1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:20 p.m. by Senate President Barbara Kerr.

2. Action on Minutes

The minutes of the January 24, 2005 Academic Senate meeting were approved as circulated, without objection. Send any corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu.

3. Announcements and Communications

3.A Senate President's Report (Barbara Kerr).

I am going to ask your permission today to reorder the agenda so that Provost Glick can speak to us about the newest redesign proposal from the ABOR consultant David Longanecker.


First, just a couple of things quickly, before I talk about the present status of the university system redesign.

On the proposal that you have endorsed in December, to allow people to choose their retirement plan later rather than sooner (whether they want optional retirement or state retirement)--and this will also allow people who are already here to have an option to switch their plan one time. We believe that if this can be done in a way that is financially neutral, it will get done. We are very positive on it, and we have given it to our attorneys to carry out their due diligence on taxes, etc. We will continue to assume we can do this, but obviously this will only get brought to life if all three universities want it to happen, and, even so, it may not get a life but we will have given it our best nevertheless. I want to express that Doug Johnson's leadership on this has been very helpful and that we are grateful to him.
The other thing that I asked Doug to assume at the same time was, right now people who are on state retirement when they retire get subsidy for their health insurance through the state plan. There is no subsidy after you retire for those of us on optional retirement plan. That creates a particular problem for those who wish to retire pre-sixty-five because Medicare does not kick in until beyond the date you turn 65 (seven months, beginning three months before the month of your birthday, and three months afterwards). But know that there are people who would really like to retire before that. So, I asked Doug to research whether there is any way at the same time we could buy health insurance coverage for those people in the optional program. He has actually gone one step further but I cannot explain his proposal, but he has put together a proposal which will be vetted as making health insurance after retirement better for everything--It saves the state money and gives better coverage to the faculty and staff. We are going to pursue both of those items, and we have our Human Resources and our General Counsel reviewing them too. Doug may want to say more later.

My third item is that we are actively pursuing a campus wellness agenda and it is now being pursued by Student Affairs and by our new Dean of Nursing, Bernadette Melnyk, who as some of you know, wants to make this the healthiest university in America. Obviously many of you are involved in this effort, and we are participating with Bern and Juan Gonzalez leading us on this task.

Going on to system redesign--Mark Twain once said, "The report of my death is greatly exaggerated." Well, two weeks ago you read in the Republic that system redesign was dead! Sunday, you read that system redesign was a done deed and it meant that different campuses and different universities would have totally different tuition rates. Neither of those is true. They may become true, but they are not true today. After all the hearings and all the discussions of the task forces, a group of eight people was assigned to propose, after all that discussion, what might be implemented. That subcommittee of eight people, two from ASU, two from NAU, two from U of A, and two from the Board of Regents office met two weeks ago. Because this is an open meeting state, we cannot even have a phone conversation without making a record of it. So, a subcommittee of eight out of a task force of 20 met with the consultant, David Longanecker, who is from WICHE, to discuss what they thought might be the best proposal to come out of all this discussion we have had on redesign. That was what they did in fact--no more, no less. Each of those representatives gave their "view" of what might be a good result and on how their university might implement said result. Then there was a meeting last Friday morning of that same group of eight people to discuss a set of recommendations that had been drafted by the consultant based upon the original proposal, the hearings, the comments of the subcommittee members and his informed judgment. They spent three hours discussing a proposal, but in the end did not vote on a final document. The next day, the newspaper carried this message--They (the subcommittee) voted to have different tuition by campus, by university, etc. They did not do that. They might do that--but that subcommittee, even if they had voted, cannot make decisions. All they can do is make a recommendation to our larger committee. As you know, if you read "One University in Many Places" there is in the recommendation that by schools we have different missions, and tuitions will reflect those different missions. That is still a decision which is going to be made by that committee, and that is not at issue. The question is--is it by school based on mission, or will it be by campus. We continue to argue that by school makes a great deal of sense, by campus does not. That is where the state of the affairs is today. Next Wednesday, there is a meeting of the full task force, which will consider the report filed by David Longanecker, and any changes he might have made in it based upon the recommendations that he heard in subcommittee last Friday, as well as any other discussions that come up before then. They are free agents to do that. So, right now, what is on the table is a consultant's set of recommendations that could well turn into a recommendation of the committee, which could turn into a recommendation of the Council of Presidents, which could turn into a decision by the Board of Regents. I am not saying that this report of the consultant has no standing. It does have standing, but in the context that it is a consultant's set of recommendations, which will be dialogue by about four to five task forces. I hope that doesn't muddy the water too much, your president is going to talk about her perspective on what she thinks are problems and good things about this report. I thought it might be helpful if I made my report first so that you would understand the context in which these recommendations now sit. As to the details, I will wait until after President Kerr has made her remarks, but if there are questions now about any of the process or questions about anything else you might wish to discuss, then after Dr. Kerr's remarks, I will stay beyond that and try to ask you
that again, until I must leave to go to the tuition meeting with our students.

**Senator Dumka:** Can you talk about a time frame for this redesign?

**Provost Glick:** Yes. It is important to the Board of Regents and it is important to me to bring closure on this. There is probably a higher concern at West Campus than any place else but all of us have concerns when we are talking about significant changes in programs. The West Campus has a special need for closure because there they really cannot make decisions to hire additional professors, so, they need to know what they are going to look like next year. I believe that it is really incumbent on everybody to have this resolved by the end of this academic year; in fact, the sooner the better. This is important to the faculty, staff, and students. I also think it would be good to get this done while this legislature is still in session.

**Senator Keim:** In part of this discussion there was some mention of a $1,000 fee for the Honors College. Was that just their decision to participate as a College, or were the students asked first?

