

CORE DOCTORAL FACULTY HANDBOOK

Published by the GTU Dean's Office

August 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Communications	1
II. Core Doctoral Faculty (CDF)	1
A. Agreement and Definition	1
B. Mission of the Doctoral Program.....	2
C. Participation in the Core Doctoral Faculty	3
1. Application to the Core Doctoral Faculty	3
2. Qualifications for Admission to the Core Doctoral Faculty	3
3. Expectations and Responsibilities of Core Doctoral Faculty	4
4. Credit for Service on the Core Doctoral Faculty	5
5. Prerequisites and Prerogatives of the Core Doctoral Faculty	5
6. Appointment of Core Doctoral Faculty	5
7. Review of Core Doctoral Faculty.....	5
D. Core Doctoral Faculty Structures	7
1. Core Doctoral Faculty Meetings	7
2. Governance Procedures: Maintenance of Doctoral Standards	7
3. Governance Structure.....	8
4. Faculty Committee Structures and Representation	8
a. Standing Committees of the Core Doctoral Faculty	10
b. Consortial Committee: Library Committee.....	11
5. Appointment Procedures for Standing Committees of CDF	11
E. The Areas	12
1. Area Meetings	12
2. Consortial Faculty Hiring and Development Agreement	12
3. Review of Areas and Area Viability	13
a. Criteria for Areas	13
b. Regular Reviews of Areas.....	14
c. Creating, Restructuring, Combining, Consolidating or Eliminating an Area.....	17
F. Resources for Core Doctoral Faculty	18
1. Dean’s Faculty Research Fund.....	18
a. Requesting an Research Assistant or Teaching Assistant (outside of Newhalls).....	18
b. Purchasing computers or equipment	19
c. Costs for travel, books, etc.	19
2. Newhall Awards.....	19
III. Governance of Academic Programs	19
A. Policy Statement on Use of Copyright Materials	19
1. Copyright Guidelines	19
2. Compliance	20
B. GTU Statement on Academic Freedom.....	21
C. Guide for Assignment of Course Levels	22

IV. Student Issues	22
A. Guidelines for Advising Prospective Applicants.....	22
1. Degree Requirements	23
2. Application Deadline	23
3. GRE/TOEFL	23
4. International Students.....	23
B. Assignment of Advisees.....	23
C. Catalog, Handbook, and Dated Policies and Procedures.....	24
D. Advising Weak Students	24
E. Annual Student Review of Satisfactory Academic Progress.....	24
1. Rationale	24
2. Procedures.....	24
F. Doctoral Student Review for Research Readiness	25
G. Student Committee Structure Regulations	25
1. Committee Chairs.....	25
2. Faculty from Second GTU Member School (or GTU roster).....	25
3. “Outside” Third Members.....	26
H. GTU Financial Aid Policies	27
V. Policies on Faculty Status	28
A. In-Residence Faculty Policy.....	28
1. Standard Academic Ranks	28
a. Regular or Tenure Track Ranks (Assistant, Associate, and Full)	28
b. Visiting Professorships (All Ranks).....	28
c. Adjunct Professorships (All Ranks).....	28
d. Emeritus Professorships	29
2. GTU Policy	29
B. Academic Policy for Endowed Chairs in the GTU	30
1. Permanent Professorships	30
2. Distinguished Professorships	30
C. Visiting Scholars	31
D. Adjunct Faculty	31
VI. Responsibilities of Conveners	31
A. Chair Area Meetings	31
B. Research Readiness Review	32
C. Review of Courses to be offered by the Area.....	33
D. Procedures for General Comprehensive Examinations	33
1. Area Convener’s Responsibility.....	33

2. Dean of Students' Office Responsibility	33
E. Special Comprehensives Proposals	33
F. Dissertation Proposals	34
G. Area Administration	34
H. Admissions, Recruitment, Follow-up	35
1. Convener's Duties	35
2. Notes on Admission	35
I. Professional Development of Students/Placement	35
J. Satisfactory Progress/Annual Student Review	36
K. Problem Areas	37
1. Student Problems	37
2. Grievance Procedures.....	37
3. Area Problems.....	37
4. Multiple Protocols and Catalogs	37
L. Archiving Area Material	38
M. Transition to Next Area Convener	38
N. Area Assistants.....	38

I. COMMUNICATIONS

One of the most difficult aspects of the diffuse and federal system of the GTU is communications. Though the Doctoral Faculty meets as a whole three times a year, we are scattered across various campuses. Everyone must make a special effort to keep informed. The revisions to the Doctoral Program and M.A. handbooks, as well as to the Core Doctoral Faculty Handbook are one major way in which we try to keep everyone apprised of new information.

The Dean's Office also asks you to keep us informed. The GTU Dean makes regular reports to the GTU Board about the achievements of Core Doctoral Faculty and students; we cannot celebrate what we do not know. The office welcomes news of publications, honors, and activities of note on the part of all of the Core Doctoral Faculty.

Also be aware of the Faculty section of the GTU website (www.gtu.edu); it provides a summary of teaching and research interests of all faculty in the GTU. It is a great way to find out more about someone you met at a meeting or reception, to track down a possible team teacher or collaborator, or to look for further resources for a student or project.

II. CORE DOCTORAL FACULTY (CDF)

A. Agreement and Definition

Agreement

In 1988-89 the Doctoral Faculty of the GTU generated a document to create a permanent Core Doctoral Faculty. After several faculty revisions, the document was approved by the GTU Board in October of 1989, and the first Core Doctoral Faculty was appointed in May of 1990. The Core Doctoral Faculty plays a prominent role in the "Academic Cooperation" section of the GTU Common Agreement (2001).

Definition

First and foremost, the Core Doctoral Faculty is the governing body of the Doctoral Program, a group appointed and reviewed by their peers, and committed to establishing and maintaining the standards of the Doctoral Program. This group provides continuity in the standards and quality of the program and is positioned as a definable faculty group to whom the GTU Dean goes for advice and direction about the doctoral program.

The Core Doctoral Faculty verifies that the procedures of the Doctoral Program and protocols of the Areas have been followed and their scholarly standards achieved. Members of the Core Doctoral Faculty, being continuously active in the governance of the Doctoral Program, are qualified to certify that the standards of that program have been maintained.

Chairs of comprehensive and dissertation committees must be Core Doctoral Faculty. The Area, with the Dean's approval, can waive this requirement if they have every confidence that the proposed chair can fulfill all of the above requirements. Such a waiver is a rare exception to the policy.

All GTU Consortial Faculty are part of the doctoral program's rich resources; according to their interests, they are encouraged to serve on committees as second readers as long as the Area is convinced that their scholarly expertise is appropriate to the particular student project. Consortial Faculty are welcome to attend and participate in Area meetings, but Core Doctoral Faculty make the commitment to be active in the Area, and knowledgeable about developments in its protocols, procedures, and bibliographies.

B. Mission of the Doctoral Program

The remarks in italics under goals and outcomes are not formally part of the policy, but indicate to an internal audience how we are to measure and assess our success in achieving these goals.

The GTU doctoral programs introduce students to the life and practice of intellectually and methodologically rigorous scholarship to prepare them for a diversity of occupations and vocations.

- As thinkers who can identify central issues, interpret them in historical perspective, and understand their practical implications.
- As scholars and writers who study religious traditions and the lives of religious communities.
- As teachers in seminaries, colleges, and universities who are conversant with the disciplines of religious and theological studies and are prepared to bring religious and theological issues to life with and for the students.
- As constructive critics and faithful reformers of living religious traditions and of society who can provide fresh voices and insightful perspectives to revitalize a sacred heritage and recover neglected opportunities within their traditions.
- As leaders and spokespersons who can articulate for their communities issues which lead to a broader awareness of the multicultural and global world and the material environment.
- As leaders of genuine dialogue among communities of faith, seeking to shape religious language for the emerging world.
- As specialists on justice issues or organizers prepared to propose fresh approaches to social and moral problems.

Education for this mission requires the following skills/goals/outcomes:

- To practice intellectually and methodologically rigorous scholarship, requiring both broad and deep grasp of a field, linguistic skills, sound research methods, and analytical capabilities.
(encompasses our general requirements, including the Research Readiness Review)
- To formulate a project in terms of the standards of a discipline, but sufficiently clear and well expressed to be comprehensible to scholars in other theological fields.
(review of comprehensives and dissertation proposals, and the Research Readiness Review)
- To open one's work to the critical challenges and assumptions of a denominational and scholarly tradition beyond one's own so that it is not unduly restricted by narrow and unexamined assumptions.

(committee structures, and Area and Doctoral Council reviews)

- To engage critically with at least one discipline, theory, or methodology of the research university outside theological and religious studies, both to benefit from those methodologies and also to be prepared to contribute to broadening the assumptions of the university disciplines.
(outside reader requirement; for the Ph.D., not the Th.D.)
- Critical engagement with at least one discipline, theory, or methodology of the secular research university, both to benefit from those methodologies and also to be prepared to contribute to broadening the assumptions of the university disciplines.
(outside reader requirement; for the Ph.D., not the Th.D.)

C. Participation in the Core Doctoral Faculty

1. Application to the Core Doctoral Faculty

Faculty wishing appointment to the Core Doctoral Faculty apply to the GTU Dean by October 15 or March 1, following the procedure below. Please submit the following to the GTU Dean by the deadline.

