

Academic Senate Summary

Monday, November 19, 2007

3:15 – 5:00 p.m.

NEW MEETING LOCATION

EDC 117

1. Call to Order (Bill Verdini).

We will bring our meeting of the Tempe/Downtown Senate to order and turn the floor over to Linda Vaughan, President of the Polytechnic campus Senate.

President Vaughan: We are going to directly go into Provost Capaldi's presentation so I will turn the floor over to Dr. Capaldi.

2. Announcements and Communications.

A. University Provost's Report (Betty Capaldi)

Thank you. I wanted to talk about some new processes that will be at the Board meeting from the Academic Affairs area and also how that ties to our own strategic planning. This will be considered at the Board meeting on December 6-7 and we expect it to pass. Regent Stuart who has been chair of the Academic Affairs Committee this year has found there is not any real time during the full board meeting to go over academic issues. Usually if you have attended a board meeting they do all of our salient issues in a short amount of time and it doesn't seem to us that we are spending enough time talking about what we are doing and having enough informed input. On the other hand, some of the items are too complex for the full board to deal with in one meeting. To address that issue Regent Stuart is proposing an Academic Affairs Committee be formed that will have a lot of delegated authority from the Board in terms of approving academic programs, and I think this will work very well. I will share a general framework with you on that—there will no longer be two steps to the approval process. Right now you submit a degree program for planning approval (step 1), and then you submit a degree program for implementation (step 2), and if you have worked through this before you know the forms look remarkably alike. They also are quite onerous. The first thing this committee will look at is making the information required simpler. There will be only one step. Secondly, this probably is the most important part—the Board wants to hear a report once per year on what our “academic plan” is. That is for the coming year. We have not decided yet (and the Board in consultation with the universities now) on when the first annual plan will take place. Because we will have an annual plan I need all our units to have annual plans. That means we all have to think ahead more than we are used to. On the annual plan you would have—what is your overall direction, what are you trying to accomplish, where are you going, and why. In that plan would also be your degree programs that you plan to implement that year. The Board would vote on that plan including all those degree programs. If you have a degree program in that plan and it does not cost new money from the state and it does not have a program fee, you are done at that point. It is very important to think ahead and try to be accurate as to what we want on our plans because it saves a lot of grief later. We Provosts did not like once per year only for our reports. The Board itself after that point will not be involved but the new committee will. The committee meets to review any degree program that was not on the plan for implementation--so this will give you a chance to put one on it that wasn't on your first submission--or if it will cost new state money or a program fee. The committee has four Regents on it and the three Provosts, faculty members, the chair of the Arizona Faculties Council (AFC), who this year is George Watson. That is a non-voting position and the President of the Student statewide governance group (ASA) is a member and that is also a non-voting position. Dennis DeConcini will be the chair of the committee. Regent Gary Stuart and Regent Ernest Calderon and the voting student regent would always be the fourth member and she is on it now. The proposal is for the Provosts to vote to accept the last version that they passed, however on anything that requires a vote by the board, a majority of the Regents have to vote yes. The presidents are not in favor of voting at this time. This will be discussed again at the December meeting. We think it is a Regent's committee so just the Regents should vote. That is the only controversial part of this committee. AT ASU we will still have to have an internal procedure for approving degree programs—the Senate will still have its procedures. Maria, David and I have been working on what we want to have internally but it is a good time to look at what we do and make it easier on

ourselves because the board is making it easier on us. They want us to be nimble and able to move quickly and they just wanted to do their responsibility in terms of knowing where we are going. It will cost money—but it isn't this Academic Affairs Committee that actually approves that part. It goes through the fee process and all that is happening at this next board meeting.

Once a year the Board approves tuition and fees as you know. So, if you had a program—your degree program getting approved wouldn't mean necessarily that you could do any fees. The fees would still have to go through this approval process. Connected to the planning for the university, each dean has been asked to provide a five year plan. They were due August 30, 2007. I had one at that time—I have a draft from everybody now except where we have interim deans because it is not really fair to ask an interim or brand new dean to this task. I have something from everyone who is a non-interim or who did not just start. President Crow wants to review all of these in January so we will iterate back and forth—a lot are just conceptual but what we really wanted is to try to do enrollment plans by college for each campus. We are also doing financial plans so we can get an idea of what money we need and how we are going to be able to allocate that or raise those funds. The academic plan should include what is your niche—what are your challenges, including how many faculty you need to hire. It is a lot to think through. You may or may not know that the Board is doing a strategic plan. They have a twenty year space plan if you can imagine. We had to put in for that 20 year space plan—20 years enrollment projection. Everybody right now is in an innovation and planning mode and I think that is good so we can figure out where we are going and how to help everybody get where they want to be. You should have been hearing about that from your Deans and if you have not, this is your alert to ask about this. The Board has not decided when we will do our annual strategic plan. We have to figure out that internally. I want to tie it to the Senate process so everyone is comfortable with the degree programs that we put on that plan but on the other hand I do not want to slow people down. I asked Maria Davidson to think that through and I also want the senate to give us input on what is the best time of year to do this so we can move things along—if you do not have a graduate programs in place by the fall, you cannot recruit students for another year. We don't want to hold people up past the fall. This is all good news and will make it easier for us to function and it is part of evolution of responsibility coming back to us. That is what I wanted to talk about today.

President Vaughan: Are there questions from the other campuses?

Q- When would proposals for new graduate programs be due from the Senate at the Provost Office? (We are trying to work that out. Maria Allison is working on that.)

Q- I have a question about a rumor that is going around—it is a governance issue—There seems to be a rumor that Lecturers will no longer be able to vote in their own departments. And as a part of that the Provost made this request? (You are the first person that I have heard this from and no, that is not true. Thanks for asking.)