**Provost Glick:** The Dean of the Honors College is in a dialogue with the students as we are speaking. We will be listening carefully to the students today. It is a balance of two things--no one wants to pay more money for tuition and we do not want to reduce the number of honors students at the Honors College. We want to increase the number that graduate from there. Only less than a third of our students actually graduate from the Honors College. One of the major investment targets, if we get this tuition increase, will be to find a way to both compensate faculty (if not in salary then in other ways) for supervision of undergraduate theses. In many ways it is a bigger undertaking than with graduate students. Secondly, to bring in outside examiners that can verify the need for this tuition increase, and also for us to tell our story nationally to faculty and therefore getting better students recruited as well. The question as to whether it should be phased in? We are flexible on how to get there but we think it is not fair to put a greater burden on the other students for the many services we now give honors students, and we will give even more if we get this increase in fees. I do worry about impacted minorities enrolled in the Honors College, and the question is what is the value proposition? Will they get enough better services and education out of this increased fee that it actually becomes a bargain? I think wholeheartedly that this university is a bargain for its students. It is of great value and we want to make it an even better value. If we make it cheaper, then we don't have that same value. Having said that, I do understand the student and family issues in dealing with higher tuition. One thing we will do is make sure that there is enough financial aid to assure students that really cannot afford it, there is financial assistance available. There are a couple of students in between who can afford it, but it is going to be some hardship on them as well.

**David Werner for Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman:** Is that going to be a per semester increase?

**Provost Glick:** No, it will be for the whole year. I would also be interested in any thoughts you may have on this because we have about seven weeks before the board meeting where this will be considered.

**Senator Keim:** I personally have one daughter in the Honors College and another that will be going there. This tuition increase, when it happens, will not be factored into the tuition scholarship for upper division students after the fact, will it?

**Provost Glick:** That is a good point, because we are always attempting to balance things, which is why we have announced it seven weeks before there will be a vote in order to have time to dialogue with the students. Unfortunately, the *State Press* misquoted the Dean of Honors in their long article as saying that he thought this would not happen for a year--but what he really said is that he did not think the press release was coming out so early, so that would give us more time to talk to the students. In fairness to the *State Press*, they reported my comments and the Dean's; but I just think that mine were right and his were misquoted. But they did quote both of us.

**David Werner for Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman:** Will this anticipated $1,000 go to fund the Academic Village?
Provost Glick: No funding will go to the Academic Village--but there will be increased footnote courses. Hopefully, more faculty will be joining the Honors College and there will be more joint appointments with other departments. We will bring external readers and evaluators in and finally set aside some money to enhance the number of honors students having experience overseas.

David Werner for Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman: Just for a little background--I am a sophomore in the Honors College, and I am also in the W.P. Carey School of Business. We have a $250 fee for our professional program, and now I have to look at the "value" of being in the Honors College. Is it worth being in the Honors College from my perspective now, as my stipend may not cover all the tuition?

Provost Glick: I believe that we can convince the student leaders who are in Honors College of the high value to this. We do believe that the Honors College is a critical part of this university and it does special things for students who could have gone to other universities, namely Stanford or MIT and others. Those are places that are turning out leaders as well.

Senate President Kerr: We probably should just take one more question and then move on.

Senator Johnson: Perhaps I can toss you a positive question for a change. Over the weekend, the Republic reported it had many high-performing high school students who would be retaking the AIMS English test, in order to qualify for tuition waivers. Is that a large program? How is it funded?

Provost Glick: It is funded out of our existing funds used for scholarships. Based on last year's AIMS performance, all the students that will get waivers are now getting them because of how they rank in their class. We don't know what will happen if the promise of a tuition waiver encourages students to increase their AIMS performance (by retaking the test) but we have some safeguards built into the program to address this.

3.C Senate President's Report (Barbara Kerr).

Now I would like to return to the Longanecker report. Some of you may have been away for the weekend and not heard about this item, but I want to read from the report from the consultant that says, our first challenge is to maintain access to the university. Second, we want to make sure that ASU is as diverse as possible. Third, it says we are not going to be able to do this because of inefficiencies in the university system. It goes on to say that there is unusual irony in the economic efficiency of the Arizona university system. On one hand Arizona's universities are quite efficient but the system as a whole is comparatively inefficient. Arizona currently relies heavily on research universities to deliver undergraduate education. Institutions focusing on undergraduates serve other states very well, but such an alternative is not possible in Arizona, and as a result, some of the parts are very expensive to the whole, a whole that Arizona has already stretched. The fourth challenge is that there are financial constraints on this state and the students--such that we feel it important to recommend that there be a variety of tuition options for students, levels of tuition as well as different types of education available, ranging from a degree that is a degree from a teaching unit that focuses mainly on undergraduate teaching, or a unit like the Honors College that makes heavy use of research faculty. So, he concludes that the first phase should have missions defined at the college. The University of Arizona will proceed with its plan to become a premier research university, adopting more rigorous admissions requirements at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Arizona State University will become a premier metropolitan university through its mission of One University in Many Places--ASU at Tempe Campus, ASU at Capital Center Campus, ASU at West Campus, and ASU at Polytechnic Campus. Northern Arizona University would proceed to become a statewide university, providing a quality, all-campus undergraduate education with two plus two collaborations, that means collaborating with community colleges that offer two-year degrees. Then it further recommended that East, West, and Downtown focus on undergraduate education, and that Tempe focus upon graduate education.

