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1. Call to Order.

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

2. Approval of the Previous Minutes (December 8, 2004).

Welcome to another semester! We will begin our meeting with approval of the previous Senate minutes from December 8, 2003. Darby sent them to you in January. If there are no objections, we will approve them as written. Then we have a full agenda to cover, so, I am going to begin with my report and we will have several reports that will be lengthy and have audience participation. We will also hear about the student referendum for the MU and the SRC.

3. Announcements and Communications.

3A Senate President’s Report (Tony Garcia).

As many of you may know, we have a presidential debate October 16, which will be the final debate in the series here, at ASU. There has been a steering committee that is led by Neal Giulliano and Colleen Jennings Rogensack that met last month, and we have subcommittees forming. Ruth Jones and I are involved in one subcommittee; we are looking at the academic and the student participation side of the debate, specifically events leading up to the presidential debate. One of the things that I want to tell you about this--we will be drafting an email and sending it to your departments, with a request for
programming that they are planning for the week leading up to the debate, also asking them to consider whether they would like to plan any events. Just be aware of that is in the works and forthcoming in the next couple of weeks.

At the first meeting of our spring semester, I want to thank the administration for last year's merit raise. It really is noteworthy, the effort made by our administration to have available monies for the merit raises. ASU was the only Arizona University to do this, so we are appreciative of that and we recognize that merit raises are an important way to recognize hard work being done by ASU employees. I wanted to follow up and discuss some of the things that we have been very focused on this year in the Academic Senate, and that is ways of improving salaries. In my opinion, employee compensation is really the overall goal, improving employee compensation in terms of salaries and benefits. The competition for the best people, as many of you know, in order for us to compete and move forward (the state's new investments in research buildings and our striving to move ASU up in the national rankings) is really fierce these days in academia. We also want to make sure we retain the most productive employees that we have. These employees can always be easily recruited due to currently low compensation for our hire packages compared to our aspiring peer institutions. Last semester at the ABOR meeting, I did mention it in one of my reports, how we fare related to compensation, and we don't fare very well, especially when you look at salaries plus benefits. One of the important components of compensation is health care insurance and access to quality health care. This is probably on all your minds. As you know, Doug Johnson is the chair of our ad hoc committee on Health Insurance, and he is closely working with the DOA now, thanks to the help of the administration, and they are looking at the whole issue of the state process and systems planning for health insurance. If any of you are interested, I think Doug is always available for a lengthy discussion on this. I wanted to follow up on this because another important component to this is the availability of different types of benefits in order to compete at a national level for the best employees. I want to be a little specific in my comments today because you may have questions, and we will have ongoing discussions on this during this semester. For example, I agree with President Likins at the UofA when he points out that the lack of domestic partner benefits puts Arizona universities at a competitive disadvantage. In the height of competitive PAC-10, six of the ten universities offer domestic partner benefits. Recently, retired Chancellor Adkinson made a case to the USC Regents in 1997 by noting that the UC system needed to be in step with the national trend in private and public universities for its offering domestic partner benefits—(aside from the availability of these benefits at Stanford, MIT, Yale, Harvard, University of Michigan and SUNY Buffalo). Here we are now, seven years later and the UC's and other public universities around the country offer these benefits. I believe that Arizona universities should move toward securing them as well as continuing to improve the overall employee compensation packages. Failure to do so will only help squander the cycle of new and continuing investments being made to make ASU nationally competitive. This is my report and my remarks and I will open the floor for question. No questions followed.

B. University President's Report (Michael Crow).

What I thought I would do today is not offer any type of policy statement, but give brief updates with hopefully enough time remaining to take questions or comments or concerns that you may have. First, on what we have called Campaign '05 is the effort to substantially improve investment patterns for the state of Arizona. We are making steady progress. We secured the following commitment from the Governor; $23 million dollar increase to the base budget of the University as a part of moving our effort forward, as well as a commitment for full growth funding in years beyond 2005. We had to obviously work this particular proposal through the legislature, which we are in the process of doing
still, and I think more fundamental than the numbers, and everyone should make note of this, is the recognition that we have been able to convince the government of this state that the universities are strategic assets, so that in spite of the fact that there are significant fiscal stresses in the state government and their funding model, unlike our sister institutions in California, in Texas, in Utah, in Oregon, in Washington, in Colorado, we are not suffering any additional budget cuts but actually budget enhancements. Further, we have secured a commitment, yet to be fully realized but a commitment for funding at investment levels, which allows us to deal with enrollment growth going forward.

