
Substitutes: Ann Hibner Koblitz for Lisa Anderson and Jackie Martinez for Dan Canary

Guests: Dan Bivona, Associate Dean, CLAS, Kathleen Church, Vice Provost, Cynthia Jewett, Associate General Counsel, and Peter Layman, Director,

A record of absences will be kept in the Senate Office.

1. Call to Order

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

2. Action on Minutes

The minutes of the February 21, 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).

Today we will be hearing executive announcements and communications later in the meeting because this will be the busiest Senate meeting we have had this year so far. Major issues are on the table and that is why there is such a large stack of materials for you to look at. We are going to begin with Kathy Church, who will be reporting from the Provost Office for Milt Glick as well as giving us a report on the university redesign project. There will be a short time for questions afterward as we must move on to business that must be voted on today. The carrot is--if we get everything done we get to leave on time. The stick is--if we do not get everything done we will have to call a special meeting before the last Senate meeting on April 18. Without further adieu, Kathy Church will speak to us.

3.B Kathleen Church, Vice Provost

Milt Glick asked me to report to you the results of the tuition discussions at the Board of Regents. I will not go into any detail because I was not at the Board meeting. What I can tell you is that the Board approved for the
Tempe campus, a resident undergraduate tuition that was increased by 8.4%. The non-resident undergraduate tuition for current students was increased by 8.4 to 8.5%. For new students coming into the university, they will have a 16.8% increase in their tuition, that is about a $2,000 difference and that is for the Tempe campus. For the first time, there is a differential in tuition among the campuses. At the East and West campuses, resident undergraduate tuition will be increased by 6.9%, rather than the 8.4 to 8.5%, and the graduate resident tuition is the same, but will increase by 8.5 percent for those that are currently here, and the non-resident tuition will be the same as the Tempe campus, an increase of about 16.8%. Those are the increases that will occur for students in the coming year. Do you have any questions on that?

Senator Umberger: Can you give us dollar amounts rather than percentages?

Vice Provost Church: It is a $342 increase for undergraduate non-residents. The total for that is $4,404 for residents. For non-residents the increase was for 8.4% increasing it by $1,094, for a total $14,011. For new non-resident students the number will be $15,093.

Senator Dwyer: Does this push us over the top--of the bottom third?

Vice Provost Church: This does not make us reach the top of the bottom third yet.

Senator Martinez: When you say that the campuses are in agreement with regard to tuition increases--do you mean the Tempe campus administration is in agreement with the Board on this?

Vice Provost Church: I do not think I said anything about being in agreement with the ABOR--I was just reporting what they passed on tuition.

I am going to spend just a little time today because I understand your need to get to the business of the agenda. I want to talk about the process that is going on with the system redesign. I am a member of the system redesign group and in case you do not know who I am, my name is Kathy Church, and I am currently a Vice Provost with the Provost Office. I was asked by the Board of Regents to serve on a committee to study the redesign of the Arizona University System. That has been a long process that has gone on this entire year. There were four members of that committee from ASU, an equal number from NAU and from the UA and three community college presidents. It was led by Dr. Mary Jo Waits, formerly of the Morrison Institute, and Dr. David Longanecker from WICHE served. We were the so-called working group for this committee. As you may recall, last year the Regents laid out a plan for how the system should be redesigned in Arizona. The reason for redesigning the system in Arizona is outlined for you in the report that I just passed out. There are more on the table in the back if you did not get a copy yet. I am not going to read the report to you or go through it entirely. The reasons are pretty clear. We are going to have an enrollment growth that is just absolutely mind boggling over the next two decades in this state. It is estimated that the universities will have to accommodate growth of about 115,000 to180, 000 students over not too long of a period of time. The demographics in the state are expected to change tremendously, and so, the whole effort is to see what we can come up with in a redesign plan that will effectively serve students in the state of Arizona. As I said you have a copy of the report. If I were to put the report in a nutshell, what it really says is that we need to have a true mission differentiation among the universities, which is nothing new--people have been saying that for a 1,000 years. What is a bit new is that we should have mission differentiation within each institution--using the example of the UofA that also has UA South as an institution that has a lot of room to grow and the mission differentiation should be great. A very new concept, which applies a lot to Arizona State University, is mission differentiation of campuses, but more interestingly, it is mission differentiation among the schools among campuses. The model that President Crow has put us on is really an interesting model, and one that we ought to probably proceed with and define much more specifically, but you can read all this in the report.

Tomorrow you are also invited to attend one of the forums that are going to take place on all the campuses. This one will be held 5-7 p.m. in the Alumni Lounge of MU on Tuesday, March 22, and after you have read the proposal and have a lot of questions, you can come and talk to the members of the committee. This report has
actually been on the Regent's website for a long time (and I know that is what you all like to spend your time reading--scanning the Regent's website for all the reports they do). Chris Herstam, a member of the Regents, led this process. We had three subcommittees: one looked at what other states were doing, one subcommittee worked on needs assessment for the state; what really were the demographics; where was the growth going to occur? Then we also spent a lot of time looking at the criteria we would use to evaluate the proposals that were submitted, and you should know that there were about 18 proposals submitted on redoing the university system in Arizona. We met on several occasions; we put together a whole lot of stakeholders groups. There were alumni groups in Flagstaff and some here. There were faculty groups, student groups, business leaders, legislators, and diversity groups; we had a diversity consultant and we talked to many people that represented the private educational sector in the State of Arizona. We did a lot of reading and a lot of listening. I just might say that I was put in charge of a subcommittee called the state subcommittee and I spent a lot of time this past year looking at ten states that were selected by the group--how they are organized in terms of higher education, how they are funded, and many other things and I really learned a lot in that process. I think that if that is enough information for now, I will leave this in your hands unless you would like me to answer a few questions.