- 1) A current *curriculum vitae*.
- 2) The faculty member's statement of his/her qualifications for the Core Doctoral Faculty and willingness to fulfill the responsibilities stipulated by the Doctoral Faculty in the Core Doctoral Faculty Handbook (excerpted below).
- 3) A supporting letter from the faculty member's Dean or designated equivalent, including a pledge to give credit for service on the Core Doctoral Faculty
- 4) The designation of a primary Area, and secondary Area, if applicable.
- 5) Samples of scholarly publications (academic books, peer-reviewed articles, book chapters), with reviews or assessment by external readers when available.

2. Qualifications for Admission to the Core Doctoral Faculty

- Have published an academic book or several peer-reviewed articles or book chapters in the discipline.
- Knowledgeable of current literature in the field, trained in research methodologies, and have active acquaintance with scholars in the discipline.
- Actively participate in professional scholarly organizations by presenting conference papers and/or serving in leadership roles.

- Hold the earned doctorate (Ph.D., Th.D., Ed.D.) or its equivalent in terms of research, publications, or stature in the discipline.
- Committed to the type of teaching and guidance of students that doctoral instruction requires.
- Attend area meetings and have been available to serve as consortial faculty members on comprehensive exam and dissertation committees.
- Application endorsed by the current Core Doctoral Faculty in the area(s) to which they are applying, as attested to by a confidential letter of support from the area convener(s) addressed directly to the Dean.

3. Expectations and Responsibilities of Core Doctoral Faculty Members

In addition to the expectation that Core Doctoral Faculty will continue to publish their research in academic books, peer-reviewed articles, and book chapters, and remain active in professional scholarly organizations, they are expected to:

- Attend Area meetings and Core Doctoral Faculty meetings to give input on policies and standards of the doctoral program.
- Serve as advisors and on comprehensive and dissertation committees. Typically, a CDF member would have one initial advisee, chair one comprehensive committee, chair one dissertation committee, and serve as a second reader on two committees.
- Ensure that all members of student committees are appropriate choices for the scholarly guidance which the students require.
- Uphold responsibilities as chairs of comprehensive committees, although faculty willingness to serve on such committees is somewhat contingent on availability; most faculty would not come back from a leave for a comprehensive exam.
- Uphold their responsibilities as chairs of dissertation committees so as not to leave students without guidance and regular feedback; should warn students well in advance of any sabbatical leave away from Berkeley (**faculty are expected to come back from a leave for a dissertation defense**); if they feel they must resign from a committee, they should take the responsibility to find a suitable replacement.
- Teach a doctoral course (5000 or 6000 level) with some regularity; approximately every one to three years.
- Serve on CDF bodies such as Faculty Council, Doctoral Council, standing committees (Appointments and Review, Admissions, Awards, Grievance) or in other CDF positions such as Faculty Trustee.

4. Credit for Service on the Core Doctoral Faculty

- The Deans agree to credit faculty service on doctoral faculty. The faculty stipulate that regular membership on the Core Doctoral Faculty (excluding special assignments such as Area Convener, or the Admissions Committee) requires 25% of their time for: attending meetings, advising students, helping prepare comprehensive and dissertation proposals, reviewing admissions folders, teaching doctoral courses, supervising individual reading courses, and keeping abreast of the literature in the field at the level of doctoral teaching.
- Each member school specifies in writing how it will credit doctoral service and allow faculty time for it. The Dean's Office has these statements on record and they are quite diverse. If you are not familiar with your school's statement, please consult your Dean.
- Each member school Dean has access to Doctoral Faculty Load data via the GTU's Colleague database.

5. Perquisites and Prerogatives of the Core Doctoral Faculty

- The faculty research monies controlled by the GTU Dean (including Newhalls) are primarily allocated to members of the Core Doctoral Faculty to support the level of research required to participate in the doctoral program.
- Because members of the Core Doctoral Faculty are mandated to establish and maintain the standards of the doctoral program, only they are empowered to vote on any policy issues pertaining to the doctoral program. In a close vote on Dissertation or comprehensive proposals when the standards of the doctoral program are at stake, the Core Doctoral Faculty holds the deciding vote. Other faculty and students are encouraged to participate in discussions and "sense of the house" votes, but only the Core Doctoral Faculty votes on matters pertaining to the governance of the Doctoral Program.

6. Appointment of Core Doctoral Faculty

- The Appointments and Review Committee will review the applications. The Committee's recommendations will be taken to the GTU Board through the Academic Committee for approval.

7. Review of Core Doctoral Faculty

In March 1998, the Core Doctoral Faculty unanimously approved changes in the review of its members.

- The following tool for evaluation will be used to examine CDF members' contribution to GTU doctoral program. The Appointments and Review Committee will conduct reviews and make recommendations to the Dean. CDF members will be asked to supply the

Committee with information with which to answer the questions listed below. Reviews will occur every five or six years (to coincide with schools' evaluation of faculty).

- The Core Doctoral Faculty has approved a simplified leave protocol for CDF members whose present interests and responsibilities do not permit full participation in the range of activities and accountabilities considered for evaluation. Requests for leaves as well as the term of the leave (normally 3-5 years) must be approved by the Appointments and Review Committee. The Appointments and Review Committee can also require that a faculty member accept a leave from the CDF for a specified time (to be reviewed by both the faculty member and the Appointments and Review Committee at the end of that time). A faculty member who is on leave is not a voting member of the CDF.

TEACHING

1. Has the CDF member offered a seminar at the 5000 to 6000 every 1-3 years? Are the Area's required languages used as appropriate in the seminar work?
2. Do student evaluations of doctoral level courses taught by the CDF member indicate that the readings, assignments, and lectures of the course exhibited doctoral level quality?
3. Do student evaluations indicate that the CDF member is "knowledgeable of current literature in the field, trained in research methodologies, and acquainted with [other] scholars in the field?"

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

1. Has the CDF member published significant articles and/or a book in the period of evaluation that demonstrate a contribution to the CDF's field?
2. Is the CDF member active in scholarly organizations and professional societies?
3. Do the CDF's publication(s) demonstrate that s/he is "knowledgeable of current literature in the field, trained in research methodologies, and actively acquainted with other scholars in the field?"

STUDENT ADVISING

1. Does the CDF member serve on and/or chair at least two doctoral students' comprehensive examination and dissertation defense committees each year? Are required forms consistently submitted to the Dean of Students' office without the need for reminders?
2. Is the CDF member available for appointments without unduly long waits? Does the CDF member keep appointments with advisees?
3. Does the CDF member make specific recommendations concerning UCB resources especially suited to advisees (courses, professors)? Does s/he insist that advisees take UCB courses at an early stage in their Ph.D. work? Does s/he coach advisees on how to approach UCB faculty (i.e. take courses and discuss their projects with UCB faculty--even read their books!) before asking for their participation on committees?
4. Does the CDF member take appropriate responsibility for forming advisees' examining committees at both the comprehensive stage and the dissertation defense?

5. Does the CDF member follow up advisees' requests that UCB faculty serve on their committee by a phone call and/or meeting to 1) answer questions regarding our expectations and procedures, and 2) thank UCB faculty for their willingness to participate.
6. Does the CDF member mentor her/his doctoral students, for example:
 - (1) assisting students to understand what a publishable article must include; (2) helping students to identify appropriate journals to which to submit articles; (3) suggesting venues for students' scholarly presentations, and (4) assisting students in various ways in their endeavors to enter scholarly discourse in their field?

GTU EXPECTATIONS

1. Does the CDF member regularly attend Area meetings? Core Doctoral Faculty meetings?
2. Has the CDF member served on GTU committees (other than student's committees) as requested in the past three years?

The Graduate Theological Union is very grateful for the work of the CDF. It is essential to our common task and to the mission of GTU. Expectations for the CDF are based on the premise that it is a great privilege to participate in training theological thinkers and religious leaders for the twenty-first century.

D. Core Doctoral Faculty Structures

1. Core Doctoral Faculty Meetings

The Core Doctoral Faculty normally meets three times a year, on the third Wednesday in October, February, and April, from 3:30 to 5:00pm in the GTU Board Room. Meeting dates are listed on the Extended Calendar, but Core Doctoral Faculty members should also receive a mailing including an agenda, reports, and proposals, more than a week in advance. If you do not receive your mailing, please contact the Dean's Office.

The Dean sees to it that the faculty receive, prior to each Core Doctoral Faculty Meeting, copies of minutes and/or reports from all faculty committees. The business portion of meetings will consist of brief committee reports and proposals. Much of the work of the Core Doctoral Faculty is done in the respective committees to free the meeting time for intellectual colloquia.

At each meeting, the Dean announces the publications of CDF from the past month. Faculty are invited to provide the Dean with information about their recent work.

An official list of Core Doctoral Faculty for each academic year is mailed in August to each faculty member.

2. Governance Procedures: Maintenance of Doctoral Standards

The Core Doctoral Faculty govern the GTU Doctoral Program, setting its standards. The GTU Dean is responsible to apply those standards consistently and equitably.

The main forum for approving the policies and procedures of the Doctoral Program is the faculty meetings; however, because of the nature of this process, much of the work must be done in committees.

Between meetings, the Dean seeks advice from the Doctoral Faculty, either through the elected Faculty Council—which not only provides recommendations but also makes and implements policy—or through the Conveners, who can take issues back to the Areas.

Individual student committee chairs play a major role in implementing and interpreting policies; any problems or issues should be referred to the Dean’s office to ensure consistent and just application of all GTU standards to all students.

3. Governance Structure

I. Core Doctoral Faculty (Plenary)

A. Constitution and Meetings

1. Consists of members duly elected to CDF and not on a leave from the CDF. Chaired by the GTU Dean.
2. Meets at least three times a year, usually in October, February, and April. The Fall meeting will be a “Town Meeting” on consortial issues. Other meetings may be scheduled as needed.

