

**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES  
ANNUAL REPORT****1999-2000**

The Committee on Committees (COC) met on June 21, August 17, August 22, August 24, and August 31 to review annual reports from 28 committees as specified in the *Faculty Manual*. The full reports are available in the Academic Senate Office.

The following committees are charged with submitting annual reports to the Academic Senate:

1. **Academic Affirmative Action Committee (AAAC)**
2. **Academic Freedom Committee (AFC)**
3. **Academic Policies Committee (APC)**
4. **Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)**
5. **All-University Committee on International Programs (AUCIP)**
6. **All-University Committee on Students, Faculty and Staff with Disabilities**
7. **All-University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEC) - no report submitted**
8. **Athletics Advisory Board**
9. **Board of Appeals and Review (BOAR)**
10. **Center for the Enhancement of Teaching Board of Directors (CET Board)**
11. **Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS)**
12. **Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC)**
13. **Educational Policies Council (EPC)**
14. **Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)**
15. **General Education Council (GEC)**
16. **Graduate Council**
17. **Honorary Degree Committee**
18. **Liberal Studies Council (LSC)**
19. **Library Advisory Committee (LAC)**
20. **Professional Development Council - no report submitted**
21. **Student Affairs Committee (SAC)**
22. **Teacher Credential Committee (TCC)**
23. **University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee**

24. **University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee**
25. **University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP)**
26. **University Interdisciplinary Council (UIC)**
27. **University Promotions Committee (UPC)**
28. **University Sabbatical Committee (USC)**

COC evaluated each report it received in light of its charge as set out in the *Faculty Manual*. COC appreciates the many hours that committee members spent reviewing, discussing, and acting on issues before them. In a number of instances they fashioned creative, workable solutions to difficult problems and made appropriate recommendations. By virtue of this important work, the committees have made valuable contributions to the life of the University. COC thanks the committee chairs and members.

COC strongly recommends that all committees review the previous COC report and appropriate committee reports. COC further urges that annual reports conform to the format outlined by the Academic Senate, including signatures by a majority of the committee. Where reports have not been received, as noted above, COC urges committee chairs to follow the charge, which is part of university policy.

## **1. ACADEMIC AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE**

COC applauds the Academic Affirmative Action Committee (**AAAC**) for its tireless efforts on behalf of academic diversity on this campus. COC also praises AAAC for its decision to forestall any problems caused by changes in committee members' teaching schedules and to work with effective subcommittees in order better to tackle their agenda. AAAC rightfully praises Joe Torres, Director of Affirmative Action, ex officio member, for his considerable efforts in keeping the committee apprised of Human Relations (HR) events, local and national affirmative action policies, and university actions. Bill Christmas receives special mention for his review of past HR reports on discrimination on campus and for putting in writing his 1998 report on "Heterosexism and Homophobia on SFSU Campus" for the benefit of AAAC. Rufus Browning also cooperated extensively with AAAC in telephone interviews to provide information on various PRI reports. Based on the work of Christmas, Browning and the AAAC, the committee has sent recommendations to the Dean of HR requesting further studies or surveys be conducted. AAAC reports that the Dean of HR is in agreement with this recommendation and has already contracted with PRI to do additional studies. A subcommittee on Diversity Training has strongly endorsed CUSP recommendation 67 on diversity training for all administrators, faculty and staff; AAAC will communicate its suggestions and recommendations about future workshops in this area to the Dean of HR, the Dean of Faculty Affairs and the Director of CET. A second subcommittee was established to conduct a review of tenure and promotion data, a comparative analysis of student enrollment and permanent faculty, student enrollment and temporary faculty, and student enrollment and administrative data; after some delays, all data necessary for the various reviews was made available for the subcommittee at the end of the Spring semester.

COC heartily endorses AAAC's ambitious agenda for 2000-2001: completing the final draft of a position paper on the legal and ethical obligations for supporting affirmative action on the SFSU campus; drafting a memo to department chairs regarding CUSP recommendation 66, defining affirmative action positions and future departmental efforts toward that end; working cooperatively with Human Relations, Faculty Affairs and CET to implement diversity training workshops; and conducting a complete and detailed review of (1) tenure and promotion data and (2) student, staff and faculty data for presentation to the Executive Committee and the full Academic Senate.

## **2. ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE**

In an otherwise low-key year, the Academic Freedom Committee (**AFC**) undertook to make more visible the work it does and to engage faculty in a deeper understanding of its role and purpose on the campus. COC strongly supports this campaign to inform faculty about the importance not just of the committee but of academic freedom issues in the University, and urges that AFC intensify the campaign in whatever way(s) possible.

As one result of reviewing concerns of a faculty member who was arbitrarily removed from an MA thesis committee, AFC has learned that SFSU lacks any policy language governing replacement of faculty members on thesis committees. If AFC has concluded that the Academic Senate should develop policy language to address this matter, COC suggests that AFC send its recommendations on this matter directly to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, which will forward them to the appropriate standing committee.

## **3. ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE**

COC commends the Academic Policies Committee (**APC**) for another year of hard work on behalf of the university. It is a fundamental principle of academic governance that the faculty, with its specialized knowledge of the curriculum and of teaching, is best qualified to develop and recommend policies regarding the curriculum and policies that are closely related to the curriculum and to teaching. The work of APC is central to this process.

We note that, for APC, 1999-2000 was a year when a wide range of important and complex issues came under discussion. Two matters were sent forward by APC to the entire Senate for action, the calendar and a set of principles on year-round operations, off-campus centers, and weekend operations (YOWO). COC is pleased that the campus now has an accepted set of principles on YOWO, and recommends that APC watch the implementation of YOWO carefully, seek a report on its operation, and consider whether a policy based on the set of principles may be required. This is related to the final item on APC's list of items to be considered during 2000-2001: to review any policies passed recently to determine if they are working as anticipated.

COC notes that APC projects a very full agenda for 2000-2001. All the items included are important. They are (1) the Graduate Student Award for Distinguished Achievement, (2) intellectual property issues, (3) religious observance principles developed by SAC, (4) degrees and programs offered through CEL, (5) written English composition requirements, and (6) review of academic minors. COC looks forward to APC's early action on a revised policy on the Graduate Student Award for Distinguished Achievement. Regarding intellectual property issues, COC suggests that APC and FAC consider a joint subcommittee. COC suggests that a high priority be given to consideration of a policy for degrees and programs offered through CEL. COC strongly encourages APC to continue with its evaluations of the current policy on meeting University requirements in composition, and to bring to the Senate, at the earliest possible time, a recommendation for changes in that policy.