President Kerr: Are there any questions for Vice Provost Church? Hearing none, as I said at the last meeting, you should read the redesign proposal and be vocal about it in that you take time to make statements on it, because someday redesign is going to happen--and it could help us out with our benefit packages, or it could restrict our freedom as well as our salaries, and affect our ability to do our work. I would suggest that you look this proposal over carefully and think it through, and think about what impact it would have upon your discipline, on your students, as well as your colleagues. Some day the redesign plan will happen, and probably a plan very much like this, unless something is proposed which is more elegant, more complex, and more sophisticated than differentiation among the campuses and differentiation of tuition by campuses. If you cannot make the meeting tomorrow night at Memorial Union, there is a meeting at Arizona State University at East campus in the Ballroom B, on Wednesday, March 23, 3-5 p.m., and another meeting in the University Center Bldg, Room 265, 5-7 p.m. at ASU West. Thank you.

4. Consent Agenda Items

President Kerr: We are still going to keep our announcements at the end of this meeting, and so now can we move forward with the acceptance of all the consent agenda items from CAPC? Is there a motion to accept all of these items? Senator Happel made the motion and there were multiple seconds to his motion.

4. A Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Michael Mayer).

Senate Motion #18 (2004-2005) (Second 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 questions, 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 #20 (2004-2005) (Second 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) (Second 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 who 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.

5. Unfinished Business (Motions from Committees)

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

President Kerr: Please allow Senator Happel to go first with the Student Faculty Policy Committee item, Senate Resolution #10 originally; it has been through about a yearlong process and we need to bring this to a vote today.

Senator Happel: We approved Senate Resolution 10-A and 10-B at the last meeting (see below).

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.

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 by student affairs, personnel and academic advisors with all incoming freshmen and transfer students.

Senator Happel: Now I would ask you to consider Resolution 10-C.

Resolution 10-C. In order to enhance a culture of academic integrity, be it resolved that a website will present the University's stance on academic integrity and dishonesty that is signed by the President of the University, the President of the Academic Senate, and the Undergraduate and Graduate Student Association Presidents; that faculty be strongly encouraged to have this website listed on the first page of the course syllabus and to address cheating and plagiarism from the start of the semester; that a faculty handbook be developed that summarizes the fundamental rules on cheating, institution support, and
types of testing methods in reference to the extent of cheating.

**Senator Happel:** Are there any questions or comments? Do I hear a motion to approve resolution 10-C?

Senator Gonzalez-Santin made the motion. There were multiple seconds to his motion. All in favor please say aye. All opposed by the same sign. Senate Resolution 10-C is now approved.

I would like you to consider **Resolution 10-D** next.

**Resolution 10-D.** In order to enhance a culture of academic integrity, be it resolved that up-to-the-moment anti-plagiarism software and other such technologies are made readily available for all faculty wanting to employ them and that their usage is announced in class.

**Senator Happel:** This is so the students can have access to this software as well. Are there any questions or comments? Is there further discussion?

**President-Elect Mattson:** I am sorry; I thought the software was to be made available to faculty and students as well.

**Senator Happel:** From what I understand, it may not be able to become available to the students overall. I do not know if faculty would turn around and make it available to all their students. I thought that is what we talked about at Executive Committee on Monday.

**President-Elect Mattson:** No. The students wanted that to be made available to them as I understood it, so that they could use it on their papers before turning them in--to check it themselves. It was to make sure that the references and citing were correct.

**Senator Happel:** Sophie is that what you wanted--you were the one that brought this issue up?

**President-Elect Mattson:** It was brought up at the student senate meeting that Sophie was not able to attend but I did attend.

**Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman:** I do not think it is actually necessary that we have total access to the software. I think that if they would like the teacher to run their paper before handing it in, that would be good.

**Senator Happel:** Are there any other problems with this? Hearing none, do we have a motion to accept 10-D?

Senator Haynes made the motion to accept and there were multiple seconds to his motion. All those in favor please say aye, all opposed by the same sign. Resolution 10-D is now approved.

I would now like you to consider **Resolution 10-E** next.

**Resolution 10-E.** In order to enhance a culture of academic integrity, be it resolved that a pool of proctors is established in each college to monitor large sections on exam days and that the University formulates procedures and training guidelines.

**Senator Happel:** Notice now that it says a pool of proctors--and this could be graduates or undergraduates. It is up to the college to decide if it wants to do this. The feeling of the Student Faculty Policy Committee was that the university should establish some guidelines and should conduct workshops to train these students. In general the intent is that a pool of proctors be established campus-wide.

**Senator Acker:** Will they be paid and if so, by whom?

**Senator Happel:** Yes, they will be paid by the colleges, I would assume.
Senator Acker: But could we suggest that the university pay them instead? (Yes, you could make that motion.)

Senator Allison: I previously raised a concern that I think creating a university-wide proctor pool made up of students leaves students in a very bad position relative to other students and faculty. I think it is a dangerous place to put students into, trained or not. I have some real concerns there.

Senator Happel: But we do that all the time now.

Senator Allison: No we do not, because usually the students who proctor are responsible to a faculty member in a classroom not a university-wide proctor pool. That is a whole different bailiwick from what I think you have here.

President-Elect Mattson: Is there a way to phrase this differently? I think there are some part-time faculty who might want to be part of this too.

Senator Burstein: How about restricting this to graduate students and faculty?

President-Elect Mattson: No, Senator Allison said that she specifically did not want students involved, even graduates.

Senator Allison: One of the arguments that I have heard in our discussion with the students was that faculty cannot proctor their classes well enough--yet you want to establish a university-wide student proctor pool?

Senator Happel: Faculty say that they do not have enough proctors. The problem is they do not have enough proctors to cover the large sections and the students tell us over and over again that the surest way to stop cheating is to have many proctors. So, our choice is either to have these proctors who may at times perhaps find themselves in a difficult situation, or we can just choose to ignore the problem entirely.

Senator Allison: We would be putting undergraduates and graduates in that difficult situation.

Senator Happel: How difficult can it be? You have a pool of students that are going to be trained. You say we need this many students for this class at this time. They are professional, they are trained, they come into the classroom. They are just like graduate assistants.

Senator Allison: The concern is if they uncover cheating.

Senator Happel: That is what they are supposed to do! Exactly, that is why we have them in there. We want them to uncover cheating. What difference does it make if it is an undergraduate or a graduate if they are a well-trained individual? I do not understand the difficulty. The choice is then, no proctors whatsoever.

