Academic Senate Summary  
Monday, August 30, 2004  

Carson Ballroom in Old Main  
3:00-5:00 p.m.

Present:  

Senators Absent: Not listed this time.

Visitors: Fred Corey, College of Public Programs, Bradford Kirkman-Liff and Kate Harris from the College of Business

1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Barb Kerr at 3:10 p.m.

2. Approval of Previous Minutes (April 26, 2004).

The minutes were approved without objection as published on the Academic Senate web page over the summer at:  

Please send all corrections to the Senate summary to darby.shaw@asu.edu.

3. Announcements and Communications.

Senate President Kerr: Let me officially open up the Academic Senate first meeting for the AY 2004-05. Welcome to our beautiful room, the Carson Ballroom. It is such legacy. This is where governance started, in Old Main, with a much smaller faculty than we have today. You have the agenda before you and the business items.

I have also placed on each table an invitation to the American Requiem Concert. The Scottsdale Center for the Arts has given us a good discount with $20 tickets and there
will be a block of ASU Tickets available. Today we will let the students go first on the agenda, because they both have 3:30 pm classes.

3.A USG President's Report (Sophie O'Keefe Zelman.)
We have been busy working on defining what is "USG" over the summer and we are continuing that study into the fall. We are in our second year and I don't think that the students know what services we provide, and so, we are making them aware of that this year. The services we provide are Safety Escort Service, a campus bike registration and we are partnering with DPS on our bike registration campaign to prevent bike theft, and we are doing a large voter's registration program, informing students how they can get involved in the campaign, how to find candidate information, and where to vote. We want to have dialogue with the legislators, the students, and just get students more involved in this community, as well in their home community, and inform them of the resources and information that are out there for them.

We are heavily involved in the presidential debate events being planned for October. We are also focusing this year on developing a sense of graduate student community. Often time's graduate students do not get to interact outside of their colleges or units. With this university becoming increasingly more research oriented, there will be a larger group of graduate students. We hope to improve the child care services for students on campus, and to provide them with better training as they will be teaching many of our freshman classes. We want to be able to recruit the best graduate students nationally and locally and be able to provide them with health care packages, more financial aid, and tuition waivers for GA's and TA's such as we have done beginning this year. We want them to realize that they are also a considerable group as a whole, and they do have a legislative voice. We have approximately 100,000 graduate students throughout the state. All they need to do is get involved and have their collective voice heard.

3.C Senate President's Report (Barb Kerr).
First of all, there have been some exciting things happening over the summer. There have been a number of initiatives begun.

The Board of Regents has accepted the entire University Design Team report and there has been time to react to those changes and to give input.

On new initiatives, the Senate has not done initiatives ever before so it seems that now is the right time to have task forces to begin exploring new initiatives that the Senate can undertake. But most of you as senators don't really know that all it takes to put forward new ideas, to suggest policy changes, to suggest legislation, are ten senators signing a petition and placing an item on the agenda for consideration by the Senate.

Over the summer a group of very talented people met and developed a visionary model for health care for faculty and staff on our campuses. The Health Care Task Force, chaired by Carol Nemeroff from Psychology met many times over the summer and developed the model, and the resulting report has now been presented to President Crow.
It would be such a convenience to be able to walk across the campus to get certain medical treatment (shots, routine tests and medicine) and then be able to go back to work. The model would also incorporate the use of nurse practitioners. There would be sick child care provision, and other concierge services offered at cost to the faculty on campus. The health care model will be a plant that hopefully blooms on our campus over the next few years.

We plan to have a salary and compensation task force this year to study salary issues and salary compression, as well as find new and creative ways to recognize and compensate faculty--such as being allowed to have a higher percentage of their salaries on grant funding, having micro enterprises that benefit the university as well as our unit. Tony Garcia and George Watson will be working on this task force, and you should call the Senate Office if you are interested in joining this effort. There are many ways to compensate faculty outside of their salaries, and Tony is gathering the resource information and materials the task force will work with. Please call us if you are interested.