As Provost Glick said in his comments, this is a set of recommendations from the ABOR consultant, David Longanecker, but my first concern is that there has not been as much faculty input as we would have liked. Part
of that is because I know many of us felt that we did not have a horse in that race and therefore, we, the Tempe Campus people did not give information at the stakeholders' meetings and did not have a strong voice. It was like--this is something that is happening to West. Well, now it is something that is happening to possibly West, East, and Tempe. If the Longanecker plan went through exactly as it is stated today, it would be a win-lose situation with students indeed winning, and we want students to win but with faculty not losing in some very big ways. First of all, it would continue to create tiers. This is where I want some real participation from the members of this Senate. First of all, I will ask you if there are any people here who would enjoy taking a three-year rotation in your career and just teach during that time, and not have any pressure to do research or seek external funding but concentrate on teaching? How many people would choose that option? That is important information. Thank you. Now this next question is even harder to answer because asking a professor if he or she would like to do research full-time is very much like asking a mother of small children if she would like to either work and be a professional—or instead ask would she like to park her children at a day care center all day long away from their mother and have a selfish career? That is like asking a faculty member to admit that he or she would actually like to do research all the time and not teach. There is a lot of value implied, but let me ask you if you had three years in which you would not have to teach at all, or just teach one course and do research full-time, all the time, how many of you would choose that option? Ok. There are more people here who would admit that they would like to take three years off and do research all the time from what I see. Now, let's see how many of you really feel that it meets your career needs to do both teaching and research? That is in line with what the Carnegie studies and other studies of faculty development have found, and that is that the majority of faculty really enjoy both their teaching and their research, that researchers tend to be good teachers and that good teachers make good researchers. There is a significant minority of faculty who have done research, who are accomplished, who are perfectly capable of research scholarship but who love teaching so much they would like to give more time to that; likewise there are some people who like and even love teaching but who would like three years just to devote to research. What you see in this room is a reflection not only of the proportions that are pretty common throughout the academic world, but it is also reflective of the fact that faculty members have a developmental depression that a faculty member's career development is not the same at 26 as it is at 56 or 66. That during those years when we are going up for tenure, we are very much focused upon our research program. We are trying to teach well but we know that if we do not get our research program together, the bottom line is that we will not be receiving tenure. On the other hand after tenure many of us have a post tenure slump and then the last thing we want to do is keep writing articles and particularly about the things that we were writing about and would like to take some time to re-devote ourselves to teaching. Likewise there is another time in your career when you have a new idea and what you want to do is research it, and find yourself wishing that you did not have so many advisees; this is the natural progression of a faculty member's career and locking people into a campus and saying to them, you are going to teach more and that other campuses say you are the researchers and you are going to teach and you are going to do research, locks people in even more. The truth about faculty is that they need career development as well as development of their commitment to teaching.

The other dangerous thing about this kind of proposal is that any time you divide people up, whether it is in a great social-psychological study--where you advise them that they will be placed on either the Rattlers group or the Eagles group. And then see what happens. I know of a study like this and what do you think happened? Immediately there was polarization and everybody had to decide who was best, there was tremendous competition for resources, and tremendous conflict. So, if you have teaching and research groups, as professors you have been assigned to being either rattlers or eagles, inevitably one will have a higher status than another. Many universities that have done things like this and have tried to say, well, we value teaching just as much as we do research, but then they don't pay their teaching professors as much, and that I see as being like telling the homemaker that she is vital to society but not offering any incentive whatsoever to perform that function.

Finally, a problem that doesn't reflect on One University in Many Places, as our provost says, if we are to become school-centered and if we truly are to be one faculty on all campuses, then thinking inside the box that this campus is for undergraduates, this campus is for graduates, just doesn't seem to do the trick, as far as I am concerned. It seems kind of ham-handed and does not really reflect the nature of our campuses as they have developed. I feel that PhD programs should probably reside where the most MA and PhD level faculty are
located, and people should be able to teach their course on other campuses as they are needed. If there is anything that we have learned from vocational psychology it is that people work more productively when they are doing one thing they love, and in a way that they like to do it. So, my commitment as your president is to try to insure that this plan does not go through like this, but I need your support in order to do this. Please contact me and let me know what you think about what I have told you today. I am going to suggest that at our next meeting we have an open forum to discuss this further. Are there any other comments at this time?

President-Elect Mattson: Because I have been more focused on promotion and tenure issues lately, campus-wide and university-wide, it just struck me that the comments that were in this report indicate that there would be different expectations of performance by faculty on the different campuses of ASU. Some campuses would be expected to do more research than others, and that does not speak to the concept of One University in Many Places, and that is to have a university-wide system of evaluating faculty and/or courses. That was my concern.

A Senator: How much tuition will they pay?

Senator Dwyer: Dr. Glick said that it would be the academic model, but is it a cost saving model? And that is a problem if it is because, as Dr. Glick said, about the Honors College tuition--if we go cheaper, the value of education will drop.

Senator Johnson: I was trying to follow that, though a bit further. There are two parties that are not present in this discussion, one is the community colleges and one is the legislature, both of which may be involved in the creating of another tier of higher education if they decide. Our problem really is that neither our institutions nor the community colleges alone have the resources to meet this huge wave of incoming students.

Senate President Kerr: It is an enormous wave that is coming through--and people are talking about it like they talk in Holland about the dams breaking. At this point, we do not have the faculty to deal with the influx of students that are on their way but the panic mentality is leading to panic-based solutions I feel. I think we need the wisdom of the faculty on this, so, I invite you to all visit the ABOR web site and read these reports in full and report to your faculty at the next faculty meeting about these issues. Please direct your faculty to the web site too so that they can read these recommendations and not to talk to the Arizona Republic about it, but rather come back at our next meeting and bring their comments to our discussion and come prepared to make a resolution if they wish. Thank you all very much, and I will turn over my report now to our guest, Paul Johnson, Associate Vice President for Research. He will talk to us today about the status of Arizona State University research issues.

3.D  Associate Vice President for Research (Paul Johnson).

Thank you for the opportunity to come and talk on behalf of my office today, which is the Office for the Vice President for Research and Economic Affairs. My boss, Jon Fink, could not be here today but I will give you a brief introduction to our office, the investments we have been making, and some of the returns we have been getting, as well as answer questions you may have.