Senator Allison: I object to the use of the term "university-wide pool of proctors."

Senator Happel: It is not university-wide; it says that each college will establish a pool of proctors. The university will provide training and procedures for this group and workshops.

Senator Martinez: I think there is a legitimate concern here in having undergraduates or graduates being trained for this mission of accusing someone of cheating! That is an ugly problem that could end up being to the detriment of the student. The alternative is to use a more informal system and try to solve it on a more local level.

Senator Happel: We are doing that now and it is having no impact. The students tell us over and over you need a large number of proctors. That is what the students say. We can say, no, no, no, we know more about what is
going on in the classroom, but students say more proctors, more proctors.

Senator Vandermeer: Point of order--I assume that one of the major elements here are the requirements that the faculty member would be in the classroom actually supervising the proctors, because the faculty member would essentially be responsible for making those initial allegations of cheating.

Senator Happel: That is right. You would not just bring the graduate students in and leave them. Part of the deal would be university guidelines to say that the faculty must be in the classroom and must work with these proctors.

Senator Ismeurt: What I hear seems to be a debate between two people. In the Academic Senate, as I recall, when we call on people from the Senate they seek to make their case, and then we call on other people before going back to the original speakers. I am concerned about this and would like the senators to make their individual cases and then let others speak.

President Kerr: Thank you senator, what you pointed out is actually what the rules of order are, that a person cannot speak a second time until every other person has had an opportunity to speak once. Thank you very much for recognizing that and we will now observe that rule of order.

Senator Happel: Are there further questions? Do we have a motion to accept Resolution 10-E? Senator Vandermeer made the motion and it was seconded by Senator Burg. All in favor please say aye and opposed by the same sign. There were some opposed, and then a hand vote was taken and a clear majority was in favor. Senate Resolution 10-E was approved by a show of hands.

I would now like you to consider Resolution 10-F next.

Resolution 10-F. In order to enhance a culture of academic integrity, be it resolved that each college designate an individual staff who serves as the lead authority when cheating problems arise in the college, who receives from faculty any instances of cheating that involve written sanctions, and who twice a year meets with the other designates to derive numbers on the overall extent of cheating and plagiarism cases and to develop steps to be taken to address specific problems.

These people are already in place in the colleges. They are collecting the information ad hoc at present and we would like to formalize this process, and in fact, if this resolution is passed we will now be able to bring these people together formally. Are there questions on this? Do I hear a motion to approve?

Senator Hahn: When you say a designated individual, will this be a faculty member or an administrator?

Senator Happel: It is a staff person. We will say individual staff then to clarify. Are there other questions or comments? Do I hear a motion to approve 10-F? Senator Acker made the motion and Senator Gonzalez-Santin seconded her motion. All in favor please say aye and opposed by the same sign. Senate Resolution 10-F was approved by a voice vote.

6. New Business

6.A Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).


The Personnel Committee recently met and accepted the report of the work group on promotion and tenure implementation. This as you know has been a long saga. This time last year, the full body accepted the report Task Force on Promotion and Tenure guidelines, making some fairly major changes on that process--establishing ad hoc committees, developing up-to-date criteria for each unit, providing a larger number of
outside letters from perhaps higher quality sources, and this in an attempt to try to accomplish two goals. 1) To create more expertise at the university-level review process and 2) to provide a mechanism for a one-university review process. So, we have seen the report, accepted the report. The implementation committee has been working and that committee's report is available on the Provost's website; it is available on the Senate's website, and you have access to these documents today. We would ask you to discuss this with your units, to be prepared at our next meeting to vote in favor or against this proposal to streamline our promotion and tenure criteria and process.

Senator Rice: Do you want feedback at this time?

Senator Johnson: You may ask questions of clarification. It is the first reading and discussion will occur at the April 18 meeting before we vote on this item.

Senator Haynes: I have had a number of questions from my junior faculty on this but I will ask this one--What thought was given to the situation on scholars who straddle several disciplines? Is there some body of knowledge on those circumstances?

Senator Johnson: Senator Mattson was a member of the workgroup, so I would ask her to respond to your question. I can then give you my personal opinion if you wish.

President-Elect Mattson: The document is very vague on that point for that very reason--that depends on who the candidates are and what disciplines they are coming from in any given academic year--and this is how these five or six broad categories are going to be established. Each year they may be different categories based on what the pool of candidates is like. Gail Hackett is really the best one to explain this because she had used a very good example and I cannot do that today, but it was primarily looking at the person's research area to establish the broad fields. Using myself as an example, I am in the College of Nursing but I also do work with minority groups from an anthropology background, so, I could request someone from Anthropology to sit on my committee, someone from the biological sciences may be appropriate too. It depends on what your research area is. So, even though you are interdisciplinary, that could even provide you with a wider opportunity than those whose research is more narrowly defined, who might not be able to draw from a university-wide pool of potential reviewers. The suggestions for three uniquely appointed members of this five-person committee come from the candidate, the chair, the dean. You all pool your ideas of why any person would be the best person to sit on your committee.

Senator Haynes: We have humanities and social sciences, and the language concerning that is ambiguous and may disadvantage some people.

President-Elect Mattson: Hopefully Gail or Nancy Gutierrez will still be able to answer that question, and we expect them to be here at the next meeting. It is hard to say directly because we don't know what kinds of disciplines are going to be created, or what kind of committees are going to be created, other than the number of people that will be on one and it very well could be social sciences or humanities, and I think you just have to go back to where your primary research is done, what is your work, where are you publishing, and what kinds of journals are you publishing in? The people who are involved with that work are who you want to be reviewing your portfolio.

Senator Rez: When does this actually begin to be applied? My understanding is that we have basically run out of time, at least according to this schedule, to find an advocate for the candidate even though the file is not yet constructed.

