Academic Senate Summary  
Monday, April 28, 2003  
Great Hall, College of Law  
3:15 – 5:00 p.m.


Substitutes: Maria Allison for Bianca Bernstein, Misty Calleroz for James Rund, Karen Leong for Lisa Anderson


Guests: Claudia Brown (Director, Center for Asian Studies), Linda Burns (Information Technology), Sarah Duerden (English), Jeanne Dugan, (English), Patty Feldman (CAPS/Academic and Professional Programs), Robert Fensky (Ed Leadership and Policy Studies), Gail Hackett (Provost), Gary Hanson (Ed Leadership and Policy Studies), Barbara Lafford (Languages and Literatures), Marie Osterman (Center for Asian Studies), Nancy Tribbensee (General Counsel)

1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Senate President George Watson at 3:24 p.m.

Senate President Watson: We have a heavy agenda today and we want to get into it. The Provost can be with us until 4:15 p.m. and there are a couple of items of business that we want to make sure that we get to before that time.

2. Approval of the Previous Minutes (March 24, 2003). The minutes summary of the March 24, 2003 Senate meeting were distributed by email and have been posted on the web. Are there corrections or changes to the minutes? Should any occur as you look them over, please send those corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu otherwise they will stand approved as posted.

3. Announcements and Communications.

3.A Senate President’s Report (George Watson).

We simply have too much business to do to get it all done today. I have sent an email to you indicating that the Executive Committee has called for another meeting of the Senate for May 5. The meeting will be held from 3:15 to 5:00 p.m. in the Memorial Union, Pima Room 218 (2nd floor near the stairs). Next we will hear from the Provost of the University.
3.B Provost of the University’s Report (Milton Glick).

Today, I would normally talk about summarizing the year and expressing my appreciation to each of you, but since we are having one additional Senate meeting, I will delay that—then depending on what happens today, I will decide on whether to thank you or not. (Much laughter here).

Budget. As an update on where we are with the budget, we think the infrastructure bill on that would begin in year 2006 to pay for debt service on some research buildings. It has about an 85% chance of passing. The Speaker of the House, Jake Flake from Snowflake, who is a rancher, when there was opposition to it because of the present state of the economy, pointed out that this is a “calving operation” because you never do not have calves because the money is low—because then you don’t have cows the next year! So, building these buildings is really part of the state’s calving operation for its economy.

AZ Biodesign Building. There will be a groundbreaking ceremony Tuesday, April 29 for the first AZ Biodesign Building that is the first new building started on this campus, with the exception of the Coor Classroom Building, which is moving right along—since 1990, and I think that it is the first research building on this campus that is primarily a research building ever built in our history. In addition, at the groundbreaking tomorrow, at 9:30 a.m., we will be announce the appointment of the new director of AZ Biodesign, an extraordinarily accomplished researcher and administrator and you will be excited when you hear his credentials. I hope that many of you can attend tomorrow.

Moving on Up. Bianca Bernstein, Dean of the Graduate School, has been asked to come to NSF to serve for two years as the director of the division of interdisciplinary education. This reflects directly on the extraordinary success that ASU has had in competing for interdisciplinary grants, and I think this is tribute to both her and the institution, and I just announced a few minutes ago in the Graduate College that Maria Allison will serve as interim dean of the Graduate College. I am very grateful to Maria agreeing to do that and I think it is a wonderful appointment.

Computers in the Brick Yard. For those of you who either will not read the newspaper or cannot read the newspaper, we are taking space in the Brick Yard, the rather magnificent now empty structure on Mill Avenue, where we will house the Institute for Computer Science and Information Technology, which will have as its core our Computer Science and Engineering Department, but then also people from the Fine Arts College, from the College of Architecture and Environmental Design and Liberal Arts; people who need to be close to people in the information technology area. We want to establish an information and technology oasis there, in addition, the Dean of Engineering’s offices will be in that building. This is part of stretching the campus.

ABOR Meeting, April 24 and 25 in Tucson. The Board of Regents this month voted to change their policy so that instead of the top half of every high school class being automatically admitted, as of 2006 it will be the top quartile of every graduating class. We also presented our annual report on what I call the Hurwitz measures, but what the Board calls the UCAR (University Consolidated Accountability Report) Measures. The UCAR has 69 different metrics that we are being judged by, but the ones to me that are the most important are our freshmen persistence and our freshmen graduation rate. We have gone up 8 points in freshmen persistence and that is more than any university in the PAC 10, the Big 10 or among our peers, and obviously it is the faculty and staff who have made that happen. But today, we have gone from 69% freshman retention to 77%--the UofA in
that same decade has gone from 78% to 76%. and I think it is a real tribute to the evidence of all of you. At the same time our graduation rate has gone from 46% to 52%. George, I think it would be good if the Senate could see the whole set of UCAR Measures, also the overheads and the slides I used in my report to the Regents. Can you post those and send them to the senators? (Yes.) You should know that the best news is that the Board has also agreed to reduce the number of metrics to a number that I can obsess over. It is hard to obsess over 69 measures. We also passed the first undergraduate program fee in the history of the university. This is a $500 a year fee for upper division business majors--with the strong support of the students. I think this is an issue that both the Board and you are going to want to have a dialog about over the next year, about philosophically what we think about special program fees for undergraduates. I think there is general acceptance that where appropriate, professional fees for graduate professional programs make sense. It is less obvious for undergraduate programs.

**New Titles Created.** Finally, on your agenda today you have a request initiated by the President and myself, to create a couple of new categories of personnel in the ABOR statutes, and then we would want to decide how much latitude they will give us within the ACD Manual on appointing them. Those new categories are: Professors of Practice and Professors of Research, where there will be assistant, associate and full professors. These appointments would be people who are highly accomplished in their field and at some point say, now, I really want to come to the academy but I don’t want to do all the pieces in the academy that would be required of a tenured faculty member to do. We think it would allow us to attract some very accomplished people who could bring much to our enterprise, and do so in a way that would reflect on their accomplishments and yet not distort our metrics. I do hope you will support this request. I think it is a positive thing and I think it allows us to take some things we no do on an Ad Hoc basis, and do them on a more regularized basis and it also allow for recognizing the important contribution of a series of people: Lecturers, Professors of Practice and Professors of Research. I would tell you at the same time, we still see the tenure and tenure track people as the core of the enterprise and we fully intend to add to the numbers of the faculty. For the last decade, while we have increased students we have not increased the number of tenure track faculty because we have used all the money we could have used for that to increase salaries for faculty and staff, which I think was the right thing to do. However, as you will see from our UCAR report that George will send out to you later, it has also stretched our faculty and staff considerably. Now my view is that I would rather pay you more and ask you to do more, than see you drop off even further off market and not ask you to do more. I think it is the right thing to do, but there is a cost and the stretching is felt by each of us and by each of you. At the President’s inaugural, Peter Likins, the President of UofA said that people who deal with fabric, which I don’t but my wife does, have to have a very fine ear because when you stretch the fabric you have to hear it “starting to tear” before it actually tears. The secret is to have that fine ear so that we don’t stretch people to the point where it is counterproductive. So, we have got to increase our numbers of faculty and staff—and among our top priorities for the tuition money this year, assuming that the state does not come back with a budget cut, is salaries for faculty and staff and hiring additional faculty. We are also fighting as hard as we possibly can to overcome what we believe was a technical error on the part of the Governor’s Budget Office—in which they funded enrollment growth for the UofA, funded enrollment growth for NAU and funded enrollment growth for the main campus of ASU, but did not fund the enrollment growth that occurred on East and West. Since those will be our major growth campuses, it is absolutely essential that they remedy that. I would be happy to answer any questions you have on my announcements at this time.
Senator Dan Landers: I see in the newspapers that they are suggesting a 2% budget cut, is that still on the table and how will that be handled—centrally, or will the departments have to pay? What is your thinking on that?