Just real quick in case you are not familiar with our office--we are a little unique because most universities do not combine these functions in the same office (research and economics). Jon Fink handles the big-picture university initiatives and whatever our university president wants him to be working on. Rob Melnick is working on things related to developments in the area--the Los Arcos project for instance. I handle most of the things on the research administration side--overhead budgets, research buildings, and the new proposal machine. Just to help you understand the philosophy of our office, we are the investment arm of the university as opposed to an institutional support arm. We like to give money to short-time duration projects as opposed to promising any monies for a long period of time. Right now we have the permission from our president to grow the research enterprise. What we are doing is making pretty heavy investments in facilities and initiatives for strategic hires. We are competitive for research proposals as well as seeking external funding, which in turn generates more overhead and gives us more money to reinvest back. There are three aspects of what we are
doing: 1) building and acquiring a lot of new world-class research facilities. By this time next year, we will have more than doubled the research capacity space of the university by adding another million square feet both in terms of things we have purchased like the Brickyard Building, the Motorola Building that is now the Flexible Display Center, as well as the BioDesign Building A--and that is already up. BioDesign B is in progress and the three ISTB buildings are going up right now. There will be other facilities for animal research built, and there will be buildings downtown later on. We are also very much involved with the deans and the colleges and the departments in recruiting senior faculty. We are trying to bring people to the university that provide leadership, mentoring, as well as help to build new programs. In particular there has been a lot of emphasis on hiring people that are National Academy members. The other thing we are doing is investing strategically in research programs and the most significant financially is that we are involved in making this campus wireless. We will have a decision theater. There is the International Institute of Sustainability, and we are investing in different areas across the university.

In terms of returns we are starting to think about what is coming back as a result of these investments--the Army Flexible Display Center is probably the most impressive--That is a $45 million five-year project and probably another five years after that. The CRESMET Center has been very successful in bringing in research projects, already $20 million for next year, there are a number of other things that have been very significant projects.

In terms of how the university as a whole is doing in terms of research growth--from 2003 to 2004 it was pretty flat--we are expecting about $300 million over the next five years. So far this year it looks like we are up about 16%.

Where does it all go? The overhead goes back in--we have differential rates for different areas of study; then somebody will feel that their overhead may be subsidizing somebody else's project, but it is equally returned on the design and the social sciences side. I must tell you about the amount of overhead we collected last year on research--of that, 25% goes directly back to the colleges and departments and the investigator discretionary fund, that is the applied research incentive. Some of the departments' investigators in colleges use that as leveraging to get additional matching funds from our department, which is about another 13% and we also put 12% into startup and renovation for major improvements. So, 50% of the money goes straight back directly into your research programs through a variety of ways. The remaining money goes to pay for research administration costs, all the ORSPA folks, all the compliance folks, all the animal care programs, etc. There are others, AZT, our IP external licensing unit; there is library support, other things in the general community that we are responsible for.

A couple of other facts: We do have negotiated rates for organizational research--these are negotiated in three to five-year cycles. What you should know is that the overhead rate does not pay for the university's costs for research, so, no matter what we charge, the university is subsidizing 50 to 75% of your research. There is a reason for that because certain things have to be included in rate negotiations. True cost is probably between 75 to 100% of your actual expenditure. The other thing is our general philosophy--that sponsors will pay for the cost of research that they are doing with us and that any reduction from standard rates should be viewed by everyone as an investment in the university and your particular research project. So if we are going to make that reduction, it has to be justified based on some benefits that will come back to the university. We do have waivers for overhead and there is a form to request it. Last year, we waived about $5 million worth of overhead so that is about 20% of my total budget. In 2006, we will be going to a new cost proposal system.

A couple of other things that are affecting my office significantly--all those new buildings are not free! I have to start paying for them and over the next few years my budget has to come up with another 8-10 million dollars. My budget is entirely overhead, so, that is another way in which we are different from most universities. Our overhead does not go to the general fund. That is what my office operates on, primarily overhead. Therefore it is obvious that my budget has to go up another 8-10 million dollars and research expenditures have to go up enough to balance that; if not, things will have to be shifted in the budget. We are pretty confident that our research expenditures are going to go up, but they may not go up soon enough and that could cause some problems for us. If you look at my budget, the only flexibility I have is research incentive distribution. So, I
have been having discussions with the deans. They are all aware of this, that they may be impacted to the amount of RID that goes back next year, and the year after that. We have made a recommendation that the IAA part not be affected, the investigator incentive part which goes directly to the faculty, but that the 20% that goes back to the colleges and departments may see a reduction, if we have to. That is it, except that while some people look at this as being sort of a negative thing, the one thing that I like to remind people of is that the reason we are having this issue is because we have made a bold step to build new buildings, hire new people, and if that causes us a couple years of pain it will be worth it in the long run.

Past President Garcia: I have a question in talking about the building costs. I was always impressed when I go visit with my collaborators at the Mayo Clinic in Scottsdale, walking down the corridors and seeing different labs that are always named after somebody. I first noticed this seven or eight years ago and asked them about that practice of having labs named after private donors. My question is, are there any barriers to doing this kind of thing at ASU? If not, then why not do that, especially in the new building? Why not have people donate and name the labs after them?

Vice President Johnson: That is a good question. I know that there will be labs in the buildings and that there is also a lot of work going on at the Foundation right now with donors.

Past President Garcia: That is what is unique about Mayo. They have to do the individual labs, they do not do the buildings. Every room is actually named.

Vice President Johnson: As far as I know there is nothing prohibiting this, but I can follow up with the Foundation on that.

Senator Rez: I am puzzled by how your numbers are adding up. You have about 100-120 potential research expenditures and an overhead rate of about 50%. Yet you only have about $26 million. I would guess there is about $50 to $60 million more needed. I do not know how it is conceivable to get $300 million in research expenditures in five years. The federal contribution is going down clearly. I would really like to know how these new buildings are being paid for. Will they be funded with bond issues? And how will expenditure for research service those bonds?

Vice President Johnson: On the first question, if everybody paid a 50% overhead, the overhead generated from the expenditure would be one third of the expenses.

Senator Rez: It would be one third of what is coming in.

