

1988-89
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 8, 1988
2:30 p.m.
Senate Chambers, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence in memory of:

ROBERT B. CATURA
Professor of German

GERARD P. CLEISZ
Professor of French, Emeritus

2. Senate meetings:

Thursday, September 29 -- Special Senate meeting: budget and
implementation plan for Faculty Professional Development

Thursday, October 13 -- Regular Senate meeting

Thursday, October 27 -- Special Senate meeting: the Library

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 88-81/ConC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Academic Policies Committee:

DAN DECIOUS, At-large, 1991
ANN MALVEAUX, Professional Services, 1991
STEPHEN FIGLER, Senator, 1990

Affirmative Action Committee:

MARY SUMMERS, At-large, 1991
JUAN HERNANDEZ, At-large, 1991
WILLIAM MITCHELL, Professional Services, 1991
CAROLE MAYER, Arts and Sciences, 1991
SYBIL JAKOB, Senator, 19--

Curriculum Committee:

PAMELA MILCHRIST, At-large, 1991
JOHN DOOLITTLE, At-large, 1991
ANN HAFFER, Professional Schools, 1991
ROBERT TZAKIRI, Senator, 1990
JANET CROSS, Senator, 1990

Faculty Affairs Committee:

STOAKLEY SWANSON, At-large, 1991
IRVING HERMAN, At-large, 1991
LEN WYCOSKY, Senator, 1989

Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

RENE MERINO, At-large, 1991

Fiscal Affairs Committee:

ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 1991
SUSAN SLAYMAKER, At-large, 1991

Graduate Policies and Programs Committee:

MINA ROBBINS, At-large, 1991
ROBYN NELSON, Professional Schools, 1991
JAMES MCCARTNEY, Arts and Sciences, 1991
SALAH YOUSIF, Senator, 1990

Research and Scholarly Activity Committee:

STEPHEN FIGLER, Senator, 1990
THERESA ROBERTS, Education, 1991
JANELLE REINELT, Arts and Sciences/Humanities, 1991
BRUCE PALMER, Library, 1991

AS 88-82/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Senate Committees:

Curriculum--1988-89 Program Review Team Pool: ANDREW BANTA,
MEL HOLLAND, DENNIS HUFF, DANIEL SCHEEL, ROSE LEIGH VINES

Faculty Professional Development Committee:

JANELLE REINELT, Member, Research and Scholarly Activity
Committee, 1988-89
PHYLLIS MILLS, Member, Faculty Affairs Committee, 1988-89
SHEILA MARSH, Library*
JOLENE KOESTER, School of Arts and Sciences*
ROBERT GARMSTON, School of Education*
HERB KUTCHINS, School of Health and Human Services*
ARTHUR JENSEN, School of Business and Public Administration*
JOEL MOORE, School of Engineering and Computer Science*

*Staggered, three-years terms to be determined at first
committee meeting.

General Education Committee:

JOHN INGRAM, A&S/Science and Math, 1990 (repl. R. Cleveland)
JOAN MAXWELL, Senator, 1990
DAVID MARTIN, Senator, 1990

Graduate Policies and Programs Committee:

KENT MEYER, Senator, 1990

GPPC--1988-89 Program Review Team Pool: THOMAS COTTINGIM,
CAROLE MAYER, THOMAS PHELPS, ROSE LEIGH VINES

University Committees:

Administrative Fellows Review Committee:

AMIN ELMALLAH, At-large, 1989

Affirmative Action Faculty Development Program:

CYNTHIA GUNSTON-PARKS, At-large, 1989

CHARLES ROBERTS, At-large, 1989

RUTH WANG, At-large, 1989

A.S.I. Budget Review Board: ROGER BARTLETT, At-large, 1989A.S.I. Elections Board of Inquiry: WALLACE ETTERBEEK, At-largeAthletic Advisory Board: JEAN TORCOM, At-large, 1989

ROBERT METCALF, At-large, 1989

Child Care Advisory Committee: SUSAN HOLL, At-largeEnergy Management Committee: HOMER IBSEER, At-large, 1990Council for University Planning (formerly URPC):

