

Substitutes: Karen Leong for Lisa Anderson, Destiny Crider for Deirdre Hahn, and Ron Hoffmeister for Marie Sushka

Guests: Fran Bernat, President, Arizona Faculties Council; Noel Fidel and Rebecca Tsosie, College of Law; Ruth Jones, Provost's Office; Brad Kirkman-Liff, College of Business; Kevin Mc Kisson, Registrar's Office

1. Call to Order.

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

2. Approval of the Previous Minutes (September 20, 2004).

The Senate Summary has been posted on the Academic Senate Web site, and there was a correction offered by Senator Haynes prior to this meeting. The Summary was approved as corrected without objection. Any further corrections should be addressed to darby.shaw@asu.edu.

3. Announcements and Communications.

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

First I want to congratulate the administration, faculty, staff and students for doing an extraordinary job during the Presidential Debate. It was amazing, because if you tuned into CNN, you could see it all day long and ASU banners were highly visible throughout.

First, we have had a meeting of the Reconceptualization of Health Care Committee. They will be looking at the Senate's Health Care Task Force report, and they have several other directives from the
administration to review regarding health care. So, the pie in the sky vision that was thought out last
year of what is possible for health care on our campuses--specifically clinics on campus using a nurse
practitioner model--there is a chance that this vision will become a reality. The original Health Care
Task Force is planning to reconvene on October 26, at 3:30 pm and will be recommending first steps to
take to the Reconceptualization Committee, regarding the task force's recent proposal.

Next, the Creative Compensation Committee, headed up by Tony Garcia and George Watson, is
meeting and anyone who would like to join that committee should contact Tony Garcia directly at
tony.garcia@asu.edu. They will be exploring every possible means of enhancing faculty
compensation. Some of the ideas that have been primary are promoting consulting within and without
the university and to integrate consulting with the service mission of the university. They are looking
for ways to make it possible to live better for faculty at all levels, and to improve the salaries at the low
levels. They will examine all causes of salary compression.

Third, the Senate will be organizing another group to work on a review of undergraduate studies, and
improving academic persistence will be brought into that discussion. If there are members of the
Senate who are not currently serving on another committee--if you have special expertise in curriculum
or with freshman students, etc., please let me know that you want to serve on this Senate committee
with an email to bkerr@asu.edu.

Finally, an initiative that has been discussed last year and that will begin this fall, regards the
relationship of the Academic Senate to the ASU Foundation and to the entire faculty. I had a very
productive meeting with members of the ASU Foundation in the spring last year, and they assure me
that they need the faculty to take a greater leadership role in raising money for the ASU Foundation.
Any contribution that we make to the foundation will go to support the work of the foundation itself
and if we support the foundation, they can do their work better, which is seeking donors. They are
very open to having a much better relationship with the faculty.

That is all I have to report, that it has been a great week and a great month for ASU, and I believe the
provost's report is next.

3.B Executive VP and Provost of the University's Report (Milton Glick).

First let me reiterate what Barb Kerr has just said, that it has been a helluva week for ASU--The
Presidential Debate has definitely provided more visibility for ASU than any other previous debate--
from the CSPAN coverage before the event, the debate itself, and then the Spin Room where ASU
posters were proudly displayed. Given the problems that arose and that we anticipated, in having the
debate in the middle of a school day, it came off better than we ever thought it would, and I appreciate
all that everyone who participated in this event did to make that happen.

There is other academic news which makes us more visible to share. I thought I would mention that
we will have added in an 18-month period six members from the National Academy. We all know by
now that we have a Nobel Prize winner as chair of the Department of Economics in the W.P. Carey
School of Business, Ed Prescott. I think it is just terrific that we have signed him here at ASU. I am
sorry to see that we lost the game with USC this weekend! We have a new dean in the College of
Nursing, and at a recent national nursing meeting we were asked what we did to attract her here--
because others tried very hard and could not. ASU is becoming more visible every day.
We are administratively, as Barbara mentioned, considering some of the good ideas contained in the proposal of the Senate's Health Care Task Force. The Committee on Reconceptualization of Health Care is working on this and other health care issues. As to how much will be doable in reacting to the needs of faculty, staff and students for better health care, we are not sure at this time. We do know that it will happen some day, and we are getting started assessing the resources it will take to make this vision become a reality.

Many of you are already dealing with a new health care provider at this time and some new physicians, as we are 18 days into the close of the open enrollment period for health care. I would like to ask each of you who may have had particularly BAD or GOOD experiences, to share those with me directly at Glick@asu.edu as we prepare for negotiations next year. I do feel that Doug Johnson and Gaye Murphy are owed much of the credit for the university being provided with better health care options this year.