Vice President Johnson: It would be one third of what we reported. So, if you take that $150 million effort, you have to subtract $20 million in 301 funds now. Then you are down to about $130 million, and that takes about one third of that to give us $40 million. And now you begin to factor in all of the areas that do not pay full overhead--so, you need to know that education is the third largest expenditure generating area--it only has standard government 50% overhead. When you begin to factor all that in, that is where the difference comes. On your second question, the issue about whether it is possible to double research expenditures in five years? That translates into about a 17% growth rate. I have done an economic model based on facilities that we are putting on line and the faculty that will be in them and I am skeptical too, but that was an expectation before my time. So, I don't disagree with things you have said. The third question you asked was about how are the buildings being funded? There are a variety of sources used--the ISTB 1, 2, and 3, and BioDesign A, B, and C buildings are all from the legislative restructuring, which provided money for the three universities. The deal on those is that the appropriated money is covering the construction of the new buildings and my office picked up the operations. The Brickyard Building is bought with money from the Foundation, and BioDesign A was a bond issue. I think that takes care of all of them.

Senate President Kerr: We will entertain one more question.
Senator Karady: Are you aware that sponsored project activity has slowed down in the last two months because of the exit of certain people? My question is what are you doing about it?

Vice President Johnson: The issue that you are referring to is that we have had three or four sponsored project officers who left our office at the same time. A) We are filling those positions, and B) we have a program called the Grant Contract Coordinator Program where we have two or three people that are officers in training at any given time. When there is a vacancy in the system that occurs, we can take those people and put them into action. One of the things that we are doing right now is going through our budgeting process for next year and trying to make decisions about the right levels of support needed for research. We are also talking to a number of department chairs and deans about what services we should be providing them, given the expectation for research from them.

Senate President Kerr: I want to say a special thanks to Paul and to mention one of his staff members, Ben Fasano, a research officer, who spent all day last Sunday on my grant proposal. Ben worked with me all day on Sunday and the next day as well, Monday, Valentines Day no less, and then at 9:00 p.m that night we were able to get my grant on an airplane on its way to NIH. The plane unfortunately crashed and my grant did not make it. Nevertheless, I just wanted you to know that Ben Fasano spent all that time to assist me in getting my grant finished and submitted by the deadline. That is what the ORSPA people do, and that has been my experience with every officer I have worked with. So, thanks very much for what your office does.

We are going to have David Stempien talk to us from the United Blood Services next.


I am here today to give you a startling fact that you can take home to all your family and friends. The question that I need to ask you first is—does anyone know how many miles of blood vessels they have in their body on average? You actually have about 50,000 miles of blood vessels all the way from your aorta down to your capillaries. So, enough to go around the equator two times! So, if anyone ever tells me that they cannot donate blood because they do not have enough for themselves, they are incorrect. I work for United Blood Services and I will go quickly to the fact about our blood supply. That is that we need to import about 30,000 units of blood each year to meet the demand in the state of Arizona. United Blood Services supplies blood to 94% of the suppliers in the state. In the last five years we have needed to import for a various number of reasons—but my appeal to you is help us get the supply back up. Last year at Arizona State University, all campuses, we collected about 750 units of blood out of 60,000 faculty, staff, and students. We need your help to get that up a little bit higher. Dr. Crow has set the goal for blood collection on campus this year and next year at 2,500 units of blood, which is what we have done in the past about four or five years ago, and 5,000 units of blood for 2007. There are a few ways that you can help us do that. 1) Donate blood—on average a person can donate up to six times per year. We are on campus typically a couple of times a week, and if you want to do so you can go online to bloodhero.com and look under ASU as a sponsor and it will tell you where we will be on campus so you can donate blood. All of the blood drives are also located on the ASU calendar web site. They are publicized in the ASU Insight and the State Press. 2) Go back to your department and think about sponsoring a blood drive. We have a few regular players from the W.P. Carey School; also the Barrett Honors College. There are many other opportunities on campus coming up. Last week, Dr. Wilkinson helped us look at how to proceed—to see what ways we can develop to collect more blood for the patients that need blood throughout the state. If you could do one of these two things, I would certainly appreciate it. Thank you very much.

Senate President Kerr: We will be glad to consider an Academic Senate Blood Drive.

3.F Senate President-Elect's Report (Susan Mattson).

Very briefly, Provost Glick's recommendation and report on the Promotion and Tenure Implementation Task Force recommendations have now come to the Senate--they will be discussed at the Personnel Committee meeting on February 28 and we will bring them to the Senate for introduction and discussion. The other thing I want to tell you is that I did attend the Undergraduate Student Senate meeting, and one of the questions that was
asked when I talked about the Student Faculty Policy Committee recommendations on academic honesty or dishonesty was that they requested if we do have the anti-plagiarism software made available to the faculty that students have access to it as well. They would like to be able to check their own papers against it. It would assist them before they turn in their papers.

**Past President García:** I just wanted to make the comment that today is President's Day, and I can remember when we used to celebrate that. Lincoln's Birthday is a special day for my family and me because 43 years ago we came to the United States on Lincoln's Birthday, and one of the famous things about the United States, and I think in terms of the promise that we make to new citizens--that we have opportunities for everyone. The reason that I bring this up is because we have a university in a neighboring state, the University of New Mexico, that has achieved something really good with their freshman enrollment this year, and so, I want to read this to you from *Black Issues in Higher Education--December 16* issue, a brief report. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Minority students make up just over half of new freshmen at the University of New Mexico for the first time in the school's history. At UNM they enrolled a record 3,086 freshmen at the university, including 1,550 Hispanic, American Indians, and other ethnic minorities. Bear in mind that New Mexico is a very unique place because it is a majority/minority state. So, this does not actually just reflect the fact that it is an increase in minorities at the university, it actually reflects the population of New Mexico. Officials say that the state's growth in minority enrollment is no accident; it did not happen overnight. When it comes to minority recruitment they have accomplished what other universities are still trying to figure out how to do, said Dr. Eliseo “Cheo” Torres, Vice President for Student Affairs. He said that he regularly contacts his cultural counterparts at other universities and seeks tips on minority recruitment. One of the reasons is that UNM buses dropped off 800 American Indian high school students from Shiprock, Zuni, Gallup, and elsewhere. They were visiting as a part of American Indian Student Day. Events were sponsored by American Indian Student Services, one of several ethnic centers ready to help minority students succeed. UNM holds similar events for other groups. Last month Hispano Student Day attracted 3,000 students and African American Student Day a group of 400. University recruiters also travel statewide to attract students. There are 178 high schools in New Mexico and they visit every one of them. New Mexico's large minority population and UNM's relaxed admission standards are other facts contributing to the large minority enrollment. Overall, minorities make up 47.5% of 18,027 undergraduates enrolling this past fall, as compared to 45% in Fall 2001, so that is not quite the population, but it is close. As for student retention, 74% of Hispanic freshmen who enrolled last fall returned this year. That is just short of 76.3% for White non-Hispanics. For other groups, 83% of Asians, 78 percent of Blacks, and 63% of American Indians who were freshmen last fall re-enrolled.