COC is concerned that APC faces a large and important agenda and suggests that APC develop subcommittees on particular items as soon as possible to expedite consideration. COC also suggests that the APC chair discuss with the Academic Senate Executive Committee ways to expedite consideration of the many important items on its agenda.

## **4. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

COC thanks and commends the Academic Program Review Committee (**APRC**) for its diligence in attending to its tasks. In its May 9, 2000 report, APRC noted that it had completed review of and reports on the following programs during 1999-2000: Business, Music, Broadcast & Electronic Communication Arts, Theatre, Engineering, Math, Center for Biomedical Laboratory Science, and Liberal Studies. The APRC chair Jerry Duke, Associate Vice President Gail Whitaker, and Faculty Liaison Jim Bebee met with the College of BSS to begin the 5th cycle of program review; APRC notes that the 4th cycle of program review is moving toward completion, although it has taken 12 years. COC commends APRC for its continued efforts to streamline the program review process and congratulates all the members of APRC on a highly productive year.

## **5. ALL-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS**

COC commends the 1999-2000 All-University Committee on International Programs (**AUCIP**) for its wide range of activities during seven meetings, including the following: (1) participating in orientation and graduation for international students; (2) supporting the interim director of the Office of International Programs (OIP) while participating in the search for the new director; (3) writing the WASC self-study chapter on "Infrastructure for International Education" and "Internationalizing the Curriculum"; (4) discussing options with Graduate Council sub-committee on Graduate English Writing Proficiency for supporting international students who have English writing deficits.

AUCIP participated in two grant programs in multiple ways. It analyzed reports from the 1998-99 International Curriculum Development grants and made recommendations to OIP on how these grants might be improved in the future. It also participated in the review of proposals for International Community Service Learning Grants.

COC recommends that the 2000-2001 AUCIP follow the suggested agenda in the 1999-2000 annual report: (1) advise OIP on internal grant programs for the promotion of internationalization of the curriculum, research or service; (2) seek funding for a pilot program to address more effective language preparation for international students, continuing the collaboration with the Graduate Council sub-committee on Writing Proficiency and working actively with other relevant bodies like the Learning Assistance Center; (3) support and advise OIP and the new Director. COC further recommends close collaboration with the University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP) on the program for international students. COC also recommends that AUCIP participate in any on-going International Community Service Learning grant program.

## **6. ALL-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON STUDENTS, FACULTY AND STAFF WITH DISABILITIES**

This year the focus of the committee was in three areas:

- a. Campus construction projects. The committee consulted with the project coordinator for the Student Center on access logistics and on establishing and maintaining effective communication protocols.
- b. Campus shuttle service. The result of committee discussions regarding this service resulted in recommendations to the Office of Parking and Transportation about training for drivers and establishing and maintaining a line at the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue transit plaza for the safety of all passengers. The committee expressed its continued support of a "greeter" position at 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- c. Accessible public safety information. After discussions regarding lack of access to public safety information, recommendations were forwarded to the Department of Public Safety at its request. The recommendation addressed developing an e-mail or voice mail notification system to notify subscribers of safety bulletins and alerts.

The committee completed the agenda for 1999-2000 and did not submit one for 2000-2001. COC urges the committee to establish an agenda at its first meeting. COC would like to thank the committee for the work completed in improving

services.

## **7. ALL-UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

COC has received no annual report from the All-University Teacher Education Committee (**AUTEC**) despite requests going back to May 2000. This committee is charged with serving as a major university forum for issues related to teacher education and to promote meaningful and positive collaboration on such issues within the university and with the community. COC recognizes the vital importance of teacher education and of full university participation in teacher education. Thus, it is essential that this committee both work productively and report on its work to the university community at large.

## **8. ATHLETICS ADVISORY BOARD**

The Athletics Advisory Board (**AAB**) met monthly in the 1999-2000 academic year. The AAB discussed the following items: (1) Athletics Director's report on the status, accomplishments and needs of the athletics program; (2) a mission statement encompassing the athletics program and overall university athletics; (3) Cox Stadium running track and soccer field renovation project; (4) wrestling room problems; (5) athletic facilities maintenance needs; (6) drug testing; (7) policies and procedures for hiring coaches; (8) status of CCAA affiliation; and (9) distribution of grants-in-aid.

The AAB made the recommendation that the President's cabinet be made aware of the athletic facility maintenance problems and increase allocation of resources for maintenance and repair. It also recommended that the responsibility for athletic facility maintenance and the prioritization and use of allocated and facility related income be re-evaluated and assigned to a designated entity or individual. COC recommends that AAB make these recommendations directly to the President's Cabinet in a formal proposal.

The agenda for 2000-2001 includes athletic scholarships and resources; status of the athlete advising program; and the status of the minimum maintenance needs of athletic facilities. COC commends AAB for its hard work and endorses the agenda for the coming year. COC also suggests future reports note the nature of some substantive discussion, especially in such important areas of review as policies and procedures for hiring coaches.

## **9. BOARD OF APPEALS AND REVIEW**

COC finds the Board of Appeals and Review (**BOAR**) annual report to be thorough and informative. BOAR met once a month and reviewed 81 petitions with an approval rate of 49% (a 10% increase in approval). BOAR also put forth a new policy whereby EOP students who want to submit a petition must see an advisor. BOAR is to be commended for its holistic approach to student problems, especially their ongoing efforts to make the review of petitions fully integrated with other forms of advising.

COC recommends that the 2000-2001 BOAR follow the suggested agenda in the 1999-2000 annual report: review late Spring 2000 and Summer 2000 petitions; encourage student representatives to sit on BOAR. While reviewing student petitions is both time-consuming and the primary responsibility of BOAR, COC also recommends that BOAR spend some time on the following activities: continue to evaluate relevant policies and regulations; continue to monitor effects of advising; develop a system for monitoring students with BOAR contracts; develop a BOAR orientation manual for new members.