Q- Could you give us an update on the M.U.? --There was a fire and on the second floor where the most important meeting rooms are. So the Arizona Ballroom and the Ventana Room are not available for use. Luckily we are covered by insurance but of course when your house burns down the insurance check is not quite the amount of money you want to spend on reconstructing it back the way it was. We know it is going to cost quite a bit of money; we are aiming to do some improvements within what we can afford above what the insurance will cover, at least to get some new carpet and paint. My deadline, the one that we said we need it back up by is March 1st because that is when orientation starts. So that is our goal. With the eating establishment and the store they will be open sooner than that but we are aiming to have the meeting rooms up by March 1st and everyone is going to work very hard to get that done. Meanwhile we are trying to help everyone find alternative venues but that is a huge loss to us on Tempe in terms of how many meetings, conferences, how many people used to eat there. They are working as best as they can to get it restored.

President Verdini: Thank you Betty, I think that is all here for us, Linda.

President Gitelson: No questions here.

B. Senate President's Report (Bill Verdini)

Let me begin with a report to you all on a couple of things that are going on. Important items to finish up today—there will be a discussion on a motion that was brought up last meeting regarding course approval of

University requirements. The Executive Committee will offer a slightly enhanced substitute motion that will come up under old business.

We have distributed and posted a document on university governance on the Senate's web page that I want to call your attention to.

http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/University_Senate_Proposal_2_.pdf

This document will not be an issue for debate today, but I would like to bring it up under open forum so that I can hear what your initial reactions are to it so we can revise it and come back with something that would be a debatable issue. The interesting thing is—reporting or acting on this document isn't the ultimate thing -- because what will happen is that whatever we decide to do will then be converted into Constitution and Bylaws changes because that is where the real vote will take place. I would like to get a sense of this body before we go ahead and try to wordsmith the constitution and bylaws. That is why we are approaching the university wide governance issue in this way. The third thing is, I just want to quickly update you on some confusions we had about task forces that we had forming – First, we talked about a Retention Task Force—then the Provost and I are working on a University Task Force on Trying to Improve Retention. Delia Saenz from the Provost Office is going to chair that committee. I have nominated some people, some faculty to be on that and there will be some students on it as well. Liz, your name was sent forward. So, that committee will be getting underway soon. Second, we have also talked about what I call the Critical Tracking Task Force. It turns out that it has been decided, and we all talked about this in the U.A.C. meeting as well as in the Provost Office, that critical tracking for students really belongs at the college level, the school level, or the unit level so that is really not something for the university wide body to deal with. We are going to let that go for awhile and not worry about it. The third group is one that Phil is working with on the Freshmen Experience in general. Where are you with that Phil?

President-elect Vandermeer: We are waiting on just a couple of nominations from other people—we are trying to get a membership from across all campuses and the major programs and colleges that have different issues in terms of the program/course. I hope to have a meeting or two within the next month.

President Verdini: Finally we have a committee that we call the Consultative Committee. It is comprised of the Senators-at-Large from all of the colleges and schools. Last year we suspended meetings of that group for the Tempe Senate because the University Academic Council which is a group of senate presidents from all of the campuses was doing that function instead. We decided to go ahead and have a Consultative Committee meeting for Tempe and that was held a week ago. Joe Schultz from WP Carey prepared some draft of notes of that meeting and as soon as those are edited and gone over by the people who attended we will post those for you to read on the Senate web page.

Are there Any questions of me before we move into approving the minutes?

3. Approval of Previous Minutes (October 22, 2007)

The draft Minutes were posted on the Senate Web page. I will entertain a motion to accept them. There was a clarification offered—Student Government is doing a Book Buy Back Program but they are not paying out \$25,000 but rather \$2,500 total. The motion to approve the minutes was made by Senator deLusé and seconded. The draft Minutes were approved as corrected by a voice vote of those present. If you see other things to correct please contact Darby or Judy Grace.

The next item contains CAPC's consent agenda items. Duane Roen cannot be here today so Phil Vandermeer is going to lead us in that discussion.

4. Adoption of Consent Agenda Items

A. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Phil VanderMeer):

You have seen this before, there are two basic parts to this report, the first being a second reading for consent items—See below and the attachments pages 18, 19, and 20 for motions 15, 16, and 17 respectively. If anyone wants to discuss these more, we need to remove them from the consent agenda. No one asked to remove items so this now comes to you as a motion to approve all three—is there a second—there were several seconds. All

in favor of approving the items on the Consent agenda please say aye. All opposed by the same sign (none). Abstentions (none). **Senate Motions 15, 16, and 17 (2006-2007) (Second Reading) were approved by voice vote of those present.**

College of Design – Senate Motion #15

School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
Implementation of a new degree/major
Master of Urban Design (MUD)in Urban Design
(Attachments Page 18) **APPROVED**

CAPC recommendation required
Senate Second Reading 11/19/07

Graduate College – Senate Motion #16

Implementation of a new degree/major
Ph.D.in Neuroscience
(Attachments Page 19) **APPROVED**

CAPC recommendation required
Senate Second Reading 11/19/07

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences #17

Department of Physics
Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
Implementation of a new degree/major
Professional Science Master’s (PSM) in Nanoscience
(Attachments Page 20) **APPROVED**

CAPC recommendation required
Senate Second Reading 11/19/07

5. CAPC report (part II) (Phil VanderMeer)

CAPC Agenda for November 8, 2007 (Attachments Page 21) **INTRODUCED** -- 11/19/07)

The Second item of CAPC business is the **first readings on courses** and I will just note those. If you have questions or interest in those proposals please contact Duane Roen and also review them on the New CAPC website. Does anyone have any particular issues with these—is there a member of CAPC here today? Are there any questions? Hearing none, we will move on to unfinished business.

6. Unfinished Business

A. Executive Committee (Bill Verdini)

Senate Motion #14 (Second Reading): Procedures for Approving University Courses and Requirements” (Attachments Page) and then proposed **Substitute Resolution #14 (2006-2007)** “Procedures for Approving Courses and University Requirements” (Attachments Page 16).

This motion was brought forward at the last Senate meeting and it dealt with procedures for approving University courses and requirements. After some discussion there were quite a few questions about what did all that mean and what about Omnibus courses? The Executive Committee took a look at that motion and then if you look at page 2, they would like to specify a substitute motion Senate Resolution #14 (2006-07). If you would read that then afterward I will entertain a motion to accept this substitute resolution.

