Academic Senate
SUMMARY

Monday, April 9, 2007
3:15 – 5:00 p.m.
SCOB 228


Substitutes: Jit Muthuswamy for Brent Vernon, Liz Simonoff for Ross Meyer, and Bree McEwan for Brian McNamara

1. CALL TO ORDER (Duane Roen).
The meeting was called to order by Senate President Duane Roen at 3:15 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES (Duane Roen)
   A. Senate Summary draft (March 19, 2007) was approved as circulated and they are posted on the Senate Web page; send corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu and copy anne.kopta@asu.edu (http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/Summ031907dr_000.pdf)

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Senate President's Report (Duane Roen)
The Spring Faculty Awards and Reception will be held on April 24th beginning at 3:00 p.m.. Provost Capaldi may say more on that under her announcements. I urge you all to attend.
A Task Force on Repeated Courses and other educational issues has been formed, which we are calling the Task Force on Student Success. It is fully populated, and Fred Corey has agreed to chair it. They will have their first meeting Monday, April 16th.

There is a Task Force on Research Policies that we are forming as a result of the resolution we passed in March, and Avi Wiezel will chair that group. We are still finding members for that one.
President Crow will speak to this body on April 30th at our last meeting. If there are any business items that you would like him to speak specifically about, please let me know and I will forward those requests to him.
Also on April 30th I have invited Head Basketball Coach Herb Sendek to speak to us about academics; he has some excellent ideas about the importance of academics.
Later today we will have a first reading of the resolution from the University Academic Council to establish a single Senate for Arizona State University.
That brings us to the Results of the 2007 Academic Assembly Elections:
First, I want to thank the Tellers who served in this election: Senators Craig Allen, Laura Stewart, Hollie White, and Bob Ismeurt. Also, I want to thank Nancy Arbaugh at the Provost Office for technology support that she and her staff provided that was really remarkable, and we are grateful.
To have a university-wide senate in place and operational by fall of 2008 means that we will need to have elections conducted next spring. To do that, we would need to have a university-wide senate in place no later than January of 2008. We have some work to do there. Now here are the election results:
President-Elect of the Academic Assembly next year will be Phil Vandermeer; Secretary of the Academic Senate will be Judy Grace; for the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (CAFT), there are two new members for three years, Susan Mattson and Rosemary Renaut; for the Academic Professional Grievance
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Committee (APGC), there is one member for three years, and one alternate for one year: the member is Gary Hembree, and the alternate is Christine Kyselka; for the Academic Professional Status Committee (CAPS), there is one member for three years, and one alternate for one year: the member is Maggie Mangini, and the alternate is Charles Kazilek; and for the Governance Grievance Committee (GGC), there are three members for three years: Steve Goldinger, Elizabeth Horan, and Horst Thieme. (applause for all followed.)

That brings us to the Provost’s report.

B. University Provost’s Report (Betty Capaldi)

I am sorry I didn’t get to attend the last Senate meeting; I broke my finger. I wanted to talk a little bit about things we are doing today, and Maria Allison is here to tell us about the Graduate Faculty Model that she and David Young are discussing and want your input on.

First, the Awards Event should be very nice. We had the Regents Professors look at the nominees, and what we are trying to do is recognize some activities that we care about and also to recognize faculty achievement. There are awards for--outstanding book--outstanding things within a discipline—the sciences or social sciences or in humanities--and also public policies and mentoring, etc. The deans will be there, there is a meaningful memento that will be awarded, and it will be catered. Next year, we will welcome input for categories that we might consider adding in this program. You can go to my web page and look at the awards that are given. If you have any suggestions for other awards, please submit them to me, and I will take those into consideration for the next cycle of awards.

I want to talk today about retention, which I have been thinking about and working on, and I really appreciate the formation of the new Student Success Task Force. Thank you. I need help in better understanding what we can do with this university to help retain our students. We have a wide variety of backgrounds in the students of this university, and one thing that has become clear is that we have to do more on bringing our entering freshmen up to speed on what they need--both academically and non-academically--to succeed. We have some issues to address—some students walk out of a class before the professor is finished lecturing, and my point would be why come, and then leave? If that is a good teacher, why upset them by leaving. Also, we have some students that don’t come at all no matter what the professor is like. If you don’t come to class, you will surely not succeed! We have a lot of students that come from families where they are first person to go to college, and then we also have lack of academic preparation sometimes, so we work on doing remedial work in math and other areas, taught by the community colleges, on our campus. We do not want our students to begin by not knowing the math that is needed for the college course we are teaching. We have a math placement test that we were not using--and now we will be using them. Art Blakemore is working on a predictive model that identifies who needs help and in what areas, and then the deans came up with the idea of ASU 101, which is a variant of a number of courses that are already being taught. In it will be material specific to the colleges. Arts and Sciences already has a course like this, and it will now be an ASU 101 course. They will teach half of what they think is important. The other half will be on other aspects important for success in a college environment. Students as freshman need to know that this is different from high school; there are many distractions and you need to have certain study skills--and you need to come to class. We are also going to talk about diversity and, we will talk about integrity, rigor, and then we will talk about some of the aspects we think are unique about ASU—the trans-disciplinary research environment. There are web sites where you can look at the current module that is being developed. So, if you have thoughts on the current model, this is the time to say fundamental things that you think students should learn.

Q- We just learned about this in the CLAS Senate, and we had a number of questions about it. Will students have to pay more to take ASU 101 courses because the state will not increase its funding for credit hours beyond 120?

It will not generate any increased credit hours, because the students still take the same loads, and they still have 120 hours total in their degree program. It is not increased revenue for tuition. CLAS already has a one credit course and this will substitute for that one credit course.

Q- Have you done studies at any institutions where this type of class is being taught that includes entrepreneurship, sustainability research, and related topics as a part of being successful at ASU?

