

Academic Senate SUMMARY

Monday, January 29, 2007
3:15 – 5:00 p.m.
SCOB 228

Present: Acker, Acereda, Allen, Allison, Adelman, Anderson, Blasko, Brewis, Broman, Burstein, (H.) Campbell, (C.) Campbell, Capaldi, Comfort, Crozier, Cruz-Torres, deLusé, Duerden, Elliot, Feldman, Fowler, Fromme, Gelb, Gonzalez-Santin, Grace, Nora Gustavsson, Henn, Ingalls, Ismeurt, Johnson, Keim, Kingston, Konomos, Kopta, Koshinsky, Kurpius, LaFaro, Lai, Liu, Mathur, Mattson, Mitchell, Moorhead, Ovando, Roen, Rose, Strom, Trotta, Vandermeer, Verdini, Zhang

Substitutes: Bree McEwan for Brian McNamara, Ig Tsong for Peter Rez, Samantha Winter for Ross Meyer

1. CALL TO ORDER (Duane Roen).

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Duane Roen at 3:18 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES (Duane Roen)

The draft Senate Summary of December 4, 2006 has been distributed and is posted on the Senate Web Page). <http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate> Send corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu and anne.kopta@asu.edu

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Senate President's Report (Duane Roen)

There will be a Spring Awards Assembly and Reception – 3:00 – 5:00, Tuesday, April 24 (ASU Art Museum).

This morning the University Academic Council met, which consists of the Senate chairs of the four campuses. We met at the West campus to discuss possible alterations to the faculty governance at Arizona State University. It was a very productive conversation, and we are making significant progress toward developing a university senate that would work in concert with campus senates. There is also discussion that colleges and schools would have governance bodies as well, because we will need those bodies to deal with local issues. Stay tuned.

Welcome to Barbara Acker, who is the new chair of CAPC (Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee). Thanks for taking on that job. It is a major responsibility--so we extend our gratitude now and we will extend it again later, and our condolences at the end.

This next item came as an email to each of you previously. That is, I have been asked to read the University Smoking Policy. Effective January 1, 2007, smoking will be prohibited in all university buildings and university vehicles. The policy was read.

B. University Provost's Report (Betty Capaldi)

I talked to you about the university reorganization that you received in an email from me at our last meeting. When I was considering coming to ASU, I read all of the documents about the kind of university we are. In the documents on the New American University were two concepts that I liked best. One was school centric. I have been a provost twice before, and I have always operated that way, and I know the disciplines vary greatly as to what kind of programs they have at the undergraduate level and graduate level, what types of scholarships they have, what their ideal profile looks like—so I have always hired deans and given them a lot of authority. That was president Crow's intention was all along and all the deans are in place with the exception of education. In talking to president Crow, I said, we are not really doing “school centric” and that I don't think we are doing one university in many places. My experience with “systems” is that they tend to be very bureaucratic. They have chancellors on many campuses. Though the system did not do anything, the system could block what the campuses needed to do to succeed. It was not my cup of tea. I do not want us to be under a system where we would have four campuses with bureaucracies set up—we could have gone to that model—one *East Valley Tribune* reporter indicated to me that when I saw they hired you, that we would now go to a system—that is completely wrong. The other model could have been--to have tiered campuses, which includes

the research campus, comprehensive colleges, community colleges, and there is a hierarchy in terms of just about everything. We don't want to have that here either. We do not want to have people see that one campus is better than another campus or any of that. I told Michael that our current administrative structure is interfering with both of those ideas because we currently have campus administrations. Why do we have them if they are not going to be separate campuses. We are all one university—there will not be presidents of Poly, or West, or Downtown Phoenix. If you look at it, we did have the equivalent structure—a provost and vice president and an academic officer under that person, and now you have deans. It was quite mimicking of the whole university structure. Academically, the real action is at the level of the deans and the faculty, and we want to maximize our quality and our potential university wide. That is why we created the new position that David Young has. Some titles have changed in the new structure and some functions—the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs—David's job, is to build connections across the whole university to maximize our ability to collaborate and be as strong as we can at ASU. I am a psychologist, and I have been meeting with everyone, which I count myself lucky to do at our great campuses, and I found way more than I expected at ASU—things that would support my work as an individual faculty member. Out at Polytechnic they have nutrition and exercise; Dean Jacobs in the Honors College teaches a course on the history and evolution of food. They have a wonderful lab facilities out at poly that I could make use of, and I would not have known that unless I journeyed out there to meet people. We want all faculty to know what possibilities there are for collaboration at each campus. David is going to help build those connections and smooth the various internal articulation issues we have. On the academic side then we decentralized with the deans being in charge of their programs, and having a person in place to help with those functions--on the administrative side we have centralized. All administrative functions are centralized -- and all financial areas are under Carol Campbell, all student affairs areas report to Jim Rund, all technology areas report to Adrian Sannier, and the libraries report to Sherrie Schmidt. I believe there will be a lot of efficiencies realized this way that can be invested back in the academic side. We do not need all these layers. It will also help the faculty on other campuses so they do not have to go through the two layers—the tenure and promotion recommendations will come directly to the dean up to the Provost and it will be done that way on all campuses. In this restructuring we are discovering some strange things. As one example, we have centralized classroom scheduling, and we found out that there is a different class break at Polytechnic (15 min) than here at Tempe (10 min) and we think we should go to fifteen minutes here as well. We will talk about this some more later on. They do not teach on Fridays--it is research day. I said that I think that we should teach on all days and we need to align up with one another, because if you look at it from the students' point of view, the students might want to go to classes in two places and why would we want to make it that hard for students. We want to make it easy for the students as well as easy for the faculty to make full use of the resources of the university. That is the context of our restructuring, and there are a lot of details to be worked out--who reports to whom, how many people we are going to have and this is on the administrative side. We are working that out. Letters should go out to everyone fairly soon. We do not want to make mistakes—as people centralize they want to make sure they maximize the contributions of all the people who are here. We need to figure out even who might be a university wide person and work on more than one campus. We are one university in many places. Once you begin to think that way it really opens up a lot of new possibilities-- David is working with Maria Allison on graduate education across the whole university, for undergraduates tracking will help them and better advisement by having better trained advisors and so on. That is my context.