I also wanted to inform you that there is a new category of Regents' award being developed this academic year, the University Professor of Teaching Award. As a matter of interest to all of you, and related to the work of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, I would like to call your attention to a free public lecture by Carol Geary Schneider in Organ Hall on October 28. She is the current president of the American Colleges and Universities (AACU), which is the leading liberal arts organization, and she will be addressing the topics of --What is Liberal Arts? What is General Education?

**Lecture with Carol Geary Schneider**

**Thursday, October 28, 3:00-4:00pm**  
**Music Building, Organ Hall**  
[Map]

Carol Geary Schneider is the President of the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Free and open to the public.

You may know that the subject of General Education has not been revisited within the last decade and we now are beginning to implement a school-centered focus at the university. In doing so, we need to look at how that fits with the university general education core curriculum, how to keep but reconfigure our general studies, and how that will align with the new school-centered focus, as well keeping our articulation agreements with the Community College from becoming too challenging. We need to break out of the current mind-set that "curriculum of the university is the autobiography of the faculty." Again, I encourage all of you to attend this Public Lecture on October 28.

Secretary Kopta called for the approval of the previous minutes of the September 20, 2004 Senate meeting. Senate President Kerr conferred with the body momentarily, and then said that without objection the minutes summary of September 20 was approved as distributed.

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

I just wanted you all to know that the P&T Implementation Task Force on P&T guidelines has begun to meet. Gail Hackett is the administrative chair of this committee. The committee has members from all the campuses including Downtown and the Capitol Campus, and a couple of members who served on the original P&T Task Force. When the report has been through a number of scheduled administrative reviews it will come to the
Senate. (The Personnel Committee will give the proposed implementation guidelines a thorough review, and then introduce it to the Senate.) But first, the implementation committee is working on this document brainstorming ideas (which are our ideas) and tweaking the proposed guidelines until January, when they must make a report to the Provost and President. You will hear update reports from me, Gail Hackett, Barb Kerr, and Doug Johnson as things are progressing.

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

The Debate is over, but we had a great turnout for our Student Conference on the Presidential Debate last Monday in MU. Student Organizations from all over the state were invited to attend, put up an information table, and participate in panel discussions with ASU professors and community members on Globalization, the War in Iraq, Media and Politics, the Reorganization of the Higher Education Act, and Immigration.

We had a very successful simulcast of the Presidential Debate in Wells Fargo Arena. It was a free event and over 7,000 students attended. Many of those same students then participated in the Debate Watch activity we sponsored in the Physical Sciences Building right after the debate.

On Monday, October 25, from 11:30-1:00 PM we are hosting a "Meet Your Candidate Day" on Hayden Lawn with over 40 candidates so that students can speak directly with candidates. Free lunch will be provided.

USG is having tuition talks and we plan to conduct three forums in November in preparation for the ABOR tuition setting process. We plan to educate our students about the tuition setting process: What is currently being done, the administrative revenue picture, and the Board of Regents policy in tuition setting and how they view tuition and financial aid. We hope to do an online poll for students on what they feel should be done with any future tuition increases.

In the Senate, we are also dealing with a referendum on condemning the policy created by Residential Life to ban any form of decoration on residence hall windows, outside of the display of the standard American Flag—and that must only cover half of the window space! The student Senate feels that different RAs and different halls are handling the administrative edict in various ways, which is an unfair situation for the students. We are interested in seeing if the policy can be changed and that it is implemented fairly across all of the halls on campus.

We are going to be involved in nominating the next new Student Regent to be a member of the Arizona Board of Regents. We will be working with the GPSA on this effort, and identifying a few names to send forward to Governor Napolitano for selection. So, if you have any students that you feel would qualify, please nominate them--call 5-3161 at the USG Office. Thank you.

Barb Kerr: I also want to say thanks to the GPSA members who were involved in the Presidential Debate. Is Deirdre Hahn here today to give the report of the Graduate Students?

3.E GPSA President's Report (Destiny Crider for Deirdre Hahn).

My name is Destiny Crider. I am the Vice President of Internal Affairs for GPSA and I am substituting for the president of GPSA. Deirdre Hahn will be coming regularly in the future to present these reports.

Deirdre Hahn has been the acting President of GPSA since September 17th and she officially confirmed her acceptance of the position on October 1st. On October 15th, the GPSA Assembly elected a new Assembly President Kirsti Cole. I have been the acting Vice President of Internal Affairs since September 17th and was elected into office on October 1st. These appointments are important in order to assure the Academic Senate and others in the university that GPSA has
mechanisms in place to maintain the order of the association and to provide continuity in times of transition.

One aspect where this is most reflected is in the strong performance of the GPSA Research Grant Program. The $55,000 program is funded by the Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Affairs and is administered by GPSA. There were approximately 150 graduate student research applications submitted to the program for review. There were over 100 volunteer graduate students who served as grant reviewers for the program. Each reviewer participated in a three-hour training program on how to evaluate research proposals. Thirty-three students were awarded funds toward their masters or doctoral research. This money is meant as seed money to get them started on research and will be used to develop further research proposals for other funding agencies. Awards averaged about $1,700 per person depending upon the budget requests. Thanks to all the faculty who wrote letters of support for their students.

