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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 September 19, 2005 was distributed electronically and is posted on the Senate Web page at: [http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/SUMM091905_004.pdf](http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/SUMM091905_004.pdf)*

A motion was made and seconded to approve the September 19, 2005 Senate Summary as distributed. The minutes were approved by a voice vote of those present. Any corrections should be directed to Anne.kopta@asu.edu and darby.shaw@asu.edu A correction was received from Jeremy Rowe and updated on the web copy following the meeting.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Senate President's Report (Susan Mattson).
I will yield my report today to Adrian Sannier, who is the ASU University Technology Officer (Office of the Senior Vice President and University Planner).

**University IT Planning** (Adrian Sannier).

I appreciate the opportunity to talk to the Senate today. The purpose of my conversation with you will be to give you an idea of the planning activity that we are going through, and what my role is in facilitating it. I am in a new position in the President's office as the University Technology Officer. The purpose of that position is to help develop a strategic plan for the use of technology at Arizona State University over the next five years. As many of you may know, our information technology systems have been reviewed externally, and those reviewers have found generally two things. The first is that things run pretty well around here. The second is that if we have a failing it is in not spending enough time and energy planning for the future, in terms of integrating new technology--in that we are a bit behind. So, in order to try and rectify that situation, President Crow asked me to join in.

I come to ASU from Iowa State University. I held a chair in interdisciplinary engineering, taught computer graphics and did research in the Virtual Reality Applications Center, doing 3-D visualization -- the kinds of things that are being done in the Decision Theatre here. My first contact with ASU came when President Crow asked me to visit to learn more from Jeremy Rowe, Anshuman Razdan, and others involved in developing the ASU Decision Theatre. From that contact I caught the passion for President Crow's New American University vision. Technology has a big role to play in that vision and when I read the document, I was so taken by it that I had to become a part of it.

How do I intend to write a meaningful strategic plan? Well, it would have been natural to either do it myself, or else convene a series of committees, filled with vim and vigor to deliver on their promises, to assist in the preparation of a document. But I was worried about the speed and credibility of those approaches.

I wanted instead a mechanism to generate input, particularly from IT staff, right from the outset. There are some 3,000 staff members and about 1,000 people in the enterprise directly related to information technology. I knew I had to get the input of those people and make them aware of the changes we might be able to effect, or that could take place if we were able to develop a plan that we can implement.

So, I started a Blog and I put the URL for it in my outlook signature. With just that little bit of marketing, within a week I suddenly had to start paying my IT provider double what I paid before just to handle the increase in readership. The power of that Blog is the degree of openness and transparency it provides into an ASU administrative process.

Every day this guy is going to write about what he is doing. He is going to talk about this plan we are putting together, he is going to talk about these issues, he is going to expose what his thoughts are, and he is just going to say what the deal is. So, whatever mistakes are made, whatever missteps get corrected, they will be out there too, which injects a great deal of accountability into the process. There will be plenty of times where I have to say in the end, I have made a huge mistake--I do not know what I was thinking to do this! But in the process, there will be openness about where we are headed.

If you are interested in the Blog, just type adrian.sannier.net into your browser and take a look. Read and comment to your heart’s content.

A lot of people have asked why it does not have an asu.edu at the end of it, to which I will tell you--you set your Blog up within the asu.edu domain and then you let me know when it is ready. As for me, it took one afternoon and about $25 to set it up outside the university. So, one of the messages that the Blog sends is that there is a fast-paced information technology landscape outside our walls that we need to keep pace with. Our students are certainly there, many of our faculty and staff are there. And we need to be there.
But however interesting the Blog might be, it still does not solve the problem of developing a strategic plan. So, adding one gimmick on top of the next, I decided that I would use another technology-based gadget, a WIKI, as the mechanism to generate and propagate the plan.

How many of you here know what a WIKI is? Not so many. Well then, let me expand a little. There is a phenomenon on the Web right now called the Wikipedia (www.wikipedia.org), which was put together by a set of people that decided they wanted to write a web-based encyclopedia. Imagine what odds you would have given them if they had come up to you and said, “Here is what we are going to do—We’re going to make a Web site for this encyclopedia and anybody who comes to it will be able to edit it. So, if you come to an article that you do not agree with, you can just change it--anything from a spelling error to a major omission. You just change it.”

Seems crazy doesn’t it, and yet that is how they made the encyclopedia. How did they keep the lunatics from taking over the asylum--how did they stop people from writing whatever they want – ads and spam, pornography, lies, propaganda?

If you have not done so, go and look at the Wikipedia for yourself. I think it is an amazing phenomenon, and it is only a little over four years old.