Secondly, this week we will be launching a series of 30 or so prototype proposals, which will be precursors to our private sector development campaign. We will get underway on a more full fledged basis beginning July 1, 2005. Between now and then, these 30 prototype proposals will be used to help us learn how to write competitive proposals for private sector investment, private donor investment, and foundation investment in the university. Some of you may be party in some of the proposals. Some of them are school level proposals, some of them are center or institute level proposals and they are intended to give us learning experience as we move forward, and to be representative of the fact that when the development campaign does get fully underway in 2005 it will be a campaign driven by ideas. It will not be specifically to request more money so we that can do what we are already doing. The campaign will actually be driven by ideas coming from the faculty and the staff. These are learning processes that we are going through as well. The hope is that we will be able to secure support for half or more of these projects, as a part of the campaign. The total being asked for all these projects is in the hundreds of billions of dollars if you total them all up. So, we are looking to get some experience under our belts.

I am happy to report that the research enterprise of the university has heated up. Proposals in the last 12 months are up by over 100% and funding to the university from its research enterprise is up by over 40 percent in that same time frame. So, that is our growth rate at the moment. That is not a sustainable growth rate over a long period of time but it is representative of a dramatic and enhanced commitment by the faculty and the staff and graduate students working with them to enhance their proposal preparation and competitiveness and then forwarding those proposals to funding agencies for either research activities, training activities, or teaching activities. The Provost will be bringing you up to speed on one of these items in particular, because we have also cracked another threshold just within the last few days in the university, and that is in competing at the highest possible level for the largest grants that the university has ever been rewarded in the past. We are making substantial progress on that front also.

On tuition increase, I have recommended to the Regents a 9.5 percent increase in undergraduate in-state tuition. I have recommended to the Regents an increase for out-of-state tuition including graduate student tuition. We have also taken recommendations from the deans for course and program fee adjustments, and we have made recommendations to establish a health fee within the university and the Provost will be reporting on what we will do if that health fee is approved and we do believe that it will be approved. It turns out, as I have said before to this group, that in the past we have been using state appropriated resources to support functions, which could more easily be justified if they were supported through student fees. We are going to be reprogramming some of those dollars to areas of critical importance. It is worth noting that we will see over the period between July 1, 2002 and the period July 1, 2005, a dramatic increase in university revenues from all sources; tuition, private giving, research, state investment, all these resources coming together, which means that as we move to a new budget model within the university, which your deans are working on with the Provost and the
Executive Vice President for Administration and Finance, we will begin to see those resources having a dramatic and positive effect on the university overall in terms of resource availability, at both the department level and the faculty level. That will take time to implement, but that is the direction that we are going and it is through those decisions that we have been making that we were able to offer the merit based salary adjustments that we have on the table for this year. Many of our sister institutions, in fact all in this region were unable to do that. We believe that we had the resources in place and the trajectory for additional resources in place to be able to provide merit raises.

Overall I have a very good feeling about where we are headed at this particular point at the beginning of this semester. I will make one comment on the domestic partners benefit issue that Tony brought up. As an administration we support that and as a president I support that. We are fighting for that and what we are looking for is the legal means to implement such a benefit package. Right now we lack the legal means and we are attempting to secure the legal means to implement it. Lacking that, we will see what else we can do but we are trying that route first. It is on our agenda and we are advancing.

That concludes my announcements, is there time for questions?

Senator Blanchard: Mr. President, you mentioned a dramatic increase in funding, yet ASU lags NAU and the UofA in terms funding per pupil. When will we get our building renewal money that has fallen in arrears for at least a couple of decades?

