Senate Summary
Monday, November 15, 2004

3:15 to 5:00 p.m.
Schwada Classroom Building, Room 210


Substitutes: Vice Provost Hackett for Milt Glick

Guests: Richard Dagger, Political Science, Noel Fidel, College of Law, Myles Lynk, Faculty Athletic Representative, Bob St. Louis, Chair, Information Systems

1. Call to Order.

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

2. Approval of the Previous Minutes (October 18, 2004).

The Senate Summary has been posted on the Academic Senate Web site. The Summary was approved without objection (multiple seconds). Please direct any further corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu.

3. Announcements and Communications.

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

My report will be brief today because we have a guest, Myles Lynk, Faculty Athletic Representative. I wanted to give you updates on projects that we have been working on. The Health Care Task Force has brainstormed ideas for first steps to be implemented to create its vision of health care clinics on campus in the future, and their goal is to improve the overall health and wellness of all faculty and staff on all our campuses, and they are working with the university administrative level committee on Health Care. Second, I have been working with Vice Provost Nancy Gutierrez and the other two Senate presidents from East and West to come together to form a joint administrative and Academic Senate task force, the Task Force on the Curriculum for a New American University, and that is what we have been talking about all summer long. We will continue this work until we decide what kind of curriculum a New American University should have, and we of course welcome your input to our
study. Again, we are not revising or changing or reorganizing the curriculum, but we are dealing with this on a much higher level. Philosophically we are looking at what kind of student we wish to have upon graduation. Third, the Creative Compensation Committee will continue its work as far as coming up with ways of increasing faculty compensation. Things are moving forward with all of our task forces. Without any further ado, I want to introduce Vice Provost Hackett to give the Provost's report today.

3.B Executive VP and Provost's Report (Vice Provost Hackett)

I am Gail Hackett, and I am the Vice Provost in the Provost Office and also the new Dean of the University College. I am here today to tell you a little bit about the University College and how it will be organized. I am also here to sub for Milt Glick who is at a professional conference today. I tried to see if we could get the Provost of the Capitol Campus, Merney Harrison, to accompany me but unfortunately, he is at the same conference that Milt is at. Perhaps you could invite him at a later time to talk about what is going on with planning for the Downtown Campus. I have just a piece of that--the concept of a University College which has been under discussion across campuses, with great faculty involvement for the past two years, and it is part of the redesign plan. Ruth Jones deserves a lot of credit for putting the concepts together, and now it is time to actually implement those general concepts. I am just beginning to have discussions with the first units that will be part of the University College, so, I am talking to you at the very beginning of an intensive planning process, and we hope to be back at a later time to talk about more details.

I have two power point slides to show you about the organization of the University College. The first is about the organization of DUAS that along with the BIS program will form a core for the new School of Interdisciplinary Studies. We will be able to expand the current BIS offerings at the Downtown Campus and coordinate all other elements of that program on the other campuses. Many of you will be involved in the planning bodies for these components of the University College.

I want to start by saying that I am a bit disconcerted by some of the media reports on the University College. While I feel they are not wrong, they are misleading. The first report that I heard was last Thursday over our holiday on NPR, that the University College is a college for "average students." The newspaper reports, too, are not inaccurate, but they are somewhat misleading because they only emphasize one part of what University College is. As a part of the planning process, we will form an academic council at the Downtown Campus, as well as a long list of things for Merney to work on, including one that Barb just asked me about, a faculty governance structure for that campus. All that is still to come and some of you may be involved in that work. Some of you may participate with the planning body. I welcome your input and ideas at any point.

First, what are the goals of a University College? The University College will be a venue for program and degree delivery starting with existing programs. In the future there will be a lot of other developments, but right now the organization of DUAS is the base for the formation of the University College and we will expand from there. We plan to expand BIS offerings at the Downtown Campus, and also to coordinate across all the campuses, as well as use the School of Interdisciplinary Studies as an incubator for new programs that may stay or move somewhere else on the Downtown Campus. The University College will be responsible for a broad range of course work for both the School of Interdisciplinary Studies as well as for pre-majors for the other colleges that will be downtown. The faculty will have to expand to meet those needs as part of our planning process and to figure out what we will need to offer--we will not have the full range of general studies courses at the Downtown Campus, but we will have a full range of general studies courses for the students there.
Related to some of what you have been hearing in the media, the University College really plans to enhance the academic exploration, advising, support services, and career related support services for our students. We will look at life planning skills and look at ways to help students connect their college academic experience to what they might want to do in their future. One point that I want to make sure of and that everyone is clear on is that, although this will be a home for undecided students who don't have a major, either because they have not selected one or because they do not know what they want to do, indecision is not related to intelligence—in fact, some of the smarter kids have a difficult time deciding what they want to do, because they have so many skills and interests. Related to that, the first college that I am talking to about possible degree offerings is the Barrett Honors College. The Dean of the Honors College is very interested in what we will provide as interdisciplinary programs offerings for honors students. Finally, as one of our goals we want to enhance freshman persistence and graduation rates for all students across campuses. Please keep in mind that although this is the design where we are starting, it may not be where we end up. As a planning committee, we are not going to feel overly constrained by this model. We do have certain goals in mind but the ways to get to those goals may vary, and we are trying to stay purely creative because President Crow's primary charge was to find a way to offer courses and degree programs such that this campus and the University College become a place students want to go to rather than a place where they are pushed to go to. As you can imagine, that is a daunting charge.