In terms of creating a WIKI here at ASU to help develop the strategic technology plan, what we have done is to select eight areas to develop:
1. Asu.edu
2. Administrative Technology @ ASU
3. Academic Technology @ ASU
4. Research Technology @ ASU
5. Capturing and Sharing Knowledge and Information Assets @ ASU
6. The Information Utility @ ASU
7. Organizational Opportunities @ ASU
8. Information Security @ ASU

For each of those areas we are developing four documents: a SWOT analysis, a Current Assessment, a Strategic Plan, and a Tactical Plan.

At this point there are some 250 named users and about 130 pages of content within the WIKI. It is still in its very early stages. Much of the contents still appear chaotic and disorganized, by no means comprehensive. But over time, as the moderation team brings more structure to the sections, you will see it settle out nicely, I predict.

At the moment, most of the focus is on developing outlines for the current assessment and strategic vision documents for each section. As the outlines come together, volunteers and invited authors will begin to write the articles that fill the outline in and help highlight the ideas we hold in common as well as the decisions we have to make.

What do we mean when we talk about strategy and vision? To give you an example, let me take one up that is near and dear to my heart, Academic Technology? When we talk about “Academic Technology” what do we mean? I think we are talking about all of the expanded ways technology can be used to present material and interact with students. For example, the two projection screens we are using here at the Senate Meeting are an example of academic technology -- technology deployed in a classroom to make teaching more effective. You can think about Blackboard system and the way it can be used to deliver course material online as an example of academic technology.
So what is our strategy at this time for Academic Technology? If you stand outside of Coor Hall, you can see a central piece of that strategy. We put a lot of machines in common locations to deploy technological resources to students en masse. Those common computing sites, those labs, are clearly a big chunk of academic technology. Likewise those few specialized classrooms with computers deployed in the tables, those are examples of academic technology. To summarize that as an element of the current strategy, you would have to say that ASU’s technology strategy has been to deploy centralized, common computing resources to provide students with access to online materials and technology tools. In the classroom, the strategy has been to deploy technology in highly specialized ways in a relatively few locations.

One of the questions I have been asking is, “Is our ongoing strategy going to be to continue doing that?” And I would argue in the negative. One of the things that I have put forward as a straw man for an alternative vision is something I have called “ASU 1:1”. ASU 1:1 would change our technology deployment away from providing common computing infrastructure and specialized “computing classrooms” toward providing support for a student body equipped with mobile, personal computing devices, accessing the Internet and the ASU scholastic network via ubiquitous wireless.

I submit that the one-to-one approach is going to happen whether we do anything about it or not. It is already happening. Every month thousands of students turn to us to help them use their mobile devices to assist them in their education and we have to turn them away because our support resources are aimed squarely at the common computing infrastructure instead.

The question is not if the University will go 1:1. It is already hurtling there. The question is at what point we will accept that it is happening, and learn how to explore that in the service of the academic enterprise. If we embrace 1:1, then a whole host of other strategic questions emerge that, as we provide answers to them, help us develop our strategic plan for going forward.

So ASU 1:1 is one example of a strategy that might come out of this planning process. I think you will see some momentum building around one-to-one computing in the next several months. For example, we are currently exploring the possibility of the downtown campus as the first one-to-one computing campus; in a program we call Downtown 1:1. I am currently working with the Provost Harrison, the Downtown Deans, the University Architect, and the Central IT group to explore what we need to do to go 1:1 Downtown.

You may also have noticed if you take an interest in the administrative side of computing, that an overhaul of the student information system -- which has been the subject of a lot of inquiry and frustration over the last several years --- is now underway. So a strategy is emerging in the administrative arena as a result of this activity.

Now despite this early progress, one of the things that I encounter, particularly among the university staff, in regard to the whole process is: “Hey, this is a nice little game you are playing, and it’s great that you’re going to produce some kind of document at the end, but you must understand that we are busy people! While manifestos and whatnot hold some attraction, actual work holds far more attraction for us, so, please don't ask us to contribute too much to this manifesto.”

And this is a position I have some sympathy with, because I am an action-oriented person myself. Like you, I have seen too many plans that either say very little, or say a whole lot that no one has any intention of ever carrying out.

I want you to know that President Crow has turned his attention to the question of how technology should serve this enterprise -- administratively, academically, in the research enterprise, and in all the various other aspects of the university. And he has asked me to put a comprehensive, implementable plan together. I think he expects that one of two outcomes will happen. Either:
a) I will fail to put this plan together, in which case he can feel free to fire me
or
b) I will succeed in drawing together a plan that has sufficient support to be implemented.