The reason that I wanted to bring up these two things is that I believe part of the problem that we have with the state legislature is the same problem that I would have if I were a state legislator. That is--why do we have a flagship state university, yet a student undergraduate population that does not reflect the population of the state? One of our basic tenets that we hold up as an example to the rest of the states, in New Mexico, a neighboring state that has a lot of the same issues that we have, they have really made it a reality. We cannot say it is because we have immigration--because they have immigration. It cannot be because we have rural areas that are poverty-stricken. They have the same issue. They also have urban issues, yet they are the ones who can achieve this enrollment. We are about 50% of the way there, if that much. So, one of the things that I would like to pose to you, and I want to put this directly into the minutes, is the fact that we are missing the point here--and since today is President's Day, it is a very good reminder that as a state university, we can argue about budgets, we can argue about what we should and should not be doing, argue about rankings, all those things, but I
think our primary mission as a state university should be to reflect the population of the state of Arizona. I just wanted to put that into the record and ask you what you think about that.

**Senator Guleserian:** In a word, what should we be doing that we are not doing?

**Past President Garcia:** First of all we should go to Albuquerque and pick their brains. I am an engineer and that is what I would do. That is the training that I teach in my classes, which I teach my graduate research students. If there is a model out there, something that works, do not recreate the wheel. We are not talking about another country, or another part of the country. Start there. I do not have the exact answers, but I do know that over the years people there have worried about this issue, and I also know that they have gotten the attention of their legislature. There are some quirks that are in the system that they have been able to build in--things like the American Indian students in New Mexico do get a lot of financial assistance and that may be part of the explanation. That is probably not the whole answer. I would start by just going to Albuquerque and I would also start by changing the way in which we engage with the legislature. As faculty members in academia, we like to talk about constants, which are ultimately abstract, and I think diversity, unfortunately, is one of those fairly abstract concepts, whereas if we say something simple, as a state university should reflect the population of the state, I think that builds in a lot of things.

**Senate President Kerr:** Let's talk about what we can do to get something going on this. With your permission, may I have CAPC give its report next? There are guests that need to leave. Michael Mayer will do both the second readings and first readings into the minutes on behalf of CAPC.


4.A **Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee** (Mike Mayer).

The first item on the consent agenda is a motion from Herberger College of Fine Arts.

**Senate Motion #13 (2004-2005) (Second Reading):** The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Herberger College of Fine Arts for the implementation of a new degree – Master of Music (MM) in Music Therapy.

**Rationale:** This Master’s degree will serve the educational needs of the music therapists currently working in the state and the nation. Entry level credentialing in music therapy is done at the Bachelor’s degree level. However, as a health care field, music therapists need advanced continuing education at the Master’s level to better serve the needs of clients in providing the best possible therapeutic intervention and to provide a means for professional development and advancement. The Master of music therapy will also foster an expanded research program in music therapy, which will emphasize community partnerships, community-based music therapy program development, and external funding.

Barbara Crowe is present to answer questions on this motion.

The second item on the consent agenda is from the College of Public Programs:

**Senate Motion #14 (2004-2005) (Second Reading):** The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Public Programs – School of Social Work for the establishment of a minor in Social Welfare.

**Rationale:** The Social Welfare minor provides theoretical and practical experiences preparing students to 1) enter graduate social work or other professional schools; or 2) attain entry-level employment in non-academic settings. The minor also serves the university’s general education component, helping to provide students with experiences essential to a liberal arts education.

These are the items on the consent agenda. Does anyone wish to take either of these items off for further
discussion? Hearing none, let's proceed to a vote. All in favor of approving all consent agenda items please say aye. All opposed? They are passed.

Under items of New Business we have several information items that were passed in December but were inadvertently left off the agenda. So, please read them now.

**Information items passed by CAPC (December 1, 2004):**

**Fulton School of Engineering**
Department of Chemical & Materials Engineering
  Establishment of a graduate concentration
PhD in Engineering Science
  Materials Science and Engineering

**Herberger College of Fine Arts**
School of Art
  Disestablishment of a graduate concentration
MFA in Art
  Photographic Studies

**College of Liberal Arts & Sciences**
Department of English
  Establishment of an undergraduate concentration
BA in English
  Creative Writing

**School of Life Sciences**
1) Revise the Minor in Biology;
2) Disestablish the Minor in Microbiology;
3) Disestablish the Minor in Plant Biology;
4) Disestablish the Minor in Plant Biology, Plant Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
   Option

**Information item passed by CAPC (January 26, 2005)**

**College of Public Programs**
School of Community Resources and Development
  Degree Planning Request
B.S. in Tourism Development and Management

5. New Business.

5.A **Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee** (Michael Mayer).

On the agenda today, we have a number of items to introduce (Senate Motions 15-21) and we want to waive the rules to vote on the first three of them (Senate Motions 15, 16 and 17) at the request of the Executive Committee on behalf of our administration.

The motions were all read into the record.
Senate Motion #15 (2004-2005) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the implementation of an undergraduate degree – Bachelor of Liberal Studies (BLS) in Liberal Studies.