We are now working on our Graduate Student Teaching Excellence program. You may nominate TA and graduate student instructors from any of the three ASU campuses, and those nominations should be submitted to the ASASU Business Office, 3rd floor of the MU, Tempe Campus, by 5PM Friday October 29. There will be 15 awards presented next spring at a special banquet during Graduate Student Appreciation Week in March. Nomination forms can be found at the following web address http://www.asu.edu/gpsa/teaching_excellence.html

GPSA Assembly and officers are conducting our own talks on the issue of graduate student tuition, and we have been actively involved with monitoring the university redesign talks and we seek to find ways to provide graduate student input where it is appropriate.


3.G  ASU West Senate Report (Bill Simmons).

At the September 20 meeting of the Tempe Senate, I handed out about 40 copies of the West Senate proposal, which is an alternative to the proposal by Regent Herstam, which is now one of 15 alternate proposals concerning the university redesign posted on the ABOR web page. I have brought a few more copies with me today, so please ask me if you are interested. I would be happy to answer any questions people might have about the restructuring and about what we did at West on our summer vacation! Over the summer, we basically mobilized to challenge the proposal made by Regent Herstam and several others. Our alternative proposal was one of 15 that were submitted to the Board of Regents. I believe that it is the longest and it is the most data driven. We actually discussed the issues in our proposal with representatives from every university, most of the community colleges, etc., business leaders, and government. Our proposal basically says two things: 1) any restructuring that would lead to a two-tiered system of higher education would be a disservice to our students and the state of Arizona and 2) that ASU West should be fully resourced to continue on its trajectory and become a learner-centered public metropolitan research campus as part of ASU. We feel that mission is something which we have done really well for the last twenty years, and that we could expand in the future the next twenty years if we are a part of ASU and we are allowed to continue to develop our mission more than if we are spun off and become Central Arizona University. So, if you have any questions please let me know. If you want more information on restructuring, the ABOR has it on their website at http://www.abor.asu.edu and we have a website devoted to restructuring on our Senate web page at http://www.west.asu.edu/asenate. Our website includes many of the data sources we used to make our report, and it includes items on Hispanics in higher education and how the restructuring will effect them, legal issues, and the latest in restructuring in higher education, etc.
Otherwise, our Senate is moving forward; we are moving forward with one university in many places, we have many things going on.

One last thing is that I would like to clear up some things that I have heard being circulated over the summer about ASU West--1) that the Herstam proposal is good one because ASU West never wanted to be part of ASU. I do know where they got that from, we have never voiced that, there may have been a legislator from the West Valley ten years ago that said that but we have always said that we wanted to be a part of ASU and this claim (that we want to be spun off from ASU) nothing could be further from the truth. 2) That ASU West needs to decide what it wants to be. I have no idea where that is coming from--there is probably no campus in the country that has looked at its navel more than ASU West--we have been part of the evolutionary task force, the strategic planning of the university design team for the last two years, the one university in many places, and then on top of that we did another 40-page report, which I have passed out to you which says what we "really, really want to be"--which is a part of ASU, one university in many places. 3) The ASU West Senate does not somehow support one university in many places. I have no idea where that comes from either; we absolutely support one university in many places. In fact, if you look at the design team report responses that were sent to Provost Glick, per capita, ASU West faculty and students probably sent more responses--probably more than anybody other than the School of Justice Studies. I personally sent four responses on behalf and in support of organizations at West campus.

In the Senate itself, we are moving forward with many things--Wednesday we are having our Senate meeting and we will be voting on the restricted withdrawal policy. Our student issues committee will be reporting back on academic integrity, on which they are working with the Tempe Student Faculty Policy Committee. We have restructured our internal grant program at ASU West; instead of having money come through the Provost Office it will be going to the Deans because that is in keeping with the school-centered model. The Provost is going to keep some money and that will be used for strategic investments and some interdisciplinary research projects. So, our committees that will receive grants are trying to figure out how they can work best to assist the deans on this.

We are also developing our EDD program which will be our first doctorate program; it will be going to ABOR hopefully by the end of the year. Also, we are working on developing a PhD in Criminal Justice; we are working on various MA programs. I am working on one, an MA in Social Justice and Human Rights, which is an interdisciplinary program involving faculty from all four of our colleges and schools on the campus, and about ten different departments are involved. It is very exciting and we are interested in working with Tempe on this. If you know anybody who might work with social justice and human rights, we would love to have some collaboration on this. We are also working on an MA in Metropolitan Studies and a BA in Ethnic Studies as well, so, we are doing a lot of curriculum development as we move forward. With that, I will take questions.

Senator Johnson: Bill, what is the next step--the legislature has a committee, everybody else has a task force, what is the next step? How do you see this sequence playing out?