Then the great thing about President Crow is -- he will implement the plan. I am looking forward to the second phase of the program and I want to invite your participation today.

For those of you who would like to contribute, but fear the technological barriers to working within the WIKI might be too high, we have a solution for you. I have added two email addresses to allow you to submit content to the WIKI without learning how to work it. Simply mail articles and ideas to UTOWIKI@asu.edu and you can put in any content that you want. You also can send things to ASKUTO@asu.edu, any comment, any query, any criticism that you would like. You can also reach me directly on my Blog site (adrian.sannier.net), which is a pretty straightforward thing to do. You just go to that Web page and click on a place where it says comment and type away.

These are some of the vehicles that we are using to try and draw together the thoughts of the university in terms of an open planning process. I invite you all to join in that process, or comment on that process, or ask me to come and talk in depth to any faculty body that you would like.

In closing, let me address the deadline for all of this activity. Well, it has already taken off much faster than I think anyone expected, so it is a little difficult to say what our target is. At the moment, I would say our goal is to have a draft version of at least a high-level picture of this plan by the end of the calendar year, as a basis to use in soliciting serious commentary from the rest of the university about which things stand up and which things do not.

Thanks very much for your time.

President Mattson: Marjorie Zatz is standing in for Provost Glick today.


We are now well into the fall semester, and already it is very evident that there is substantial progress being made in many realms, including enrollment growth, steps that are being taken to increase retention and graduation rates, increases in research and sponsored projects, strategic hires, the conceptualization of new schools, and faculty diversity. We are ready to approve another set of five Southwest Borderlands Initiative recruitment proposals, and those new hires will also contribute to our faculty diversity efforts. So on all of these fronts, it is very clear that the faculty are accomplishing a huge amount, and we want to thank you for that.

We have a number of items that we will be bringing to your attention soon. Those include the academic professionals' policy on personnel actions (ACD 507) that we will be talking about today and next month. We also will be coming to you with revisions on ACD language for full-time contract faculty. You approved rolling contracts for full-time contract faculty last spring, and those policies are now being clarified so that the language will be consistent with the new academic professionals’ policy. Those will be coming forward, probably next month. We are developing a new "principal lecturer" position, and also personnel policies for postdoctoral scholars. So, there is a lot going on and many of you, as well as other people across the university, are engaged in these endeavors. We really appreciate that. Thank you.


President Mattson: In the absence of the student organization presidents, the past president and the presidents from Polytechnic and West campuses, we will move to the next item of business, which is the
consent agenda. First, there is an information item about the W.P. Carey School of Business, establishment of a graduate concentration, a Ph.D in Agribusiness. There are also five CAPC motions for second readings and a vote: Senate Motions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, which are posted on the Senate Web page. They are in the record as they appeared in the agenda below:

4. Consent Agenda Items

All consent items will be dealt with by a single motion, unless any one is removed for further discussion under unfinished business. Does anyone wish to remove an item from the consent agenda for discussion? Hearing none, I move that we accept the items on the consent agenda. A vote was taken in this favor.

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

Information Item (does not require Senate action)

On September 28, 2005 the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommended approval of the following curriculum proposal:

W.P. Carey School of Business
Establishment of a graduate concentration (Ph.D)
Agribusiness

Actions Items

Senate Motion #2 (2005-2006) (Second 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.

Senate Motion #3 (2005-2006) (Second 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.

**Senate Motion #4 (2005-2006) (Second 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.

**Senate Motion #5 (2005-2006) (Second 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.

**Senate Motion #6 (2005-2006) (Second 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.

**President Mattson:** To those of our guests who may have attended to answer questions on any of these motions on the Consent Agenda, we thank you for coming, and senators may email them directly if you have further questions.

We will move to unfinished business next.

5. **Unfinished Business**

5. A **Personnel Committee** (Doug Johnson).
One of the high points of the last two or three meetings is that on the Promotion and Tenure proposal--I think we have gotten the message to revise and resubmit--and that is exactly what the committee proposes to do. We will try to reappear this time at the next meeting with a new version that perhaps will find a better consensus. This is such an important issue that the committee felt that although we had a slight majority vote we did not have a strong consensus.

**President Mattson:** Thank you. Basically the committee is going to meet again and they are withdrawing the motion that has been on the floor for a couple of months. It may not be at the November meeting but the committee is meeting tomorrow morning to get our ideas in a coherent format; there are a few venues that we need to run it by as well as the faculty. It may be ready by November 14 but if not, it will be in the December meeting.