Another interesting new task force has been formed by Vice Provost Nancy Gutierrez that will investigate undergraduate education. We will have a grass roots task force made up of students, faculty, and administrators to examine first of all our number one crisis statistic, the retention rate of students. Many students are examining us right now, and our job will be to attract and keep them here.

That is just an idea of the ways we can bring initiatives forward. Now I am going to turn over our meeting to President Crow.

3.D University President's Report (Michael Crow).
Welcome back to those of you that have not been here over the summer. It is an exciting time for all of us as we embark on what is ASU's biggest and best year--we will have enrolled by the 21st day of the semester just under 60,000 students, which is below the 63 or 64,000 that we could have had this fall. We exercised every policy option that we have available this year, to send 800 freshmen to the community colleges for additional preparation, as well as having a soft application deadline at the University of April 15th. That application deadline will become a hard application deadline next year on April 15th. The use of a soft application deadline this year reduced the number of applications after April 15th by 40%, and the quality of those students that didn't apply after April 15th were basically the students who would have had the most difficult time making it through the university. Our rational for doing this is not because we want to push the students away. It is the exact opposite of that, because we are trying to position the university for growth in very careful and deliberate kinds of ways. We not ready for 3 to 4,000 additional students this year but we might be in several years, and as the Capital Center campus and the Polytechnic campus continue to grow and expand, and as the West campus continues to flesh out, and as the Tempe campus stabilizes around the schools--that will be the core of this overall institution.
In the freshmen class this year we do have nearly 8,000 students. Among them we saw more than a 20% increase in those who graduated in the upper 10% of their high school classes, a marked increase in those students who are quite expensive to the university because those students win scholarships upon admission. We also saw a dramatic increase in full-time students and a waning of part-time students. So, while it is the case that our total cap will be just under 60,000 students this semester, our full-time equivalent students has gone up almost 12%, a sign of increased retention, a sign of increased focus on our programs, and it is a positive sign. We will also break records in all categories of university performance measurements, and that includes national merit scholars, faculty awards, faculty research, faculty scholarship productivity, faculty salaries, all categories that we are trying to ramp up. That is sort of an overview of the University.

I am now in the beginning of my third year in as President of this University. I am on the ten year initial plan from my perspective. The first year was a year of testing and experimenting to see what the system could bear. It turns out the system is robust and can bear as many requests as we receive from the private sector, many requests from the government, and from individuals, and so we have learned some of the limits too. The second year, we focused a lot of attention on the university design team, on ultimately having a one university being in many places, the report of the Design Team was approved in its entirety by the Regents at the April 2004 Board meeting, and we are now moving things forward with its implementation on all aspects, including the renaming of campuses, the moving of schools, renaming of the schools, and the building of the new schools, all the things that are included in that report which the Regents have now approved. Many of us have come back to the Senate for approval of individual items in that report and I now believe we have a green light to move ahead with that plan. Next year we will concentrate on resource acquisition, trying to build out a resource base for the university, building out of our additional campuses to build capacity, the growth and maturation of this campus into a national class university, if not an international class overall university. We will keep focused on competitive scholarship across all disciplines, and it will take us about 8 years to acquire the resources, the facilities, the additional faculty, the expansion of the faculty, the enhancement of student quality, the enhancement of student capability, and that is about an 8 year undertaking. My hope is that at the State Centennial in 2012, we will be able to definitively say that the last ten years in the life of Arizona State University has moved us to a national university status.

For the next two or three years, we have to stay focused on three things at the same time, some of which is confusing. The first is, we have to run a large university on a daily basis, which has all its inherent complexities, and in trying to deal with that as the Senate President has already suggested, trying to deal with the fact that US News and World Report ranks our faculty around 60th among all universities in the country, which is now standard achievement, which demonstrates all the ability of those of you who are gathered here at this meeting, but around 140th as a performing university, with the three areas that we are underachieving in being graduation rate, predicted graduation rate, and the investment per student, the three areas where we are falling down in. We have undertaken a number of initiatives related to this. The first thing we must work on now is to make this university work at its highest possible level. We are underpowered in a lot
of places. We are struggling with how to expand our dormitory facilities on all of our campuses, because we get a 15% uptake in retention among students who stay in the dorms. After this year, and after looking at the freshmen rate of retention on students who started their year in the dorms this year--that will be 82%, which is not quite where we want to be, North of 90% (which is where we want to go), but we are making progress in that direction.

