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1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:18 p.m. by Senate President Susan Mattson.

2. PREVIOUS MINUTES

A motion was made, seconded, and approved to accept the Senate Summary of December 5, 2005 as posted on the Senate Web page. Any further corrections should be directed to Anne.kopta@asu.edu and darby.shaw@asu.edu

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

3.A Senate President's Report (Susan Mattson).

President Mattson reminded everyone of the Welcome Back Breakfast on Tuesday, January 24, 2006 at 7:30 a.m. in the Arizona Room. At the breakfast an amendment will be introduced to the ACD 112-01 Constitution and Bylaws to add all full-time contract faculty to the membership of the Academic Assembly. A voting link will be emailed to members of the Assembly within one week of the breakfast.

Jean Boyd, Associate Director of Intercollegiate Athletics was introduced to talk about the relationship between academics and athletics and how important that is to our student athletes.
3.B Academic and Athletics (Jean Boyd, Associate Athletic Director, ICA).

My title is Associate Athletic Director for Student Athlete Development, and that is the unit within the Athletic Department that focuses on the academic and life skill development of our 500 plus student athletes. I will go through some slides today to explain what our commitment is to helping our young people develop into good students first and good athletes second. Our mission is to provide services, programs, and guidance that foster academic success, the development of critical life skills, graduation from ASU, and to prepare these young people for life beyond college athletics. We have a mantra that we use with our student athletes, and it starts on day one when we are recruiting them, all the way through their experience at ASU. It is CPC, which stands for compete with passion and character in every single thing that you do. Our charge is to challenge them to compete and make sure that their perspective (CPC) is one that encompasses everything they do from the classroom to the community at large and on the field of play. We challenge them intellectually to perform at the very highest level just as they would on the field of play. In fact, we call our staff--academic coaches. Our academic coaches serve as a liaison with college advisors and with faculty. For example, every semester student athletes are required to visit with their college advisors. We do not claim to be the experts on every curriculum on campus, so when we advise student athletes about what course they may want to take, then we leave it up to their college advisor to dictate what sequencing the student athlete should go under. Our role is to provide planning and help student athletes understand what their schedule looks like so that they are able to put together a schedule that works, without conflicts with travel and practices. On occasion I am required to get involved with faculty members, for instance, if a student athlete is going to travel on a Thursday and they have an exam scheduled on Friday that is a conflict. If a faculty member tells their class that there are five tests and the students can drop the lowest one, I might need to help clarify that with the faculty member that the student athlete, because they are participating in a university-sanctioned event, should have the opportunity to take all five exams versus dropping a single test when they are away from campus. That is one example of how we serve as a liaison to the faculty.

The first year of a student's experience in the collegiate and athletic environment at ASU is critical to how successful they will be in their remaining time at ASU. In our department we offer an orientation program in conjunction with the University's orientation, and we touch on such subjects as "identity as a student athlete." One part of that identity is that athletes are being recruited constantly by outside parties who call them at home and these are the people who run various recruitment web sites usually. They are trying to ascertain what school the athletes are going to go to; which school they like the best; how their trip was last weekend, etc. We teach them how to deal with that situation in our athletic orientation. We also offer our students a course for credit, Uni-194, Student Athlete Success, and in that we deal with such issues as organization, time management, career choices, sexual responsibility, and good-decision making. As freshman, student athletes are required to attend a study program for a minimum of four hours a week and depending on their academic profile it could be up to ten hours per week. For student athletes that may be at higher risk, they work with a mentor one-on-one. After the first year, if student athletes perform with a 2.4 or higher cumulative GPA, they can graduate from the study program. If they go back below the 2.4, they are mandated to return to the study program. Tutoring and academic mentoring are things that we provide in conjunction with what the university offers. Academic mentors can work with a student from 3-5 hours a week. When a student athlete is in season, they will be involved in travel in addition to practice time and other activities. They have to do a constant balancing act between schoolbooks and play books as we tell them.

