
Substitutes: Robert Cardy for James Hershauer and Jackie Martinez for Dan Canary

Guests: Yasser Alamoodi, incoming USG President; Linda Essig, Chair, Theatre; Nancy Gutierrez, Vice Provost; Cynthia Jewett, Associate General Counsel; Gina Stephens, Assistant Dean, Herberger College of Fine Arts; and Miguel Valenti, Lincoln Professor of Theatre

A record of absences will be kept in the Senate Office.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:21 p.m. by Senate President Barbara Kerr.

2. ACTION ON PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the March 21, 2005 Academic Senate meeting were approved as circulated, without objection. Send any corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

3.A Senate President's Report (Barbara Kerr).

I want to begin by thanking all of you, and all of the people that helped us move the university forward this year toward a New American University. Will the officers please stand. Our committee chairs this year need to be recognized as well but they do not have to stand.

President Kerr gave a brief summary of committee accomplishments this year and these items were also covered in the business of the day, with the exception of the Resolution on Academic Integrity that was handled by the Student Faculty Policy Committee. We all are in agreement that ASU is committed to making this university experience for students one of integrity, honesty, and added value to its degree recipients. Thanks to our students, administration, faculty, staff, and professionals who work together each day to make this happen on our campuses!

There were also special task forces at work this year. We had and still have a task force on university governance at work to find a model for university governance that will incorporate all campuses of ASU into one model of governance. We have presented a proposed model to President Crow, and now we have been
asked to go out and learn about what other campuses are doing nationally and we have added that to our travel schedule. This is one of the projects that I will continue with as past president next year, traveling to university systems that are most similar to ours and studying the ways in which they provide their members with governance.

The Health Care Task Force not only completed their work in record time and then passed that report on to a committee which now is headed by Dean Bernadette (monsoon) Melynk, who has guaranteed us that we will become one of the healthiest campuses in the nation and we hope that the day will come when we will have much greater emphasis placed on preventative health care, and the kind of health care that is health care of the 21st Century.

The Task Force on Salaries and Compensation into which Tony Garcia and George Watson have put in a lot of time, looked at many creative ways to compensate faculty. And I will continue to work with them on that project next year.

We also have had many members of our Senate, as well as our friend Bill Simmons from West Campus, working very hard this year to make sense of the University Redesign, and Bill will bring us an update on that. I think the major change that our senators have been through at the Tempe Campus, with regard to the University Redesign, is that they no longer see the redesign as a race that we do not have a horse in. We do have a horse in that race and we are part of that process.

So, I have come to the end of my term as Senate President and I am feeling very much like the denizen of an imaginary planet in one of Isaac Asminov's books, similar to Mercury, which revolves so quickly that all the beings on that planet were born, lived, and died within one year! Having just one year to do this work--it took a year to understand the intricacies of the university system and to understand that when you change any part of that system, all the other parts must change as well. It took this long to learn how many people it really takes to create the university that we have now.

Finally, I think the greatest lesson of my presidency has been the learning that there is a silent energy that fuels everything we do in the Senate, and that is the energy of goodwill. If there has been anything that I have attempted to do in this office, it was to fuel the Academic Senate with a greater sense of goodwill and to receive and accept and magnify the goodwill in each of you, as you have given it to the Senate and to one another, and that is how we survive as an academic community. So, I want to thank you very much for having honored me with this role, and I hope to continue to serve the university in any way that I can.

Now, I want to announce to you the winner of the election for President-Elect of the Academic Senate, Duane Roen. Duane comes to us with an extraordinary background in faculty development and with a true commitment not only to teaching but to mentoring faculty, and now he will bring that same energy to this Senate. I think we have done very well in our elections. The elected individuals that were reported to me by our 2005 Tellers Committee (Senators: Sandy Cohn, Sarah Duerden, Bob Keim, and Cynthia Tompkins) are as follows:

**President-Elect,** Duane Roen, Professor, English
**Secretary of the Senate,** Anne Kopta, Associate Professor, School of Music

**Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure:**
**Member:** (2005-2008)
Petra Fromme, Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry

**Academic Professional Grievance Committee:**
**Member:** (2005-2008)
Julie Tharp, Associate Librarian, Library Reference Service
**Alternate Members:** (2005-2006)
Committee on Academic Professional Status (CAPS)
Members: (2005-2008)
Beth DiFelice, Assistant Director, Law Library
Judy Grace, Director, Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence
Lydia LaFaro, Librarian, Library Reference Service
Brenda Shears, Research Administrator, International Institute for Sustainability

Alternate Members: (2005-2006)
John Wheatley, Research Professional Senior, Center for Solid State Science
Barry Wilkens, Research Professional Senior, Center for Solid State Science

A motion was entertained to ratify the results of the 2005 Academic Assembly election. Senator Burstein made the motion and Senator Johnson seconded the motion. The results were ratified by a voice vote of the Senate.


I would like to go through five to six points in my announcements and then ask you if you have any questions or concerns or issues that senators would like to bring up.

I am very happy with the faculty recruitments this year. The new faculty members that I have been made aware of and that were brought in by the various departments seem generally outstanding to me. The way that we are able to project the trajectory that we have at ASU, and I do not know if that was a factor, but faculty we have recruited seem outstanding.

I would like to mention three or four new hires in the senior administration of the university. Beginning on June 1, 2005, Carol Campbell will begin as Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of the University. She will be responsible for all management and financial aspects of the institution in terms of its day-to-day financial operations, facility operations, and support operations, and she comes with experience in two previous positions as CFO of Carlton College in Minnesota and most recently at TCU in Fort Worth, Texas. She also before those two positions rose to the number two person in the financial management shop at the University of Minnesota. So, she brings the skill sets that we need. We have hired a new Associate Vice President for Planning and Budget, Lisa Frace. She will be joining us sometime over the summer. She comes from Amtrak, where she is their Chief Financial Officer. Also, there is a new Nursing Dean as Barb mentioned earlier--Bernadette Melynk. If you have not seen the small tornado coming out of the Nursing College, she is Bernadette. She has touched the ground and is moving forward.

I want to say that I have been very happy with the promotion and tenure cases, on the level of quality and energy that has gone into these cases--the way the cases have been made, the background behind them, and the evidence of the performance of our faculty members. There is tremendous potential in our younger faculty that are coming up for tenure and in our senior faculty who are moving on to the rank of professor. I am very pleased with the way that is going overall.

If we were to sum up this academic year, it would be a year where nearly every numerically derived indicator that we have as an institution will reach a new record for the size of the university, the quality of the university, the performance that we have of our faculty in external competitions, and the numbers of awards gained by our students, our faculty, and others. The graduation and retention rates, all of our academic indicators of success, of competitiveness, are on the upward slope, and all of them are moving past whatever the previous records have been. That is an indication of quality of our faculty, our staff, our overall enterprise, and that is not the case at every other university and state, such as we have had this year.