Provost Glick: We are fighting with all the ammunition we can—that 2% budget cutting back—in fact, two things—when the chairs of the House and Senate brought back their new revised budget, the only thing that was different was the university got cut 2%, and lost their enrollment growth. We are using all possible ammunition to stop that. It is still a possibility though, and to the extent any of you have friends in the legislature it is critical that we argue for the enrollment growth at East and West and that we not take a budget cut beyond what we have already taken. I can’t tell you exactly how we would handle any additional cut, Dan, it will not be pretty. I don’t have any easy ways to deal with it at this point.

Senator Hirata: You mentioned in the three new positions that there will be ranks—assistant, associate, and full, because that is not in the proposal that we are looking at. Will you then be proposing that these be added?

Senator Burstein: It is not in the ACD Manual.

Provost Glick: I assumed, but I do not know the answer to that question. To some extent, the Professor of Research having ranks in that doesn’t make a lot of sense, because these are for truly accomplished people who are not accomplished as faculty but are accomplished as creative artists, etc. For Clinical Faculty, I think that Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor make a great deal of sense. That is where I think we will end up.

Senator Komnenich: The Academic Professionals, where will they fall?

Provost Glick: At this point there has been no change in Academic Professionals in policy and we are not proposing any at this time. Obviously, this will be a discussion next year on how we will rewrite language to address these issues.

Senator Booksh: You mentioned that we will have new faculty hires—how much do we intend to grow the faculty?

Provost Glick: How much do we intend to grow the faculty? The answer is, we don’t know because we don’t know our budget yet, but what we have done is to ask Kathy Church to look at what our student faculty ratios are on this for the three campuses, and then we tried to look at where our competition is. We are going to set some five-year goals to bring the student to faculty ratio down but I can’t tell you what it will do in the next year.

Senator Segal: With this new proposal would that play into also teaching professionals, in other words would that be counted in the UCAR measures in the faculty/student ratio?

Provost Glick: Her question was in these ratios, of how many of your classes were taught by ranked faculty, will the Professors of Practice be counted? Probably yes in the ranked faculty one, and no in the tenured and tenure track faculty one. You should know that I find that particular measure inconsistent with the whole concept of the Hurwitz Measures, which was outcomes—graduation rates, student satisfaction, and persistence—so, as we are going to be asked to trim these back, I am going to
push outcomes, outcomes, outcomes. Judge us by what our students learn, judge us by what our students think of us and judge us by student success.

**George Watson:** Without objection I would like to move to unfinished business in order to take up the issues, some of which Milt was referring to under the Personnel Committee--items 5.C.1 and 5.C.2—both of these are second read items today. One was sent back to the Personnel Committee as a tabled item and Personnel Committee met on that resolution, #3, and it comes back to you now. It was tabled until the April meeting so it comes forward automatically. The other item is the one that we were just talking about in terms of the Professor of Practice, etc. Doug Johnson, chair of Personnel Committee will present these items now.

**5.C.1 Senate Resolution #3 (2002-2003)(Second Reading)**

**Senator Johnson:** Thank you George. Mr. Provost and members of the Senate, I ask your consideration for Resolution #3—it is up for a second reading. This issue was discussed at a previous meeting and remanded to the Personnel Committee for further consideration. The Personnel Committee has met with a large number of lecturers, with a group of lecturers at the last Personnel Committee meeting, and with a number of administrators who would be responsible for administering such a policy. The Personnel Committee asks for your approval of a modified version of this resolution and the copy is on the screen above. This version provides for a three-year rolling contract based on meritorious annual reviews of performance. Obtaining some greater security and potential for academic freedom for lecturers was one of the main agreements, one of the main objectives of the task force and the Personnel Committee as well. Many lecturers spoke in favor of a five-year fixed contract. The Personnel Committee after a wide discussion, are advancing the three-year rolling contract concept because many administrators indicate that they would not be likely to award a five-year fixed contract. That was too great of an uncertainty for their budget at this point in time, and that a three-year rolling contract would provide the major gains in security and reduction of uncertainty that we were seeking. The second modification to this proposed resolution is to clarify that the advisory committee that would be established would be predominantly full-time, non-permanent faculty, including representation from each group in the category of full-time, non-tenure accruing faculty— instructors, clinical faculty, etc. but also might include others with relevant expertise. The objective of having an advisory committee is to bring information to bear and to provide informed decisions. We believe that this is perhaps the most significant provision in this resolution for improving the status of lecturers and that this clarification should guide the formation of a function and effective body. Those two recommendations for modification are open for discussion to the floor at this time.

**Senator Comfort:** I don’t mind reading it from an overhead, but does the advisory committee consist of only the non-permanent faculty, or are there permanent faculty included in that?

**Senator Johnson:** There could be others besides non-tenure track faculty who might have expertise that would be informative and helpful to that group. We would make provision for them to be included.

**Senate President Watson:** It doesn’t say one way or the other on the slides—it says it is made up of a representative group of full-time, non-permanent faculty. It really doesn’t say exclusively, but the clear indication is that certainly the majority of that group.
Senator Comfort: The reason I ask is that there was a memo from Provost Glick to Mort Munk, some time ago, which indicated that the committee would be composed of people from both categories.

Senator Johnson: We may have a document version problem here I think. The modification from the Personnel Committee does say “predominantly” non-tenure track. So, if you would allow that additional modification to the language as is projected, and consider this as an amended resolution, that will address your issue.

Are there other concerns? If not, then all in favor of resolution #3, please raise your right hand. All opposed. Abstain. Thank you. The motion carries with one abstention duly noted (Senator Swan).


Senator Johnson: Senate Resolution #4 is up for a second reading. This is the resolution that proposes titles for Professor of Practice, Research Professor and Clinical Professor appointments. This is a proposed change in the Board of Regents policy, the umbrella policy that guides personnel appointments (Chapter 6). The Personnel Committee after reviewing the proposed changes recommends the acceptance of this resolution. We believe that these titles will add value to the university. We have assurances that these appointments will not be made in unreasonable numbers. One modification that we are seeking today would be to reestablish a cap on the total percentage of non-tenure track faculty in relation to full tenure track faculty in this overall guideline. Realizing that we are “recommending” to the Board of Regents and they will do what they decide on this recommendation. We feel that some guideline is appropriate and our Committee discussed 12 to 15% as being the appropriate amount. A little history on that; the current ABOR document includes a 4% cap. For years we have been around 8% in actuality; we do anticipate some increase in the number of non-tenure track faculty that are on our campus, and the 15% total would appear to be a reasonable working constraint that would be sensitive both to the needs of the non-tenure track faculty as well as our tenure track faculty. The 15% of the full-time faculty provides an upper limit that the faculty can live with, and would allow some growth on our full-time, non-tenure track accruing faculty, while not threatening to change the climate or the culture to dilution.

George Watson: I might mention for those of you who are watching the amendments as we go that the committee agreed to 12-15% range, and just before our Senate meeting, it came back from the Provost and the Provost suggested that 15% would probably work better. Doug in the meantime had put in 12% on his version, and after speaking to the Provost, we moved it to the 15% on the overhead.