Jean shared brief highlights and achievements of academic scholarship and athletic performance during the past year. He explained the Scholar Baller Program. He said that in keeping with the spirit of where this university is headed, being non-traditional, thinking outside the box, trying to address our young people's needs, we have developed the Scholar Baller Program to reward high achievers with an athletic patch that they must put on their jersey when they play on the home court and in competition (for earning a 3.0 in the fall or spring semester of any given year). Their friends and family and fellow students respect their achievements on the playing field and this patch recognizes their hard work in the classroom. Other students will aspire to be like them. This program was begun in 2001 to incentivize academic performance,
and we have had some remarkable results. It was started with football but will be in basketball, and also wrestling soon.

In addition to academics, we school our students about life skills development--backpack to briefcase we call it--to challenge our student athletes to become savvy about career opportunities; writing a resume; doing interviews and making a good impression; how to create internship opportunities; network; and we want them very involved in the community. Every football student athlete is required to do at least one community service project per semester.

To close, I would like to say that we tell our student athletes from day one that the intercollegiate athletic experience is a laboratory for life-long success. If they are to embrace that opportunity they will equip themselves to excel in life. Are they are any questions?

Q-Is there a Scholar Baller patch for women too?
Answer: Yes, the icon for the Scholar Baller is the Thinkman for men, and for women it is the Thinkwoman.

Q- Are you going to address graduation rates for football and basketball?
Answer: The NCAA rules are currently changing the way that we look at graduation rates. In the past when students transferred or went professional from this institution, that worked against the graduation rate of the institution, and now the NCAA will be saying, if a person was eligible when they left that won't count against the graduation rate, if they graduated or left the university with good academic standing.

Senate President Mattson: At one of the football games, National Merit Scholars were brought onto the football field and introduced and there were one or two football team members that were among them I noticed. Thank you very much for coming today, Jean. Now I would like to ask President Crow if he would make some announcements.

3.C University President's Report (Michael Crow).

Dr. Crow said that he and Provost Glick take special interest in the direction that the athletic program is moving, but that the athletic department is currently outperforming the rest of the university and that is due in major part to the excellent resources that are available to them. He made mention that the football team in the Bowl game at the end of December had 19 seniors who played, and of the 19 most of them had already graduated or will be graduating. It was the only bowl team where every senior on a team has or will have graduated. Coach Cutter makes this a part of the hallmark of his program and Jean does as well.

In general, on all matters related to the institution's well being, we are moving in the right direction. The Governor's budget proposal is good one relative to the present legislative cycle we are in. We want to maintain the Governor's numbers, which will not be easy but if we are successful it will be a record investment year from the state in the university and provide resources for new faculty, resources for salary adjustments, resources for new facilities, resources for facility maintenance, and for academic classroom facilities.

President Crow will meet with the College of Education faculty at the end of this week to discuss allocation of the investment resources received from the Ira Fulton gift at the end of December, for an additional 100 million dollars. There are substantial new resources that will be focused in the College of Education.

We have progressed on a number of other fronts in terms our overall strategy, and have broken records on 18 of the 20 indicators of university performance and success including academic performance of the faculty, the quality of the student body, the attainment of the students, the diversity of the students, the faculty that were hired, the diversity of the faculty that were hired, so things are working well. He asked if there were questions from the floor on any of his announcements.

Q - When will we have a decision on the budget?
Answer: The process is that the Governor proposes, the legislature counter proposes and that means the first two weeks in May and at the latest in June, which is the end of the current fiscal year. This makes
our planning process more complicated in that tuition recommendations are due next Monday, but that
decision is not made by the Board until March. The tuition numbers and the state numbers do affect where
we are, but we will not have a true picture until late June of our actual budget model. There are many
scenarios are playing out simultaneously with the budget, and we cannot make decisions earlier than we do
because it could slow up certain academic processes.

Q - How are our plans going with the Downtown Campus?
Answer: There is a multi-year project that will roll out over the next several years. There is also
planning in progress for the implementation of the first schools to move downtown and that involves the
renovation of many buildings, some of which are now being renovated.