There are many other universities in the country that do this type of course, and it is very common. It depends on what university you are referring to--the course is not about entrepreneurship; the course is about succeeding at ASU, so, the context of all of these courses is that a student needs to meet someone who is
knowledgeable in a small group setting, early on, and this course is for first semester freshmen only. They will learn about what it takes to succeed and what the university is like. That is an example of what we are like—we are fast moving, changing, things develop quickly. There is a whole list of current modules on my website, which is www.asu.edu/asu101 A group of people is working on this, but it is not totally developed; it is being developed. I think it is going to vary by college, and I am trying to get everybody I know who is a senior faculty to volunteer. After all, 5 weeks are online, 5 weeks in person, and 5 hours of your time. It would be great if all of you could get to meet 19 freshmen and find out what freshmen are like to help us write good retention programs, and also so that they can meet some of our faculty.

Q- I would like to know more about the content. Normally you would volunteer to teach a class, but these are required.

I don’t know why it took so long to get this information to the departments because the deans have known about it for quite awhile. Please go to the web page, and I think you all know a lot about ASU, about what it takes to succeed as a student, which is probably the two most important pieces—diversity and integrity are two other pieces. Part of it will be done in prepared modules, and then there is an opportunity to discuss this with someone who is knowledgeable. CLAS prepares half the content, and indeed the college prepares this, and you can do it by departments also. The idea is to get the students into the university understanding what they are getting into, so if you have students who already know they want to be it would still be great if they get to talk to a mentor, for the half that is yours.

Q- How many degrees of freedom will we have when it is an introductory course that is developed ½ by the college and ½ by the university, will it only be our way of teaching someone else’s course?

All of these courses across the country have a certain core, and that is to introduce the student to the university in terms of work habits, integrity, and diversity, and we really wanted that as our part, then the other half is totally at the college and unit discretion. It is like teaching a required introductory psychology course. There are certain things that you would have to teach, and then you have your own way of teaching as your contribution. It is not an issue of academic freedom because it is a required course that has certain content the university wants to have in there, and then you can teach your own way. The purpose of the course is to teach about the university and how to succeed. You have no choice and that is the purpose of the course. Within the topics that will be taught there is incredible flexibility, indeed, if you do not want to use the modules you do not have to use them. We are trying to help with the process because it is rather late notice in terms of presenting these modules, although there are some very high quality things in them, particularly about diversity that is more meaningful, and is something that could be used beyond this course.

Q- Will those courses be pass or fail?

Yes, they will.

Q- Will the teacher be evaluated by the students from these classes? If the evaluation is performed in the last five-week session, this would be more difficult. As volunteers in some departments, this type of duty is viewed as service credit and is not weighted as heavily as teaching.

The answer is, yes, all courses must be evaluated. We will also be attending the courses to see the success. We will have to see how it goes.

Comment: I just want to note that for many of us, student evaluations are especially poor in our own department—numerically—in contrast to the number of credit hours in the course.

Well, I would imagine that one credit is a small amount of your teaching load. I would assume that the majority of your teaching evaluations will be from other courses than this one credit course.

That is what I am asking about—could it be weighted as research?

It should be—we talked about tenure and promotion at the last deans meeting, and every individual is different and every individual should be evaluated in light of their workload. If your primary assignment is teaching and you are teaching a large number of courses, that would be the primary weight of your evaluation.

My question was that in my department research is weighted 35 and teaching is weighted 26.
Why isn’t there service in that mix?
We are told that we cannot afford to count this as service.
I can talk to your dean. It is teaching, and it is a class.

Q- Are the English and Mathematics criteria for the university so low that when students sign up you immediately have to put them in remedial mathematics, in classes being taught by people who are from the community college, on our campus—indicating the students are not meeting the admission standards in English and Mathematics. Maybe they should be taught in the community colleges by community college faculty.
They are meeting our standards and they have the competencies, but they probably did not take enough math in high school when they should have. One comment here was that there was no evaluation to deal with that problem, before they were put into math and English classes. This is not uncommon, regarding your comment on the high schools of America.

Q- Is that a suggestion that we should raise the standards for admission to the university in relation to mathematics?
No, it suggests to me that we would like to see four years of math in the high schools. Right now there are only three years required, and that it be assessed by level of achievement. There is a year gap when they finish the three years of math, and then they have a year with no math and that causes problems in college. I think this is a fundamental issue to Arizona, and we are talking with the community colleges about how we can evaluate that for transfer students, which is another complication because we don’t want to see students unprepared, but if they are not, then we can either send them back or do remedial work here.

Q- I am concerned about what the goals are for ASU 101 courses because I came here wanting to see my students succeed. As a faculty member I always have that goal in mind, to help students learn how to study, how to succeed, and where the learning resources are that they may avail themselves of. I presume that other instructors will do the same. That is one point. My other point is that as a senator in the CLAS I speak for a lot of my colleagues in that college, and there are two concerns that they have one is that ASU 101 is another way to improve the U.S. News and World Report’s rankings of ASU, and--is this linked somehow to the Board of Regents telling President Crow that he will get $150,000 increase if he shows certain improvements. Is ASU 101 linked to that issue?
The deans created this at one of their meetings, and your dean was present at that meeting. President Crow was given his offer in a Board agreement, and it has nothing to do with ASU 101. And those are not all the measures he will be evaluated on. Only three things were noted: retention, graduation rate, and expenditures per student in the article in the papers--the last one does not make sense because we do not control that measure. They do.

Class size is not even being evaluated in our ranking and we have many classes at the university. I am a big on rankings myself, but U.S. News is not my favorite one because they want to sell magazines—and to do so they change the weightings of their rankings every year and change what they evaluate every year; because if everything stayed the same they would not sell magazines.
The short answer to your question is that ASU 101 had nothing to do with Dr. Crow’s offer from the Regents.

Q- Can I make one suggestion? Some of us in CLAS are confused and think that participation in the ASU 101 course is a service ranking, not an instructional rank, which makes no sense to us. If the directive would come from your office saying that this is instructional that would help.
I will do that. I appreciate you telling me. Maria Allison is now going to talk to you about the new graduate faculty model.