I want to mention briefly about PeopleSoft, which those of us that have been at other universities know that while it is being put in place is it awful, but once it is in place it is much better. We are aware that there are dislocations—graduate admissions is undergoing training and in undergraduate admissions we had a lot of stuff to go through. As one example, I tried to hire someone the other day -- and then we found she would have to get trained for a whole day before they could even allow her on this system. Our experience is better here than at other universities though and I thought I would tell you that. That is all I wanted to say today—I feel your pain and that we are trying to make things as good as we can in all areas. I will take questions now.

Q- What should departments do that cannot access student applications readily. Some have even been lost during the installation of PeopleSoft I hear.

We hear that all documents are available now because they have all been scanned.

Q- What about if you cannot locate them easily?

If units can actually view their documents that means they have been scanned up. If there is a problem beyond that talk directly to Mike (in Graduate Studies) because as far as we know, all of the incoming

applications and other documents for applicants have been scanned up for each department, and we are right on target with that process.

On the undergraduate side we are finally squared away too. It took awhile.

Q- A couple of years ago, we moved HR Office off the Tempe campus a couple blocks up on Rural Road. We have created a problem in terms of many faculty need to get signatures on documents, and currently we charge them a dollar to park if they can find a parking place. After your predecessor tried to intervene for us a couple of years ago, there are now five loading zone spaces that are available for 20-minute intervals that faculty could take advantage of, unfortunately, there seems to be people parked in them all the time. They may actually be full time parkers. There are two issues here: 1) an announcement that the HR group is going to start asking you to register if you are parking in one of those spaces, so do sign in at the front desk if you are trying to use one of those spaces. The word from parking so far has been that we cannot have anymore spaces, and if you could intervene on that issue we would be impressed.

I will look into that. The good thing is that parking is under Carol Campbell along with HR. I will talk to her about this problem, and if she cannot help then I will bring her to the Senate to tell you why.

Q- I read in the newspaper that faculty have agreed to do a self-evaluation for teaching. Did you see that? I was wondering what that is all about.

I don't know if you have ever had a bad experience with a reporter, but that was mine. We think we need to talk to Chris Callahan, the director of our journalism school to fix this kind of thing. That was not even what the interview was about.

Someday, I also need to come and do a presentation on the budget method to the Senate. We now have a budget method that goes to the deans, based in part on academic excellence and how do you determine academic excellence and demonstrate that. Each unit is supposed to have aspirational peers and then measures of quality of scholarship and teaching. So, the reporter commented--you will be measuring quality of teaching? I said if a unit chooses to put a measure it might be where do their students go, and I gave them some examples, and that was what the article was all about. I read it later and said oh, my Gosh! I am glad you brought that up, so I can explain it. Now he is going to come back to me next and ask where your university-wide measures are. Don't believe everything you read in the newspapers.

Q- Where do you stand now in hiring a Vice President for Undergraduate Instruction? What do you have in mind with that position?

It is hard to get someone, and that is interesting. There are still some people I have not talked to. The job has a responsibility to help in the retention effort, to help with the internal articulation issue, so that a student can go across the various campuses and take courses. There are number of transfer issues within this university to address. There are a number of issues in evaluating teaching to address. I talked to someone in the teaching academy the other day on this. We do not have consistency in evaluation of teaching and that makes it hard when tenure and promotion cases come up. In my listing for this position, I said half-time or full-time, because I know that some people have very busy lives. Art Blakemore for instance is half-time, because he did not want to give up what he was doing in Economics. So far I have talked to about half the people that are in the pool of applicants, and none of them want to take this job on. It is an important job and I can make it more attractive.

Thanks very much for your questions and welcome back everyone.

C. Senate President-Elect's Report (Bill Verdini) – No report today. (Sighs of relief followed.)

D. USG President's Report (Samantha Winter for Ross Meyer).

Our USG poll starts at 10:00, and we are open to 2:30 p.m. daily.