B. Powers and Responsibilities

1. Approves graduates of Ph.D., Th.D., and Common M.A. programs.
2. Elects CDF committees: Grievance, Awards, Nominating Committee, Faculty Council, and Doctoral Council.
3. Elects two faculty members of the Board of Trustees.
4. Provides detailed input on the agenda, issues, and policy matters before the Faculty Council.
5. Addresses consortial issues through the Faculty Council and Town Meetings.

I. Faculty Council

A. Constitution and Meetings

1. Consists of eight members elected by CDF.
2. Accountable both to the CDF as a whole and to the Areas. Each Faculty Council member will have one or two Areas for which s/he will serve as liaison, and every Area will be in regular contact with its liaison on the Council.
3. Meets several times during the academic year; chaired by the GTU Dean, who is a voting member.
4. Elected from a slate of candidates developed by the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee consists of two Core Doctoral Faculty members elected at the Fall meeting of CDF. CDF will be solicited for nominations by e-mail. The Nominating Committee will review the nominations, develop a slate which is

broadly representative, and check with potential candidates about their availability to serve.

5. Serves two-year terms, with half of the Council retiring each year. Retiring members are not eligible for re-election for two years.

B. Powers and Responsibilities

1. Oversees academic planning for the doctoral program, including attention to long-range issues.
2. Shares and reviews Area protocol changes in light of the entire doctoral program. Advises all Areas of implications of these changes
3. Develops and decides (by a majority of at least six votes) Core Doctoral Faculty policies in thorough consultation with the Areas and with the CDF (through e-mail and hearings).*
4. Develops the agenda for the Annual Town Meeting on GTU consortial issues, and sees that appropriate parties are invited.
5. Hears regularly from CDF Board Representatives and provides CDF input on Board issues for those representatives.
6. Oversees Area reviews and status of Areas, as well as any major changes in Areas.
7. Oversees regular CDF reviews and Area reviews, with an eye to policy issues and consistent quality of the doctoral program.
8. Develops CDF responses to, or input on, consortial issues with impact on the doctoral program at the request of the GTU Dean.

I. Areas

A. Constitution and Meetings

1. Consist of all consortial faculty whose academic work falls within the purview of the Area. Non-CDF members may not chair doctoral student committees or vote on matters of CDF policy.
2. Meet monthly (third Wednesdays during the academic year) under the leadership of a Convener.
3. Conveners appointed by the GTU Dean on nomination of the Area and in consultation with the Dean of each Convener's School of Affiliation.

A. Powers and Responsibilities

1. Recommend to the Admissions Committee regarding the qualifications of applicants and assign appropriate and available advisors for admitted students.
2. Conduct research readiness reviews of their students.
3. Determine Area protocols and examinations within doctoral program guidelines.

* An Area or a petition of five CDF can request a Faculty Council hearing on an issue; such hearings will be well publicized so that interested parties may attend. After consultation, "final" policy statements will be circulated to the faculty, allowing another month of input and deliberation (in Areas or from individual faculty). After taking the input into account, the Council may finalize the policy. The Council may also take an e-mail poll on an issue, to determine faculty support for or opposition to a policy or an aspect thereof.

4. Review and approve Comprehensive proposals and committees
 5. Review and approve Dissertation proposals and committees for submission to Doctoral Council.
 6. Discuss general issues of doctoral program policies and procedures as they pertain to the Areas, sending their views to the Faculty Council by means of their Area's liaison
 7. Discuss and review course offerings of the Area for the next academic year.
 8. Provide Area-specific professional development for students.
- I. Doctoral Council
- A. Constitution and Meetings
 1. Two CDF members elected by the CDF, plus the Dean and two student representatives.
 2. Meets monthly during academic year on the first Wednesday of the month.
 - B. Powers and Responsibilities
 1. Reviews and approves dissertation proposals and committees.
 2. Advises the Dean on refinements or changes in doctoral program procedures.
 3. Selects winner of the "best dissertation proposal" award.

4. Faculty Committee Structures and Representation

There are a number of committees that form the structure of faculty governance of the Doctoral Program and of the consortium.

a. Standing Committees of the Core Doctoral Faculty:

- 1) **Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees:** Consists of two faculty appointed for three-year terms, and approved by the CDF, as representatives to the GTU Board. One typically serves on the Academic Committee, and one on the Finance Committee of the Board.
- 2) **Admissions Committee:** The Doctoral Admissions Committee consists of faculty from different areas and is chaired by the Dean. Each Area selects a review team in early fall. This team consists of the Convener and at least two faculty members selected by a vote of the Area faculty. The Admissions Committee oversees the integrity and quality of the program as a whole, reviews candidates recommended by Areas for quality and consistency and may, at its discretion, review all recommendations for acceptance and rejection; makes final decisions on those candidates to be admitted; and, determines major scholarships.
- 3) **Doctoral Council:** Consists of two CDF members plus the Dean and two Doctoral Student representatives. The faculty members of the Doctoral Council approve all dissertation proposals.

- 4) **Grievance Committee:** Consists of three faculty elected by the Core Doctoral Faculty at a faculty meeting and two student representatives. One or two alternates are also elected, in case a committee member should have to disqualify him- or herself on a particular case. The purpose of the committee is to hear grievances brought by students concerning misapplication of GTU policies and procedures after those complaints have been through the prior review process specified in the document (for the Grievance Procedure, see the Doctoral Program Handbook).
- 5) **Awards Committee:** Consists of two faculty elected by the CDF who review entries and make decisions on the Chan Essay Contest, the Newhall awards, and the GTU Doctoral Student Travel Awards.
- 6) **Appointments and Review Committee:** Consists of two members of the Core Doctoral Faculty, nominated and elected at a faculty meeting, and the GTU Dean. The committee reviews applications for the Core Doctoral Faculty and draws up the slate for committee nominations.

b. Consortial Committee:

Library Committee:

Consists of one faculty representative from each of the member schools, appointed by the Council of Deans, and a student representative. The Council attempts to maintain some balance of Areas and Doctoral and non-doctoral faculty on the committee. The library committee advises the Director of the Library on collection priorities and development, library procedures and general policies.

5. Appointment Procedures for Standing Committees of CDF

As noted above, the Faculty Council, Doctoral Council, Appointments and Review Committee, Awards Committee, and the Grievance Committee are elected by the faculty. The other standing committee appointments are normally made in the spring of the academic year.

The procedure for appointments is a bit elaborate, reflecting the complex structures of the GTU. All Standing Committee Appointments must be approved by the Core Doctoral Faculty. In bringing nominations for these committees, the Dean seeks the advice of the Appointments and Review Committee. The Dean must also ascertain the willingness of the faculty to serve, and get the clearance of the Deans of the schools. In making these appointments, the Dean must not only give attention to representations of the Areas and the recent service record of each faculty member, but to the distribution of doctoral service across the various schools of the GTU. S/he must also have back-up nominations. Election of a faculty member to the Faculty Council, because of its considerable service, should free the faculty from other major doctoral faculty committee obligations. As much as possible, service on doctoral faculty committees should be spread across the Core Doctoral Faculty. CDF, as part of their appointment, agree to be available for service on committees as their circumstances allow.

E. The Areas

1. Area Meetings

The Areas meet in the early afternoon on the third Wednesday of the month, September through November, and February through April. Core Doctoral Faculty are expected to attend these meetings regularly.

In addition to reviewing student comprehensive and dissertation proposals, the Areas conduct internal business and discuss issues before the Core Doctoral Faculty referred to them by the Dean or by Committees. They may also hold or plan Area colloquia or receptions.

The Doctoral Faculty voted in 1989 that only Core Doctoral Faculty can vote on issues of policy in the Doctoral Program. Members of the students' committees, including consortial, non-CDF members, should definitely have a vote on comprehensive and dissertation proposals. It is certainly appropriate to have a "sense of the house", which includes the votes of everyone present or all faculty members present, according to the tradition of the Area. If there is a deep division, the Core Doctoral Faculty present need to determine whether the issue at stake involves "the standards of the doctoral program", in which case their views govern. A legitimate intellectual debate about how best to present the proposal need not be confined to CDF judgment. If significant problems emerge, the CDF may want to clarify the intention of their decision. Complicated problems that may challenge standards should be referred to and reviewed by the Dean.

2. Consortial Faculty Hiring and Development Agreement

Approved by the GTU Board of Trustees, 13 May 1999. Coordination in the search for new faculty by member schools or the GTU should be as extensive as possible, with the understanding that the ultimate decision lies with the school making the appointment. To that end:

- a. Member schools shall explore with each other strategies for sharing faculty resources, or rotating faculty searches, to maintain a pool of full-time faculty whose composition reflects diversity of competence, race, gender and ethnicity.
- b. The Council of Deans shall conduct an annual survey of the academic needs of member schools, and of the doctoral program [**i.e., the areas**], as well as how previous needs were addressed through faculty appointments or curriculum revision.
- c. Member schools, prior to initiating a faculty search, shall:
 - 1) notify in writing the Council of Deans concerning the nature and purpose of the search, in order to elicit early feedback regarding (a.) possible parallel searches by other schools, (b.) perceived needs which a new faculty appointment might address for the wider GTU community, and (c.) potential candidates for the position;

- 2) inform, and solicit suggestions from, the core doctoral faculty area likely to be affected by the appointment; and, when appropriate, from representatives of the University of California Berkeley faculty;
 - 3) invite a faculty member from that core doctoral area, but from outside the member school, to join the school's search committee for the purpose of representing the faculty interests of the wider GTU.
- d. The GTU Dean shall consult with the Council of Deans regarding the appointment of rostered faculty in order to ensure
- 1) that faculty resources currently available at the member schools are taken into consideration; and
 - 2) that the rostered appointments enhance the GTU doctoral program as well as address the needs of the professional and ministerial programs of the member schools.

