Members Present:

Substitutes:
Karen Corral for Bob Keim, Katherine Roberson for Anna Wales, and Scott Yabiku for Jennifer Glick

Guests:
Robert Denhardt, School of Public Affairs, Ellen Fineout-Overholt, Nursing, Megan Jehn, SHMP, Lisa Love, Intercollegiate Athletics, Mark Reiser, SHMP, and Jeremy Rowe, Information Technology

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:20 p.m. by Senate President Susan Mattson.

2. PREVIOUS MINUTES

*The Senate Summary of August 29, 2005 was distributed electronically and is posted on the Senate Web page at: [http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/SUMM082905.pdf](http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/SUMM082905.pdf)*

Motion was made by Senator Burstein and seconded by Senator Gonzalez-Santin to approve the minutes as they were distributed. The minutes were approved by a voice vote, with one nay vote duly noted. Any corrections should be directed to Anne.kopta@asu.edu and darby.shaw@asu.edu

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Senate President’s Report (Susan Mattson).

I would like to reorder the agenda today and introduce Lisa Love, our new Director of Intercollegiate Athletics to speak to you about her goals for ASU Athletics.

B. Director of Athletics (Lisa Love).

We have three standards for the way that athletics will fit into the culture of ASU.

1. Education is the top line item for all our coaches and the social and emotional growth of our student athletes is very important to us. We have even tied this into our evaluations.
2. Playing by the rules to get to where we want to go, and we are resolved to bring no scandal to the university in doing that.
3. Be of a winning caliber and joining the elite top ten Division I schools. (University of Texas, UCLA, and Stanford look out because we intend to crash your party.)

We want to do our best in seeking and cultivating private donors. You know that the entrepreneurial growth and the business community in the Valley of the Sun right now just seem to be limitless. If we can capture what is best about private education with regard to donor relations, that which makes private universities thrive and survive, and if we can capture that to that degree here at this wonderful public university, then we will have a great monster on our hands—in fun and good ways. I am hoping to shed positive light for the school and what you are doing and your efforts as faculty, to help us do this.

As far as the Athletics Department and the student athletes' relationship to the faculty, we are under very strict guidelines imposed on us by the NCAA. So, outside of our own personal commitment there are new guidelines in play, and I am referring to the academic progress report. This not only means that in athletics you have to say that your goal is to graduate your athletes and retain your athletes, but you must do it or else pay the piper. Now you are evaluated annually on performance of your team rosters with regard to eligibility, retention, and graduation, and if you do not reach your marks, they have put teeth into the policy to address that. This means that sports periodically could be docked their athletic scholarships by a certain quota. So, outside of talking the talk, we need to walk the walk because these are punitive sanctions.

Something that the faculty can do to help athletics is to report and post grades in a timely manner so that we know exactly what is going on with certain athletes. We do not want to have to track down the faculty member to see what grade a student has received. We are held to all sorts of deadlines in athletics, we must report certain things in September, October, November, and December. We report all the time and determine eligibilities each semester. Our sisters and brothers in the other conferences report just three times a year, but we are under all sorts of deadlines here.

The other area you can help us with is to be aware of, and maybe be facilitative in helping us with, what we are trying to do with our student athletes' time demands. There are rules about how much time a coach can demand of an athlete's time. There is a reason for that because there are a lot of things asked of student athletes. For instance, you cannot ask for more than twenty hours a week of play time from an athlete; their coaches tell them you can play this many contests during the year, and that is because this is what a "reasonable" student at the university can handle, in being both a student and an athlete. There are all kinds of deadlines on travel, and I share this with you because what we tell our athletes to do, and we feel it is a prime way to guarantee academic success at the institution, is to get to know your professors on the first day of class. We say to them tell your professor that because of time demands and travel demands, you may have to be absent from class and the campus due to training and playing games. Tell them you want to keep up with class work and other projects, but that you are representing the university and investing your time in these extracurricular commitments—I want you to know who I am and what my roll is in representing the university, and my extracurricular commitment to the university. They must manage this extraordinary amount of time being asked of them in athletics. All we ask from a faculty perspective is that you treat an athlete individually, case by case, and not by a general perception that somehow somebody that walks up to you from a team will be treated as just who they are, one student. Sometimes that carries a negative connotation of special treatment, but all we ask is that you treat each student athlete fairly as an individual and let them establish the rapport as we have told them to do. Efficiency in posting grades and that relationship go a long way in trying to help these young people figure it out and how to solve their commitment to being a great high jumper and how to solve their commitment to English at the same time.

I know you have a pressing agenda and I do not know how much longer you want to hear about the scoreboard. I know you need to get to the business at hand today. May we open the floor for a little Q & A at this time?