On March 14 there is a bond election that we want to win. The polling data indicates that there is
strong support for the university's specific elements of the bond election. Exit polls show support in excess
of the mid 60's. I will tell you some good news relative to the university, taken from a free survey of the
people that live in the city of Phoenix about their opinions about ASU. The data were extremely positive--
more than 85% on a score of 0-5 had between four and five in their views expressed about ASU. More
than one-third of the residents of Phoenix have a personal connection to the university in some way. And
these university graduates represent some 40,000 people who will most likely vote in the bond election.

Q - What about the question of the community colleges awarding four-year degrees?
Answer: The drive for additional four-year degrees coming from the community colleges is coming
from a variety of sources and for varying reasons. Most are driven by the right motivation, gaining
additional access to baccalaureate degrees. Some are not. It is likely that our efforts to expand our
relationship to the community colleges over the last two years has been met positively, and these are a good
interim step before legislation is considered to allow community colleges to award four-year degrees, or
legislation to establish a state college system. Provost Glick and I have been participating in
discussions with the presidents of the community colleges and the rest of the universities. We have made a
lot of progress in talking with them. They do not really want to take on the task of doing four years
degrees, with one or two exceptions, without additional resources--and there are no resources on the table.

It is also the case that we are not ready to deal with the demographic shift in the number of high school
graduates which will dramatically increase in the next 15 years. I would calculate that the probability of
four-year colleges breaking out in the legislature seems rather low at this time, and meanwhile we are
trying to be as helpful and productive as we can in working with the community colleges.

President Crow talked more about the budget. He said that last year ASU generated a 7.5% increase in
the state's investment compared to the UA whose increase was 1.2%. The absolute number this year is
going to be north of $60 million and then there is the 301 allocation which is roughly another $24 million
added to that. This represents double-digit increase recommendations. For us, $65 million was our
request; $32 million was the Governor's recommendation but that did not include the salary adjustments
that she put in, and that is another $30 million. We will not get $62 million probably but we will receive
additional investments beyond the rate of increase that we received last year. We will be well on our way
to getting the core support that we should be receiving from the state, based on what we think the amount of
student investment should be.

Q - One of the crises in education in Arizona is financial under funding. Will there be any
opportunities for advancing that funding?
Answer: President Crow said that we have increased university investment in financial aid by 160% in
the last three years, and we are now investing $72 million of the university's resources into financial aid this
year. This year including federal resources, we will spend about $380 million dollars on financial aid. The
lowest amount of money in that $380 million is $400,000 for the state of Arizona, so, that is one-tenth of
one percent, and we are working to increase that and this will be a multi-year fight.

We will continue to expand our various financial aid programs (tuition set aside; our out of state
tuition experiment will be replicated). Additional revenue from out of state tuition helps support financial
aid.
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We are committed to raising $150 million in our endowment for financial aid.

Last March we launched the Access ASU program, a program where we take students from below the poverty level and they can attend ASU and graduate without debt for tuition, room and board, and fees. These are students from families with under $18,000 in income. We have increased in 50% in one year the number of students from that socio-economic level. Of those students that came in, 50% of them were in the upper 20th percentile of the university's academic performance.

Q- But what happens for a family of four with income of $19,000? Are they eligible to receive other aid?

Answer: There are a lot of things that might be adjusted. Families eligible for a Pell Grant, which is in Arizona in the low $40's, have had to take on any of the tuition increases over the last three years. It also turns out that the Pell Grant is roughly $4,500, the equivalent of our present tuition. We have more than 40,000 students receiving substantial financial aid right now--students receiving their entire tuition paid. It is a huge financial aid operation and the scales are not hard and fast, they are gradual depending on the exact financial circumstances of the individual families, and the formulas have 20 to 30 parameters that we look at.

President Mattson: We have a few other items of business to deal with on our agenda today and so, I will ask the Provost is he has anything to report. (No) Then I would like to adjust the order of the agenda to Old Business next, to consider the P&T proposal presented at the last Senate meeting in December. At this time I will also entertain a motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole to have a discussion and a vote on this item.