3. Review of Areas and Area Viability

This policy deals with two key elements of evaluation: 1) regularly scheduled Area reviews; and 2) procedures for creating, restructuring, or eliminating Areas.

a. Criteria for Areas

The Consortium, as represented by the Council of Deans, the Council of Presidents, and the GTU Board of Trustees seek to maintain the viability of all approved and healthy Areas. To be considered "healthy," an area must meet the following criteria:

- Represent a research discipline which can enhance a curricular division within the boundaries of theological education
- Prepare students for a type of position which is available, or will be available, within higher education, the church, or society
- Span a range of denominations, e.g., not exclusively Roman Catholic or Unitarian or Reform
- Involve long-term commitments by member schools and the GTU collectively to hire faculty which can serve the Area
- Involve faculty who contribute to both academic and professional programs
- Require a minimum of four Core Doctoral Faculty.

a. Regular Reviews of Areas

GTU areas are reviewed approximately every five years on a rotating basis. A revised area review process, modeled on the reaccreditation procedures of the Western Association for Schools and Colleges, was implemented in 2005. This revised process provides for systematic and regular evaluation that recognizes the diversity of the doctoral program areas, focuses on core purposes and results, encourages research-based inquiry about issues of particular current significance, and incorporates analysis of various forms of evidence, including direct assessment of student work.

The area review process is designed to concentrate on the area's effectiveness in helping students complete the program and prepare for appropriate positions after graduation. The design also allows areas to structure their reviews in ways that are relevant and authentic to their particular issues. The process is outlined here and summarized in the "Area Review Tasks and Timelines" chart below.

First, The Office of Institutional Research produces some preliminary descriptive data about students in the area (primarily reflecting area specific, program-level outcomes), while the area itself gathers information about comparable programs in peer schools. The area uses this data, in consultation with the GTU Dean, to identify potential issues and areas of concern. The area develops a "Review Proposal" that makes some tentative claims about student success and area distinctiveness and identifies one or two research questions or topics to guide their review; this proposal must be approved by the Faculty Council of the CDF. The area then collects additional current students and graduates data to help test their claims and address their research inquiries.

Descriptive Evidence: The area review begins with an assessment of various descriptive data including number of applications, offers of admissions, number of matriculated students, completion rates, time to completion, and current student demographics over a series of years in order to reveal profiles and trends. The area also reviews placement data for recent graduates from their area, including dissertation titles, employment types, and employment titles and locations.

Indirect Evidence: The area faculty surveys graduates from their area at least since the last area review, asking graduates about their expectations of and success in the program and the nature of their preparedness for their vocation following graduation. Surveys or focus groups with current students are conducted as well.

Direct Evidence: Area faculty review authentic student work to gauge quality and alignment with area and program goals. In most cases, this consists of a systematic reading by a group of area faculty of dissertations, comprehensive examinations, and/or examination and dissertation proposals. Each area must settle on at least one line of inquiry that involves an evaluation of actual student work.

Reporting Processes and Feedback Loops Available During Area Review: The area submits their Review Proposal to the GTU Dean and Faculty Council, who review it and provide

feedback before the area begins additional data collection and analysis. The area has the opportunity to incorporate that feedback in the final Review Report before it is submitted to the GTU Dean and Faculty Council. The Faculty Council reviews the Report at their next regularly scheduled meeting, with the GTU Dean present. The Dean then meets with the area faculty and students to discuss the Faculty Council's response to the report. Finally, major findings from the review are reported to the Council of Deans and the Academic Committee of the GTU Board of Trustees.

(FALL START)	Area Review Tasks and Timelines	(SPRING START)
Summer	Institutional Research collects Standard Data: a) applications, admissions, enrollments; b) retention; c) time to completion; d) demographics. IR also does a "scan" of data for all phases of program to see if any major issues emerge. Area convener investigates some similar programs.	Intersession
Sept	Area reviews standard data, info from other programs, any issues raised by the Dean's office. Preliminary identification of major issues for the review	Feb
Oct	Area discusses draft of report developing responses to last month's data.	Mar
Nov	Area reviews and approves final draft of "Review Proposal" (responding to standard data, identifying issues for review); identifies student portfolios (no fewer than 3; approximately 10% of all graduates; represent struggling, average, and exemplary students) and graduate focus groups (assign faculty to study them); requests any special data (if needed) After meeting: Final version of "Review Proposal" submitted to Dean and Faculty Council	Apr
Intersession	Faculty do preliminary studies of portfolios, focus groups, data	Summer
Feb	Preliminary discussion of portfolio/focus group findings	Sept
March	Area discusses issues and findings for Review Report	Oct
Apr	Area discusses first rough draft of Review Report	Nov
Summer	Report revised and edited	Intersession
Sept	Review and adopt draft report; discuss with Faculty Council Rep.	Feb
Oct	Approve final draft of Review Report to submit to Dean/Faculty Council	Mar
Nov	Faculty Council reviews report	May
Dec	Dean meets with Area to discuss Review	May
Feb	Major findings/issues reported to CDF in Dean's or Faculty Council's report, to Academic Committee of Board	Oct

c. Creating, Restructuring, Combining, Consolidating or Eliminating an Area

The proposal to consider creating, restructuring, combining, consolidating or eliminating an Area comes out of a regular Area review, from a faculty proposal, or from the GTU Dean and/or the Council of Deans. Such a proposal is directed to the GTU Dean, who takes the following steps:

- 1) Initiates a discussion of the proposal and the reasons for it with directly and closely affected faculty, particularly members of the Core Doctoral Faculty. These discussions have the purpose of clarifying, refining, or reshaping the proposal to fit the actual situation and faculty views.
- 2) Reviews the proposal with members of the Faculty Council and with the Council of Deans, adding further revisions.
- 3) Reviews the proposal with current students whose programs would be affected and with key alumni/ae if it seems appropriate.
- 4) Keeps the Academic Committee of the Board apprised of discussions.
- 5) When some consensus about the appropriate shape of the proposal emerges, it is then formally reviewed by: the Core Doctoral Faculty, Council of Deans, Council of Presidents, GTU Board Academic Committee of the Board and Board of Trustees.

Because there is a limit to the number of sustainable Areas, proposals are tested thoroughly to see if they can exist under the umbrella of an existing Area, or as a cross-Area special program, or as a part of a reorganization of the existing Areas. Those making the proposal would present a case in terms of student market and the needs for specialists in the field of study either in academic or other specialized roles.

F. Resources for Core Doctoral Faculty

Information on the Student Affairs Staff and Dean's Office Assistance are discussed in the Doctoral Program Handbook.

1. Dean's Faculty Research Fund

Each year the GTU Dean awards small research grants to members of the GTU Core Doctoral Faculty. Applications for grants are accepted throughout the academic year and are for a maximum amount of about \$750. Grant funds may be used for any purpose related to scholarly research including, but not limited to, research assistance, editorial assistance and travel.

To apply for a grant you must address a letter or email to the GTU Dean which describes the following: the goals and objectives of the research project, how this project benefits your teaching and/or research, what the funds will be used for and an itemized budget summary. The funds are distributed on a first come first served basis so that more money is available earlier in the fiscal year. Grant requests should be submitted to the GTU Dean.

a. Requesting a Research Assistant or Teaching Assistant (outside of Newhalls)

If you need a research assistant or teaching assistant, these may be applied for through the Newhalls (described below) or through the Dean's Faculty Research Funds. The major difference is in the size of the grant: the Newhalls are much more generous, and thus you can have more hours of student assistance. If you have a short-term need for a research assistant, or a not too demanding Teaching Assistant position, you can request such a grant from the GTU Dean. (Since the funding is really too sparse for the Teaching Assistant positions, these will be granted only in special circumstances and as funds allow.)

b. Purchasing computers or equipment

If your research grant includes the purchase of a computer or any other equipment, the funds allocated to you must by law be reported to the IRS by the GTU as taxable income. You are then responsible for documenting any deductions or depreciation with the IRS.

c. Costs for travel, books, etc.

When your grant includes costs such as travel, lodging, meals, or books you must submit the original receipt—photocopies are not sufficient. For airline tickets you must submit the actual ticket receipt. The Business Office is required to document expenses to prove that the restricted research fund was expended for its appropriate purpose.

2. Newhall Awards

Newhall Awards are designed to provide teaching and research opportunities for our doctoral students in close collaboration with members of the Core Doctoral Faculty. The intent is for both parties to benefit maximally from this award. This is the only budget line the GTU Dean's Office currently has to support Teaching Assistants, and it is more generous in Research Assistant support than the limited Dean's Faculty Research Fund. Faculty are encouraged to seek out appropriate students and apply for Newhalls regularly. The competition is judged by the Faculty Awards Committee, following the published guidelines. The Award deadline is once a year in late fall. The Dean's Newsletter announces the competition, and the application deadline.

The Newhall guidelines and procedures for application are listed in detail in the Student Section of the Doctoral Program Handbook.

III. GOVERNANCE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Information on GTU policies covering the honor code, grievance proceedings, inclusive language use, FERPA, and plagiarism are listed in the Doctoral Program Handbook.

A. Policy Statement on Use of Copyright Materials

1. Copyright Guidelines

Materials used for teaching and research are subject to “Title 17” of the United States Code (commonly referred to as the “copyright law”). As specifically stated in section 107 of this law, reproduction of a copyrighted work for teaching--including the production of multiple copies for classroom use--is not an infringement of the copyright as long as the particular case constitutes “fair use.” In order to determine fair use, the following four factors must be considered:

- a. The purpose and the character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes;
- b. The nature of the copyrighted work;
- c. The amount and the substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole;
- d. The effect of the use upon the potential market for or the value of the copyrighted work.

