From: Marcia Woolf
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2005 3:46 PM
To: Carmen Arciniega; Marcy Boyle; Karen Haynes; Robert Sheath; Janet Powell; Judy Papenhausen; Linda Holt; Andre Kundgen; Gabriela Sonntag; Gilbert Valadez; Glen Brodowsky; John R. Dick Montanari; Kathleen Watson; Marie Thomas; Marshall Whittlesey; Mohammad Oskoorouchi; Pamela Stricker; Rosario Diaz-Greenberg; Sharon Elise
Cc: Don Barrett
Subject: EC: FAC review of college RTP policies

Dear EC member,

Following today's discussion, I sought out information concerning FAC and the Senate's roles in the process of reviewing college RTP policies. Please see the language below, excerpted from the university's RTP policy:

"V. PRINCIPLES FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

"A. General principles

"1. Faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Unit 3 CBA as well as standards approved for their
Departments or equivalent units (when such standards exist), standards approved by their College/Library/SSP,AR, and in accordance with this policy. Such standards shall be reviewed by the
College Dean, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Provost, **approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee, and forwarded to the Academic Senate as an information item**. In case of conflict between
the Department and College/Library/SSP,AR standards, the College/Library/SSP,AR standards shall
prevail. The policies and procedures in this document are subject to Board of Trustees policies, Title 5
of the California Administrative Code, California Education Code, the Unit 3 CBA, and other applicable
State and Federal laws."

The full text of the policy is available here:
http://www.csusm.edu/fas/FullP&P_PDFs/FacPersProcPTR.pdf

Marcia
Marcia Woolf
Academic Senate Coordinator
CSU San Marcos
San Marcos CA USA 92096-0001
760-750-4058
fax 760-750-3041
http://www.csusm.edu/academic_senate/

EMERITUS FACULTY POLICY   **POLICY**

Implementation Date: 04/17/00   Revised: 00/00/00

1   **I.   Preamble**
2   Emerita/emeritus status is an honorary title awarded for distinguished service to the academic
3   community. The President (or designee) shall bestow the title on a temporary or tenure-track
4   instructional faculty member, librarian, or SSP-AR ~~a tenured faculty member~~ who is entering
5   ~~permanent~~ retirement from CSUSM and who has served the University with distinction. It is
6   expected that emerita/emeritus status will be granted to faculty members who have contributed
7   continuously throughout their career and have a distinguished professional record.
8
9   **II.   Eligibility**
10   Normally, emerita/emeritus status is limited to those individuals who:
11   1. for tenure-track instructional faculty, hold the rank of full professor with tenure and have at
12   least 10 years of active unit-3 faculty service to CSUSM, or
13   2. for librarians, hold the rank of full librarian with tenure and have at least 10 years of active
14   unit-3 faculty service to CSUSM, or
15   3. for SSP-ARs, hold the rank of SSP-AR III with tenure and have at least 10 years of active
16   unit-3 faculty service to CSUSM, or
17   4. for temporary instructional faculty, have served for at least 10 years in full-time
18   employment or have accumulated part-time service equivalent to 10 years of full-time
19   service.
20   These eligibility criteria may be waived in exceptional cases.
21
22 **III.   Procedures**
23   1. Deans shall inform their colleges in a timely manner of the retirement of each employee
24   who is eligible for emerita/emeritus status.
25   2. Each nomination of an eligible candidate shall be presented to the appropriate department
26   chair, dean, or program director, who shall then refer it to a representative committee of the
27   nominee's academic unit. This committee shall evaluate the candidate's curriculum vitae
28   based on the criteria stated in section V, and shall determine whether to recommend the
29   candidate for emerita/emeritus status.
30   3. ~~The academic unit, department, or its representative committee~~ If the committee makes a
31   positive decision, it shall forward the candidate's curriculum vitae and a recommendation
32   letter ~~for each candidate~~ to the Dean outlining why the ~~faculty member~~ candidate should be
33   granted emerita/emeritus status based on the recommendation criteria.
34   4. The Dean shall review the recommendation and state in writing whether s/he concurs with
35   the recommendation.
36   5. Both recommendations shall then be forwarded to the Provost who shall make his/her
37   recommendation.
38   6. The President (or designee) shall make a final determination based on his/her review of the
39   recommendations.
40   7. Emerita/emeritus status may be bestowed posthumously.
41   8. The President (or designee) shall announce the names of faculty awarded emeritus status at
42   spring commencement.
43
44 **IV.   Recognition and Privileges**
45   1. Emeriti faculty are considered an important and integral part of the university community.