Q-Do you support adding a twelfth game?
Ans: Yes. I think by and large our ability to play a full Pac10 schedule does not impact too terribly the issue of student athlete welfare and that is what we evaluate most closely with regard to adding one additional game in the football season. The reality of that is in periodic years, depending on the calendar dates the decision on whether or not you were allowed to play a twelfth football game was controlled by that, and now we want to make it a standard practice. The second part of that question would ordinarily be, are you in favor of a championship playoff for football? But since you did not ask that question, I will not answer it.

Q-My understanding is that two or three years ago, of professors who turned in their mid-term grades, there was only one third from Liberal Arts that turned them in on time. The administration of course just recently again requested that we turn them in on time, and that is to help with retention of freshmen I believe. But it would also help if your program could alert coaches to problems that arise by mid-term. I think we should request that the deans enforce that request in each college.

President Mattson: The current standard is that you turn in deficiencies at mid-term. You do not have to report a positive grade. A message in my college goes out about when they are due and reminds our faculty.

Q-How well do they enforce that? That is the problem.

President Mattson: I can only speak for my own unit and we do that. I think that although we do not know about other units, but we can offer to put this into the minutes that the Academic Senate would like the faculty to be reminded of the need to report deficiencies at mid-term, for a number of reasons.

Discussion: This is something that deans should be enforcing and that is not happening. We could request that deans enforce this for recruitment and retention purposes and then that would also help Lisa and her staff in the process.

Q-One of the biggest challenges is the athletic road trips. What distance resources can athletes avail themselves of such as online classes?

Lisa Love: He is asking me about the demand of road trips on student athletes, and the degree that distance learning or hybrid classes are available to student athletes on the road. I can tell you that we have quite a laptop checkout program that facilitates this for our students. While on the road, a lot of our student athletes can be potentially connected to a lot of the classes that way. Our athletic tech people are working diligently on that program so that student athletes are able to travel with a checked-out laptop, if they cannot afford one themselves, and get online and follow what you are teaching in the classroom that they might miss. The distance-learning phenomenon is just exploding, so we are trying to capture that to combat the absence problems.

Thank you very much.

Senate President: We will be hearing from Myles Lynk, the Faculty Athletic Representative in the spring.


I want to start by thanking you all for all your research efforts at the University. In 1995, we had $60 million in research expenditures, in 2004 we had $150 million, and in 2005 we estimate that we will have $180 million in research expenditures. Overwhelmingly those dollars are in competitive grants that you and your colleagues have attracted. Unfortunately, in spite of that extraordinary growth, where we are in the universe of research has remained flat. That puts a lot of additional pressure on us.
The other thing is, a decade ago, our freshman retention was 68% and as some of you know, I stand up every year before the Board of Regents, and proclaim some beautiful number (that has to do with the water in Arizona) and I am very proud of the fact that last year our retention had increased nine points to 77%, and this year we believe it will go to 79%. That is a huge increase and I think we should all take some credit for this.

I also want to thank those of you that helped in settling students from New Orleans here. We have close to one hundred students enrolled now from New Orleans institutions. They have paid tuition there and we will not require them to pay it here. If they paid room and board they will not have to pay it again here. The President of Tulane has asked if they have to pay us back. We are declining to do so. Everything that I have heard from families of students that have come here from the New Orleans area say they are just overwhelmed by the generosity of individuals on this campus. The game against LSU was almost a huge success too, except that we lost. But certainly in terms of reaching out to the people who were hurt by this terrible disaster, the game was a huge success.

One of the more exciting things going on at campus is that an Architecture degree at Tulane is a five-year program. The fifth year is a cohort program in their state where they take on a major design project. We have roughly 40 Tulane Architecture students who are studying with us and five of their faculty. In one week we were able to capture the annex of the Foundation Building to house classes for them. We got a donor to deliver desks and put in wireless infrastructure, and that is space that we also have to rent, so everything was ready when they arrived last Friday, and these forty students are doing a project here with their own faculty and some of our faculty working together, which will be related to how to build sustainable cities, and what to do in terms of rebuilding New Orleans. Should it be rebuilt, and if so, how should it be rebuilt? It is a very exciting important project, and those of you who have some spare time, please wander over there to the annex, and see what is going on. It is one of the ways that we are seeking to reach out to the students, and you should know that faculty in Engineering and elsewhere have offered up office space and lab space to those students. I think this campus has done itself proud.

I have one other item and it is kind of a mia culpa. Last year we agreed with the leadership of the Senate that we ought to defer voting on the P&T revisions until this fall. A group of people worked very hard this summer. They even came over to my office and we came up with several revisions, some of which I liked and some of which I did not like. I do not know whether to ask you for another try at discussing these today or just ask you to understand that we may have to come back with some additional suggestions. Let me share some of my concerns with you.