Senator Johnson: The earliest date would probably be 2005-2006. It appears that we will not have acted on this until after the deadlines for this annual review process. It will probably be a year after that before the procedure is fully established.
President-Elect Mattson: But the plan is to implement these procedures next year. The majority of the work goes to the Provost's Office to get all the committees assembled, get all the information back, and Nancy Gutierrez has said that her Office and she in particular are going to be working on this for the next couple of months, if this passed April 18. We already know who is going up next year, and I am not quite sure what the comment is about "running out of time"--they are not doing anything this year that they have not already done before. They still have to do their annual evaluations, they still have to write their letters to the P&T committee, then it goes to the department P&T committee and there is not anything different now other than the work of the Provost Office between April 18 and June, if this is passed by the Senate, to get the committees established and in place so that a candidate knows who is on the committee, before they ever start thinking about the department and college's reviews.

David Burstein: I think you are misinterpreting--what our chair told us was that he had to make a decision on the candidate on May 1, before any letters come in. Our personnel committees consider the candidate after the letters come in, not before the letters come in. The chair considers the candidate after the letters come in, not before the letters come in. That is wherein the problem lies. If we were to ask our chairs to make decisions on candidates before the letters come in, that is a big problem.

President-Elect Mattson: Was your chair told that his or her recommendation has to be done somewhere before May 1, before the letters come in? That is what I do not understand.

Senator Burstein: That is what he told us.

President-Elect Mattson: That did not come from our committee though. I do not know where that came from. The dean may have decided that is how he or she wants to implement it.

Senator Burstein: That came from Nancy Gutierrez. Apparently there was a chairs and directors meeting where our chair came away with that impression.

Vice Provost Church: I can check on that for you.

Senator Johnson: My understanding is that the chair is to submit names, but not a recommendation on those candidates.

President Kerr: One more point of clarification.

Senator Watson: My response to what Senator Rez said was that the purpose of doing this was to make the process more flexible for people who are cross-disciplinary, and that the individual himself or herself has, first of all, the opportunity to select which one of those areas that he or she wants to go into in terms of committees. Also, because they are in fact ad hoc committees, that the composition of the committee would then reflect that rather dual nature of the candidate. I do not know if that is different than your perception.

Senator Rez: Our chair was reporting from that same meeting, and basically there was no specific issue that was brought up, but he thinks this is unworkable and it is extremely confusing.

Senator Johnson: Another comment on that?

Ann Hibner Koblitz for Senator Lisa Anderson: I wonder if there has been any thought given to placing a limit on the number of committees an individual faculty member would be requested to serve on, because I come from Women's Studies and we have a small unit even though we have 120 affiliates. We are little bit worried that we will be over-tasked with ad hoc committee service.

President-Elect Mattson: There is one chair, and one representative from the Academic Senate, who would only serve on that discipline's reviews, however many there were, 10, 12 reviews, within that particular
discipline in any given year. With the ad hoc committee members, we did not set a limit, what I was more concerned about was that someone actually could serve on more than one committee, if that was the need. We need to think about whether to set a maximum number of times a person can serve. We could talk about that further.

**Doug Johnson:** One possible benefit of this proposal would be that the work of the University would be split among four to six subcommittees, so that one individual might not be so over tasked.

**Senator Vandermeer:** There is a line in here that says the ad hoc committee will make whatever initial inquires it feels are necessary. Is that restricted to people who have participated in the review process, or does it mean that they can contact just anyone?

**Doug Johnson:** My understanding is that this refers only to consulting with people that have written letters.

**Senator Siferd:** My question is about the timeline, with respect to the candidates. I know what President Crow wants, but people are already preparing their files without even knowing what the available ad hoc disciplinary committees will be.

**President-Elect Mattson:** I don't think it will be any different than it is right now, in that you go through your department and college review on the usual timetable, which is in the fall, then it comes to the ad hoc committee meetings in the spring, just like it goes to the university committee now.

**Doug Johnson:** So, what we have is a need for the Provost Office to create these pools from the broad areas early enough so that candidates can select one, and that is really the only change in the calendar.

**Senator Siferd:** Who will write these letters?

**Doug Johnson:** They indicate their desire to go forward with their candidacy in March normally.

**Susan Mattson:** Well, March is when the names go to the Provost Office of who is going up for promotion and tenure, so, they can then create the discipline areas based on where the people are falling out. This is announced. The deans, the candidates and the chairs will then be asked to be thinking of people in the university that could be on the ad hoc committees. The Senate leadership will be asked to nominate people to represent the Senate and it all sort of happens simultaneously. Then these committees are chosen from the names submitted by the deans, chairs, the candidates and the Senate to form the committees which will be announced in June, before the August or September submission when the candidates turn in their document. Then they select the committee that they want. It is the Provost Office that is behind schedule in what tasks they have to do--that is this March 1, and that has already past.

**Senator Siferd:** Ok. We are already behind that.

**Susan Mattson:** But that is not our issue. It is the Provost Office that is behind in what they have to do between whenever this is passed, and June. That is why I am saying it is the Provost Office that is getting the brunt of the implementation, especially this first time out. Next year it will be in place, so that by March 1 the candidates' names will go forward to the Provost's Office and they can start at a reasonable time rather than starting May 1 to be ready for June. It is because of the time crunch right at the moment. If we delay this another year, the point was that last year, we accepted the revised procedure and we gave the task force this year to work on the implementation piece and bring it back to the Senate. It has gone out to the associate deans, it has gone out to the deans, it has gone to various people in the university community and now it is in the Senate.

**Doug Johnson:** Ok. Are their any final questions?

**Senator Martinez:** Regarding the ad hoc committees, this seems to presume that the selection of the three
names (not from the department) will be a task that the candidate has been thinking about for some time even before the names go to the Provost on March 1, and this year that will not be the case, as the broad discipline areas are not set up yet. Also, the chair of my department has expressed some negative feeling about this too.

**President Kerr:** There will be opportunity to amend this document at the April 18 meeting, as it will receive a second reading and more in depth discussion.

**Senator Johnson:** I am going to ask that this process come to a close for now. I would ask you to seek the advice and consent of your department to guide your vote at the next meeting. It is a major issue for the university; it is conceived as a way to enable the university to move forward and to gain a national reputation and status. What we have to balance that with is the cost to faculty and departments as there certainly will be additional administrative work associated with this process.