Q- I have a question on procedure? If we have the motion to accept it can we then talk about it briefly? (Yes, more than briefly because then it is a motion on the table for debate). The only issue here was that last time there was so much confusion over the original one, we wanted to have it reworded.

Senator deLusé moved to accept the substitute resolution #14. Seconded by Senator Gonzalez-Santin. Is there discussion on this – only on whether or not to accept this substitute motion that is.

Q- Does this have any connection to the ASU 101 course? Is there a place for course approvals as a result of ASU 101? Is this in response to that or does it conflict in any way with the proposal that this Senate has already passed.

President Verdini: No it does not conflict with the proposal that this Senate passed, however, this is related to the ASU 101 debate because it was unclear whether we had anything in place to handle these kinds of new things in our policies and procedures. ASU 101 is still being considered by CAPC; it is being reviewed just as the Senate wanted it to be. In addition, in case there is an ASU 201 sometime we would be on record as having specified a procedure for that to be handled.

Q- In response to this you have now changed the approach to approving all courses, including graduate courses.

President Verdini: All of that is possible of course but first I have to get this approved by all of you as a substitute motion, then we can talk about the details. Are there questions? Hearing none, all in favor please say aye. Any opposed? (none) Abstentions? (none). The Substitute Resolution #14 will be considered next.

I would like to suggest an amendment to change the language to say “all permanent and undergraduate courses” because the graduate courses need more flexibility.

President Verdini: There is a motion to amend this resolution to include the word undergraduate after the word permanent—it would read “all permanent undergraduate courses.” Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. So, we have a motion to amend on the floor. Are there questions about the amendment?

Q- What does “permanent” mean? Do you mean “required,” do you mean “elected,” or do you mean if it has something other than an Omnibus number?

President-elect Vandermeer: There may be different view to that. I think the idea was that an Omnibus course number is a permanent number of what is being taught under the Omnibus number, it is not in and of itself permanently a course/topic. Graduate courses by that fact which are Omnibus courses can continue to be offered as they have been. This is not envisioning any effort to change any of that, if there are senators who believe that this requires volumes of change then we have to clarify the language.

I oppose the amendment as it is. I do not want to give the impression through our resolution that Provost or administration or some other body can go ahead and make changes to graduate requirements and graduate courses, etc. without approval by some sort of faculty governance process. If we want flexibility we should do that by changing the Senate procedures. If we just say undergraduate, we are leaving a significant door wide open and I am not sure why we don't need flexibility for undergraduate offerings as well at least in some departments and programs.

President Verdini: There is a lot of flexibility in the Omnibus number series and also the 94 series—and it has some general name--and the topics change semester by semester. I believe that is true at the graduate level also.

I would like to speak against the amendment because the original motion said that courses must be approved by the faculty. It doesn't matter if I read it correctly unit level, college level—I really don't see how graduate courses could be created on just the whim of one person. It must be the case that even for a graduate course one has to consult ones colleagues and be talked about at the department level. I really don't see what the issue is. The original motion said that faculty have to be involved in the creation of courses.

I am not sure that the amendment is needed. I am just trying to recall and maybe there are people from Graduate Council here to address this. To add undergraduates suggests that we could remove the Graduate Council role in approving graduate courses?

Could we hear from the maker of this motion again why you want to add undergraduates—if it was already covered and why do we want to exclude graduate courses?

The point we were trying to make is that “all courses have to be approved by a curriculum committee.”
President Verdini: Bullet item #1 does say that it would be approved by a faculty curriculum committee or other elected faculty group—it does not say that it has to go through the Academic Senate or the CAPC committee. We are debating an amendment to this resolution, to insert “undergraduate” in bullet point #1.

A faculty person or an elected group—I would change this to The faculty and The elected group. So that is clear that both of these are equal and it is not just an ad hoc faculty committee—it is The faculty committee that is appropriate.

President Verdini: The reason the article is ambiguous is that if it is a departmental faculty curriculum committee, the college, or the school level one, or perhaps a university one, that was why there is an “and” an elected faculty governance group—so that if it is not an appointed committee that does the review and preparation, the course still needs some approval by an elected group. If it is at the department level, an elected group there, and if it is the college level, an elected group there. If it is at the University level, it would be the Senate.

Just as follow-up it seems that some units do not always have elected faculty groups—it just seems like that language is potentially confusing depending on how the governance group is structured.

President Verdini: In that particular situation I am speculating but let’s say that the department has an appointed curriculum committee that comes up with a new course. If that went through than this new course would have to go to an elected school or college faculty group other than just the appointed group. If the department has an elected curriculum committee or an elected group, or if every faculty member of the department happened to be on the curriculum committee, then I don’t see that would be an issue.

We are still on the amendment to add the word “undergraduate”--are there any other questions on the amendment to insert the word undergraduate?

I am still confused – Review of the curriculum is part of faculty responsibility and being that the graduate courses already go through Graduate Council plus CAPC committee and that is a Senate committee, I am not quite sure what the issue is yet.

Just as clarification—I think that permanent graduate courses go through CAPC but I think that Omnibus courses and some others like 598—if you simply change that to say “all permanent excluding Omnibus courses must be approved by a faculty curriculum committee” then I think you have the flexibility to offer it a few times and try it and make it special topics.

President Verdini: Are you suggesting we substitute the words “excluding Omnibus courses? For the word undergraduate?

The question has been called on the amendment—is there any opposition to that? Ok. Then we will vote on whether or not to insert the word “undergraduate”— All in favor of that that amendment please say aye. All opposed (some opposed) Are there abstentions? That amendment did not pass.

Now we are back to the original motion.

Q- Why would a faculty curriculum committee be better than by “**the** faculty curriculum committee?”

Could we say “or” instead of and? (No. That would change the meaning).

Part of the reason for that is could put together a group of faculty, design a course, send a course, and if that group of faculty approved the course—is that enough? The idea was that governance has to do with representation of the faculty rather than some hand picked faculty. That could occur at the chair level, the dean level, and the Provost level.