LESTER GABRIEL, At-large, 1990

Financial Aid Advisory Committee:

MEL HOLLAND, Instructional Faculty, 1990

Financial Aid Scholarship Selection Committee:

JUANITA BARRENA, At-large, 1989

Hornet Foundation Board of Directors:

SUSAN SLAYMAKER, At-large, 1991

International Issues, ad hoc Committee on:

MARJORIE LEE, School of Education

RUTH WANG, School of Business and Public Administration

SYLVIA NAVARI, School of Health and Human Services

FLOYD LECUREUX, School of Engineering and Computer Science

ANGUS WRIGHT, School of Arts and Sciences

RICHARD KORNWEIBEL, General Education Committee liaison

LES KONG, Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and
Programs Committee liaison

KERMIT SMITH, International Program Subcommittee liaison

*Removed
list on
error*

Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture Committee:

JOHN BRACKMANN, At-large, 1990
EDITH LEFEBVRE, At-large, 1990

Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards Committee:

THEODORE LANE, Unit 3 faculty, 1989
THERESA ROBERTS, Unit 3 faculty, 1989
JEAN TORCOM, Unit 3 faculty, 1989

Public Safety Advisory Committee: JAMES BOSCO, At-large, 1989
(individual also serves as member of Parking Subcommittee)

Student Disciplinary Hearing Officers:

EDWARD BRADLEY, At-large, 1989
PAUL FALZONE, At-large, 1989
SUSAN GERINGER, At-large, 1989
ERWIN KELLY, At-large, 1989
CAROLE MAYER, At-large, 1989
PETER MICHAEL, At-large, 1989
NOBUAKI NAMIKI, At-large, 1989

Student Health Advisory Committee: DENNIS HUFF, At-large, 1989

University Center Board: HOWARD GOLDFRIED, At-large, 1989

University Union Board of Directors:

STEVEN BUSS, At-large, 1989

AS 88-83/Ex. ELECTION OF 1988-89 SECRETARY AND PARLIMENTARIAN

The Academic Senate elects JANICE McPHERSON, Secretary, and WILLIAM A. DILLON, JR., Parliamentarian, of the Academic Senate for 1988-89.

AS 88-84/CC, FISA, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGES - ART

Art Minor: More clearly defines Art History and Art Education minors and updates requirements for Studio Art minor.

Art Waiver Program: Deletes Art 70 from choice between Art 70 and Art 88; deletes Art 134, 150, 152, 154, and 186 from the Basic Core and replaces with Art 133; deletes Art 108 and 118 from present choices of Art 100, 108, 111, 112, 117 and 118; and deletes Art 133 from the elective choices (now in Basic Core).

CONSENT CALENDAR - INFORMATIONAS 88-79/Ex. INTERNATIONAL ISSUES, AD HOC COMMITTEE ON

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, endorses the establishment of an ad hoc Committee on International Issues to assume the charge defined in Vice President Burger's April 18, 1988, "Working Paper on the Initiation of a Study of the International Center," (Attachment) with the understanding that the Academic Senate will be provided the opportunity to review and to comment on the recommendations that issue from the study, and further recommend the following ad hoc committee composition:

- One member, International Programs Subcommittee liaison
- One member, Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Program Committee liaison
- One member, General Education Committee liaison
- One member, International Center staff
- One member, Dean/Associate Dean, designated by the Academic Vice President
- One faculty member from each of the five schools

AS 88-80/Ex. WASC VISIT, PROCEDURES FOR

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, endorses the "Procedures for the Fifth Year Response to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges," amended as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition]:

Procedures for the Fifth Year Response
to the Western Association of School and Colleges

I. Designation of Responsible Administrative Office

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, through Dr. June Stuckey, the WASC Liaison Officer, will have oversight responsibility for the Fifth Year Response and the subsequent site visit.

II. Preparation of the Written Response

The campus will prepare a detailed response to the recommendations contained in the 1985 WASC Accreditation Report to this University. In addition, we shall report major changes that have occurred since the last site visit and project future directions.