Our safety escort service is up and running, and we are really trying to expand the service. We have scooters now, and that is exciting. We are trying to extend the service to weekends. We have a task force that is working with issues and complaints about services. So far it has been positively reviewed.

We have our new student web page up (allasu.net), and it is just a better way for students to find things they are interested in. We have an events calendar, off campus housing listings, ratings of on-campus halls.

Beyond that we are working on the Parent's Centennial Professorship; the tentative date for that is mid-April through the end of May.

We have been trying to visit the state legislature as much as possible on behalf of our students.

E. GPSA President's Report (Bree McEwan for Brian McNamara)

I am Brian today. One of the things that we have been doing in GPSA—at our last meeting we discovered that we are coming to the end of our funding lines for research for graduate students. So, in the next month there will be about 8 to 9 different research polls—make sure your graduate students fill these out. We still do have some money available for graduate orientation which we are working on currently. So, encourage your students to apply for these funds for their projects where they need an extra five hundred dollars. We have that money available. Other than that we finished up our new bylaws and they are ready to go for elections. We have looked into the process for getting health care coverage but we are not yet there—we are working on a white paper to illustrate the different options that graduate students will need. Our other big initiative is child care—we are just about ready to have a packet put together for graduate student parents that outlines what resources are available around the valley and that information will be put online as well. We have finished up our Pac10 comparison on what is available at the other Pac10 universities.

Q- Are you negotiating for insurance for foreign graduate students too?

The university level is working on that. The issue becomes who ends up paying for that coverage, so in our negotiations we are not doing the negotiation; the university is. When we are looking at that, we are down to three options, and it seems that right now that all we are able to do is pick the option with the cheapest coverage for students. I do agree that we need coverage available to international students for recruitment and to open up graduate school to people who have children, not just people without them. The cheapest option to add a child is roughly \$4,500, and on a graduate stipend that is not going to cover it. You are not even talking about a variety of other costs that go along with that coverage, and that really makes it prohibitive unless you have a spouse who is insured elsewhere. We would love to have dependent coverage—one of the things we are looking into is connecting with ASA and seeing if we can get down to the State Legislature and say look, you people run on education and family. Here is an excellent way to combine that, if you provide money earmarked in order to provide it. (That was exactly my point.)

F. University Academic Council Report (John Brock – email option) – Duane gave the report.

G. ASU at the Polytechnic campus Report (John Brock - email option) – No report.

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

I. ASU at the DTP campus Report (Susan Mattson) - No report

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

K. Personnel Committee Report (Doug Johnson)

There are a couple of items for the Senate to consider. One is that if you are in the Arizona Foundation for your health insurance, unfortunately, Mayo Clinic is no longer part of that network. There will be an open enrollment period next week for the people who need to make a change. It is a significant enough change that the network will provide another choice. The second point is that we will be coming forward with a workshop on retirement issues including some inside information on using the brokerage window. Stay tuned for more information.

Q-A clarification on the Mayo Clinic item--can you explain how it is possible for a contract to be changed in the middle of a plan year?

There is a contract between Mayo Clinic and the Arizona Foundation that is on a different calendar than our contract with Arizona Foundation. Whenever you sign a contract with a health insurance organization, you accept the network that they have in place at that time, but that is subject to change. (Is that written in the contract?) It is the normal situation. Any of our plans can make changes—if it is a minor change, they don't have to let you change. This is considered a major change, therefore you can reselect.

Q- This is a PPO. Is there an HMO?

There is an EPO through Arizona Foundation, but it did not include Mayo Clinic.

President Roen: Under the Consent Agenda, we have one item today, the resolution on grades. Does anyone wish to remove that item from the consent agenda? By removing it from the consent agenda, we may discuss it in full. There was a request to remove it from the consent agenda.

I have one announcement to make on this; the West campus Academic Senate voted on this resolution in December and they passed it. This is another example why we need a university-wide senate.

Discussion:

I have two or three objections to this resolution. First of all, where it says “whereas,” the word “conflicting” is incorrect. I do not see these issues as conflicting. They represent different issues. The grade point average to start off with is average of all grades in all courses. Some universities, including this one, acknowledge for the first couple of years, a student may not be entirely accustomed to a university environment and will give a little bit of leniency, and will then provide a policy like we have but those are different principles, not conflicting ones. I would scrap the draft resolution in the first place because what we have is perfectly fine. I see those two principles, and I am willing to accept them, but I am not willing to accept basically the lowering of standards, which is what this represents. I think that what a grade point average starts off as is an average of all grades in all courses.

I am shocked that students who, upon seeing their final scores and that it is not good enough to get a B, ask me if I would give them a D or E. They are not satisfied with a C. The professors who go easy may give them the B. This will not prepare students for the real world out there. You boss will probably not give you a “redo” when your performance is not good enough. Most students want to graduate in 4 years. If a student has the time and wants to go 5 years for mastery, I am not against that. The other thing I have a problem with is teachers wanting to prevent this from happening and saying I don’t want to do that. They should say to students, you will just have to be happy with a C. In the real world, they do not give extra length of time to get a project done beyond what was anticipated to complete it.

I second this. If a student asked me to give them a D or E so they can take the course over, I would strongly disagree with that. I agree there needs to be a transition period for students who are working really hard to achieve a certain grade for a major admission.