Dean Allison: Thank you. One of the things that I think Provost Capaldi noted, in coming to ASU was that even though we talk about being One University in Many Places, we don’t necessarily have the structure in place to facilitate that concept. We are trying to move in that direction, and we in Graduate Studies are trying to facilitate the orchestration of graduate education, particularly at the Ph.D. level and that is what we are talking about right now. We have reviewed many of our peers and looked at the systems that we have in place here, and we have put together in a graduate faculty model that we think will help this process. The link to the PowerPoint I will share is below, and entered into the minutes by request from the floor.
The goal is to develop a graduate education structure that builds on the concept of One University in Many Places and that expands the intellectual capital of all faculty at this university and creates graduate doctoral education which makes us more viable as a university entity. (Please review the PowerPoint presentation, which will help explain the model that Dean Allison talked about to the Senate. Contact Dean Allison directly if you have any further input.)

Q- Will this have any impact on the Promotion and Tenure Process?
Betty Capaldi addressed this point at Dean Allison’s’ request.
What we want for tenure and promotion is for everyone to indicate their contribution to graduate education, whatever they do; if they are on a number of different Ph.D. committees or are supervising Ph.D. candidates in different programs, etc. There seems to be a little too much variety in what is presented in this cycle of P&T, and we will be getting back to people on that—some are under reporting some of their activities, particularly in this area.

Dean Allison: It seems to me that what is important is expanding our capacities and documenting that expansion into the outer workings at the university, in our promotion and tenure cycle.

Q- Will we be establishing new committees?
We will affirm the committees that are already in place I believe and then ask for nominations to affirm a couple of other people that would be good additions. Initially we are going to affirm the inclusiveness of that committee and make sure we are embracing a broader model beyond our own department. Right now, if you look at some of the department criteria for chairing dissertations—in some of them it says you must be a member of a department to chair a committee—things like that need to go away because we want to focus on disciplinary home rather than department home.

Q- I am curious if this will impact qualifying exams, graduate entrance exams for students who have interest in several areas—and where will their home be?
The difference will be in bringing more people to the table on the committees. We are not trying to create multiple department affiliations all across the university for students. We are trying to expand the resource base that they have to choose from.

Q- Can you give some guidance as to how faculty in more specific disciplinary areas can transition into the graduate faculty?
There may be some sub tracks developed within more specific disciplines where the faculty work together regularly and this is a natural evolvement, as it is now. We will be looking to the disciplines to see how we can guide and move this forward, we are not going to try to impose something that is rigid, it is more a resolving model that makes sense for students who are attracted to the disciplinary expertise that we have in graduate programs here.

Q- What is the timeline?
We are hoping to have a committee in place and have materials put together by mid summer and the next review cycle. What I really want to do is get some web sites up and start thinking about ways to orchestrate all these groups of faculty. In the next recruitment cycle, we hope to have it laid out.

Q- How are these overarching areas, like the example from communication, or the example from sustainability, how will those be composed?
Most will be linked to a Ph.D. degree granting units—yours, for example, would be a graduate faculty in graduate affairs, or public administration.

Senate President Roen: We need to request that Myles Lynk give his report on athletics at the April 30th Senate meeting.

I am also reminded that we need a motion to accept the report of the Tellers Committee on Elections.
So moved and seconded; the report was approved by a voice vote without dissent.
Do we have a report from the President-elect? Hearing none, do we have a report from the Student government leaders at this time?

C. Senate President-Elect’s Report (Bill Verdini) No Report. (sighs of relief followed)

D. USG President’s Report (Liz Simonhoff)

Good afternoon, everybody. For those of you who don’t know, we brought Al Gore to campus last Monday. It was a phenomenal event, and we covered important issues. We are now thinking about who we would like to bring to campus next year because it was a successful dialogue this time. About two weeks ago we had an Off-campus Housing Fair, and we were able to sign on about twenty-five vendors to come to campus from all over the Tempe area to help students find housing opportunities for next year. In terms of today, we are continuing our work on the Parents Professorship awards (Samantha Winter)—the applications are due this Friday, and the ceremony that is planned will be on April 25th. We will update you on that. We had a Higher Education Rally last week where about 50-60 students went down to the legislature to rally on behalf of more legislative funding for higher education. It was exciting and we got to talk to our legislators and begin to develop a relationship with them and to let them know that we care about ASU. The Student-Faculty Policy Committee—and you will talk about this later—is introducing one piece of legislation today to extend the drop period by an extra week, which is something that we feel adamantly about and we think it will be better for students. Another thing we have been doing is writing something with Dr. Arredondo that encourages faculty to turn in their textbook orders early. One last thing, we are putting out our hiring packets next week for hiring new staff at USG—we have about 20 staff positions for students in the fall, and we want to get them involved and onboard before next year.

E. GPSA President’s Report (Breanna McEwan)

We are wrapping up at this point, and like you in the Senate are working on transitioning into next year’s programs. At our last GPSA meeting last week, I can report that we funded about 10 different symposiums throughout the year that Graduate students were able to attend. On April 26th is the National Take Your Child to Work Day—GPSA is also sponsoring for graduate students a Take Your Child to Campus Day and the main event will be from 10-Noon that day. We will have different groups there to put on activities for the children to participate in.

TA Awards were wonderful during Graduate Week. For the Teaching Award we had 80 nominees from among the graduate student instructors, and we presented out 22 awards.

Q- Do you have any comment to make on the Graduate Faculty Proposal?

I went through it when we received it, and I thought it was interesting. I just did not see how it will turn out—it seems in the early stages, and I have no particular thoughts to share. The one comment that I did have as I first read it was that the way it is structured now it seems to take so much to enter a particular program and to assembly a committee that is not made up of members of that program.

Senate President Roen next read the two reports received from John Brock.