A second area of focus we have is the implementation of the ASU design. In that case we are a four campus setting. We are a one-university in many places design, attempting to think about and implement individualized and differentiated schools on each of those campuses. If you have not seen the plan you can access it on the web. The assumption is that we will build at the end of the day, 30 or so schools around the various campuses, and that they will be ASU schools first located on particular a campus setting, and that all the names of the campuses will be deleted essentially. There will be no ASU East, or ASU West, or ASU Main. What we will have is Arizona State University. We will have the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences of Arizona State University, at the Tempe Campus. At the West Campus it will be a new College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences with differentiated departments of Arizona State University at the West Campus. So the notion will be school centered, college centered, and every school and every college being complimentary, within the university's overall structure. I will talk a bit more about this at the breakfast tomorrow. Those two things, the running of the university that we have and the designing of the university that we want to be--that consumes about 99% of my time, and 99% of our administration's energy, and hopefully about 99% or more of your energy.

The ABOR has as one of its missions this year to address--that we are about 40 to 50 years behind in conceptualizing the size of the university system to embrace the doubling number of the college students who are qualified to attend the universities in the next 13 years. So, that means we will roughly go from 100,000 to 200,000 students who are qualified to attend the university by 2017. That is a huge social and demographic shift. The Regents have not addressed this at all. There has been no system scale redesign for over 50 years and that is something that needs a lot of attention.

If you read about it in terms of system level redesign, and the 13 or 14 proposals that have been submitted to a committee made up of faculty members and administrators and others--they will spend a year worrying about that. They will then come up with some ideas about how we address that, and then report back to the University Presidents and the Board of Regents with their respective ideas about how to advance the university's system. The most important issue is enrollment growth and the most important issue there is how we will manage that enrollment growth.

Here are two items of importance to me, one of which I hope this body can take on as an agenda item, and I know that there is a committee working on this now. The first item is the notion of one university in many places. The reason for the elimination of the title ASU Main is that it immediately causes artificial and unnecessary tiers among our campuses. However, we have no differentiation in the review of faculty at the various
campuses in terms of promotion and tenure. We have no differentiation in expectations of performance of faculty on the various campuses. The expectations are the same. They vary by discipline. They vary by what we are trying to do with a particular discipline; they don't vary by campus. So, perhaps that is subtle angle of review that we have ahead, but the notion that you will see me push very hard this year and in the years ahead, will be to have one university in many places--one faculty culture, one set of ideals, one university, and one ASU home, for any student that happens to go to any of the schools on any of the campuses. Each of the campuses will have their own set of cultural characters because there will be a differentiation of programs. Each of the campuses will have linkages between the programs, but they will all be ASU programs. This means--and I think this is perhaps something very important for this body to think about--my desire is that there be one University Senate established. That would be in the same way that the University of California has one University Senate connecting all of its campuses, with individual bodies at individual campuses. That University of California Senate is a powerful force and a powerful ally to the president of the University of California. It is the voice of the collective faculty, it is a quality control mechanism, if you would like to read about the evolution of that Senate, and read about the evolution of that body of faculty, please buy Clark Kerr's Volume I, The Blue and The Gold. It is a fascinating story of the emergence of the University of California System. The decisions that were made take the Senate from the Santa Barbara Normal College, for instance, which was a Home Economics College and turned it into UC Santa Barbara. They moved forward at lightening speed. The interplay between the various campuses, and finally the acceptance of the need to mature the entire institution, not just elements of the institution, were involved. That is what we are experiencing at ASU, and I am very much interested in seeing the leadership of the Senate take on the task of thinking about one University Senate, that is a legislative body to aid us in moving the University forward.

