

TO: Dr. Dan Howard, Interim Chancellor ASU Jonesboro  
CC: ASU Community  
FROM: Mike McDaniel, Chair, Shared Governance Oversight Committee  
RE: End of Semester Report for Spring and Summer 2010  
DATE: August 16, 2010

I am pleased to report that the spring term was, in my opinion, a period when there was continuing stability and progress in the learning curve of the Shared Governance Oversight Committee (SGOC). There were far fewer proposals processed during this term than there were for the same period a year ago. This allowed the SGOC to focus its attention on the development and launching of the new web based electronic tracking and reporting system. There are still a few kinks to be worked out of the electronic system but they appear to be minor and the SGOC hopes to have them all addressed and settled in the fall 2010 term.

As chairman of the SGOC I have taken an active role in trying to maintain the published committees on the ASU web as well as the members of the various shared governance committees. This is an ongoing process that needs constant attention. However, I feel that having one person responsible as the "go to" contact is working.

Since January 2010 the SGOC has processed 20 proposals. This number is down from 32 in the spring 2009 term. Of those 20, one was a continuation from the spring 09 term, one was from the Faculty Handbook Committee, one from the Chancellor's Office, one from the Student Government Association, One from Academic Affairs, one form Information Technology, two from the Graduate Council, three from the Faculty Senate, three from the Office of Admission, three from the Education and Technology Committee and four from the ASU Systems Office. Thirteen proposals have (or are being) reported to the ASU Chancellor's Office. Five proposals were pulled while two are still pending. The following is a brief summary of the activity of the SGOC regarding those proposals for the spring and summer 2010 terms with their final dispositions when possible. It should be noted that the tracking number is most often followed by a brief name which may not always perfectly described the actual proposal.

Proposal 10SP-01 An ASU Jonesboro proposal to remove restrictions from faculty extra compensation

The SGOC received the above mentioned proposal on January 4, 2010 from the Faculty Handbook Committee. The SGOC met on January 11, 2010 to set the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue and it should

receive an expedited review under the direction of Faculty Handbook Committee. In addition, it was felt that this proposal was a Faculty Handbook issue. The standing constituency groups that were selected to review this proposal were the Faculty Senate, Dean's Council, and the Chair's Council. The proposal was sent to the constituency groups by the Faculty Handbook Committee. According to records, all constituency groups supported the proposal.

#### Proposal 10SP-02 An ASU Systems proposal to regulate social networking

The SGOC received this proposal on January 13, 2010 from the ASU Jonesboro Chancellor's Office and met on January 18, 2010 to set the disposition. It was the SGOC's opinion that this was a shared governance issue and it was assigned to the Computer and Technology Committee for a full review. All constituency groups indicated their desire to review the proposal and it was disseminated shortly after the disposition meeting. On or about January 20, the chair of the SGOC was contacted by the Director of IT Services and informed that this proposal was but one piece of a larger proposal that was being developed and it should be pulled from consideration. After contacting the ASU Systems Office General Council, the proposal was pulled.

#### Proposal 10SP-03 An ASU Jonesboro proposal to change the grade recalculation policy

The SGOC received the above mentioned proposal from the SGA on January 21, 2010. The SGOC met on February 1, 2010 to set the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue in which faculty had primacy. It was felt the proposal should receive a review under the direction of the SGOC acting as the responsible shared governance committee. In addition, it was felt that this proposal was not a Faculty Handbook issue. The constituency group set to review this proposal was the Faculty Senate. The proposal was sent to the Faculty Senate on or about February 2, 2010. A report back from the Faculty Senate indicated overwhelming and unanimous lack of support for the proposal in its current form. Acting as the responsible committee for the proposal, the SGOC also failed to support the proposal. The SGOC joined with some members of the faculty by indicating that should the SGA wish to revisit this issue in light of policies on other comparable campus they would be willing to study a revised policy.

#### Proposal 10SP-04 An ASU Jonesboro proposal for changing the GPA for receiving graduate degrees

The SGOC received the above mentioned proposal on February 20, 2010 from the ASU Jonesboro Graduate Council. The SGOC met on March 1, 2010 to set the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue and it should receive a full review under the direction of the Graduate Council. In addition, it was not felt that this was a Faculty Handbook issue and that the Faculty Senate, Dean's Council, Chair's Council, and the Graduate Student Council should be the constituency groups to review the proposal. The proposal was sent to the various constituency groups

by the new automated process. A report back to the SGOC on April 2, 2010 indicated that there was universal support for the proposal.