## **10. CENTER FOR THE ENHANCEMENT OF TEACHING - BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

COC thanks the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching Board of Directors (**CET Board**) for its comprehensive report and commends it for its diligence. COC notes with approval that the CET Board remains active in working with the CET Director on faculty hiring for CET, on new faculty orientation, and in soliciting input from faculty, staff and students regarding CET's programs and services. The CET Board will remain active in these areas during the next year, and COC endorses this agenda. COC believes that the CET Board's closer working relationship with the CET Director as well as the CET Board's clearer sense of its own responsibilities, as outlined in its 1999-2000 report, will continue to serve SFSU well.

## **11. COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS**

COC thanks and commends the University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (**CPHS**) for another year of work on behalf of the university's faculty and students as they comply with federal and campus requirements in this area. COC also thanks and commends CPHS for a fine annual report. CPHS read 1,234 proposals during 1999-2000, found 1,115 to be exempt, and reviewed the remaining 119. Of the proposals given detailed review, 58 required revisions and subsequent review, and 17 required a third review. COC notes with approval that revision of the CPHS handbook seems to have reduced the number of deficient proposals from previous years. COC is pleased to note that an inspection of CPHS operations by the US Food and Drug Administration found significant improvements in CPHS operations as compared to the previous inspection in 1993. The more recent inspection revealed only three deficiencies, and CPHS has taken action to correct them.

COC notes with approval CPHS's list of agenda items for 2000-2001: revise and update manual; meet in fall to address policies and procedures; appoint three permanent members of CPHS; appoint a videotaping specialist; consult with faculty members and departments as necessary. COC also notes the requests from CPHS regarding a change in the policy on committee composition, and COC recommends that the Executive Committee consider this request, meet with CPHS as necessary, and forward the policy change to the full Senate for action if the Executive Committee approves. COC also notes the requests of CPHS for a student assistant and for assistance with web design. COC recommends that the senate chair and CPHS chair work together to approach the Provost to seek student assistance funds and that the senate chair and CPHS chair work together to secure assistance for the web design.

COC applauds CPHS because its final report carries the signatures of all committee members but one, who was unavailable due to a family emergency.

## **12. CURRICULUM REVIEW AND APPROVAL COMMITTEE**

The Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (**CRAC**) worked very hard to review and approve 15 proposals for revisions to existing programs or requests for creation of new academic programs. It is a fundamental principle of academic governance that the faculty, with its specialized knowledge and its immediate experience in curriculum development, is best qualified to review and recommend curricular changes.

CRAC reviewed and approved the following program revisions: BA in International Relations, BA in Dance, minor in World Music and Dance, BS in Apparel and Interior Design, BS in Business Administration-Concentration in Business Analysis, minor in Business Computer Information Systems, BS in Business Administration-Concentration in Office Systems, BS in Business Administration-Concentration in Computer Information Systems, BA in Family Consumer Science-Concentration in Clothing and Textiles, BA in Family Consumer Science-Concentration in Interior Design, and minor in Psychology.

The new programs included: BS in Atmospheric and Oceanic Science, minor in Hospitality Management, certificate in

Information Technology Auditing, and BA in Jewish Studies. As in previous years, CRAC also met with the Curriculum Coordinator to discuss the curriculum review process, continued to update the CRAC manual, participated in joint meetings with the Graduate Council to discuss issues of mutual concern, and met with the Academic Policies Committee to review proposals for discontinuance of several academic programs.

It is not clear from its report whether CRAC followed through on recommendations from last year's COC report. Recommendations doing a complete review on the MS in Health Science and completing discussions of concerns raised in previous years (e.g., curriculum consultation, distance education, resource implications of new curricula, effects of revised requirements on student access and diversity, assessment and evaluation of new curricula).

COC recognizes the heavy volume of the CRAC workload and appreciates the attention to detail shown by the committee. In future reports, it would be helpful to show the extent of involvement and collaboration with other committees (for example, by separating which curricular matters were reviewed by CRAC alone and by CRAC with the Graduate Council). COC would also appreciate a fuller report of discussions and concerns raised during the year. To that end, COC recommends that closer review and discussion be done when new or unusual issues arise and that such review and discussion be reflected in the year-end report (e.g., requests for changes from BA to BS, distance education programs). COC strongly urges the committee to complete revisions to the CRAC manual, possibly creating a sub-committee for that purpose. COC urges the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to assist CRAC in any way it can to ensure that the revised manual be available for distribution by the close of the 2000-2001 academic year.

### **13. EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COUNCIL**

COC commends the Educational Policies Council (**EPC**, which consists of APC and CRAC meeting jointly) for their careful work during two very full meetings in fall 1999. They reviewed and recommended to the Senate the discontinuance of the following concentrations, degrees, or certificates: three concentrations in the BA in Dance; the MS in Accountancy; the Internal Auditing Concentration in the BS in Business Administration; the Real Estate Concentration in the BS in Business Administration; the Resource Specialist Certificate; the Certificate in Serious Emotional Disturbance; the Certificate in Rehabilitation Teaching for the Blind; the MS in Health Science; the Concentration in Individual Major and the Concentration in Physical Science in the BA in Science; the MA in Science. All recommendations were passed. EPC declined to recommend the discontinuance of the BA in Kinesiology and the minor in Athletic Coaching.

In keeping with its charge, EPC appointed liaisons to the General Education Council (GEC) and the Graduate Council, and the EPC chair received University Interdisciplinary Council meeting minutes on a regular basis, also receiving feedback from UIC on some discontinuance proposals. Overall, EPC successfully implemented the revised charge it received in September 1999.

In light of the increase in discontinuances, EPC also has raised legitimate concerns about changes in the character of academic programs at SFSU, in part by having the EPC chair serve on an Asilocampus 2000 panel that addressed such issues.

Since EPC meets on an as-needed basis, the 2000-2001 agenda cannot be set, but COC recommends that EPC continue the successful process set by the 1999-2000 committee by taking the initiative to appoint liaisons to GEC and the Graduate Council; consult with other committee chairs whenever relevant issues arise; continue to carefully review individual discontinuances as well as the larger context. In addition, the 2000-2001 EPC chair should review the agenda and recommendations for the coming year made in the 1999-2000 annual report.