III. Involvement of the Campus Community

All Program Center Heads, the faculty, through the Academic Senate, including Librarians and Student Affairs

Professionals, and student representatives need to be knowledgeable about the response and involved as appropriate in preparing the report.

IV. Methodology

1. The Associate Vice President will appoint, from a list of three names recommended by the Academic Senate, Dr. Stuckey will consult (Spring Semester, 1988) with the Academic Senate Chair and its Executive Committee in appointing a faculty member to chair a drafting team and to write the initial draft of the Fifth Year Response. This faculty appointment will be given three units of assigned time both Fall and Spring Semesters, 1988-89. The remainder of the drafting team will be appointed as follows:
 - The Dean of Students shall appoint one Student Affairs Professional to the drafting team. (Spring Semester, 1988)
 - One student shall be appointed to the drafting team by the appropriate procedure. (Fall Semester, 1988)
 - The Academic Senate shall appoint one faculty to the drafting team (Spring Semester, 1988)
 - Dr. Stuckey will serve as the administrative appointee to the drafting team.
2. Dr. Stuckey will send to each Program Center Head (June, 1988) a copy of the 1985 Accreditation Report, with sections marked that need a response from that Program Center. Program Center Heads will make assignments to appropriate individuals within the Unit for preparing the response. Due date for the response shall be November 1, 1988. This timeline should allow unit heads to initiate actions that are necessary if for some reason recommendations have not yet been addressed.
3. The Chair of the Drafting Team, in consultation with the team, will draft during Fall Semester, 1988 the Section #4 "Descriptive Background and History" of the Report. The Chair, also during the Fall Semester, will interview or otherwise collect information from Program Center Heads for response to Section #7 and 8 "Description and Evaluation of Major Changes and Developments Since the Last Visit" and "Plans for Changes and Improvements." Much of this information can be obtained from Program Center Unit Plans, due to URPC by October 1, 1988.

4. The Chair of the Drafting Committee will prepare during January, 1989 an initial draft of the "Fifth Year Report," including all sections except #5 and 9 "Institutional Summary Data Form" and "Required Documents" which will be assembled Fall Semester, 1989 so that these sections will reflect the latest institutional data and publications.
5. During the first two weeks of February, 1989, the initial draft will be edited by the Drafting Team.
6. Edited First Draft will be sent approximately February 15, 1989, to the Council of Deans, the Program Center Heads, the Planning Committee, and the Senate's Executive Committee for review, comment and suggestions for modification.
7. Comments on the Edited First Draft will be returned to the Chair of the Drafting Team by March 1, 1989.
8. During March, the Chair, in consultation with the drafting team, will make modifications deemed appropriate.
9. On about April 1, 1989, the Second Edited Draft will be presented to the Council of Deans, the Program Center Heads, the Planning Committee, and the Senate's Executive Committee for their final suggestions for modification. By April 17, 1989, these groups will notify the Chair of suggested modifications.
10. The Chair of the Drafting Team in consultation with the team will make appropriate modifications based upon the suggestions received and present a final revised team report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by May 12, 1988.
11. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will distribute the final team report to the President's Staff, Program Center Heads, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the President of Associated Students.
12. The President will review the final revised team report and, considering any comments from the Program Centers, Chair of the Academic Senate, and the President of Associated Students, make any modifications deemed necessary before approving the document for conveyance to WASC prior to November 15, 1989.

Oct 13 Agenda!

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 88-85/Ex. BY-LAWS REVISION - ELECTION PROCEDURES FOR SENATORS REPRESENTING TEMPORARY FACULTY

III. VOTING PROCEDURES FOR ELECTION OF ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERS

A. Procedures for nomination and election of full-time faculty representatives

...

IV. PROCEDURES FOR NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF AT-LARGE SENATORS REPRESENTING TEMPORARY FACULTY

A. Procedures for Nomination and Election

All nominations and elections shall be conducted in the spring semester. Nominations and elections shall be by and from the temporary faculty who have at least six wtu's during the semester of the election. To be nominated, an eligible faculty member must submit a nomination petition signed by six members of the electing body.