**Senate Resolution #24 (2004-2005) (First Reading):** A proposal from the Personnel Committee to create a VEBA (Voluntary Employee Beneficiary Association) to tax shelter funds for post-retirement health care. Currently the state has a policy, the RASCL policy, which allows employees to receive payment for excess sick leave, up to a total of $30,000. What currently happens is that upon retirement you receive the cash payment for unused sick leave and then have to pay income tax on it and the state has to pay payroll taxes on it. If we create a VEBA trust, however, the funds that roll into that trust we would not have to pay income tax on. We would also have more benefit from the existing funding that is already available. The additional possibility would be for individuals or employers to make contributions to this fund to enhance their post-retirement health care benefits. In a first reading, I would like you to consider this proposal. See the power point attachment for the Senate meeting on the Senate website where you can read the entire Senate Resolution #24, on slides # 7-8.

**Senator Guleserian:** Would faculty have a choice where their funds go?

**Senator Johnson:** These plans can be implemented in a variety of ways. They have such plans at the University of Washington, the University of Montana, and in both of those cases the individual has the option of electing the VEBA trust as an alternative to receiving cash.

**Senator Haynes:** Are the payments restricted to health coverage?

**Senator Johnson:** There are additional options but they are all health-related-- including life insurance, long-term care and medical benefits.

**All Discuss:** Are there documents that cover all this information? Reading the proposal that is in your package is a good place to start. If you send me your email, I will be glad to provide you with more information. Could you send this information to all the senators? I plan to have it posted on the website.

**President Kerr:** The promotion and tenure issue is going to be one that we really will need feedback on. Remember that it did not originate in the Academic Senate; this was a proposal that originated from the situation that has been substantially changed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. It has changed, but it is still very important to consider, especially the kinds of issues that have been brought up today. This is the first time that the department chairs are weighing in to us, though they have, of course, weighed in to the P&T Task Force but it is the first time we have heard these concerns, so bring this information to our next meeting as well.

We have had a guest waiting for quite some time to help us out with CAPC items, so, let us move on now to the CAPC report.

**6.B Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee** (Michael Mayer). Items of unfinished business (Second Reading) and new business (First Reading) are contained in this report.
Senate Motion #19 AS REVISED (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 and the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the implementation of an undergraduate degree – BA in Film with concentrations in Film & Media Production and Film and Media Studies.

Rationale: The BA in Film will fill a long-standing and clearly articulated need at Arizona State University for a coherent and complete film production program and a humanities-based film and media studies program. Students have been requesting a program at the University for some time now, and their requests are growing. The multidisciplinary BA will expose students to cutting edge technologies of production and ethics content and will engender in them the high level of visual literacy and the critical faculty necessary for understanding and actively contributing to the media-saturated world in which they live and work. The degree is intended to draw upon relevant courses from the humanities, social and natural sciences, communications and the full range of the fine arts.

Senator Mayer: On this item, you will notice that it is revised. For the first reading, it was for a BA in Film and Media Studies (2/21/05 Senate meeting) and the revised proposal states that we will have a BA in Film and Media Production, as well as a BA in Film and Media Studies. However, the committee has not had an opportunity to meet on the portion that is associated with the Film and Media Production. The Provost Office has agreed that what we will do is go back to the original proposal that we had in Senate Motion #19 for the first reading, which is to have the implementation of an undergraduate degree BA in Film and Media Studies. We will see the Senate part of this at the CAPC meeting next week (March 30), the film and production portion of this, at which time it will be vetted. Eventually, the desire will be to take the two separate programs and fold them into a single degree, a BA in Film. The committee members did see the revision and had some concerns that they did wish to talk about at their meeting on March 30. I have invited Dan Bivona and Peter Layman as the person on the BA in Film and Media Studies. Are there are any questions at this time on that part of the proposal?

Senator Umberger: From what I am reading it does not say where this degree will be housed. In which department and which college would that be?

Michael Mayer: It looks like in the College of Fine Arts.

Dan Bivona: That is the other degree. The BA in Film and Media Studies will be housed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, in the office of the Undergraduate Programs, and the director will be Peter Layman. Is there a reason to act on this now, or do we need to wait until we get a more official word?

Senator Mayer: The FMS degree got a first reading last time, and my understanding of it is that it is preferable to get this degree in place now, because we have done away with the degrees in humanities and this will be proposed as a replacement.

Senator Fowler: When will both of these programs begin?

President Kerr: It will be the replacement beginning in the fall.

Senator Fowler: The only thing is that there will be some kind of interface with the Film and Production Program, and we will see what that interface will be, but there was no question from CAPC or CLAS about the Film and Media Studies program.

Senator Mayer: It was initially presented to CAPC as separate degree programs, but since then a decision has been made to try to fold them into one but CAPC still needs to look at the film and media production degree.
Dan Bivona: The distinction essentially is that Film and Media Studies is housed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences while the Film and Production degree is housed in the Herberger College, and they both share a common core of three courses.

Senator Mayer: Are there other questions? What was introduced last time was Senate Motion #19, a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for implementation of an undergraduate degree BA in Film and 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.

That is what last month's motion said. That is not what you have before you now, but that is what you are voting on. So, is there any further discussion or are there other questions on that wording? Hearing no further questions, all in favor of the BA in Film and Media Studies please signify by saying aye and opposed by the same sign. Senate Motion #19 has been passed (original wording from 2/21/05).

Senate Motion #22 (2004-2005) (First Reading) of a proposal from the College of Nursing for the establishment of a graduate certificate in Nurse Education and Academic and Practical Settings. Rationale: The purpose of the Nurse Educator (NED) Graduate Certificate is to offer NED courses as an expanded new and revised predominantly online graduate certificate curriculum that will provide clinically based nurse educators, who choose not to pursue the master’s degree or who wish to supplement their graduate degree in advanced practice nursing, an opportunity to enhance teaching competence in working with students at all levels and/or to educate staff nurses to better meet the health care needs of the public.