Bill Simmons: The study group that the Board of Regents put together is led by Regent Herstam and Mary Jo Waits, formerly of the Morrison Institute. They will be meeting next week, and they have three subcommittees: one on models, one on needs, and one on criteria--how do you measure any proposal. They are hoping to come back with a rough draft of a plan as early as December but more likely in January or February. That proposal will be sent to the seven stakeholders groups and they will then review it. It will go to forums, then to the Council of Presidents, and then it will go to the Board of Regents if the Council of Presidents approves it. Mary Jo Waits has agreed to come to ASU West--as ASU West is kind of the biggest prize in the puzzle, we are trying to get to as many people
who are actively involved in restructuring on our campus as possible. Mary Jo is coming tomorrow and President of the Regents Gary Stewart will be coming next Monday. As you can imagine, the reorganization proposal has put a slight kink in some of our hiring plans. We are looking for a new dean of Human Services. It is very difficult to go out and find a top flight dean, as you have in Nursing, without knowing what we are going to be. So, we hope to resolve this as soon as possible.

**Senate President Kerr:** When Bill took on this job as ASU West Senate president, I don't think he had any idea what it was going to be like--and I think he did not know he would have such a busy summer. I just wanted to make one comment, and that is just that all three senate presidents have had a meeting this past month to talk about situations that affect all of us. One of the concerns we discussed was that ASU West was what Bill termed the deafening silence from our Senate at the time this proposal came out. I did not sign a letter of support for the West alternate proposal; however, I had a lot of ambivalence about not signing it. I think that is because at the time it came out, over the summer, there was no way of polling the Academic Senate to find out what the sense of the faculty was on this issue. It is true what is said that any decision affects all decisions, so, on this matter I would ask all of you to read the West campus proposal, if you have not yet done so, read about Regent Herstam's first proposal and discuss it informally with your colleagues to get a sense of what controversy there is. You can form your opinions and then please let me know your opinions. For many of our colleagues at ASU West feel that their professional lives depend on this decision. We owe it to them to at least reflect intelligently upon their report.

**Senator Dwyer:** Is there a particular time frame in which we need to respond on this report?

**Senate President Kerr:** Yes, and we will be having more meetings of the three senate presidents, so, we will have this discussion again. I will not take an official stand on behalf of the Senate until I have gotten a true sense of the controversy that is involved, and until I have heard from all of you as to what your thoughts are. Bill, thank you for coming to our meetings and for presenting the West issues.

**Karen Leong for Senator Lisa Anderson:** Is there a place to go to get all the necessary information that is available?

**Bill Simmons:** We have our West Senate web site, which contains all our information at [http://www.west.asu.edu/asenate](http://www.west.asu.edu/asenate) The Board of Regents web site also contains all of the alternate proposals, and the information about the stakeholders groups, etc. at [http://www.abor.asu.edu](http://www.abor.asu.edu)

### 3.H East Assembly Report (Paul Patterson).

At East campus, or as we now call ourselves Polytechnic, we have an Academic Assembly for our faculty. We have three standing committees for curriculum, personnel, and a grievance body, and our faculty serve on the Tempe Senate as well. On matters of governance, we took part in the discussion with Tony Garcia last spring on creating a University Senate, and that discussion is still ongoing with Bill and Barb and I in our president meetings. At East, we are trying to make our academic issues and governance views more visible, and even though many things are dealt with by our Assembly separately, we are taking steps to work toward creating a governance structure for one university in many places and we are looking at how we will integrate our Assembly at East into that structure.

Today, I want to report briefly on what our committees at East are working on. Our curriculum committee met on October 1 and is chaired by Senator Hutt. They are working on several issues.
They have dealt with the renaming of several concentrations, then a proposal to reorganize the East educational unit, which resides in the East College. We expect the curriculum committee to make a recommendation that this unit become the Division of Education. It will include two new departments, a department of Teacher Education and it will also house the department of Physical Education, which is moving to East from this campus. The Curriculum Committee will meet again on October 29. They will consider a proposal for a PhD in Exercise Science.

In terms of other activities on the campus, we have a charge from our provost of forming a task force to review business education on Polytechnic campus. We have dedicated our new student union facility, and on October 22, we will have our newest Agriculture Center building dedication.

My last item is that we want to invite you all to come to visit the East campus for a joint senate meeting on January 24, the day your Senate meets at Tempe. I would like to invite you all to attend and spend at least your afternoon at East and see our campus, and have discussion with us.

Senator President Kerr: This is an idea that we really can get into--and it will be a retreat, hopefully. I am trying to organize transportation for us, and Paul is negotiating with his Provost for catering. We will either be loading up on the regular shuttle that goes east, or I will make a request to our Provost for a special shuttle, with hosts and hostesses. It will be very close to a retreat rather than a regular Senate meeting. Please try to rearrange your schedules so that you can take part of the afternoon off and join us. Thanks Paul, for all your efforts to make this happen.