In the event that the number of nominees exceeds twice the number of positions to be filled, the Election Committee may hold a primary election in order to reduce the number of candidates.

Each member of the electing body may vote for as many candidates on the secondary ballot as there are positions to be filled. The positions shall be filled in the order of greatest number of votes received. However, no more than two at-large Senators may be from the same school. Two-year positions shall be filled before one-year positions. In the event of ties there shall be a ballot with each member of the electing body voting for one of the tied candidates.

All ballots shall be secret ballots.

B. Terms of Office

The four at-large Senators shall serve two year terms, staggered so that two members are elected to new terms each year. At-large Senators must have at least six wtu's during the semester of their election, and must continue to have at least 3 wtu's for each semester of their term. An at-large Senator may serve at most six consecutive years. At no time

may more than two at-large Senators be from the same school.

C. Vacancies

If an at-large Senate seat is vacant, the Academic Senate may appoint a replacement who is willing to serve voluntarily for the remainder of the academic year from the temporary faculty who have at least 6 wtu's during the semester of their appointment. If this leaves a remaining year of the term, the position shall be filled for the second year by means of the elections held during the spring semester of the first year.

IVY. PROCEDURES FOR ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE CSU ACADEMIC SENATE

AS 88-86A/FPDC, ^{EX} COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL (PCP) FUNDED RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY PROGRAMS

Carried over
The Academic Senate recommends that the campus committee required under the Guidelines for Allocation of Funds Received Through the Program Change Proposal on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (AAP 88-26) be established as an elected committee of the Senate for the 1988-89 Academic Year.

Whereas, the Guidelines for Allocation of Funds Received Through the Program Change Proposal on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity require that a campus committee be established on each campus to develop a plan for the use of PCP funded Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and to review proposals for funding, and

Whereas, the guidelines specify that the committee be composed of a majority of faculty who shall be elected by probationary and tenured faculty or who shall be members of an existing elected committee, and

Whereas, each campus shall "have discretion to allocate funds among the three categories enumerated (in the PCP) in a way most appropriate to that campus," and

Whereas, in 1988 the Academic Senate recommended and the President approved a comprehensive plan for faculty professional development, and

- Whereas, in accordance with the campus plan for faculty professional development, a Senate committee, named the Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC), has been established to provide general oversight of faculty professional development activities, and
- Whereas, the campus plan for faculty professional development contained provision for the establishment of the committee called for in the PCP as a subcommittee of the FPDC, be it
- Resolved: the Academic Senate recommends that the committee called for in the guidelines be established as a committee of the Senate, and be it further
- Resolved: the Academic Senate recommends that the Committee on PCP Funded Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Programs be comprised as follows:

Eight tenured or probationary faculty (three from Arts and Sciences, one from each of the professional schools, and one from the Library) nominated by the probationary and tenured faculty in each school and elected at-large by the probationary and tenured faculty.

One graduate student, in good standing in a degree program, who has participated in a faculty research project, appointed by A.S.I.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs/or designee.

One school-level administrator selected by the Council of ~~Instructional~~ Deans
Academic

One member of the FPDC (ex-officio, non-voting) appointed by the FPDC

and, be it further

- Resolved: the Academic Senate recommends that the charge of the committee be as follows:
1. To develop criteria and guidelines for each of the categories specified in the PCP for review by the Senate.

2. To develop a plan for the allocation of funds to each of the categories specified in the PCP for review by the Senate.

Note: Criteria, guidelines and allocation plan shall be subject to Senate review and recommendation to the President prior to campus adoption.

3. To recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs the allocation of funds to individual faculty based on a review of proposals according to the guidelines and criteria adopted by the campus.
4. To prepare a report to the faculty on the number and types of proposals funded.
5. To evaluate the degree to which the funded programs achieved their stated goals. The results of this evaluation shall be forwarded to the FPDC.

and, be it further

Resolved: the Academic Senate shall conduct a review of the 1988-89 procedures for implementation of the PCP funded research, scholarship, and creative activity programs, including a review of the selection and composition of the campus committee required under the guidelines.