Senator Johnson: I do support the 15%, I think it is a reasonable level to establish this at. Is there discussion on Resolution #4?

Senator Swan: I have two questions. What is the difference between Professor of Practice and a Clinical Professor?

Senator Johnson: A title. The real answer is that Professor of Practice has a distinguished career that is the basis for their appointment. We are talking about a CEO or someone who has a significant track record but not an academic record for appointment.

Senator Swan: So, let’s just play around with this for a minute—Let’s say you are a faculty associate and you have been working here forever and ever as a non-tenured part-time worker, teaching a zillion
classes and doing a great job. Are you now possibly a Professor of Practice because all you have been doing is teaching?

**Senator Johnson:** My understanding would be that this appointment, as a Professor of Practice, would be based on work done outside the university. If one who has been around campus and has done great things and has great capabilities and wanted to apply for a Clinical Faculty position, I presume they would be considered for that.

**Senator Swan:** On the same note—suppose that I am working for a medical university. I have a title of Clinical Professor there, never to teach, never have done anything but research. Now I am here, do I still sit on promotion and tenure committees, am I still a potential person that can vote on somebody else’s tenure who has to go through teaching, research and service?

**Senator Johnson:** I think that those types of questions rely on the bylaws of the unit that you are dealing with.

**Senator Swan:** My last question on this is, what would it mean—I really don’t understand what it means to the people that currently hold different positions of assistant, associate, full and all the other levels that we have. Could someone articulate what the potential ratification of this would have on all those other positions?

**Senator Johnson:** Professor of Practice and Research Professor are not intended to be a career path or a ladder for advancement. However, as the Provost indicated earlier there may make sense to have three levels of Clinical Professor that would allow for progression.

**Senator Ray:** I wanted clarification on Motion #11—It shows the possibility of lecturers teaching graduate courses and I am a lecturer and am currently not allowed to teach graduate courses. If one lecturer in a university teaches graduate courses, then can any lecturer at the university teach graduate courses?

**Senator Johnson:** The assignment to a class would be made by an administrator in your unit. I would think that would be the point where this decision would be made.

**Senator Segal:** I appreciate the media stuff, but we have not seen this full document, correct?

**Senate President Watson:** It has been posted for four or five weeks now on the Academic Senate Web site.

**Senator Yao:** Where are they—on soft money? (The Research Professors)

**Senator Johnson:** Traditionally Research Professor positions have been largely on soft money. This policy does not speak to that. Perhaps Gail Hackett can address this?

**Vice Provost Hackett:** That would have to be defined. Research Professors are pretty much a soft money position. The others could be on hard money.

**Senator Johnson:** This document does not address the funding.
Senator Komnenich: Is that someone who may be in a physician in clinical practice, a psychologist in clinical practice, who might be given the title of Clinical Professor versus the clinical track option that really has the different ranks in Nursing. I am a little bit confused on that and may have missed something.

Senator Johnson: The track for clinical professors I don’t think is conceptually different than what we have currently. It may be a little broader. Other units that have not traditionally used that title might be interested in appointing faculty that have “clinical skills.”

A Senator: The Clinical Professor here is mainly allowing the multiple year appointments for clinical faculty. This is what I understand this to say.

Senator Swan: Is it potentially possible that you will lose tenure track lines if you pick one of these people in your unit?

Senator Johnson: That is a budget issue that has to be handled at the college.

Senator Comfort: I may have missed it, as I was looking at things before this meeting on the web, trying to pick up all the relevant documents, but I don’t recall seeing that. I am trying to get a grasp of what this really is about. I am familiar with positions of this type elsewhere as I was an associate research professor before coming here, for example, and there are many universities that do have those lines, they have different ranks. People are given tenure in those ranks but if you are on soft money, it is a contract and your employment disappears. How is this related to that, is this really something very different that only a few select people at the highest level could possibly be appointed to—is the door open to different ranks? If it is going to be on soft money, why is there a limitation of the number of people that can be appointed? The scope of this is very unclear to me.

Senator Johnson: The Research Professor—this is a policy that is a recommendation for expanding the Board of Regents policy—we will subsequently clarify as we adopt the ACD Manual language that will provide details. This is an enabling document to allow any of the three universities to adapt their policy. It is intended to be more inclusive, but we are not committing ourselves at this point to anything except that these kind of distinguished appointments might add value to the university.

Senator Comfort: I am very much in favor of that. I think that the University has a deficit in lost opportunities in not having these kinds of positions. As I heard the discussion it sounded like it was rather restrictive—I didn’t see the basis for that, but if you say that this is basically an enabling document, you need to clarify that, and I could be very supportive of this motion on that basis.

Provost Glick: I will do my best. First, it is an enabling document. We will have to figure out what works for us. In a way, by putting the three together it muddies the waters but it was an opportunity. As long as we are going to get the Board to open up the issue of multiple year appointment options, we might as well get it done for three different groups, depending on how you define these groups. We use Clinical Faculty now, particularly in the College of Education and the College of Nursing, for people who would not be by their assignments and by their time distribution likely to get tenure, but those are annual appointments. This was done to give some stability to these people, to recognize that they will be better faculty by having some guarantee of some length of employment. The Research Professor is one we have already and those are largely soft money people but again, on annual appointments. This would allow us to do a multiple year appointment for that category, provided the
soft money was secure or the department was willing to underwrite it. The third is a very new title, Professor of Practice. These appointments are really for people in a very distinguished practice career, whether as an artist, a singer or a CEO of a corporation, who at this point would like to come full-time to the university but do not wish to take on the full spectrum of responsibility that we expect for assistant, associate and professor—to allow us to have those people without being in a position of having to go up or down on tenure but rather to have them on multiple year appointment. In a way, we muddied the water by having all three categories at once, but if we are going to open up this issue of multiple year appointments, it seemed better to do it in one shot instead of three. Does that answer your question Joe?

Senator Comfort: Yes. I think that multiple year appointment is really the key to this because the description the university held when I came in was one year only appointments and there was no exception to that except maybe the football coach.

Provost Glick: Right now, the only people that are on multiple year appointments are the President, the football coach, other coaches, the athletic director and lecturers, but not clinical faculty. Again, I think that we will be back to the Senate to discuss how ASU will use this option. I hope that by laying out those three positions and understanding they are three different kinds of people. Again, if we are going to talk about multiple year enablement, I don’t want to do it three times with the Board of Regents.

Senator Comfort: One question—where it speaks of non-tenure eligible faculty—could that be loosened up?

Provost Glick: I would say they could not in that role become tenure eligible. Someone who did a superb job at the department could not be given tenure in these ranks. Tenure will be for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. Those are already tenured positions and they will remain that way, but that does not mean that someone couldn’t move from one to the other, in the same way that several years ago we collapsed a number of part-time faculty positions into instructor and lecturer positions, and we got better service as a result. We expanded that now with the motion you just passed—to provide more professional development opportunities to that group of people, who play a critical role in delivering education, especially in areas such as English, Mathematics and Languages where we have this large need for good quality faculty at the freshman level. I hope I did not muddy the water too much.

Senator Johnson: Thank you Milt. I believe that there is a question over here.

Senator Booksh: I have a question about the lecturer positions in that I assumed that there are not an even number of lecturers across the university. Assuming that we do reach the 15% cap we are setting, will there then be a waiting list for lecturers to retire? Who will decide which academic units will get new lecturers?

Senator Johnson: The current situation is that we have a 4% cap and an 8% practice, which would suggest that it does rather loosely applied policy.

