

University Senate Annual Committee Report
Academic Year 2020-2021

Section I

Name of Committee: Student and Faculty Policy Committee

Submitted by: Scott Day, W.P Carey Management and Entrepreneurship

Date Submitted: 4/23/2021

Membership Roster:

Valerie Adams, Interdisciplinary Humanities and Communication

Scott Day (chairperson), W.P Carey Management and Entrepreneurship

Don Frost, W. P. Carey School of Accountancy

Mark Hager, Community Resources and Development

Hala King, School of Mathematical and Natural Sciences

Gilberto Lopez, Transborder Studies

Maureen McCoy, College of Health Solutions

Ashley Randall, Counseling and Counseling Psychology

Joseph Russomanno, Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication

Catherine Saucier, Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts School of Music Dance and Theatre

Overview Narrative:

The following summarizes committee work accomplished throughout this past year:

The purpose of the Student Faculty Policy Committee (SFPC) is to serve in a policy-forming and advising capacity in matters governing student conduct, consistent with the Rules of Maintenance of Public Order and the Student Code of Conduct, in matters concerning student organizations, and in other matters related to students including:

- undergraduate and graduate admission and readmission policies and procedures;
- registration, graduation requirements, grading policies, scheduling, withdrawal policies, course load maximums, and program of study filing requirements;
- student activities related to academic development, including advisement, counseling, and academic organizations;
- policy development with respect to student-faculty-administration relationships;
- review of organized extra-classroom activities to assess their continued effective relation to university academic goals;
- policy development with respect to academic integrity and

- review of undergraduate education, including teaching in a research institution.

The SFPC reviews a variety of Requests for Consultation (RFC) submitted by the committee members, senators, ASU faculty, and ASU students. RFCs very often require research and investigative work by committee members in order to develop a thorough understanding of an issue and a possible resolution. During 2020 -2021, the committee actively worked on the following RFCs:

RFC-199 The Associated Students of Arizona State University Undergraduate Student Government, Tempe Senate Resolution 07 _S07, a resolution urging the university to remove voting barriers on election day.

RFC- 207 Explore ways to mitigate food insecurity on all ASU campuses.

RFC- 220 Operation of the new Academic Integrity Office (Role of the Provost office in academic integrity procedures)

RFC- 222 A resolution to expand funding, access, and equity for childcare resources across all campuses

Section II

Request for Consultations and/or topics reviewed by the committee and outcomes (topics reviewed by the committee with actions noted):

RFC-199 The Associated Students of Arizona State University Undergraduate Student Government, Tempe Senate Resolution 2020-74, a resolution urging the university to remove voting barriers on election day passed in the senate in 2019-2020 and took effect in the November 2020 election.

<https://usenate.asu.edu/motions/2020-74>

RFC - 207 Request of support for a basic needs coalition, inclusion of basic needs resources in all syllabi, and on-campus space for an ASU food pantry (Pitchfork Pantry) at all four campuses.

Outcome: The committee drafted a motion, which was approved by the senate

<https://usenate.asu.edu/motions/2021-27>. The motion passed in the Senate.

RFC- 220 Operation of the new Academic Integrity Office (Role of the Provost office in academic integrity procedures). Outcome: Committee Report, [Appendix A](#). Resolution: closed.

Section III

RFC-188 Subject Request Senate Review the Current Academic Renewal Policy: Request to review the current policy to ensure it is effective in achieving the desired outcome to secure and maintain the quality of the ASU degree.

Dr. Fred Corey stated on Monday, October 26, 2020 via email:

“Based on the recommendations of the senate, we changed the policy as suggested.
To address the issue of the 75 hours, the following textual change was made:

Credit earned before the absence is accepted in the same manner as is community college transfer credit. This will apply to the maximum number of community college transfer credits allowed by the program, as specified by SSM-401-01.

We do not need to take further action on this item.”

Request for Consultations and/or topics that were not started or remain unfinished and need to be carried over to the next academic year.

RFC-176 Inserting Open Access Policy into the ACD

Dr. Anali Perry, of the University library has requested that the current open access policy at ASU, approved in Senate motion 2017 – 46, be considered for insertion into the ACD manual. In addition, she is also requesting that a revision be made where the policy refers to faculty, when in fact it should apply to all members of the academic assembly. Dr. Perry made revisions and subsequently the RCF was closed in 2020. However, the chair was unable to locate the policy in the ACD manual and contacted Dr. Perry. Dr. Perry located an archived email and has forwarded her suggested revisions to the policy.

Recommendations

This RFC will be reviewed in Fall 2021 and the policy can be reviewed by this committee. According to the policy it is to be reviewed every 3 years <https://usenate.asu.edu/motions/2017-46>. Secondly, review the policy in the ACD manual to ensure it is updated during this time.

RFC - 222 A resolution to expand funding, access, and equity for childcare resources across all campuses.

The GPSA has drafted a [resolution regarding child care initiatives](#) and they would like faculty support. Originally it was brought to the USFC's attention and it was transferred to the Student-Faculty Policy Committee. The contact person from the GPSA is Aaron Cromar (acromar@asu.edu). This committee received this RFC on March 16, 2021 after our March meeting. We reviewed it in our April 12, 2021 meeting and this will continue into Fall 2021.