1) We have gone from having a committee that is all appointed; and now the proposal is for one half elected and one half appointed members, in consultation with the Senate leadership and the deans, etc. It is very important to me that we get this right before we take a final vote and make a recommendation to have these disciplinary committees established. We also need to make the case on balancing them.

2) The second concern I have is that the way these disciplinary committees are set up, each senate will elect one person from each campus on the committees, and soon we will have a second advocate perhaps, which would mean that we would have four elected people and three appointed people. When the Tempe campus has 1400 faculty and the other campuses have 50 to 100 faculty, somehow it does not seem very reflective. What I think people will say is you can make all your appointments, and the provost at Tempe will balance it out. Then we will be doing what people accuse us of doing that, is thinking everything starts and ends at Tempe. So, by this balancing it puts us in a position where we create all the balance to represent better the larger institution. We will be accused, I fear, of being Tempe-centered and in our office we are really trying hard not to be Tempe-centered. Those things give me concern, and I do not know what I am asking you to do about it but I expect this will be rich discussion today, with or without my comments, and I thought it better for me to make them up front. It is also a mia culpa on my part because we have had many conversations in my office about this. It is very important how we create balance for all of the campuses on
these committees and yet also consider the eclectic differences between them, such as size. This is not the last conversation we will have like this and it is my hope that you will have a continuing collegial dialogue today. That ends my report. Thank you.

Senate President: With the permission of the body again, I would like to reorder the agenda to hear the Personnel Committee report so that we will have ample opportunity to discussion the P&T revisions. For the purpose of facilitating the discussion, I would entertain a motion that the Senate resolve into a committee of the whole, so we can adequately discuss the issues. The motion was made by Senator Burstein and seconded by Senator Komnenich. The motion carried by a voice vote.

4. Consent Items

This item was dealt with out of order after unfinished business.

5. Unfinished Business

5. A Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

I would like to give you a background to this document, and then go into a committee of the whole in order to discuss this proposal, and to hear from all sides what possible concerns and comments that they have brought from their unit and college. Then we will rise from the committee of the whole and vote and take amendments.

We have been examining the P&T process over the last couple of years. You will recall from our last meeting in April what we are focusing on is the university level due process. There is a unit review, a college review, and our university has been conducted by a single committee on this campus and it has a representative from each college plus one member of the Academic Senate. Over a recent period of time, we have begun to accumulate campuses and that has complicated our process. The number of cases this university committee is expected to review has increased significantly to the point that perhaps it is not a feasible task to ask them to endure. The proposal that has been circulating last year from the implementation committee attempted to formulate a promotion and tenure process that concluded and focused on a single ad hoc committee for each candidate, the advocate for an individual could attempt to clarify information in the portfolio. Those two issues came to this group in April and were very controversial. There was enough concern with those issues that we decided that the best policy was to back up and work this over again. The work group resolved that issue by removing those two features and substituting area committees, six area committees that attempt to span the broad disciplinary areas on campus. By removing the advocate, the argument was that the department chair is making the case for the individual in documentation that goes forward with the case, and under the new proposal it is also an open portfolio so that they can go back to the unit if anything was ambiguous, unclear, or incomplete. Material can now be updated so that in effect, the role of the advocate is being carried out by the chair in their letter that goes forward with the portfolio. There are certain legal advantages to this decision. The provost raises the issue whether or not there is balance in representation across the campuses and we were a long ways from being one man, one vote. There is perhaps a certain amount of paranoia in the faculty over promotion and tenure, and probably it is greater in the smaller, newer campuses, and to some extent balancing, and having representation from each campus was designed to allay those concerns. We could certainly add additional members to committees, but they get more cumbersome and more costly in faculty hours. Where is the balance in that situation? The issue in terms of ad hoc committees and the issue of balance across campuses are fundamental concerns.

Point of order: Are you advocating for this or describing it?

The issue that I would ask of you is this. The calendars we are looking at locate the fall semester for deliberation and decision on this process. It is your choice, and we can afford to delay the process without
serious consequences at this point. Having said that, are there comments or questions that need to be brought forward?

President Mattson: I would just like to point out that we have received written comments from a couple of people having to do with the titles of the disciplinary committees or names of potential faculty under them as well as the issue of the advocate, and I would just like for the people that submitted them if they are representing their college, to turn them into discussion at this point so that every one can have a chance to speak to them.

Senator Johnson: I believe your question was--are these six broad disciplinary committees descriptive and adequate?