Provost Glick: Let me add that percent is based on the number of people on multiple year appointment. That is, we can have one over the cap and that person can be appointed but only on an annual appointment. I don’t know the answer to your real question.
Senator Johnson: At some time we hope to deal with that too.

Senator Haynes: The fact that this is enabling legislation makes it a little difficult for my faculty because so much of the details of implementation are critical—frankly, my faculty are very concerned about the Professor of Practice position, such as bringing people in who might not be voted on, without having some sort of significant academic credentials and it is very unclear about how that occurs. Is that something the university decides then delegates this to the department—is the department going to be involved? So, all these questions that come up and given the fact that this a proposal for authority—It makes it hard for us to discuss now. I guess my question is how is it these issues will be resolved, should that authority be granted?

Senator Johnson: My quick answer is that we will have another opportunity to vote before it gets specific.

Provost Glick: We certainly intend to work with the Senate Personnel Committee on the details, but on the bigger answer, we do not plan to put Professors of Practice in a unit unless that unit has approved them. Let us say that up until now we have never appointed a faculty member that I know of at ASU who has not received the support of the department. We do have some people that get appointed in multiple years, and we think that is more and more going to be true, as we become more and more interdisciplinary with our research agenda and our teaching agenda, and we will have to find more creative ways to appoint people.

Senator Johnson: The fact that we as a Senate will have an opportunity to look at the specific operationalized version of this policy and approve it, I think that provides a protection for your concerns.

Senator Stahl: I wish you would add this--that the Professors of Practice “may be” appointed because the definition as you have it there says, will be appointed. It should also allow for one-year appointments.

Senator Johnson: If you would like to make a motion to that effect, we will accept it.

Senator Stahl: So moved.

Senate President Watson: So, you would like to say “may be” appointed.

Senator Mattson: But that is just the definition of the Professor of Practice.

Senator Johnson: I believe that Senator Mattson is correct that this is not governing the appointment procedure but describing the appointment.

Senator Watson: That is correct. It is under the section of Definitions, C.

Senator Johnson: Are there other questions?

Senator Koshinsky: Will the operationalized version of this include a salary grade assigned to it?
Senator Johnson: I don’t think other appointments are identified by salary grades, so, I would not think they would do it in this case either.

Senator Watson: In response to your question, Section B.1 remains in effect in that Board policy chapter, which is—each university president shall establish written procedures to which faculty, etc, shall have opportunity for effective participation...that still remains in effect.

Senator Johnson: So, what we have before you is a request for approval of an enabling document that expands language in the Board of Regents policy manual to accommodate new titles that would add value to the university. One more question over here.

Senator Hirata: Doug, since this is a proposal to the Board of Regents and I assume that it does go to the Board of Regents, we faculty have another opportunity to provide any input through the elected officers that are represented on the Arizona Faculties Council. Am I correct?

Senator Johnson: That is correct, Ernie. This is in the form of a resolution not a motion and we are in effect endorsing this as a strategy move for the Board of Regents. If there are no further questions, we will move to a final vote. Senate Resolution #4 passed by a show of hands: 5 against and the rest for with 2 abstentions duly noted.

Senator Ray: Is Senate Resolution #3 on the web where I can access that?

Senate President Watson: There is a version of it on the web but I don’t know that it is the most recent version. When I get back from the Senate meeting I will make sure that it is there.

Senator Park-Fuller: As a point of order, I realize that others can read this and maybe that some of us can’t, like me, but we voted on one resolution that we passed and didn’t read. We were supposed to have text emailed to us, and there was not indication at this point that we should accept resolution #4 and to go to the web site and read it. It would be great if we just got that when we got the agenda in the future.

Senate President Watson: I apologize, I thought we all had a copy of the three motions that were distributed at the last meeting and then the changes that were made, once it was tabled, I thought were sufficiently insignificant such that we didn’t need to run off new copies, because it consisted of inserting the word “lecturer” at one point and two other phrases at another. With respect to the Chapter 6 of the ABOR manual, that has been up on the web now for awhile, and I don’t know—we did not distribute that because of its length but probably should have. So, we will make sure that those get at least sent to you via email as a hard copy attachment that you can print out. Also, Darby noted that Senate Resolution #3 is in the March 24 minutes summary, on page 3.

I would like to move to item 5.A.1 Senate Motion #8 (2002-2003)(Second Reading) now. We have another specialist here, Nancy Tribbensee is our legal counsel to answer questions on the intellectual property issue. This motion has been distributed at the March meeting with the report from the Ad Hoc Intellectual Property Committee on Online Works. We had a first read on this item at the March 24 meeting and had several questions at that time, which were answered. We had a discussion of those at the last meeting. The motion is to accept the particular report of the Ad Hoc Committee. I would like to ask if anyone has questions on that. Nancy Tribbensee and Betty Craft are here to address your questions.
Are there any further questions? Hearing none, if there are no objections we will move to a vote—Senate Motion #8 (2002-2003) was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

I am going to go back into the regular order of the agenda now. I do like to accommodate when I can for the people that we ask to come to respond to questions.

**Academic Assembly Election Results.** We will ask that the new president-elect attend our final meeting on May 5. The new president-elect is Barbara Kerr, from Psychology in Education and we congratulate Barb. Congratulations to Ruth Yabes, who has been re-elected for another term as Secretary of the Senate. These positions were elected from both the Academic Professional and the Faculty Ballots. On the Faculty Ballot: for the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure: Richard Burg, Chuck Claiborn, Angelita Reyes and Mary Rothschild were elected. The Academic Senate Representative to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee: Pier Baldini was elected. On the Governance Grievance Committee: Barbara Guzzetti, Dan Landers and Sheldon Simon were elected. Congratulations as you are hearing this for the first time if you are in the Senate today. On the Academic Professional ballot: for the Academic Professional Grievance Committee: Steve Hefner, Chuck Kazilek and Brenda Shears were elected. On the Committee on Academic Professional Status (CAPS): Barbara Trapido-Lurie was elected as the new member and alternates Judy Grace and Paul Scowen were elected. Those are the results that were reported to the Executive Committee and ratified April 21, 2003.

**Update on Plus Minus Grades.** I know you wish this would go away, we all do. Yet, in the survey that I ran to get a sense from you about whether or not you would be willing to consider any of these issues further, just about 2/3 of you responded favorably. About half of you responded from the Senate, and 2/3 of that half indicated willingness to consider these couple of issues that remain. This came because the student proposal was for a different system and it was a system that had a full range of A+ down through D-, particularly a concern to students was the A+ of 4.333. The students also met with President Crow to put forward their issue. I have not sent forward our letter on our Senate Resolution #2 to President Crow yet, in part pending the opportunity to come back to you, because I must tell you that President Crow seemed to respond favorably to the students in some respect. He made note that both the faculty and the students were in fact agreeing that the plus minus system would be beneficial. That is the consensus as President Crow sees it. Now, I can still go forward with our resolution as it stands—and say this is what the faculty voted on and this is what the faculty want. So, you can decide how you want me to proceed. If as I anticipate that President Crow might say no to our proposal—he may ask us to work something out, and see if we can come back to him with a different proposal. He is not daunted at all by having a 4.333 for an A+. He feels that would be extra incentive for students at that level perhaps. He is also not particularly concerned by the C-, D+, D-, although much less attention was focused on that because the students paid much less attention to that. My perception, being in part because there was probably no C students represented in the student group. There were probably only A students participating and a few B+ students who rather like the system. Given that 2/3 of you have indicated some willingness to reconsider, what I am willing to accept is a motion as an amendment to our resolution #2, for an A+ grade in our system that would be worth a grade point value of 4.333. That motion would carry over to the May 5 meeting. I think we know the issues, therefore I don’t believe it needs a long discussion. I am also willing to accept a motion to implement a C- grade and that motion could either stop with a C- or go with a C-/D+ or D-. I would prefer to have these as separate motions because I think they are separate issues. I am willing to have us accept that motion today, for once again a vote on May 5. I don’t think we want to vote today.
because I think you need to go back to your faculty and perhaps address those issues. So, that is where I am at. I will end here for a minute to entertain any motions or anyone’s comments before a motion is made. I will consider this as an open forum aspect of our meeting for two minutes.