This also punishes the instructors of 100-level courses, because that contributes to lowering our success rate when students take our classes over. If they have that option more students will consequently do this.

I would like to take issue with the second “whereas.” I am not at all sure that the student who takes a class and gets a B and then takes the class again and gets a C that this necessarily reflects what the student has achieved. It seems to me that there is a difference between sitting through a course twice and sitting through a course once and getting exactly the same grade. Our employers are not going to put people in training programs and say in order for you to really do well, we will just put you back through it again—rather, you would be out the door.

I am in favor of this because there are serious reasons why students need to take a class over. Students have emergencies that come up. If they get a C in some courses, they will never be able to get into medical school.

There is a policy on compassionate leave already in place for such things, and the withdrawal never shows on the external records.

Part of our task as a university is to signal employers about performance of the students. I am shocked to learn that we are purposely manipulating the signal. I have no problem with students taking classes over, but the GPA should reflect retakes, otherwise we are presenting a biased statistic. We should not do this at any level. We can deal with the question of types of withdrawal deadlines later.

One of the reasons for the resolution I would think is the retention of major, declaration of, etc. I had asked if there were any data available on this about how many students would be affected if we made a change. Are there data available to us?

Provost Capaldi said she thought the data was sent once but will send it again. She explained that we are dealing with two issues that may need clarified here: Tracking is to give the student an opportunity to achieve the grade that they think is indicative of success and give them more than one chance. So, if they need to get a B in Statistics and the student gets a C, part of tracking is to give the student the opportunity to get that grade by taking the course again in the summer or the winter session and to stay on track and get the good grade that is needed in that course. I think that is something we need to discuss, whether we think that is good or not good, because part of what we are trying to do in the university is have the student learn. If a student cannot learn in one major, I believe we want to give them the opportunity to figure out where they should be. Even that will be an issue, as faculty are developing their tracks some have grade point criteria submitted that are inconsistent with all our policies. I want our policies to be clear to the entire faculty as we are working on this. It may be worth discussing together how this will affect tracks and retention at a future meeting. Also, I have ideas that I want to talk to you about – that we may be able to use learning as a measure of quality as opposed to what we do now. I know that grades reflect learning but we also could have better ways to do that and use technology and

the courses would not necessarily have to take fifteen weeks. If you learn the material sooner, you could move on and so could the faculty member. This is a concept that I have, and once the tracks are all in place and March 1 is our deadline to get them on the computer--we will see what happens.

The grade represents the ability of the student to learn the material, so, if you want a better grade, the only thing that would help the student is if we only count the last grade. If they want to take the course five times, it is up to the students. Eventually they will show that they have learned the material with the last time they take the course. My approach is that the only grades that should count are the last ones.

Philosophically I have a real problem with that, since when I was an undergraduate, if I had gone into an administrator or one of my professors and asked to retake a course because I received a D or E, once they finished laughing, the door would have closed behind me. If we let students take the higher of the two grades, this is already happening—when a student does moderately badly on a single test, they tend to give up. The semester is over for them as far as they are concerned. They throw the final exam and don't show up knowing they are going to fail the course, and then they retake the course.

We all know that a student can retake the SATs if they do not do well, however, the Law School will take the average of those grades. We don't take the highest grades. If that is the case, I don't understand why we should take the highest grade here, if the course is retaken. The grade average is the way to go.

The argument is that the last time they take the course their performance is indicative of their level of learning. I guess what concerns me as a taxpayer; I don't want to pay state subsidy for students to take a course over and over again. I would rather invest in the student who needs the opportunity to take the course. The other thing is that at a previous institution I was at, they said fine, take courses over again, once you have taken 150 credit hours, that is it, if you have not completed a degree by that time, it is all over. The government of Ontario said it was not paying subsidy for people taking courses over and over again.

Some further comments were inaudible.

It is not really a taxpayer problem if you only can take the course twice. But if a student had unlimited times--that would create a problem.

Are we ready to vote? Another option would be to table this resolution until February 19th so we can get the data to review. Would anyone make that motion?

I make that motion because this is the first time we have a number of senators actually have conversation, and I would like to have people stand and address the room on this loudly so everyone can hear. We don't want to constantly strain to hear your comments. I ask you to also reflect for a moment if this information would make a difference to you and your vote today?

I don't know the answer to that, but I think on principle one of the senators has requested that information and we should try to get it before we vote.

Senator Ismeurt moved to table and that we get the information before the next meeting.

The Parliamentarian said we could table to February 19th and perhaps have a briefer discussion of this same resolution after we have had an opportunity to review the data.

This motion received several seconds.

The motion to table the resolution on repeated grades until February 19th, passed unanimously by a voice vote.

4. ADOPTION OF ALL CONSENT ACTION ITEMS, INFORMATION ITEMS, AND REPORTS (For February 19th Senate Meeting). Please read items on the CAPC web page at <http://www.asu.edu/provost/CAPC>. They will be given a second reading at the February 19th Senate meeting.

See New Business for CAPC (item 6.D, page 11).