I believe that Senator Pauline Komnenich is present to answer questions on this proposal. Also, David Hrabe is present. This is a first reading so it is to answer questions--does the body have any questions for either Pauline or David? Hearing no questions, we will vote next time on this motion.

President Kerr: Moving backwards on the agenda, Pauline is ready to give her report from the Committee on Committees.

6.C  Committee on Committees (Pauline Komnenich).

I wanted to remind you that the ballot is now online. You should have received an email about it. The voting begins today and will be open until April 1. I would encourage all of you to vote. There is just one more task to handle. I believe we have filled all of the committee vacancies for next year in terms of Senate members with the exception of the Committee on Committees which had three vacancies, two faculty and one academic professional. We managed to get two faculty names and one academic professional name from among the senators who would be willing to serve. We did not have other candidates to run against them, so, I was asked to bring the names of the volunteers to the Senate for approval in a voice vote rather than conducting a ballot.

Note: (Jay Blanchard, Psychology in Education, Barbara Lafford, Languages and Literatures, and Marcia Anderson, Library Reference Service, will serve from the Senate and Ed Greenberg from Nursing will serve as a special data consultant to the Committee on Committees next year.) That announcement will be made again to the Senate on April 18 for final confirmation at the request of Senator Burstein.

President Kerr: Pauline, I am not sure if you are aware of the crisis that happened right before the Academic Senate meeting. Provost staff was in charge of sending out the email for us on our election and for making the data pull from the HR data warehouse, as to who could vote in this election. Inadvertently, there was an incorrect data pull made that included members of the West Campus from the faculty and academic
professionals. As a result, they received a notice to vote and some were a bit upset and wrote to us. That is how we found out initially. As soon as I was made aware of the situation, I suspended the election at that point temporarily, and contacted as many Executive Committee members as possible about what to do next. Those members who were available voted to have a revote and to provide an explanation to the voters. One hundred votes had already been cast. We do not know how many came from West Campus but we had to invalidate those votes. Therefore, if you are one of those one hundred eager people who voted within the first thirty minutes of voting, you will need to revote. You will receive a notice to that effect. So, the Academic Assembly election officially began again at 2:30 p.m. this afternoon. The ballot was offline for about two hours while we solved the problem. I am sorry, Pauline, you had been in meetings all day and probably did not know about the crisis that was happening in your bailiwick, but I hope that you are glad that our SWAT team managed it. So, on to George Watson now.

6.D University Affairs Committee (George Watson).

There are three items from the University Affairs Committee that are coming before you on a first-read basis today. We will vote on these items at the April 18 meeting. Please turn to the last page of your attachments for the Senate meeting. The first item involves the additions to the ACD Manual. The last page is a policy on reference checks and background information. That item goes together with the draft document "ACD Reference Check and Background Verification." This page gives you the rationale of why these additions are occurring in the ACD Manual. It basically comes down to this: a bill was introduced in the legislature that would require additional steps to be taken to help insure that the people we are hiring and employ at ASU have backgrounds that do not represent security risks, and do not represent other kinds of financial risks to the university. However, I must tell you that the proposal made by the legislature would have made us fingerprint everybody literally. That was not well received by the university and was not well received by the Arizona Board of Regents. I myself have never been fingerprinted. So, ABOR then passed a policy and the ABOR policy suggests that the universities take care of background verification and reference checks. What you have in the ACD Manual is ASU's effort in terms of background verification and reference checks. I urge you to read through that particular document for changes in the ACD Manual. Cindy Jewett is here and she can give this introduction better than I can and answer any questions that you may have. Cindy, can you come on down to the podium and continue with the overview of this document?

Cindy Jewett: For those of you that do not know me, I am Cynthia Jewett and I am Associate General Counsel in the General Counsel's Office and I have been the attorney primarily responsible for trying to take the ABOR's mandatory policy and develop a university policy that will match it. What the policy will require is that at a mandatory point--and we have had for some time a discretionary policy--we will be required to apply this policy to all new hires to the university and to promotions within the university that are competed for. This does not refer to moving from assistant to associate professor, or to full professor situations. But in competing for a position, the top finalists would be required to go through a mandatory background check. This will include checking employment records, checking employment history, and doing a criminal history conviction check. That will be done through a third party agency that will comply with the Fair Credit Reporting Act and depending on requirement for the options in the background check, that could include a driver's license, academic credentials, and credit check if a person has financial responsibilities in the position they are applying for. They may need to have certain professional certifications verified as well, such as in hiring a psychologist, they have to be admitted to the Board of Psychology Examiners. It is just a check to see if this person is suitable for employment at the university. The policy is intended to make sure that federal law is followed during this hiring process. Most important from your prospective, it is the hiring unit who is making the hire, and any information that pertains to that will be shared with the hiring official, because it is the hiring unit that makes the call of whether this information is a problem or not. The goal there is not to have Human Resources dictate to the academic side of the house, but to make sure that we are aware if there is a problem. The fact that someone might have a criminal conviction is not out of this ballpark by any means. It would certainly be more of a problem for someone who fails to disclose that conviction, and then if that is discovered it would be a problem. We do want to make fair judgments based on how many years ago was it, what was it for, what was the person's employment history; all these factors are relevant in that decision. If someone is an employee at the time a
promotion comes up and they are competing for it, and something comes to light, whichever employment category they are in will fall under the applicable due process provision. So, if it were a faculty member, we would use the ACD policy manual, if it was a staff member we would use the SPP Manual. We are not trying to reinvent the wheel but we are simply trying to apply existing policy and we are trying to apply federal law. I think for those of you in this room, and for your respective colleges and departments, the bad side of the news is that you are at the forefront of the wave of academics having to have mandatory background checks, but it is a mandatory board policy so we are supposed to develop institutional policy that is fair and reasonable that doesn't slow down your searches.

Senator Johnson: There is a concern that there is potential for slowing down the search process, and possibly making it less competitive in some situations. Do you anticipate that the three finalists will have background checks run and will the cost be low enough that it is not going to put much of a burden on the departments?