In slide two, the first box on the left hand side contains the School of Interdisciplinary Studies. The BIS program is the only program there, but the other box has a place for incubator programs that we have been working on. The center box and its sub-boxes are focusing on advising and similar functions. The middle rectangular box, "University Advising Coordinator," emphasizes the part of the chart of the University College that has a physical presence at the Downtown Campus, but also has some responsibilities that extend across the University. I am in conversations with what is going on at all the campuses at this point and trying to figure out how we are going to work this all out, and hope that we can come up with some creative collaborative arrangements. Also, you will see the Alliance and Transfer Center—this is a nascent concept, but one that people have been working on for awhile. The alliance is an alliance with Arizona community colleges and Maricopa community colleges primarily, that will ease transfers and provide opportunities for collaboration to promote student success in various ways. You also see in the circles at the bottom—the University College is a safety net for students who either don't know where they want to go within the university when they first come in—coming out of another major or college and don't know where to go to next—or they are not eligible to enter a major or a college and need assistance in order to pursue their academic interests. It is also a place for students to choose to come to get assistance with academic exploration. Finally, on the right hand side you see an assortment of other undergraduate academic services, all of which already exist through DUAS and all of which also support the goal of enhancing student success. Do you have any questions?

**Senator Johnson:** When do you anticipate the University College being in operation?

**Vice Provost Hackett:** We are in operation today. We plan to move to the Downtown Campus in Fall of 2006, and have the first wave of new students. So, that is not a lot of time to create a college and as you might expect with the School of Interdisciplinary Studies providing courses for majors in the other colleges, as well as the interdisciplinary courses that BIS students need, we will have to hire faculty in that college first. We will also be trying to figure out ways to interest some of you in spending at least part of your time at the Downtown Campus. Again, that is with the intent that we want to attract you and make it worth your while to participate with us.
**Senator Rez:** What does BIS mean? (Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies)

**Senator Vandermeer:** I wonder if you can explain these alliances--How will that go or will that go beyond articulation with the community colleges--why are we having this formation?

**Vice Provost Hackett:** All the articulation functions will be there, but it is beyond articulation in that down the road there might be joint admissions, there might be some of the students starting at a community college and then if they meet certain criteria they could move seamlessly into ASU. There might be some possibilities for joint faculty. I have not been involved in the planning of that--my understanding is superficial at this point and the concept is not fully developed yet. I will come back and tell you more as things go forward.

**Senator Karady:** Will the University College hire its own faculty or will they borrow faculty--will it be at a different level, what is the concept?

**Vice Provost Hackett:** All of that and more. I would not say that it would be a different level of faculty--although I need some clarification of what you mean by that.

**Senator Karady:** Would it be a separate independent faculty? At some different level?

**Vice Provost Hackett:** That would not be the case. What we are going to have is a wide range of students. We are going to, as a university, allow school-centered model schools to change their standards depending on the different schools. The University College will provide a safety net for students who are eligible at the university level but who may not have been accepted into a school. We will provide a range of academic options, but with regard to the faculty, it is too early to know exactly how many people we will hire, but I suspect that we will have all of the above, that is, we will have to hire some new faculty, set tenure standards, and figure out how to do that. We will be hiring adjuncts, contract faculty, lecturers and clinical faculty too, and we will find ways to get some of you to come down and participate.

**Senator Witt:** We have one program already involved in BIS--we took it on primarily because of the added resources without it costing us anything. What advantage will the University College be to us?

**Vice Provost Hackett:** I cannot give you a specific answer to that question, but let me say the BIS will continue to function on the different campuses, and I would expect that we will find ways to share that enrollment, so it will not be a disincentive to participate. Details will follow.

**Senator Witt:** But if you take students away from this campus, it will be a disincentive to Architecture and Environmental Design to participate in the BIS program.

**Vice Provost Hackett:** Remember that part of the reason that we are operating a University College is that we are looking ahead ten years, when we will have increases in enrollment that the University expects at ASU. I expect that a portion of the enrollment increase on the Downtown Campus is going to be that enrollment--maintaining our current enrollment standards. As you know, in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design there are many majors that cannot accommodate great numbers of students, so we will reject some very good students in some of our majors. We will have to find ways to accommodate all of our students so that we are not creating a disincentive for you to participate in the BIS program.
USG President O'Keefe-Zelman: I am not an expert on community colleges, but to me it seems like the community colleges would serve this purpose. How will this be different, and have you looked at the structure of a university college at other universities?

Vice Provost Hackett: First of all, it would not be in competition with the community colleges. There may be overlap, but there is a distinct advantage to entering ASU directly--what we are going to try to do is provide integrative and enhanced services so that students who decide to come to us will have a greater success rate. Remember where our graduation rate is--in the low 50s and needs a great deal of improvement. Our persistence rate, if you remember, is only about 78%--that means that about 22% of our students who come here the first year do not come back the second year. Our transfer students do not do as well in terms of graduation rate as the students who started with us. Therefore, there are many reasons why we would want to enhance services at this university.

Senator Johnson: Being the Dean of the University College sounds like quite a challenge. Do you anticipate continuing in your role of vice provost?

Vice Provost Hackett: I will continue in a vice provost role as well as Dean of University College--the vice provost label refers to a university-wide assignment, and the Dean part is specific to the place where the University College resides. What Doug is probably getting at is that I have been responsible for academic personnel, promotion and tenure, among other responsibilities as Vice Provost. Those responsibilities have now been reassigned primarily to Nancy Gutierrez in the Provost Office and she has a great deal of experience.