3.1 Arizona Faculties Council Report (Fran Bernat).

My name is Fran Bernat and I am chair of the Arizona Faculties Council this year. For those of you who don't know about the AFC, it is composed of the Senate leaders from the three universities around the state: ASU Tempe, East and West, NAU and UofA and UofA South. One of the things that we are doing this year is taking a look at faculty salaries. Normally the AFC meets when the Board of Regents meets at each campus. I am the President of this group for this academic year and I sit with the Regents to represent the faculty leadership at the Board meetings. We are looking at salary issues this year in depth--NAU faculty have just received their first raise in many years, and they are still below the mean salary for comparable universities. It is a serious issue in this state and one that we can help the Regents study.

As chair of the AFC, I also am chairing the faculty stakeholders group. I am attending the faculty stakeholder meetings and considering all the redesign issues and data, and then providing this information and data to the Regents. This year the Board plan to once again ask each of the Senates at the three universities to take a look at salary compression, salary inversion, salary equity issues within colleges, across departments, and across campuses, so that we can understand more completely how salary compression, inversion and pay equity issues happen. We are not going to highlight one faculty salary that is out of whack with everyone else's. We intend to look at all the important issues and then work on helping the Board of Regents find a way to address them. The legislature has not provided salary increments for several years now, and as you know, our President has found a way to provide for salary increase this year internally with tuition monies at ASU. It is not an easy issue but there has to be some better way to provide adequate salaries for faculty and academic professionals in the university system.

A Senator asked a question but it was inaudible.
Fran Bernat: It depends on what numbers you are looking at. NAU says their salaries are at zero and subzero among their faculty peers. I am not sure of UofA's ranking but I can say that the AFC is committed to looking at all issues related to salary compression, inversion and pay equity issues this year.

Another thing I want to remind everyone as we study the redesign of the university system this year--send your questions and comments to me frances.bernat@asu.edu as well as Barbara Kerr on the restructuring proposals, especially those of you that are being directly affected in the near term by reorganization and moving. We want to know what will happen with Foundation monies--how that will be distributed and scholarships awarded, etc. Tenure will not be affected. Please examine the ABOR Website, the AFC homepage, and send us your questions because we will be putting up a FAQ page in addition to that page to provide answers to your redesign concerns. We already have a link on the West Senate page to the ABOR redesign page. We may not have answers that are definitive right away to your questions, but we will keep pressing the Regents to provide these answers so that we can alleviate any fears or misconceptions that may be circulating.

Past President Garcia: Last month we heard that Governor Napolitano has said that she is not in favor of increasing faculty salaries. What implication does that have for our salary compression, inversion and equity issues?

Fran Bernat: I won't respond to what the governor specifically said, or how the Regents have responded to that, but that the Board of Regents at their last meeting did discuss salaries. Each university had to provide their budget requests that are going to the state right now, and the Board of Regents has committed to arguing as cogently as they can about faculty salaries to the legislature, knowing that in the past couple of years the legislature has not approved a salary pay raise. On the other hand, I just read another article, in which the Regents said they are going to address faculty salaries. Meanwhile, when I was at the NAU Senate meeting, people said what does that mean?--because they are being told that the Regents have no money to address their plight. They have a small budget for their Board Office. They do not pay us directly. What I think the Regents were talking about at their last meeting is that faculty salaries are supported by state funds. Knowing that the legislature has not provided regularly for salary increase, they are going to look at other creative ways to utilize university money, internally, as we did this year from tuition increase to increase our faculty salaries, and looking for ways that this could be systematized. So, when they say that we will look for those monies--we need to impress on the legislature the need to "retain the brains" and also to impress on the university system to find monies within their budget. President Hager at NAU said to one of the Regents, How am I going to find money for faculty salaries, when the legislature has not appropriated money for the past several years? The response that came back was, if you place it as a priority, you will find the money. He placed it as a priority, and then this last year he allocated $5,000 across the board for every full professor, $3,500 for every associate professor, and $2,500 for every assistant professor. At the last meeting they said--We can't do this every year, across the board! But if everyone is staying at the same level--you are experiencing a loss of $1,000 per year in salary base and compression. So, this needs to be a multi-tier task, we have to look at compression and where it is happening. We need to look at inversion and see where that is happening. We also need to address how to provide salary increments in order to keep up faculty morale. NAU faculty are the hardest hit at this point.

Senate President Kerr: I know it takes a long time to complete all our reports, but just let me take this time to remind senators of their role in taking what they learn at Senate meetings back to their department colleagues, and to report on all these reports they have heard today. Your department chair
does not have all this information. The only way that your faculty will know about many of these issues is if you take it to them. Thanks Fran, for your report and update on what is happening with the AFC, the Regents and at the legislature.

4. Unfinished Business.

4.A Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (George Watson for Mike Mayer).