### **14. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

COC thanks and commends the Faculty Affairs Committee (**FAC**) for another year of hard work on behalf of the university. It is a fundamental principle of academic governance that the faculty, with its specialized knowledge and its immediate experience in teaching, scholarship/research/creative work, and service, is crucial to the development of policies having to do with the criteria and standards for faculty personnel policies, with faculty rights and obligations, and with faculty development. FAC is vital to this process.

COC notes that FAC was exceptionally productive during 1999-2000, bringing five new or revised policies to the senate: revision of policy on temporary faculty; new policy on FMI; revision of policy on evaluation of tenured faculty; revision of policy on department chairs; and creation of policy on temporary faculty range elevation. COC recommends that FAC closely monitor these policies during implementation and consider any needed modifications.

COC notes that the FAC report indicates two agenda items for 2000-2001: minor revisions of policies on promotion and tenure, and instruments for student evaluation of teaching effectiveness. COC notes that UPC has recommended that the Academic Senate consider amending the promotions policy to address the issue of outside evaluations. Though there are likely to be other matters that will require the attention of FAC, COC suggests that FAC and APC confer regarding intellectual property issues and consider empanelling a joint sub-committee to make recommendations regarding intellectual property issues. FAC may also need to address policy issues involving (a) appointment of a person to a tenured/tenure-track position that involves more than one college and (b) appointment to an endowed chair.

## **15. GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL**

In its lengthy and idiosyncratic narrative of work done during 1999-2000, by far the best "read" of the spring reports, the General Education Council (**GEC**) allots considerable space to the time it spent discussing the relative success of department/program assessment activities on campus, and in assessing the value of these activities. The attention to both devotees and critics of assessment is noteworthy. Of equal importance is GEC's conclusion that the chief reason for inactivity of various GE committees is, simply, that there is no work for them to do. However, it also predicts that should

its recommendations for 2000-2001 be followed, these committees "will resurrect themselves." While COC appreciates this optimism, it is at the same time concerned about GEC's continuing to offer leadership to the committees that fall within its jurisdiction. Exempted from the concerns about inactivity was the Segment III committee, whose efforts to demystify and reorganize the GE clusters GEC applauds heartily. Additionally, GEC had discussions (with the appropriate persons) of community service learning and its relation to GE objectives, the First Year Orientation Course, and GatorAid as a means of publicizing GE issues. In an unprecedented attempt to raise the morale of the Council itself, it passed an attendance rule "mildly modeled on the Senate's," which COC devoutly hopes will produce the intended effect.

GEC agenda items for 2000-001 include review of the "overall policies and procedures" governing GE offerings, in the hope of ensuring that they deliver the "program our students need." Looking at a sorely-neglected issue, the Council "suggest[s] discussion and policy for student writing in GE courses," a task which could support efforts to promote a Writing across the Curriculum program on this campus. COC recommends that it consult on this topic with the CWEP. The GEC agenda also includes follow-up on activities started in 1999-2000; discussion of the report from the Academic Senate's "Multi-cultural Committee," a report written two years ago; study the implications ("curricular, academic freedom, and faculty governance") of the assessment data from 1999-2000; and a host of smaller tasks. From a governance perspective, its concern about clarifying the relationship between GEC and the Academic Senate seems well-founded, and its plan to initiate dialogue about the GE program a wise strategy. COC recognizes the sensitivity of the issues with which GEC has concerned itself and plans to pursue, and appreciates deeply the depth of commitment shown by this body. It looks forward to whatever thoughts about the 'global' issues that GEC may have to share with the University community. All in all, COC awards the GEC report two thumbs up!

## **16. GRADUATE COUNCIL**

The Graduate Council provided a clear and comprehensive report of its tasks and accomplishments during the 1999-2000 academic year. This report is reflective of the fine work the Graduate Council continues to do on a variety of important issues. Happily, for the first time ever, the Graduate Council received assigned time for its Chair.

The Graduate Council began the year by narrowing its focus on a few goals, with the hope of being more likely to make progress on a finite number of tasks rather than wading through a morass of issues. In order to better accomplish its goals, the Graduate Council formed three subcommittees and met jointly with a variety of constituencies. The subcommittees addressed the issues of financial support for graduate students, graduate writing proficiency, and proposed revisions to the Distinguished Student Award (forming a joint subcommittee with two APC members).

In addition to the work of its subcommittees, the Graduate Council held joint meetings with CRAC, conducted a workshop on graduate issues at Asilocampus, hosted a reception for CSU Student Research Competition winners, facilitated two campuswide graduate coordinators' meetings, and participated in graduate program assessment. The Graduate Council reviewed and approved programs through CEL: MAs in Education with concentrations in Educational Administration and Special Interest (School Reform); an accelerated MBA and an Alliance MBA. In a joint meeting, CRAC and the Graduate Council reviewed and approved a program revision to the MA in Elementary Education and a new MA in Human Sexuality Studies.

One issue that was brought up in the 1997-98 report that does not seem to have been addressed is the request by COC to re-examine the Graduate Council's organizational structure and function of committees at SFSU. Given the effectiveness with which the Graduate Council appears to have worked in recent times, this may no longer be necessary. Its subcommittee model might well be adopted by other committees with tremendous workloads.

COC agrees with the Graduate Council's plan to develop a fourth subcommittee to address the issue of faculty workload. In addition, COC agrees with the other agenda items for the coming year: continue working on issues of graduate writing proficiency, including working with other campus groups involved in this endeavor; continue to collaborate with APC regarding bringing a policy to the Academic Senate in Fall 2000 regarding the Distinguished Achievement Award; pursue its work on graduate student-related faculty workload (possibly forming an additional subcommittee); and explore the program assessment process for masters degree programs offered through CEL. COC recommends that the Graduate Council continue to meet with appropriate constituencies and recommends that it consult with all campus entities that are addressing the issue of writing proficiency.

Since continuous enrollment of graduate students is appropriate to and well within the charge of the Graduate Council, COC requests that the Graduate Council make a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate regarding this issue, preferably by the end of the fall semester.