As these regulations are not further explicated in the text of the law, the GTU follows the specific guidelines contained in the “Agreement on Guidelines for Classroom Copying in Not-For-Profit Educational Institutions with Respect to Books and Periodicals” (Ad Hoc Committee on Copyright Law Revision, Author-Publisher Group, March 19, 1976).

Under these guidelines, multiple copies are considered acceptable for classroom or discussion use if the tests for “*brevity, spontaneity and cumulative effect*” are met and if each copy carries a notice of copyright.

Brevity is defined as either a complete article, story or essay of less than 2,500 words or an excerpt from any prose work of not more than 1,000 words or 10% of the work, whichever is less; but a minimum of 500 is allowed in all circumstances.

To meet the test of *spontaneity* the copying must be done at the request of the teacher, and the decision to use the copyrighted work must be so close to the time needed that it would be unreasonable to expect a timely reply to a request for permission to copy the material.

To meet the *cumulative effect* test:

1. the material copied must be for only one course in the school;

2. no more than one short article, essay or two excerpts may be copied from the same collective work or periodical volume during one class term;
3. there shall be not more than nine instances of multiple copying for one course during a given term.

The following are specifically prohibited by these guidelines:

1. Copying used to create, replace, or substitute for anthologies, compilations, or collective works;
2. Copying of “consumable” materials (i.e.. workbooks, exercises and standardized tests);
3. Copying used to substitute for the purchase of books, periodicals or publishers reprints;
4. Copying directed by “higher authority” (i.e. Dean of a school);
5. Repeated copying of the same item for the same instructor from term to term.

2. Compliance

Faculty, Administration, Staff and Students of GTU will comply with the procedures contained in the “Guidelines for Use of Copyrighted Material”. Willful infringement of copyrights using GTU equipment or on behalf of GTU using other equipment can be cause for termination of employment or expulsion from the student body.

No faculty member or student is authorized to use any GTU photocopying machine to make illegal copies for teaching or research purposes. If your school does not keep you informed about the regulations, the GTU Dean’s Office has a handout about copyright laws which you can use for reference.

B. GTU Statement on Academic Freedom

On January 25, 1988, the Executive Committee of the GTU Board approved a “Statement on Academic Freedom in the GTU.”

The Graduate Theological Union is a consortium of diverse theological schools, each of which has its own statement on academic freedom, reflecting its distinctive heritage, history and values. Those statements govern the instruction and research of faculties in their member school roles. The Graduate Theological Union statement defines our policy on academic freedom a) for those faculty rostered in the GTU; and b) for instruction of all faculty in the doctoral program, which is under the guidance of the GTU Dean.

The nature, structure, and mission of the GTU establish a multi-layered foundation for our commitment to academic freedom. First, we are an academic institution. Our faculty members share with their colleagues at universities a devotion to the unfettered pursuit of truth. Second, the ecumenical and interreligious structure of the GTU embraces a broad spectrum of religious traditions that must take cognizance of each other. This structure challenges each of the member

schools and centers to stretch beyond its tradition to meet new occasions and engage in interreligious conversation. Third, there is a religious foundation to our commitment to academic freedom. The apprehension of divine or transcendent reality which we seek as scholars of religion inspires an awareness of richness and complexity, and compels an opening to new paths of thought and spheres of feeling, study, and action. Moreover, our philosophical and religious heritages embrace virtues of peace and tolerance that serve as a foundation for academic freedom.

In this spirit, we affirm an adaptation of the statement on academic freedom on of the American Association of University Professors ([AAUP Policy Documents and Reports](#) 1984 edition, pp. 3-4).

Academic freedom implies certain rights. Faculty members are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties. They are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subjects. As citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline.

Each of these rights also entails certain responsibilities. Research for pecuniary return is to be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution. Faculty members are not to introduce in the classroom controversial matters that have no relation to their subject. As persons of learning and educational officers, they are to remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, exercise appropriate restraint, show respect for the opinions of others, and make every effort to indicate that they are not institutional spokespersons.

As an institution of theological education, we also affirm principles of academic freedom regarding religious belief and practice. The GTU is an educational institution that supports the research, study, and teaching of religion and promotes academic cooperation among schools and centers representing a range of religious traditions. It imposes no test of religious belief or affiliation on its faculty. Faculty members, however, are responsible to show the utmost respect for the religious beliefs and commitments represented in the GTU community.

The Graduate Theological Union supports open and frank conversations and debates about the plurality of religious views and practices represented in Christianity, in Judaism, and among the range of religions in the United States and the world. There are real and deep differences among the various traditions that cannot be superficially resolved. Such conversations, however, are to be conducted in an atmosphere of mutual respect; it is the obligation of faculty members to aspire to fairness and avoid distortion in confronting other religious positions, although they are free to disagree with and criticize them on intellectual grounds.

C. Guide for Assignment of Course Levels

1. 1000; introductory; required M.Div. courses (in some schools)

2. 2000-3000; foundational; survey at the introductory level (in some schools); extending/building on introductory courses
3. 4000; advanced; M.Div./M.A. based on difficulty of required reading, complexity of topics treated; critical analysis expected in discussions/papers
4. 5000; history and current issues in the field at the doctoral level; courses composed primarily of doctoral students (exceptional others with instructor's permission); major papers required; use of original languages if appropriate
5. 6000; doctoral students only; original languages used; students expected to exhibit increasing self-understanding as scholars conversing with other scholars in the field

IV. STUDENT ISSUES

A. Guidelines for Advising Prospective Applicants

Each year, many Core Doctoral Faculty come in contact with prospective applicants. More and more students come to visit and request to meet with specific professors. It may help to consult the following guide when answering questions. This will ensure that faculty are disseminating the same information. You may also refer applicants directly to the Admissions Office, or contact the Admissions Office yourself with questions or comments.

1. Degree Requirements

- Applicants must hold a B.A. (or B.S.) from an accredited institution
- Applicants who hold a B.Th. instead of a B.A. or B.S. may apply for admission to the Th.D. program only
- Applicants must hold an M.Div., M.T.S., or M.A. in religion, theology, or a closely related field
- Applicants may not just complete the coursework portion of the M.A. and then begin the doctoral program, unless they already hold a graduate degree in religion.

2. Application Deadline

All materials must be postmarked by December 15, with the exception of GRE and TOEFL scores, which may arrive after that date.

3. GRE/TOEFL

- All applicants must submit GRE or TOEFL scores, unless the applicant has a Ph.D. in the Humanities
- International students whose first language is not English submit TOEFL scores in lieu of GRE scores, except students who have completed a year of study at an institution in the U.S. and are required to submit GRE scores.

4. International Students

- International students must meet all of the above degree requirements. Undergraduate degrees must be at least four-year degrees

- International students must prove that they have financial resources equivalent to one full year of study (consult Admissions or Financial Aid for the amount required) in order for the GTU to issue their visa paperwork (such resources are typically a combination of their own resources and the resources of a personal sponsor, church, etc., plus GTU grant-in-aid). Think carefully about encouraging international students to apply for admission if they do not have the kinds of funds needed for their studies.

B. Assignment of Advisees

The Area Application Review Committee makes advisor assignment recommendations as part of the application review process in January. The Director of Admissions confers with the Conveners to verify the assignments. In late spring, Admissions sends out the letters informing the faculty and students of the advisor assignments. If there is a problem, please let the Admissions office know immediately so that it can be rectified.

Each year the Dean of Students will send out the current list of the student committee service of each faculty member. If the list seems inaccurate, that probably means that the information did not make its way into the student's file. We need to check this information regularly in order to correct errors so that the files are up to date and accurate. Some students think that if they make an agreement with a faculty member to change advisors, that is all there is to it; however, we need to have official records of these changes in the students' files in order to credit the appropriate faculty member.

C. Catalog, Handbook, and Dated Policies and Procedures

It is a convention of the academic world that the Catalog given to the student on admission is a kind of contract; the same is true of policies and regulations in the Handbook. Although the GTU Dean's office advises students that it is often in their interest to adopt voluntarily new protocols or procedures, we cannot require them to do so. Please check with the Dean of Students to be sure which regulations apply to which students. The Dean of Students' office keeps a complete file of GTU catalogs, and endeavors, with the help of the Areas, to keep dated policies and protocols.

D. Advising Weak Students

There are a small percentage of doctoral students who have real problems in the doctoral program. There are a number of points in the program at which faculty may address these problems:

- Diagnostic interview and/or initial advising
- Annual review of student's progress
- Research readiness review of student, normally conducted during the second year
- At the time of the comprehensive examination proposal or oral defense
- At the time of the dissertation proposal or at any time in the process prior to the dissertation oral defense

When a student is struggling with the program, it is in everyone's interest to address the problem in a timely manner. In addition to the review points above, faculty members may wish to use the following mechanisms to address performance problems:

- Invoke Academic or Advisory Probation, giving a student an opportunity to address specific concerns within a specific time frame, and to bring closure to the process if the performance is inadequate.
- If a student has completed some portion of the special comprehensive examinations, suggest a terminal M.A. if the performance warrants this and there is an appropriate paper which could be used for a thesis.

E. Annual Student Review of Satisfactory Academic Progress

1. Rationale

In 1989-90, the Doctoral Faculty passed as part of the Doctoral Plan a procedure for annual review of student progress. This procedure is, on the one hand, part of our improved doctoral advising system; these reports are also a necessary part of our certification of Satisfactory Academic Progress, which keeps our students eligible for federal financial aid. The federal requirements largely govern the calendar by which the faculty-designed process must proceed.