Section IV

Recommendations to the Senate or Final Comments

This has been a productive year for this committee, and as chair, I appreciate the members' service. We recommend that student representatives be formally assigned to this committee, so that they are a part of our meetings. Lastly, provide the committee, each year, with a list of any policies that are up for review.

Appendix A

April 12, 2021

To: ASU Senate Faculty-Student Policy Committee

From: Mark Hager and Donald Frost, members

Re: Report on Clarifications of the Role of the Provost's Office in the Academic Integrity Process

The Student-Faculty Policy Committee was asked to seek background, clarification, and resolution on three related queries regarding the relationship between individual university faculty and the Provost's role in decision-making on academic integrity (AI) cases. The first two queries regard the role and authority of individual faculty for cases remanded to the university level. The third query regards the timeliness of review.

We interviewed several college-level Academic Integrity Officers regarding their experience. We also interviewed the key individuals in the Provost's office, Fred Corey (Vice President for Undergraduate Education) and Anne Jones (an ASU faculty member training to work in the Provost's Office). The interviews suggested that university faculty are not always clear about the respective roles of Colleges/Units, and the Provost's Office in resolution of academic integrity cases. This condition is perhaps precipitated by the Provost Office's relatively recent effort to harmonize rulings between Colleges (since penalties for infractions varied substantially between units) and to promote information-sharing between Colleges (since a student could have a serious infraction in one College that would be unknown during review of an infraction by a different College).

The Provost's Office asked Colleges to assign an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) who would meet periodically with peers across the University. Importantly, the Provost's Office emphasizes that there is no university-level "Academic Integrity Office" and that decision making on academic integrity issues still reside in individual Colleges, as outlined in the policies documented at <https://provost.asu.edu/academic-integrity/policy>. The Provost's Office provides advice and facilitates information exchange between Academic Integrity Officers. Any university-level action is conducted through the Provost's Office.

Almost all academic integrity action is conducted and decided at the Department, School, or College levels. The University academic integrity policy makes clear that the only cases that can be appealed from a College to the Provost's office is when a College Dean rules for the suspension or expulsion of a student. This must be done within 10 days of the College ruling. This is rare. On its occasion, the Provost's Office must create and convene a three-member Hearing Board. This board may seek testimony from the student, relevant faculty, and other relevant parties. On advice from the Hearing Board, The Provost's office makes a final binding decision regarding the suspension or expulsion of the student. The Provost's Office estimates that this procedure might take as long as six weeks to complete. Our committee was asked to seek clarification on the role of the instructor in academic integrity cases. We learned that the instructor's decision is most salient at the School and College level, when a decision is made. However, students have multiple opportunities for appeal, wherein School or Department heads and Deans make decisions that supersede and may not fully comport with instructor decisions.

Our committee was asked to seek clarification on the authority of instructors in cases remanded to the Provost's office. We found that university policy is clear that the Provost's office will only hear cases that support a result of suspension or expulsion of a student, and that the Provost's office will convene a Hearing Board for such cases. ASU Student Code of Conduct Procedures specifies that the Hearing Board is advisory, and the Senior Vice President (SVP) for Educational Outreach and Student Services makes a final decision, but the Academic Integrity Policy stipulates that the SVP is replaced in this case by the Provost or the Provost's designee.

Our committee was asked to seek clarification on the order of operations on academic integrity cases, with a particular attention for concern for timely decisions. We learned that almost all cases remain with Colleges and are subject to the rules and timelines of individual Colleges. On the rare occasion that the College recommends suspension or expulsion of a student, the student can appeal to the Provost's office (by policy). The Provost's Office reports that they would plan to move expeditiously to convene a Hearing Board, conduct any necessary investigation, and render a decision; ideally within six weeks.

Observations and Suggestions:

1. Research conducted by the Committee indicates a degree of misunderstanding among faculty as to the structure and function of the AI process. For example, we engaged several faculty members who believe there is a central AI Office at the University level responsible for processing all alleged AI infractions. The Committee suggests an effort to communicate more broadly the actual extant nature of the AI process at ASU. In accord with long-standing AI policy (as maintained by the Office of the Provost and in consonance with ABOR policies), the majority of AI-related decisions continue to be made at the college/unit level.

2. Information provided to the Committee specified that at certain Colleges/Units, some faculty were concerned with the timeliness of AI decisions – the perception there is a backlog of AI cases. Subsequent research by the Committee did not reveal any systemic problems of this nature – any backlogs appear to be localized events in particular Colleges/Units. However, given the import of the AI adjudication process to all involved, any backlog (for whatever reason) is of concern. Accordingly, the Committee suggests each College/Unit take appropriate steps to ensure adequate time and resources (e.g., staff, additional meeting hours) are available to process and resolve AI cases on a timely basis. While we are not in a position to advise a particular College/Unit, we suggest, for example, that enhanced sharing of “best practices” across the various college/unit AI functionaries may be of benefit to all involved.