It was moved and seconded that the Senate move into the Committee of the Whole. Senator Johnson led the discussion and chaired the Committee of the Whole.

5. Unfinished Business.

5.A Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

To read the document click on the hyperlink below on the Senate's Web page.


Senator Johnson said this proposal has been discussed for the past three years and we are to the point where we have examined some fairly radical changes from our traditional tenure and promotion model with things like advocates, area committees, and we did not find a consensus for those ideas. We have moved back to something that is more evolutionary in nature and we have reviewed all your comments and input as well.

One of the ideas we are revising in our policy is that we are trying to encompass all the university campuses into one promotion and tenure process. We are trying to identify a system that is fair and provides assurances across all parts of the university.

Our typical promotion and tenure process unit based; based on the criteria that are established by your unit, so that is the foundation. It is critical that your unit does a good job articulating the criteria that are being used.

We are focusing today on the university committee and how that will work. The sequence of events in this proposal is not substantially different from what we have done all these previous years.

From what we have gathered in your responses it seems that we just do not know enough about this process in general, so I will identify a few of the aspects of the current university promotion and tenure committee:

It is a 12-person committee at this campus. The nominations come from the deans, so, there is a representation from the colleges. There is relatively little faculty input into that process. One member of that committee is nominated by the Senate. At the university level the process operates with two members
of the university committee serving as primary reviewers for each package. Then they take the case to the entire university committee. The full committee votes and their recommendations and the vote are passed on to our provost and president. One additional issue is that anyone from the candidate's department must disqualify themselves and leave the proceedings, so, we end up removing people that have some personal knowledge of the case.

We are trying to address these things in proposing a new structure for the university committee. We need a larger committee in order to have representation from our campuses. The terminology used is "respected teacher scholar" and that language is intended to identify the faculty from all areas who are qualified to do this task—primarily full professors. They will serve three-year staggered terms. The Senate leadership will identify a list of candidates, the provost will generate a list of candidates, and there will be a discussion on both lists. They will be a hard working committee as they will deal with about 60 promotion and tenure cases a year.

Clarification was noted that the Graduate Dean will not participate in the final selection process but the Vice Provost for Personnel and the Provost will.

The committee being proposed will have four members for each primary review committee, and they will point out the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will consult with the co-chair of the university committee to make the assignment of those four member review committees. They will present the case to the whole committee later and then the comments and vote of the entire committee will be passed along to the university provost and president.

Each case will be reviewed based on the unit criteria of the candidate, bearing in mind the university policies. The calendar would indicate we will start this process very soon if it is approved by the Senate. We would be identifying our candidate pool in February, discussion would continue through March, and the process for the coming year would begin in March. Are there comments or questions?

Q- There is at least the impression that professors at other campuses are perhaps not as accomplished as professors at ASU Tempe, but the committee is not divided into professors who are from specific campuses, so are you going to have a problem making judgments about professors from other campuses?

Answer: The description indicates that we are supposed to have one representative from each campus on the review panel (4). The people put on this committee will have to take a university view while evaluating on the basis of unit criteria.

President Mattson: I want to clarify that the committee will have 24 members with representation from each campus.

Q- But will the criteria be the same? Will a history department at one campus and a history department at another campus have the same criteria?

Answer: The unit of the candidate's criteria is the one that will be used.

Vice Provost Zatz: While their home department would not participate in the university committee discussion, the four-person review committee will have to be knowledgeable about the candidate's discipline, the campus, and the criteria of the candidate's unit in order to evaluate the file. They will present this case to the entire committee and from this discussion of the entire committee. Only any immediate members of the candidate's department would have to be excused.

President-Elect Roen: There is a bullet on the second page of the document, with four diamonds in it, it says, "Operates under the rule that members of this committee cannot contribute to or participate in other related personnel committee or discussion." That I interpret to mean that if you are on the university committee, you cannot participate in the department discussion of that candidate's case.

Comment: There cannot be double dipping.
Senator Komnenich: I am concerned about the potential for shifting criteria. Will the criteria for each history department be the same regardless of the campus?

Senator Johnson: They would have different mission statements and each would have different criteria.