F. University Academic Council Report (John Brock)

The UAC had a good meeting on March 29 discussing a resolution for formation of a university senate. Kudos to George Watson for doing background work and drafting the resolution. The plan is for this resolution is to be presented to the ASU Tempe/Downtown, Polytechnic, and West academic senates this spring. Further planning for the university senate will be completed by a taskforce working with the UAC to be established ASAP to develop the structure for representation to the university senate. This will be based on ASU’s specific needs with review of faculty governance structure at other universities with more than one campus.

G. ASU at the Polytechnic campus Report (John Brock)
Next week on Friday, April 13, and their Senate will be meeting at 1:30 p.m. At their previous meeting they passed a motion concerning a change of grade policy which we also considered—essentially that all students be treated equally, with the highest grade earned for a repeated course be used in calculating the GPA. We will introduce for first reading of a resolution to confirm the concept of an ASU Academic Senate. We will ask for Senate volunteers to serve on three task forces: Student Success; University Research; and ASU Academic Senate Structure. We will also solicit volunteers to serve on university wide committees, for example the Committee on Committees.

H. ASU at the West campus Report (Gary Anders). No report.

I. ASU at the DTP campus Report (Susan Mattson)
  On April 20, we are having our Faculty Academic Assembly Luncheon, and tomorrow we will be reviewing the results of the questionnaire that we sent out about life at the Downtown Phoenix campus. For those that are currently there and for those that are coming we asked about what are your joys, concerns, and your ideas you have at the end of our first year at this campus? We will be having an election for another president-elect sometime in the next couple of weeks. Those of you who are downtown will receive an electronic ballot.

J. Past Senate President’s Report (Susan Mattson) No report.

Senate President Roen: We are now at the consent agenda items which appear in your agenda. Is there anyone who wishes to have any of the consent agenda items removed? Hearing none, we will accept a motion to approve these items. Motion was made and seconded to approve all items. Senate Motions 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37 were approved by voice vote without dissention.

4. ADOPTION OF ALL CONSENT ACTION ITEMS, INFORMATION ITEMS, AND REPORTS

A. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Barbara Acker)

Senate Motion #31 (2006-2007): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the W.P. Carey School of Business, School of Health Management & Policy, to Establish a Graduate Certificate, Health Sector Management (Attached, p. 4)

Senate Motion #32 (2006-2007): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the Mary Lou Fulton College of Education, Division of Psychology in Education, to Establish a Graduate Certificate, Educational Technology (Attached, p. 5)

Senate Motion #33 (2006-2007): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering, Del E. Webb School of Construction, to Implement a Graduate Degree, Ph.D. in Construction (Attached, p. 6)

Senate Motion #34 (2006-2007): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering, School of Materials, to Transfer the BS Degree in Materials Science & Engineering From the Department of Chemical & Materials Engineering To the School of Materials (Attached, p. 7)

Senate Motion #35 (2006-2007): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the Division of Graduate Studies, to Implement a Graduate Degree, Ph.D. in Biological Design (Attached, p. 8)

Senate Motion #36 (2006-2007): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Nursing and Healthcare Innovation, to Disestablish a Graduate Degree, Doctor of Nursing Science (DNS) (Attached, p. 9)
Senate Motion #37 (2006-2007): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Public Programs, School of Community Resources & Development, To Change the Name of a Graduate Degree, From MS Recreation To MS Recreation and Tourism Studies (memo Attached, p.10)

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - There was no unfinished business.

6. NEW BUSINESS (Reports and new motions - from Senate committees)

A. Executive Committee (Duane Roen).

Senate Resolution #38 (2006-2007): UAC Resolution to form a Unified University Senate and Campus Caucuses (Attached, p.11)

You have in your packets the resolution for the University Academic Council and at this point we will not debate it. If there are any questions about it several of us who have participated in ongoing conversations are present and can answer questions. The purpose of this resolution is simply to move forward with the concept of establishing a single university senate.

Q- I am still confused as to what this university senate would look like. Will it replace this body, or will it be a traveling body. Traveling to downtown regularly might be difficult.

That is one of the things that we will be asking for, assuming that all of our senates pass this resolution--for volunteers from each of the senates to work this summer to develop a plan implementing a one university senate. We have lots of plans that we are looking at, and we are gathering structures from other universities to see what might work. I will mention that almost every day I work on this campus and the Polytechnic campus, and there are some days I end up on all four campuses. The travel is not as bad as what you might think.

Q- As a teacher downtown, who actually drove over here to attend Senate today, I actually think it is very daunting, but I do think there is also the issue of whether a university wide body is appropriate have its meeting here all the time.

I can’t tell you more about that because it is still part of the discussion. We have talked about the importance of having it moved from campus to campus, and we are also talking about how to use technology more effectively.

Past President Mattson: In the tentative plans which are being fleshed out we would not be meeting every month, we would meet as a body once or twice a semester. You would have the campus caucuses or bodies that might meet more frequently to generate agenda items and issues that would then go to the one university senate for discussion. I drive from downtown twice monthly to attend Executive Committee and Senate meetings, at this current time I can identify with your problem. We have tried meeting at the different campuses for UAC with varying success but we were meeting frequently as well. This body would not meet every month.

Q- Would the caucus be as inclusive as this assembly is?

The group that meets this summer will develop a proposal for this but in our UAC discussions so far, we have been talking about the kinds of representation possible. Some people want to make sure that every department on every campus, or every academic unit has representation.

Q- I am having a hard time selling this to my faculty and knowing how to promote these kinds of details that are not worked out yet.

All this resolution does is to give authority to move forward to develop a plan. The plan that would be developed this summer and then voted on sometime next fall.

The second reading of this resolution will be at the April 30th meeting.

B. Committee on Committees (MarciaAnderson and Judy Grace). Nothing further to report. The committee will meet tomorrow afternoon.

C. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Barbara Acker).
Information Items: There were none.