President Crow: I always like being given problems that haven't been solved for 20 years! The agreement that we have with the Governor, which is just one of the forces on the chess board, is full funding of our traditional enrollment growth model. It turns out if you look back at the last 15 years; we have received roughly 50 percent of what that model should have provided in terms of investments. We were funded at the 50th percentile. Those things are on the table and we are advancing that model--it has some serious flaws--it definitely has political flaws if you are the only university that is growing dramatically and the others are not because it doesn't really quite work for them. So, we are in the process of modifying that model but it is on the table. To your other question about equity and funding for students--of course, we have taken more students without subsequent funding than the other universities, which has driven our available dollars per student down dramatically. In fact, we are below the University of Arizona's funding per student by 25%. That is an issue of keen importance on our agenda. We are waiting for the political moment to advance that particular issue as a second issue in terms of our funding. That is responsible for an under funding of the university, North of 100 million dollars. If you show up at the legislature, however, and say, can I please have my hundred million dollars, it doesn't work that way. So, we will address the issue of investment by the state equity as soon as we believe that the time is right. It will be driven by the strength of the Arizona economy, which if you are tracking it very closely is now running at a red hot positive level--it is unbelievable the numbers in the last three or four months.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: Can you, in terms of this dramatic projected increase, talk a little bit about the principles you had in mind for distributing it across the university--you mentioned departmental level and faculty level, what kinds of principles do you have in mind, or are you forging, to make that distribution?

President Crow: There are some principles on the table, and it goes to the dean's level and the dean's interaction with the Provost--obviously, we are looking to remedy the issue associated with the student and faculty ratio, as resources become available. We are looking to make investments in programs,
groups, departments' initiatives that help pull the university forward in critical areas. I would say that it is a combination of stabilizing and expanding our enterprise to deal with growth and quality while at the same time making investments in initiatives. Those are the two principles. Milt, do you want to add anything? Those are the two principles driving me, which is basically what is in our budget.

**Provost Glick:** The other thing in the model is to distribute tuition according to those that earn it—giving more ability to deans as owners of their own fate, and then to use that money that we have centrally to invest in critical areas that either enhance our research capacity, enhance our ability to make key community connected investments, and service students better.

**President Crow:** So, one of the things driving us is the notion of making the deans the responsible proof, in a sense, decentralizing responsibility and authority away from the central administration to the school level, giving the deans and senates mechanisms to advance their own enterprise, giving them ways to generate the revenues to be able to do that. The process that we are in right now, which is a complicated one, is called "responsibility centered management." We are in the early stages of implementing that kind of process, and having additional revenues in our system allows us to be able to do that in something other than just an academic exercise mode. One of the principles is decentralization of authority to the school level, because I am a strong believer that the schools should be driving their agendas forward. The university should be working to find ways to knit the schools together and to leverage the schools, but the schools should be driving their agendas in full.

**Senator Lattouf:** I wanted to know if you have an idea of when we can expect a response back from you on the Design Team recommendations.

**President Crow:** Soon but I do not know exactly when. It's heavy on my mind right now, it is in my thinking, it is on a list of many things that I am trying to worry about at the same time, but it is a very high priority. Certainly, that will be before the end of the semester, hopefully long enough before the end of the semester so that people can give reactions, hopefully within the next few weeks. That is where I am. I have been through them several times, I have many thoughts and ideas and what I will say is that this is intended to be a constructive, positive process. We are not going through the exercise that the University of Arizona has gone through, they called it a program of focused excellence where you weed; we are not trying to weed, we are trying to plant. The planting, nurturing and feeding processes are what we are trying to figure out is how can we best nurture and feed programs to become successful, because in my conceptualization of the university is many schools spread out across the university and many programs.

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

First, I am very pleased to announce that Maria Allison has agreed to take on the role of Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. I think that Maria in her six months as interim dean of the Graduate School has done an amazing job of focusing, making it more of a facilitating organization and turning back to the departments the responsibility for decision making. She has built in quality assurance so that the Graduate School becomes part of the solution, not a part of the problem. You will notice her position has a slightly different title, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, and the purpose of that was two fold 1) to emphasize that graduate education is a high priority of this university and therefore has a special role in the Provost Office and 2) to recognize that in the decision that was made many years ago, to put academic program review and accreditation functions in the office of the Graduate Dean is for in fact for program review at all levels, not just graduate programs. The dual
title reflects that this is larger than just the graduate school—and indeed, we have been working
together, Maria’s office and mine, putting in the meaning, the significance, and the standardization of academic program review, at the same time reducing the amount of effort that goes into preparing it. The idea is to have a standard database, which we will maintain centrally that we will give to the departments and then ask the departments to focus on the narrative part (what they want to be, what they think they are, and who they compare themselves with). So, I think you will find it a much more streamlined meaningful process.