President-elect Vandermeer: Just to speak to the earlier question about “the faculty curriculum committee”—the problem is that we are trying to make a general principle here without writing this in 17 different clauses and sections

What saying a “Relevant” faculty committee?

A department faculty committee would be relevant and college curriculum committee would be relevant—what we are talking about is having a clear existing policy—maybe what we are talking about is having a relevant University curriculum committee. Right now we don’t have that committee—we have campus curriculum committees and we are at this awkward stage of being between governance structures.

We seek not to change what is already there—the university, the college, the CAPC and the Senate. You have to look at the writing that says proposals originate at the unit level and in some cases it can be a college—the college curriculum committees review them and then they go to CAPC and TCCS and to the Senate in some cases. I don’t myself see a problem with the way it is worded because it is consistent.

I am not speaking against the substitute motion, but I want to ask what happens if we removed (a faculty curriculum committee)—why don’t we just remove that language and add an “and” “must be approved by an elected faculty governance group at the appropriate unit or college level.” What would be lost if we just took that out?

President-elect VanderMeer: That would change the policy we have right now—the policy as Senator Comfort was saying was that we have curriculum committees that make the initial approval and then college or university senates make decisions. He is right in saying that the purpose of this resolution was simply to remove any confusion about what the intention was for procedures of approving any courses at the university.

This should mean an elected faculty committee that gives approval – isn’t that the main issue that we want to be sure that an elected faculty governance group is involved in the approval process. What I don’t understand is what is being added here by saying that you have to have approval by a faculty governance committee and an elected faculty group?

President-elect VanderMeer—You and I have served on curriculum committees and their work is necessary for serious proposals, so my sense is that we still need both.

It is my understanding that the wording to have “a faculty curriculum committee” without using the word elected was simply to accommodate the present circumstance that not all curriculum committees in all units are elected, some in fact are appointed. It is important that these matters be reviewed by a curriculum committee—That seems to be to me to be most accommodating to our present circumstances and at the same time preserves the real concern that an elected faculty body ultimately approves them.

In reading this I realized that by saying approved by an appropriate faculty governance group at the appropriate unit or college level—it leaves out the Senate level if you are saying that—and at the university level needs to be added there too.

I propose that it say “at the appropriate unit or college level and at the Senate(s) level(s).”

President-elect Vandermeer: You don’t really want to say that because right now we are not really approving courses that go through a college.

Don’t they have to go to TCC currently and that is not the university—TCCS is campus not the university—the problem is with the language.

Amendment has been made, do I hear a second? (Seconded)

Motion has been made to add that wording to the original motion—is there any debate on this amendment?

Q- If you meant at the Senate level at all campuses, the Senate and the level should be made plural.

At the Senate(s) level(s). Will this be acceptable. (Yes because at the Senate level does mean the Senate and its committees will be involved.)

Is there debate on this amendment?

A friendly amendment—rather than saying at the Senate(s) level(s)—could we say “at the appropriate unit or higher level?” I move to substitute “at the appropriate unit or higher level” for “appropriate unit or college level and in the Senate(s) level(s).”

Is this really necessary when we have the faculty curriculum committees and an elected faculty governance group—we should not have to approve every single course. I would welcome number 2 because it is all university wide.

In theory I agree except that we were told that we have to have an online degree starting in the fall by Provost level. So, I don't know, it seems to me that it might be appropriate to keep all of this in there because this was not generated out of the faculty, this was generated out of the Provost level, the new push for online degrees. I think there are strange curricular issues afoot that are not coming out of departments.

Are we ready to vote on the amendment? The amendment is substituting “and at the Senate(s) level(s)”. All in favor of this amendment say aye. Opposed say nay (one) and abstentions? (one). Ok, we are now back to the original proposal as amended.

I just want to make this as concrete as possible—Let's say I want a permanent course and it has to be approved by a faculty curriculum committee from my unit, which we don't have, and by an elected faculty governance group, which we don't have, at the appropriate unit or college level—we are a school--so, does it get approved then at the School or could I get it approved at the College or is it supposed to be done at both of those levels. Is that how it is supposed to happen?

This is not envisioning necessarily any change—presumably the unit level is where you are already having curriculum decisions and clearly the college does have a curriculum committee and a senate, so, any proposal from your unit would at a minimum go through that and this does not change that process.

According to the definitions in ACD schools are units, if they are parts of colleges, unit would cover schools as well as departments. However, this was talked about earlier and I wanted to suggest a wording change, offer an amendment—at the beginning of the second line of number 1)—an elected faculty governance group—I am troubled by the idea that in instances a departmental meeting is elected—everybody in the department votes—they are not really elected, it is representative though—perhaps representative can be elected indicating a meeting of the whole?

Are you proposing an amendment?

Yes, replace “elected” with the word “representative.”

I know the intent is good but I think representative allows—

Let me interrupt here—I need a second to that amendment. Seconded.

I think that some claim that a certain appointed group is representative—and if the elected group does not vote on it then I am against this.

Anyone else want to speak to the amendment? Hearing nothing further, all in favor of the amendment which is to get rid of elected and put in representative—all in favor of that please say aye. All opposed say nay (several nays). That motion fails.

So we are back to the substitute motion as amended. Any other questions?

I think the committee should be elected but in small units if they choose to structure as a committee of the whole they should be allowed to do that.

Could it be something like elected “or” committee of the whole?

Then you are telling units how they have to define their structures and I think you cannot tell units how to structure themselves.

Try to imagine if a committee of the whole in a department approving a particular course for a program by a majority vote, and someone would come back and say even though everybody in the department got to vote on it they were not elected—I think in fact the substance of that would fall apart very quickly upon closer examination.

Look at the course proposal graph that is on the Provost’s web page. The starting box clearly is at the unit level and it speaks about a department committee reviewing things and going through the record and approved by the chair before it goes to the college, but if you look beyond that, if you look at the ACD manual it says that the proposals originate at the college level. I think that most colleges, the University College being the exception, have an elected curriculum committee. If they don’t maybe that is something to look into but if that is the case I think the wording that is there is probably fine.