Withdrawn
AS 88-86B/Ex. SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL (PCP)
 FUNDED RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY
 PROGRAMS

The Academic Senate recommends that the campus committee required under the Guidelines for Allocation of Funds Received Through the Program Change Proposal on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (AAP 88-26) be established as an elected subcommittee of the Senate's Faculty Professional Development Committee.

Whereas, the Guidelines for Allocation of Funds Received Through the Program Change Proposal on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity require that a campus committee be established on each campus to develop a plan for the use of PCP funded Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and to review proposals for funding, and

- Whereas, the guidelines specify that the committee be composed of a majority of faculty who shall be elected by probationary and tenured faculty or who shall be members of an existing elected committee, and
- Whereas, each campus shall "have discretion to allocate funds among the three categories enumerated (in the PCP) in a way most appropriate to that campus," and
- Whereas, in 1988 the Academic Senate recommended and the President approved a comprehensive plan for faculty professional development, and
- Whereas, in accordance with the campus plan for faculty professional development, a Senate committee, named the Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC), has been established to provide general oversight of faculty professional development activities, and
- Whereas, the campus plan for faculty professional development contained provision for the establishment of the committee called for in the PCP as a subcommittee of the FPDC, be it
- Resolved: the Academic Senate recommends that the committee called for in the guidelines be established as a subcommittee of the Senate's FPDC, and be it further
- Resolved: the Academic Senate recommends that the Subcommittee on PCP Funded Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Programs be comprised as follows:
- Five at-large, tenured or probationary faculty, no more than two from the same school, elected by the probationary and tenured faculty.
 - One graduate student, in good standing in a degree program, who has participated in a faculty research project, appointed by A.S.I.
 - The Vice President for Academic Affairs/or designee.
 - One school-level administrator selected by the Council of Instructional Deans
 - One member of the FPDC (ex-officio, non-voting) appointed by the FPDC

and, be it further

Resolved: the Academic Senate recommends that the charge of the subcommittee be as follows:

1. To develop criteria and guidelines for each of the categories specified in the PCP for review by the FPDC.
2. To develop a plan for the allocation of funds to each of the categories specified in the PCP for review by the FPDC.

Note: Criteria, guidelines and allocation plan shall be subject to Senate review and recommendation to the President prior to campus adoption.

3. To recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs the allocation of funds to individual faculty based on a review of proposals according to the guidelines and criteria adopted by the campus.
4. To prepare a report to the faculty on the number and types of proposals funded.
5. To evaluate the degree to which the funded programs achieved their stated goals. The results of this evaluation shall be forwarded to the FPDC.

AS 88-87/AP, Ex. ACADEMIC YEAR SCHEDULE

The Academic Senate supports in concept the adoption by the University of an annual class schedule. The production of such a schedule may prove to be a valuable program planning document as well as an important academic advising tool. However, since the campus appears to be divided more in opinion about the feasibility rather than the desirability of an annual schedule, the Committee recommends a trial and evaluation period precede the formal adoption of an annual schedule. This test period would allow for examining the mechanics of putting together an annual schedule, including the time and effort spent on the enterprise, as well as for comparing the number and types of changes required under an annual schedule and a semester schedule. To this end, the Committee recommends that during the 1989-90 academic year the University continue to publish class schedules each semester while the evaluation of the feasibility of the annual schedule is tested as described below.

In the Spring of 1989, all academic units will submit to Academic Affairs class schedules for both 1989-90 semesters. Units will have an opportunity to update their Spring 1990 schedules in the Fall of 1989. With the annual schedule data, as submitted in Spring 1989, Academic Services will experiment, in cooperation with the academic units, with the mechanics of preparing and producing electronically an annual schedule. Departments and Academic Services will be asked to comment upon time and effort required to produce the data for the annual year schedule in comparison to a one semester schedule. Also, Academic Services will keep track of the number and types of changes required to produce an annual schedule and its supplemental update as compared to a semester schedule and its supplemental update. Based upon the information and experience gained from this test period, Academic Policies Committee will recommend to the Senate, no later than March 1, 1990, whether the publication of an annual schedule of classes shall be adopted as University policy. In any regard, academic units will continue to prepare and submit in the Spring of 1990 a complete class schedule for both semesters of the following academic year. This material then, whether published as a semester or an annual class schedule, may be used by departments and faculty as a planning guide and an advising tool.