2. Procedures

Each June the Dean of Students Reviews the student's academic records and makes a decision regarding the student's progress in the program. The Dean of Students invites the CDF to share concerns they or their areas might have with the quality and/or pace of their students' work. Students receive written confirmation of the results of their progress review from the Dean of Students in July with copies sent to the student's advisor, Area Convener, and the GTU Financial Aid Office.

Some Areas also undertake an annual review of their students. Where possible, the Area's review should be incorporated in the work of the Dean of Students.

For more information on Satisfactory Academic Progress, see the Doctoral Program Handbook. It is good to acquaint yourself with the criteria for Satisfactory Academic Progress, which stress—among other things—the normative time schedule. Giving students repeated extensions may not be in their best interest, particularly if they receive financial aid.

F. Doctoral Student Review for Research Readiness

In April 1993, the Core Doctoral Faculty approved the Review for Research Readiness in order to ensure that students receive concrete and helpful feedback early in their program about the adequacy of their preparation and skills for doctoral level research. The review is also a tool for the Area to identify students who, in light of their preparation and skill-development, and a clearer sense of their interests, may need to be terminated from the program. See the Doctoral Program Handbook for the procedures involved.

G. Student Committee Structure Regulations

Forming and getting approval for committees is a major hurdle for GTU doctoral students. Thus we have provided detailed information on this procedure in the Doctoral Program Handbook. It would be useful for faculty to review and be familiar with this information.

The handbook includes information about comprehensive examinations committee relations and expectations and the procedures for committee appointment and approval. You may also find pertinent the common wisdom section on the comprehensive exams, which is included in the back of the Doctoral Program Handbook.

The handbook also includes information about constructing a dissertation committee and about procedures for getting the prospectus approved.

1. Committee Chairs

They must be members of the Core Doctoral Faculty and the student's Area. Exceptions must be strongly supported by the Area and the Dean to ensure that the standards, procedures, and protocols of the Area and the Doctoral Program will be effectively implemented; that is a major role of the chair.

2. Faculty from Second GTU Member School (or GTU roster)

Second readers need not be members of Core Doctoral Faculty, but must be listed as Consortial faculty at the GTU or at a member school. (Adjunct faculty may not serve as second readers.) Core Doctoral Faculty in the Area and the Dean must be confident that the second GTU faculty member is an appropriate member of the committee in terms of what he/she can contribute to the specific comprehensives/dissertation project.

The second reader will ordinarily be from a different school or center from that of the committee chair. The intent is to provide an ecumenical/interreligious perspective on the dissertation. Exceptions for good cause must be approved by the Dean upon the recommendation of the area faculty.

GTU Adjuncts from UCB do not count as being from another school in the GTU.

3. "Outside" Third Members

(Th.D. students need only a third member, normally from the GTU. Ph.D. students must have an "outside member", normally from UCB; UCB faculty need no approval for qualifications, but should be certified by Area CDF as appropriate to the dissertation or comprehensive substance.)

Outside readers represent the research disciplines of the university. They should not normally be faculty from another theological institution unless their training and publications shows them fully steeped in a research discipline, or unless the research discipline is otherwise represented on the committee.

The "research disciplines of the university" is meant to exclude **only** those disciplines offered solely in theological schools and departments of theology: theology narrowly conceived; pastoral care; homiletics; liturgy; religious education; missiology.

The university disciplines include religious studies; intellectual history; philosophy; psychology and psychiatry; rhetoric; anthropology; history; education; sociology; area studies; philology; art history; and so forth.

Any faculty member who has a degree in a field other than those offered **solely** in theological schools or departments and who publishes in the journals of that field is eligible to serve as an outside member even if he/she happens to teach in a theological school or department of theology. The purpose of the requirement is to make certain, following national standards set by the Council on Graduate Studies in Religion, that Ph.D. students are exposed to the issues and methods of disciplines beyond those which are exclusive to theological institutions.

Non-UCB outside persons must submit a C.V. for approval by the Dean; there is a folder of approved C.V.s in the Academic Secretary's office; if the person is already listed in it, there is no need to request another C.V.

Outside persons should have the Ph.D., an academic position at an accredited institution, and a publication record suitable for advising doctoral students.

If an outside member cannot attend the oral examination or defense in person; he/she may participate by means of a conference phone call, for which the student will pay. In very rare situations, where the outside reader is not available for a conference call, written questions or comments can be used. The student must receive approval from the committee chair and the Dean of Students to involve the outside member in this manner.

H. GTU Financial Aid Policies

The Financial Aid Office sets and annually reviews and refines the GTU policies and guidelines and their application. For a description of the current guidelines, see the Doctoral Program Handbook.

V. POLICIES ON FACULTY STATUS

A. In-Residence Faculty Policy

The GTU Board approved a policy for In-Residence faculty, which had been previously approved by the Doctoral Faculty, on February 25, 1988.

As background to the discussion of the policy on “In-Residence” ranks, it might be useful briefly to review the other standard academic ranks used in our institution, as in all academic institutions.

1. Standard Academic Ranks

a. Regular or Tenure Track Ranks (Assistant, Associate, and Full)

Regular faculty are hired in tenure track lines approved in advance, in accordance with an academic plan, by the Doctoral Faculty, the Dean and President, and the Board of Trustees. Candidates are selected through a national search and screen process that follows institutional guidelines in accordance with acceptable academic procedures. In a tenure track appointment, the institution has made a financial commitment to fund the line, and to award tenure on the basis of the candidate’s academic performance and productivity.

b. Visiting Professorships (All Ranks)

These are temporary appointments, often for only one semester, but sometimes as long as a year or two. They are funded either on soft money or by funds released through sabbaticals or leaves of other faculty. Visiting rank indicates that the faculty member is permanently employed at another institution and has taken temporary leave from his or her normal position to teach at our institution. The title is also sometimes used for foreign scholars, even though they may, because of retirement or some other reason, not currently hold a formal position elsewhere.

c. Adjunct Professorships (All Ranks)

Adjunct status indicates that the individual’s primary professional commitment is to another institution or organization, but because of special expertise and interest in some aspect of the GTU doctoral program, they occasionally offer courses for our students. A number of UCB faculty have held adjunct ranks in the GTU. There are two chief distinctions between adjunct and In-Residence appointments:

a) in the former, the GTU is not the primary professional commitment, and b) there is less regularity and predictability in the teaching load and level of participation in GTU academic programs.

Area Adjuncts

Some Areas of the GTU have developed close working relationships with faculty at other institutions in the Bay Area, or eminent and active emeritus faculty who have settled in the Area. Such persons may be appointed as Area Adjuncts and listed in the *GTU Catalog* as such. Such a listing designates the close relationships and the availability of such faculty to serve as outside readers for dissertations in the Area. Area nominated

Adjuncts do not teach courses, but are willing to serve on committees, and may participate from time to time in Area colloquies or special projects.

Appointment of such an Adjunct is initiated by Area faculty, who obtain a c.v. of the nominee and write a paragraph to the GTU Dean in support of the nomination. The nomination must be reviewed by the full Area faculty, by the Faculty Council, and by the GTU Dean and President. Appointment is considered ongoing, but the active status of the Area adjunct will be reconfirmed as the *Catalog* is reissued semiannually.

d. Emeritus Professorships

This is a rank held by former, retired faculty of the GTU. Emeritus professors may remain quite active in teaching and advising of students. If funds are available, they may agree to teach courses, and a number serve on doctoral committees of students. Their service is often very valuable, but is entirely dependent on their willingness and availability. They have no formal responsibilities, but rather an ongoing relationship with the institution.

2. GTU Policy

The category of “In-Residence” faculty is modeled on the “In-Residence” ranks within the UCB system. An “In-Residence” faculty member: 1) is not supported on the general instructional budget of the GTU; 2) does not hold a tenure track line; 3) has a formal relationship with an Area or recognized affiliate of the GTU, which constitutes his or her primary professional commitment; and 4) has in all respects comparable academic qualifications to those who hold the same rank (assistant, associate, or full) in tenure track lines.

Appointment to “In-Residence” status is made by the Dean through a formal letter of appointment. 1) Such an appointment is initiated by a letter to the Dean from the Area Convener or the Director of the academic unit recommending the appointment. 2) The teaching load will be specified by the Dean after discussions with the candidate and the Area. 3) Letters of appointment are for a limited term, renewable, but the appointment to “In-Residence rank” is not to a tenure track line. Should a tenure track position open in the area of appointment, the “In-Residence” faculty could be a candidate in the national search. 4) The letter will stipulate the source of the funding for the appointment. The appointment is always to be made explicitly contingent on the availability of funding; the GTU instructional budget and general fund are not liable for these appointments. 5) “In residence” faculty will be reviewed annually by the GTU Dean, as are all GTU rostered faculty. “In residence” faculty will also be reviewed by the Appointments and Review Committee at the time of initial appointment, and at regular intervals, normally of three years. 6) “In residence” faculty proceed through ranks of assistant, associate, and full, on the same schedule, and under the same conditions as regular tenure track faculty.

“In residence” status is a device for recognizing and utilizing the contributions of scholars who are formally affiliated with the GTU through some means other than search and appointment to a faculty line. It is not a substitute for regular faculty appointments.

Faculty lines designated by the GTU administration and Board as part of the GTU academic plan will be tenure track appointments.

B. Academic Policy for Endowed Chairs in the GTU

On February 23, 1989, the GTU Board passed a policy on the endowment of chairs in the GTU. This policy had been previously reviewed and passed by the Doctoral Faculty.