Senate President Kerr: What relationship will the University College have with the Office of Youth Preparation, and to the Bridge Program?

Vice Provost Hackett: I can't answer that because that is under study right now.

Senator Canary: I have heard, although I don't have any evidence in support of this statistic, that one of the most popular combinations in the BIS degree is business and communication and I know that those two units will be remaining on campus.

Vice Provost Hackett: Part of what is going to happen in the School of Interdisciplinary Studies is to include a presence of fine arts, business, architecture and environmental design, education and honors--it is not limited to those units, but those units are among the units that we will have a presence for. We need to figure out how to do that.

Senator Komnenich: I see it just as you described it, and I know you tried hard not to have this look as if it is a remedial school, but it does appear that way in a lot of ways when you think about how it is structured.

Vice Provost Hackett: There will be some of that in the school but it is not a remedial school. What I am trying to communicate and what I hope people walk away with is the notion that if we do this now--it is not remediation--there are simply issues that our students have that must be addressed. There are a lot of our students, including many of our talented students, who don't know what they want to do. Because of that affects their academic performance, there are other kids who probably don't perform academically at the level they have the potential to perform at, because they do not know what, or they are not following the right path that makes sense for them. Those kinds of functions I don't see as
remedial. Let me tell you that 70 to 80% of adults say that the number one thing they wish they had had at some point was assistance in career exploration and academic decision making. Think about it. How many of you very smart people took awhile to figure out what you wanted to do? I don't call that remedial. I call that a standard service that we should be performing for our students and that is a big part of what we are going to be doing, academic advising and exploration of career--we would like to tie that into academic support services. The first degree program we will talk about is for honors students in Interdisciplinary Studies and for just that reason. Again, we will have the student body that most of you have now. All the schools in your existing colleges, because of increasing entrance standards, will not have quite the range of students; they will go to the University College. However, we will have the top part of the range as well as the bottom part of the range, so our range will be wider than most colleges. Does that answer your question?

**Senate President Kerr:** Yes, thank you. I think we are very fortunate to have Vice Provost Hackett in this position. I don't know how many of you know that Dr. Hackett's background is in career development. Therefore, I think there could be no better person for this position nationally from this area of career development and exploration, and certainly academic decision making.

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

My report is on the agenda in that the *Early Edition* of the November Senate newsletter is posted on the Academic Senate web page and hard copies will follow in the campus mail within a few days.

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

A couple of Monday's ago right before the election, we had our Meet the Candidate event where we invited all the legislative candidates to campus to show their wares to our students basically and to speak with them about the issues. That went very well, and I appreciated the opportunity to get students informed on the issues before they went to the polls, which they did in pretty high numbers at least in Maricopa County. We were very excited about that and we did a lot to get our students to the polls including having a phone bank on the weekend before elections--we called all the students that we registered and we did dorm storms. We put up flyers in the dorms showing people where they needed to go to vote. We had an Election Day event on Hayden Lawn, where we gave out polling site information. We asked the Young Democrats and the Young Republicans to come out, and we provided golf cart rides to the local polls. Of course, they had to wait in line for three hours so we could not give them a ride back, but at least we got them there.

We are also starting our preliminary tuition talks, trying to find out what students are thinking, the kinds of services and resources they would like to see if we stage another tuition increase, which will probably happen. We had our first tuition forum last Wednesday, where we talked with students about how the tuition process works, the current ABOR's tuition policy, what student government has done in the past to represent students in the tuition setting process, and just to get student input on the services that they would like to see if tuition is increased. That was pretty successful and we are getting ready to send out another online survey to students that probably either will go out after Thanksgiving or in the spring semester. We have not decided on the timing and the technical feasibility of that but that is a great way to reach students and to let them have a little bit of input in what we say to the administration and the Board of Regents regarding tuition.

The Student Regent selection process is well underway. Letters of intent are due at 5:00 pm today for potential applicants and the deadline for application is November 19; then we will be interviewing on
November 30. So, in early December we hope to have our top three names to forward to the Governor's office. Hopefully, we can get a student regent confirmed.

We are also considering our discussions with MU regarding options for the meal plan—the potential for meal plans for all the freshmen in the residence halls. Some campuses already have this type of meal plan and options available—we need to look over those options so we can come to a better conclusion for us. Of course, we are still working on the "no posting" policy in the residence hall windows—we have been working with RHA to try to create some legislation to change their policy, we have been talking to all involved parties, the GPSA, the General Counsel Office, the ACLU, in order to come to some kind of consensus and to represent the students on this issue. The USG resolution that was passed said that we were in disagreement with the policy and believe it should be altered, and that enforcement of the policy is very inequitable across the residence halls.

President-Elect Mattson: Sophie, what is the rationale for not allowing anything in the windows?

USG President O'Keefe-Zelman: From what I have heard, the policy was instituted in 1998 after a couple of offensive messages were posted up on windows and people took offense to that and they felt they needed a better way to create a positive living environment. So, they just decided that nothing would be better. So, we are just trying to work things out now. Are there questions?

Senate President Kerr: If the faculty can assist you on any of these issues, I am sure that there are people here that would support you in those tasks.

3.E Past Senate President's Report (Tony Garcia).