On October 13th, we will be hosting the third official presidential debate. If John Kerry has his way there will be another one on that Friday, but I don't know if President Bush will agree to that. The University in case you did not know, keyed into this last year, three universities were selected, and we are the first university in the western United States to be selected for this debate. It is a huge deal and it is a huge pain. It is a huge pain because 2,500 press members will be coming, international terrorist are doing whatever they do to occupy their time and bother everyone, and so, the notion of us hosting a debate is both a big deal and a huge burden. We understand this and we will be taking every step we possibly can to minimize that burden. Already in many academic departments there are many events being planned to maximize the benefit of this debate to students, to citizens, and faculty and others. Even sitting here right now, in August, I cannot tell you all the details because the people running this on a national basis don't know. There are too many variables, too many things up in the air. We do know that of the 3,000 seats available in the Gammage Auditorium; something on the order of 300 will be useable because the rest of the space is being used for television broadcasts. Because of that, we will be opening Wells Fargo Arena and putting in live television and actually hosting some other events, to which some of you will be invited. I hope that many of you are able to do that.
We are also working hard on budget planning and our budget process. We will be announcing shortly the number of new reorganizations in the senior administration of the university including realignment of the Budget Office, as we move into the new budget models we hope will advance the budget of the university. Relative to the budget of the university, we are already embarked on the FY06 legislative and executive campaign as we make our case, and we believe we will successfully make our case for special investments, and we believe that we will make our case for special funding for the large number of students we are expecting. One of the things that we did last year and I don't know if everyone is here from the math and English departments, but we had given those two departments 50 new instructors to reduce the size of freshmen math and freshmen English sections, and we are very hopeful that this will help, particularly with freshmen retention. This undertaking was possible due to the tuition increase, also most of you by now have heard about the faculty and salary adjustment, and that is a result of the tuition increase as well as the limited enrollment growth support that we received from the state. Let me comment and put the state's investment in the university in perspective: we have among the largest percent of our budget relying on the state, out of any of the universities in the country. We are still north of 30%, the University of Michigan is 8%--it is my job to drive that percentage down to below 20% and you don't drive it down by cutting it back. You drive it by basically moving it forward by raising other resources along the way.

Are there any questions or comments?

Senator Guleserian: Is there any news on the development of the Los Arcos property in Scottsdale?

President Crow: The City of Scottsdale approached the university about 18 months ago and said southern Scottsdale and northern Tempe are in a period of significant economic distress--the answer to that question is a tentative, yes. They asked us what we might be able to do about this--we said not very much because the only piece of property that we can do anything on is held up and bound in a land dispute right now. The Arizona Foundation Real Estate Committee chaired by Steve Evans, is trying to find a way to break that log jam and find a way to make that property available. We indicated that the City of Scottsdale could do nothing unless the land it owns in trust is paid for. We said we apologize for that, but that is the way we acquire all of our land and all of our infrastructure. We are now at a stage where the City of Scottsdale has purchased that piece of property; they have leased it to the Arizona State University Foundation for 198 years, which is the essential equivalent of a gift. Arizona State University Foundation on about October 15 will release a request for a massive donation to help us to develop that site as a site where we are hopeful that businesses interested in proximity to the university in areas of art, science, technology, and business might locate. If we can find a massive donor that is handled in a way that a few dozen other projects which have been very successful around the world, largely in Europe, have done, we will propose that we do the same thing here. We have a team of people at the university that are working with a team of people from the ASU Foundation, working with a team of people from the City to advance that project. The financial investment by the University in that project at the
moment is zero. The Foundation will take on the task of managing the mass developer. What we will be doing is helping to outline what set of facilities would be of the greatest benefit to us, as we move forward not only for the university, but for private commercials. It is a planning process. The City of Scottsdale has spent 83 million dollars to buy land and to locate structures, including apartments which were quite expensive. A parking structure will not be built until there is a need for a parking structure. The City of Scottsdale is providing 37 acres it has set aside for the Foundation's use, including facilitate building a hotel on a five acre piece of property. It turns out that all of the universities that are further along the evolutionary path than we are, in terms of creative and research activities, all have facilities like this one to work with, but they are different than our research park which is a more traditional large scale enterprise facility, as opposed to a small scale enterprises that are planned for the Scottsdale property.