Fund raising last year has broken the university's single-year record. We are very happy with where that is
headed. We also broke records in what we spent for financial aid dramatically, in enhancing and expanding our investment in financial aid, and in maintaining access to the university. It is the case that none of the last three tuition increases have been applied to any family eligible for Pell Grants and that continues to the be case going forward. More importantly, we announced the Access ASU program a few weeks ago, which is the first time that the University has put in place a program for families whose incomes fall below the poverty line within Arizona. Students qualified to attend the University whose family income falls below the poverty line are now guaranteed that they will leave Arizona State University without having to take on debt to cover the cost of either their tuition or their room and board. This is a significant change in the way this institution is operating. I will not say that it has gone unnoticed, and it has not gone unnoticed by those people that are eligible and who are qualified but it has gone unnoticed by others. We have increased by 300 percent the number of students coming to campus at that income level, while in past these students have had little or no access to the university at all.

Let me make one comment on our state investment request. Some of you know that the state's appropriation represents an increasingly small percentage of the University's overall operating budget. It will fall below 30 percent this year in terms of our overall operating budget at ASU. That request is still tied up in the political negotiations between the governor and the legislature. It is the case that we have alignment between the Republican leadership in the House and the Republican leadership in the Senate and the Democratic leadership in the House and the Senate and the Governor, around the notion of formulaically funding enrollment growth in the university system. This will bear fruit of various types and various sizes over time, but for the first time we have broken the traditional model for public investment and the Arizona investment in the three universities. In the past, for the past 20 to 25 years, it has been basically ratio funding, meaning that two dollars out of every five dollars for ASU, two dollars out of every five dollars for UofA, and one dollar out of every five dollars were invested for NAU. It is no longer the case and it will not be the case this year. Enrollment growth and the allocation of resources, according to enrollment growth, will now be the main driver prior to the allocation of dollars for special admission. This year there will not be a 2:2:1 ratio, and although we have not secured all of the dollars that we need to manage our enrollment growth, we have secured the model for funding enrollment growth. We do have more than 50 percent of the funds that we need to fund enrollment growth. Those are present in every model of the budget that has been advanced either from the majority party in either house of the legislature, or by the minority party of either house of the legislature, and by the Governor's budget, and that is what I call consensus around the notion of enrollment growth. The budgets that are floating around do include some potential resources to assist those employees who are on Arizona State Retirement System. There are mandatory increases in the contributions to those retirement funds, as well as some contribution for the university pool for salary adjustment. The state may make some investment to what salary adjustment there may be here at the University. They will also have to consider other investments, so, all those things are in the State's overall investment for the universities. While we are not happy with the details of some of the outcomes from the state investment strategy, yet we are happy with the directions that the outcomes seem to be moving in. Those are the things that I have on my mind that I thought you would be interested in. Are there issues, questions, or concerns about anything else?

Senator Watson: I have one thing and normally I would bring these things up not in a public forum like this but I do have some concern about the Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence. It seems to me that there has been no search for a new director and we have had an interim person for this year; there has been a reduction in physical space at CLTE; there are personnel decisions being made without the advice or input of any CLTE advisory committee, and other things about where we are with respect to direction for the CLTE. That originally was a body created by the Academic Senate and then ultimately it was given over to the Provost Office. That is one of my concerns and I am hoping it will get the proper attention it needs this year.

President Crow: I am not familiar with those facts and Milt is, so I will ask if he wants to respond to your questions.

Provost Glick: I am not familiar with the space issue. It is true that we have been consulting across the campus on what our CLTE center should be, and as you know, George, the parents professors were asked to give us
advice directly on that and they have been reticent to provide us with any input. So, we are having to seek outside advice on the questions we asked them at this point. We do have several options that we will be discussing broadly across the campus.

**Senator Dwyer:** In terms of the records and background check policy—there was some discussion at some point that this is something that other places are dealing with nationally, can you comment on that?

**President Crow:** The Provost is going to comment on this specifically, but let me tell you that yes, this is something that is not only in Arizona. It is derivative of a range of concerns. We have worked very hard to make it simple, doable and un-intrusive. It did not come from us. Milt do you want to say anything else?

**Provost Glick:** The Regents made what I think was a wise decision after a bill was introduced in the legislature about mandatory background checks and fingerprinting for all state employees. The ABOR in response passed a policy which requires that the universities will have a reference and background check policy. The model that was designed for us is relatively painless and does not require that we look at backgrounds for every candidate nor finalist, but in most cases it would be a fairly quick easy check if someone is in a position that is considered a sensitive hire, because they will work with children or other areas like that including financial budgeting, or if a person states in their initial application that they have been convicted of a felony. Then we will have to ask them to go through a much deeper check. Units will also be able to make tentative offers that are contingent upon a successful background check. No one looks forward to this process, but we think it is better to take a hold of our own fate than to have the legislature pass their bill instead.

**Senator Dwyer:** We asked about other institutions because we want to know what is behind this initiative here. Will there be time to have discussion later on the agenda?

**President Crow:** I can tell you that things are relatively sensitive at ASU, and so, I will not give you the origin story where this came from but it is derivative of actions taken here, and people employed here. So, the point being that the issue is one where this was a reaction to actions that we took. The reaction was not legislation; the reaction policy was done by the Regents, and the reaction is one that we are trying to get into the mode of as un-intrusively as possible. My own preference for these kinds of things is self-reporting on the part of prospective employees; self-reporting with a penalty clause that is quite harsh. Tell us if these things may be issues, because if we find out they are, and you were not truthful, you are gone.

**Provost Glick:** In the case at ASU, it was not an issue of withheld information about previous conviction. We knew all the facts.

**Senator Niles:** We are scheduled to go downtown, the School of Social Work in the fall of 2006, and I noticed the timetable is posted on the website. Is that timeline still accurate?

**President Crow:** That is a good question—we are in the process of closing in the next few weeks on what we call the intergovernmental agreement between the City of Phoenix and the University relative to the conditions under which we would be willing to execute our plan. So, there is a plan, and then there is the execution of the plan. The plan is that the schools so named, yours being one, will move to downtown on a certain schedule. Right now we are on that schedule. It is a very tight schedule. If we for whatever reason do not get satisfactory execution of the plan on certain dates, we cannot meet that schedule and it will have to be delayed. The best answer I can give you is that we are on a very tight schedule with little room for error or fluctuation. If we stay on that schedule, yes, that is when things will happen, and if not, then it will be delayed. What I will also say is that we have set very stringent conditions and that is the agreement between us and the City of Phoenix. I will say that we are not moving anybody downtown unless we have the complete agreement on the reshaping of the entire neighborhood, not just the buildings. That is a part of the discussion and a part of the negotiations. We do not want to move a school downtown Phoenix and then have the neighborhood stay in the general condition that it is in. We are looking for the facilitation of the development of the overall place and we are making progress toward that now, but we are not ready to execute the plan.
Senator Denhardt: Will you be staying for the discussion of the Promotion and Tenure Implementation Plan?