Q-I will start then by saying that I represent the School of Journalism and Mass Communication. There were a couple of concerns, one with the composition of the disciplinary committees. The Cronkite School consists of people who are first of all doing applied research for a particular profession as opposed to being more theoretical in the research that they do. So much so, that it is a combination of creative activities versus certain research that we might think in terms of publication. There are areas that always pose problems in the tenure process and we need to know how to handle these particular things. But when we look at the disciplinary committees we feel like there may not be a place for people who are interdisciplinary, as many of us are. We have a particular professional orientation; then you have a mix of creative activity and research. The proposed solution for that makes us feel a little bit uncertain. We wanted to make our concerns public in this meeting. One possibility that was mentioned was that in the sixth group, which was an effort to catch some people in business and law--called Managerial and Legal Studies, it might be re-titled so that it could include reference to professional programs or professional studies. However, simply re-titling something does not reconstitute how it is constituted. Whether or not that would actually meet the concerns, I do not know, although it could draw more attention to them. Another possibility was to create a seventh committee that would pay attention to that, or maybe one that was specific to interdisciplinary studies. The composition of that could be either unique or strung together from members of the other groups. If a candidate did not know if they should choose between humanities and social sciences, for example, might have a group made up of some members from the humanities committee and some members from the social sciences committee. That was another possibility. As an aside almost in terms of the advocate, there was general favoritism towards having the advocate role--although, some raised the question whether or not it is an appropriate name, maybe the idea of specialist as opposed to advocate might be useful, in the sense that the person who is up for promotion and tenure might be able to name someone, either for the advocate role, or maybe as a specialist role, who would not be there to necessarily advocate but certainly there to answer questions involving the discipline.

Q-What if a person went to their chair or dean and said--I do not know whether I should have a member of my committee from Humanities or the Social Sciences, or they say I do not know if my committee should include someone from engineering? Should there be some provision that allows the members of these committees to be equally on all the committees?

Senator Johnson: By the time we set up these standing committees there would be election from the faculty in each of these areas, so then the Provost would appoint additional members to create balance in terms of gender and specialization. If there were a large number of people coming up with a particular focus, perhaps they could be accommodated by the current appointments from the provost. But what you described is a custom-tailored panel, what has been referred to as an ad hoc committee. The standing committees do not work this way.

Q-I represent the College of Design. I had the pleasure and the honor to serve on the UPTC. I felt this process worked very well. Most of the young faculty in our department did not like having a committee
named Arts and Sciences, and having made that comment about having a large group come forward, what would you do for just one person who needs that scenario--might they be out of luck?

Senator Johnson: It is possible that the Provost's office can be sensitive to that, more competing demands for balance in a different direction.

Q-I represent Languages and Literatures and our faculty have a few of the same questions. When in the timetable will these committees be in place, and will they be formed before candidates have to make their choice as to which committee to go up before.

Senator Johnson: The drafting committee anticipated that the names of the individuals and their backgrounds would be available to the candidate.

Q- What about having these committees named after the colleges, not duplicating the committee at the college level, but mapping them under the main structure of the University Committee.

Discussion: I served on the committee that put this proposal together and I was at all of the meetings. The idea of having broad area committees was specifically not to have it be discipline specific. That was the whole idea, and that way it does not duplicate the work of the unit and college committees. Therefore, the notion that we can somehow craft a committee that would be deemed more sympathetic to your discipline, as we conceived of it originally is the wrong idea. It was not supposed to do that. You were supposed to go before a panel of your colleagues that is more humane, interested in what happens to you, and what happens to the university. We are supposed to look at your case as not just members of your discipline but as members of the university community. The committee structure was not put into place to placate the smaller campuses. It is not supposed to be representative. That was not the idea. The idea is to get the largest group of people we can possibly get together and put them on this committee. It may be the case that a particular campus has no such program X, but, therefore, they would not have anybody on this committee. And the idea is not somehow to make it representative of a committee of all the campuses as they are populated. It is a university level committee and having more Tempe faculty on there would guarantee no one anything. The idea is balance, and we have that because we start out with the presumption that faculty are in charge of promotion and tenure. This is our area, according to state law, this is our stuff. Curriculum and personnel belong to the faculty. If we do not take responsibility for it, then we probably need to be concerned.

Q-I am wondering given that clarification, how different is the structure of the six or seven university committees as opposed to the old one that was also representing our colleges and the university at large? Why did we need six or seven committees? Did we have a workload issue?