#### Proposal 10SP-05 An ASU Jonesboro Proposal for an accelerated master's degree

The SGOC received the above mentioned proposal on February 20, 2010 from the ASU Jonesboro Graduate Council. The SGOC met on March 1, 2010 to set the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue and it should receive a full review under the direction of the Graduate Council. In addition, it was not felt that this was a Faculty Handbook issue and that the Faculty Senate, Dean's Council, Chair's Council, and the Graduate Student Council should be the constituency groups to review the proposal. The proposal was sent to the various constituency groups by the new automated process. A report back to the SGOC on April 2, 2010 indicated that there was universal support for the proposal.

#### Proposal 10SP-06 An ASU Systems proposal to bring each of the ASU campuses into compliance with the Arkansas Clean Air Act (Smoking Ban Policy)

The SGOC received the proposal on February 18, 2010 from the ASU System's Office via the ASU Jonesboro Office of the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. The SGOC met on March 1, 2010 to set the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that the proposal represented a shared governance issue and that it should have an extended review under the direction of the Buildings and Grounds Committee. The Faculty and Staff Senates as well as the SGA and the GSC all indicated that they wished to review the proposal. No formal reports were made back to the SGOC and it is the chair of the SGOC's strong supposition that after further review it was clear that the proposal was not really a proposal but rather a mandate and not subject for discussion. It should be noted that the SGOC did hold a public forum for questions pertaining to the smoking ban.

#### Proposal 10SP-07 An ASU Jonesboro health and wellness proposal

The SGOC received this proposal from the Faculty Senate on March 1, 2010 and met later that same day to set the disposition for this proposal. It was felt the proposal represented a shared governance issue and should have a full review under the direction of the Benefits Committee. All of the constituency groups with the exception of the Chair's Council elected to review the proposal. A report back to the SGOC from the Benefits committee contained the following statement: "1. Selection criteria for participation in the program was not clear, thereby leaving room for charges of discrimination against the university. The committee felt that selection criteria needed to be formalized in such a way that it could be posted on the internet and clearly understood by anyone reading the posted policy. 2. The source of funding for the proposal was not made clear. Before the committee can support such a proposal the source of funding needs to be made clear." Additionally, the proposal failed to gain support from Dean's Council. The Faculty Senate and the Graduate Student Council both supported the proposal while the Staff Senate and the SGA were silent. At the request of the Faculty Senate, the proposal was pulled.

#### Proposal 10SP-08 An ASU Jonesboro proposal for responding to financial exigency

The proposal was received by the SGOC on March 5, 2010 from the Faculty Senate. The disposition date was March 15, 2010. It was felt that the proposal represented a shared governance issue and that it should have an expedited review under the direction of the Faculty Handbook Committee. The Faculty Senate, Chair's Council and the Dean's Council were the constituency groups electing to review the proposal. A report back to the SGOC from the chairperson of the Faculty Handbook Committee was as follows: "The Exigency proposal from the Faculty Senate ad hoc committee was reviewed and several questions were raised. Additionally, the senate also had further thoughts after further deliberation on this proposal. For these reasons, the proposal was tabled at the last SGOC meeting and I have respectfully asked that the senate ad hoc committee reconvene to edit this important proposal. We will likely be asked to guide this again after they complete their work". In point of fact, none of the constituency groups supported the proposal in its current version. This proposal has been pulled at the request of the Faculty Senate.

#### Proposal 10SP-09 An ASU Jonesboro proposal to increase admission standards for freshman for 2011

The SGOC received the above mentioned proposal on March 3, 2010 from the ASU Jonesboro Office of Academic Affairs. The SGOC met on March 15, 2010 to set the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue and it should receive an expedited review under the direction of the ASU Jonesboro Undergraduate Enrollment and Academic Policy Committee. In addition, it was felt that this was not a Faculty Handbook issue. The Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Dean's Council, Chair's Council, and the Student Government Association elected to be the standing constituency groups to review the proposal. The proposal was sent to the constituency groups shortly following the disposition meeting. A report back from the ASU Jonesboro Undergraduate Enrollment and Academic Policy Committee indicated the proposal was supported by the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and the Dean's Council. Additionally the responsible committee elected to support the proposal while the Chair's Council elected not to support the proposal. Both of these two bodies expressed concerns along the lines of "...although the committee voted to support the proposal, concern was expressed regarding the time frame for implementation. It was suggested that delaying implementation would allow for assessment of previous changes to admission standards..." To date, the SGA has been silent regarding the proposal.