I just wanted to talk to you about a couple of issues related to compensation. In today's Arizona Republic there was an article in the valley and state section about university presidents' compensation and what drew my attention to this is actually the last sentence--"The median pay for ASU's full professors is $94,600 dollars, officials said." In looking at that statement and thinking about the average Arizona worker—that is three times what the average Arizona employee makes. I just want to bring that up because the way the issues are being discussed about salaries and universities is very important. When the average person hears about the university asking for more salary for the faculty—and when they see this in the paper, they may not understand what is being talked about. The second thing is that after reading this article I went to the AAUP website and looked up to see what the latest statistics are on faculty salaries. Their latest salary report has the average for all public universities, for full professors, at $94,606, so that was right on the money. My point is to show you that statistics in and of themselves in discussions that we have about salaries get really detailed and bogged down because, obviously, the issue that we are talking about in this case is not the 1,400 plus public universities that responded to this survey, but instead in our documentation to the Board of Regents our peer institutions would be the important figures. In a discussion that we had last week with the ASU chairs group, we talked about this--our ranking from 2000 was 37 among our peers, and now it is 17 within the peer group. We need to examine the gender issues as well. But first, we need to formulate what we are trying to do by adjusting salaries. The reality is that we are trying to compete with our peers. We are also trying to retain and attract good faculty. The second issue is that with creative compensation we need to go beyond the statistics, because the statistics over the last four years are not encouraging and there have been efforts to improve compensation, yet we are slipping more and more. We are turning to the Senate, especially the senators at large this year, to help us take the lead on studying compensation for creative activity. Specifically, I need more ideas about what is going on in your colleges to try to supplement faculty pay and compensation, in the consulting area, and we also
want to know more about how faculty are compensated, what sources are outside the regular nine-month contract. Most of our attention is focused by this article on the fact that our CEO is making five times a full professor's salary, which is not bad compared to the CEO of an outside corporation. If you want to make that comparison, fine, but salary is a continual struggle--and there is a lot of competition out there. The other aspect of compensation is a full package, health insurance and other benefits, and there has been a great effort by Doug Johnson and other people this year to secure a better health insurance package for the university.

Senator Dwyer: I don't know if this is pertinent, but is the creative compensation committee looking at tenure track and tenured only, or do you look at other categories?

Past President Garcia: We will be surveying all our senators to get a picture of what is going on and also for ideas, but ultimately we know that there are big issues of compensation that are university-wide. We are just starting at this level. The other thing about our committee name is that the Committee on Creative Compensation sounds really good, but perhaps it is a double entendre--Compensation for Creative Activity might be better. My point was that statistics can be pulled sideways to prove any point you want to make.

Senate President Kerr: I talked to the AZ Republic reporter who wrote the article, and he asked how we felt about President Crow's salary. I told him that he was worth every penny of that if he can raise faculty salaries. So, when I write to that person, in response to his article, I will share with him a copy of the ASU Almanac of Facts, and I will highlight certain ones about salary and make sure that this person has the correct information and picture of all salary levels.

Senator Landers: I saw in a recent issue of the Chronicle an article that states that the highest paid university president makes just under $800,000 and the author of that article makes the case that tuition has been upped a great deal, and makes a further implication that this is being done to raise administrator salaries.

Past President Garcia: Here we are making the case that tuition increase will go for increasing student financial aid packages, and we are also looking at addressing faculty salary issues.

President-Elect Mattson: This is interesting, because although I am not a math and statistics person--you both are using terms interchangeably and they are not interchangeable. You have been talking about average salaries and what was quoted in the paper was a median salary, which is very different from an average salary, and you quoted AAUP data as being average salaries, so, I think that it can get a bit skewed--if the average could be much higher--and I think that if you looked at the median, it still sort of depresses me as to where I fall, because if it is really the median salary, then I am certainly on the bottom half of that median! You are right, these are full professors, and I read that Arizona Republic article too--what Barb said in the article was that Michael Crow is worth it, and if anybody can get the professors increase in salaries, he should be able to. The reporter could have given the median salary for full professors, without lumping everybody into that category.

Senator Duerden: I would like to say that the salaries for full-time contract persons and lecturers and senior lecturers are on the low end of the scale--some of my colleagues are paid under a pittance, the low of the median or average salary, and these are the people who teach the bulk of the freshmen classes.
Senator Komnenich: We really need to also make it clear that the majority of faculty are on nine-month appointments rather than twelve-month appointments, so that is an annual salary.

Senate President Kerr: If the reporter is not willing to do another article, then I definitely am going to write up something that points these things out.

ASUW Senate President Simmons: A couple of thoughts: 1) The ABOR report on salaries will show better what Tony is talking about, 2) I would bring this to the attention of Regent Boice who has really taken this on as an issue in his subcommittee. The column writer probably thought--if I quote Regent Stuart that gives a certain legitimacy to the whole story, whereas if Regent Boice would speak to this issue, I think that would actually help the cause, and 3) the Chronicle had another article recently on faculty workload, based on a national survey--I think it showed that something like 40% of full-time faculty work over 60 hours a week. This might be something that we would want to stress. I think people have that in the public perception that faculty teach six hours a week in the classroom and that is all we do, when in fact we actually work 60 to 70 hours a week.

Senate President Kerr: I would really appreciate having that information sent to me and I would like to invite the entire senate when you run across other things, facts, articles, studies, surveys that may strengthen any argument we might make. Send that information to me at bkerr@asu.edu and we will make sure that it gets incorporated into any statement that the Academic Senate puts out about compensation and salary. Are there other comments? Thank you.