Senate President: That was part of it. It certainly spreads the workload because the one committee of 15 would review 100 plus documents every year, and if you have ever served on that committee, you know that every Friday you would be locked away in a room and work on that for the whole spring semester. Now those 100 plus docies will be shared among six groups of people, who might be reviewing twenty or more portfolios, depending on which particular areas are going to be reviewed that year. One reason we set it up this way was it might enable us to retain very well motivated and qualified people to serve on these committees, if the workload was not as demanding and that you could get more people who would be willing to take it on than those that were serving on the present one. That is why I put that chart up, so you could see the role of different committee levels, and at the university level it is for their recommendations to the president and provost. It is not just a procedural check. They look at the outside letters. The purpose of having every campus have one representative on each of the standing committees was to represent the culture of that campus. The advocate’s role was going to be in taking the candidate's case and answering questions about how it fit into the context of the unit or the college on a given campus. We felt that representation from each campus was important because there are different cultures in the units located at Polytechnic, Downtown, and West or Tempe. There is a somewhat different approach to scholarly work at each, and one
is not good or bad, but one that is representative of that culture of that campus, and this was important for us to include in the review process.

Q: How will this differ from the existing committee? You will have 42 members in total on these six to seven proposed committees. The existing UPTC has 15 members. Could they just go to 25 or 30 members and organize their work that way. This would remove the need for a candidate to make the decision of which committee should they try to be heard by. I just offer this as an alternative suggestion.

Senate President: That is part of it. One of the things that goes on in the university committee is that there is a representative from each college on the UPTC; if there is a person from that college going through review, the member of the UPTC from that college currently has to excuse themselves and not participate in the discussion. If you have the broad area committees set up, you at least have someone who has some connection in a way to the candidate's work and can enter into discussions and offer opinions and vote on it.

Senator Johnson: We did discuss having a larger committee and part of the concern there was transparency. If you have one large committee that breaks into six to seven subcommittees, by making it public the subcommittees are perhaps more useful and open.

Q: Why don't we just name them by number, Committees 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7? Why must we name them after disciplinary areas?

Senator Johnson: That is a possibility, of course. This compromise of disciplinary area names is one that we decided to use, to maintain some flavor of near expertise, and we felt that would be an improvement over the current process.

Q: I want to share concerns from the faculty of Geological Sciences. We feel that the proposed creation of the standing committee structure could be problematic for faculty who are working in interdisciplinary fields. There is a strong attitude that people at the unit level would have more knowledge of the work of the candidate in those instances. There was another issue; it was not clear that the person who is asked to advocate with the promotion and tenure package will be able to have it available to them to look at before they make their decision or would they be forced to make their decision without that material to support it.

Senator Johnson: Both are good issues.

Q: Since I am about to be moved to the downtown campus, having each campus have representatives still seems to indicate differing promotion and tenure processes, and I thought that we were going to have a one university process, the same process at different campuses. I feel it is important that we determine whether this new committee structure will in fact have real credence with the President, and the Provost in its decisions.

Senate President: I think it is important to have representatives from the Downtown campus on all the committees, because several of our Tempe units are moving down there--Public Affairs, Cronkite School, Nursing, and Social Work, and we need to have faculty that can speak directly to the context of the campus culture as that review goes forward, and who can respond to questions about that campus.

Doug: The best way to approach this is to have each unit draft and update their bylaws and criteria for P&T as this is what will be used to guide outside letters and these committees in their decision-making.

Q: The College of Technology and Applied Sciences at East has parallel concerns because most of our work is interdisciplinary and professional, and my question is, who will represent this professional as to the last question, about interdisciplinary and professional work? My second question is why throw things away (the advocate role) when we are moving toward this homogeneous structure, and whether it is committees 1-6, or
Arts and Sciences, or Managerial and Legal Studies, it seems that we make the decision based on college information and that we would want a specialist or an advocate there.

Q-I am from the Department of Exercise and Wellness at the Polytechnic campus and in our department there were a lot of concerns about how we would deal with interdisciplinary and professional research. There may be unintended consequences for junior faculty to move away from interdisciplinary research, if the view is that at the very highest level they will be under a disciplinary structure. I just wondered if you had considered that possibility.

Senator Johnson: The question is how thin can we slice certain issues? Yes, we did think about that.

Q-My department supports the idea of having committees, but they want to remove the advocate. The other feedback has been that if these committees do not have credence with the provost or president then we should just send the case files directly to the president for his review.

Senate President: While we may not have Arts and Sciences, and other units located downtown, we will certainly have Public Programs, Social Work, Nursing and eventually Fine Arts and the Cronkite School. I would like to have representation from there when we have faculty members from there going up for tenure. These committees need to understand the context of the case file, and the letters from the chairs and the dean and the committees and the outside letters will probably reflect that culture, and if someone from that campus is present on the committee they can answer questions about that context. That is the philosophy behind why we are proposing members from each campus on these committees.