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Executive Committee (Duane Roen)

Resolution from Executive Committee to accept the Report of the Task Force on Classified research and the Substitute Resolution on Classified Research (attached: original resolution from last spring and the draft substitute resolution from the Task Force on Classified Research) posted on the Academic Senate Web Page (<http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/SenateReportonClassifiedResearch2006.pdf>)

President Roen: We have two other items to cover under unfinished business. The first is a motion to accept the report from the Task Force on Classified Research. After that, I will ask you if there are any objections to suspending the rules to go into a Committee of the Whole so we can have a full discussion of this item. If there are objections, we will take a vote on suspending the rules. Before that, I need a second to the motion to accept the report. (So moved.)

Is there further discussion on that? Hearing none, we have received the report; it does not mean that we have approved it. All in favor please say aye. Opposed? Absentions? Passed.

The motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Is there anyone who objects to the suspending of the rules so that we may enter into a committee of the whole so we can have a full discussion?

Q- Why is it necessary for us to suspend the rules as opposed to accepting the report and then putting it on the agenda for the next meeting?

We can talk about the time being of the essence, but we did discuss this in December. As you recall, Peter Crozier led a pretty lengthy discussion of the issues.

I just don't think there is any reason why we need to suspend the rules when our bylaws require that we introduce things at one meeting and vote on them at the next. We did hear the report in December. I don't know if this time there is something different than what was in Peter's report, or if there is a compelling reason to suspend the rules. I would support it, but I just did not hear that.

The Parliamentarian clarified that we had a motion a year ago and that was tabled. This is in connection with that motion, so essentially what we have today is considering a second reading of that motion, to bring it off the table, but since this report is so much larger a discussion of it, what we plan to do is move directly to talk about the substitute motion, using this report and Peter's discussion from December.

The Committee of the Whole allows us to have multiple participation by individuals, and after that we can take up the question of that original motion and whether we want allow a substitute motion. It is not that we are changing the rules in terms of reading once or twice. What we are doing is suspending the rules in the order of the day, so we can go into a Committee of the Whole, and that is the change.

Q - Are you suggesting that there should be a discussion in the Committee of the Whole prior to a vote on a substantive motion? (Yes.)

Because there are a few people who may want to speak more than once, it would be easier here to go into the Committee of the Whole instead of debating the original motion and then debate a substitute motion.

Why can't we propose to accept the substitute motion in place of the original motion and then debate whether people may have objections to it? We can discuss and make amendments to the substitute motion.

We could do it that way. According to our rules, people are supposed to be allowed to speak only once. We are not doing that strictly now but the Committee of the Whole allows people to speak more than once and there are people who have more to say on this issue, and that is what the senate has been doing for the last couple of years. That does not change the substance of the way in which we will make a decision.

No vote can be taken while in the committee of the whole.

President Roen: What is the pleasure of the body? Is there any objection? Do we have a motion to suspend the rules? So moved. Seconded. This requires a 2/3rds majority. May we have a show of hands in favor of suspending the rules? Opposed? Abstentions? Passed.

The motion to go into a *committee of the whole* passed unanimously by a show of hands.

I am going to ask Peter Crozier to lead our discussion.

Senator Crozier: We had a rather extensive discussion last time on the content of this report. The report as you know may get technical in places so there may be things in this report that need clarified. I urge you to read it and get an understanding of it at some point. Today rather than go through the report, I want to address the substitute resolution, its components, and tell you what the issues are connected to that particular component and why we decided to write it the way that we did.

The motion has a preamble because we thought it provided a context for interpretation of the substitute motion. Then there are a number of different sections (A, B, C, D, & E) which I will describe a bit to you for clarification. We can then discuss a number of issues related to each one of those sections.

The Classified Research Task Force wrestled with the question of whether the university benefits from classified research activity in the university, or is the university harmed by classified research activity. Remember that at the moment the university has a policy on classified research that is rather liberal and it allows a lot of classified research to take place on campus. The motion that was proposed last year was a very conservative motion banning all classified research on campus. We have been trying to balance these two things. As to the question about whether the university benefits, some of you may have strong views on this; we decided that there could be some benefit to having some classified research activity (examples given)—as to whether the university is harmed by this, we should be concerned with doing something that will undermine the open scholarly atmosphere that we all feel is very important for a campus. This would affect our students as well. These are the broad issues we discussed in the task force.

1) We believe that classified research should not negatively impact student education nor should it negatively impact the scholarly atmosphere on campus. In section A of the substitute resolution, what you are seeing is that the university can undertake classified research provided it does not interfere with access. What that means we think is that it cannot be undertaken if it will impose additional restrictions on access to facilities. If you are working on a project in your office and you have some classified documents there provided it does not get in the hands of your colleague next door we are ok with that. We don't impose any restrictions on classified research activities that take place off campus. We do define on campus and off campus. Then we do recognize that in times of emergency we may have to relax these policies, and have some high level research on campus. That is what section A of the resolution deals with.

2) We felt that the university should be focused primarily on open research. The way that we make that happen is by using evaluation methods that continue to encourage faculty to focus their efforts on open research. In sections B and C of the substitute motion we address that. Students are not allowed to submit classified material in theses or dissertations. It must be open research. Faculty are not allowed to use classified research for promotion, tenure, reappointment, or merit raises. That is the way we want to guide things so that more of us are engaged most of the time on open research.