**Senator Keim:** I move that we add A+ at the grade point average of 4.333 (seconded by Senator Burg).

**Senate President Watson:** That motion is now on the floor. I have indicated that we would treat that as a first reading today--and carry on to a second motion, but if you wish to speak to the motion just briefly knowing that we will not be voting on it? (Senator Keim: Just put it forward)

**Senator Danzig:** So, can we introduce a motion to do away with plus minus grades?

**Senate President Watson:** I will tell you why I didn’t say I would consider that, because that option was not one that was put forward by more than a hand full as far as an option that was favored. It was a motion that was soundly defeated in terms of the adoption of Senate Resolution #2 in the first place. It is conceivable that there would be a majority to carry that, but quite frankly I don’t see that.

**Senator Danzig:** I seems to me that is a little circular. The students came here to the Senate objecting to any plus minus system and now we are justifying opening up an A+ system to accommodate students who came to us asking for no plus minus system. So, if the rationale is to accommodate student requests, then we should consider having no plus minus grades.

**Senate President Watson:** That is not quite right. They came to us proposing a full-blown plus minus system, one that ranged from an A+ to a D-.

**Senator Danzig:** A lot of students also talked against the plus minus system, any plus minus system.

**Senate President Watson:** Ultimately when they organized that is the proposal that they brought forth. I would prefer not to entertain that, but, of course, you may make that motion. If you want to introduce that motion as an amendment and have it seconded, and that can be one more that we will vote on May 5. Would you like to make that motion?

**Senator Danzig:** I make that motion (seconded by Senator Comfort).

**Senate President Watson:** We will hold that motion over to May 5. Finally, is there another motion.

**Senator Mattson:** I don’t want to make a motion, but a comment—I understand that what you are proposing is that we take the current system that we have and add the A+ on top of that, and I guess it is sort of unbalanced that way. I agree that adding an A+ on may give incentives to those with better grades, but I still see that all of this is at one end, without going down the other way. I don’t like the full range of plus and minus grades. I just don’t see the A+ by itself.

**Senate President Watson:** We will debate that issue on May 5 within a limited time frame, and we will discuss the pros and cons of that then.

**Senator Mayer:** I will move that the C-, D+ and D- be added (seconded by Senator Burg).
**Senate President Watson:** I believe that is a full range of motions now. What we will do then is send out a note to you fairly quickly—we will take those motions in whatever order makes sense, and I think your motion makes the most sense Senator Danzig to cover first, having no plus minus grades. Then if your motion passes I see the others as becoming irrelevant. If your motion fails to pass, then I see moving to the A+ motion next and debating that one and then finally moving to the C-, D+ and D- motion.

**Senator Hedjuk:** Can you clarify the rules that if you cannot be here on May 5, can senators vote by proxy?

**Senator Burstein:** Send your proxy vote to Professor Watson.

**Senate President Watson:** May they send simply a proxy vote on how they wish to vote, or may they also send a proxy person as it were to vote for them. (Either one.) Ok. Are there any further questions?

Moving along, Senate Committees do need to select new chairs for next year. Vacancies on Senate standing committees (Committee on Committees, Personnel Committee, Student Faculty Policy Committee and University Affairs Committee)—there are some vacancies to fill before next fall. (That may have to be done by mail ballot to the senators in May.)

I had spoken to you earlier about trying to create a new Information Committee that would deal largely with political information and other information. Upon reviewing the bylaws, it strikes me that we don’t need to have a new committee, because the University Affairs Committee is really already structured and needs attention—and the kind of attention that it needs, because I see its mandate as being too narrow, we could broaden the mandate of the University Affairs Committee and that is being proposed by the Ad Hoc Bylaws review committee. Any questions on any of my information items so far?


Thank you George, before I begin my report I would like to thank everyone because I have learned more about parliamentary procedures this year than ever before, especially about plus minus grades! My report will touch on three items. One is the Arizona Faculties Council which met last week during the Board of Regents meeting in Tucson, and one of the items on the agenda was to consider a request by the UofA Academic Senate to have the Arizona Faculties Council consider changing the wording for the ABOR policy manual, Chapter 6 again, Conditions of Faculty Service. UofA Academic Senate wanted AFC to consider changing the wording on the dismissal of faculty from “by a preponderance of the evidence” to “clear and convincing evidence.” The idea behind this is that clear and convincing evidence has a higher threshold for proving that there is a cause for dismissal. We talked about this at length during the AFC meeting, and we decided at the time last week that more information was needed because civil cases use preponderance of evidence and we weren’t sure if there had been precedent about this—for professional cases regarding whether the level of evidence warranted was that much different from civil cases. So, at our next ABOR/AFC meeting, presumably there will be some more information provided on that.

Also, in anticipation of integrating the three campuses, ASU East has taken the lead to get a draft document to see how East/West/Main campuses can work together, coordinating our Academic
Assembly/Senate in anticipation of the integration of our campuses and basically putting on paper things that we have been talking about over the last few months. This is in the very early stages. We will be discussing this and my view is that changes will have to come about through the bylaws revision at some point. We are still at the early stages of discussion but by Fall we will know more on all of this.

**The P&T Task Force II Committee**, chaired by Mike Underhill—we have gotten input on models for different tenure cases in terms of the process at different universities—the pros and cons of each—we looked at the information—we had a visit with President Crow on this where he talked at length about some of the models. One of the things that we are focusing on over the last couple of meetings was ways of making the process more substantive. It seems that in the tenure cases this year, one of the recurrent themes was to see if we can make the process itself lend itself more to creating substance throughout the chain, from the department all the way up to the university and the president’s review. We have formed subcommittees to look at the process at the departmental, college and university levels. Each of these subcommittees are bringing in reports, and we are in the process of looking over them and finalizing our subcommittee reports. Next, we will be making recommendations within the next few weeks. That is my report in terms of substantive items—does anyone have questions?

**Senator Haynes:** On your statement about dismissal—I don’t think it is accurate to say that all civil matters use “preponderance of evidence” historically. Clear and convincing evidence is in fact applied in civil cases, and I am aware of information that would substantiate that.

**Senator Garcia:** That is a really good point, and I will be contacting you by email about this. We were talking in general about civil cases, but there was discussion during the meeting that some people had indicated but no one had given us examples of what you just stated. One of the things that we are going to do in terms of compiling information is contacting individuals at all three campuses to get some more information on what kinds of cases and what precedents are out there.

**Senate President Watson:** I took a moment to look at the web site to see if Chapter six is up there. In case you are not aware of where it is—under **Issues:**—that is normally where I have been posting a lot of the documents. We have had a section up there for some time now on proposed new professorial titles. So, that text has been up there as a .pdf file. That is also where some of the various resolutions that are coming up are posted as well. I am also going to start posting those on the Senate Black Board site.