Provost Glick: We have worked hard on each unit having different names on different campuses. That would be to express the different orientation of their faculty and in many cases different workload expectations. If someone has a Ph.D program and relatively low teaching loads and the other program does not have a Ph.D program and has high teaching expectations, then that all has to be factored into what quantity of scholarship is expected. Yes, there will some touchy areas, but we are working very hard to have different names for similar departments on different campuses.

Comment: Speaking of touchy areas, it does not serve the university to talk about or assume that there are differing levels of faculty performance at different campuses! I am a faculty member in a unit that will be moving downtown and I intend to work just as hard there as I have here.

Q - I have a concern about fairness about composition of the committee when the understanding of a candidates's work is at risk here. An example was given where having someone from your department on the committee could be advantageous in understanding your work or disadvantageous, perhaps based even on whether they favor your work. Actually the candidate may not even have anyone who is very familiar with their work from among the 24-member committee.

Answer: The committee has the primary focus of getting members on the 4-member review committee who are from the closest scholarship area in the college to the candidate, without using faculty from that candidate's unit.

Q- Are problems with the current university committee that will be resolved with the new proposal? For instance there will still be a tremendous amount of work to be accomplished by the university committee. Will the doubling of the committee size be an advantage? Is there any sense that we may have difficulty in finding that many people to serve?

Answer: We are trying to insure fairness and expand the expertise on the committee with having more people serve. There is no doubt about it this is going to be a hardworking committee and it is also one that is very fundamental to the success of the university.

Comment: My faculty are very welcoming of the flexibility of having a four-person committee review. They were disturbed by silo type disciplinary committees. As a point of clarification to do with page 2, where it says the charge of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee--is being responsible for evaluating each file according to unit criteria based on university policies on the value of variable workloads. These policies are not enumerated.

President Mattson: After the last comments were made in the Senate in December, the task force met again and revised some additional things and this language you refer to is not in this draft being considered. We also included a provision of a minority opinion when needed to go forward with the committee recommendations and vote.

Q- What are the criteria for including or not including members of the faculty from serving on this committee? The choice of words highly respected faculty is demeaning because some may have to be disqualified to serve after having been nominated by other highly respected faculty?

Answer: One of the primary considerations is that the committee will be composed of serious responsible university citizens.

President Mattson: If there are no further questions, the motion to approve is on the floor.
Point of clarification: One of the bullets says that Senate leadership is not eligible to serve.

Susan Mattson: That means that the president and president-elect or past president should not serve. They are too busy the year they are president and president-elect to serve on that committee. And we do not want a conflict of interest because they are serving on the nominating committee.

Q- When we had our faculty meeting in December we discussed this proposal and we felt that there should be more general faculty participation in the process. So we would ask the task force to consider having the heads of units nominate people and slates of candidates forwarded for consideration and participation on this committee.

Answer: One of the goals that we had in mind in designing this structure is to have more faculty participate in the process but this will not be an election process. The Provost appoints the members.

Vice Provost Zatz: We were very concerned about that because right now there is only one person who is elected to the committee from the Senate. Others are all suggested by Deans. The new process will have the names coming up through the faculty and the Senate representatives, and we could have the chairs and deans involved in suggesting names as well. The Provost Office would also recommend names and then the Senate leadership and the Provost Office together would come up with the final slate which means that far more faculty will be involved than has ever been the case.

President Mattson: It could be that we are looking at this as being a little bit more representative and looking at the Senate leadership as representative of the faculty, who are working with the Provosts on this.

Senator Johnson: Soliciting from department chairs and deans is going to be one aspect, but our senators at large from the colleges could help us compose the list that comes from the Senate Leadership. Whether that needs to be formalized is debatable.

President Mattson: Election was originally proposed but the logistics of implementing that process was going to be very complicated, electing on four campuses eventually for the same body. That is why we chose to have the Senate Leadership and the Provost Office work together on this and solicit names from various sources with the Provost making the final appointments.

Comment: In the College of Design, we have quite explicit processes for soliciting names to serve on personnel committees.