## **17. HONORARY DEGREE COMMITTEE**

COC commends the 1999-2000 Honorary Degree Committee for their efforts. As the Annual Report indicates, the nomination process went smoothly with good communication between the committee and the President making it easy to meet the Chancellor's Office deadline for submission of honorary degree nominees. The President met with the committee at its second meeting; the committee put out calls for campus nominations through various means; the committee submitted five nominees to the President late November; the President advised the committee of the nominees' status in February; two nominations were sent forward and approved by the Board of Trustees, and both honorees accepted.

COC recommends that the 2000-2001 Honorary Degree Committee follow the suggested agenda from the 1999-2000 committee, following the same process summarized above while trying to meet with the President in its first meeting. In addition, the 2000-2001 committee should follow the successful pattern of electing the following year's committee and selecting the Chair in a spring 2000 meeting.

## **18. LIBERAL STUDIES COUNCIL**

In a very busy year, the Liberal Studies Council (**LSC**) addressed major issues including assessment of students who complete the Multiple Subject Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) equivalency; assessment of the Liberal Studies major; core sequences in Areas I and II; the Freshman Year Experience Course (AU 101); and the self-study and program review for the Liberal Studies major (with the MOU to be taken up again in 2000-2001). In the context of the self-study, and in response to recommendations made by external reviewers, it considered program governance issues, a discussion that it appears to pursue in the coming year. In addition, LSC made time for what it calls "general Liberal Studies business," in itself a complicated set of tasks.

Its agenda for 2000-2001 is equally lengthy, some of it a carryover from the past year (e.g., sequencing of courses in Area II), and some of it new (articulation issues related to community college transfer programs; revised standards of quality for subject matter programs for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential; the Liberal Studies Course prefix). Although it is difficult to distinguish from the report which of the issues LSC perceived as critical and those it ranked lower on the scale of importance, COC sees how challenging a year the Council had and applauds it for persevering on some very thorny issues. It looks forward to more detail about how LSC resolves some of the items it has ahead of it.

## **19. LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Facility issues dominated the work and discussions of the Library Advisory Committee (**LAC**), as well as discussions regarding appropriate means of securing faculty input to the library renovation project. The initial plans are scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2000. The LAC explored the major aspects of the shortage of space for collections, study space for library patrons, and library services. Other areas of concern and discussion were seismic and other structural problems and the encroachment of non-library services on library space.

A review of the Basic Information Competence Requirement for Undergraduates was completed by the LAC, and feedback was provided to the library staff. The new requirements are to be implemented in Fall 2000. The LAC is to be commended for its work and continuing efforts, as well as for its continued collaboration with the university librarian and library staff, as well as with offices of planning and space management. COC endorses the LAC agenda for 2000-2001: planning for the library's expansion and renovation; the bound periodicals offsite storage project; reviewing the implementation of the new Basic Information Competence Requirement; and reviewing CSU library funding in the Fall.

## **20. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL**

COC has received no annual report from the Professional Development Council despite requests going back to May 2000. This committee is charged to meet at least three times per semester to, among many things, invite, evaluate, and recommend funding of proposals pertaining to faculty professional development. It is imperative that this committee both work productively and report on its work to the university community at large. COC recommends that the Academic Senate Executive Committee investigate whether or not the Professional Development Council has been convened as per A.S.

Policy #S99-183, and, if it has not, to convene the committee itself as early as possible.

## **21. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

The Student Affairs Committee (**SAC**), after hearing from various speakers on different activities and issues related to student life, created a number of subcommittees to focus on its 1999-2000 agenda:

- a. Religious observance policy. A policy to publicize the intent of Education Code 8932- on religious observance was drafted and sent to APC for review.
- b. Master calendar of events. A document was drafted after much research; however, the Academic Senate passed a resolution to establish a task force to explore the implementation of a master calendar of university events.
- c. SAC liaison. Student discussions regarding the source of merchandise produced in sweatshops and sold at SFSU led to the establishment of a SAC liaison with the Office of Human Relations, CFA, and Associated Students, to further explore this topic.

COC expresses its appreciation of the work done by SAC and endorses its 2000-2001 agenda: participation in the task force to implement a master calendar of university events; forwarding to the Senate Executive Committee a final draft of the policy on religious observance; continuing to seek information on improving services for students on campus; following up on all issues sent to the committee from the Executive Committee.

## **22. TEACHER CREDENTIAL COMMITTEE**

The Teacher Credential Committee (**TCC**) had three foci of activity in 1999-2000:

- \* review and approval of the Four Year Integrated BA in Liberal Studies and Multiple Subjects Credential Program;
- \* the NCATE/COA reviews of the College of Education;
- \* a study of how better to attract underrepresented groups to teacher credential programs at SFSU.

In exploring how to attract a more diverse group of students to credential programs, TCC conducted an attitudes survey among students in the College of Ethnic Studies. The results indicate that their top subject area preferences were English, history, mathematics and art, and that their information about teaching as a career limited. TCC recommends that the College of Education--in conjunction with faculty from the College of Ethnic Studies--offer orientation workshops for students in Ethnic Studies courses interested in teaching credentials. It also recommends that the survey be re-administered in 2000-2001 to "tap a broader sample of students from the College of Ethnic Studies." Given the small sample size, COC heartily endorses the proposal for repeating the original survey.

Because its work intersects with that of other individuals and entities on campus, TCC regularly hears reports from them in a demonstration of collegiality for which COC applauds it. COC notes TCC's concern that AUTECH no longer meets regularly and shares that concern.

COC also notes the range of agenda items that TCC has scheduled for 2000-2001: review of the foreign languages subject matter program, review of programs in business and industrial arts and technology, review of the availability of technology in SFSU class-rooms and of the requirement for computer literacy in credential candidates. COC suggests that TCC adopt its usual collegial mode in studying the availability of educational technology on this campus, and both recognizes and appreciates the attention to detail demonstrated in all the work of the Council.

### **23. UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

COC applauds the hard work, dedication and enthusiasm of the members of the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC). We find that the report is complete and thorough. The committee met in full four times during the academic year. In addition, sub-committees ("work groups") met throughout the year. UAAAC provided a liaison between faculty and the Coordinator of Academic Assessment.