AS 88-88/AP, Ex. DISRUPTIVE STUDENT, DEALING WITH THE

The Academic Senate endorses the following statement as advisory to faculty in dealing with disruptive students:

THE RECOMMENDED WAY TO DEAL WITH THE DISRUPTIVE STUDENT

Due process is the key to handling the disruptive student. The student cannot be prevented from attending class or disenrolled from a course unless the student has been accorded due process.¹

Because of recent court cases in which universities have been ruled against, the following is the suggested procedure to use:

1. The disruptive student should be informed by the instructor that he/she is being disruptive.
 - a. Explain how the behavior exhibited is disruptive to your teaching.
 - b. Explain how the disruptive student is depriving others in the classroom of an education.

- c. Advise the student at this time that he/she will be reported to the Dean of Student Affairs if behavior continues.
2. If the student's disruptive behavior continues after the student has been informed, contact the Assistant to the Dean of Student Affairs, Student Service Center, Room 206, ext. 6060, for assistance.²

All of the above steps must be followed to assure that the student has been accorded due process. This process need take no longer than three class meetings.

The student should be allowed to attend class during the steps outlined above, so long as the student does not continue to be disruptive. However, the student can be dismissed for the remainder of any class period when his/her behavior impedes the regular activity of the class. **IF AT ANY TIME YOU FEEL A STUDENT IS A PHYSICAL THREAT, IMMEDIATELY CALL THE CAMPUS POLICE AT EXT. 6900.**

¹Disenrollment from class is a possible discipline sanction by the Dean of Student Affairs Office.

²Feel free to call the Discipline Coordinator, ext. 6060 for assistance anytime during the above process.

AS 88-89/AA, Ex. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION HIRING PROCESS

Whereas, The intent of affirmative action is to achieve a balanced work force to more nearly approximate the University's public constituency, and

Whereas, Executive Order 340, Systemwide Guidelines for Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Programs in Employment, mandates "... far reaching and special efforts to attract qualified minorities, women, the disabled, disabled veterans and Vietnam era veterans." (Section V, B. 2), and

Whereas, The CSUS is committed to affirmative action, therefore be it,

Resolved, that the following University Process for Affirmative Action Hiring be adopted:

UNIVERSITY PROCESS FOR
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION HIRING

1. Statements in the Position Advertisement

Characteristics such as experience in developing programs for students from underrepresented groups, teaching in a multicultural setting, working with students who have learning or other disabilities, enhance the university's educational equity program. Departments shall consider which of such qualifications will support their own programs and state on the "Request to Advertise for Full-Time Faculty" that preference will be given to candidates with those qualifications.

Departments should consider that listing openings as "Assistant/Associate Professor" level positions provides flexibility in making an offer to the most desirable qualified candidate in order to meet the department's affirmative action goals.

2. Strategies of Recruitment

Before preparing a "Request to Advertise," departments should contact the Affirmative Action Office for information regarding location of underrepresented candidates with the qualifications suited to the department's programmatic needs.

Departments must develop a recruitment plan to be submitted to their Dean with the "Request to Advertise."

- A. The recruitment plan must include a tentative timetable for the recruitment process.
- B. Recruitment Strategies for Hiring New Faculty (attached) is a guide for developing the recruitment plan. Strategies to be used must be specified in the plan.
- C. Characteristics of candidates which are related to the department's affirmative action goals, and which would lead to additional consideration should be listed in the advertisement.
- D. Advertisements must appear in professional journals and newsletters likely to be consulted by minority candidates. The Affirmative Action Office can give

assistance with the selection of appropriate periodicals. Departments may have to bear the expense of advertising, but should consult the Affirmative Action Office and the Dean about the availability of special funds for recruitment.

3. Determining Adequacy of Candidate Pool

At the close of the announced period for submission of applications, departments should request a summary of the pool of candidates from the Affirmative Action Office.