I am announcing for first reading the items listed in your agenda:

Mary Lou Fulton College of Education  
Curriculum and Instruction  
Establishment of a Graduate Certificate  
An Overview of Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD)

Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering  
School of Computers and Informatics  
Certificate Name Change  
From: Certificate in Information Sciences  
To: Certificate in Informatics

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
School of Human Evolution and Social Change  
Implementation Proposal  
Ph.D. in Environmental Social Science

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
School of Social and Family Dynamics  
Implementation Proposal  
Master of Advanced Study in Infant Family Practice

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
School of Social and Family Dynamics  
Implementation Proposal  
Master of Advanced Study in Marriage and Family

Senate President Roen: We will have people present later this month to answer questions about the proposals.

D. Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson) No report.  
The next meeting will be April 25, 1:40-2:40 p.m. in ADMB 365.

E. Student-Faculty Policy Committee (Rojann Alpers).  
The next meeting will be on Tuesday, April 24, 8:00-9:30 a.m. in ADMB 365.

Senate Motion #39 (2006-07) (First Reading): Undergraduate Comprehensive Examination (CLEP) Policy.  
On page 12, Senate Motion #39 is up for first reading and you can see what the background is. It is about the undergraduate comprehensive examinations (CLEP) Policy and we are suggesting that we amend that policy to allow students to test out of courses past the current 100 credit hour restriction and to remove the requirements for these tests to be taken within the first or second semester, while all other policy criteria would be maintained.

Senate Motion #40 (2006-07) (First Reading): Drop/Add Deadline  
On page 13, Senate Motion #40 and this is the drop/add deadline and we are recommending that the drop deadline be altered by one additional week to facilitate better student evaluation of course fit and anticipated workload but to keep the add deadline as it is, so that we do not delay any instruction or disadvantage already fully committed students.
Senate Resolution #41 (2006-07) (First Reading): Excused Absence/Missed Class Policy

On page 14, Senate Motion #41—In this one we are suggesting that we retain the excused absence/missed class policy as it is without any amendment.

Senate Resolution #42) (2006-07) (First Reading): Textbook Cost

On page 15, Senate Motion #42--is to inform faculty about the impact of the textbook orders deadline and that all faculty should be very careful in their selection of books and considering other supplemental materials. For those courses that have multiple sections or large numbers that there can be some room for negotiation with the different book companies, all in an attempt to best represent the issues and benefits to our students. We are looking to making certain that all the changes that we suggest as faculty are essential and significant.

Are there any questions on these items?

Q- On the way over here today, I stopped by the Bookstore just to ask when they needed to have the hold notices for books used in the spring that would also be used in the fall, so students could have the opportunity to sell their books back at higher prices yet this spring. Then I was told the drop dead week was April 30--and that is the date that we take up this motion. I would encourage our colleagues here, and I am a member of the Student-Faculty Policy Committee and we have been talking about this all year long, that if the faculty here would encourage their colleagues where possible to let the Bookstore know before April 30th whether a book being used this semester will be retained for next fall. That will give our students the opportunity to sell those books back at a much higher price than if that information is not available. I encourage everyone to pass on your part of this before the Senate takes up Resolution #42 on April 30th.

Q-Why is it necessary to have a resolution (#41) that doesn’t do anything.

Because we were asked to review the policy and this is our report that we are recommending, that the Excused Absence/Missed Class Policy remain unchanged.

Q-On the CLEP issue, that is fine, but most degrees are about 120 hours. Currently if students have over 100 hours, they cannot test out. Could you clarify what this is about?

I would invite the rest of the committee to help out here. As students move between different degrees, or make different decisions, and if they have already taken over 100 hours, even though they might be able test out, they are not allowed to do so. There is still an enormous amount of departmental discretion implicit in the policy and in the general recommendations. Does the rest of the committee have anything else to add?

This is a language change suggestion, as a friendly amendment, because this was about “when” in their program they could not take the CLEP tests any longer (after 100 hours). The way it reads now, it could be interpreted that they could test out at 100 hours of credit.

Please email me sooner rather than later on your thoughts on this, because I will not be able to attend the April 30th Senate meeting as that is our retirement event, and I have the honor of speaking on behalf of some of our retirees. But since I won’t be here, I would like to take this opportunity to give my thanks to a committee that has been extremely hardworking and very committed, and the people that I would particularly like to highlight are Jerry Kingston, Madelaine Adelman, Ron Roedel, Patricia Arredondo, Bill Verdini, Anne Kopta, Bree McEwan, Samantha Winter, and Darby Shaw for her support of this committee. Applause followed.

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

7. Open Forum.

Senate President Roen: Are there any topics you would like to bring forward?

Q- The School of Justice and Social Inquiry would like to bring up the matter of our concern with changes in staffing policy, in hiring. The two points that we would like to have addressed are: Classified Staff are being pushed to be considered as Service Professionals. That unfortunately only provides annual contracts and provides very little protection from unjust dismissal. Second, there are staff who are being repurposed,
transferred around the campus. Oftentimes these moves are done with little consultation with the unit or the administration themselves. We are really concerned about the tentative appointment for our staff, and the low morale that staff and faculty have because of this new push, and, of course, the kind of performance issues that come out of all this. We think that this will create inefficient staffing for the university. We are very concerned about what has been going on for the last semester or two, and we would like to see this discussed in the personnel committees or other committees where it is appropriate.

Senate President Roen: If members of this body wish to create a motion to the floor, a motion to the Executive Committee, they can be assigned to a committee from there. We will ask to have Matt McElrath from HR to come and talk to us about this at our next opportunity.

Have you talked to the classified staff council? (We have not. We wanted the faculty to also be involved.) Meantime, if you were to send something in writing that we can share with Matt McElrath that would be desirable.

Q – On the Graduate Faculty Model--Does this body approve the concept, or is there anything in writing where the faculty have said that this is what they want to do, voting to create a new class of faculty?

This is not a new class of faculty. It is a way of framing what is already in place. There is a body, the Graduate Council, and that has representation from all colleges and campuses. It is an expansion of that model, which is an active body that deals with graduate policies and procedures, curriculum, and we work with CAPC to make sure all the graduate degrees are in place. It is an ongoing body and the graduate faculty will be too.