I want to go back to my prior amendment--I think we can resolve the problem if we eliminate “by a curriculum committee and”—then we will have by an elected faculty governance group at the appropriate unit or college level and at the Senate(s) level(s). I am making that as a motion to amend.

Is there a second.

Whether or not an elected faculty governance committee is involved may not be as important as having an elected curriculum committee involved.

The spirit here is that among the colleges there is a diversity of experiences and procedures throughout the university. I think we all know more or less what we are talking about but as we are going to be doing more of this on Senate proposals we are looking at ways to try to strengthen the basic principle we are talking about which is, faculty governance trying to figure out ways to look at the colleges and to strengthen those bodies and in the same time address the same questions we are raising here in that subsequent debate.

I just wanted to see if the previous speaker--I wanted to point out that with the amendment we do not exclude a units non-elected faculty making its recommendation and moving the thing forward to the college level. It just insists that there be an elected faculty governance group that does approve it eventually.

Any other specific discussion on this point or are we ready to vote? All in favor of “by a faculty curriculum committee” say aye. Opposed say nay (several nays). The motion fails. We are back to the motion as amended. Are we now ready to vote?

I just wanted to make sure I understood why we spent all this time on numbers? Any university wide curriculum requirement would be approved by CAPC and then the Senate – so does that assume that there would not be any involvement below that? Isn’t part of CAPC’s procedures to make sure that they work with General Studies Council on things? This is a double barreled question.

Again, I think that this does not change anything that currently exists which is to say how CAPC does things. The question is would you take a university wide requirement and take that back to individual colleges? And what this says is that CAPC then says it has to go, and the university, this Senate for this campus, can decide—when we move to a single university senate and a single university CAPC than they would decided.

So, CLAS with their elected curriculum committee could come up with some course that they then could have our units do because it say “or”?

1. All permanent courses....and by an elected faculty governance group at the appropriate unit OR college level.

I was just reading what it says, so,

Whose course is this? I would hope that it would be a course from our school which would then go to the college, but apparently it doesn't look like it has to.

Are you talking about whether courses have to be approved at the college level?

No it is backwards. If it would be top down instead of bottom up is what I meant. Let me retighten that—it is possible under these specifications for a college to develop and approve a course that a department has to offer—and the department never had anything to say about it. Because now it says “or”—if taken to the extreme could CAPC get together and say you know what we would like to have a family studies course 501—we are going to pass it, and now you are going to teach that course for us.

We would like to have ASU 101 in all the departments and schools under CLAS...This is not expertise it is workmanship. The Senate meets in CLAS.

I would interpret that to mean a faculty committee and I would not assume that is a department committee. But if the department has a curriculum committee.

I am not speaking to this particular point but it is relevant—whenever you have “or” and “and” there are two ways to interpret this. The “and” could be going with just the second disjunction—or it could be going with both, the whole assumption. In other words, I believe what was intended here was the following—that the “,” solves the problem as far as I am concerned.

Are you moving that as an amendment?

May I do that as a friendly amendment—I think that is what you intended.

It is friendly to the substitute resolution.

I would like to speak to the substance. For me the key word is “appropriate.” If the course is a course taught by the unit then the appropriate level or the governance group is the unit level. I think we would be going too far to try to craft this into a statement about the structure for successive procedure of courses. As long as we can capture the idea that in order for a course to be implemented it has to be approved at the appropriate level, I think that solves a lot of problems. The college says you unit has to teach a certain course—it can't unless at your level a faculty curriculum and governance committee says yes. I think this guarantees the kind of process that you mentioned if it is saying all departments have to teach this course--then that is a college level issue.

I think your example was very good. Maybe we can just verify it by what we don't like and that is we don't want to be told by the upper administration that we have to teach X,Y, and Z. We should have this statement to prevent this—No college or university or unit can be forced to teach—they should be asked—no unit should have to teach a course that they did not approve.

If I understand what you are saying—you are suggesting that it should say something like all permanent courses should originate at the relevant unit, period.

I don't know that I want to limit where ideas come from, but regardless of where the idea originates it needs faculty input. That is the issue.

I think if we ever got to a situation in which a college curriculum committee approved a course and the department would have to teach it without having the consent or the support of the department—if such a motion ever arose in the Academic Senate here I believe it could be dead on arrival, and if we could not insure that then I really don't think we are going to accomplish anything with any of the rest of the words on that screen as well. The Senate has to approve it by the wording we have there--and I just cannot imagine the circumstance in which a Senate made up of faculty would approve something being crammed down the throats of an academic unit—if we did, we deserve it.

I think there is one other point in point 2. CAPC has the responsibility for contacting all of the units, schools and colleges where this might be affected. It is part of the responsibility of the Provost Office to insure that is taken care of. A proposal comes through—along the process units are going to be contacted and asked—is this relevant to you? That is the way it is written.

Is there further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of this motion as amended say aye. Opposed say nay (no) Abstentions (none). Thank you, the substitute resolution passes as amended (at the end of point one add—“ , and at the Senate(s) level(s).”

Substitute Senate Resolution #14 passed as amended by a voice vote of those present. (Attachments Page 17).

President Verdini: It passed!!!! Well, thank you all. I do think the spirit of it is just as we stated that faculty input and approval of curricular matters is an important part of our process. I am going to change the order of business here. We will move on past new business to committee reports but my understanding is the committees have no new business to report, they have only reports, so we will defer that a bit and invite Deborah Sullivan to come up. We have some changes in the Student Policies that will be before the Regents at their meeting in January. Fortunately, we don't meet in December, so, I need you to hear this now so that if you have any issues you can get back to Deborah Sullivan on this.