3.F ASUW Senate Report (Bill Simmons).

Just a few items about what we have done in the last couple Senate meetings. At our last Senate meeting we had a presentation about our new Ed.D program--it was an excellent presentation--I think the way that our College of Teacher Education and Leadership has put that together, getting the whole college involved is really a good development model for all future programs. This will be our first doctoral program on our campus and that should go to the Board of Regents in March for approval. We are also at the Board of Regents meeting this week seeking approval for another research center on our campus. It will be a Center for Violence Prevention and will serve community and state needs too. It will be housed on our College of Human Services but it is campus-wide and there are faculty from all the campuses involved. Last Senate meeting, we voted--as you did in your last Senate meeting, on the elimination of restricted withdrawal. We voted unanimously to approve it and sent our recommendation to the administration. We had a resolution in our Senate in support of one university in many places, because there has been some question as to where our faculty stand on these issues--we had a resolution that said "the ASU Senate at the West campus firmly resolves to remain part of ASU and supports the implementation of one university in many places. That also passed unanimously and we forwarded it the appropriate people.

Our Student Issues Committee is looking at a new software program called "Turnitin.com," which is to combat plagiarism. This was originally approved by our ITACW committee, which is our technology committee, but there are some issues involved with student privacy with that, so we felt it best to kick it over to the Student Issues Committee, which is already looking at privacy issues and is also looking at academic integrity issues. If you do not know about this software, it allows a faculty member to turn a paper in over the web. It will be checked against a database of electronic sources but also a database of previously turned in papers and will file a report with the paper as to whether or not there is plagiarism. Once a professor checks the paper, the paper actually goes into the database, so, there is a question of student privacy and how students will feel if their papers are being entered into a database.
Other universities have put statements on syllabi alerting students to this possibility, so what our Student Issues Committee is going to do is look at what other universities have done, and also do some dry runs with the software to see how faculty-friendly it is.

We are paying attention to the system restructuring, as you can imagine. On Wednesday, at the Board of Regents meeting down in Tucson, they will hear subcommittee reports on needs assessments, state models and on criteria for judging any restructuring. So, that will be a pretty important ABOR meeting. They have also done capacities reports from each university and the community colleges—we have been very active in this. The president of the Board of Regents came to our campus two or three weeks ago and met with faculty and students. The leader of the work study group, Mary Jo Waits, came to campus and spent about five hours at the campus in various meetings. We have been very active in the faculty stakeholders committee, which is looking to prepare a report to the Board of Regents based on restructuring. If you are interested in this phase of drafting the report that will go to the Board of Regents, please contact some of the ASU Tempe faculty members who are on the stakeholders group. I think there are four of us. Barb is one of them.

Finally, our Senate meeting for this Wednesday is going to be postponed until the next Wednesday because of the Board of Regents meeting in Tucson. Are there any questions?


We have four items: 1) The East Campus Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee that primarily approves new courses has approved an application from the Department of Exercise and Wellness Sciences to seek authorization for an interdisciplinary Ph.D in Physical Activity, Nutrition and Wellness. 2) In January you are all invited out to East Campus to have an Academic Senate meeting at East, on January 24th. It will be held in the new Student Union building. 3) Our next East Faculty Assembly meeting is going to be on December 8 at 11:00 a.m. 4) We have a committee looking at general studies requirements for a "polytechnic."

**Senate President Kerr:** I want to give a simple introduction to Myles Lynk, our new Faculty Athletic Representative by talking a bit about the relationship of academic people to athletics. In many of our meetings in which I sat with the athletic people, I have often heard it said that faculty members don't seem to understand athletics or that faculty members don't seem to support athletics or that faculty members don't seem to like athletics. That is a broad term—but I can genuinely empathize with our athletics department that works very hard to help us understand their role. All this year the athletics department has been doing special programs, inviting schools and colleges to learn more about what they are doing. It has been difficult in getting attendance to these events. So, at the last meeting of the ICA Board, as we once again raised this issue, I made a little speech about faculty attitudes towards athletics—going back to the youth of faculty—so, I will ask right now, how many of you were on your high school football, basketball, or baseball teams? That is quite a few actually. How many people here were on their college, or any intercollegiate college sports teams? That is a small number. Many of us as children were the kids who were not the athletic types; how many of us were instead the wimpy ones, the nerds or the ones that weren't exactly hooked up to a team of most coordinated and speedy kids on the block? So, sometimes it is difficult for athletes and academics to talk to each other. Even as children, they were speaking different languages and they belonged to different cultures. I would like to introduce Myles Lynk as one of those faculty members who not only works hard but works to build a bridge between athletics and faculty while also trying to make sure that our athletes are receiving the best possible education that they can have.
3.H Faculty Athletic Representative's Report (Dr. Myles Lynk).