East Department of Management Technology input included that assurances are needed that justice will be done and appropriate criteria are in place all the way up. This proposal adds an unnecessary and possibly detrimental layer to the P&T process. They do not support the use of an advocate. At our aspirational peer institutions, it is the chair of the department, at the school level who participates, in other words, department chairs do not have as much clout as deans at the university level. We should model our system after our aspirational peers such as Cal Poly and Purdue. There is widespread discontent with the P&T system currently and they see the decisions of the president as being arbitrary. We need specific criteria and guidelines from the president's office to articulate what are the criteria for P&T at the university level. We see a two-tiered system being developed of 1) tenured and 2) untenured professors and what seems to be held most in high esteem is bringing in high dollars.

I am troubled by the elimination of the use of an advocate. I notice in the draft it says that it should not be required but it seems to serve the information needs of the candidate. If a candidate wants to have an advocate, it seems valuable to have that person present for the purposes of explaining intricacies, or ambiguities that the candidate and the candidate's department understand better than anyone else. With more committees, it seems likely they would need the advocate even more to clarify things.

It seems to me there is an inherent bias in the very nature of the committees because some candidates will have one expertise represented more than others, so all problems of the interdisciplinary expertise have come forward, but when you speak about these committees, you also say if criteria standards at your department level are clear enough, then this committee will have the information it needs to decide if you have met the standards of your unit. This is almost talking about these committees as though they have expertise that is like the departmental level, and saying we understand the requirements of this process and are voting on trust these are the correct criteria. The other way we are looking at these committees is that we understand that different departments have different standards; we accept their statement that the standards have been met, so we are making sure that this department is being fair with its candidates. At the university level it needs to be more procedural than expert or substantive. It seems to me that we are trying to do both, and it is a hard dance to do.
Senator Johnson: Unfortunately, we are charged by the Board of Regents to do a substantive review, while our tradition has been to view it as a due process right.

I would object to having an advocate for two reasons. First, if you make the advocate possible, as opposed to required, that puts undue pressure on the people coming up for tenure, especially those who don't have a good relationship with their chair. Second, it does require of the advocate to know more about that person's portfolio than the person does themselves, and I do not think many advocates will agree to do that. I think the idea of having an advocate is a bad idea.

Having a chair or advocate there is one thing, but the units must say what their requirements are, and clearly communicate them in terms of that culture of that department.

On the question of having the advocate or specialist, the theory is that the level of information available will be a wide variety of things, at the university-level committee. Nevertheless, we need to have human beings to communicate with on this file all the way up, and now we need to have real human beings at the university level as well, especially to clarify the specialty, and the candidate's work. A specialist could be someone who is on hand to clarify and span the entire process. We should also restructure the names of these committees to broaden them. The names are too restrictive.

Senator Johnson: It is amazing what happens--Last April we heard what danger ad hoc committees would be, what a danger, and how difficult it would be for us to have an advocate that would go forward! At this time, we have the opportunity to rise out of the committee of the whole and return to our normal agenda, and I will turn over the meeting to the Senate President.

President Mattson: I would like advice from our parliamentarian here.

Parliametnarian Watson: First of all, I heard no objection to having the committee of the whole rise and report to the full group, so we are now back to the agenda and the floor is open to motions. Therefore, I move that we postpone the vote on this to yet one more meeting (postpone until October 24). We had a very good discussion today and what I would like to see next month when we come to this again, that there would be specific amendments to consider, in advance of that meeting. We will invite Milt to attend this meeting and express any concerns about what he would like to see changed as well. We need to have all specific concerns to consider, those that were already addressed today in the form of a written amendment especially. Then we can finally vote. This motion is debatable.

President Mattson: I would like to make an amendment or make a comment on where we spend our time in the next month. I would particularly like to look at the labeling of the committees. I do not know what we could do to accommodate all of the interdisciplinary area or all of the departments that we have been studying. We have already talked a little bit about where some of the professional or applied sciences types of disciplines might fit.

Are you directing us to refer this to the task force that has been working on it over the summer, or to the Personnel Committee that has been working on it? Whoever is working on this would need to wrestle with the issues, particularly the advocate, and if Milt, Marjorie, and the deans would also like to make some specific proposals about the composition of the committee this would be welcome information. I must say at this juncture we will not want to go completely back to the drawing board, and I am hopeful that is not what is being proposed today. We have made some long strides and have received a lot of input from the very beginning in this process, and it was originally proposed that we have outside reviewers join the ad hoc task forces, and now we have cancelled that. Just to remind you on personnel matters, particularly promotion and tenure, it is in the hands of the faculty. This proposal represents peers reviewing peers, and we need to just step up and say we will do the job. If this was not part of the governance structure, then we might as well send the case file to the president as was suggested.
Is there a way to make an amendment that would add teeth to this proposal making the decisions of these committees binding on the president's decision somehow?