Deborah Sullivan, Director for Student Life

Good afternoon, I really do appreciate you giving me a few minutes on your agenda today. I will be brief. I am the Director for Student Life here at the Tempe campus and I asked for a few minutes today on your agenda to speak to you about the *Arizona Board of Regents Student Code of Conduct and Student Disciplinary Procedures*. The document that is up on the screen is an executive summary that will be going to the Regents in January. As I am sure you all may be familiar with this, it is that document that governs student behavior at the three state universities. Back in the fall of 2000, we went through a major set of revisions to this document. It has been about five years since the last revisions were passed, so folks at the three universities knew it was time to sit down and look at this document again. For the last couple of years people from the judicial areas at the four ASU campuses, at NAU and UofA along with the attorneys for the three state universities, and the attorney for the Regents have been meeting regularly to review the *Student Code of Conduct and the Student Disciplinary Procedures*. Those revisions as I said will be going to the Regents in January. There are several revisions and I have provided Bill with an electronic copy of the actual documents and my understanding from Judy is that it will be up on the screen today or whatever will give you access to these documents and policies.

The executive summary provides the changes that will be going to the Regents. As you know it has to go to two readings before the Regents and the first reading is in January and the second reading at their meeting March. Once approved we are going to be implementing the new policy by July of 2008. I will take a couple of minutes and go over what the substantive revisions are. Mostly it is clarification in language and that is to accommodate any changes in state or federal laws or university policies.

For the Code of Conduct—on the second page, the substantive changes as I said mostly are language changes to help clarify to make the policy clearer for students and faculty, staff, parents and everybody else. Some of the substantive changes in the code itself address the issue of all campus behavior. This document has always allowed the three state universities to look at the issue of off campus behavior, but we have clarified the language to make that clearer as well as to include language that says that if that behavior “interfere with protection of university interests or the pursuit of university objectives.” Some of the other revisions are definitions to prohibit weapons, explosives, and fireworks and partly because those definitions previously had

not been included in this document but were included in university policies at the three state universities. We have come up with language now that is in this document to address those things. We have updated definitions to language for gambling and hazing, again to reflect changes in Arizona law. We updated descriptions to the language that talks about threatening or violent behavior of students—to discrimination and weapons. We did add one new prohibitive conduct and that reference is surreptitious video taping. That is something that all three state universities as well as universities across the country have been seeing more of—now with cell phones and all the technology that is out there are issues of students engaging in video taping where there is an expectation of privacy. The language we put in makes clear that this sort of prohibitive conduct is only where there would be an expectation of privacy such as in one's residential life room, in a bathroom, in a gym locker room, that sort of thing. For the procedures, the main revisions have to do with language that clarifies what is called immediate interim action, or in other words immediate suspension. This is language that allows judicial folks on each of the campuses to get a student off campus immediately if there is an issue that poses a risk back to the campus community. We also made some changes to conform to an Arizona law to the number of days involved in hearings and appeals, and that language has been clarified in the document. Then also we have a lot more flexibility in the length of time so that students have more time to prepare for a hearing, for an administrative hearing so that the students office also has more time and so does the university hearing board have more time in which to hear the case. Those are the substantive changes. They are all outlined in the document. The Regents will get not only get this executive summary but obviously the documents in congressional format so they can see the current document and then the proposed changes. I welcome any feedback if you will send it to me at Dsullivan@asu.edu. My phone number is 965-6547 and if you could get me any comments or concerns or feedback within the next couple of weeks it would be appreciated. I need that because it is going on the January Regents agenda—we have to have it back to the Regents offices so that they can prepare the packets. I will take any questions now.

Q- What student opportunities were given to get their input into this process?

We have been vetting this with campus constituencies across all three state universities as well as the other three ASU campuses. We are presenting to all the student governments—I have attended both Undergraduate Student Government meetings and Graduate and Professional Students Association meetings, the Residence Hall Association meetings, and the Classified Staff Council meetings. The same process is occurring on the other campuses.

I am just a little concerned that you have been at this for two years and it is going to go to the Regents in January but this is the first time we are hearing about it at the November Senate meeting without the opportunity to have any substantive input or discussion. I chair the Student Faculty Policy Committee on this campus and this is the first I have heard of this and I am concerned and would like to make sure that we are able to meet our responsibilities here on this campus.

Let me tell you that NAU and UofA are spending time with the students reviewing the policies and the feedback that I have gotten so far has been very good—they are happy for the changes—they think the language is clear now and I was involved in the last Senate revisions of this seven years ago and these are really more clarifying language and language that has to be amended to be in line with state law compared to the last time which truly were some major revisions. I can tell you that the process this time is the same process that was used the last time. But take a look at the documents and if anything is a real concern let me know.

USG President Simonhoff: I know you came to our senate meeting and I appreciate that—is there anyway you can come to our staff meeting as well. We have another forty students who would be at that meeting. (Yes.)

Q- Just a clarification and I want to thank your office for doing this—we work with you a lot and you come forward in a lot of tough situations, thank you. One of the things that I hope is clear in this document and it may be clearer in the new documents, is about the behavior of students in online courses. I am not sure that faculty are aware of this problem but that also comes under all these things and is becoming an increasing issue.

The document clarifies even a definition for “student.” This is because we even have had students that applied to the university but not yet registered that we have had problems with at times. It clarifies what a “student” is. It includes non-degree seeking students. Basically once you have applied to ASU you will now meet the definition of “students” and however you are taking a class applies, whether off campus or on campus or online. This document only applies to students, obviously not faculty or staff. I thank you for your time and email me any questions or concerns to Dsullivan@asu.edu.

We will put the entire set of documents on the web site tonight or tomorrow and then I correct myself we do have a December 3 meeting this semester. We can talk some more about this then. Also because we have that meeting I would like to ask you to read more carefully the University Governance document and we will bring that up again too. I would like to go now to our committee reports and give them an opportunity to address you.

7. New Business

A. Executive Committee (Bill Verdini) No report.

B. Committee on Committees (Tory Trotta)

Tory is working on the Preference Survey.

C. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee/Past President’s Report (Duane Roen).

CAPC has already reported to you.

Next Meeting: November 29, 2007, 3:30-5:00 p.m., Ira A. Fulton Foundation Building, Room 4440

D Personnel Committee (Bob McPhee) No report.

President Verdini: I would like you to know that Bob has been working closely with Doug Johnson and the Retirees Association, the Emeritus College, and George Watson, on retirement benefits.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, December 5, 11:00 am – 12:00 Noon

E Student-Faculty Policy Committee (Jerry Kingston).