First let me dispel one notion--I was not a student athlete in high school or college but I did have big glasses and a pocket protector filled with pencils and looked like a nerd, so my children tell me. I want to thank Senate President Kerr for allowing me to speak to you today, and I would like to give you a little background of this job. When I first took this job, I told Jerry Kingston that replacing him as Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) was like replacing Babe Ruth on the New York Yankees outfield. I don't know if you realize it but Jerry was the dean of faculty athletic reps in the PAC10 Conference. He had served in the position longer and he had defined the role as expansively and as effectively as it could be defined. He was one of the founders of the Faculty Athletic Representatives Association. For many athletic reps at Division One schools around the country, they look to Jerry and what he did, as an example of what a FAR should do. One of my ambitions as FAR is to make sure that we do not diminish the role at ASU vis-à-vis the Athletics Department, for the future of FARs, and for the future faculty here. The position of Faculty Athletic Representative is mandated by the NCAA constitution and rules as a primary means whereby NCAA member institutions maintain institutional control over intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA constitution requires each member institution to appoint a FAR. The NCAA constitution recognizes the FAR as a representative of the institution and its faculty in relationship between the NCAA and the local institutional campus. The FAR is appointed by the President. He or she is responsible to the President and is to report to the faculty on the eligibility of student athletes to participate in intercollegiate sports, their welfare at the institution, and the range of issues affecting them at the member institution. The FAR at PAC10 also represents the institution as the President's designee at the conference level. I am here today to report to you on a number of issues, including new NCAA requirements on the academic performance rates that will begin to take effect in 2005, and which are intended to bolster graduation rates for student athletes at Division One schools.

Dr. Lynk presented his report to the Senate and provided each member with a copy of an annual report that goes to the Board of Regents from all the three public universities about the progress of student athletes at each university--"Arizona University System Annual Report on the Academic Progress of Student Athletes 2003-2004" that can be located in the Regents November agenda (click on link): http://www.abor.asu.edu/1_the_regents/meetings/board_book/Nov%202004/Item%2001ICA%20Update%20Executive%20Summary%20Nov%202004.pdf and a statistical summary specific to ASU student athlete progress, "Academic Preparation, Performance and Outcomes, Comparing all ASU Students with Scholarship Student-Athletes, by Varsity Sports Team." The details of these items will not be published in the Senate minutes, therefore if you have additional questions to discuss please call Dr. Lynk at 965-0433 or email them to Myles.lynk@asu.edu.

Dr. Lynk: Let me briefly mention a new NCAA requirement that is intended to encourage the Division One schools to improve their graduation and persistence rates. Generally speaking beginning in January of 2005, NCAA Bylaw 23 will institute a new academic performance rate program that will set cutoff figures for graduation rates in each sport, and will penalize schools with a loss of scholarships in a sport if that school's success rate in that sport fails to meet the minimum cutoff figure set by the NCAA. Academic performance rates will be measured by the number of students in each sport who are both eligible to participate and have been retained by the institution. For example, a so-called extemporaneous penalty will be assessed to the institution at the first available opportunity, if the following factors arise--it would be assessed against the team depending on the number of student athletes each semester who leave the institution and would have been ineligible to participate if they had stayed. What this is trying to get at is you don't want to recruit people or you shouldn't recruit
people who you know will not succeed--if they play for a semester and then they leave and they left because they would be academically ineligible to participate if they had stayed. What is happening that causes this concern is that people are just being churned through an institution without any likelihood that they will actually earn a degree. Thus, for example, if the NCAA sets a cutoff APR rate in men's basketball of 87% and a men's basketball team has a two year APR of 85%, then that team will be below the cutoff point and subject to a penalty. The penalty will be a loss of scholarships equal to the number of students who have left the institution and would have been ineligible to play had they remained. The NCAA feels this will provide an incentive for coaches to make sure that their students are meeting or exceeding the minimum achievement levels for academic success. Division One schools such as ASU have already determined their APRs for the 2003-2004 AY in preparation for the institution of this requirement next year. At ASU the APR for 2003-2004 was 92% across all sports and no sport had an APR below 85%. The NCAA has not yet set its cutoff level and so we will have to see, but the overall rate of 92% is very positive. Since the penalties will be assessed sport by sport, or team by team, the average really doesn't mean that much. The question is what effect will this have on sports that have traditionally not had a high persistence rate?

Let me mention some of the issues that I am looking at currently: I am working with the ICA department and the University's Financial Aid Office to see how we can improve the ability of the ICA to accurately monitor the financial aid disbursement to student athletes in the form of so-called cash in lieu payments, and more accurately monitor deductions from scholarships for meal plan and training table expenses. I am reviewing changes in admissions office policies to see whether and how they will affect the decisions on the admission of individual student athletes to ASU. With the support of Jennifer Glassen, the coordinator of student athlete eligibility in our office, and an acknowledged expert on student athlete eligibility issues in the PAC10 conference, I am responsible for certifying student athletes' eligibility to participate in intercollegiate sports. With the ICA's Director of Compliance, I submit petitions and reports to the NCAA and the PAC10 seeking waivers, where appropriate, of NCAA rules that allow student athletes to participate in intercollegiate sports and to report any violations of NCAA rules and requirements.

Let me say in conclusion that after four and one half months as ASU's Faculty Athletic Representative, I am impressed by the amount of work involved and by the dedication of so many people in the ICA to the welfare of student athletes, and the needs of these students as people first and athletes second. Student athletes and their coaches and staff have a difficult role in balancing conflicting responsibilities, but we as faculty must never forget--institutional control of NCAA intercollegiate athletics means that we must be involved and must participate in this process in as positive a way as possible. I would also like to thank President Crow for appointing me and the Senate leadership for their support and assistance and for many other people, Jerry Kingston is not here today but his generous advice and time have proved very useful. Are there any questions?

**Senate President Kerr**: Please note that the report from the Carillon Society will occur at the December 6th meeting. The carillon has been found but it is in pretty bad shape.