Comment: I have been around here for many years, and I can follow up on that topic. Many years ago we established those procedures. Given that you have those already in place, I still don’t see why we need this new class of faculty. We decided at that time not to have a graduate faculty, and we put all the procedures in place that you would have to meet, in order to chair a doctoral dissertation committee. Given the number of times that you have said “all this stuff is already in place” I don’t see the need for a new graduate faculty model.

We have pieces of this in place, and it is working well in some instances but not in others. At the systemic level across the university this is not working uniformly. What we need to do is create a new system that will help make sure that this is working well across the campuses. This could allow us to create something that is very transparent for our students, a process that is transparent for our faculty, and a way of talking about graduate education at a different level than what we are doing now.

I think there is probably no difference for faculty on Tempe or in departments that have graduate degrees. The only two differences that I can see are, if you are located on one of the other campuses, which has no Ph.D. program in your field, you now can participate here in the Ph.D. program at Tempe and that should be a normal thing we think, all the time. We want to create a new interdisciplinary graduate program, and that would be very easy to do with this in place and right now that would be hard to do. I don’t think there will be any new class of graduate faculty created. Maria Allison has always approved people who serve on dissertation committees, and she will still receive recommendations to chair on the graduate faculty.

Comment: In our department we don’t have people at West on our committees. We have people in other departments that serve here. We get them involved. It seems very organic and natural to do this.

Q- Which department will own this degree if faculty from many departments serve on the committee?

The faculty that teach the program and their department will own the degree. This will be an adding on of faculty who have specific expertise in that area. It will be an expanded faculty, a hybrid mixed model, under the umbrella of a Graduate Faculty; specific to your discipline area.

Q - In History there are many specific sub areas--who would decide which graduate students are assigned and how would they be assigned?

They would do the same as they are doing it now. There will be an expanded faculty group and many of those faculty are already engaged in doctoral education. They do not have to apply; they will be part of that graduate faculty. They will be nominated and reviewed as we do now.

Q- By whom?
They will be recommended by the Executive Committee to the Graduate Dean. So it is the History Department?

It is not the History Department; it will be the faculty in the History Ph.D. program. They will make the decision about whether those other faculty in other departments would be appropriate for this. They will make a recommendation to the Division of Graduate Studies office.

Are there any new topics to discuss?

Q: I would like to bring up some history that may be relevant to the ASU 101. Ten years ago ASU created a whole bunch of one unit classes that were supposed to be taught by tenured and tenure track faculty. In creating the ASU 101, was anyone looking back at this to see how and if it worked?

The whole area of retention needs a lot of hard work. Uni 101 mostly identifies with the University college, and University College did look at how this worked, and apparently those courses did not really serve their purpose. We also are planning research on the ASU 101 courses. University College is working on how to get students into their majors as soon as possible, which means there will be fewer exploratory students. Students will still be able to change majors. We have to ask them, though, if you want to change your major, and you are in a college, to go see an advisor in that college who can advise you on what all the other majors are. We are going to have training for advisors to help students transition into new majors. This is all being discussed and that is why the Task Force for Student Success should look at these aspects. Uni 101 is just not serving its purpose.

Q: Would it be wise to do a pilot study of the ASU 101 rather than have everyone do it. From what you are saying to me, that it is instructional and not service—our dean told us that it is service. There is a lack of understanding.

We are actually running many pilots because each college is running it one half what they think is the best way and we will study how that comes out. Your college already has a course like this, and I must object to “coming out of the sky”--we had a deans' discussion of this twice, over a three-month period. This came out of those discussions and it was decided as a way to do this, to try and have each college do part the way they want, have a commentary on it and that is very common at other universities, about university success, Uni 101, and try to do this very well. In essence, we are going to try it and see how it works.

Comment: I have a sense that some departments are stronger on this than others. I think if there are negative comments from different departments and that could be because the dean has not talked to them about this much.

It is a wonderful thing at a university this size, if we could do this right to have students actually meet someone knowledgeable early, in a small group and get the right perspective of what they need to do, because I am surprised how many students do not know what ASU is about, and many do not know what the right behavior to succeed is about.

We are really not very tapped out yet on ideas--there is a lot of different ways that colleges want to do their courses. Business already has a 101, the only change is in the numbering—now it will be ASU 101 and ½ of whatever they did will still be there, and one half will be the university's information. The faculty in Honors are doing this too.

Comment: I was just going to say that it seems that faculty did not have input on this decision.

Some faculty have had that opportunity. I apologize for those who did not receive communication on this.

Comment: We are now told we have to have six volunteers to teach. I have already participated in learning communities, and have taken freshmen and talked to them about standards of success about what they have to do, the resources, etc. and it seems like we have actually accomplished what we set out to do.

The learning communities are very valuable but they seem to be most valuable for better students. I am told this by others working more closely with these programs. I think we will end up with different methods for different types of students, which we really should have been doing all along. As we were discussing, students not prepared require a whole different kind of support than if it is a really good student who just needs to see how ASU works. Right now we really do not have that menu completely set up, and a way to try things out. I know we will learn things as we go along and the deans are committed to doing this.
Comment: Since several people have mentioned courses that seem to accomplish the main objectives we are talking about here, is there a possibility of having those courses essentially applied, not which course, so that students can opt out of this mandatory requirement.

Some are three credit courses; this is only one. We were aiming for comment on this instruction so we make sure that we reach all students. There are a lot of these one credit courses around. We decided it was better to do half the variable and half the content—to make sure every student is touched. Right now every student is not touched.

Comment: In my conversations I have heard a lot of skepticism about whether students will really enjoy this experience.

I have had both reactions from students who say it sounded great, and other students who said until you know the name of the course—how can they decide what to take. Of course the courses do not all yet exist. I find that interesting without knowing much about these courses, this is the feedback from students I get.

Comment: If there are students who already have taken Learning Community courses, why would they have to take ASU 101?