GTU fund-raising priorities are established in the Strategic Plan. Contacts with donors are guided and orchestrated by the Office of Institutional Advancement. This document affirms these procedures and establishes academic policies to be followed in the administration of chair endowments.

There are two models of endowed chairs: 1) a permanent faculty position in a specified area of study; and 2) a “distinguished professorship” which is filled for a limited time by a visiting scholar or a member of the existing faculty.

1. Permanent Professorships

The disciplinary area covered by a prospective endowed chair should be consistent both with the academic mission and the long-range academic plan of the institution.

Commitments to raise endowments for a particular professorship would be made in a consortial strategic planning process, endorsed by the Doctoral Faculty, the Council of Deans, the Council of Presidents, and the Board of Trustees.

If a donor or constituency approaches the GTU with an offer to endow a chair in a specific field, that proposal will be entertained under the following conditions: 1) that it meets the general outlines of the academic plan and mission of the GTU; 2) that the donor(s) agree that the GTU would have full control over hiring, promotion, and tenure of the professorship; and 3) that the proposal win the approval of the Doctoral Faculty, the Council of Deans, the Council of Presidents and the Board.

The endowment of a permanent chair requires a full financial base for the support of a faculty member, including a salary at or above the normal range of the professorial level, benefits normal to the institution’s policy, and, in addition, perquisites for research assistance, travel, and/or secretarial assistance as well as funding for appropriate overhead. No professor will be appointed until the endowment is complete.

All appointments to endowed chairs must be made in accordance with “GTU Faculty Appointments and Procedures” (February, 1982), which specifies a national or international search. Under no circumstances can a donor or donor group stipulate the occupant of the chair, or the precise content of courses to be taught. Holders of endowed chairs will be on the GTU instructional budget and under the supervision of the GTU Dean, the Academic Committee, and the Board.

2. Distinguished Professorships

The Consortium, in the process of strategic planning, might also commit to endow a distinguished professorship, designed to recognize and honor GTU faculty or visiting

scholars for a finite time period (a year or two). Such professorships may or may not match full salary, but they would in all cases provide a panoply of perquisites to support the research life of the scholar so honored. At the end of each appointment, the use of the endowment would be reconsidered in accordance with needs for faculty employment and deployment, in consultation with the Doctoral Faculty, the Council of Deans, the Council of Presidents, and the Board.

C. Visiting Scholars

Faculty members who have a doctorate and an appointment at an accredited academic institution may apply to be a visiting scholar at the GTU by contacting the Dean's Administrative Assistant. They will be sent an application form that requests all needed information.

When a Visiting Scholar arrives at the GTU, he or she should check in with the Dean's Administrative Assistant to learn how to get his or her Library I.D. card.

D. Adjunct Faculty

The GTU Dean's office has no budget line for Adjunct Faculty appointments. Occasionally, an Area has made an urgent case that there is a need for an adjunct to teach a particular course, crucial for the Area's program, which cannot be taught by faculty available that year. Such requests have to be made by October of the year prior to become part of the GTU's budgetary planning. A request competes with many other such requests in a tight budget situation, so that funding is by no means assured. However, without lead time for planning funding is nearly impossible. Please notify the Dean as soon as possible about any extraordinary needs.

VI. RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONVENERS

A. Chair Area Meetings

- Establish and arrange a regular meeting room and time, and inform the Academic Secretary, including any changes, since students and faculty often call her office for information.
- Set the agenda 10 days in advance of the Area meeting, including student proposals, suggestions from Area members, and requests from the Dean, Dean of Students, and the Faculty Council.
- Have the Area Assistant type up agenda and collect, copy, and distribute to all Core Doctoral Faculty members all required materials 10 days in advance. Establish with the Assistant a clear procedure for where and by what deadline material is to be collected.
- Make sure accurate minutes are kept and distributed. A copy should be sent to the Dean of Students for Student Affairs Office files, highlighting any formal decisions about students passing comprehensives or dissertation proposals, or about policies and procedures that the Dean of Students must know for counseling students. Minutes should include a list of attendees. This will provide a record of which Area faculty participated

in a particular decision and will also provide a record of faculty participation in Area meetings for the Dean's Office and future Conveners.

- Send a memo or a formal statement from the minutes to the Dean and Dean of Students with Area input on issues. Without the paper trails, such input may be lost sight of or forgotten.
- Oversee Doctoral Faculty establishment and maintenance of doctoral policies and standards. Doctoral Faculty voted in May of 1990 that only Core Doctoral Faculty may formally vote on issues that involve the policies or standards of the doctoral program. It is perfectly acceptable to get a "sense of the house" from broader constituencies, especially if it is Area custom for all consortial faculty and/or students to vote. But if the vote is divided among Core Doctoral Faculty, that vote should be carefully counted, for they have the responsibility for the standards and policies of the program. The Doctoral Faculty welcomes broad input, but they need to follow their own "constitutional procedures" to have doctoral faculty governance in the hands of those who have made the commitment to the program.
- Make announcements concerning upcoming consortial events of interest to students and faculty in the Area; this helps to sustain consortial efforts at communication.
- Approve arrangements for non-required languages.

B. Research Readiness Review

The Core Doctoral Faculty approved this review procedure in April 1993. The procedure is described in the *Doctoral Program Handbook*.

Conveners need to be aware of the following:

- Your Area needs to designate to incoming students at the beginning of their first semester whether their review will be in the third or the fifth semester, and review with them the preparations they need to make. This information needs to be sent to the Dean of Students.
- The Dean of Students will send out reminders based on the information you send her/him.
- Areas are to conduct the review according to the procedures outlined in the *Doctoral Program Handbook*, and send a copy of the results to the Dean of Students to be put in the student's file.
- If a student does not complete the review by the deadline, the student, with the approval of the advisor and Convener, must reschedule the review. This is not to the student's advantage. Please notify the student quickly and concretely about the steps to be taken to prepare for the review in the next year.

C. Review of Courses to be offered by the Area

The GTU as a consortium seeks to be intentional about reviewing course offerings, to eliminate redundancies and ensure that courses are being offered at all levels for all programs.

At the beginning of each year the Deans and Conveners undertake the review of course offerings for the following academic year. Please note that the Areas will be asked to discuss tentative offerings in October, and forward any concerns or suggestions to the Council of Deans.

D. Procedures for General Comprehensive Examinations

The dates for General Comprehensive exams are set in consultation with the Area Convener by the Dean of Students for publication in the Extended Calendar. This occurs during the spring semester of each year.

1. Area Convener's Responsibility

- Appoint Area readers and writers of exams and notify Dean of Students of who will serve.
- Confirm list of students taking exam by the deadline stipulated in the Area's protocol. Communicate this information to the Dean of Students.
- Notify writers of the exam whether the exam will be offered each semester (i.e. whether there are students for the exam).
- Make certain that readers have completed their evaluation of exams in a timely fashion, usually within a month of the exam date, and have reported results to the Dean of Students.

2. Dean of Students' Office Responsibility (Academic Secretary is the primary contact)

- Arrange for exam rooms for students.
- Administer the exam.
- Copy the handwritten exam immediately following the exam.
- Collect the typed copies of the exam from the student.
- Distribute copies of exams to readers and advisor.
- Notify student with the exam result.

E. Special Comprehensives Proposals

The Areas are empowered to review and approve comprehensive proposals and committees in light of their protocols and standards as well as the standards of the doctoral program as a whole. The Dean must also approve the committee. If there is any question in the minds of the Area faculty or the Convener about the appropriateness or strength of the committee for this specific proposal, please inform the Dean. The Dean relies on faculty decisions about the academic appropriateness of the committee, and wants to back faculty in ensuring that only committees that have faculty confidence are approved. The Dean will scrutinize the committee to see to it that it meets the general doctoral program standards about structure, including the standards concerning the outside readers. These standards are defined in detail in the *Doctoral Program Handbook*.

F. Dissertation Proposals

The Area is the second forum for review of the dissertation proposal, after the student's committee. The concerns about committee structure and appropriateness are the same as in the case of comprehensives. (General standards regarding these committees are specified in the *Doctoral Program Handbook*.) Even if the Dean has "approved" the committee first, the Area or Convener should feel perfectly free to raise questions about the appropriateness of the committee to the project. Both approvals are necessary for the committee to be official.

The dissertation proposal will go on to the Doctoral Council, who determine that it meets the general standards of the doctoral program. The work of the Doctoral Council will be much smoother if the Areas take seriously their role of review. Proposals about which the Area has serious doubts should not go forward to the Doctoral Council. Quality control is more effective and ultimately more profitable for the student. It also assures the student of their academic and professional integrity. In other words, the seriousness of the Area's role in reviewing dissertation proposals is imperative. Committees should not let proposals in which they do not have faith go to the Area; nor should Areas let proposals in which they have less than full faith come to the Doctoral Council.

G. Area Administration

In order to keep students moving through the program with due progress, there must be attention to the various stages of their program. The Dean of Students maintains student files, computer records, semester-by-semester grade reports, and implements annual academic progress reviews, but the actual guidance in the program of the Area must be provided by the faculty, with the coordination of the Convener.