President Crow: The Provost will be talking about that and that will be altered depending upon the provost's report. We will see.

Senator Denhardt: I have a follow-up question if you do stay.

Senator Vandermeer asked a question that was inaudible on the recording, and President Crow responded: There are some in the legislature that believe the University should be de-funded--our budget reduced, for every student that has credit hours in excess of not 155 really but 140, as seniors. That is more than 40 percent of our graduating students! Those individuals that support this measure in the legislature believe that the University campus is filled with slackers, goof-offs, and other malcontents, and that the best way to advance the University is to find some way to cut them off because they are somehow on a free ride. None of those things are true. It turns out that we studied the universities that have students with more than 140 credit hours and the vast majority of those students are one of three types: 1) Students that transferred in credit hours from another institution, not here, and for whatever reason have to complete a number of credit hours from here to get the degree that they want from ASU. 2) Students with two or three undergraduate majors, or one major and three minors, or whatever it is that they are putting together for their own program. 3) There are some students who are in a professional program that did not start in a professional program, so, they decided late that they wanted to be a nurse, or they decided late that they wanted to be something that required them to go back in and take a whole bunch of additional courses along the way. The number of students who are slackers are few therein. We have therefore argued against this--it was vetoed by the Governor, but it may appear again in different forms and we will continue to argue against this. We think there are ways to address some of the concerns that some of these legislators have and we will try to do that. That is the story of what is going on. Mostly in this legislative session, I have been dealing with trying to offer justifications as to why we have a graduate shortage, of any type at all. Second would be--How are we any different from a community college? (much laughter here) Thank you.


Thank you Barbara, as well as thanks to the leadership of the student government, because one of the things that has made possible a lot of the progress the university has made over the last decade is extreme willingness to work together collegially by our faculty and students. It has made a great deal of difference and it has been tested by the rate of change that we are undergoing right now. Probably it has seen more rapid change than any university in the modern era. It also has been tested by the fact that we have taken on more students and more responsibilities with the same number of faculty and staff. We have stretched our people. That stretching has been deliberate in the sense that we made a decision many years ago that a top priority would always be salaries and so we have tried every year now to allocate one or two percent into salary increases. Ours has been a hard budgetary situation, which has meant no growth in faculty and staff. While it has only been a percent here and there, the difference would be noted if you read the latest AAUP Survey that came out today and compare it to the other universities—that considerable gap has grown between ASU and the other universities, grown in a positive way vis-à-vis ASU, and that is in one decision for a series of years--of trying to find a little extra money each year for salaries internally. There should be some relief in that this year, because last year we hired the largest number of faculty in any one year of our history--169 faculty, with high diversity, high quality, and in fact there are six National Academy members, seven actually as of this week, and we see more on the horizon. Now why do we do that? We do that because that opens the door to us to add very high caliber faculty at every level. It changes the perception of us, and these are people that leverage the rest of the faculty and help them get better. One of the things we discovered is that the marketplace is becoming even more competitive; that's true at the senior level as well as at the junior level. So, it becomes especially important that we try each year to find some money to help the faculty and staff that are here. We also just hired one new dean that the President did not mention, Deborah Freedman, from the University of Washington, who will be the Dean of Public Programs, the new college of Public Programs, and we are presently interviewing four candidates for Dean of the Cronkite
School as well. That will be the first dean of that School and in both cases all of the candidates were extremely qualified.

On retention, which we talk about again and again, how to increase student success rate—we are now nine points above where we have started and nine points up in graduation rate too. Although, none of us are satisfied with that, and we have signaled to the deans and the chairs that we have a very high priority of continuing to increase our student success rate. Each year it gets harder as you are succeeding better, but nonetheless we do feel we are at the place we need to be as an institution yet, so, we will continue to bring this progress report back to you and continue to look to you to tell us what are good ways to improve student success.

Let me go onto the issue of the Promotion and Tenure Implementation Plan. You heard President Crow say that he is very pleased this year with the quality of the cases brought before him, and particularly with improved quality of documentation as evidence, because he has made it clear to all of us that he is a fanatic about good evidence in making decisions. We appreciate the willingness of the faculty on all our campuses to engage in revisiting how we structure the promotion and tenure process. Last year we approved a policy statement. This year we are bringing to you an implementation statement. We know that there is still some concern out there about it, and we know we will never get full agreement from every individual on any system we implement at the university. Nonetheless, we consider this a very workable initiative and therefore we want to do it right. On that basis, the president and I have just recommended to your president that we take today's meeting and go into a committee of the whole in order that you may one more time express concerns and thoughts that you have about this plan with the intent that we will spend the summer going through one more refinement of it and bring this back to you at the first meeting in the fall. Again, we do not expect every person to agree but we would like a consensus, because there is nothing we do that is more critical in quality than who we make lifetime commitments to. That has to begin at the level of who do we hire, and we have asked the deans to become much more engaged in the hiring process because if you do not hire the right people you are not going to tenure them. We do believe that to continue to make the progress we have made depends on having the best people at every level. For that reason, if you choose to do so we would be willing to go into the committee of the whole and give you one more chance to share your concerns, recognizing we will then be urging in the fall quickly, an approval for revision of whatever we propose, because we do believe that this needs to be in place no later than Fall 2006. If you decide to do this, we are willing to entertain that action.

Senator Guleserian: Does that mean that it will not automatically be instituted this year?

Provost Glick: We will implement it for Fall 2006, that is correct. That means this next year the promotion and tenure process would go as it went this year. The year after, however, we will have a new system in place, that is also correct. Are there other questions? If not, I will turn the floor back over.

President Kerr: Doug Johnson will lead off our discussion of the promotion and tenure implementation plan and Vice Provost Nancy Gutierrez is here to assist him.

Senator Johnson: I want to thank President Crow and Provost Glick for the opportunity to hear further input on this very important issue. We agree that promotion and tenure decisions are the most crucial to the University and that we would hope to provide insight and advice and recognize issues that will help us design the very best possible plan for ASU. I had prepared slides to promote discussion of this issue and I think they are still appropriate. The Personnel Committee does recommend the acceptance of the recommendations for implementation, subject to a review and reconsideration over the coming summer. In discussing this with a wide variety of individuals, there came an awareness of factual issues that perhaps are not well understood. I thought I would begin by looking at some of the provisions in the P&T Task Force Implementation Recommendations.