Send me the learning community description and if it is that similar we do not want to undo what has already been done. I am sorry that the information has not been available in some colleges but the deans thought this was very important, and that is why we have been talking a lot about it.

Comment: You may want to talk to Dan Bivona who runs one of the learning communities. I run one of the largest learning communities in the university for the past four years, and we do a lot of things that you are talking about in the ASU 101. That is the strength in a learning community. We introduce students to all the resources that are out there. The first group of learning community students are graduating this year, so, Dan would be an excellent resource for you to touch base with in understanding a lot of things that you plan to do.

As I have said, there is a module on diversity, and we have some on integrity issues, and we are open to suggestion on these.

There were not further topics to discuss.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.
Senate Motion # 31 (2006–07)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Barbara Acker, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: March 19, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 9, 2007 - APPROVED

Title of Motion: Request from the W. P. Carey School of Business – School of Health Management & Policy for the establishment of a Graduate Certificate in Health Sector Management

1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval

2 of a proposal submitted by the W. P. Carey School of Business – School of Health Management and Policy for the establishment of a Graduate Certificate

3 in Health Sector Management

Rationale:

The Certificate in Health Sector Management was conceived in response to requests for certificate programs from organizations such as St. Joseph’s Hospital and Medical Center, Mayo Clinic, Arizona Department of Health Services, and Maricopa Integrated Health System. The certificate program is designed to introduce participants to the unique organizational structures and metrics of the health industry, with an emphasis on evidence-based management. The program is intended for working professionals with a clinical background who seek to add managerial training to their resume, for working professionals with a managerial background who are contemplating a move to the health sector, and for individuals who are considering a Master of Health Sector Management but want to have a better understanding of the field before applying to the degree program.
Senate Motion # 32 (2006–07)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Barbara Acker, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: March 19, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 9, 2007 - APPROVED

Title of Motion: Request from the Mary Lou Fulton College of Education for the Establishment of a Graduate Certificate in Educational Technology

1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Mary Lou Fulton College of Education for the establishment of a Graduate Certificate in Educational Technology

2

3

Rationale:

The Graduate Certificate is appropriate for ASU students, many of whom will be entering the technology and educational workforce after obtaining their degree. It also provides opportunities for people in the workforce to enhance their skills and broaden their knowledge of educational technology.

The Graduate Certificate in Educational Technology is designed for individuals interested in (a) gaining proficiency in the design, development and evaluation of instructional systems and (b) learning how to utilize various educational technology applications to support learning.
The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering-Del E. Webb School of Construction for a new degree - Ph.D. in Construction

Rationale:

The construction market is changing rapidly as customer demand changes: broader, more comprehensive services, new materials and construction methods, world economic growth with parallel demand for better housing, infrastructure advancement, and better facilities are but a few of the changes occurring. In response to these changes, the industry profile is rapidly moving from predominantly small, locally owned companies to large, publicly traded national and international companies, thereby creating an increased demand for professionals who are well educated and prepared to succeed in the challenging, fast-paced interdisciplinary environment that is the new construction industry.

The creation of a PhD degree program in Construction is designed to capitalize on our current leadership in US construction education programs and the current needs in the industry and in education. The purpose of this proposed program is to prepare research scholars, new faculty, and professionals for positions in industry, universities, and government, as well as facilitate a higher level of investigation and knowledge creation through the professor-PhD student dynamic.
Senate Motion # 34 (2006–07)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Barbara Acker, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: March 19, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 9, 2007 - APPROVED

Title of Motion: Request from the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering, School of Materials to transfer – BS in Materials Science & Engineering from the Department of Chemical & Materials Engineering to the School of Materials

The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering, School of Materials to transfer the BS in Materials Science & Engineering from the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering to the School of Materials.

Rationale:

The Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering requests the transfer of a BS degree in Materials Science and Engineering from the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering to the School of Materials. The current title remains unchanged.
Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Barbara Acker, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: March 19, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 9, 2007 - APPROVED

Title of Motion: Request from the Division of Graduate Studies for a new degree - Ph.D. in Biological Design

1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate
2 approval of a proposal submitted by the Division of Graduate Studies for a new degree –
3 Ph.D. in Biological Design

Rationale:

The mission of this new program will be to train highly qualified students in a biology related discipline at the same time maximizing the training in how to conduct and participate in interdisciplinary science with a strong use-inspired mission. The didactic training will be highly personalized to meet this goal. In order to insure that this added dimension does not unduly extend the term of training, this program will be exceptional in the level of mentoring.
Senate Motion # 36 (2006–07)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Barbara Acker, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: March 19, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 9, 2007 - APPROVED

Title of Motion: Request from the College of Nursing and Healthcare Innovation to disestablish a degree – Doctor of Nursing Science

1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval

2 of a proposal submitted by the College of Nursing and Healthcare Innovation to disestablish

3 a degree – Doctor of Nursing Science

Rationale:

The request for disestablishment of the Doctor of Nursing Science (DNS) degree at the CONHI is concurrent with the request for planning and implementation of the PhD, which will replace the DNS. The current Doctor of Nursing Science (DNS) program at CONHI has been admitting students since Fall of 2005. The current program has a heavy research intensive focus and the courses/requirements currently in place are comparable to other PhD programs in top schools of nursing across the country. The program emphasizes intensive, on-site mentored research by faculty members and socialization to the role of scientist and educator.