To move back to the agenda then, Mike Leingang is not here, does anyone have a student report from ASASU?

Mort Munk is next then, our past president (Mort had no report today).

**3.D ASU West Senate Report** (Fran Bernat).

We also have academic election results to report: Will Simmons was elected as our new President-elect, Assistant Professor, ASU West Social/Behavioral Science and Alice Christie, College of Education has been elected as secretary.

Next year, we will be looking at the P&T processes and some of the things that you are looking at, for example, the two year and six year clock, teaching evaluations, instruments of tradition, the new
processes occurring with the changes in the Board policy, and support for faculty and staff awards will be considered in our senate during the next academic year.

We passed two motions—the IP policy passed, we also revised our ACDW in regard to the grievance processes. Our ACDW grievance procedures are merged, so we had to separate out the Academic Professional and the Faculty processes. We had to separate out those two processes so it is possible that the Academic Professionals will review theirs separately in the next academic year.

In regard to the plus minus grading, West Campus has proposed their own plus minus grading system to President Crow; they are in favor of plus minus grading system because it does allow more incentive to the students who are in the plus area to do well, and if you allow for a plus system, then you should also have a minus system, but they created a new type of accounting system for a plus minus grading—if you have an A- that is 4.0, and A and A+ both are 4.0, but when you are in the B, C and D range, the B- would be a 3.0, the B would be 3.3, and B+ 3.67. So, the incentive increases within the category we think needs it. They think this would make the students at ASU competitive compared to NAU and UofA, so that students at those campuses are not getting C-’s, B-’s, or A-’s are given 4,3,2, respectively, and we do not want to see their GPA’s hurt but at the same time they recognize that this would provide incentive for students to be better. Our ASU West Senate has not reopened the issue for plus minus grading system—it was felt that we had fully informed faculty and faculty fully debated this in their colleges and departments, so, we did not rescind our vote or reopen our vote. Our faculty senate will not revisit it at this point, unless President Crow comes back with a request that we do that.

**Senate President Watson:** Thank you Fran, are there any questions for Fran. If not, we will move forward.

**3.E ASU East Assembly Report** (Ernest Hirata).

I thought this was a final report for the Senate, so, I gave a report to you in the agenda, which was to inform you about what has been happening at ASU East. I submit that as my report. In our Assembly meetings, as you know our senators are also participating in your meeting at ASU, so we have been running sort of parallel in the types of decisions or recommendations that we have made here. There is one thing that I do have to correct on the fourth to the last sentence, the data in terms of the research is wrong in the sense that I for some reason reported the data 2001-2002, the number of proposals submitted was 121 and then 32. Please note that change. We are improving in terms of our research, not just stepping backwards. Thank you.

**Senate President Watson:** Any questions for Ernie?

**Senator Haynes:** We might also want to change the dollar amounts around too. (Yes. We will do that.)

**5. Unfinished Business** (Motions from Committees).

**5.A Executive Committee** (George Watson).

**5.A.1 Senate Motion #8** has been approved earlier—the draft on IP rights in electronic publications, an addendum to RSP-116 Intellectual Property Implementation Policy one item, 5.A.
5.B Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Michael Mayer).

5.B.1 Senate Motion #7 (2002-2003) (Second Reading): “The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Graduate College for the Establishment of a Graduate Certificate in Asian Studies. **Rationale:** The Graduate Certificate in Asian Studies will provide graduate students with a transcript credential that documents their interdisciplinary specialization in Asian language and area studies. Certification of graduate level specialization in Asian Studies can be useful in job searches and optimizing career opportunities. The Phoenix metropolitan area is home to several major global corporations that depend upon suppliers and corporate partners located in East or Southeast Asia.

We have two people to answer questions present—Claudia Brown and Marie Osterman.

Senate President Watson: Are there any questions or issues to discuss—this is the time to speak. Hearing none we will proceed to a vote.

Senator Mayer: All in favor say aye. None opposed. **Senate Motion #7 passed unanimously following a voice vote.**

6. New Business (Committee Reports and New Motions).

6.A Executive Committee (George Watson). No further report.

6.B Committee on Committees (Ernest Hirata).

Senate President Watson: The annual report was in the agenda today and will be covered at the May 5 meeting. Do you have additional things to report today?

Senator Hirata: Yes. In terms of the elections, we conducted our election process electronically this year. We were somewhat disappointed in the percentage who voted, 55%, compared to the last year’s election done by mail ballot. The UofA at our AFC meeting last week reported that they had also for the first time voted electronically and that they received only 25% of the votes in comparison to the number that voted last year. So, that made me feel better, because we are doing better than the UofA (laughter here).

Senate President Watson: We are going to move slightly out of order here and Mike, I will let you set the order here.

6.C Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Michael Mayer).

Action Items

6.C.1 Senate Motion #13: (2002-2003) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee at its meeting of April 23, 2003, recommended Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Education, Division of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, to establish a Graduate Certificate in Institutional Research. **Rationale:** The graduate certificate program in Institutional Research is needed because there is a paucity of graduate degree programs focusing on preparation for the field. The potential market is very large. Every institution of higher education in the United States has policy and data analysis support services for administrative decision-making and strategic planning. The term institutional research is generally used to refer to these services.
Robert Fenske and Gary Hanson are present to explain the motion (However their comments were inaudible on the tape recording, apologies).

**Senator Baldini:** I anticipated that the certificates would be put on hold since the March discussion in the Senate.

**Senator Mayer:** We have a proposal that is getting a first reading to unfreeze the undergraduate certificate, but at the moment this one is a graduate certificate and therefore was not on hold.

**Senate President Watson:** Are there other questions? This is a first reading, therefore it will be voted upon at the May 5 meeting.

### 6.C.2 Senate Motion #14 (2002-2003) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee at its meeting of April 23, 2003, recommended Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Committee on Linguistics, to establish a Certificate: Graduate Certificate in Linguistics. **Rationale:** The field of linguistics has grown rapidly since the 1960’s. Interest in the analysis of language and the application of this knowledge to the solution of real problems (i.e., language teaching, translation, artificial intelligence), has brought about the creation of graduate programs in linguistics in over 120 institutions in the U.S. and the establishment of departments of linguistics in large research institutions. This proposed interdisciplinary graduate certificate in linguistics would offer students in several fields the opportunity to gain an understanding of the way in which languages are structured, how they are acquired and how they vary over time, space, social distance and situational contexts.

Barbara Lafford was present to answer questions on this motion.

**Information Items**

At its meeting of March 12, CAPC tabled a proposal to increase the GPA for summa cum laude, until a decision has been made by the university president regarding the implementation of plus/minus grades. This would move Summa Cum Laude from 3.80 and 3.89 and Cum Laude from 2.60 to 2.70. The feeling of the committee was that given that we might get a plus minus system that we would like to see the effects of that before we might be concerned about doing this.

At its meeting of April 23, CAPC approved the following information items:

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

- **Change the name of a minor**
  - Interdisciplinary Humanities Program to change the name of a minor: Humanities to Culture and Media Studies.

- **Change the status of a Consortium**
  - Change the status of the Russian and East European Studies Consortium to the Center for Russian and East European Studies.