#### Proposal 10SP-10 An ASU System's proposal for a policy to regulate commercial filming on the ASU campuses

The SGOC received the above mentioned proposal on March 29, 2010 from the ASU Systems Office. The SGOC met on April 5, 2010 to set the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue and it should receive an expedited review under the direction of the SGOC. It was not felt that this proposal

represented a Faculty Handbook issue. The Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Dean's Council, Chair's Council, Graduate Student Council and the Student Government Association were the standing constituency groups electing to review the proposal. The proposal was disseminated to the constituency groups by the SGOC. To date, the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and the Chair's Council have reported the results of their deliberations back to the SGOC. The Faculty Senate elected to not support the proposal while the Staff Senate and the Chair's Council reported their support for the proposal. The remaining constituency groups have been silent but regardless of the outcome of the remaining constituency groups' deliberations, the report is that support for this proposal was mixed.

Proposal 10SP-11 An ASU Jonesboro proposal to change the policy for readmit following academic suspension.

The SGOC received the above mentioned proposal from the ASU-Jonesboro Admissions Office on April 1, 2010. The SGOC met on April 5, 2010 to decide the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue and it should receive a full review under the direction of the Undergraduate Enrollment and Academic Policy Committee. It was felt that this proposal was a Faculty Handbook issue. The standing constituency groups set to review this proposal were the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Dean's Council, Chair's Council, and the Student Government Association. The proposal was sent to the various constituency groups by the responsible committee shortly after the disposition meeting. A report back from that committee to the SGOC indicated that there was support for the proposal from all constituency groups.

Proposal 10SP-12 An ASU Jonesboro proposal to revise academic standing for summer enrollment

The SGOC received the proposal on April 1, 2010 from the ASU Jonesboro Admissions Office. The SGOC met on April 5, 2010 to decide the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue and it should receive a full review under the direction of the Undergraduate Enrollment and Academic Policy Committee. In addition, it was not felt that this was a Faculty Handbook issue. The Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Dean's Council, Chair's Council, and the Student Government Association each indicated that they wanted to review the proposal. The proposal was sent to the constituency groups shortly after the disposition meeting. A report back to the SGOC has indicated that there was universal support for the proposal with the exception of the SGA which was silent.

Proposal 10SP-13 An ASU Jonesboro proposal to revise the transfer student admission policy

The SGOC received the proposal on April 1, 2010 from the ASU Jonesboro Admissions Office. The SGOC met on April 5, 2010 to decide the disposition for this proposal. At that meeting it was felt that this was a shared governance issue and it should receive a full review under the direction of the Undergraduate Enrollment and Academic Policy Committee. In addition, it was not felt that this was a Faculty Handbook issue and that



the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Dean's Council, Chair's Council, and the Student Government Association would be the constituency groups to review the proposal. The proposal was sent to the various constituency groups shortly after the disposition meeting. A report back to the SGOC indicated that there was universal support for the proposal with the exception of the SGA which was silent.

Proposal 10SP-14 A revised ASU Jonesboro proposal for health and wellness.

The SGOC received the revised policy on or around April 15, 2010 from the Faculty Senate and set the new disposition on April 19, 2010. As before, it was felt this was a shared governance issue and should receive an expedited review under the direction of the Benefits Committee. Again, it was not felt that the proposal represented a Faculty Handbook issue. All of the standing constituency groups except the Chair's Council requested to review the proposal. The report back to the SGOC was as follows: "While the Employee Benefits Committee does support the proposal, there is a strong feeling on the committee that the university would better serve the faculty by putting more resources into the HPESS center. It appears that exactly the reverse is occurring. Historically, the HPESS center was used by a significant number of faculty for exercise purposes and, by restricting hours of availability, the university is making regular exercise more difficult for faculty to obtain. Additional financial support of the HPESS center is probably the most effective and least costly way to encourage healthy exercise on the part of the faculty." Each of the constituency groups reviewing the proposal supported it with the exception of the Dean's Council. They commented "...The Academic Deans strongly support the concept of wellness. However, the ADC does not support the subsidization of individual memberships in wellness centers by the University. Wellness is a personal responsibility. There is consensus across the group that during this time of budgetary constraint, resources should be directed to more strategic imperatives." The report on this proposal is that support was mixed.