As you know, this process began with President Crow's charge to a task force to design a new promotion and tenure process, one that would improve consistency, documentation, and create the best possible model for ASU. The Task Force met for a year. They discussed a variety of different issues. They recommended that we
have more outside letters from top scholars, that we allow updated information in the process, and that ad hoc committees be created for the review of each individual candidate. You as a Senate approved this in concept last year, and the implementation committee has been working to streamline and operationalize that concept of ad hoc committees. The notion of ad hoc committees as it is currently conceived to have a substantive review at the university level, that would mean that the committees convened would have near expertise to the field of the candidate, and the disciplinary and interdisciplinary facets of the work of our faculty. These committees would be composed of faculty who are outside of the individual academic unit and there would be some members that would be constant in all of the ad hoc committees in a particular field, whereas other members would be appointed specifically for the individual. There would be a minimum of five members on any committee. The current model that we worked with is far from perfect. Those of you that served on the UPTC committee know that it is a huge undertaking, a big commitment of time and energy, perhaps without comparison on campus. This committee may review as many as 50 to 100 cases a year. It is a substantive review, and they make a recommendation on promotion and tenure for that individual to the President of the University. There was a variety of issues that were considered. The workload of the committee (UPTC) is extremely heavy and in breaking that into ad hoc subcommittees that has great appeal and allows people to spend sufficient time to evaluate each case and that is very important to each individual up for review. These committees will be constituted so that there is expertise. It will not be an easy task, but one that will have a high priority on the formation of the committees. Creating consistency across committees would be an important characteristic and dealing with the high costs, in terms of time and resources would be necessary for this review process and that is not trivial. We do commit a lot of faculty time and in the current situation you really do not have the expertise of your discipline being brought to bear on the decision process. The procedure in creating the ad hoc committees is that the Provost would create the ad hoc committees, that colleges would identify candidates by March 1, and there would be four to six of these disciplinary areas or fields identified based on the individuals that are going forward with promotion papers in that particular year. The members of the committees would be distinguished professors, there would be a Senate representative, there is a chair for each field committee that is a full professor, and that the Provost would appoint and announce these fields. Each individual candidate would select an area, would submit a list of nominees, would provide a statement explaining relationships with these nominees, a description of their scholarly area, and perhaps any conflicts that they believe would prevent individuals on campus from serving on their committee. The chair would convey this information to the Provost by May 1.

To look at the procedure a little further, the chairs and deans would also provide a nominee list. The Provost would then finalize ad hoc committee memberships. The candidate would be informed of the membership at the start of year, and the Provost will support and work with these committees during that period--and the process would end by mid-May of the year following. The advocate would present the case of the candidate, recognize the contributions to the unit's mission and goals, clarify the facts about the individual's case, and would not be present during the final deliberations. That advocate would be assigned by the dean and would generally be the chair of the department. The candidate could choose an alternative advocate if they were not supported by the department chair, and there could be a second advocate where that would help describe the individual's field.

In discussing this proposal within the implementation work group, a variety of arguments have come down to the Personnel Committee, both pro and con. People have suggested that having emphasis at the university level in promotion and tenure decisions could have a negative effect on recruiting new faculty. I think that we all agree that we want to hire people that are tenure-able and not to have a revolving door situation develop. There is also the suggestion that this process is very costly in terms of the time and energy of faculty, and that more of us will be paying the price under the proposed ad hoc committee structure. The potential for lack of consistency with multiple committees operating at the same time, and the fields for review not being well known nor knowable by the faculty in advance have been concerns that we have discussed. It is believed by some that there is limited expertise in dealing with substantive review at the university level currently. Those of us on the Personnel Committee have also heard positive comments and suggestions that this is a very reasonable thing to do--that ad hoc committees will add to the quality of the decision process--that particularly they would provide a much more texturalized review process. That may mean that the individual's department also gets its mission and goals into the process, and they could be further developed through the interaction of the ad hoc committee.
members. By creating six committees we have the potential to alleviate the extremely heavy workload of the people on the university-level committee, to spread that workload among a larger group of people, and this would allow a larger number of faculty to participate, and this is viewed as a positive thing. I think as much as anything else, by moving forward with this as soon as it is feasible to implement, we will get junior faculty out of limbo. We are at a point where they will know the process that they will be evaluated under, and they can begin to make normal progress to assure their success. These are issues that have been coming to the discussion of the Personnel Committee as well as the implementation committee. I present them here to you as a seed for beginning our discussion. We have an opportunity to add to this list or to clarify or modify it. Are there comments from the floor at this time?

With your permission, I have asked Vice Provost Nancy Gutierrez to add one more thing to what I have said. One of the concerns that we have is that each year a different set of field committees ought to be created. They are presumably selected in order to meet the set of applicants for that particular year, but we don't really have a very good feel for how those categories might be selected and what those might be. So, I have asked Nancy to look at the data from the last couple of years and see if she could give us some pro forma information as to what these committees might look like.

Vice Provost Gutierrez: This is a quick study. I looked at the Promotion and Tenure files that went forward, not just this past year, but the year previous to that also. The implementation group always thought that we would work with four to six groups and certainly not more than six. So, I have decided to illustrate the full six in terms of looking at this group of faculty members for last year. So, this is only one way, my thoughts on how we would formulate a possible set of committees, realizing that if this is put into action and approved in the fall, that a whole group of people would be working on the list of possible committees each year.

**2003-2004**

**Engineering and Technology (8)**

- Agribusiness
- Mech & Mr Eng. Technology
- Chemical and Materials Engineering
- Civil and Environmental
- Electrical Engineering
- Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

**Social Sciences (10)**

- Curriculum and Instruction
- Planning and Landscape Architecture
- Anthropology
- Chicana/o Studies
- Geography
- Asian Pacific American Studies
- Justice Studies
- Public Affairs

**Bioscience (9)**

- Kinesiology
- Bioengineering
- Life Sciences
- Speech and Hearing Science

**Humanities, Design, and the Arts (8)**

- Architecture
- Music
- Theatre
- English
- History
- Languages & Literatures

**Behavioral Sciences (7)**

- Management
- Psychology in Education
- Psychology
- Human Services
- Recreation and Tourism Management

**Physical Sciences and Mathematics (6)**

- Computer Science
- Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Mathematics and Statistics
- Physics and Astronomy

Then I looked at this year's individuals to form another list and decided to do four committees.
2004-2005
Arts, Design, and Letters (12)
Architecture and Landscape Architecture
Design
Theatre
Art
English
History
Languages and Literatures
Philosophy
Women's Studies

Social and Behavioral Sciences (16)
Accountancy
Information Systems
Curriculum and Instruction
Psychology in Education
Anthropology
Sociology
Management
Psychology
Social Work
Communication Studies
Exercise and Wellness
Agribusiness

Engineering and Technology (18)
Chemical and Materials
Bioengineering
Civil and Environmental
Electrical
Construction
Mechanical and Aerospace
Aeronautical Man. Tech.