### 6.C.3 Senate Motion #9 (2002-2003) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the W.P. Carey School of Business for the Reorganization of an Academic Unit from School of Accountancy and Information Management to School of Accountancy and the Department of Information Systems. **Rationale:** The W.P. Carey School of Business has submitted a request for the reorganization of the School of Accountancy and Information Management into two new units: the School of Accountancy
and the Department of Information Systems. While the two units separately will have the same relationship to the Mission and Scope statements adopted by the Board of Regents as does the existing School of Accountancy and Information Management, as separate units they will be able to more freely enhance synergies with other units within the W. P. Carey School. The proposed academic reorganization will enable Information Systems to effectively fulfill the important role that it plays in the W.P. Carey School’s curriculum, programs, and course delivery.

Are there any questions on the split of these two units? Hearing none we will move on.

6.C.4 Senate Motion #10 (2002-2003) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee at its meeting of March 12, approved decreasing the number of in residence hours required for a degree from 60 to 56. This change would mean that someone with an A.A. degree from a community college could graduate from ASU with 120 hours.

It currently take 64 hours in order to get an AA degree from a community college and we were just trying to streamline the number of hours needed for students who can get the AA requirements, in the 120. If this is ok, then I will move on.

6.C.5 Senate Motion #12 (2002-2003) (First Reading): A motion from the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee regarding certificates, concentrations and minors. (A five page handout was distributed to senators). If you will note that at the bottom of the first sheet, we discuss concentrations. I am going to focus on the certificates rather than the concentrations and the minor, because I think those are more straight forward. What we are trying to do with the undergraduate certificate is to have a linked series of courses from at least two fields that cross disciplinary boundaries and they may be free standing or affiliated with degree programs. The certificate provides a structured and focused set of courses that can be used to enhance a student’s baccalaureate experience or professional development. Please skip down to the third bullet now: Geographic area certificates must include only courses specific to the title of the certificate, other than a non-English language. For example, if someone proposed a certificate in “East Timor,” you would not only have to have courses in whatever language it is, but would also have to have classes in cultural geography, history, political science, etc. for specifically East Timor, and not the islands of the Eastern Pacific. That is what the geographic area certificate means. In order to qualify for a certificate and these would need to be justified by check sheets—it says—undergraduate certificates should be cross disciplinary or certified by a professional or accredited organizational/governmental agency, or clearly lead to a professional degree or be granted to a program that doesn’t currently have a major. Finally, where certificates are suggested there will be a mandatory review for a certificate every five years, and at this point, we do not have any departments that we have knowledge, with respect to that. Those would come later and those would go to the Senate for approval once they have been developed.

Maria Allison: Mike, would you help me understand why bubble three is needed?

Senator Mayer: We were thinking along the lines of something like the Museum certificate, that I believe is a graduate one—it is something that leads to a professional sort of degree.

Maria Allison: I am talking about the geographic area one.

Senator Mayer: This entire process started when we had a proposal for a certificate in Brazilian Studies, and all of the courses under it are in Portuguese, which is considered Latin American in
general—so, they ended up being not specific to that particular area, and if you look at, for example, the
Certificate for Asian Studies that came out of the Graduate College, the courses that are included there
are courses such as South East Asia, Japan, China, etc. They are relatively specific to the geographic
area. The idea behind it is so that you don’t pick out every little country and get a certificate.

Senator Hirata: I thought you said the committee was also going to look at non-degree certificates. I
see no mention of that.

Senator Mayer: We were looking at degree certificates only. The ones that come through Extended
Ed do not come to our committee, which is what I believe all the non-degree ones are. I do not know
what the process is for those certificates, all I know is that we do not approve them.

Senator Johnson: Mike, could you clarify your intention about—a certificate leading to a professional
degree?

Senator Mayer: It is intended to get someone into a specific job, and I do not know of whatever other
examples there would be outside of the Museum Certificate—at some level of specific training that
leads to the possibility of a profession that is not within the context of a professional organization or
government agency.

Are there further questions? Draft check sheets are also attached to the this sheet and that would
indicate the hoops that a new proposal would have to jump through in order to get a concentration, a
minor, or a certificate, so you may want to take a look at those carefully.

Senate President Watson: You mentioned something about this also requires the approval of the
AAAC (Academic Administration Advisory Committee).

Senator Mayer: Right. This is going to AAAC for a Wednesday meeting. It is multi-campus, I
served on it once and at that time it is was faculty reps from West and Main, and now East, and we met
with people from the Provost Office from each of the campuses.

Senate President Watson: So, this is a second reading of this for May 5. Please be prepared to vote
on the motion (5 page handout before us). There may be some amendments coming into that,
depending on what we hear from AAAC. I believe we are ready for a report from the Personnel
Committee.

6.D Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

Senator Johnson: The new business from the Personnel Committee is Senate Motion #11, which was
distributed to you today. This is a first read, this is a follow-up on the resolution that was passed last
year to implement recommendations from the Promotion and Tenure Task Force. We are asking you
to look at the language that is now available in the ACD Manual sections 506 and 507 posted on the
Academic Senate Web page. These provisions pertain to faculty—there are provisions for academic
professionals to be added. We felt that it was desirable to go ahead and approve the faculty provisions
in order to have those in place for the next year. This is an area that we think we have made some
improvements on; there is a new Promotion and Tenure Task Force II underway now. We would like
to digest this bit of it before the next one comes upon us. There is in addition to the 506, 507
document itself, there is an outline of these provisions, and it is also available.
**Senate President Watson:** I might want to add that, Doug, please pay particular attention to new things that have been added since this came before us last time. In that motion it talks about new items that have been introduced, in particular a change in probationary reviews from the second and fourth year to the third year. There are a couple of other items in there too so please pay attention to that and be ready to either ask questions or to vote intelligently on that.

**Senator Yabes:** Under point two on the new items, if that is a clarification, what is it clarifying?

**Senate President Watson:** Tony prepared the new items and he can give us the information.

**Senator Garcia:** Yes. It was a change in the people that are listed there—the change was in the order of the people, the University Provost and the President of the University. That was reorganized.

**Senator Burstein:** It was in the campus Provost essentially.

**Senator Garcia:** It was campus Provost and then it was changed to University Provost.

**Senate President Watson:** That is relatively a minor change because of new designations.

**Senator Crozier:** This morning there was a meeting of all the academic professionals with Gail Hackett and somebody raised this issue with Gail, and her understanding was that no changes were made as far as academic professionals were concerned but that the academic professional items had been reordered or renumbered. Is that the committee’s recollection of this?

**Senator Johnson:** There is an Academic Professional Committee that will have to go over the provisions for academic professionals. These changes that you see are pertaining to faculty.

**Senator Crozier:** But she has said that there was a renumbering.

**Senator Johnson:** The outline that is on the web page indicates those sections that have AP components.

**Senator Mulvihill:** Again, I don’t want to labor this point but saying things are going to be renumbered, that may be true but the fact is that the procedures and policies that were in 506 that related academic professionals do not exist in this new document. To see an outline is one thing but I would be much more comfortable having assurance that the outline actually had something in it.

**Senate President Watson:** I received something from Gail by email about ten minutes before we came over to the meeting and that was the renumbering aspect that was going on. So, all I have been told, and you can assist me on this, Doug, is that the changes that were being made, did not in fact include academic professionals at all, that it included basically faculty. The changes in the ACD that were going to involve academic professionals have yet to be made, that is in process. I assume when they say it is in process that means there is a committee that is dealing with that. (Gail: No, not yet.) It is forthcoming though.

**Senator Crozier:** If this policy gets approved, where does that leave academic professionals in terms of certain policies?
Senator Johnson: My understanding is that this will not change the current policies for the academic professionals. I called this to the attention of the CAPS group, and Patty Feldman is quite aware of this.