No, because the decisions going forward include the recommendations of the committees, and as long as ABOR vests the power of decision making with the president, it is not going to be any more binding than your units official criteria for promotion and tenure, which have been sent forward with your case. It does not guarantee anything, but having clear and updated criteria in place in every unit, and having them well vetted, is as binding as we can be through the committee's decision-making authority.

If amendments are sent to the Personnel Committee for consideration from all areas as they were posed today, and then assembled somehow, we may well end up with conflicting amendments--a hodge podge of issues to vote on.

You raise a legitimate point, and that could be complicated. However, if we could have the Personnel Committee see these amendments in advance this might be helpful in allowing them to assemble this as a committee report, and in a form that we could vote to accept or reject each amendment at the next Senate meeting. It is a problem if these are major substantive changes. There may be conflicting things that we have to put out for a vote, but at least it would have the consistencies and inconsistencies pointed out.

Provost Zatz: I think it might be helpful if the Senate could urge through its members that in their units they endeavor to send us their current updated criteria and bylaws, as we have been doing recently ourselves.

In the College of Design (formerly the College of Architecture and Environmental Design) none of our bylaws contain anything about the requirement of outside funding for extramural research. Our young faculty need to know about this early on. Our faculty may in fact be able to meet our criteria as they have been carefully laid out. However, I continually advise my junior faculty to seek extramural funding because as it has been paraphrased to me, "No idea is a good idea if it does not come with money attached." I think that our college is going to have to put that into our bylaws eventually--so that young faculty will not proceed with the illusion that they will get tenure by doing academic research and publication, etc.

Senate President: I agree with you, but I personally would not like to see dollar amounts in the bylaws because some of us cannot always do that, but I think there needs to be a statement about some types of extramural funding.

Provost Glick: There are a number of people that have received tenure over the last three years without external funding, but it is true that this has now become a higher priority for us, particularly to be known as a national player, and that is how you achieve this by expanding external funding.

Q-Is there a central collection point for these proposed amendments and comments?

Parliamentarian Watson: They should go back to the Personnel Committee or the people that made this proposal.

Senate President: I want to clarify that the motion came from the Personnel Committee with the input of an informal task force that worked on it over the summer. I am referring it back to the Personnel Committee and from there they will invite other members to give input from Milt's Office. I would like to call for the question now, a vote on the proposal to postpone the issue until the next Academic Senate meeting in order to review the proposed amendments to the process.

The vote was by a show of hands (48 in favor and 3 against). The motion was approved by a voice vote.
With the permission of the body, the Senate President rearranged the agenda again, and asked Mary Kihl to present the CAPC items. The committee reports were delayed.

**Back to the normal agenda order.**

**4. CONSENT ACTION ITEM**

**4.A Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Mary Kihl).**

At the last meeting we did have a chance for some discussion on the undergraduate certificate that we will be voting on today.

Senator Kihl read the motion.

**Senate Motion #1 (2005-2006) (Second Reading):** The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Public Programs, School of Public Affairs for the establishment of an undergraduate certificate in Leadership & Ethics.

**Rationale:**
The certificate in Leadership & Ethics is designed to prepare individuals for positions of leadership and responsibility in the university, in their communities, and throughout their careers in business, government, and society. The certificate will explore the relationship between leadership, and the capacity for individuals to assume responsibility for their actions and to act with a sense of ethics and integrity.

I understand that Professor Robert Denhardt is present to answer questions.

Q- Is there a mechanism for adding other classes to this certificate, or substitution of other classes with the approval of an advisor?

Prof. Denhardt: There is no specific mechanism but I assume the proposal could be amended to include that.

Senate President: Because this is coming for a second reading today, and I hear no further questions or debate, will all those in favor please say aye and opposed please say nay. The motion carried by voice vote of those present. I would like to call your attention now to CAPC items under new business that are being given a first reading today. If there are questions we can address some of them now.

**5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** (this item was dealt with earlier on the agenda, prior to Consent Action Items)

**6. NEW BUSINESS** (Reports and Motions from Committees).

**6.A Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Mary Kihl).**

Senator Kihl read the motion into the record:

**Senate Motion #2 (2005-2006) (First Reading):** The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering for the establishment of a school – School of Computing and Informatics
Rationale:
The emphasis on informatics literacy and on building collaborative relationships between computer science and other academic disciplines for research and instruction are key things in preparing the workforce and researchers of the future.