This summary will indicate the number of candidates who voluntarily return the request for identification of status with regard to underrepresented group membership.

From the pool of applicants, those who may be members of underrepresented groups may be identified. Although the status of the applicants does not appear on the applications submitted to the department, affirmative action candidates can often be ^{inferred} identified by the colleges and universities they attended, subject matter and titles of their publications, membership in professional and community organizations (including social organizations, fraternities, sororities, etc.), university and community service, and courses previously taught.

At this point, the department's pool will be examined by the Dean and/or the Affirmative Action Officer.

If the pool is found to be inadequate, a decision will have to be made as to whether the closing date should be extended, the process aborted or the hiring of a tenure-track position postponed.

4. Paper-Screening of Applicants

It is legitimate to give credit to candidates for characteristics related to the department's affirmative action goals. Criteria and weights must be consistent with the advertisement(s) announcing the position. If search committees are unsure about the legitimacy of their ranking procedure, they should consult with the Affirmative Action Officer.

5. Interviewing of Candidates

Before arranging interviews, the files of candidates selected for interviews must be submitted to the Dean, along with the "Affirmative Action Process Summary" completed through Section IV B.

delete
 (M) Brackman
 (M) Herman
delete

If the candidates selected do not apparently include a candidate from an underrepresented group and if the affirmative action goals of the department call for an affirmative action candidate, the department's search committee must meet with the Dean before proceeding with any interviews.

When conducting interviews, if appropriate or if a telephone interview, information regarding campus services to disabled individuals should be provided. Search committees should obtain information appropriate to any possible candidate prior to conducting the interview by contacting the Affirmative Action Office or the Office of Disabled Student Services.

6. Negotiations with Candidates

It is important to remember that only the President has the power to extend an offer to a candidate; search committees must not make promises or commitments of any kind.

When candidates inquire about special benefits (such as for student assistants, release time, computer support moving expenses, benefits, etc.), such considerations must be discussed with the Dean prior to proceeding with that candidate.

If an offer cannot be made by the last day of the spring semester, a waiver must be obtained from the Dean and the Affirmative Action Officer in order to continue the hiring process. A lectureship position might be discussed with the Dean.

ATTACHMENT

Recruitment Strategies for Hiring New Faculty

- I. Minimum recruitment efforts necessary for establishing a pool of applicants:
 - A. Advertise the vacancy in a university-wide recruitment effort.
 - B. Advertise the vacancy in professional journals.
 - C. Mail vacancy announcements to institutions known to have doctoral programs in the subject area. Include

historically black universities, with personal notes attached if the faculty knows someone at the University.

- D. Contact (via letter, telephone, or in person at meetings) the minority and women's caucuses or professional associations in the field.
 - E. Inform any active school or department alumnae association.
 - F. Attend professional meetings and "network" the vacancy. Be careful to avoid the appearance of an "offer" to a prospective applicant.
- II. Effective affirmative action searches should include the following action:
- A. Conduct A through F above.
 - B. Contact doctoral programs in the field, requesting ethnic and gender data on their students, and establishing networks with those institutions with prospective underrepresented faculty applicants.
 - C. Consult with campus minority and women faculty on recruitment strategies--follow suggestions.
 - D. Expand advertising efforts.
 - E. Notify the Affirmative Action Office when a minority or female applicant rejects an offer. Try to find out the real reasons for rejection.
 - F. When you get an "out-of-cycle" application, acknowledge it and keep it on file for the future. Send vacancy announcements out to past applicants.
 - G. "Grow" you own. Encourage promising underrepresented students to think about teaching as a career. Help them get into doctoral programs. Hire them as part-time faculty.

90

AS 88-1/AA, Ex. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

In the spirit of affirmative action, being the charge of the Affirmative Action Committee, the Academic Senate approves the following change in representation:

- (1) Student member
- (1) Staff member
- ~~(1) Faculty member, Arts and Sciences~~
- ~~(1) Faculty member, Professional Schools~~
- (5) Faculty members (one from each School):
 - Arts and Sciences
 - Education
 - Business and Public Administration
 - Engineering and Computer Science
 - Health and Human Services
- (4) At-large faculty members
- (2) Academic Senators
- (1) Professional Services member
- ~~12~~ Total voting members

- 2 Administrative Staff representatives (ex officio)
- 1 Chair, Academic Senate (ex officio)
- ~~14~~15 Total committee membership

The Senate in making appointments shall consider the representation of all protected classes, including persons with disabilities.