**Rationale:** This degree program is designed principally for former students with 60-90 credits that include hours from any of the Arizona universities or community colleges who, for one reason or another, were unable to complete their degrees. Students will not complete the degree program by taking on-campus courses. Through the creation of online courses and online independent study courses, students will be offered the opportunity to complete their degrees in a timely and convenient way.

Senate Motion #16 (2004-2005) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the establishment of an academic school – School of Global Studies.

**Rationale:** The School of Global Studies will advance ABOR’s Vision, Mission and Strategic directives by concentrating many discipline-based resources in one unit whose specific focus is the study of global issues. The basic goal of the new school will be to create trans-disciplinary, outcomes oriented research and teaching programs that explore solutions to problems of global import and magnitude.

The School of Global Studies will enable ASU faculty and students to engage in trans-disciplinary, problem-focused research and teaching designed to foster an intellectual vibrant exchange; an action-oriented research within local communities, the State of Arizona, and far beyond; and a collaboration with policy makers and organizations across the globe.

Senate Motion #17 (2004-2005) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the establishment of an undergraduate degree – BA in Global Studies.

**Rationale:** This program will be trans-disciplinary in scope, integrating the social and behavioral sciences, humanities and natural sciences, and oriented toward addressing real-world problems and issues. The Bachelor of Arts degree will educate and train students for a world that is in rapid social, economic and political transition. The degree program will provide students with an environment that is intellectually stimulating and enable them to obtain the tools and marketable skills for understanding and interpreting global developments.

Senate Motion #18 (2004-2005) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the establishment of an academic school – School of Human Evolution & Social Change.

**Rationale:** The School of Human Evolution and Social Change will take the lead in re-inventing anthropology and transforming the way we address the most compelling issues of the day, aiming for nothing less than international leadership in advancing knowledge and understanding of the past, present and future of human societies and cultures. The School will introduce and define new approaches to long-standing question, by bringing together social sciences and humanities with a number of environmental and other disciplines. Building on the considerable strengths of the Department of Anthropology, the School will greatly enhance ASU’s role in social science research and teaching.

Senate Motion #19 (2004-2005) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of
Liberal Arts & Sciences for the implementation of an undergraduate degree – BA in Film & Media Studies.

Rationale: The degree program will share a common core with the Department of Theatre and Film and draw on relevant courses from the humanities, social and natural sciences and Fine Arts. The BA will provide students with the high level of visual literacy necessary for understanding and contributing in a critically informed manner to the media-saturated society in which they live and work.

Senate Motion #20 (2004-2005) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the implementation of a graduate degree – Master of Liberal Studies (MLS) in Liberal Studies.

Rationale: The program is intended for students seeking a graduate degree that explores the integration of the humanities with political, religious, social and scientific questions within their cultural contexts. The Master of Liberal Studies (MLS) is designed for students interested in a multidisciplinary approach to human ideas and values, providing an opportunity for students to expand their liberal arts background. The distinctive feature of this degree program consists of three integrated core seminars specifically designed for the MLS. This core series will provide graduate level, integrated, interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary approach to problems and issues articulated by the study of individuals in society.

Senate Motion #21 (2004-2005) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the disestablishment of degrees and minor – BA, MA in Humanities, Minor in Humanities

Rationale: These programs are in a small unit with approximately 100 majors, 50 of whom are specializing in film and media studies and will be incorporated into the proposed BA in Film and Media Studies. Film and Media Studies is a vital, growing area within the college. The remaining graduate and undergraduate students will be allowed to complete their Humanities degrees/minors. The reorganization fits in with the college’s move to consolidate smaller programs and departments and to bring them in line with the college’s top priorities.

Senator Mayer: First I want to recognize anyone who is present to answer questions on any of these motions? Dan Bivona, CLAS Undergraduate Programs is present to answer questions on (SM #’s 15, 16, 17 and 20 & 21), Sander Van Der Leeuw, Anthropology, is present to answer questions on (SM #18) and Aaron Baker, Humanities, is present to answer questions on the film and media studies degree (SM #19).

I would ask for a suspension of the rules on items 15, 16 and 17? (Seconded by Senator Vandermeer). Is there further discussion on the motion to suspend? Hearing none, all in favor of suspending the rules please say aye. Opposed by the same sign. The rules are now suspended. Are there further questions on items 15, 16 or 17? Hearing none, we will proceed to a vote. All in favor of passing these three motions please signify by saying aye. All were passed.

Senate President Kerr: Thanks very much for agreeing to expedite these motions quickly. Let’s go on to the next item on the agenda which is a report from Paul Patterson from East Campus.

ASU East Assembly Report (Paul Patterson).

I just want to thank all of you that joined us in our meeting last time at East. And just to let you know, we are in the process of redesigning our Assembly into a Senate and this is being done in line with our work on the proposal for a University Council.
Senate President Kerr: We will move on to our next item of unfinished business, which is Senate Resolution #10 that our Student Faculty Policy Committee has been working on for some time and our students and our administration want this to happen too. They would like to be able to say that ASU is an institution which highly values academic honesty, and that our degrees really mean something.

5.B Student Faculty Policy Committee (Steve Happel).

Senate Resolution 10-A (Second reading) was read into the record.

Affirming Academic Integrity

Resolution 10-A. Whereas all universities face ongoing issues of academic integrity and dishonesty (cheating, plagiarism, deception), whereas new technologies (cell phones, other electronic devices) make testing ever more difficult, whereas ASU strives for the highest standing as a renowned teaching institution, and whereas ASU seeks ethical behavior and individual performance from its students, be it resolved that the institution highly values a culture of academic integrity, one that is respected by students, faculty, university administrators and the community at large.

Senator Happel: If we just vote on this we will get it resolved today. All in favor of Senate Resolution 10-A please say aye--opposed by the same sign--10-A passes.