Cindy Jewett: We want to make the policy flexible enough that if a hiring unit wants to do a search of three finalists, they will have the ability to do that, so that they might start the process a little earlier if they are not nervous about losing the person by doing that. The cost is estimated to be from $35 to $75 generally. The more you layer onto it, and if it is performed by the outside company, by and large it is still a fairly modest cost overall. At this point in time they want it to be a cost-free situation. There is a piece that I did not mention that is in the policy, but it is not anywhere near ready to be implemented, and that is a component on fingerprint checks, which is restricted to security-sensitive positions. That is an area where we try to define it narrowly but with flexibility, so that if job titles change or priorities change, administration can disclose and expand that category as necessary. It is the fingerprint check that is a one-time, at the time of hire, cost of $29.00. That is not a security clearance card that has DPS checking every day, and it would have to be renewed. But it is not going to happen until such time as our state legislature approves a bill that lets the university get fingerprint information. A bill in the legislature this session was passed by the house; it was then sent to the senate, and it has been referred back to the house. It has not been hit by the house committee yet for a hearing, so it may or may be not. We will not be doing any fingerprinting unless and until we have the ability--and that will be when that bill is passed into state law.

Senator Duerden: But what about individuals who teach only one to two semesters in the English Department? That would mean doing 25 checks for our faculty associates, and for our 46 instructors.

Cindy Jewett: You are going to have to work that out. I would say we will probably find a rationale where that does not have to happen for those who work one or two semesters, for example. I have yearly appointments. I do not think that we will recommend that every service professional, every academic professional, every administrator, everyone who gets a yearly appointment has a background check each year. Are there any other questions?

Senator Rez: While I appreciate ABOR and the university administration's efforts to limit the impact this policy will have, I still have some concerns about the university having a giant fishing expedition on every single new hire. I believe we should limit the number of background checks to job-related things, such as checking their performance on the job. This sounds preposterous.

Cindy Jewett: I think that the data that I have seen may be not consistent with your view--that it is only a very small sliver of individuals that present a problem. We have experienced resume fraud, whether it is with academic credentials or employment history, and I would hope that our new process would alert us to those situations. But we are in the mode of having to respond to ABOR policy at this point. They understand that we were not very happy about it but it is a political compromise and it is intended to give us greater control over the process, which if left to the legislature alone, would not give us control, it would be onerous. The proposed bill mandates fingerprinting for all university employees before they can start work and it would involve an FBI clearance card. Every six or seven years you would have to submit new fingerprints and the state DPS would check the reports to see if any of you have been convicted of a crime or other things.
Senator Acker: Thank you for cushioning the blow, but I wonder if this body can express disdain? There is a real sense of anger over this.

Senator Watson: It seems then there are two hostilities here 1) voting on the ACD changes, either affirming or not affirming these changes as presented, and then 2) the issue that you raised, Senator Acker, and perhaps in a separate resolution then raising concerns and expressing that as the sense of the Senate. This has already gone through the Arizona Faculties Council. Bill Simmons can tell us about that.

Senator Simmons: This is something that the Arizona Faculties Council was involved with in the spring of last year and over the summer. The ABOR did ask us for our input on these items. We were given a draft in March which we said was unacceptable! We quickly understood the realities that were building in the legislature and we worked with ABOR, we tried to cushion the fall a little bit, and by June this is what we came up with, what you have in front of you today. Then there was some flexibility as to how each university could do this as well. The AFC did have some input in the process and maybe there is a third option too, George, if there is a sense in the house that you would like the AFC to take something back to ABOR, we can.

Senator Watson: Think about that--for those of you who begrudgingly accept these changes--how to formulate a resolution that may go back to the AFC and then the ABOR as soon as possible.

Senator Bryan: A number of schools have students who are foreign nationals. How will this work for them? How are they going to access databases outside the US--and what is the quality of those databases at other places?

Cindy Jewett: Those are all good questions, and I think the answer is going to be that we will be working with all hiring units to allow them to do conditional offer letters so we can offer a position to someone based on the successful outcome of a background check. You can at least bring people here because international hires take months and sometimes years to get a report anyway. It can be a long time to correct concerns and questions also. I think that if they are going to look us up in Choice Point articles just two weeks ago, those are very helpful in terms of educating everyone that the mere fact that something is stated in a database does not make it so. Then there are a lot of inaccuracies and our process has to allow for fairness to the applicant to give us corrected information, and also time for units to make sure that they are comfortable that we have accurate information.

Senator: On these security-sensitive positions, can you say more about that?

Cindy Jewett: Some of our faculty may be doing research in smallpox or other toxins that are rather dangerous. They will be subject to background checks strictly due to federal regulation, separate from department policies. Our policy is acknowledging that should we have faculty who do this type of work, they would be subject to fingerprinting.

Senator Watson: Are there any other questions? If not, you should go back to your department and present this.

Cindy Jewett: If you do have further questions you can contact me in the Office of General Counsel and I will be happy to talk with you.

Senator Dwyer: In English we are hiring all the time. I am wondering about teaching assistants, are they part of this?

Cindy Jewett: As we worked the Board policy through, we managed to state expressly that it applies to faculty, academic professionals, service professionals, and classified staff. So, by that explicit definition it does not apply to graduate assistants, research assistants, and student workers.
With the fingerprint provision, for example, unrestricted access to dorm rooms, if the director of Residential Life thinks that he wants RAs to go through fingerprint checks, he would have the discretion to require that but not until the legislature passes this bill.

**Senator Haynes:** Are adjunct faculty also exempt?

**Cindy Jewett:** We have to address that in procedures.

**Senator Watson:** Are there any other questions? Hearing none, let us move on to the next issue, which is the misuse of University properties policy. So, there are some changes that are being proposed there and Cindy, can you briefly point out why those ACD manual changes have come about?