Natural Sciences and Mathematics (8)
Chemistry and Biochemistry
Geological Sciences
Life Sciences
Mathematics
Physics and Astronomy
Integrative Studies
Computing Studies

Senator Armbruster: What would be the process to change these area designations, as I can imagine a mathematics case that would be much closer to engineering than to natural sciences.

Vice Provost Gutierrez: As the discussions with the Senate leadership have gone, there would be a group of faculty members that would be directly appointed by the Academic Senate and the Provost Office that will look at the faculty members coming up in a single year to determine these areas. These can change from year to year, or they may not. It really is dependent on the steering committee, etc. It may be that this grouping which is clearly a more natural grouping, only having four major categories, general categories, would be the one to go with at least at first.

Provost Glick: However, either way, the individual faculty member once these four categories are established, can choose which of those categories they want to be classified under.

Vice Provost Gutierrez: And the fact that we have the opportunity of having unique faculty members in each group would then allow us to really try to address all of the various areas of expertise that the faculty member has.

Senator Haynes: In choosing our committee, will there be some outside members chosen? And where are lawyers to be found on this list?

Vice Provost Gutierrez: Do you mean can people outside your department unit be nominated, yes, they can. We don't have any lawyers, and we would have to look at what the lawyer does, and the lawyer would have to choose what area they wish to be classified under.

Senator Rez: With the expansion of the University and the natural sciences, it is quite conceivable that we could have someone from every department going up for tenure. As I understand it, ad hoc committees can only have members from other departments other than the department of the candidate. So, would we not be dealing with an empty set at that point? You can only have on the ad hoc committee members of departments that do not have anyone going up for tenure? (No.)
President-Elect Mattson: It says that members of the ad hoc committee cannot be from the same department as the candidate going up for consideration.

Senator Rez: But the ad hoc committees are reviewing candidates from a large number of departments.

Vice Provost Gutierrez: No, only two members of each ad hoc committee will be the same. There will be a Senate representative, and the chairs for each one of those areas. Those two members will remain constant for the 12, 16 or 18 ad hoc committees within that area. If a faculty from a unit goes up, what we have said in the document is that the chair and the Academic Senate rep will need to recuse him or herself at the lower committee.

Senator Rez: To give an example, let's say that every one of those departments listed has a candidate, who then goes on the ad hoc committee?

Vice Provost Gutierrez: Of the two members that are the same, if there is a geological scientist that is chairing that committee as one example, when a faculty member from Geological Sciences goes up, that chair may not participate in the lower level of decision.

President-Elect Mattson: For each one of those eight candidates in Natural Sciences, there is a committee of five people—the chair, the Senate rep, and three unique people from outside of Geological Sciences, if that is the department you are talking about. It is conceivable that the uniquely appointed individuals would serve on more than one ad hoc committee—and the constants are the chair and the Academic Senate rep. Then the other three are uniquely appointed from a pool of nominations from the candidate, the chair, other people in the department, the Provost Office with the collaboration of an advisory committee of Senate leadership and/or other faculty will help sift through these names and appoint the unique committees.

Senator Rez: I have another question—am I right in understanding that these ad hoc committees will look at that evidence that the department level committee has provided in the review of that individual?

Nancy Gutierrez: Yes, that is the way it is now and that is still the way it will continue to be.

Doug Johnson: I do appreciate your sharing these potential clusters with us, Nancy. You can see that there are difficulties in the fact analysis of the collection though of data, in that we, each of us, might produce a somewhat different set, so one of our recommendations is that we should have an advisory committee that participates in this decision process to make sure there is a good fit between the candidates that are up for promotion and tenure and the fields that are constituted for that particular year. Before we discuss this issue more, just some procedural things: We would like to first of all announce that the Personnel Committee is amending the resolution that came to you at the last meeting to include more modifications as you see on the screen, that 1) we want to defer the implementation, as the President and the Provost and Senate President have discussed, 2) that we create an advisory committee to help guide the creation of these fields and ad hoc committees, 3) that we develop training processes that provide some hope of consistency across these multiple committees, and 4) to require a review process at the conclusion of the first year of this model. These four items seem to be widely supported and we bring them to you as part of this amendment now. This is a second reading on the issue but to promote a wider discussion and to provide higher quality input to this deliberation, we are now going to move to a committee of the whole, and that will allow for more relaxed rules for discussion.

President Kerr: The motion before the Senate is the amendment of the Tenure and Promotion implementation proposal. We will now recognize Senator Watson who will make that motion.

Senator Watson: I move that we resolve into a committee of the whole. (That motion was seconded by Senator Allen.)
President Kerr: The motion has been made and seconded, all in favor please indicate by saying aye. The motion has passed. George please explain to us what it means to go into a committee of the whole.

Senator Watson: The relaxed debate is this; under normal rules of debate in the Senate you are limited to speaking only two times. In the committee of the whole, you may speak as often as you can be recognized. However, the rule that before you speak a second time any others who have not had the opportunity to speak should have that opportunity to speak remains in force in the committee of the whole. Also in a committee of the whole it does not permit a certain motion such as one that would derail the discussion. Therefore, this is a way to facilitate further discussion. At the end of the committee of the whole, we simply return to ourselves as the assembly. The committee of the whole is not making a decision about anything and that allows us to discuss and then return to the assembly in order to dispense with the motion. By the way, I think it would facilitate the discussions on any particularly controversial issues and as long as I am in the Senate, I will move for a committee of the whole on these kinds of issues in the future as well.

President Kerr: I think this is an excellent way to go about this issue. Therefore, to complete the formality, I must say Senator Johnson, would you please chair this committee of the whole.

Senator Johnson: Thank you President Crow and President Kerr. Is there any business to discuss at this time?

Senator Denhardt: I would like to discuss some concerns of my colleagues, and also a proposal. Although I think a lot of these changes are very positive and very constructive, and we appreciate the hard work that went into this plan, there remains some concern about the ad hoc committees. Three primary concerns were raised in this regard. One you mentioned with regard to consistency, but also the fact that there will be members of the committee that will have no one to compare this case to. It would be like trying to hire someone and only bringing in one candidate and not being able to compare across packages. The second thing that was raised was that it may even discourage interdisciplinary work. This professor may find out that there is a faculty member in another department or school, therefore similar to them, and that they might be interested in what they do. It is not a good idea for them to collaborate under the new plan because they might want that person to serve on their ad hoc committee. That may be an unintended consequence. The President and Provost said that the quality of promotion and tenure packages that are coming forward have increased dramatically--there are more outside letters now, more evidence based on types of arguments, everyone is trying to do a better job with this. Therefore, I propose that if we are making such good progress, such a dramatic change may not be warranted; that may have new problems and unintended consequences. My idea is that instead of having individual ad hoc committees for every individual candidate that we instead have standing disciplinary committees such that we would break up the workload and we would still have near disciplinary expertise, but that would introduce consistency, at least within disciplines. I propose that on behalf of my colleagues and myself.