Mike Mayer is ill today and I am presenting his items. I will first call your attention to item #4 on the senate agenda, acceptance of all consent items and information items. The use of a consent agenda is new this year, and the way that it works is that all four of these action items will be approved together in one vote, unless anyone wishes to remove any item from the consent agenda, and if so, we will move those under unfinished business. Are there any items you wish to remove?

Senator Ismeurt: I would like to request that Senate Motion #6 be removed from the consent agenda.

Senator Etter: I would like to ask a question about the usage of MLS in Senate Motion #4 to designate the new Master of Legal Studies, regarding Master of Library Science, which is also, abbreviated MLS. I thought you were not supposed to use initials to abbreviate the names of degrees that were already being used.

Parliamentarian Watson read the consent items into the record:

Senate Motion #3 (second reading)--a proposal from the College of Architecture & Environmental Design for the Name Change of a Degree from Master of Environmental Planning (MEP) to Master of Urban & Environmental Planning (MUEP). (Attachment 3)

Senate Motion #4 (second reading)--a proposal from the College of Law for the Implementation of a new Degree, Master of Legal Studies (MLS). (Attachment 4)

Senate Motion #5 (second reading)--a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Department of Political Science for the disestablishment of an undergraduate certificate in American Public Policy. (Attachment 5)

Senate Motion #6 (second reading)--a proposal from the Office of the Provost to change withdrawal policies. (Attachment 6)

Noel Fidel, Associate Dean of the Law College, spoke to the question on Senate Motion #4 and said that they could consider the usage of MSL instead of MLS for that degree. Originally they considered that abbreviation.

Parliamentarian Watson summarized that there have been separate requests made to remove Senate Motions 4 and 6 from the consent agenda. That is not debatable. All in favor said aye and Senate Motions 3 and 5 were approved as presented in the consent agenda.

The discussion began with a reading of Senate Motion #4, clarification as to the usage of MLS for the new degree, Master of Legal Studies.

Senator Etter: I would like to state my concern that MLS also stands for Master of Library Science.

Associate Dean Noel Fidel: I do not care either way because we originally considered using either MSL or MLS.
Vice Provost Jones: I don't believe there is a conflict in using that abbreviation for both degrees because we have many BA and BS degrees and MA and MS degrees.

Senator Crozier: Why do we care about this usage--is it related to job requirements?

Senator Koshinsky: It relates to universal employment code designations.

Vice Provost Allison: The Graduate division did not see this as an issue with the proposal.

Senator Haynes: It was unclear as to the target audience for this degree because the students select it irrespective of law as their discipline.

Associate Dean Fidel: In the proposal, they contemplated targeting a one-year academic law school experience for those who are working in law-related fields but did not want to pursue an advanced law degree, rather experience and knowledge in an area of specialty--such as U.S. constitutional law or law, science and technology. It would be of interest to journalists or legal regulatory people, or foreign students with interest in learning about U.S. law for example. We wanted to develop the most flexible program for what we expect will be a small number of students.

There was a call for the question (not debatable).

Senate President Kerr: All in favor say aye; all opposed, nay. Senate Motion #4 was approved by voice vote. (Attachment 4)

Senate Motion #6 was read by Parliamentarian Watson (Attachment 6).

Senator Ismeurt: Other than streamlining the policy on withdrawal so that faculty and students won't be confused, are there any other educational principles that came to CAPC on this policy change, to support it? I believe that students should be held accountable for their decisions to enroll or withdraw from a class. That is why I am asking what educational principle would support this change.

Vice Provost Jones: Problems have arisen because students who do not understand the difference between an unrestricted withdrawal and a restricted withdrawal (attempting to withdraw after the drop add date). Another problem is that a student may have received advice from a faculty member that they should try and tough it out in their class to see if they could do the work, when they could not. There is time enough for them to withdraw without penalty from a course under the new change, and then come back and take it again next year. Problems sometimes occur with transfer students who are not prepared for the rigors of a research university curriculum. Some students may in fact just want to withdraw to avoid a bad grade, or to avoid taking responsibility for their class work and lack of attendance, but there are many reasons why students withdraw, and we cannot be the judge of those reasons. By eliminating restricted withdrawals, extending the course withdrawal deadline to completely withdraw from all courses, not only is the policy streamlined and more easily understood, it eliminates the need to worry about whether a student is taking up a valuable $ amount, or a seat that someone else needs because there is adequate time to make the decision to withdraw early, without penalty, and someone else might take up that seat. There is no money to return to the student for registering for that course because that comes under a totally separate policy.

Past President Garcia: A problem is that in the College of Engineering and in other colleges, students are required to take a certain curriculum. The change in the withdrawal policy as it is now stated may
cause lots of people to decide to take a "W," and have you thought about the option of auditing the class, and then the option of changing from audit to a letter grade at a point when they are more certain of their performance?