In response to a question that was asked—On December 30, 2003 we did provide President Crow from my office our recommendations on the Design Team recommendations. We have had had several conversations and will continue to. You should know that the President is not just looking at the recommendations of the Design Team and the recommendations of our office, but rather in a much larger context of how do we organize the University for success. I shared my recommendations with the Senate leadership last week at the Executive Committee and with the deans on Thursday. You could contact Darby to get that information (Provost Glick later requested that it be sent to all the senators electronically). The reason that we have not sent them out to the whole university community is that they are still incomplete. They are not final decisions; they are my recommendations as Provost to President Crow. There have been so many pieces of paper already that we want to minimize that number somewhat.

The third thing I want to talk about today is the health fee that the students will be paying this year. If the Board of Regents approves it, it will relieve the university of a burden of about 2.5 million dollars, but in addition it would generate a couple million dollars beyond that. The surplus beyond that would be reinvested in student services, particular in student health services; broaden the capacity of student health facilities for students and to reduce their copays. Basically it will encourage students to use the student health service when they need it, to provide a healthier climate for all students. The resources that will be freed up will be directly reinvested into improving student success in undergraduate education. Two of the things we are going to do with it—right now we are looking at introductory math with sections as high as 50—think about who takes introductory Math and now you are going to put them in a class of 15 to learn math skills. We have also been teaching English classes that run between 25 and 28 students, English Composition, and our goal will be to try to reduce the size of introductory Math and English classes below 20 in the fall term. We not quite there yet, but that is the single largest thing we are working on. Beyond that we will invest in advising and a University College, as we flesh that out.

Next, I want to talk about the issue of how we achieve. We know that we cannot no matter how hard our faculty work, ramp up our external funding on just single investigator grants alone. It requires the kind of large grants that we have worked for decades to get. 1) Our efforts to win the next $325 million Mars flight, which will be the first flight to be competed on by a University. We had competition from all the name brand schools—Harvard, Cornell and Princeton—we finally ended up with two in the final pass, UofA and us. They made an error! They gave it to the UofA (laughter here) but the fact is that to be coming out of all the universities in the country as well as private sector competitors—we ended up learning a lot about how to work with private industry and we learned about what kind of presentation you are required to make to get grants of that size. We learned a lot of that knowledge from some of our partners like ATL and Lockheed. We believe we did everything right, we just did not win. We know that we will be better able to compete next time around.
The second grant I want to talk about is one that the Army put out, an RFP about 4 months ago to create a Center in Flexible Display Technology. The Army is interested in them because you can wind them around your arm, and you will be able to have real time maps beamed to you from a satellite, real time directions, and the kinds of things that in this modern technological warfare become critical. This whole issue of flexible display, thin panel displays, is a real test beyond that particular application of whether this country can complete with the global technology and economy that we used to think we owned. We own less and less of it today and it is no longer just that they are doing the manufacturing overseas, they are also making breakthroughs overseas. This RFP was highly competed; there were only four months to put it together. It came down to four competitors, Princeton, Cornell, UT Dallas, and ASU, so, we made it that far--Princeton and Cornell were cut and it is now at two, UT Dallas and ASU. Cornell has joined our effort and Princeton has joined UT Dallas. This is a $41 million grant, it would be the largest federal grant in this University's history, and tomorrow morning we will know if we are in that grant. So, stay tuned. We are very optimistic that we put together a competitive package.