**Senate President Kerr:** Are there any further questions of President Crow?

**Senator Haynes:** What is the status of the proposal made for a new university at the ASU West campus?

**President Crow:** There was a committee of 18 individuals formed by the Regents, including the provosts, and Mark Searle, who is the new West provost. They have that proposal plus about 15 or 16 other proposals that have been submitted to them, and they are going through all of those proposals. They are also doing a needs assessment to come forward with a set of proposals on how to design a university--so, the process is that that group will evaluate the proposals and they will submit those ideas and recommendations to the university presidents. That group will then make specific proposals for the ABOR to consider. This will likely occur 12 months after next August, and it could happen before that too. We are moving forward with one university in many places until we hear otherwise, or until the system decides that they are going to change configuration, we are moving forward with that plan in every way.

This was the end of the President Crow's report.

**3.E ASU Polytechnic Assembly Report** (Paul Patterson).
I would like to report that at ASU East we have started a New Year with about 4,000 students, and we started this New Year with one newly renovated building, one new building, and one new Provost, Dr. Jerry Jakubowski. In terms of Assembly business, our present issue is a charge from our Provost to define what a "polytechnic" is. We know that the Board of Regents has approved the renaming of the campus as ASU Polytechnic, but the legislature must approve it before we can use it and they meet in January. Meanwhile we are busy defining "polytechnic" while also being part one university in many places. That is the main task before us.

**Senate President Kerr:** What is this rumor I hear about us having a retreat out there?
Senator Patterson: Barb, the last time we discussed this idea, we were in the midst of our Provost search at East. When Dr. Jakubowski met with administration and faculty at main campus, he asked them how many had been out to ASU East, and about 10-12 people raised their hands. So, he thinks we ought to change that number, and has given me his approval to have a retreat of some kind, and to invite the Senate members at Main to attend.

Senate President Kerr: On the Senate agenda, all our meetings are listed and I would like our senators to help me choose one of our meetings that we could utilize to travel out to East for a retreat. The Senate has had its leadership retreat with the Senate committee chairs and the Senators at Large on Friday, August 27th.

As a result of that meeting, I would like to talk to you about several concerns that we discussed in that meeting, about the role of the Academic Senators. We would like to suggest that for this year, if any senator cannot attend a particular meeting that they send a replacement. That is because although the Senate meetings can be long, there are times when your vote can be very important and a majority of our members must be present in order to approve an item. For instance, when promotion and tenure is being considered, and when the task force comes back with implementation plans, we need a full house. We need someone in your place to make your vote! Please send someone in your place if you cannot be present and give them your proxy vote. You may also be wondering what you are supposed to do beyond attending all those meetings. We would like you to make the effort to report back from each Senate meeting to your department or college. Too often people in the department do not know what the Academic Senate does or is. What that means to your colleagues is that they have only once source of information on important items about changes that are happening in the university, and that is your department chair. To depend entirely on the department chair for all the information you need about the changes that are happening, may not be a good idea depending on your department chair. I would like to suggest that an academic senator become an important source of information, not only about current events at the university but about what sorts of things are happening at the university that affect faculty. One of the important roles is to report what goes on in the Senate at your faculty meetings. If you department does not have meetings, then I would suggest that you email all your colleagues and ask them what are their concerns? Please do some kind of report to them and receive their input on the issues and report that back to us. Remember it only takes 10 senator's signatures to place an item on the Senate's agenda. Last year as we considered the promotion and tenure documents and many amendments were brought forward at the meetings by faculty members who had brought petitions with them.

What has happened to make this a concern? Well, a number of senators have made the observation that the time and service they spend in Academic Senate meetings is not taken seriously by their departments, when it comes time for consideration of merit review. I would like to suggest that you should send me an email each semester, and in a few sentences or a paragraph summarize what you have done in your department on behalf of the Senate, and I will turn that into a letter for your service portfolio, along with
an explanation of what the Academic Senate is for those committees that consider service merit. I hope that sounds like a good idea to you. Are there any questions about that?

**Senator Rice:** When are the recommendations for implementing the new promotion and tenure policies be coming back to the Senate?

**Senate President Kerr:** Susan Mattson will know more about that as she is sitting with the Pac20. Is there a schedule yet?