A WORKING PAPER ON THE INITIATION OF A STUDY
OF THE CSUS INTERNATIONAL CENTER

April 18, 1988

International Education at CSUS

Universities have traditionally been international institutions. As a comprehensive regional university, CSUS has the obligation to ensure that the benefits of an international component in university education are made available to its students and to the people of Sacramento. The university is meeting this obligation well.

CSU Sacramento's involvement in international education has many elements. The most obvious and important elements are the subjects we offer. These include foreign language teaching; English as a second language; comparative government; international affairs; international business; comparative literature and culture; world history, especially the history of non-Western nations and cultures. These curricular elements are also represented in the General Education package required of all students.

Other components of our international mission include: study abroad programs administered either by the CSU as a system or by CSUS itself; opportunities for travel and study abroad on either a credit or non-credit basis; faculty and student exchange agreements with other nations and higher education institutions abroad, some regarding specific disciplines; individual faculty exchanged; and visiting professors from abroad.

In sheer numbers, perhaps the largest element of our international mission is our foreign student enrollment. In Spring 1988, 459 visa students and 1327 permanent resident aliens were enrolled.

The university is fulfilling its international mission well for three reasons: Many CSUS faculty are deeply involved in international programs; the International Center took administrative responsibility for the faculty and student exchange and international visitors and scholars, as well as the international student functions; and the administration of the International Center under Dr. Preston Stegenga has been both stable and creative.

Several events have converged to produce the need for a systematic campus-wide study of the International Center. The first event is Dr. Stegenga's announced retirement after twenty years of leadership in the International Center. Recognizing this imminent change in leadership, Vice President Burger proposed in December a review of the International Center and its activities. As a first step, Dr. Burger retained Dr. Carl Zachrisson of the Institute of International Education to advise her on the general issue of international education and on the directions that a CSUS study might take. In addition, a faculty commission on the internationalization of the undergraduate

curriculum produced a report last June. This report is under consideration currently by the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate. On March 30, Dr. Zachrisson submitted a report to Dr. Burger with recommendations.

As a result of these events, and with these materials available, it seems useful to form a group to conduct a review of the International Center and to respond to issues raised in recent years about the direction and focus of the Center. The Commission to Study the International Center (or C-SIC for short) would review the International Center, its mission, its activities, and its capabilities. It would also review the administration of international topics in the university generally.

The report of the Committee on Internationalization of the Undergraduate Curriculum recommends the designation of a university administrator directly responsible to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This administrator would have responsibility for internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum and for all the activities of the university with an international dimension. Dr. Zachrisson's report makes a similar recommendation: appointment of a Director of International Programs reporting directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, with administrative responsibility for present international programs (and for increasing and strengthening them) as well as for internationalization of the curriculum. Dr. Zachrisson also recommends the appointment of an Associate Director from the academic senate who would be given special responsibility for promoting and coordinating the internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum.

Two important directions are emerging at this point. First, international functions of the university are, or should be, related; and second, the best expression of that relation is to have the functions administered by a single office. The first topic the Commission might study is whether this is indeed the best expression.

Unifying all international functions under one office raises several questions. Courses with international subjects, or that should have international subjects included, are all located in departments. How should the responsibilities of the International Center relate to the responsibilities of a department? The faculty committee's report recommends a university committee for plans promoting internationalization. Is such a committee the answer to the "turf" question?

A second question raised by uniting all the functions under one office concerns General Education. The relations between a Director of International Programs and the General Education Committee would need clarification.

There are doubtless other questions to be considered. The first task of the Commission would be to review the Center's activities and the reports presently available. The Commission could have a report on the Center ready by early September, 1988, when the Search for the Director is expected to begin.