In its initial year the UAAAC focused its efforts on developing a university-wide policy on academic assessment and faculty development, discussing methods and measures to assess the quality and performance of SFSU's programs and services, and consulting on the WASC self-study process. The committee ably met its charge of providing a channel for communication, advice, and liaison among Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, and the faculty on academic assessment. Members helped identify faculty development needs and opportunities, participated in campus- and statewide programs on assessment, and contributed to the development of assessment resources and newsletters.

The committee made a point of recognizing the extraordinary contributions of Nuria Cuevas, Coordinator of Academic Assessment and ex officio member of UAAAC. COC encourages UAAAC to continue its good work and its plans for the coming year, which include: (1) preparing a draft of an SFSU policy on academic assessment with the goal of bringing it to the Academic Senate by Spring 2001, (2) continuing to consult on the WASC self-study process in the area of assessment, (3) continuing to delineate the role of assessment in the CSU accountability process, and (4) developing additional resources for use by faculty in academic assessment.

### **24. UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT ACTIVITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

The University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee annual report indicates that the committee "suspended" its operation in 1999-2000 due to the university's Centennial Celebration. There is no indication that the committee met and voted on such a suspension. This all-university committee is charged to meet at least once per semester to provide counsel on the planning and execution of diverse university advancement activities, including special events. COC recognizes the importance of university advancement activities as well as the success of the relatively new administrative Division of University Advancement; however, full university participation by way of this committee is both vital and part of official university policy. COC endorses the agenda for 2000-2001: review of development goals and publications projects. COC also recommends that the Academic Senate Executive Committee ensure that the University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee has been convened as per A.S. Policy #S98-184, and, if it has not, to convene the committee itself as early as possible.

### **25. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON WRITTEN ENGLISH PROFICIENCY**

COC commends the University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP) for its hard work in responding to the multiple charges of the committee. The committee met seven times and focused its efforts in the following areas: (1) continuing its research and reporting on the educational experiences and needs of students often characterized as bilingual; (2) serving as subject-matter resources to program chairs seeking assistance in developing writing components in their programs; (3) sponsoring an articulation conference with local community colleges on undergraduate written English requirements; (4) revising the committee charge and its relationship with other committees and constituencies.

The Bilingual Subcommittee of CWEP continued to disseminate findings from its survey of the linguistic profiles of SFSU's immigrant and American-born students who can be characterized as coming from non-English-speaking backgrounds. Most

of these students do not fit neatly into the traditional categories of "ESL students" or "basic writers."

CWEP carefully analyzed its charge (especially its resource/consultant role) and its relationship with other bodies addressing issues of undergraduate and graduate written proficiency. The bulk of the work in 1999-2000 was information-gathering about key constituencies' ongoing or proposed projects and their knowledge of CWEP's charge. CWEP drafted a revision to the committee charge that will be submitted to the Academic Senate Executive Committee in Fall 2000.

COC supports the above 2000-2001 agenda item, as well as the rest of the 2000-2001 agenda from the 1999-2000 report: continue to explore ways CWEP may link its efforts more effectively with other campus constituencies (e.g., GEC, APRC, CRAC); continue to explore ways to better enforce the university's existing literacy requirements; present findings of bilingual study in new venues (e.g., CSU English Council); continue to sponsor workshops that explore the articulation between SFSU's and local community colleges' literacy curriculum and expectations. COC urges CWEP to participate with the All-University Committee on International Programs in its goal of funding a pilot program to address more effective language preparation for international students. Since CWEP is the only university-wide faculty committee charged with oversight of both undergraduate and graduate writing, COC also urges the CWEP Chair to establish effective liaison with all projects and committees working on writing. These would include Writing in the Disciplines, writing subcommittees of the Graduate Council and the General Education Council, the JEPET and GET coordinators, and the Academic Policies Committee as it works on policies concerning composition.

## **26. UNIVERSITY INTERDISCIPLINARY COUNCIL**

As in the past, the University Interdisciplinary Council (UIC) provided COC with an excellent and complete summary of its activities for the year.

UIC met twice a month during the year. Although focusing on its assessment project which began with a grant from the Provost the previous year, UIC also found time to consult on proposals for revisions, discontinuances, and creation of interdisciplinary programs. UIC provided comment on two program reviews: Liberal Studies and American Studies. Finally, UIC provided a representative to the GE Segment III committee and consulted with the GEC regarding the question of overlap between GE Segment III clusters and interdisciplinary majors. Also, UIC made a recommendation to the Provost for future support of cross-college teaching endeavors. UIC continues to try to find better ways to review interdisciplinary activities of both students and faculty.

COC applauds UIC's diligent work on its assessment project. Since there is no satisfactory national instrument that would assess the familiarity and experience of students with interdisciplinary education, UIC had to design an instrument from scratch. After extensive consultation and discussion, UIC developed a pilot survey that was administered to over 400 students in Spring 2000.

COC encourages UIC to pursue its agenda for the coming year. We look forward to receiving a report on the results of the assessment survey. UIC also plans to participate as appropriate in the WASC accreditation process, update its website, investigate whether UIC might participate in the new faculty orientation, and revisit UIC policy regarding how programs are designated interdisciplinary (currently it is a process of self-selection).

## **27. UNIVERSITY PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE**

COC thanks and commends the University Promotions Committee (UPC) for another year of long hours and hard work on behalf of the university and for its usual fine report. It is a fundamental principle of academic governance that the faculty,

with its specialized knowledge and its immediate experience in teaching, scholarship/research/creative work, and service, is best qualified to evaluate the qualifications of other faculty. COC is pleased to note UPC's comment that the work of most departmental committees, department chairs, and college deans was done well, and that the majority of applications were complete and well organized, and that a majority of the applications clearly described the activities of the candidate during the period of review. COC is also pleased to note UPC's comment regarding the increase in the number and value of letters by outside evaluators in the category of scholarship/research/creative work.

COC is concerned that UPC reports that some candidates are disadvantaged in the process by inconsistencies, problems with the presentation of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, inclusion of inappropriate material, the absence of peer review of teaching effectiveness, and the absence of careful evaluation of the candidate's scholarship/research/creative work. COC appreciates UPC's thorough efforts to inform all participants in the process of what is expected of them; however, COC recognizes that the problems outlined in the UPC report constitute a problem for the entire University. COC is concerned with maintaining the integrity of the promotions process and suggests that the UPC chair consider meeting with the specific departments or department chairs who have demonstrated that they need the most assistance. COC notes the crucial role of deans in securing full compliance with University policy by department committees and chairs, so COC suggests that the UPC chair meet individually with those deans who need the most assistance.