Proposal 10SP-15 An ASU System's Office proposal to set guidelines for social networking within the ASU System

The SGOC received this proposal on April 27, 2010 from the ASU System's Office via the ASU Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Finance and Administration. The SGOC met on the same date to set the disposition for the proposal. It was felt that the proposal was a shared governance issue and that it should have a full review under the direction of the SGOC. The proposal was not felt to be a Faculty Handbook issue. Because of the broad scope of the proposal all standing constituency groups elected to review the proposal. In addition, the SGOC exercised the option of calling in two committees to review the proposal as constituency groups. Those two committees were the Computer and Technology Committee and the Education and Technology Committee. This proposal came late in the academic term and several of the constituency groups have been unable to give their responses to the proposal. Only two constituency groups have provided their opinion. The Staff Senate is in support of the proposal while the Dean's Council is not. Although we are beyond the time line for reporting reviews back to the SGOC, in the interest of all, the SGOC requests that final action on this proposal be delayed until after

the start of the fall 2010 term.

#### 10SP-16 An ASU System's proposal for a persona non grata policy

The SGOC received this proposal on May 11, 2010 from the ASU System's Office. The SGOC met on June 7, 2010 to set the disposition for the proposal. It was felt that the proposal was a shared governance issue and that it should have an expedited review under the direction of the SGOC. It was felt that the proposal did not represent a Faculty Handbook issue. Because of the broad scope of the proposal all constituency groups elected to review the proposal. This proposal came very late following the academic term and several of the constituency groups have been unable to give their responses to the proposal. Only two constituency groups have provided their opinion. The Staff Senate is in support of the proposal while the Dean's Council is not in the present form. The Dean's Council indicated they could support the proposal with revisions and clarifications. The following is a response from the Dean's Council: "...The ADC recognizes the need for a system policy of this nature. The ADC supports the proposed policy contingent upon revision and clarification of letters a, f and g under Section 2--Definitions. There is concern that the policy as written is too inclusive, that it should not supersede other established processes that are in place and that it should be clearly articulated when the system policy will be applied in lieu of a campus policy. Letters f and g are particularly problematic in that as written one could theoretically be evicted from campus for a violation as minor as parking in a non-designated spot on campus. There is also concern that the definition of University Community is inconsistent across the Persona Non Grata Policy and the Appropriate Use of Information & Technology Resources Policy that is currently working through the shared governance process. There should be consistency in definitions across all System Policies." The SGOC has not begun the rewriting of the policy because the remaining constituency groups have to date been silent on their review. Although we are beyond the time line for reporting reviews back to the SGOC, in the interest of all, the SGOC requests that final action on this proposal be delayed until after the start of the fall 2010 term.

#### 10SP-17 An ASU Jonesboro proposal for appropriate use of information and technology

The SGOC received the proposal on June 7, 2010 from the ASU Jonesboro Office of Information Technology. That same day the SGOC met to set the disposition for the proposal. At that meeting it was felt this was a shared governance issue and that it should have an extended review under the direction of the Communication and Technology Committee. Additionally, it was felt that was a potential Faculty Handbook issue and all of the standing constituency groups indicated their wish to review the proposal. Besides the standing constituency groups the SGOC felt it was also appropriate for the Education and Technology Committee to serve as an ad hoc constituency group for this proposal. Subsequent to sending out the proposal notification the chair of the SGOC was contacted by the ASU Jonesboro Chancellor indicating that he and the ASU Jonesboro Executive Committee did not feel the proposal was ready for a full campus vetting and asked that it be pulled. It has been.