Parliamentarian Watson: At the risk of complicating the process further, I want you to understand what we can do to the document we are discussing. We are in a committee of the whole and amendments can be proposed in the COTW and then voted upon. When we leave the COTW and report back there will still be an opportunity for any final debate or final proposal of amendment(s).

Q - I see in the newest version on the bottom of the first page--and a few of my colleagues were concerned about there still being language on deleting the nominated candidates that are considered unacceptable. Can you be more specific about what criteria this is based on?

Answer: Some may be on sabbatical. Some may have devoted more of their career trajectory toward one of the three components. They may have done more teaching than research or done more research than teaching. I do not know the exact criteria that are going to be used in narrowing the list to 24.

Senator Johnson: We would like to find people that have a university perspective.
Q - I have a concern because although there have been many iterations of this document, for the most part this is a very sound proposal even if it has taken three years to develop it. How will we evaluate its effectiveness if we vote this document up today and begin the process?

Answer: One of the things we have included is a regular evaluation within three years. There may be tweaking each year as necessary, and then a thorough overall evaluation at the end of three years. Then there will be areas that may need discussion as we go along.

Q - Would you entertain a friendly amendment to insert words on the first page under the second bullet point to include nominations from the faculty?

Answer: I believe that to be implicit, but if you would like to propose that amendment you may.

Motion was made by Senator Acker to amend the first page, second bullet point:

"Beginning with a list of full professors (and possibly suggestions from college deans AND NOMINATIONS FROM THE FACULTY) the senate leadership…"

Senator Watson seconded that amendment.

Senator Johnson: It has been moved and seconded to enlarge the suggestion pool. Is there further discussion?

Q- Could just one person make a nomination?

Answer: I believe someone might use that language to nominate him or herself.

Q - Would you consider a friendly amendment to your amendment to say "equally nominated?"

Answer: President Mattson clarified that there are certain criteria--they have to be full professors and they have to be tenured and so they would be on the list already. If someone wants to speak about why they should be nominated, they can indicate that in an email note to the provost and that we could consider in our joint discussion of the appointment.

Senator Acker: It would probably be better to do this through the Senate and I would agree to add that to the amendment.

Senator Johnson: Are there others that wish to speak to this amendment? It has been moved and seconded that we enlarge the group who may nominate. All in favor please raise your right hand. All opposed? This amendment is approved.

Let me take a moment here to say that what we are doing here today is trying to design a system that is satisfactory to the faculty as well as the Provost and President, so, perhaps our President has a comment to share on this before he has to depart.

President Crow: My comment would be that I appreciate the work that senators and others have put into this process and it looks very solid. I just wanted to ask before I left if there were any other questions you might have of me?

Q - We would like to know the criteria you will use in making your final decision?

Answer: The criteria are the same ones the unit develops that I use in making my final decision. The one thing that is different is that I have the singular role of making the decision from the perspective of the university. The criteria are as established at the departmental level and my assignment from the Board of Regents is to do all that I can to help Arizona State University be the institution that you have heard us talk about. There are no criteria that are unique to me as I must weigh all the evidence from all of the sources and all of the information that is available, whereas each of the other elements in the process is run on a somewhat narrower perspective.
Senator Johnson: Are there other questions?

Q- I just want to ask if there is a possibility if you disagree with one group or another in their decision-making, would you give an explanation to the department or the candidate in the form of a letter.

Answer: Generally when that situation arises--it usually means there have been mixed feelings along the way. One group may say yes, and one group may have said no, and in every case where there is some kind of question, we bring in the chair of the department and enter into a discussion with them about where we are on the case and talk about where things are headed. I have also met with individual candidates, particularly those candidates where there has been a promotion without tenure. Where that candidate has felt that the explanation offered by the enterprise as a whole was insufficient, I sit with that candidate and have a discussion. It is not just a "no" without dialogue. There is a dialogue.

