to present the topic to the committee. By way of additional information, I have attached to this letter several more documents generated in the UARTP Committee. These documents may help to identify the issues of principle and language defining the discussion of open recruiting so far.

WD:j

Attachments

cc: David Wagner, Dean, Faculty and Staff Affairs
Sheila Orman, Director of Faculty Affairs

Draft Policy Governing Open Recruiting at CSUS

6.10.E Open Recruiting

1. Open recruiting is a means of eliciting applications to teach in the University from sources unanticipated in the usual course of inviting applications. It is used to encourage qualified applicants to seek employment in any campus department or program even if the department or program is not at the time of the application formally conducting a search to fill an already authorized position. Its use assumes that departments or programs continue in every case of appointment to determine the normal minimum qualifications for a full-time appointment.
2. Open recruiting advertisements developed by Academic Affairs or Faculty and Staff Affairs shall be widely disseminated. Such advertisements may be used as a supplement to other recruiting efforts.
3. Applications generated through open recruiting shall be directed initially to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs. That office shall then forward them to the College Deans who may send them to relevant departments and programs for review.
4. If the relevant department is currently recruiting in the area of expertise of the applicant responding to open recruiting, his/her application shall be included in the



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

OFFICE OF FACULTY AND STAFF AFFAIRS

October 27, 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, University ARTP Committee

FROM: Sheila M. Orman
Director of Faculty Affairs

SUBJECT: Open Recruitment

Attached is a copy of the text of the Open Recruitment advertisement that was placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education and the University Bulletin last year. Also attached is a copy of the process for reviewing open recruitment applications.

SMO:ew
Attachments

cc: Dean Wagner

OPEN RECRUITMENT

To assist California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) in achieving its goals, the University has adopted a philosophy of open recruitment for full-time faculty. Qualified individuals are encouraged to apply for any campus department or program as areas of appointment have not been determined. The normal minimum qualifications for full-time appointment include:

1. An appropriate terminal degree from an accredited university.
2. Evidence of success or of strong potential for success as a university level teacher.
3. Evidence of success or of strong potential for success as a scholar or performing or creative artist.
4. Clear potential for success as a contributor to the university's overall mission as a multicultural and comprehensive university.

For the 1998-99 academic year, appointments will begin on August 24, 1998 for the Fall 1998 semester, and January 27, 1999 for the Spring 1999 semester. Appointment dates for the 1999-2000 academic year are August 23, 1999 for the Fall 1999 semester, and January 26, 2000 for the Spring 2000 semester. There is no deadline for applying, but candidates are encouraged to submit resumes as soon as possible in order to receive full consideration. Resumes, inquiries, or nominations should be addressed to:

David L. Wagner
Dean, Faculty and Staff Affairs
California State University, Sacramento, Box R
Sacramento, California 95819-6032

CSUS is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer and hires only those individuals legally authorized to accept employment in the United States.

PROCESS FOR OPEN RECRUITMENT AD APPLICANTS

1. Advertisement appears in national publication(s) and campus Bulletin.
2. Applicant packages received by Dean Wagner.
 - a. Logged in by FSA.
 - b. Acknowledgment letters and Applicant Flow Questionnaire sent by FSA.
 - c. Applicant packages forwarded to appropriate dean(s).
3. Applicant packages received and reviewed by school deans(s).
 - a. If applicant appears to be qualified for an appointment, the package is forwarded to appropriate department(s) for their review.
 - b. If applicant appears not to be qualified for an appointment, the school dean sends a letter to applicant notifying him/her that he/she will not be considered.
4. Applicant packages received and reviewed by department(s) in accordance with normal department procedures.
 - a. If a search is in progress or planned, and if the application is timely, it is included in the current or proposed search.
 - b. If the application is not timely, department(s) confers with dean on position availability.
 - c. Department notifies candidate in writing of status or review.
5. Reporting.
 - a. Every two (2) months FSA will send to each school dean a list of those applicants referred to the school. The dean will be asked to report back on the status of each applicant and to copy FSA on all correspondence with the candidates.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

OFFICE OF FACULTY AND STAFF AFFAIRS

MEMORANDUM

April 13, 1999

TO: UARTP Committee

FROM: *David L. Wagner/mik*
David L. Wagner, Dean
Faculty and Staff Affairs

I am still in court, and there is no guarantee that I will be able to attend your meeting. I understand some of the concern expressed over open recruitment by members of the committee. However, I hope that we are able to work out the problems associated with implementation of open recruitment rather than eliminating it as an option for department faculty to use in hiring.

A number of individuals who applied under this program were placed in the pool for review under existing searches. Sharon spoke of this aspect of the program at a meeting in the fall. Indeed, I believe that her department hired someone who initially was added to the pool in this manner. However, there are also times when there is no separate search underway. Nine individuals have been hired in the past nine years in these circumstances. These faculty have been at various stages of their respective careers and have been hired at all ranks. All, I believe, have added to the strength of the hiring department.

Under open recruitment the faculty in the department decide if they want to begin a hiring process with a limited number of applicants. Open recruitment applicants must still go through the usual interview process before a hire can be made. I hope that the committee is convinced that this type of flexibility should continue to be made available to departments.

DLW:mik

*Introduced by Louis Elfenbaum and Sharon Alexander.
Discussed if further discussion postponed in favor of
establishing sub. committee to draft amendment to UARTP
document. Sp. 1999*

Open Recruitment Advertisements

WHEREAS: The proposal to advertise widely as "an additional means of recruiting highly qualified faculty and/or to supplement existing recruitment efforts" comes to the UARTP committee for approval written in the future tense; and

WHEREAS: The proposed additional means of recruiting is currently being practiced without a legitimate basis in policy; and

WHEREAS: The committee was told that it is an effort to continue PM 90-5, a pilot study that ended in 1993, that aimed to increase diversity in hiring. This proposal does not contain any reference to diversity; and

WHEREAS: The committee was told that it would be a means for hiring "Stars" even though we have other means such as full time lecturer positions, 2 year appointments and no preclusion for applying for tenure track positions; and

WHEREAS: The committee was told that the "Review of open recruitment applicants will be subject to a regular screening process in accordance with section 6.06 B of this policy" (MOU 12:11), yet the proposal does not address the first line of that section that states: "Recommendations regarding probationary appointments shall originate at the department or equivalent unit;" and

WHEREAS: Members of this committee whose colleges have had questionable experience with this proposed policy as it is currently practiced have found that it was: (1) used to avoid a national search when administration identified candidates were brought to the attention of the college with a two position offer if departments agreed to their hiring; and (2) used by the administration to arbitrarily change two positions to tenure track, after the search for lecturers had concluded, which resulted in tenure track positions offered to candidates who had been recommended for lecturer positions by the department, thus avoiding a national search for tenure track positions; therefore be it

Resolved: That the UARTP Committee reject the proposal on open recruitment advertising; and be it further

Resolved: That the Administration through the office of Faculty and Staff Affairs immediately cease and desist from the practice of open recruitment advertising and hiring of probationary personnel; and be it further

Resolved: That the UARTP Committee forward this resolution to the Faculty Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate for consideration and endorsement of this resolution.