3) In the final section C, as we all use the term “one university in many places,” we decided that it was useful to define what we mean by on campus and off campus. Essentially we decided to say that the campus would be defined as those areas where most of the significant education and research involving graduate and undergraduate students takes place. We define that to be on the Tempe, the Downtown Phoenix campus, the Polytechnic campus, and the West campus. Off-campus then become places such as the ASU Research Park or Skysong. We felt that it is important to differentiate between places where we have a lot of educational activity and places where we have less educational activity.

Finally, does all of this work and how do we know it works? We have decided that we need to have a faculty oversight committee monitoring this. We are proposing (as was in a previous policy), a faculty oversight committee that will anticipate any decisions that affect classified research at one university in many places. It will monitor if a project meets the criteria as set out in the policy. That faculty oversight committee will also report to the Senate on a yearly basis and tell them how much classified research has been undertaken by the university so that we have a mechanism for getting important information to change the policy if necessary.

I want to open this up to discussion now.

Comment: I just want to congratulate the Task Force. I think this is one of the most well balanced, well documented reports on classified research in higher education that I have read. I teach, write, and consult in the area of national security, and I have been involved with two other institutions, and this is by far the best document I have seen. Congratulations. (Applause followed).

Q-I was curious if the amount of funding that sometimes comes with secret research begins to be the tail that wags the dog. Are there any mechanisms to bring that into consideration?

In some ways there were two opposing tensions in the task force. One was the requirement for flexibility and people would like maximize research expenditures and see that number growing and the other concern was the impact on the scholarly environment. That is why we built in these evaluation metrics because essentially what most people on the task force felt was that you can have a little bit of this going on (classified research), but we certainly don't want to maximize research expenditures for that to become the dominate force. That is why a section on evaluation methods will address some of your concerns. I should tell you that at the moment there is no classified research being done at ASU. Nor has there been. We don't know what will happen if we open that door but we could open it a little bit.

Q-Your oversight committee will be the ultimate yea or nay then?

No, it is advisory to the Vice President for Research. (That is true of any university.) What we do see is that the Vice President for Research overrides the faculty advisory committee recommendations; he or she needs to provide the Senate with the reasons why that decision was made.

Q- Has "in times of emergency" been defined? (No. It is up to the faculty advisory committee to interpret that.) We did discuss that issue, in the original motion it was defined to be that the university actually has to be asked by local, state, or federal government, and we decided that is probably too strong a statement. The faculty advisory committee will have to determine that.

Q-You said that merit raises would not be permissible under this kind of rubric, but would no merit pay raises be allowed?

Is the principle here is that the personnel committee may not look at such research in order to make a merit pay decision?

The problem with classified research activity is that it would be very difficult to evaluate the merits of it.

Q- Does this also apply to an inflationary raise? (No.)

One would expect that everybody receives a cost-of-living raise, and the problem here is that if one is engaged in certain research, part of the goal of faculty at the university is to cross check yourself –you have done your research, found something, put it out to the public, where they can scrutinize it. Then we get feedback, or inform someone else about it. Since classified research cannot be scrutinized in the merit pay contest, or the reappointment process, it just can't contribute to our record.

Q-What about the marriage of classified research and university research? Could the university ban that too?

We didn't want to judge the different approaches other universities have taken but there are some that do ban it altogether.

Q -There is several mentions in here of the oversight committee as watchdog. I would like to make sure that these six faculty members selected will widely represent the university, not just be specialists in this field. When you are involved in research on behalf of the entire university, the membership of this group should reflect that.

We talked about that and we never got more specific. That is a good idea.

Q- What does "not do harm to the community mean?"

This report does not address biological weapons research, for instance. We need to have faculty oversight expertise in the field of public safety involved on this committee. Then we could make sure we are protected.

The issue of public safety is always important, but I don't think it is necessarily limited to classified research. All research has this component. I would hope on the faculty oversight committee that one of the members has that expertise or has it available to them.

Comment: The selected agent's paragraph covers this subject. (The rest of this comment was inaudible.)

Q -I wonder about the method of selection for this committee and why it should be appointed rather than elected?

We took the opposite view and used the language that was found in the RSP 108 policy. The appointees must be approved by the Senate.

Several comments were inaudible that followed.

Q -Should there be a distinction between classified research and research being done by the University, as opposed to a university faculty member that enters into a contract to consult? Are they outside the scope of this policy, or does the policy cover that as well?

This policy will affect the way in which the university conducts classified research, but as a faculty member who is consulting with an outside agent on classified research, and if they are using university facilities to do that, the policy would apply.

However, faculty are free to consult and do classified research up to 20% of their time, without restriction. The policy does not pertain to what research is selected. Although we are to notify university officials of any clearances involved if we are bringing classified documents onto campus. In terms of us using the equipment on campus, I believe that would come under the policy directly.

That raises the issue of how can the committee be made aware of who is entering into what contracts? Only the contracts that the university enters into are reported to the oversight committee. If you using university resources for your project, that will have to be reported.