**Cindy Jewett:** Regarding the revised ACD 123 policy: Misuse of University Assets policy is to replace the existing Misappropriation of University Assets policy. That policy was done in 1985 and has a very distinctive police component to it wherein a suspected case of misappropriation ought to be referred to ASU DPS as a criminal allegation upon discovery. The policy really does not reflect our current practices over the past years for handling suspected cases of misuse of university assets. We have adopted a practice that places far greater reliance on internal audit and financial services to determine if we have a violation of policy (Is it financial misuse? Is it practice that is not good university policy?) It is really at the end of that review that we make a judgment call about whether there is enough evidence that it might be criminal. If there is, we will refer matters to the DPS, but that is not our first stop. The revised policy tries to be far more explicit about what is a university asset--what constitutes misuse--who the policy applies to, and it tended to be a consolidated policy that refers the reader to other relevant policies that might exist in other manuals. We found 35 separate policies currently that address misuse of university assets and that is too much, it is not efficient. The policy also has some mandatory notifications because our Board of Regents has an audit committee that directs us to give them notice at the beginning of an audit and periodic updates. The policy also has in it a requirement that the unit has a corrective action plan, if it is determined that misuse of university assets occurs. Sometimes it is a bad actor and that really does require action, but sometimes we just have procedures that could be enhanced to prevent this sort of thing from happening again. A corrective action plan is really a risk management tool and it helps all of us do better, and sometimes the mistakes of one unit are turned to benefit the whole university and everyone has a chance to recreate their policies.

I hope you read both of these policies so that additional questions at the second reading can be addressed.

**Senator Watson:** Are there any other questions? Thank you very much, Cindy. I have one more item, Senate Resolution #23 (2004-2005) to add full-time contract faculty (instructors, clinical and research faculty, and professors of practice as members of the Academic Assembly. It is in your attachments and below. We will vote on this at the April 18 Senate meeting.

**Senate Resolution #23 (2004-2005)(First Reading):** Whereas the ACD Manual defines faculty as “an employee of the board in teaching, research, or service whose notice of appointment is as lecturer, senior lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or Regents Professor, or whose notice of appointment otherwise expressly designates a faculty position;” and

Whereas membership in the Academic Assembly is granted to all faculty in a tenure-track position, all academic professionals with probationary or continuing appointment positions, all full-time lecturers and senior lecturers, with three-year renewable contracts, but denied to other full-time contract faculty who are instructors, professors of practice, clinical and research faculty; and

Whereas these full-time contract faculty are valued members of the faculty engaged in the teaching, research, and service missions of the university; and
Whereas many of these full-time contract faculty have their contracts renewed year after year, resulting in long and continued service to the university;

Be it therefore resolved that ACD 112-01A be amended to include the following membership categories to the Academic Assembly:

1. All full-time instructors;

2. All full-time clinical and research faculty;

3. All full-time professors of practice.

Senator Watson: By the way, with respect to the two ACD revisions, these items have come before the University Affairs Committee and we went through them more or less line by line and we approved them to be forwarded to the Senate. Resolution #23 is coming forward to you only so that you have a first reading today, and the UAC and the Senate Executive Committee will look at this in more detail before the next Senate meeting, along with you. It is one that we told you at the beginning of the year would likely come forward and here it is, and what it suggests is that there are classifications which are listed as being faculty at this university who are nonetheless not members of the Academic Assembly, specifically full-time instructors, full-time clinical and research faculty, and full-time professors of practice. We offer that to you as a first reading and I will try to answer any questions you have. I want you to understand that it may sound like a pro forma resolution and of course if it is something that you may want to do, on the other hand, I simply want you to give this some thought and afterward questions, if there may be consequences in having this happen in your particular department with respect to department meetings and department voting rights. You might want to make sure you take this up in your department as soon as feasible. English and Mathematics obviously have a great number of these people. Nursing has a great number of clinical faculty, so, I do urge you to take this issue up with your department.

Senator Guleserian: Remember that even if these categories are added to the Assembly, that still does not guarantee full voting power in their departments.

Senator Watson: No, not necessarily but it could. That is up to the department.

Senator Guleserian: But that would take an act by the department.

Senator Watson: However, I do think that membership in the Academic Assembly would give them a stronger voice as to what the department should do. They could say then--if we are members of the Academic Assembly and can vote there, why are we not voting members of our own departments? I think it is an issue worth pursuing.

Senator Siferd: They could at least vote in all Assembly elections for Senate and Assembly officers and committees.

Senator Watson: Are there any other questions or comments? Thank you.

President Kerr: We have completed our business today in a timely manner, and we need to have a few announcements and we will begin with Deirdre Hahn.

(3.C) GPSA President's Report (Deirdre Hahn).

We are having Graduate Appreciation Week this week. We are having activities, forums and other sessions. We will present fifteen teaching excellence awards this year, at a luncheon on Wednesday afternoon, and 100
assorted gift cards and a plaque will be given to the recipients of the awards. On Friday, we have our Graduate and Professional Student Appreciation Picnic for all graduate students, and we would like to invite you to stop by Old Main lawn by the fountain between 3:00 and 5:00 p.m. and network with us and the state legislators that we have invited to attend. We are glad to have received the official proclamation of Graduate Appreciation Week from Governor Napolitano.

**President Kerr:** We also would like to proclaim that it is Graduate Appreciation Week officially as a Senate. I will entertain such a motion from the floor (several senators made that motion and there were multiple seconds). All in favor said aye and **the proclamation was made to declare our appreciation, as faculty and as members of the Senate, for our ASU graduate students and to proclaim the opening of Graduate Appreciation Week.**

(3.D) **USG President's Report** (Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman).

We have our apartment fair coming up on April 10-11 on Hayden Lawn. It is a great way for students to find out about off-campus housing options and get some good deals and discounts. There is always free food, so feel free to stop by. On April 11, we are having a statewide Student Lobby Day down at the Capitol. It is similar to the statehood picnic you all have except that students will be having lunch and a rally on the lawn, as well as meeting with legislators throughout the day. We have our elections coming up! There are signs everywhere on campus. We have eight tickets running and who knows who will be president next year, so, I am looking forward to bringing my successor to the next Senate meeting.

**President Kerr:** Thank you, Sophie. Is there any other business? Hearing none, we will adjourn.

7. **Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Recorded and edited by:
Darby Shaw, Executive Assistant

Final editing by:
Anne Kopta, Secretary of the Senate