The Convener's duties are the following:

- By May 1, confirm or alter the initial advisor selected in the admissions process
- Coordinate selection of the diagnostic interview committees for incoming students, as applicable.
- At the outset of the year, review and summarize in writing significant policy/procedure decisions of the previous year and discuss at first Area meeting for the sake of all, but particularly of faculty or students who have been on leave; the written summary will help the Area, the Dean, and the Dean of Students keep track of the dates of Area decisions.
- Maintain files of Area minutes, protocols, and bibliographies (current and historical), and work with the Dean of Students to see that their files are also complete and accurate.
- Conduct Area review of problems raised by sabbatical leaves and faculty absences by the October meeting so that the information can be discussed by the COD in December. (There is some time to negotiate arrangements before the final course schedule is reviewed, so be sure to send problems along to the COD.)

- Provide information requested by the Dean, Dean of Students, Faculty Council, or other faculty committees in timely fashion.
- See also under Admissions, Recruitment, and follow-up; Professional Development and Placement; Satisfactory Progress.

H. Admissions, Recruitment, Follow-up

The GTU Admissions Committee consists of two members of the Core Doctoral Faculty and is chaired by the Dean. Because Area members are most knowledgeable about the needs and capacities of the Area, their recommendations are essential to all admissions decisions.

1. Convener's Duties

- By October 30, have the Area select a representative committee of at least three readers, normally consisting of the Convener and at least two faculty who are members of the Core Doctoral Faculty. The Area Review Committee reads applications in early January, makes admissions recommendations, assigns a provisional advisor for those applicants who are recommended for admission, and provides reasons for not admitting applicants. The GTU Admissions Committee reviews all Area acceptance recommendations in order to ensure the equality of standards, makes the final admissions decisions, and selects the Presidential Scholars.
- Work with the Admissions Office to help arrange faculty and student interviews for prospective students and applicants. The GTU Admissions Office has a small amount of money to house visiting prospective students for a few days in a GTU school dormitory. Please call the Admissions Office if there is a student you think should have a campus visit.
- Work with the Admissions Office to create and revise recruitment materials from the Area that can be sent to prospective students.
- Coordinate Area follow-up on admitted students. The Admissions Office will be of assistance.

2. Notes on Admissions

The Associate Dean for Admissions sends load studies to Areas with quotas for admissions with a suggested number to admit in order to yield a number of students suitable to the overall capacity of faculty in the Area. Factoring in existing faculty loads and sabbatical plans, the Area reviews the information about faculty in order to select those available to serve as advisors to new students. In those cases where the Area wishes to make exception to the quotas, they should make a case to the Admissions Committee.

I. Professional Development of Students/Placement

The Office of the Dean of Students offers a cycle of professional development workshops for Doctoral Students on topics of general concern. These are listed on the Extended Calendar,

and they will also be advertised in the Dean's Newsletter. Please urge Area students to attend. However, there are some aspects of professional development that should occur within the Areas.

Conveners are to:

- Maintain a list of professional associations students in the Area should consider joining; discuss it with all incoming students; and keep it as an active student resource.
- Respond promptly to requests from the Dean's Office or Dean of Students' Office for nominations for a particular job or fellowship opportunity.
- Maintain a list of key journals published in the field, and share it with incoming and current students.
- Refer students to the Dean's Administrative Assistant as soon as they are ready to take advantage of the Doctoral Placement Services (after dissertation proposal is approved by Doctoral Council).
- Recommend to Area students that they attend professional development/ placement workshops offered by the GTU and appropriate professional organizations.
- Keep an ear to the ground and inform students and/or the Dean and Dean of Students about any teaching opportunities for our doctoral students in the consortium or in the Bay Area.

J. Satisfactory Progress/Annual Student Review

The Dean of Students will:

- Send out review letters in July.
- Use the letters to raise issues about particular students who are having difficulty.
- Keep track of students in extension or who are on probation, and see that they have a plan to complete the program in due course.

The Faculty have an Academic Probation Policy and an Advisory Probation Policy, which are described in the *Doctoral Program Handbook*. These provide the structure within which serious student problems can be addressed.

Please familiarize yourself with them as Conveners and note that probation measures must be based upon and consistent with previous written feedback students have received. It is important that you help the Dean of Students persuade faculty to give students frank feedback in writing while problems are still manageable.

Any serious faculty concerns about students should be brought quickly to the attention of the Dean of Students so that he/she may assist the faculty in their resolution, assure an adequate paper trail, and ensure that there is consistency in application of the standards. The student network is alive with nervous tension about negotiating the hurdles of the program. It is

important that all students are treated equitably. The Dean of Students can be a valuable resource in this respect.

K. Problem Areas

1. Student Problems

Problems with a particular student (finding an advisor, testing anxiety, problems in communication, resistance to advising, etc.) can be troublesome. The Convener provides moral support and advice to the faculty and students on these matters, and the Dean of Students provides moral support and advice to Conveners and Faculty. The Dean of Students can help inform Conveners about past solutions to similar problems for your consideration.

The Dean of Students attempts to facilitate communication and problem solving in a way that upholds the standards of the doctoral program equitably for all students. She/he can advise on strategies to clarify issues. It is wise to consult the Dean of Students before anything is sent in writing to the student on a particularly sensitive issue; what is put down on paper can be very complicated to sort out and may have legal ramifications.

2. Grievance Procedures

Grievance Procedures, as outlined in the *Doctoral Program Handbook*, begin with the Area Convener, who attempts to solve the problem within the Area. The next level is the Dean of Students. The Convener is encouraged to call on the Dean of Students for support and advice if that will be helpful. The Dean of Students will refer it to the Dean if necessary.

3. Area Problems

Since GTU Areas are a congeries of faculties drawn from schools with different philosophies of education, it is not surprising that there may sometimes be disputes within an Area. While many disputes may be resolved internally with careful communication, some are more troublesome. The job of the Dean's office is in part to provide confidential support to Conveners in adjudicating such disputes. The Dean is willing to attend Area meetings or have meetings with disputed parties, if that would be helpful, or to recommend another respected third party who might be of service.

4. Multiple Protocols and Catalogs

Academic tradition clearly stipulates that students are bound by the requirements and procedures specified in the catalog under which they were admitted (the one sent to them when they applied) and the protocols described therein and distributed in the first semester. Since some doctoral students may stay in the program more than seven years, most Areas have several sets of protocols governing their students. The students may opt for their original protocol or the current protocol, but not a combination of the two. (Please note: in the case where a student has not advanced to a program stage that is undergoing change, and the Area is certain the student has not invested time and effort on work that follows the original protocol for that stage, the Area may require the student to

follow the new protocol. This adaptation applies to students who have not progressed to the program stage involved within the normative time schedule.)

Because faculty and the Dean's Office have a hard time keeping track of all of this, it is crucial we maintain historical files of protocols and catalogs, which can be used to determine the requirements governing each student. The Academic Secretary or Dean of Students can easily verify the entrance date of a student, since it is recorded both in their paper files and in our computer database.

L. Archiving Area Materials

Each area should archive the following materials on the Area Moodle site:

- Monthly Area agendas;
- Monthly Area minutes;
- Background materials, raw descriptive, indirect and direct data for Area reviews (optional);
- Area review drafts, worksheets, and other working documents (optional);
- Background materials and raw data for any other case-specific projects (optional);
- Final case-specific project proposals or reports.

An Area should submit any materials it wishes to archive that are not in electronic form and, therefore, not stored on the Moodle site to the Dean of Students; these materials will be stored in the Dean of Students administrative files and, then, moved to GTU archives to be held permanently.

M. Transition to Next Area Convener

When your term as an Area Convener is coming to an end, please meet with your successor to help orient him/her to the job, hand over the area files, and discuss any area projects or problems that are still in progress. Thank you for your work as an Area Convener!

N. Area Assistants

In order to help with the Convener's clerical work, the Dean's Office funds an Assistant for each of the Areas. In the past, these Assistants had to be work-study students, but because of problems in finding Assistants for some of the Areas, the Dean converted this to a wage line item in the budget (although Conveners and prospective student Area Assistants are encouraged to pursue work-study support if available). This means that each Area is allotted a specific amount. Please consult with the Dean about the current funds available for the Area and specific use of funds. Area Assistants' timesheets should be submitted to the Dean's Office.

Area Assistant's Responsibilities:

- Type agenda, and copy and distribute them with attendant materials. Take Area minutes, and prepare them for distribution, with approval of the Convener.
- Help plan any Area events or colloquia.
- Help Conveners survey Area on various issues, as requested.

Conveners are responsible for locating a student to work as an Assistant; it is generally better if the Assistant is a doctoral student in the Area, since he or she will have a special interest in the activities of the Area, and will often do an outstanding job. However, there is no requirement that Assistants come from the Area.

To hire an assistant, simply write a brief memo to the Dean of Students appointing him or her Area Assistant, and send the student with the memo to the Dean of Students' Office. The Dean of Students will authorize the hire, and send the student to the Financial Aid Office to first explore options for work-study funding. He/she will authorize the hire and send the student to the GTU Personnel Office to go through student employment procedures. Any additions to the standard job description should be specified in the memo. (See the *Doctoral Program Handbook*)

The one caution in the hiring process is that if the student is on Financial Aid, their earnings as Assistant cannot put them over their legally calculated "need." It is thus wise to begin this process early enough that any problems can be resolved in ample time. The standard wage for an Area Assistant is set in accordance with current GTU guidelines. Students will have to fill in time sheets, signed by the Convener, to receive their wages for Area Assistant work.

If the Area Assistant has a work-study award, they may use it for the Area Assistant position. That has two advantages: since 60% of work-study wages are paid by the Federal Program, the wage line could support more hours if the Area is undertaking some major project which will require more clerical assistance, or the Area could save part of the wage line, which the Dean can then use to fund other Area activities. However, be forewarned that the budgetary strictures at most of the schools, including the GTU, now mandate that they hire work-study students to keep many offices running, so that there may not be sufficient work-study students for this purpose.