COC notes that UPC suggests that the Academic Senate should consider revising the University promotions policy to address the issue of outside evaluations. COC suggests that, regardless of Senate action on this matter during 2000-2001, UPC may want to consider providing guidance to all participants regarding outside evaluators -- how to select outside evaluators, how to approach them, what information and materials to provide them, what information they should include in their evaluation.

COC endorses UPC's recommendations for future promotions processes: (1) all participants in the process must be trained each and every cycle; (2) UPC members need to be available during the fall; (3) UPC should meet in the fall with deans in addition to the college meetings. COC endorses UPC's set of questions for participants in the process and recommends that those questions (or something similar) be included with the materials that are provided to all participants during the fall: (1) how good is the clarity and flow of materials? (2) does the file contain peer evaluations from several semesters and different classes? (3) did the candidate include personal statements for each of the major categories of evaluation? (4) are the student evaluations of teaching effectiveness put in context? (5) are there sufficient evaluations of professional growth from experts in that field who reside outside SFSU? (6) do the service activities stem from the candidate's academic expertise?

COC is concerned about one set of data that is missing from the UPC report. By including no data on those who were eligible to seek promotion. The number who were eligible when compared with the number of applications indicates the number of eligible faculty members who did not apply, for whatever reason. This data is properly a part of the overall picture of the University promotions process - in part because COC understands that department committees and department chairs may discourage applications from faculty members who do not meet the criteria. COC considers it appropriate and responsible for department committees and chairs to take such action and suggests that this be a part of the Fall informational meetings, if it is not already.

## **28. UNIVERSITY SABBATICAL COMMITTEE**

COC notes with approval the comprehensive first report of the new University Sabbatical Committee (USC) and applauds the diligence and hard work of the members of this inaugural USC: Raquel Rivera Pinderhughes (chair), Betsy Blosser, Rudolph Busby, Caroline Harnly, and Marsha Melnick. During several meetings in the month of November 1999 USC developed its ranking materials and procedures, after consulting the processes used by various colleges. USC's 5 point ranking system is

related to five criteria: (1) college ranking; (2) intellectual/creative significance of the proposed project; (3) significance of the proposed project to the faculty member's professional development; (4) applicant's professional background relevant to the ability to carry out the project; (5) potential for successful completion. USC also asked for additional information: (1) the significance of the project to the University, and whether the project was (2) new or (3) a continuation of existing

professional work. Committee members worked to review and rank the 50 proposals submitted; as a result, 30 proposals were recommended. In each case USC reviewed not only rankings and mean scores but reviewed all proposals with regard to principles of equitable distribution. In early Spring 2000 Committee members met with Provost La Belle and Dean Barnes to discuss the review process and to make recommendations for the next round of reviews.

Although USC notes "remarkable consensus" among the participating committee members, it also takes note of two difficulties about which COC shares its concern: (1) the College of Education did not submit its proposals and rankings until the day before the USC was scheduled to meet to discuss its own rankings and make initial decisions; and (2) only 4 colleges and the library were represented on the committee. The colleges of Education and Science & Engineering did not provide members for the

USC, and the representatives elected by the colleges of Ethnic Studies and Business did not participate (the latter representative being on leave and not replaced). COC is equally concerned with this lack of participation, and urges the Senate chair to work closely with the deans to make sure that elections are held and representatives are chosen, in accordance with Senate policy. Finally, COC notes with appreciation the efforts of the USC to ensure equity in the distribution of sabbatical leaves, and it

recommends that, in future, USC provide a summary showing the numerical distribution of recommended sabbaticals across colleges and, if possible, the final numerical disposition of sabbaticals granted. COC also recommends that the Academic Senate chair invite the chair of USC to present its report annually to the Senate.

## COMMITTEES ON COMMITTEES

### ANNUAL REPORT - 1999-2000

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. COC applauds the Academic Affirmative Action Committee (**AAAC**) for its tireless efforts on behalf of academic diversity on this campus and heartily endorses AAAC's ambitious agenda for 2000-2001, especially the review of tenure and promotion data, and student, staff and faculty data for presentation to the Executive Committee and the full Academic Senate.
2. COC strongly supports the Academic Freedom Committee (**AFC**) efforts to inform faculty about the importance not just of the committee but of academic freedom issues in the University.
3. The Academic Senate approved the a set of principles from the Academic Policies Committee (**APC**) on year-round operations, off-campus centers, and weekend operations (YOWO). COC endorses the full and important APC agenda for 2000-2001 and also encourages APC to bring a recommendation to the Senate for changes in the policy on meeting University requirements in composition.
4. The Academic Program Review Committee (**APRC**) completed review of and reports on the following programs during 1999-2000: Business, Music, Broadcast & Electronic Communication Arts, Theatre, Engineering, Math, Center for Biomedical Laboratory Science, and Liberal Studies.