Patty Feldman (CAPS): Well, the committee has yet to be appointed; Gail Hackett met with the academic professionals this morning and she will be appointing the committee. She also knows that we are concerned about this issue.

Senator Lyons: The fact is that the way things are stated now, the academic professionals are not grouped together in the sense that faculty are. I think it is a really great idea to say we are going to revise this and we are going to revise that, however, right now if those changes to the faculty policy are made, then the academic professionals are really left without a cause—all this says is that we are going revise it, but what are you going to revise it too? Who is going to be revising it? What we know right now is that 100% of the academic professionals who went up for promotion and continuing appointment did not get continuing appointment. So, in this environment, we are really worried about being cut out entirely of the ACD promotion and tenure process. When Gail Hackett met with us recently, one thing that was said is that 508 will be revised, which addresses academic professionals, and that is not reassuring to us at all.

Senator Johnson: I certainly can understand your concern. I think that perhaps the way to handle this would be on this motion if it is clearly stated that this pertains strictly to the faculty and does not remove any language pertinent to academic professionals, so that you are not left without anything.

Senator Burstein: Clarification. The fact that we pass this policy does not mean that it goes immediately go into ACD. There is a whole process now to put things into the ACD Manual. The current ACD policy is in place and what I suspect will happen is that they will wait until they have policy for academic professionals approved before they put the whole policy in.

Senator Lyons: Oh, I don’t know. Senator Johnson said that we were hurrying along with these changes so they will be place for faculty by fall. There is no committee that exists yet to revise the language for academic professionals, so that is taking a huge risk to say, yes, let’s separate these two policies and put the academic professionals into a section (508) yet to be revised.

Senator Johnson: My belief here is that there is no attempt to cut academic professionals out of this at all. I understand your concern and we will try to work out some language that will provide some assurance for you.

Senate President Watson: Why don’t we have an amendment that would come forward—it does not have to come forward right at this moment but we can introduce it on May 5, which gives the sense of the Senate on the urgency to do something, and seeking a commitment to do something like that. Is that something that the Personnel Committee could compose? Can we work with the four of you to secure some language that we might be able to use, in effect to attach to this motion? Would that work, would that be helpful? (Yes.)

What I have put up by the way is what I received from Gail Hackett’s office, and that is being referred to—you can see that there is now a section 508 where they were listing some things about academic professionals—you can also see and I will be posting this to the Web site—and it ought to be available.
to you tomorrow. It also shows where some other aspects of academic professionals are coming into play with respect to 506 and 507, what is happening to those. That is what was submitted to us about ten minutes before coming over here. I will get that posted and either Doug or I will get in touch with you, and let’s work something out that way. Are there any other questions?

Senator Yabes: I was just wondering about that last clarification—why was it recommended that we go from two and four reviews to a third year review?

Senate President Watson: I think the logic of that was, if I may speak to that, was that the second year review was simply too early. If there was not enough time for people to be here, to even get a sense about what they might have accomplished now and what may need to accomplish—it was just too soon. Therefore, it made more sense to have a third year review and if you have a third year review, it doesn’t make a whole lot of sense to have a fourth year review. So, the idea of having a third year review was that it was placed rather well in terms of allowing us to see what somebody’s record is when they have come in, and yet giving them feedback sufficiently early that it would be helpful to them for tenure and promotion.

Senator Acker: Coming from a department that is notorious for loading up dumb turks with a load of teaching, I am concerned about number three—removal of the statement of work load distribution from promotion and tenure, leaving it in the annual evaluation. If we have certainly laid it on in terms of teaching, why wouldn’t that be a part of their statement of promotion and tenure, a context in which to look at their research record?

Senator Burstein: It is more about annual evaluation than issues of promotion and tenure.

Senator Acker: But not in promotion and tenure?

Senator Garcia: The thought is that workload distribution refers to the annual evaluation in terms of the distribution of effort being projected and agreed upon and that the annual review is supposed to reflect that. Tenure and promotion are supposed to refer to a larger body about being excellent in teaching and research. We tried to make the ACD Manual more useful and more specific—the discussion in the manual about workload distribution fits in the annual evaluation because in the annual evaluation the individual and the department agree upon distribution of effort and in the annual evaluation, the performance is supposed to be based on that. Whereas in tenure and promotion, the consideration for tenure and promotion is based on evidence and the excellence in teaching and research and depending on whether it is a tenure or full professor case there are different expectations in terms of service. So, it was thought that the discussion about workload distribution did not fit in a promotion and tenure section—that is was not cogent to that—but it is cogent to annual evaluations.

Senator Acker: But how do we protect dumb faculty who have no control over workload distribution and come up for tenure?

Senator Garcia: That is an issue for departments. We were not trying to address in the ACD manual, those specific bylaws or things like that.

Senator Mayer: Back to the 2 and 4 year review—We had a number of these last year in our unit, including people who were out for simply the second year, and I thought that the 2 and the 4 year would work better than a single three. I would also add to that, as a unit we have tended to hire people
who have experience elsewhere so that when you are talking about having a 3 year review only, that might be too late in the progression of the career of those individuals.

**Senator Burstein:** In the case of someone hired as an associate, given four years for tenure, it comes in the second year, not the third year. In other words, the policy does permit there to be a 4 year for someone who is hired as an associate professor without tenure.

**Senator Mayer:** In other words, the change then is intended only for individuals who are coming out of graduate school?

**Senator Burstein:** No. The change is only for assistant professors. The change is also for people hired at the associate level for a 4-year review, in other words, the change in the policy includes both a 6 year time to tenure and a 4 year time to tenure.

**Senate President Watson:** For the 4 year time you are saying that it comes at the 2\textsuperscript{nd} year and for the 6 year time at the 3\textsuperscript{rd} year.

**Senator Burstein:** In both cases it comes at the half time period.

**Senator Mayer:** Ok. Thank you.

**Senate President Watson:** We will need to look over the language carefully in the ACD. Again, that is posted on the Web site. Are there any other Personnel Committee items?

6.E  **Student Faculty Policy Committee** (Craig Allen).

About 250 faculty filled out our survey on classroom conditions and negative comments ran ahead of positive ones by a 4 to 5 margin. Next week in our last meeting of the year on this, Gail Hackett will come before our committee to answer some questions that we have and to explain to us the priorities of the administration in regard to classrooms. After that we will start writing our report.

**Senate President Watson:** Are there any questions for Craig? Karen Dwyer is ill but I have report from her with respect to the University Affairs Committee on the proposed bylaws revisions. There are posted on the Web site as proposed changes to the bylaws. This is a four-year event because every four years we are required to review our bylaws. That is not an item that is voted upon by the Academic Senate; the Academic Assembly must vote on this. The Senate approves the changes then a vote of the Assembly is required. This is an item that you will have some feedback on. This will probably layover in the summer to give more opportunity to look them over. But there are some substantial changes in the bylaws. I will try to get a document posted that summarizes what those changes are so it will facilitate you reading through that item.

I might mention one other thing then before adjournment—just as I was thinking about some of the things that came forward. I am meeting with Milton Glick tomorrow to discuss promotion and tenure issues—we have had a number of questions that have been raised with respect to the tenure and promotion decisions that have come down so far. There have been various meetings on them but I am sure that you are hearing a lot of buzz about that. I am trying to take some of those issues to Milt. I will talk to you more about that on May 5 at our last meeting. I also expect to have a newsletter...
coming out shortly, and that will contain a piece about that as well. That is all I will say for the moment.

Are there any other items? If not, we stand adjourned.

7. **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m.
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