Senator Johnson: Thank you for those well considered thoughts. Those are issues that the work group did discuss. Certainly the workload of the current committee is very onerous and some kind of distribution of that load seems to be a high priority in the process.

Senator Burstein: The problem of creating just one committee for each candidate--if you look at Physics and Natural Science and Mathematics--you would have to make up that committee of the natural sciences and math and then it becomes the situation of the null set again, because the person in that department will have to recuse him or herself.

Senator Johnson: Senator Burstein, I think the proposal included the possibility of multiple committees, but different from the ad hoc committee prescription, from the work group. They would be the same for everyone in that particular discipline area. Is that correct?

Senator Burstein: A lot of committees will have six or seven members and that will not conserve faculty effort.

Senator Johnson: This was one of the alternatives considered by the work group, and there is a trade-off
between the possibility of getting closer expertise to the individual's case by custom tailoring the committee to the individual. So, there are pluses and minuses with that alternative. Are there other issues?

**Senator Martinez:** Just a couple of comments. First, it does seem to contribute to an academic community to be more engaged across disciplines. It is also clear that the President wants more expertise at a higher level in the decision process and that is a good thing. But one of the things that I worry about in this type of structure is that the Provost appoints the advisory committee, and we also want variance on the committees. I believe that there is an awful lot of power that resides in the ability to define knowledge areas. As one example, for assistant professors coming into a department where there are varying interpretations about what that department's mission is, that produces competition and ambiguity first off. They must then figure out what is valued across the department. With the new P&T plan, there will be new layers added to their frustration, by the formation of the ad hoc committee structure. It looks like the only recourse would be to go to the Provost and identify that "these people" should not be on my committee. Then others finalize the committee membership. This and the political gamesmanship that already exists will create more stress for assistant professors. Since the person already knows there are people in their department that do not value their research and this will only exacerbate the process all the way up.

**Senator Johnson:** Thank you for your comments. Are there others?

**Senator Guleserian:** I would like to understand better the role of experts outside the university. You have the letters. Suppose the ad hoc committee is dealing with a hard case and maybe they are not in agreement; it is a close call. Now, what can they do? First of all, can they get more information from the same people who wrote those letters? Secondly, can they request more letters? Or talk to others informally that are outside the university? What are the rules on this?

**Senator Johnson:** The current proposal suggests that we contact individuals that have written letters and ask for elaboration and clarification.

**Senator Guleserian:** And that is it?

**Senator Johnson:** That is my understanding. Susan Mattson was a member of the work group. Perhaps she would like to clarify.

**President-Elect Mattson:** Nancy can.

**Vice Provost Gutierrez:** Right now the situation is that the information comes forward within the framework of the file that has already been presented. That will remain the same. With that being said, you cannot ask for more new letters. You can ask for more information from the original letter writers.

**Senator Tompkins:** I am representing people in Languages and Literatures and it bothers us about the ad hoc committees. Especially for faculty who are going up for tenure and who do interdisciplinary work. We all appreciate the idea of bringing in national experts but worry about the internal composition of the committees more. Who has the right to define who is an expert or near expert in the discipline area, and what about across disciplines? Then you have all these notes about who you do not want to have on a person's committee; how confidential is that information going to remain? It is the politics, the fear of working with someone, or not being able to work with someone, that may cause people who are currently considering us to take another offer elsewhere. Then there is a timing problem in that the candidate will not know who the chairs of the committees are until October.

**Senator Johnson:** Thank you for your input.

**Senator Colbourn:** Who is it exactly that determines whether or not the chair is supportive? Does the chair do that, or does the candidate determine that?
Provost Glick: The chair must make a recommendation and he must make that recommendation known to the faculty member, and that of the departmental committee. Then the candidate has the opportunity to withdraw if they are not supported at their department level, so that the dean does not also turn it down.

Senator Colbourn: My concern is that the chair may well give lukewarm support and that may not be sufficient enough to be a good advocate for the case. Does this qualify as supportive?

President-Elect Mattson: The original document or recommendation was that the dean in consultation with the candidate appointed the advocate. It was a mutual decision between the candidate, the dean, and/or the chair. If the dean says to the candidate, I am planning on appointing your chair and the candidate says, that person might not be the strongest advocate and I would like to suggest, or could you suggest, someone else within the department who can speak to my value to the department, what my work has been about. It is supposed to be a mutual decision and that was the intent.

Senator Colbourn: Well would the chair then be informed that they have not been selected as the advocate, before they consider the case at the unit level?

President-Elect Mattson: No, that is one of the things—that the advocate would actually not be formally named until the fall or after the recommendation has been made and goes forward.

Senator Johnson: We have a question over here.

Senator Duerden: English has many of the same issues, so, ditto for us.

Senator Haynes: I think that the variance of the committees is the general issue especially for those of us who do interdisciplinary work. It is an issue for people who work in two areas. Will they in fact have to disqualify some of the most knowledgeable people they have collaborated with because they cannot sit on their ad hoc committee? I think that really this is one of the separate issues you need to look at further. They believe they are disadvantaged already and we know the social construction of reality—those things believed to be true are what become true often. What this tends to do is undercut junior faculty from doing interdisciplinary work, and we are doing exciting things across this campus in interdisciplinary work. People are also concerned about what data is being considered in selecting the knowledge areas. Where does Law go in this structure?

President-Elect Mattson: Well, primarily you must look at where your research is, what journals are you publishing in, and if you are doing interdisciplinary work, who are you working with. For instance, I work with anthropologists. A lot of our faculty work in exercise and wellness or they do scholarship in that area—in communication, and psychology. There are a lot of fields that we may or may not be doing research in directly. While our research is in nursing, that research may have application, or resources, and references for scholarship in another field as well. A lot of our work is interdisciplinary. I do not see it as a detriment to interdisciplinary work. I see it as encouragement because it gives you more areas that you might conceivably submit your dossier in or more areas to consider that might be more beneficial to the candidate, and it may just be my perspective of it.

Vice Provost Gutierrez: I can imagine a faculty member with this configuration—arts and sciences letters--then they chose the chair and the Academic Senate rep, within that knowledge field; then they would have the opportunity to add three more members, who might actually be aligned more to engineering and technology, and vice versa. I really see the ad hoc committee model as an advantage here.

Senator Haynes: I thought that you could not have anyone from those other disciplines serve on your committee.

President-Elect Mattson: That is not a restriction; you just cannot have anyone from your department serve.
Senator Johnson: Remember that the current University committee has a representative from each college, so, you are bringing more expertise to that particular individual's research.

Senator Acker: My department was curious why expertise and knowledge of the field disqualified you for serving on an ad hoc committee—in other words, should someone be a historian, the historian on the committee would have to be recused?

Senator Johnson: Your department would be making a recommendation, one of many that goes to the President.

Senator Acker: Can you give some direction on that because I don't understand.