4. **Consent Agenda Items.**

**Senate President Kerr**: We will now vote on the consent agenda, and as you know all items will be approved unless there are any items that you want to remove.
Senator Mayer: I would like to say that Noel Fidel from the Law College is present to answer questions about Senate Motion #7 (second reading) regarding the implementation of a new degree, Master of Laws--LL.M. in Tribal Policy, Law and Government. (See Attachment 1).

Senate President Kerr: Then without objection, I will request a motion to accept the consent agenda items--so moved, seconded and passed.

5. Unfinished Business.

5.A Executive Committee. No further report.

5.B Committee on Committees (Pauline Komnenich).

The Academic Preference Survey forms are now available online on the Senate web page and I would just encourage you to make your choices for service.

Senate President Kerr: We would really like those of you who are considering the possibility of running for Academic Senate president in the future to come forward as soon as possible so that you can discuss your ambitions with us and we can then twist your arm. We need two people who really want to give their year to this leadership position and to run for the office. We want to talk about it with you and help you to understand what that entails. Does anyone have any questions?

5.C Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Mike Mayer).

We have four information items that were printed in the agenda (See Attachment 2) and they have to do with the establishment of concentrations, and one name change--also, Senate Motion #8 (first reading) on the establishment of an Undergraduate Certificate in Philosophy, Politics, and Law (See Attachment 3). Richard Dagger from Political Science is our guest on this motion. Are there any questions?

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

We have met three times, and will be meeting again next Monday to vote on recommendations that we will bring forward in December on academic dishonesty.

5.E Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

I hope that your health insurance has settled down--that you have your ID cards, have selected your primary care physician, and everything is going well. I do need to remind you, however, that the month of November is your opportunity to also sign up for a flexible spending account to save for your co-pays, medications, and other things that are not covered by your health plan, and pay for them with pretax dollars. You can sign up on the HR web page and we encourage you to investigate that. The downside of flexible spending accounts is that you use the money or you lose it. So, you need to closely estimate your medical needs for the coming year--remembering that the month of November is the only time that you can take advantage of this option.

The other item of business that we bring to you today is Senate Resolution #9 (first reading), an issue about our retirement program. The intent is to delay the decision time for making a selection of a retirement plan. He read the motion (See Attachment 4). "Be it therefore resolved that retirement
policies and enabling legislation should be revised to allow a one-time opportunity to change the retirement plan selection after the employee's opportunity for continued employment has been determined (i.e. after the tenure decision for tenure track faculty, or after five consecutive years of service for other eligible groups) and that in transition to this proposed policy, all optional retirement plan eligible employees should have a one-time opportunity (a 30-day window) to change their retirement plan selection."

In talking with a wide variety of faculty, no one feels very comfortable making this type of plan choice on their first day of the job, as we are currently encouraged to do. There are many people who are in the retirement plan and that was a satisfactory plan at the time that they chose it, but they now believe because of risk variables or specific benefits that are available with the state retirement plan that it might have been a better choice for them. This proposal's goal is to allow people to have a little more time to make that choice, a little more complete information, and hopefully, that will result in a better decision. There are significant consequences and it would affect faculty and academic professionals as well as professional administrators who want to switch plans. Bob St. Louis is here today as an advocate for this proposal. Are there any questions?

**Senator Haynes:** What is the locus of decision making on this--will we be asking the administration and the Board of Regents to consider this?

**Senator Johnson:** This is a fairly complex undertaking and we need to have support at the university level to go forward. However, it will ultimately take legislation. On the other hand, if we are in a situation where the legislature may be willing to do this--if it does not cost them anything--that could speed up the process. This will not affect everyone by the way. There are people who are very happy with their current retirement plans. We are really fortunate to have great choices here. If you are currently in one of the optional plans you have to face the uncertainties of the stock market, but by and large people have done well who are in those plans. The state retirement system is viewed as one of the premier plans in the country--it does offer the option of purchasing prior services credits--military service or working for other governmental agencies. It also provides a fairly modest supplement to health insurance. Many people might prefer to be in a defined benefit system too, because there is a lot less uncertainty as to what is going to be there when they retire. There is less management required over the portfolio. There are good features in both systems and people might be inclined to switch in either direction. We would like to believe that you should make this decision when people have enough information, or at least more information, to make an intelligent choice.

**Senator Canary:** I am wondering if you meant this in a narrow sense that there would be one opportunity to change, at tenure--or after any kind of probationary period where a person gets an evaluation.

**Senator Johnson:** We are speculating what is possible under the law and policy, and we hope what is reasonable would be to have a policy that is somewhat determined--but it should apply to each and all appropriate dates for evaluation of employees for permanent employment.

**Senator Canary:** The reason that I ask this question is what if a person decides to leave the university upon receiving a negative evaluation on their three-year review. They will not have reached the fifth year evaluation and tenure review.

**Senator Johnson:** Under those circumstances, if someone was terminated after three years, they are going to be able to take their contribution but they will not be vested.
**Senator Vandermeer:** With TIAA-CREF it is ten years before you can withdraw. Will this require an agreement with TIAA-CREF to do this sooner?

**Senator Johnson:** I have been discussing this with TIAA-CREF and they generally like the concept. There is some flexibility on which accounts, as to how long it takes to roll it out, but there is some type of systematic withdrawal.

**Senator Vandermeer:** Is there some way to speed it up?

**Senator Johnson:** It is not clear that they are ready to change their rules to allow that to happen, but they do allow at least a rollover over a period of time.