President Verdini: I want to commend Jerry and the Student Faculty Policy Committee—You have implemented a process that we have wanted to do by submitted a committee report and then asking for questions on it.

Any further comments (Questions only!) Thank you very much.

November 19 report (Attachments Page 7)

Next Meeting: Monday, November 26, 1:45 - 2:45 p.m., ADMB 365

F. University Affairs Committee (Rojann Alpers) – No report.

President Verdini: Let me give you an update on UAC—I tasked them this year with rewriting the Constitution and Bylaws. The goal I had was to get a set of bylaws in the constitution that outlined a university wide governing body. I am going to revise my forecast and say that I don’t know if by the end of this year we are going to be that far along. University Affairs is now focusing primarily on getting the current constitution and bylaws to reflect what it is that we are doing right now. Right now we do things that are not in the constitution and bylaws. It is largely because our procedures are evolving the process and the example is of West campus—but there is no provision for West in any of the constitutions and bylaws. It is going to therefore be a two phase piece.

November 15 meeting had to be cancelled.

Next Meeting: December meeting will be by email.

They are studying the ACD 112-01 Academic Constitution and Bylaws, for possible revision.

Send your suggestions to revise directly to Rojann@asu.edu.

8. Reports

A. USG Report (Liz Simonhoff).

We have moved the offices of Student Government to PE West building so we are all in the Safety Escort Office during the day so it has been a lot of fun and bonding time. That is where we are located for the rest of the semester--until we hear further updates on the Memorial Union reopening.

Two weeks ago we had our housing fair. Over twenty-five complexes came to campus. Students got the opportunity to start inquiring about places off campus and we raised about \$20,000 for Student Government III and we also had that same week our Voter Blitz week and we had a statewide competition with NAU and UofA and ASU and our goal is to register 2,008 students by 2008, we are half way there—we have about 1,200 students registered to vote and we have registered 600 in that week. We are beating NAU and UofA so far.

Student Government runs the Safety Escort Service and we are getting obviously an increase in duties of what we do on a daily basis so we are working with Residence Life right now to increase our capabilities and what our carts are needed for—sometimes faculty and staff need rides. We get approximately 50 calls a day.

We are working to get an extra office operating on campus by next semester in an attempt to span the campus. We are expanding our services to meet our expanding demand.

In terms of our book buy back program; our 2,500 buy back not 25,000 program—hopefully next year. We are working with the bookstore and we are going to take back the first 500 books that the Bookstore won't take back, and we will give student five dollars for them and this is being done so students will not have to throw away any books. Five dollars is not a lot of money but we want to try to address the problem.

Jerry Kingston has been so wonderful and he has got so much done with the Student Faculty Policy Committee particularly with the issue of repeated courses and also with the textbook initiative—we have been doing a lot of great things the semester and it has been a pleasure working with that committee so far.

Finally all campuses across the university-West, Downtown, Polytechnic, as well as GPSA have been working with the administration on the possibility of implementing a student activity fee and we are really behind here compared to other universities and student governments in the country that are funded solely on fees. We took a student priority survey and students are highly in support of this and we are getting endorsements to hopefully present this to the Arizona Board of Regents in December. This is very exciting and I think we have the ability to affect the culture of the university in the future by having students fund a fee they think is important.

I want to also thank the Academic Senate and Darby and President Verdini because we have been having our staff meetings in the Academic Senate Conference Room, so, we are sort of scrambling around and you have been so supportive of us and we really appreciate it. Happy Thanksgiving everybody.

I don't see Bree McEwan but we do have Justin Moore today.

B. GPSA Report (Justin Moore)

I am representing Brae McEwan as she is out of town this weekend. I am the director of issues research for GPSA and I am in the Hugh Downs School of Communication. GPSA is pleased to report and to announce our Centennial Professors Program which recognizes junior faculty on the Tempe campus. More information will be following in degrees between now and your December meeting so I will give you more information at that meeting.

We have finished our first round of Teaching Excellence Award nominations for Graduate teachers on the Tempe campus and the second round of those nominations will occur in the spring, and the awards for both fall and spring will be awarded in the spring.

The GPSA assembly has finalized our tuition and our fee proposals and quite interested in the ABOR Taskforce on Tuition. We would also like to extend a welcome to the USG if they would like to use our offices at any time considering what has happened to the MU.

Thank you very much; are there any questions? Thank you.

President Verdini: I managed to rush us right through. We could go to open forum now or if you would trust us to do the university wide document and code of conduct on December 3, I will make sure and reserve time to do just those two things.

9. Adjournment

I would also entertain a motion to adjourn early for a change. Moved and seconded. Thank you and have a great Thanksgiving. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Recorded and edited by:
Darby Shaw, Executive Assistant

Final editing by:
Judy Grace, Secretary

ATTACHMENTS

**ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE
FALL 2007 SESSION**

**Substitute Resolution
#14 replaces this Motion.**

Senate Motion # 14 (2007-08)

Motion Introduced by: Executive Committee
William Verdini, Chair

**Date of Introduction
for First Reading:** October 22, 2007

Date of Second Reading: November 19, 2007 *Under Unfinished Business

Title of Motion: Procedures for Approving University Courses and Requirements

- 1 All courses must be approved by a faculty curriculum committee and elected faculty council.
- 2 Any university-wide requirement must be approved by the University Academic Curriculum and Programs Committee(s) and by the Senate(s).

Substitute Resolution 14

APPROVED as **amended** November 19, 2007

Procedures for Approving Courses and University Requirements

Whereas the consultative role of faculty in academic policy is well-established by state law (ARS 15-1601), the policies of the Arizona Board of Regents (Policy Manual 6-201), and the policies and procedures of Arizona State University (ACD 112-01 I-D1); and

Whereas curriculum procedures at ASU have long required faculty approval of new courses and curriculum requirements;

Be it therefore reaffirmed by the Academic Senate that:

1. All permanent courses must be approved by a faculty curriculum committee and by an elected faculty governance group at the appropriate unit or college level, **and at the Senate (s) level(s).**
2. Any university-wide curriculum requirement must be approved by the Curriculum and Academic Program Committees and the Senates of each campus.