Provost Glick: Remember that the tenure decision is made on the positive evidence that is convincing. It is not made on there being no negatives. The chair or the dean knows how we made our decision. If the individual candidate requests a special explanation, we do that, but many candidates are better served by not having that information in the sense that when they are looking for their next job--if they are asked why they did not receive tenure, they may wish to say--I don't know, rather than having to be more explicit.

President Mattson: Is there further discussion on this in view of the time remaining.

Q - I have a concern about the people from the candidate's department being recused. The question is are the unit's standards being met? Those standards ought to be clear enough so that people know what they are. My worry is that using people from the unit of a candidate could be either positive or negative, because they will have a history with the candidate, and will not be able to say to that candidate that they "had" to recuse themselves is we change that process. That is a wonderful position for that member of the department to be in, especially if the decision is negative one. I think there it is more than just a matter of the knowledge and information that a person can bring. I would suggest that we say that the person must recuse themselves, but if the committee wants information about the nature of the criteria that the unit has, they could still consult that person. I am just very uneasy about the kinds of conflict of interest both positive and negative and I would like to see us consider very carefully whether we as a group are concerned about that.

Q - I have that same concern and I move that we amend the current roll to say "Operates under the rule that members of this committee cannot contribute to or participate in any other related personnel committee or discussion at the unit level."

President Mattson: Shall we use the word "unit" -- with all the changes that going on with names and titles of school and colleges changing rapidly -- I think it is clearer to say "the candidate's unit."

Senator Johnson: The motion before us is: the members on the committee from the candidate's unit must recuse themselves in the university committee evaluation process.

Comment: We try to do that now. Each member of the university committee is from a college but they are not supposed to be participating in earlier levels of the process, am I correct on that?

Provost Glick: Right now they can participate earlier, because they cannot participate at the university level, and the idea is that they should not have two bites of the apple. But they can vote if it is at the department level.

Senator Johnson: It is ok for them to vote and participate at the unit or college level, as long as they recuse themselves at the University level. That is my interpretation of the amendment as well.
Provost Glick: I would like to clarify one other issue. We need to all agree on this process, because within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences that would be ok as the amendment is stated, but in the College of Nursing they do not have departments, so does the unit mean "college?"

It was suggested that "tenure home" might be more descriptive?

Senator Johnson: To summarize, this is a friendly amendment to the amendment that elaborates that only one level of participation in the discussion is allowable.

Point of clarification: We have previously suggested that the person who will recuse themselves at the university level discussion may be contacted by the committee if needed, to clarify information about the unit criteria.

Point of clarification: The university committee members cannot participate in any other related personnel discussions, and I believe that means if you serve on the university committee you are not on the college or the departmental committee.

Further clarification: However, one person out of the department who may serve on the university committee may not serve on the unit personnel committee, and could therefore vote at the college level or the university level.

Comment: This amendment does not say that.

President Mattson: So, it should say that the members of the university committee cannot enter into personnel committee discussions but can participate in the unit level discussions?

Senator Patterson: I am confused, because we have very explicit language saying that a member of the university committee cannot serve on lower level committees. We have to keep this amendment simple.

Senator Colbourn: I do not like this idea that you are recused automatically from the university level discussion because you have participated in a lower level committee decision. This in essence implies that the university committee is lesser in its rights, if some of its members are disenfranchised.

President-Elect Roen: With this amendment we are considering right now, we can strike that bullet which says "Operates under the rule…and members of this committee cannot contribute or participate in other related personnel committees or discussion--because the purpose of that statement was to prevent double dipping, as Provost Glick said. We can delete that bullet and replace it with the amendment that is under discussion.

Are there other comments? Hearing none, Professor Roen read the amendment.
"Members of the university committee from the candidate's tenuring unit must recuse themselves from participation in all discussion, and vote in the university committee for that candidate."

Senator Johnson: The amendment has been moved and seconded. All in favor please raise your right hand. All opposed? The motion to amend carries.

President Mattson: We should also make a motion to delete the bullet that says "Operates under the rule that members of this committee cannot contribute to or participate in any other related personnel committee or discussion."
President-Elect Roen read the motion to amend as approved. "Members of the university from the candidate's tenuring unit must recuse themselves from participation in all deliberations and vote on the university committee for that candidate."