Resolution 10-B. In order to enhance a culture of academic integrity, be it resolved: that the brochure on academic integrity is widely distributed and discussed with all incoming freshmen and transfer students, then signed and kept by the students; up-to-moment anti-plagiarism software is readily available for all faculty wishing to use it; a university-wide pool of graduate student proctors is established so that large classes have extensive proctoring for exams; and the degree of assistance for faculty confronting issues of dishonesty by the Office of Student Life and college units be more widely understood and utilized.

Senator Happel: I have met with representatives from the Provost Office, Legal Counsel, and Student Faculty Policy Committee this morning, and I want to put Senate Resolution 10-B on the table again. I am coming back with this recommendation based on all the discussion we have had. One of the criticisms was, that the wording is campus-specific because the Office of Student Life does not exist on the East or West campus. Nancy Tribbensee has suggested that we have a university web site where there is a statement on cheating. We already have wording to this effect but now we are going to have President Crow sign it, Provost Glick sign it, President of ASASU sign it, and President of the Academic Senate sign it. This will be a web site that hopefully will be listed on all student syllabi or faculty syllabi--telling students here is where you go to learn about what we feel about cheating. Hopefully faculty will talk about cheating the very first day of class and faculty will be encouraged to have material on cheating in their syllabi. We will use the up-to-date anti-plagiarism software for faculty and students. We will not have a university-wide pool of graduate students; instead we will encourage colleges in their large classes to have a pool of proctors, graduate and undergraduate, who will be trained and they will have a training session, and we will try to stop the cheating first and foremost in the large classes. We are going to take the Mayor Giuliani approach like he did in New York, start where it is most apparent in the large lecture classes and we are going to try to figure out ways to quash it there. We will have other ways for faculty to prevent cheating, such as software, and ultimately each college will have a designated staff member that the faculty member can go to and tell them that a person that is cheating needs to be kept track of. The designated staff person tracks that information and then twice a year this group of people will meet together and talk over what is going on throughout the campus with regard to cheating and make recommendations.

Senator Burstein: Does it make a difference that we vote on this now or at the next meeting?

Senate President Kerr: It matters a lot to Vice Provost Ruth Jones because in order to get printing done for the brochures, we need to give Senate approval.
A Senator asked: Who would discuss this with the students?

Senate President Kerr: It would be the incoming advisors at the Student Orientation meetings.

Senator Happel: There are six advisors who actually put together this brochure originally on what cheating would constitute. We may want to spiff it up a little bit, but basically it is sponsored by the Academic Senate and the Office of the Provost and will be used for all incoming students.

Senate President Kerr: I would make a motion that the brochure on academic integrity is widely distributed and discussed by student affairs, personnel and academic advisors to all incoming freshmen and transfer students. Are there further questions? Then all in favor say aye. All opposed by the same sign. Resolution 10-B passes.

Senator Happel: So, my committee will come back with Senate Resolution 10-C next time.

President-Elect Mattson: So who will do the central tracking?

Senator Happel: This would be the advisors. If you want to give me feedback that would be fine, but I think we are in the home stretch now about what we think we can do legally, and then what will have an impact on these students.

5.C Committee on Committees (Pauline Komnenich).

Well, we are at the point now where we are just about ready to announce our candidates for the election, but we still have the challenge of filling vacancies on Senate Committee for next fall. We need you to notify me or the Senate Office if you are being replaced or reelected in the Senate next year. What I will probably do, and you may be hearing from me by email, is that I will request that some of you fill these vacancies, those of you not on a Senate committee already. Then we will have a small ballot at our March meeting. I do thank all of you who did fill out the Preference Survey. All in all it went pretty well. We are almost there. There is a schedule for the ballot for the Assembly, and electronic voting will be between March 21 and April 1. Thank you all very much.

5.D Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

Just a brief report on the items so far--The proposal that was passed by the Senate in December has been forwarded to UofA and NAU for their endorsement. Hopefully with their support we will find a way to have greater flexibility in our choice of retirement programs. As Provost Glick mentioned, we are seeking a health insurance benefit, a full retirement benefit for our employees, and this is a major goal not only for faculty but also for the university, and it appears that there may be a way to do this on a tax-sheltered basis. I have asked University General Counsel to double check my analysis, but it appears that we should be able to roll over and tax shelter our payout on sick leave, and make that available for health insurance upon retirement instead. Also, the individual and the employer can make contributions on a tax-sheltered basis and that may turn out to be very important to us (as a couple who is retiring at age 65 probably should expect something like $200,000 worth of health insurance premiums). That is a pretty major hurdle for people to get over and if we can manage to structure a VEBA trust so that it will become possible to deal with pre-tax dollars, that will be the goal.

The other item that is going on currently is our optional retirement plan is being reviewed. I represent ASU on that group. Currently we have four vendors--TIAA-CREF that has the majority of the accounts is one, but also Fidelity, Valic, and Vanguard. If you have any feedback on performance or lack of performance of any of those vendors that you would like to make, I would appreciate hearing from you. The catch is to change our options in this optional retirement plan--currently the majority of people probably do not manage their own retirement accounts, or very passively if they do--then there are about 10% who are very actively involved and are looking
for additional investment options to provide a greater diversity in their portfolio. We are trying to accomplish both goals. The RFP that is going out this week will ask for each vendor to identify a recommended investment vehicle in each type of fund will continue to offer a wide selection and currently they are required to have three years experience in managing their programs, and they will be asked to provide a brokerage window so that people can invest their retirement funds themselves. So, the delicate balance to provide greater choice while simplifying is what we are trying to do, press on with both things.

**Senate President Kerr:** Aren't we all grateful that we actually have a professor of accountancy who is actually taking the lead with our benefits? Thank you, Doug.

5. **University Affairs Committee** (George Watson).

Our committee has not met since the break, but we have received a report from the full-time contract faculty task force, and we will be having a meeting soon to go over that and make a recommendation to the Senate. (That meeting is planned for Friday, March 11, in the Foundation Building, 4440, at 3:00 p.m.).

6. **Adjournment.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
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