Senate Motion # 15 (2007-08)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Duane Roen, Chair

**Date of Introduction
for First Reading:** October 22, 2007

Date of Second Reading: November 19, 2007 APPROVED

Title of Motion: Request from the College of Design - School of Architecture and
Landscape Architecture for the implementation of a new degree/major
–Master of Urban Design (MUD) in Urban Design

- 1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval
- 2 of a proposal submitted by the College of Design, School of Architecture and
- 3 Landscape Architecture for the implementation of a new degree/major
- 4 Master of Urban Design (MUD) in Urban Design

Rationale:

The Master of Urban Design program at Arizona State University is a multi-disciplinary program in the College of Design. The curriculum is built around the analysis and understanding of contemporary urban conditions specific to rapidly urbanizing and arid regions of the world.

The purpose of the program is to educate design professionals in the field of Urban Design. Urban Design is concerned with the organization, aesthetics, systems of regulation, and function of cities. The focus of the program is on the integration of the public and private sector as it affects the civic realm. The program synthesizes through built form, the complexity of conditions that contribute to and shape the urban environment. These include; architecture, landscape architecture, planning, public programs, economics, engineering, development, law, government, and sustainability.

Senate Motion # 16 (2007–08)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Duane Roen, Chair

**Date of Introduction
for First Reading:** October 22, 2007

Date of Second Reading: November 19, 2007 **APPROVED**

Title of Motion: Request from the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences – Department of Physics, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry for the implementation of a new degree/major –Professional Science Master’s (PSM) in Nanoscience

- 1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval
- 2 of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, Department of Physics
- 3 Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry for the implementation of a new degree/major
- 4 Professional Science Master’s (PSM) in Nanoscience

Rationale:

At the present time, no graduate programs exist in the state of Arizona for professional training in Nanoscience. Nanoscience is a transdisciplinary subject spanning physics, chemistry and biochemistry, materials and electrical engineering. The purpose of the program is to train graduate students in Nanoscience within an interdisciplinary and professional environment. The need and market demand is strong, based on in-depth knowledge of High-Tech industry in Arizona, and the current and projected demand for rapid change and continuing professional development in a range of related industries. These include the optics, semiconductor electronics and optoelectronics, sensors, nano-medicine and healthcare sectors.

Senate Motion # 17 (2007–08)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Duane Roen, Chair

**Date of Introduction
for First Reading:** October 22, 2007

Date of Second Reading: November 19, 2007 APPROVED

Title of Motion: Request from the Graduate College – for the implementation of a new degree/major – Ph.D. in Neuroscience

- 1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval
- 2 of a proposal submitted by the Graduate College for the implementation of a
- 3 a new degree/major – Ph.D. in Neuroscience

Rationale:

The study of Neuroscience is essential for the understanding of many brain and neuromuscular diseases, as well as their treatment and rehabilitation, and must incorporate studies at multiple levels of function, including studies at the cellular, organ and organism level. Neuroscience involves the study of the nervous system and its relation to an organisms function. It encompasses how gene and nerve networks interact with the environment throughout an organism's development to account for behavior. This program will bring together broadly distributed research programs in the analysis of nervous system function from many disciplines including biology, mathematics, biochemistry, engineering, psychology. As such, the field of Neuroscience is broadly interdisciplinary and is not adequately captured by any single existing academic program.

The PhD in Neuroscience degree program will also have tremendous social relevance. Many ASU researchers have funding from federal, state and private sources to perform basic research on the relation between the brain, neuromuscular function and behavior.

CAPC Agenda Items

On November 8, 2007, the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee, recommended approval of the following: *one reading on these items

[College of Design](#)

**Name change of an undergraduate concentration
BA Design Studies
From Design Management to Management**

CAPC recommendation required
*Senate information item

**Name change of an undergraduate concentration
BA Design Studies
From Design History & Culture to Design History**

CAPC recommendation required
*Senate information item

**Disestablishment of an undergraduate concentration
BA Design Studies
The Built Environment**

CAPC recommendation required
*Senate information item

**Disestablishment of an undergraduate concentration
BA Design Studies
Urban Studies**

CAPC recommendation required
*Senate information item

[Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering](#)

**Authority to Plan a new Undergraduate Degree Program
B.S. in Biomedical Informatics**

CAPC information item
*Senate information item

(When the ABOR approves planning a **new** degree--the proposal will then come back to the Senate as an action item).

Report of the Student Faculty Policy Committee

At this time the Student Faculty Policy Committee is working on the following issues or topics:

1. We are conducting follow up work on the report of the Student Success Task Force. This task force was appointed by the Provost in the spring of 2007, and submitted its report to the Academic Senate in October, 2007. The Senate referred the report, and its recommendations, to the Faculty Student Policy Committee for further study. We currently are reviewing the policies on repeated courses at peer institutions and formulating a data request for the Office of Institutional Analysis related to the impact on cumulative GPA of alternative ways of treating grades in repeated courses. We also are examining the impact of our current policies related to course repetition on the implementation of critical tracking requirements which specify: (a) a student must receive a grade of B in a critical track course or courses; and (b) a student must achieve a minimum cumulative GPA value in critical tracking courses.
2. We are continuing to gather information related to the cost of required course-related materials. The percentage of the faculty that submitted their requests to the ASU Bookstore for required course-related materials for the spring semester of 2008 was up substantially over the previous year. Although considerable progress has been made, the committee is attempting to identify yet other ways that would reduce the (net) cost of required course-related materials for our students.
3. The committee has requested that one of its members be included on two new task forces to be appointed by the Senate president, one on the freshman year experience and the other on student retention.
4. The committee has been asked by the Senate president to review current policies related to Reading Day activities, and to make recommendations, as appropriate. This topic was last taken up by the committee during the 2005-06 academic year, with no recommendations being forwarded to the Academic Senate.
5. The next meeting of the committee in Monday, November 26, at 1:45 PM in the Academic Senate Office conference room. This meeting will immediately precede the Executive Committee meeting which begins at 3:00 PM.

Jerry Kingston
Chair