**Vice Provost Jones:** But the undergraduates don't seem to understand the audit option and the system for recording grades would have to be altered so that the audit could be electronically changed to a letter grade. We have discussed this with Linda Burns and she says there would be a big cost and a lot of man hours involved. A better approach might be to have more student-friendly people, advisors, available to help students with that decision, of whether or not they should withdraw. That way there would be less tears and fewer requests for withdrawal put on professors to help determine, and the process will be fairer to the students overall. Right now, the policy is applied differently across the campus. Some professors are very generous in signing withdrawals while some are overly strict. We need to have evenness for our students.

**Senator Karady:** I believe it is a good idea to allow students to withdraw for good reasons and to save face, and it also gives students who complete the class more recognition for their effort.

**President-Elect Mattson:** I am concerned too, along with Senator Ismeurt about students being held accountable for their performance. In the College of Nursing all the slots are taken up by the 8-10 week period and cannot be refilled by someone else then. I don't agree that there should be an option of leaving class or a program completely in the 10th week without a letter grade on the transcript.

**Karen Leong for Lisa Anderson:** Eight weeks is too long. The reasons are already there for a student to withdraw after three to four weeks. Can we compromise and make it four weeks?

**Vice Provost Jones:** We did look at other institutions and the pros and cons of those policies. We have decided that eight weeks is expedient.

**Senator Crozier:** Won't there be an unfair advantage given to students who take a course twice and learn from that 8-10 week experience in the class. It would certainly be unfair to the student who struggles and stays in the class the first time around but earns a B or a C. Academic advisors should take a greater role in telling a student the disadvantages of taking a course that they are not prepared for.

**Senator Cohn:** I understand your fairness concern but receiving the same treatment is not necessarily fair. Your transcript should be a history of your accomplishment--if it takes two times to pass your class with a W the first time and a letter grade the second time that says something.

**Senator Witt:** I am in favor of this change because it is beneficial to the students. Many of them need a second chance to pass a course. Some of our courses are extremely difficult to grasp the subject matter and to err on the side of the student will help our persistence rate and more students will earn their degrees. But it may not improve their time to graduate.

**Senator Siferd:** I am in favor of this change. I have been at the university, not as long as Tom but I have seen many troubled people during that time, and I cannot be the judge and jury on this, nor can administrative levels that don't have all the facts.

**Senator Ismeurt:** What efforts have been made to overcome this confusion previously experienced by students and faculty regarding the current withdrawal policy? Have you made other attempts to
remediate the problem? Faculty and students should be held accountable. The argument is confusing and I want to know what has already been tried.

Senator Komnenich: It goes beyond the policy because if students have considered this policy punitive--to err on the side of the student is what I would be in favor of.

Karen Leong for Lisa Anderson: I feel that eight weeks favors certain income levels. People may be able to afford to take a class several times if only for that reason, whereas the working student or those with family dependents may be struggling financially, so this shift in policy change will not help those people make the decision to withdraw a viable option.

Senator Haynes: The issue is not a function of this policy whether or not we wish to be agreeable or disagreeable to students. The issue is to try and not use up what others desperately want. There are appropriate consequences for withdrawal in that you will take longer to graduate. I am opposed to this change. Perhaps there may be other issues that we should address within this broader issue.

Senator Burstein: For the sake of the students and the faculty I am in favor of a more liberal policy that is less confusing. The issue is not spaces--it is the issue of where spaces are taken up, there should be more responsibility put upon the student. But I cannot presuppose that the reason to withdraw is either good or bad.

President-Elect Mattson: What is the time period for students to have their tuition and fees refunded, and how will that be affected if we propose a four or five week deadline for withdrawal?

Kevin McKisson: The refund policy is four weeks and that policy stays in place.

Senator Patterson called for the question and that motion was seconded by Senator Johnson (not debatable).

Senate President Kerr: All in favor please say aye. All opposed say nay. Senate Motion 6 was passed by voice vote with several nays duly noted.

5. New Business.

5.A Committee on Committees (Pauline Komnenich).

We are meeting tomorrow and we are working on redesigning the Academic Preference Survey so that we can link interactive forms (AP and Faculty) with a common spreadsheet housed on a server, and we are hoping to expedite that document to you for your consideration as soon as possible.

5.B Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (George Watson for Mike Mayer).

5.B.1 Senate Motion #7 was introduced for a first reading (Attachment 7): a proposal from the College of Law for the implementation of a new Degree, Master of Laws - LL.M in Tribal Policy, Law and Government. Rebecca Tsosie and Noel Fidel were present to answer questions about this motion. There were no questions.

5.C Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).
The Personnel Committee is studying the issue of our current health insurance plan and important events related to that—including the anticipated renegotiation of that contract in the coming year.

As Milt has asked of you, please send him your good and bad experiences with the new health care plans, which you have selected.