46   2. Emeriti faculty shall be recognized through:
47   a. listing of the names of emeriti faculty in the campus commencement program at the
48   time of retirement,
49   b. issuing a permanent ID card indicating status as an emerita/emeritus member of the
50   faculty,
51   c. listing of name and title of all emeriti faculty in all university catalogues,
52   d. listing of name and title in the CSUSM phone directory.[1]
53   3. Upon commencement of ~~permanent~~ retirement and approval of emeritus status by the
54   President (or designee), the following privileges shall become available[2]:
55   a. eligibility to propose research projects/creative endeavors, compete for and administer
56   grants from agencies outside the CSU system,
57   b. free parking privileges,
58   c. Emeritus level library and technology privileges (to be determined by LATAC in
59   consultation with the Library and IITS, and to be reviewed annually)
60   d. invited participation in selected department, school and university functions,
61   e. attendance at public university functions and celebrations affirming the academic
62   mission of the university,
63   f. invitations to participate in seminars, lectures, and scholarly meetings and ceremonies
64   both as contributors and attendees.
65
66 **V.   Criteria for Recommendation**
67   ~~The academic unit, department, or its representative committee may decide not to recommend a~~
68   ~~faculty member for emeritus status on the basis of the criteria below.~~ When formally
69   recommending a faculty member for emeritus status, ~~the following criteria should be~~
70   ~~considered and incorporated into the recommendation letters~~ the representative committee of
71   the relevant academic unit must demonstrate that the candidate has achieved excellence in the
72   performance of his or her appropriate professional duties in the areas of normal review.
73
74   ~~1. For faculty, a history of positive evaluations to include:~~
75   ~~a. effective teaching,~~
76   ~~b. research/creative endeavors, publications, and presentations at professional meetings,~~
77   ~~c. contributions to the development of their academic program, the University, the~~
78   ~~community, and/or their profession.~~
79   ~~2. For librarians, a history of positive evaluations to include:~~
80   ~~a. effective professional performance and growth, as well as effective leadership,~~
81   ~~supervision, and administrative responsibilities,~~
82   ~~b. research/creative endeavors, publications, and presentations at professional meetings,~~
83   ~~c. contributions to the University and profession, locally, nationally, and internationally.~~
84   ~~3. For SSP-ARs, a history of positive evaluations to include:~~
85   ~~a. effective professional performance,~~
86   ~~b. professional development,~~
87   ~~c. service to the department, division, university, and community.~~

---

[1] At the request of the emerita/emeritus faculty, he or she will be listed in the CSUSM phone directory.
[2] For faculty opting into the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), emerita/emeritus privileges listed in Section IV.3 will become available upon completion of FERP.

From: Don Barrett
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2006 3:36 PM
To: Marcia Woolf; Linda Holt; Gilbert Valadez; Rosario Diaz-Greenberg
Cc: Glen Brodowsky
Subject: Postponed first reading

All:

As I mentioned in Senate today, we need to figure out what is the correct thing to do when an item that was a first reading in the previous senate is postponed from being a second reading in the subsequent Senate. This is in reference to the LATAC item of today, but we need a general policy.

On this agenda we had it as a second reading but had 'postponement requested' listed next to it. As I noted, I'm uncomfortable with that. If we put it on the agenda as a second reading, then it is official Senate business once the agenda has been approved. Once it is official business of the Senate, the originator can't 'postpone it'. As we handling old business, the originator would have to propose to the Senate that action be suspended on the item, and the Senate would have to vote on that proposal. A needless amount of confusion if there's a simpler solution....

There's two inter-connected issues with this, one is documentation, and one is the status of the item. I'll address documentation first.

Technically any item that was a first reading can be withdrawn by the presenter and not appear as a second reading in the subsequent Senate. As Marcia, Linda, and I agreed, we don't want items to simply disappear, we need somehow to document in the agenda what happened to it. I had originally thought that maybe we should leave it under 'new business', but that is confusing since we're not going to be acting on it. I think the best solution then is to list it under the Secretary's report. Since the Secretary is responsible for reporting the flow of Senate business, that seems to be the best place.

Secondly, there's the issue of what to do when the item is re-introduced. Since this doesn't happen very often, I'm favoring that when it is reintroduced, it is introduced again as new business. I don't feel that we should allow for lags between items being first and second readings

I'm cc'ing Glen on this as something we may want to address when we come up with 'standing rules' for the Senate.

These are just my thoughts on this, I may have missed something important...

don