5. COC commends the All-University Committee on International Programs (**AUCIP**) for its wide-ranging support of international programs during a year of transition in the Office of International Programs and endorses AUCIP's continued work with international grant programs and programs addressing more effective language preparation for international students.
6. The All-University Committee on Students, Faculty and Staff with Disabilities focused on the Student Center construction project, campus shuttle service, and accessible public safety information.
7. COC notes with great concern the lack of an annual report or other evidence of meeting from the All-University Teacher Education Committee's (**AUTEC**), for this committee is charged with serving as a major university forum for issues related to teacher education and to promote meaningful and positive collaboration on such issues within the university and with the community.
8. COC notes the regular meetings and wide-ranging discussion of the Athletics Advisory Board (**AAB**). COC recommends that AAB make its recommendations on athletic facility maintenance problems directly to the President's Cabinet.
9. COC commends the Board of Appeals and Review (**BOAR**) for its careful review of student petitions and its ongoing efforts to make the review of petitions fully integrated with other forms of advising.
10. COC notes with approval the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching Board of Directors' (**CET Board**) work with the CET Director on faculty hiring for CET, on new faculty orientation, and in soliciting input from faculty, staff and students regarding CET's programs and services.
11. The Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (**CPHS**) received 1,234 proposals during 1999-2000, found 1,115 to be exempt, and reviewed the remaining 119. COC applauds that hard work and is also pleased to note that an inspection of CPHS operations by the US Food and Drug Administration found significant improvements in CPHS operations as compared to the previous inspection in 1993.
12. The Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (**CRAC**) reviewed and approved the following program revisions: BA in International Relations, BA in Dance, minor in World Music and Dance, BS in Apparel and Interior Design, BS in Business Administration-Concentration in Business Analysis, minor in Business Computer Information Systems, BS in Business Administration-Concentration in Office Systems, BS in Business Administration-Concentration in Computer Information Systems, BA in Family Consumer Science-Concentration in Clothing and Textiles, BA in Family Consumer Science-Concentration in Interior Design, and minor in Psychology. CRAC reviewed and approved the following new programs: BS in Atmospheric and Oceanic Science, minor in Hospitality Management, certificate in Information Technology Auditing, and BA in Jewish Studies.
13. The Educational Policies Council (**EPC**) reviewed and recommended to the Senate the discontinuance of the following concentrations, degrees, or certificates: three concentrations in the BA in Dance; the MS in Accountancy; the Internal Auditing Concentration in the BS in Business Administration; the Real Estate Concentration in the BS in Business Administration; the Resource Specialist Certificate; the Certificate in Serious Emotional Disturbance; the Certificate in Rehabilitation Teaching for the Blind; the MS in Health Science; the Concentration in Individual Major and the Concentration in Physical Science in the BA in Science; the MA in Science. All recommendations were passed. EPC declined to recommend the discontinuance of the BA in Kinesiology and the minor in Athletic Coaching.
14. In a very productive year, the Faculty Affairs Committee (**FAC**) brought five new or revised policies to the senate: revision of policy on temporary faculty; new policy on FMI; revision of policy on evaluation of tenured faculty; revision of policy on department chairs; and creation of policy on temporary faculty range elevation.

15. The General Education Council (**GEC**) Segment III committee made considerable efforts to reorganize the Segment III GE clusters. COC endorses the ambitious GEC agenda for 2000-2001.
16. The Graduate Council met jointly with a variety of constituencies and formed three subcommittees to directly address issues of financial support for graduate students, graduate writing proficiency, and proposed revisions to the Distinguished Student Award.
17. The Honorary Degree Committee successfully completed its mission to seek, evaluate, and forward worthy nominees for honorary degrees.
18. The Liberal Studies Council (**LSC**) addressed major issues including assessment of students who complete the Multiple Subject Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) equivalency; assessment of the Liberal Studies major; core sequences in Areas I and II; the Freshman Year Experience Course (AU 101); and the self-study and program review for the Liberal Studies major.
19. The Library Advisory Committee spent the bulk of its time on facility issues with the library renovation project to continue as a major item for the coming year. The Library Advisory Committee also reviewed the Basic Information Competence Requirement for undergraduates, which will be implemented Fall 2000.
20. COC notes with great concern the lack of an annual report or other evidence of meeting from the Professional Development Council. This committee is charged to meet at least three times per semester to, among many things, invite, evaluate, and recommend funding of proposals pertaining to faculty professional development.
21. The Student Affairs Committee (**SAC**) focused on the following areas: drafting a new policy on religious observance; passing a resolution in the Academic Senate to establish a task force to explore the implementation of a Master Calendar of University Events; participating in discussions regarding merchandise produced in sweatshops and sold at SFSU.
22. The Teacher Credential Committee (**TCC**) had three foci of activity in 1999-2000: review and approval of the Four Year Integrated BA in Liberal Studies and Multiple Subjects Credential Program; the NCATE/COA reviews of the College of Education; a study of how better to attract underrepresented groups to teacher credential programs at SFSU.
23. In its initial year the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (**UAAAC**) focused its efforts on developing a university-wide policy on academic assessment and faculty development, discussing methods and measures to assess the quality and performance of SFSU's programs and services, and consulting on the WASC self-study process.
24. The University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee annual report indicates that the committee "suspended" its operation in 1999-2000 due to the university's Centennial Celebration. COC recognizes the importance of university advancement activities as well as the success of the relatively new administrative Division of University Advancement; however, full university participation by way of this committee is both vital and part of official university policy.
25. The University Committee on Written English Proficiency (**CWEP**) focused its efforts in the following areas: (1) continuing its research and reporting on the educational experiences and needs of students often characterized as bilingual; (2) serving as subject-matter resources to program chairs seeking assistance in developing writing components in their programs; (3) sponsoring an articulation conference with local community colleges on undergraduate written English requirements; (4) revising the committee charge and its relationship with other committees and constituencies. COC endorses the ambitious CWEP 2000-2001 agenda and, since CWEP is the only university-wide faculty committee charged with oversight of both undergraduate and graduate writing, COC also urges the CWEP Chair to establish effective liaison with all projects and committees working on writing.

26. While focusing on its assessment project, the University Interdisciplinary Council (**UIC**) also found time to consult on proposals for revisions, discontinuances, and creation of interdisciplinary programs.
27. COC commends the University Promotions Committee (**UPC**) for the hard work done in reviewing and recommending candidates for promotion as well as its feedback on the promotion process. COC endorses the UPC recommendations for future promotions processes: (1) all participants in the process must be trained each and every cycle; (2) UPC members need to be available during the fall; (3) UPC should meet in the fall with deans in addition to the college meetings.
28. COC applauds the diligence and hard work of the members of the inaugural University Sabbatical Committee (**USC**). It developed ranking materials and procedures, reviewed and ranked the 50 proposals submitted, and recommended 30 proposals. USC also provided a valuable faculty perspective at all stages of the process.

## **COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

### **MEMBERSHIP**

-

**1999-2000**

**Dane Johnson, World & Comparative Literature, Chair**

**Guadalupe Avila, Counseling and Psychological Services**

**Robert Cherny, History**

**Helen Goldsmith, Liberal Studies**

**Jan Gregory, English**

**Pamela Vaughn, Classics**