The committee is studying retirement issues including the possibility of making a one-time additional decision about which type of retirement program you wish to participate in, at a time when you are more certain of your stability of employment, rather than only on the first day or two of employment.

We are also looking at the current faculty sick leave provision to cover classes in case of illness, and an alternative duty assignment option to the sick leave policy, which Gail Hackett has been working on. We are at this time urging new faculty who have not been at the university long enough to accumulate sick leave to perhaps choose short-term disability coverage, because the current rate of accumulated sick leave for faculty is only nine days, and you are supposed to report any time off taken for illness or other medical purposes. You cannot, as classified staff do, convert your accumulated vacation hours into sick leave time, because faculty do not accumulate vacation hours. So, even if you pay someone to teach your classes you must still report sick leave that you use up—and be docked for it beyond that, because if you are a new faculty member, who has not been here long enough to accumulate any sick leave, that could mean a reduction in pay.

5.D University Services Committee (George Watson).

We are going to renew the idea of conducting a faculty survey, one that we can do and evaluate by ourselves. We are participating in and evaluating the recommendations of the Creative Compensation Committee that will study salary compression, inversion, and equity issues—and all plausible ways to address them both inside and outside the university.

We are going to author a proposal to revise the constitution to address the membership of the full-time contract faculty in the Academic Assembly. This will include clinical track faculty, one-year contract lecturers and other full-time contract faculty.

We will bring you the latest update on the implementation of the plus minus grades this year—the first grades were input this week. We are working with the Student Faculty Policy Committee to make an assessment of the impact that this has had on students and faculty.

6. Adjournment.

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Kopta, Secretary of the Senate
Darby Shaw, Executive Assistant
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Senate Motion # 3 (2004–05)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Michael Mayer, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: September 20, 2004

Date of Second Reading: October 18, 2004

Title of Motion: Request from the College of Architecture & Environmental Design for the Name Change of a Degree from Master of Environmental Planning (MEP) to Master of Urban & Environmental Planning (MUEP)

1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval

2 of a proposal submitted by the College of Architecture & Environmental Design

3 for the Name Change of a Degree from Master of Environmental Planning (MEP)

4 to Master of Urban & Environmental Planning (MUEP)

Rationale:
The requested name MUEP will more accurately represent the courses and substantive emphasis currently offered. The name change will serve to attract the attention of those graduate students who might have overlooked the MEP program, inaccurately perceiving it to address and emphasize only environmental planning. The degree program and the degree requirements will not change.
Attachment 4

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE
Fall 2004 SESSION

Senate Motion # 4 (2004–05)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
                        Michael Mayer, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: September 20, 2004

Date of Second Reading: October 18, 2004

Title of Motion: Request from the College of Law for the Implementation for a new Degree – Master of Legal Studies (M.L.S.)

1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval
2 of a proposal submitted by the College of Law for the Implementation of a new Degree,
3 Master of Legal Studies (M.L.S.)

Rationale:

The purpose of this program is to provide an interdisciplinary immersion in the law school curriculum for a small but highly qualified group of non-lawyers who want to obtain a basic familiarity with legal thought and to explore the relation of law to their ongoing fields of work or study.
Senate Motion # 5 (2004–05)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Michael Mayer, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: September 20, 2004

Date of Second Reading: October 18, 2004

Title of Motion: Request from the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences – Department of Political Science for the Disestablishment of an Undergraduate Certificate – American Public Policy

1. The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, Department of
2. Political Science for the disestablishment of an undergraduate certificate in
3. American Public Policy

Rationale:
The department no longer has the faculty to teach the courses required in this program and are not likely to hire new faculty in this area in the near future.
Senate Motion # 6 (2004–05)

Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Michael Mayer, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: September 20, 2004

Date of Second Reading: October 18, 2004

Title of Motion: Request from the Office of the Provost – To Change Withdrawal Policies

1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate

2 approval of a proposal submitted by the Office of the Provost to change withdrawal policies

Rationale:

The Office of the Provost, on behalf of the Academic and Administrative Advisory Committee (AAAC) is proposing a change in current withdrawal policies, making the withdrawal from a course more palpable for students.

The change in withdrawal policies would eliminate restricted withdrawals, extend the course withdrawal deadline, and extend complete withdrawal deadline.
Motion Introduced by: Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee
Michael Mayer, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: October 18, 2004

Date of Second Reading: November 15, 2004

Title of Motion: Request from the College of Law for the Implementation for a new Degree – Master of Laws – LL.M. in Tribal Policy, Law & Government

1 The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval
2 of a proposal submitted by the College of Law for the Implementation of a new Degree,
3 Master of Laws – LL.M. in Tribal Policy, Law & Government

Rationale:
The LL.M. in Tribal Policy, Law, and Government is designed for law graduates who desire to work on issues related to tribal law and federal Indian law at the professional or academic levels. This degree program will provide students with a detailed understanding of the nature of tribal government, law, and policy development within the domestic federal structure.