The fact that research assignments do lead to dissertations many times—do we need to advise our research assistants in case they are working with us on outside projects at Skysong, that they will not be able to publish any of this work?

The fact that you cannot publish this type of research and the phrase that faculty must report their consulting projects each year is redundant, because emphasis under classified research in this case appears to be based solely in access to university facilities. However, a faculty member who is working in his office must ask permission to do so.

The oversight committee still will review all classified research being done on campus, regardless of whether it is a single person or not is my understanding. If you remove that statement then we are down to classified research may only be undertaken in times of a national emergency. That means you cannot have any classified research on campus except in times of national emergency, so it is not redundant. The faculty oversight committee will review all classified research that is done on campus (using university facilities).

This is an important issue that people should seriously think about. It goes to the heart of the question with respect to what could be allowed on campus. This actually allows laboratories that might have a dual use, for instance, on Sundays it might be open to most students who come in, and on other days it is restricted. A group of faculty may get together and work with a national laboratory to conduct research in that particular laboratory and then decide they want to close the doors two days a week in order to do that. That phrase does allow for that situation to occur.

President Roen: We have other business that we must finish up before 5 o'clock. May I suggest that we go back in session, and then if someone wants to make a motion to table so we can complete this discussion at the next Senate meeting?

Motion was made and seconded to come out of the *committee of the whole*. This motion was passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Motion was made and seconded to table until February 19th.

Parliamentarian confirmed that we have the motion from last year to deal with and that is all we have on the table. Do we want to talk about a substitute motion and then table that one instead, so it comes up next time?

We are still dealing with that original motion from one year ago that is in the report as an appendices.

Motion was made to remove the original motion from the table. Seconded. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstentions? The motion to remove from the table passed by voice vote with one abstention duly noted.

Motion was made to consider the substitute resolution. Seconded. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstentions? This motion was passed unanimously by voice vote.

President Roen: Is there further discussion? Motion was made to table “the motion before us” until the next Senate meeting. All in favor say aye? Opposed?

Motion was made to table the former substitute motion—now the main motion--was passed by voice vote with two abstentions duly noted.

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

A. Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson). (See Announcements and Communications)

B. Executive Committee (Duane Roen).

C. Committee on Committees (Marcia Anderson and Judy Grace).

The next meeting of the Committee on Committees is scheduled for February 6, 3:00-4:30 p.m. in ADM B 365. We will be reviewing the results of the fall preference survey. Special thanks to Senator Tory Trotta for her leadership in getting this survey up and out there and the results compiled.

D. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Barbara Acker).

As items of information to the Senate:

(ENGR) The Ira Fulton School of Engineering has proposed the establishment of an Undergraduate Concentration in Computational and Mathematical Engineering.

(CLAS) The School of Human Evolution and Social Change (SHEC) has proposed a new graduate degree program Ph.D. in Environmental and Social Sciences.

Action items for the Senate:

(CLAS)The School of Human Evolution and Social Change (SHEC) proposed implementation of a new graduate degree program, Ph.D. in Social Science and Health.

(CLAS)The School of Human Evolution and Social Change proposed implementation of a new undergraduate degree program B.A. Global Health.

(COPP) The School of Social Work has proposed the establishment of a graduate certificate in Integrated Health.

(COPP) The School of Community Resources and Development has proposed the establishment of an undergraduate certificate in Convention Sales and Meeting Planning.

President Roen: Barbara will invite people to represent these program to the February 19th Senate meeting.

Note: All CAPC proposals are available on the CAPC website (www.asu.edu/provost/CAPC)

G. Student-Faculty Policy Committee (Rojann Alpers).

Progress report on +/- Survey

Rojann could not be here today so President Roen read the report: Preliminary results from the student and faculty survey about plus/minus grading have arrived. We will be looking it over as we meet on Tuesday morning the 30th, 8-9:30 in ADM B 365. We have also been asked to look at the policy on requiring comprehensive exams. In addition, Samantha Winter is constructing a one-page bullet report to the ACDC group about textbook costs and placing academic textbook orders, etc. The Committee on Academic Integrity is working to formulate a policy that would standardize the process used to investigate the issues of integrity.

In my department we would like to have a statement added to the Academic Integrity policy such that you cannot copy tests/problems/practice questions from the black board course sites because this is also the property of the faculty.

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

7. Open Forum. – Time ran out.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Attachment This item was tabled until February 19th.

Draft Resolution on Grades for Repeated Courses (Senate Resolution #23)(Second Reading)

Background: There are two existing policies on calculating cumulative GPAs for undergraduate students who repeat courses. For lower-division courses that are repeated, the higher grade is used when calculating the cumulative GPA. For upper-division courses that are repeated, the cumulative GPA reflects both grades, in effect averaging the two grades. In all instances, both grades appear on the transcript.

Whereas these two conflicting policies for calculating cumulative GPAs cause confusion, and

Whereas the policy for calculating grades in lower-division courses more accurately reflects students' achievement in repeated courses,

The Academic Senate **resolves** that the policy of using the higher grade for calculating cumulative GPAs be applied to both lower-division and upper-division courses.