**Senator Alpers:** I would like to make a comment on this. My question is why we are continuing to look at developing a promotion and tenure process when it became clear at the last meeting that the faculty do not own the promotion and tenure process; we have no authority in fact in the final decision-making. So, it seemed to me as I was thinking about this that if what these different processes are supposed to do is to provide context for the president to make his unilateral decision that we already have that process in place in each of the colleges. So, why do we need an intermediary process, when there is nothing binding or that has any authority to it? That is my question, why do we continue to look for a process that has no teeth in it?

**Vice Provost Zatz:** I think it is important to recognize that while the final authority does rest with the President of the University, the faculty recommendations are very important. I feel they are weighed heavily and considered, so, yes they still should be tracked in discussions at each level.

**Senator Johnson:** Just one quick comment. I still believe that there is a possibility of constructing a mechanism in which there would be some credibility in faculty recommendations. It is a joint process that we must establish in a way that is credible from both perspectives.

**President Mattson:** It does not give a direct answer, a yes, or a no, but it is still seen as a valuable piece of the process from the faculty governance standpoint as much as for outcomes.

**Senator Rez:** Just to add to what has already been said, when a department recommends someone, a college goes along with that recommendation, and then a university committee backs up that recommendation, but the President denies the promotion or tenure that puts the agrieved person in a very strong position when it comes to an inevitable round of litigation.

**President Mattson:** Well, thank you, and that is true. If the recommendations are based particularly on the unit's criteria all along, it is more input into the recommendations in the respect that they are coming from the faculties at all levels.

6. New Business

A. **Executive Committee** (Susan Mattson). No further business to report.

B. **Committee on Committees** (Pauline Komnenich).

The date of our next meeting is Tuesday, October 25 at 3:00 p.m.

C. **Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee** (Mary Kihl).
Thank you for expediting our CAPC second readings to move forward on the agenda today. Just to let you know that the kind of questions that we have had in the Senate for the last couple of meetings have been primarily to give you more information on those particular proposals. In response to that we now are posting the proposals that come before the Senate up on the Senate Web page for anyone to take a look at before each meeting. If there are any questions that come to mind while you are taking a look, please feel free to email me your questions or comments. The idea was just to be efficient and expeditious in how we are handling things, not to stifle debate. If there are issues when the proposals are posted on the Web site, again, please feel free to send your comments to me and we will duly note those and bring them forward for discussion. Now I will present to you for a first reading, Senate Motions #7:

Senate Motion #7 (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 Community and Public Health Practice.

Rationale:
This graduate certificate will provide students in practice settings an opportunity to enhance public health competencies in working with professions at all levels in order to better meet the health needs of the public.

The goal of this program is to provide post-baccalaureate students with an interdisciplinary educational program in the essentials of community and public health practice in order to prepare nurses and other health professionals to carry out the mission and functions of public health.

Senator Kihl: Evelyn Cesarotti, a representative of the program, is present to answer questions regarding this proposal. It will be appearing on the Web site shortly. Are there any questions, or discussion?

Q- Senator Verdini: Is this proposal in conjunction with the School of Health and Policy at all? Have they commented on it?

Ans: Evelyn Cesarotti: We have one course that we are locked in on. Jeff Wilson of that school wrote a letter of support for this program.

Senator Mossman: I am a junior senator from the School of Life Sciences (Sols)--Anything that has to do with public health I am enthusiastically supportive of. I think it is a great thing. But I have to wonder given the history of this institution, and the problems that we had in the tri-university arrangement with the University of Arizona and Northern Arizona University, and when the College of Public Health proposal that failed is now solely within the realm of the University of Arizona, will we run into any political problems in terms of getting this thing passed through because of ownership--that the University of Arizona might think that they have. Having said that, I am entirely supportive of this motion.

Evelyn Cesarotti: Thank you, but we were part of that tri-university agreement and this is in response to the deficit from that joint program, and it was the UofA College of Health that suggested I do a certificate program. They are no longer going to have the Community Practice concentration. They have done away with that as well doing away with our agreement. So, our courses would only be accepted as electives for their program, because it is no longer a concentration. I was a little concerned because we are still teaching the same courses we taught as the dual degree, but there is no conflict at this point.

Q- Senator Allison: As additional clarification, I wish to indicate that certificates do not go beyond ASU for approval, so that will not be going to ABOR for approval.
Discussion:

President Mattson: I thought that this was one of the purposes for this certificate--for rural public health nurses to increase their educational standing, improve their knowledge base, because of its online status. It will be a real help to nurses out in rural areas in Arizona.