Comment: This would then allow me to be a member of the college or the school personnel committee but when someone from my department came up to the university level I could not participate. However, if someone from another department or school came up, I would not have to recuse myself, and yet, I could be on the school personnel committee and already have had a say about that person? I could actually do that under what you are proposing.

Comment: In the College of Design, if we participate in the unit, we cannot participate in the college decision, and if we participate in the college we may not participate in the unit decision.

President Mattson: I really do not like the potential for double dipping. That is why I liked the idea that anybody on the university committee could not participate in any other level of review, because they were voting at the university level. Perhaps the bullet should say that they simply cannot sit on a unit or college personnel committee if they are on the university level committee.

Provost Glick: I am going to make a suggestion to the parliamentarian. There is much value in getting this vote done today. A lot of people have spent a many years on this. I am also concerned that we are on track with this language. I wonder if you could vote on this motion today with the request that the Executive Committee come back at the February 13 Senate meeting with some clarifying language on this amendment rather than everybody trying to work on from the floor at this late hour. The parliamentarian could present two alternatives at the February meeting from the Executive Committee, and the body could choose between them. This could be considered a substitute for the one we are rewording now.

Senator Johnson: Would the amender be willing to move that suggestion? (Yes, if the spirit of the suggested language is kept in the language that is brought back.) In that case, we will return from the Committee of the Whole to the Senate meeting.

President Mattson: We have a resolution before us from the Senate Personnel Committee which is to approve the draft document from the Promotion and Tenure Task Force of the university with the provision that the Executive Committee will come back at the next Senate meeting with language that incorporates just these two amendments for further discussion, but the document as a whole regarding the constitution of the committee and how it is done and everything else is now going to be voted upon.

All those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed? The motion carries. Thank you very much. We will move on to New Business at this time, in order to read the items from CAPC into the record for a first reading. We have guests that have come to answer question on these motions and my apologies to them for the lateness of the hour. The items are in your agenda.

Senator Burstein: I would like to move to suspend the rules on Senate Motion #17 to go to a second reading immediately, and this has to do with ABOR issues.

Senate President: Sue Siferd is here and she will read the titles of the motions first before we consider that motion Senator Burstein.

6. New Business

6.A Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Sue Siferd for Mary Kihl).

Professor Siferd introduced guests Richard Fabes and Gary Ladd on behalf of Senate Motions 14 and 15.
6.A.1 Senate Motion #14 (2005-2006) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the Reorganized Organizational Unit – School of Social and Family Dynamics (SSFD).

6.A.2 Senate Motion #15 (2005-2006) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the establishment of a New Organizational Unit – Institute for families, Children, and Society (IFCS).

Professor Simon Peacock was present to answer questions on Senate Motion #16.

6.A.3 Senate Motion #16 (2005-2006) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the Reorganization of an Existing Academic Unit – School of Geographical Sciences.

Senator Burstein has requested a suspension of the rules to have a second reading on Senate Motion #17. (Not debatable).

6.A.4 Senate Motion #17 (2005-2006) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the New Academic Organizational Unit – School of Earth and Space Exploration (SESE).

President Mattson: Are there any further questions? Hearing none, we have a motion before us to suspend the rules to vote on Senate Motion #17. All those in favor of suspending the rules? All those opposed? The rules are now suspended.

We have before us Senate Motion #17 for a second reading. Is there further discussion of Senate Motion #17 (to establish a new academic organizational Unit, the School of Earth and Space Exploration (SESE). Hearing none we will move to a vote. All in favor please say aye. All opposed? The motion passes.

Q - Will the institute in Senate Motion #15 come under the sunset review process? And since the College of Nursing offers a similar program through its Institute for Community Health and Wellness, was there consultation or collaboration with the Dean of Nursing on this proposal as it went forward to CAPC?

Answer: Professor Fabes said that there will be a sunset review of this institute, and that the proposers would welcome the collaboration of the College of Nursing. He will contact Dean Mylnek.

7. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.
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