10SP-18 An ASU Jonesboro proposal to reserve faculty parking until 7 p.m. on school nights

The SGOC received the proposal on May 7, 2010 from the Education and Technology Committee and met on June 7, 2010 to set the disposition. The reason for the delay was that the University was closed for most of that time. At the disposition meeting it was felt this was a shared governance issue and that it should receive a full review under the direction of the Parking and Motor Vehicle Committee. It was not felt that this had the potential for being a Faculty Handbook issue and all of the standing constituency groups indicated they wanted to review the proposal. A report back to the SGOC from the responsible committee was as follows: "The PMV Committee expressed concern for enforcement during this extended time since it is after parking services has closed. UPD will be the enforcement unit. UPD priority during this time will be for resident and traffic safeties with parking concerns addressed as other priorities are cleared." The Staff Senate failed to support the proposal. Their comment was: "Faculty/staff parking is already restricted until 6:00 p.m. which is an hour beyond the 5:00 p.m. cutoff for restrictions on other parking zones on campus. The Staff Senate feels that students should have access after 6:00 p.m. as current policy allows. The campus police officers need to devote attention and resources to safety and security issues and not continued enforcement of faculty/staff parking until 7:00 p.m." The Faculty Senate, Dean's Council, and Chair's Council all supported the proposal while the SGA did not support the proposal. The final report is that support was mixed for this proposal.

10SP-19 An ASU Jonesboro proposal for a policy to restrict parking around the library for faculty who teach CVN courses

The SGOC received the proposal on May 11, 2010 from the Education and Technology Committee and met on June 7, 2010 to set the disposition. The reason for the delay was that the University was closed for most of that time. At the disposition meeting it was felt this was a shared governance issue and that it should receive a full review under the direction of the Parking and Motor Vehicle Committee. It was not felt that this had the potential for being a Faculty Handbook issue and all of the standing constituency groups indicated they wanted to review the proposal. A report back to the SGOC from the responsible committee indicated they did not support the proposal. Their comment was as follows: "Many faculty are often required to carry cumbersome materials to their offices/classrooms. This is not unique to CVN faculty. Any faculty members who are required to carry cumbersome loads for their courses may use the department placard during the brief time they are loading and unloading their vehicles to park close to the building. Once the materials have been delivered to the office/classroom they can then move their vehicles to a correct parking space." The proposal was not supported by the Staff Senate, Chair's Council, or the Dean's Council while being supported by the Faculty Senate and the SGA. The Graduate Student Council was silent on the proposal. The final report is that support was mixed for this proposal.

10SP-20 An ASJ Jonesboro proposal for allowing adjunct faculty to purchase parking hang tags (decals)



The SGOC received the proposal on May 11, 2010 from the Education and Technology Committee and met on June 7, 2010 to set the disposition. The reason for the delay was that the University was closed for most of that time. At the disposition meeting it was felt this was a shared governance issue and that it should receive a full review under the direction of the Parking and Motor Vehicle Committee. It was not felt that this had the potential for being a Faculty Handbook issue and all of the standing constituency groups indicated they wanted to review the proposal. A report back to the SGOC from the responsible committee indicated they did not support the proposal and their comment was as follows: "The number of adjunct faculty employed during the 2009-2010 academic year was 253. ASU-J has 430 faculty/staff parking spaces. Approximately 1,100 faculty/staff decals are purchased per year. As a result, allowing adjunct faculty to purchase faculty/staff decals would put a burdensome need on the number of spaces severely limiting the number of parking spaces for full-time faculty and staff. Also, if this was made possible for adjunct faculty, to be consistent this would have to be extended to part-time staff as well. This would only increase the burden on the number of faculty/staff parking spaces available." The Staff Senate did not support the proposal while the Faculty Senate, Dean's Council and SGA voiced their support for the proposal. The Chair's Council and the Graduate Student Council were silent on the proposal. The final report is that the support for the proposal was mixed.

Looking forward, it seems evident that there are issues that need to be resolved concerning proposals coming from the ASU System's Office and how those fit into the ASU Jonesboro shared governance process. An example of this situation is the current Conflict of Interest Policy. The General Council for the ASU Systems contention is that there is a policy in place. However, the policy was never thoroughly vetted on the ASU Jonesboro campus. The ASU Jonesboro Faculty Senate has appointed an ad hoc committee to try and resolve this issue and a report from the committee will be forthcoming in the early fall.

Kindest regards,

D. Mike McDaniel, Chair  
ASU Jonesboro SGOC

In the event you have questions pertaining to this report I can be reached at #3546 or at [dmcdan@astate.edu](mailto:dmcdan@astate.edu) .