This new school will support the evolution of computing and informatics as discrete disciplines. The School responds to needs for partnership and collaboration between computer and information sciences and a broad range of disciplinary areas at ASU. This integration of computer and information sciences with other academic disciplines, such as geology, ecology, anthropology, public health, urban planning, earth and space sciences and biology will provide an academic structure to foster, nurture, and support these collaborations, differentiate research, and create new knowledge.

Professor Jeremy Rowe was present to answer questions of procedure on the proposal.

Q-How does this relate to the computing unit that we have had on campus?
Ans: It is a reorganization of the Computer Science and Engineering Department into a school.

Q-Is this school going to become the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, some freestanding institution? What is its mission?
Ans: We will have to ask Jeremy Rowe to answer such a question at the next meeting when we vote.

Senator Kihl read the motion into the record.

Senate Motion #3 (2005-2006) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering and the School of Computing and Informatics for the establishment of a Department – Biomedical Informatics

Rationale:
The Department of Biomedical Informatics will reside within the newly organized School of Computing and Informatics. The Department of Biomedical Informatics is the first expression of an informatics-oriented department targeting the biological and medical sciences. The research conducted by the Department and its partners will focus on breakthroughs in basic biological research and improvements in the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, cure, and management of chronic disease, and the maximization of quality of life.

The Department will evolve new kinds of interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary courses that bridge diverse domains and cultures in the biological, medical, and computing sciences.

Senator Kihl: Again, Professor Rowe is here to answer questions.

Q-Is this department going to have ties to the ABC Building, the medical school?
Ans: Yes.

Senator Kihl read this motion into the record.

Senate Motion #4 (2005-2006) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Nursing for the establishment of a graduate certificate in Evidence-Based Practice in Nursing and Healthcare.
Rationale:
The purpose of this graduate certificate program is to prepare nurse clinicians and other healthcare professionals as experts in evidence-based practice (EBP). The expectation of high quality, cost-effective care and the rapid expansion of easily accessible knowledge in a competing healthcare marketplace have driven the need for the daily use of evidence to improve point of service care.

As there are no known academic certificate programs in EBP, the unique online format will facilitate national involvement in this program and interest in Arizona and across the country.

Senator Kihl: Are there questions on that proposal? Hearing none, I will move on. Thank you Professor Fineout-Overholt for coming.

Senator Kihl read this motion into the record.

Senate Motion #5 (2005-2006) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the W.P. Carey School of Business for the establishment of a graduate certificate in Epidemiology and Biostatistics

Rationale:
The certificate in Epidemiology and Biostatistics will provide students the knowledge and tools required to serve as research analysts in the health field. The certificate program will serve as a means of certifying those students who wish to pursue a formal training in epidemiology and biostatistics.

This proposal seeks to establish a structured graduate certificate in Epidemiology and Biostatistics through the School of Health Management and Policy. The goal of this program is to provide a program in epidemiology and biostatistics that gives students a competitive advantage in research applications in the health industry.

Senator Kihl: Professor Mark Reiser is present to answer questions.

Q-How is that related to the W.P. Carey School of Business?
Ans: The School of Health Management and Policy, within the W.P. Carey School of Business.

Q-Will a summary of the proposal for each certificate be provided and posted before the next Academic Senate meeting on the Academic Senate Web page, as we had for the one in Leadership and Ethics?
Ans: Yes, they make them available to us in electronic form for CAPC's review. We can ask Darby to post them.

Senator Kihl read the last motion into the record.

Senate Motion #6 (2005-2006) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering for the establishment of an undergraduate certificate in Technology Entrepreneurship.

Rationale:
This certificate program is designed specifically for engineers. By providing knowledge and skills important to the creation and leadership of entrepreneurial ventures, the certificate program in Technology Entrepreneurship aims to train the founders and leaders of tomorrow’s high-tech ventures.
Courses are approached from the perspective of the student whose primary interest is in technological innovation, whose primary concentration is on engineering, and who has little or no prior business education.

Our guest is not available today to answer your questions. He was teaching a class. Are there issues that we can present and get answers for before the next meeting?

The proposal is desired on this one. Yes, thanks.

Q-Is this request coming from our students? As most everybody knows, any entrepreneurial type student is already out there inventing, manufacturing, and perhaps marketing their own new ideas. The last thing they want is a certificate; they want to do as Bill Gates did and go out and make money.

Senate President: I must remind you that although we can at your request post them on the web in summary form, that these proposals do come out originally from Ruth Jones's office to deans and senators-at-large for each of your colleges, ahead of time right as they are forwarded to the CAPC committee. I would recommend that those of you with questions followup with your senators-at-large and deans as well as us about posting the summary on the web page.

Due to the lateness of the hour, we will delay the rest of our committee reports until the next meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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