The PhD degree is consistent with both the national initiative toward clear delineation of academic/scientist and clinical practice doctorates and the direction of Arizona State University as a New American University. Nationally, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) is strongly encouraging Colleges of Nursing to move to two doctoral programs: one emphasizing advanced clinical practice (DNP), and one emphasizing research and scholarship (PhD). Further, the move to the PhD at this time is consistent with changes in the focus of the College of Nursing & Healthcare Innovation, and ASU as an institution.
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Senate Motion # 37 (2006–07)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Barbara Acker, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: March 19, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 9, 2007 - APPROVED

Title of Motion: Request from the College of Public Programs – School of Community Resources & Development to change the name of a graduate degree – from MS Recreation to MS Recreation and Tourism Studies

The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Public Programs – School of Community Resources and Development, to change the name of a graduate degree From MS Recreation to MS Recreation and Tourism Studies

Rationale:
The faculty believes that it would be strategically advantageous to change the name of the degree to better reflect the curricula, academic expertise, current student interest and professional employment opportunities. An option will be provided to allow current students to stay in the MS Recreation degree or switch to the newer MS Recreation and Tourism Studies degree.
Resolution for a Unified University Senate and Campus Caucuses

Whereas Arizona Revised Statutes 15-1601 guarantees that university faculty “... shall share responsibility for academic and educational activities and matters related to faculty personnel, ... participate in the governance of their respective universities and ... actively participate in the development of university policy;”

Whereas the Arizona Board of Regents states in Section 602-1 of its policy manual that “... the process of faculty participation and consultation in matters of academic policy is a valuable tradition that must be preserved” and obliges the faculty “... to share in the responsibilities and obligations of governance and administration;”

Whereas the ASU Academic Assembly, operating through its representative body, the Academic Senate, is endowed with “... the power ... to propose on all matters of educational policy, faculty grievance, faculty personnel, financial affairs, university support services, and all other matters affecting the faculty and academic professional role in the university ...;”

Whereas Arizona State University has been designated as a single university entity, not a system with separate campuses nor one main campus with branch campuses;

Whereas the campus nonetheless remains a focal point for faculty work and each campus has been endowed with a unique identity in a unique setting operating with distinct campus administrations;

Be it hereby resolved that:

1. A single University Senate be established to represent the ASU Academic Assembly in the duties and responsibilities permitted by state law, the Arizona Board of Regents and the University’s Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Manual;

2. A caucus be established at each campus to represent members of the ASU Academic Assembly in matters concerning the campus and other duties and responsibilities designated by the University Senate.

3. A proposal for the establishment of the Senate and campus caucuses be presented by the University Academic Council in the Fall 2007 semester for deliberation, debate, and approval by the current Senates and the subsequent transmission to the Academic Assembly for approval.
Senate Motion # 39 (2006–07)

Motion Introduced by: Student Faculty Policy Committee
Rojann Alpers, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: April 9, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 30, 2007

Title of Motion: Undergraduate Comprehensive Examination (CLEP) Policy

Background

The Department of Languages and Literatures requested a review of the Undergraduate Comprehensive Examination (CLEP) Policy.

The faculty and university administration support the removal of unnecessary barriers to learning (artificial timeline and credit/semester hour limitations).

Student-centered learning and responsibility and the provision of appropriate choice and opportunity for students are highly valued by all university constituents.

The Student Faculty Policy Committee therefore recommends Academic Senate approval of the following motion:

[Amend the Undergraduate Comprehensive Examination (CLEP) Policy to allow students to ‘test out’ of courses past the current 100 credit hours restriction; remove the requirements for these tests to be taken within the first or second semester; and maintain all other current policy criteria.—this language will be revised before 4/30/07]

References: None
Senate Motion # 40 (2006–07)

Motion Introduced by: Student Faculty Policy Committee
Rojann Alpers, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: April 9, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 30, 2007

Title of Motion: Drop/Add Deadline

Background:

The current Drop/Add deadline is a 6-day period;

It is difficult for students to thoroughly evaluation their ‘goodness of fit’ with course expectations and anticipated workload, often within one-class meeting in a once-a-week course;

Dropping a class after the current 6-day period is recorded on student transcripts which may be perceived as a negative reflection on their scholastic performance;

The Student Faculty Policy Committee therefore recommends Academic Senate approval of the following motion:

Extend the ‘Drop’ deadline by one-week to better facilitate student evaluation of course fit and anticipated workload;

Keep the current ‘Add’ deadline to avoid delaying instruction or disadvantaging fully committed students.

References: University of California, Los Angeles; University of Colorado, Boulder; University of Connecticut; University of Maryland; University of Oklahoma Senate/Administrative Regulations on Asynchronous Drop/Add Deadlines

Senate Resolution # 41 (2006–07)

Resolution Introduced by: Student Faculty Policy Committee
Rojann Alpers, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: April 9, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 30, 2007

Title of Resolution: Excused Absence/Missed Class Policy

The Student Faculty Policy recommends Academic Senate approval of the following resolution:

Whereas, the Athletic Department has requested a review of the Excused Absence/Missed Class Policy; and

Whereas, the current policy and its appeals process remain appropriate in resolving current and emerging conflicts; and

Whereas, this was a recently developed and thoroughly debated policy;

Therefore be it
RESOLVED, that the current Excused Absence/Missed Class Policy be retained without amendment.

References: None
Senate Resolution # 42 (2006–07)

Resolution Introduced by: Student Faculty Policy Committee
Rojann Alpers, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: April 9, 2007

Date of Second Reading: April 30, 2007

Title of Resolution: Textbook Costs

The Student Faculty Policy Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of the following resolution:

Whereas, The cost of textbooks are rising; and

Whereas, this has caused concern for students, faculty, and university administration; and

Whereas, faculty textbook orders are often late to arrive at the bookstore (only 2% of faculty meet the requested Bookstore deadline which creates less of a market for students to ‘sell back’ text books and often results in reducing/limiting opportunities for students to purchase used text book); therefore be it

RESOLVED, that faculty be informed of the impact late textbook orders have on students; and
be it further

RESOLVED, that faculty carefully select a minimal number of essential books and consider supplementing textbooks with other information resources (on-line articles, etc.); and be it further

RESOLVED, that for courses with larger numbers of students, or for courses with multiple sections, faculty consider negotiating with booksellers for reduced costs or value-added amenities; and be it further

RESOLVED, that faculty carefully, consider the significance of change when selecting a ‘new edition’ of an existing textbook.


Relevant Policy: None