President-Elect Mattson: I don't understand why you think that they must recuse themselves from the ad hoc committee as you stated your question, based on expertise. If the historian is chair of one of the ad hoc groups, I suppose that would be the social behavioral sciences area, if they served on a department or a college personnel committee for that candidate, then they need to recuse themselves from the review of that person's dossier at the university level ad hoc committee.

Senator Vandermeer: There is some ambiguity about the person's home department—does that mean their tenure home? There are joint appointments and affiliated faculty appointments.

Senator Siferd: What effect that will have on co-authors in departments. We need good mentoring for our younger faculty and this may discourage that, if they cannot be an advocate later on.

Senator Johnson: The issue of whether or not an individual has worked so closely that their view of the individual might be biased has been discussed widely. The idea would be to get people who can judge more objectively. We are approaching the hour of five minutes of 5 o'clock, and I hesitate to lengthen this out too much but is there anyone who has not had an opportunity yet to speak?

Senator Martinez: Just a comment—I think when we talk about objectivity, we need to be very careful how we operationalize this assumption, because I think it is a false assumption to say that someone would automatically be biased in favor of a person having worked closely with them, or by being more familiar with their research.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5.A Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

(Item 1) Report of the Promotion and Tenure Implementation Work Group (2/9/05).

Senator Watson: I make a motion that the committee of the whole rise and report to the Senate floor, then a second motion to request the Senate to recommit this to the Personnel Committee, and to the administration, along with the remarks that we had today, and that we bring this back to the first Senate meeting in the fall to accept any further changes.

Senator Johnson: Are there any objections to these motions. All in favor of committing the information and suggestions, recommendations, and issues that have been raised here today to the Provost and President for reconsideration, and for action at our next Senate meeting in the fall, please say aye. All opposed? The motion carries.

President Kerr: That was the committee of the whole and now we actually need to do it again as an Academic Senate. Is there a motion that the Academic Senate accepts the recommendations of the committee of the whole?
Senator Mayer: So moved. The motion was seconded by President-Elect Mattson.

President Kerr: It has been moved and seconded, all in favor please say aye. Opposed say nay? It has been moved and seconded and passed that we recommend that the Personnel Committee take this up again in view of the remarks today and then bring it back to the first fall Senate meeting. Next we will consider the other item of unfinished business that we had before.

(Item 2) Multiple-Year Faculty Appointments for Faculty (Second Reading).

Senator Johnson: The issue that Barb speaks to is an issue of old business that we have approved in concept; the rolling contracts for full-time contract faculty and that group has discussed and developed procedures for implementation. It comes back to us today as an opportunity to recommend approval and put this language into action in the ACD Manual. We do need to waive our rules, as rules require us to introduce a motion in advance. This item needs to be addressed today, so I would ask for your permission to waive our rules and that we consider this issue in this session. All in favor please say aye, opposed say nay. The motion carried. This in many respects is a housekeeping item; it does allow us to implement and modify the ACD Manual language to allow us to have a rolling appointment option for all faculty members eligible for multiple-year appointments.

"Multiple year appointments are made for a period of two or three academic or fiscal years. The appointments may be fixed-term or rolling. Contracts offered for a one-year period are single-year appointments. Faculty who may receive multiple-year appointments are Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Clinical Faculty, Research Faculty at all ranks, and Professors of Practice. An individual is normally not eligible for a rolling appointment until he or she has been employed at ASU in the same or a similar position for at least three years, either on a single-year or fixed-term appointment…"

A Senator asked a question that was inaudible and Senator Johnson answered that this is being done to allow faculty on multiple-year contracts to have rolling contracts that would provide some additional security.

Senator Johnson: All in favor please indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The motion carried.

President Kerr: Now we have several items that we must vote on. First of all, we have one consent agenda item, but it also appears that we need to have the other CAPC items approved today as well. Senator Mayer will explain these items. Remember, whole departments are counting on us.

(Please see the agenda for this meeting that is posted on the Senate website for the full text of each item.)

4. ADOPTION OF ALL CONSENT ACTION ITEMS

4.A Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Mike Mayer)

Senate Motion #22, is for approval of a graduate certificate in Nurse Education in Academic and Practice Settings. Hearing no questions, all in favor please say aye. Opposed say nay. The ayes have it.

6. NEW BUSINESS

6.A Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Mike Mayer)

Senate Motion #25 to reorganize an academic unit - disestablish the College of Extended Education and establish the School of Extended Education within University College. Is there discussion on that? Can we have a motion to waive the rules to consider this for a second reading today? Motion was made, seconded and carried to suspend the rules. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of Senate Motion #25 please say aye. Opposed say nay. The motion carries.
Senate Motion #26 to disestablish the undergraduate certificate program in Health Physics in the School of Life Sciences. Is there discussion? Can we have a motion to suspend the rules to consider this for a second reading today? Motion as made, second and carried to suspend the rules. Is there further discussion? All in favor of Senate Motion #26 say aye. Opposed say nay. The motion carries.

Senate Motion #27 (2004-2005) (First Reading) to establish a BA in Film with concentrations in (Film and Media Production) and in (Film and Media Studies). We have three guests today to answer questions on this motion: Assistant Dean Gina Stephens, Herberger College of Fine Arts; Linda Essig, Chair, Department of Theatre; and Miguel Valenti, Lincoln Professor, Department of Theatre. Can we have a motion to suspend the rules to consider this for a second reading today? Motion was made, seconded, and carried to suspend the rules. All in favor of Senate Motion #27 signify by saying aye. Opposed say nay. The motion carries.

Thank you and thanks to my guests for being present to answer questions. (Refer to the attachments of the Senate meeting posted on the Senate's web site for the full text of these motions.)

President Kerr: I believe that Senator Johnson has one more resolution to cover. Then we will move to the security issue.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5.A Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

Senate Resolution #24 (2004-2005) (Second Reading): This was introduced at the last Senate meeting and it calls for the University to establish a trust to tax-sheltered sick leave payout at the point of retirement (VEBA). This would be an elective possibility. You could choose if it is to your advantage and you can choose not to do it if you did not see it as being to your benefit. It has significant potential to benefit retirees. Is there discussion on this item? If not, all in favor of resolution #24 please say aye. Opposed say nay. The motion carries. (See the attachments on the Senate's website for the full text of this motion.)

President Kerr: Now we will consider the proposed university policy on misuse of university assets, as well as reference checks and background information. Senator Watson will present these items.

5. B University Affairs Committee (George Watson).

Senate Resolution #23 (2004-2005) (Second Reading): This resolution adds full-time contract faculty (instructors, clinical and research faculty, and professors of practice) to the Academic Assembly. That resolution has been talked about at our last meeting. Are there any questions?

Senator Armbruster: We have had discussion on this in the Math Department--we were not clear on the issue of instructors being able to vote in departments. Our bylaws say that instructors do not vote. How will that change?