**Senate President-Elect Mattson:** A schedule has not been constituted yet. Gail Hackett who is chairing the implementation task force told us that once a process is agreed upon, we will begin meeting as a committee, and like we did last year, we will report to the Senate every month. In the spring, the entire senate will consider it along with the personnel committee, which is chaired by Doug Johnson this year.

**Senator Rez:** I am confused by the legislative process--you have asked us to participate in--when the university is run by the administration. Is that in our constitution as a Senate?

**Senate President Kerr:** I think the important thing is to read the ACD manual, 112-01 and find out what our actual powers are. We are in many ways to act in an advisory capacity, but the Academic Senate has a lot more power than it actually uses. One of our most important powers is the power to slow down steamrolling processes that might get started. As you all know under any administrator, it can happen that a bright idea can suddenly become a locomotive. We have the power to slow these kinds of things down. We also have the power to propose entirely new initiatives. For example, you as a faculty member would like to see a group come together to accomplish anything, any kind of program or project. Often you have to work through your department chair in order to get the money needed to fund your idea. This happens at any university and any new idea has to work its way through the vast bureaucracy--in the case of the Academic Senate we can short circuit that birth process of a new idea. We can also insure that an idea a department chair does not approve, or even an interdisciplinary initiative that perhaps one chair or dean did not care about at all come to life because a group of faculty come to the Senate and say we need a center of this or we need a policy about that. An example would be a few years back when the deans were in the habit of appointing interim deans without any faculty being involved. The Senate in response to this had a petition, had a motion, that when an interim dean was appointed, the faculty would be involved in this process. I want you to read ACD 112-01 and notice the areas that faculty can be involved because you will be surprised as to what we can do. Does that answer your question?

**Senator Rez:** Are we then more like the House of Lords or the House of Commons?

**Senate President Kerr:** I think we are more like the House of Lords than the House of Commons, but I hope we become more common as the year goes by.
4. **Unfinished Business.**
There were no items of unfinished business to consider.

5. **New Business.**

5.A **Committee on Committees** (Pauline Komnenich).

*Senate President Kerr:* Pauline was not present but Darby asked to give a brief report on the agenda items for fall.

The *Mini-Preference Survey for Senate Committees* is attached to the agenda. Please fill it out and return it to us, because there are still vacancies on some Senate standing committees, and there will definitely be some next fall.

The Committee on Committees will also develop and distribute the *Academic Preference Survey* in September for service on University Boards, Committees and Councils (service to begin August 15 of 2005.) Please look for this important form when it is distributed, and fill it out and send it in to the Senate office electronically or in the campus mail.

5.B **Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee** (Mike Mayer).

Senator Mayer read the information item first: At its meeting of April 28, 2004, the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee approved planning authorization for a new degree program: Master of Laws (LLM) in Tribal Policy, Law and Government.

Senator Mayer read *Senate Motion #1 (2004-2005)(first Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the establishment of an Undergraduate Certificate in Healthcare Organizations and Society.*

Rationale: There is a need for an interdisciplinary undergraduate program that helps students gain an understanding of the healthcare systems from several perspectives. This certificate will enhance student preparation of business, life science, and the planning of careers in the health industry. Students will benefit from exposure to the interdisciplinary distribution of courses, the variety of ways of thinking about healthcare systems, the healthcare industry, and the ethical and legal issues confronted within the healthcare industry.

Bradford Kirkman-Liff and Kate Harris from the College of Business were present to answer questions on this motion.

A Senator: Is this new certificate program a joint program with the College of Business Healthcare Management program? (No.)

**Senator Mayer:** This proposal will be considered next month and I will send you an update on that item close to that date.
Senator Mayer read Senate Motion #2 (2004-2005) (First Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Public Programs for the establishment of an Undergraduate Certificate in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies.

Rationale: Through the certificate program, members of the ASU academic community will be given the opportunity to prepare students for diversity and participatory democracy. This proposed certificate would give students a set of analytical skills and a sense of civic responsibility. The educational experience is enhanced when student are introduced to complex intersections between and among sexual, racial, ethnic, religious, geographic, and national identities.