Evelyn Cesarotti: This is true, and all of these courses are requirements for the online degree in Nursing, but we also have a number of health professionals with non-nursing degrees and we wanted to continue to have this kind of dual health care. Several people, even with doctorates in other fields, wanted to get into this program if it goes online, but it still fills the essentials of a health practice certificate, which is what these six courses are.

Senator Kihl: I will invite all of you to take a look at the Senate Web site and become more familiar with that program, and we will bring it back for a second reading in November on the consent agenda. Thank you.

D. Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

As many of you know over the last few years, the ACD Manual has been revised, particularly the Section 506 that pertains to full-time tenure track faculty. Currently the revisions are comparable for academic professionals who are under review, and the PC committee now recommends a package of changes, new section ACD 507 that pertains only to academic professionals. The AP council has reviewed the proposed language, the Personnel Committee has reviewed it, and we have worked out a lot of the inconsistencies in language. It is a good document at this point and we recommend it to you for a first reading today. It is a 40-page document and it is posted on the Web site for your review. Are there questions?

Q-Senator Rez: Would you please summarize the essential points of this set of changes?

Ans: Senator Crozier summarized that most of what has been the document in the ACD manual previously is still there (from section 506). The most substantial changes are the sections on multi-year appointments, which are new, rolling contracts, and a section on post-continuing status review for academic professionals, which parallels post-tenure review for faculty. More or less the rest of it is really just tidying things up and making sure everything is consistent. So, there are just those two things.

President Mattson: Several years ago when we redid a lot of the ACD Manual and the final section about faculty having to do with some of the promotion and tenure, hiring, the new categories of faculty that had been established--the academic professionals were all in there as well--because the language was rather different than that used for tenure track faculty as far as talking about tenure and the terms of the probationary appointment, and all the review that went into it. It was agreed that the academic professional language would be pulled out of section 506 and made into a new section 507. A task force of academic professionals has been working on this for several years now getting the document into the form it is in today and that is the language that was essentially in the 506 section. Then the new pieces were added about continuing appointments and rolling contracts. That is the history behind why we have the whole new section of ACD manual 507 that we want you to approve.

Q-Senator Watson: I have a question on another item to ask. Doug, can you give us a status report on a couple of other personnel issues, where we might be with them. One of them involves health care for retirees, and whether or not any movement has occurred there in terms of a buy-in to health care.

Senator Johnson: As you recall from last year, there were two proposals passed by the Senate. The first was to allow people to change retirement programs, either from the optional plan to the ARS plan or from the ARS plan to the optional plan. We met with Paul Ward, the university's General Counsel, and he agreed that this was a worthy cause and that he would seek an outside law firm to request a private letter ruling from the
I.R.S. That process continues. The I.R.S. is perhaps more inscrutable in deliberating on those issues than any of us originally thought. The second proposal was to allow a tax shelter for excess sick leave payout that is currently available through the RASL program. Many faculty and other university employees will retire with significant excess, unused sick leave and currently there is a cash payment available in the first three years of retirement that is treated as ordinary income, and payroll tax is required on it, it is taxable income, and you pay regular state and federal income tax on it as well. So, you net about 60 cents on the dollar in that type of payout. The proposal was to roll that money into a trust that would pay health insurance expenses. In that case there would be no tax consequences. It is a way to leverage those funds. A task force has been meeting on that proposal, and we are in the process of seeking support for a bill in the legislature to enable that to happen. We are working with the Arizona Department of Administration. They are generally supportive of the idea. There are some legal issues that are becoming unique to Arizona that make this more difficult than it was in other states that have been able to implement it. However, we are making some progress on that. It is not happening as fast as I expected, but it is happening.

E. Student-Faculty Policy Committee (Bill Verdini).

We have been meeting primarily on the Myles Lynk survey that was conducted this past summer. We have been meeting and analyzing the data from that survey. The committee believes that we will not be able to draw any statistical conclusions because of how the survey was taken. However, 2,400 people did respond to the survey so we are going over the responses to the open-ended questions, to see what kinds of policy changes or suggestions we may be able to identify.

One interesting result of the survey that I want to share with you--one of the questions asked each of the respondents on the survey--is how much they knew about the Student Code of Conduct? Of the 2,400 people that responded, on the chart I am holding up, it illustrates that the number of people who are not familiar with it at all--is well over 700, and on the right side of the chart are people who knew anything at all about it, a lot less than that! So, one of the things we need to do is think about how to get people more aware of the Student Code of Conduct. The respondents were faculty, students, and staff (anyone who chose to turn the survey in). We will keep you updated as we continue our discussion. Thank you.

F. University Affairs Committee (David Burstein). No report.

7. Adjournment

As there were no further items of business to consider, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
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