Senator Watson: We researched that issue in the University Affairs Committee and there is nothing in the Academic Constitution and Bylaws that would dictate anything--it would neither allow instructors to vote nor not allow them to vote. It is silent on the issue of voting within the department. The departments must decide that issue. However, it could be interpreted that as members of the Academic Assembly that since they can vote on matters before the Assembly, therefore that raises the issue that departments might have to take up the matter and settle it on voting, but it is up to the departments and their bylaws.

Senator Tompkins: If these people are added to the Assembly, then how would they be represented in the Senate?
Senator Watson: First of all, the first step would be that this is a recommendation to the Academic Assembly to change the constitution. This will have to come before a vote of the Academic Assembly in the fall. A separate issue would be, if we have a whole new set of instructors now as members of the Academic Assembly, is there any mechanism by which they can be represented in the Senate. At the moment there is no way for that to be done except by being elected to represent their individual departments. I think an issue that should be taken up next year, I cannot guarantee that it will be, but an issue that should be taken up next year is how do we define membership in the Senate? Should we then in fact add special Senate representation for instructors and others in the Academic Assembly, not simply have our membership determined by the department, or should membership of particularly large departments, for example, like Math, rise considerably, or should they be limited to just two members, or should there be more members? These are obvious issues that need to be addressed but they are not addressed in the motion that is before us. Are there other issues?

Senator Etter: Is there a list of how many people there are in these categories? Does the Committee on Committees have this list?

Senator Watson: The Committee on Committee would certainly have their names on some list for committee service, but the COC does not raise names to be elected as members of the Senate.

Senator Burstein: They do not have to organize as a group to be represented in the Assembly, but they would need to be organized as a group to be represented in the Senate.

Senator Watson: These people would be eligible to be in the Assembly regardless of whether their department granted them voting rights. Are we ready for a vote on this item? All in favor of Senate Resolution #23 please signify by saying aye. All opposed, say nay. The motion carries.

There are two other issues still to consider from the University Affairs Committee.

(Second Reading) Background Check and Records Verification Policy--this is a motion to accept the language that has been forwarded for the ACD Manual by the Office of General Counsel. Cindy Jewett is here to answer additional questions on this item. This was discussed last Senate meeting in some detail. Are there questions or comments?

Senator Dwyer: Some people in my department have asked about how affirmative action will be affected by this?

Cindy Jewett: We were asked if the adoption of this policy would adversely affect the affirmative action policy of the University. This would not mean that the arrest record of applicants would be automatically checked. It does mean that if you have a criminal conviction and do not disclose it in the initial interview, and it later comes to light you may be dismissed, or if you do indicate that you have had a criminal conviction that the interviewing unit would have the right to do a more thorough background check, and also can review how long ago this conviction occurred, and the nature of the conviction before making their decision to hire. Many factors come into play, including the nature of the job, whether it is what is considered a sensitive position where a person would work with children, or be in charge of financial matters. There would be some tough questions.

Senator Timothy: I suppose that would be limited to the U.S. since on international candidates, it is more difficult to get background information, and it could be incorrect. It would be much harder to provide that information in a reasonable amount of time.

Cindy Jewett: The international hires have different laws, etc. I suspect that we will have to recognize equivalencies, such as when this person comes to this country, the background check done for the process of obtaining a visa would have to be sufficient to hire them. We do need to hire experts from outside the U.S. and we do not want to put up too many roadblocks to prevent this from happening.
Senator Vandermeer: Some of my colleagues were wondering about how much of a change this represents, and I was wondering will it be required that all applicants reveal their criminal convictions?

Cindy Jewett: The top finalist in faculty positions might be asked to undergo this process once they have been notified they are finalists.

Senator Duerden: Will all instructors or faculty associates on one-year contracts come under this process? (No.)

Cindy Jewett: It will apply to all faculty, academic professionals, classified staff, service professionals, and administrators at this time (any maybe beyond at some point in time). It will also be up to the hiring committee to use discretion in choosing to do the background check options that we provide.

Senator Watson: Are there other questions. All those in favor of the motion to approve this language for the ACD Manual signify by saying aye. Opposed say nay. (Several noes were duly recorded). The motion passes.

The Misuse of University Assets Policy. That involves a considerable amount of draft language for ACD 123. We have gone over that last month, but is there any discussion or questions on this policy? Hearing none, are you ready to move to a vote? All those in favor of the language for that ACD policy please signify by saying aye. All opposed, say nay. This language is approved.

President Kerr: We now will consider a series of very quick reports before the passing of the gavel and Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman is recognized next.

Return to ANNOUNCEMENTS

3. D USG President's Report (Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman): I did want you to meet our newly elected incoming president of USG, Yasser Alamoodi, who was elected last Thursday. It was a hot election. He is ready to go after that and he can say a few words to you on our behalf.

USG President-Elect Alamoodi: I look forward to working with you all in the fall and sharing our agenda items.

President Kerr: We have a report from Bill Simmons and that has been distributed already.

3.E ASUW Senate President (Bill Simmons).

I will try to answer any questions you may have about the update report on the restructuring, which was approved last Thursday by the work group. It will go to the full Board of Regents on April 28 for what we hope will be a final vote.

President Kerr: Thank you Bill. And now, is there any further business that has to be done before we pass this gavel?

7. PASSING OF THE GAVEL (Barb Kerr).

Susan Mattson and Darby were asked to come up to the front. Barbara Kerr commented that as she passed the gavel to Susan Mattson, she knows that she will be a very able president, and in addition she passes along the friendship of Darby Shaw which has been most precious to her this year as President. I know that you will use both the gavel, the wisdom that Darby will provide about the Senate, and all the goodwill of the Senate as well. Good luck to you and all the best from the faculty.
President-Elect Mattson: Before I do the most important act, which is to adjourn us, I do have some things to say about Barb. Well, here is her gavel that she gets to keep and do with as she will. I thought about what I could say about her and I thought that, well, I could say that I have some pretty big shoes to fill and I thought again that would not be polite, and then I thought I could say there is a big chair to be filled and that seemed even worse, so, I will read what is on the plaque instead:

"In appreciation to Barbara A. Kerr, President of the Academic Assembly and Senate 2004-2005. Thank you for being advocate for faculty, staff and students, inclusive of diverse constituents of the university, and promoter of health and wellness for all colleagues. We know you will continue to integrate physical, mental and spiritual healing within the campus community."

Much clapping followed.

That is the formal stuff and this is the fun stuff. I have a few things so she will not forget us--here are some ASU socks to wear, and also a T-shirt that says Academic Senate on it, President 2004-05 and then finally, so you can forget us, here is an hour massage with the most wonderful therapist at the Scottsdale Health Care Women's Center named Laurie. Now, the most important business-- that I declare us adjourned until August of '05.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to conduct the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.
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