Associate Dean, Fred Corey, from the College of Public Programs was present to answer questions about this motion.

5.C Student Faculty Policy Committee (Steve Happel).
We have been working on a number of things over the past year concerning testing and configurations of classrooms. I think this year our primary focus will be on academic integrity and cheating. I have met with the Council of Deans in the spring and I have worked with the Student Government as they passed a resolution last year, so, we will be bringing some motions forward on this issue. Do you have any questions?

5.D Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).
The good news is that we have choices this year on our health care plans. The bad news is that we have choices! So, I would encourage you to make your selections online. Let me see a show of hands as to how many of you have made that election already. This is a good number, but the University as a whole has a way to go on this. There is an actual tendency to hold out and wait for more information. I do want to tell you that these are all very good companies, so you cannot make a bad choice. Some are better for individuals, related to their primary care physician choice. I will be available if anyone wants to chat about options that are available to them, but in the next couple of weeks make your selection and we will begin to think about some other possibilities for the future. The two issues that we are continuing to push with the Department of Administration (DOA) are a separate rate for individuals and for an employee plus one dependent. Right now we just have family and individual rates. We have also discussed partner benefits with the DOA but they are not willing to work with us on that. We did get three separate one year contracts with our vendors. The rates will be locked in for the next year plus two more. Of course, this is in an environment where the rates for health care are increasing nationally at 15% per year. So, we are doing pretty well. We would appreciate hearing if you have difficulties, or need help on health care.

The Personnel Committee has a pretty ambitious schedule for the coming year; one of the issues is a review of some of our retirement options. If you have not selected a committee to work on as a senator, we need a few more good members on our committee and would appreciate your help.
Senator Guleserian: Has the State agreed to pay for medical care? Are they going to be administering the process?

Senator Johnson: We have two types of companies, United is an integrated company; they provide the administration services for who selects that option. They are a stand alone package. There are several companies that use a third party administrator to process claims and to handle your questions and administer the plan. These are self-funded at the state level. The state has reserved funds to cover the cost of health insurance, and if our health care costs are less than anticipated that will be very good, but should we spend more on health care this year, the state appropriations process will have to address that.

Senator Siferd: Is there a difference between the new EPO and the HMO we have this year?

Senator Johnson: The EPO we have this year is a self-insured HMO. You will notice that there are some significant changes, including that you are not required to get an approval to see a specialist. There is a blurry extension between the plans--The PPO and the EPO differ because with the PPO, you can see specialist without a referral, but you can also go outside of the coverage area and seek a specialist or treatment.

5.E University Services Committee (George Watson).
All last year we worked on the bylaws changes, and the Senate has approved them and the Assembly has approved them. We are waiting on approval from President Crow's Office and he sought consultation with the General Counsel's Office before he makes his final answer.

This year the University Affairs Committee will have an expanded agenda due to the bylaws changes. The first thing we will be addressing has to do with legislative education, informing faculty and staff of their choices that they have in elections. I hope later on in the year to deal with looking at a new definition of membership in the Academic Assembly and that will require a change to our bylaws. We will also deal with looking at our methodology to publicize our meeting business on the web page, and in the Newsletter. Are there any questions? Thank you.

Senate President Kerr: We have met each of our committee chairs now, and they have informed us of what target issues they will have this year. We will talk more about duties of our senators with regard to committees. The charge for each committee can be found on the Senate's web page and a roster for each committee. There are still some open positions.

I want to announce that David Burstein is our new faculty ombudsperson for 2004-2006. He has had a lengthy service record in the Senate as you all know as Senate President, and he chaired the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure last year. If you have a problem that you cannot solve by the ordinary means, please contact David.
I also want to announce that George Watson will be our parliamentarian this year. So if you have any questions about Senate procedure, please talk to George. He is studying up on the most recent version of Robert's Rules of Procedure, as am I.

6. Adjournment.
There being no further business to discuss the meeting was declared adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Anne Kopta, Secretary of the Senate
Darby Shaw, Executive Assistant

Remaining Senate meetings:

- September 20
- October 18
- November 15
- December 6
- January 24
- February 21
- March 21
- April 18