**Past President Garcia:** Is there a model at other universities to offer this?

**Senator Johnson:** We are just trying to do what makes sense for us. I don’t see a model at other universities that would work for us.

**Senator Siferd:** It this supposed to allow us to switch either way, from State into TIAA-CREF or from just TIAA-CREF into state retirement?

**Senator Johnson:** Probably the biggest obstacle to this is that the State Retirement System may not be flexible enough to allow people to roll money out of that fund. You would have the opportunity nevertheless to participate in an optional plan. We are trying to keep it as general as possible, leaving the least maneuvering room to deal with our legislators when the time comes.

**Senator Duerden:** What about moving from VALIC to the State plan?

**Senator Johnson:** But if you are a member of the State Retirement System you are eligible to buy prior years of service credits and presumably with funds from your existing plan.

**Senate President Kerr:** Again, this is a first reading and we will vote December 6. Please take this proposal to your faculty. A strong vote on this can send a strong message. So, if you have colleagues that are not here, please tell them to come next time so we can get this motion strongly voted upon.

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

**Senate President Kerr:** There will not be a report today; however, I would like to note that I am going to be talking with the presidents of the other two senates at west and east, and with our University Affairs Committee. We are beginning to informally discuss how we might be able to create a university-wide governance council that would be satisfactory to all of the stakeholders. So, I wanted you to know that is just one of the challenges that lie ahead of us, and George Watson as chair of the UAC will be working with us on this.

6. **Adjournment.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
Attachment 1

Information Items from CAPC:

College of Education, Division of Curriculum & Instruction
- Establishment of an undergraduate concentration
- BAE in Elementary Education, Indigenous Teacher Preparations

Herberger College of Fine Arts, Department of Theatre
- Name Change of a graduate concentration
- MFA in Theatre--From: Scenography To: Performance Design
- Establishment of a graduate concentration
- MFA in Theatre--Directing
- Establishment of a graduate concentration
- Ph.D. in Theatre--Theatre & Performance of the Americas
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Senate Motion # 7 (2004–05)

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.
Senate Motion # 8 (2004–05)

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

Date of Introduction for First Reading: November 15, 2004

Date of Second Reading: December 6, 2004

Title of Motion: Request from the Barrett Honors College for the Establishment of an Undergraduate Certificate in Philosophy, Politics, & Law

Rationale:

As a distinctive interdisciplinary program that draws on ASU’s exceptional faculty resources in the areas of political, legal, and moral philosophy, PPL would attract to ASU highly talented students who have strong interests in questions of law, justice, and morality. Establishing a certificate granting program in Philosophy, Politics, and Law would also enable the faculty who work in this area scattered among various departments and colleges to coordinate their course offerings and provide direction to students who enter the program. In these ways, a certificate program in PPL would contribute to both the Barrett Honors College’s recruiting efforts and its ability to organize ASU’s resources for the benefit of the students it recruits.
Senate Resolution # 9 (2004–05)

Resolution Introduced by: Personnel Committee
Douglas Johnson, Chair

Date of Introduction for First Reading: November 15, 2004
Date of Second Reading: December 6, 2004

Title of Resolution: Proposal to delay the decision for making a retirement plan choice

Whereas, optional retirement plan eligible employees (e.g. faculty, academic professionals, administrative professionals…) do not have sufficient information to select a retirement plan at the date of hire (first 30 days of employment), as required by current policy; and.

Whereas, this group is currently required to make an irrevocable choice with the potential for significant suboptimal life long financial consequences; and

Whereas, the uncertainty of receiving tenure and the opportunity for long-term university employment unduly constrains this retirement plan choice;

Be it therefore resolved,

That retirement policies and enabling legislation should be revised to allow a one time opportunity to change the retirement plan selection after the employee’s opportunity for continued employment has been determined (i.e. after the tenure decision for tenure track faculty, or after five consecutive years service for other eligible groups); and

That in transition to this proposed policy; all optional retirement plan eligible employees should have a one time opportunity (a 30 day window) to change their retirement plan selection.

Rationale:

This change should benefit eligible employees.
Eligible university faculty, academic professionals, and administrators are fortunate to have a choice between the outstanding Arizona State Retirement System Plan and optional plans offered by several highly regarded retirement plan providers (i.e. TIAA-CREF, VALIC, etc….). [Note: they may also choose to participate in supplemental tax advantaged retirement plans (i.e. 403(b) and 457c plans).]
• However, due to short run employment uncertainty, they may not select the plan which would be in their long term best interests.
• After long term employment becomes a possibility, a better determination of which plan design features will become advantageous after retirement should be possible (e.g. ASRS allows purchase of prior year service credits for military and other government service, and provides a limited health insurance benefit. These benefits are not currently available for optional plan participants).

This change should benefit the university.
• A more flexible retirement plan policy should be more attractive to potential employees and support the university goal of attracting and retaining outstanding faculty and professionals.
• A change in retirement plans may facilitate retirement by senior faculty and create strategic flexibility for the university.

This change should benefit the ASRS and Optional Plan Providers.
• Allowing employees to change their retirement plan selection should enable more optimal decisions; a goal of plan providers whose mission it is to provide the best possible benefits to participants.
• Allowing a flexible choice among plans promotes competition among alternative plans. Those plans offering superior benefits will attract more participants and enjoy the advantages of larger investment portfolios.