Attachment This item was tabled until February 19th.

Amended (Substitute) Resolution on Classified Research (Senate Resolution # 28 (Second Reading))

Substitute Resolution, Nov 22, 2006

WHEREAS The Academic Senate and the Administration, consulting together, concurred and adopted a policy on Classified and Propriety Research in November, 1985, and

WHEREAS The Faculty policy on Classified and Propriety Research was incorporated into University policy manuals as RSP-108, and

WHEREAS The Academic Senate wishes to update and clarify the current policy on classified research.

The Academic Senate resolves that the University policy on classified research be as follows.

Policy on Classified Research

Purpose: To protect the special interest of the University to carry out research in an open and unrestricted manner.

Source: *Policy Statement on Classified and Propriety Research*, prepared by the Ad Hoc Academic Senate Committee on Classified and Propriety Research, 1984.

Report of the Task Force on Classified Research, 2006.

Policy:

General

The faculty of Arizona State University is committed to a large and varied agenda of research. The research agenda assumes that the university's role in society is not fulfilled unless research and teaching are vigorously pursued and fully integrated at all levels. Thus, faculty research advances knowledge, enriches teaching, and serves the community.

The principle of the indivisibility of teaching and research requires the University to carry out research in an open and unrestricted manner, with complete freedom to publish or otherwise disseminate the results of the search for knowledge. This special mission of a University makes it necessary for students and faculty to have access to University facilities with minimal restrictions. While society can benefit from classified research, the requirements of secrecy and restrictions on freedom to publish which are inherent in governmental security classification, can be in opposition to the special mission stated above. This makes it necessary to place clear limits upon the classified research conducted by the University.

The research policies below are intended to prevent the restrictions associated with classified research from interfering with the educational and open research activities of the University. These policies do not, however, prohibit self-imposed restrictions based upon the professional ethics of a particular discipline. Moreover, faculty who undertake classified research outside of University facilities will be governed by normal University provisions and procedures for consulting, public service, and leave of absence.

Classified Research Policies

A. The University shall not undertake, on campus, any classified research that introduces new limits on the access to a facility unless:

- a) the project requires the use of unique specialized facilities or the participation of personnel unique to this University, *and*
- b) the project clearly represents a critical public service at a time of local, state, or national emergency.

In no case shall the University enter into such a proposed agreement unless the proposed research has been reviewed by the Research Oversight Committee (see below).

B. No theses or dissertations will be accepted in fulfillment of degree requirements that cannot be freely published or disseminated. Research assignments leading to theses or dissertations that would be subject to such restrictions are unacceptable and are to be prohibited.

C. No secret research or materials shall be considered with regard to appointments, reappointments, tenure, promotions, or merit pay raises.

D. Except as stated above, the University shall not enter into or renew any contract or accept any grant for a classified research project that bars access by University faculty and students to University facilities.

E. The term 'on campus' shall designate those areas and physical facilities in which education and research involving undergraduate and graduate students takes place. Initially, these areas shall include the Tempe, Phoenix Downtown, Polytechnic, and the West campuses, and exclude the Research Park and Skysong.

The Research Oversight Committee

The Committee

There shall be a standing faculty Research Oversight Committee composed of six faculty members, with the associate vice president for research (or equivalent University officer) serving *ex officio*. The faculty members of the committee will be nominated by the President of the Academic Senate and approved by the Senate for staggered terms of three years each. Normally, two new members will be nominated by each new President of the Academic Senate.

Authority and Responsibilities of the Committee

The Research Oversight Committee shall review any proposal for new research or for

renewal of a research project that will involve classified activities or materials, and shall make a recommendation that the proposed project does or does not satisfy the criteria for exceptions stated above. The chair of the committee shall appoint three individuals with relevant technical competence to assess the proposed research project and the capabilities of the University's personnel and facilities. They shall be informed of the details of the proposed research project and will determine if the project satisfies the criteria stated above.

The same review shall also be conducted for any project that is originally unclassified but becomes so during the period of its grant or contract. The Committee shall also be responsible for interpretations of paragraphs B through E, above, and for resolving issues or conflicts that might arise there under.

The Vice President for Research and Economic Affairs shall consult annually with the Research Oversight Committee and inform the committee of any research grant or contract which the University has accepted, agreed to, or renewed since the last report and which involves classified research. The Research Oversight Committee shall transmit a written report of its deliberations, recommendations, and university actions annually to the chair of the Academic Senate.

If the University decides not to follow a recommendation of the Research Oversight Committee, the Vice President for Research and Economic Affairs shall at that time provide a written justification to the Committee, with a copy to the chair of the Academic Senate, of the reasons for the University's actions.

The Classified Materials Management Group

Under ABOR policy 3-202, ABOR and ASU have established a Classified Materials Management Group (MG), with responsibility for negotiating, executing, and administering classified research projects. The MG includes a regent, the University president, the vice president for research and economic affairs, the associate vice president for research, the director of research administration, and the vice president and general counsel. Under no circumstances will the University enter into a classified research agreement without a quorum of the Management Group certifying that the contemplated project satisfies the above criteria.