I want to talk about what it takes to put a package together in three months, because every time we go into these large multi-investigator, multi-enterprise grant competitions, we have to learn from them because we are younger at doing this process. 1) We had a group of faculty here that could compete with the best in the world, in the area of display technology and semiconductor technology, and flexible display. 2) When Motorola closed down its flat panel research facility, only about three years after they finished building it in our research park we took the very best people in that facility under the leadership of Dr. Zenhausern and hired them. That did several things 1) It gave us a unique capacity--people that were trained in making their own way as industrial scientists who understood the business end of things--Executives that were really top end scientists--we kept that group here in the valley instead of them going to San Diego or wherever they might have gone. We now have a lead person scientifically, in Dr. Zenhausern and his group. 3) Jon Fink assigned, virtually full-time to the project, Greg Raupp from his office to be the leader and principal investigator. He then brought the forces to bear and helped organize 30, 40, 50, 60 faculty across campus. We put together 14 industrial partners in three months, and Greg Raupp and Dr. Zenhausern get the credit for doing that. 5) One of the unique goals of this RFP that was issued is that they wanted to be able to develop it rapidly, and put it into production. When Motorola closed its flat panel facility, it is a world class facility, with 50,000 square feet of the highest quality clean room space and another 100,000 square feet of other space in the Research Park; we negotiated an option, taking a six month option on that facility. If this effort is funded, we will purchase that facility in full. If it is not funded, we won't even though we would very much like to own the facility, we have people that could use it, but we cannot do a cash flow business plan that works, but we will be able to, if we win this grant. We put skin in the game; we took some capital and took an option which expires in another month. If we get this grant, it is bigger than the $41 million, because it has got a $50 million renewal attached to it and we believe it will become a national center, because there are numerous sectors of the economy and of the government that are very interested in it. Making this all possible, we have faculty here that are capable, we hired a leader-scientist, we assigned a top engineering scientist from a research office, we took an option on the building and we went out and got 14 partners. If this works, we win and this will be a huge statement that we can compete with grants of that magnitude. Whether we win or lose we will take the lessons we learned and apply them to the next one.

Finally, one other grant related activity--It will be announced within the next day or two that we received two USDA grants for $300,000 apiece. That is at an obviously different price point than $40 million, but what is significant about this is that USAID money almost overwhelmingly goes to land
grant universities because of the close ties between USAID and USDA. We have not had a record of being able to compete for USAID grants. We competed in two areas, Engineering, which was done in partnership with Tec de Monterrey (Mexico), and Architecture done in partnership with Instituto Tecnológico de Sonora-ITSON (Mexico). In both cases, we used Jorge de la Santos, who is now director of ASU Office of Pan American Initiatives, to help us compete in that arena. The key is in the Architecture grant, this is an area where there are not a lot of faculty who have histories in the grant activity because they have not have not had opportunities to do so. So, one of our goals is to help build opportunities for talented people who by their discipline have not had the opportunity in the past, obviously that is less true of the Engineering group where they are expected to compete and have the resources to compete. Mr. President that concludes my report, I will be happy to take questions.

Senate President-elect Kerr: What ever happened with Homeland Security? There was a lot of buzz about that and many of us attended a meeting and then it disappeared.

Provost Glick: The President could comment better on that as he is closer to the issue.

President Crow: Nothing disappears! It turns out that Homeland Security in Washington is in a chaotic state at the moment and they are not able to advance with all of their initiatives. This learning process that the Provost talks about in terms of learning to engage on these large scale grants competitions, there is a campaign underway to establish a new national laboratory related to Homeland Security and we are trying to get our finger in that. We also have another project which we have not announced yet but we will shortly, which will be the largest bio-terrorism project funded yet in the country that we are likely to be the winner of. So, we are engaged at the project level while we are waiting for them to get organized.

Provost Glick: The one very large grant that has been made went to UC. The one that looked like it was earmarked for Texas actually went to the University of California. UC has a long history, for 50 years they have run the Los Alamos, Livermore, and Berkeley facilities and we are doing catch up work, but each of these major efforts we make, if we don't learn from them then we haven't maximized our future potential. I think that we are learning. It is not that we have had no efforts and that we have not had good people, it is that going after grants of this magnitude requires a whole different set of parameters, political judgments than we as faculty were trained to do. We know how to write a grant but this is a very different game piece, large center grants for 40, 50 and 100 million dollars. A place we have been very effective, of course, has been in the planetary science area where in fact we have competed successfully for a number of years. Actually I think we have the best track record in the country when it comes to the Mars Mission. I hope too that we all have taken pride in the emails we have gotten from our colleagues at other places in the country saying, I have been reading about what the Rovers have been doing. Not only do we have the Rovers, we have the single key instrument on those rovers that will find out if there was water historically on Mars! But in addition to that, the second landing sight was identified by Phil Christiansen and from everything that we hear it is a dynamite site. It is much better than we could have ever imagined to try and answer the question if there was water on Mars--and if there was water on Mars what was its history and was it the kind of thing that could have supported life, or not. I have now told you slightly more than I know (laughter here).

Senator Haynes: Do you see this model as being ubiquitous and applicable to all parts of the university, or do you see that as being particularly more appropriate in the technology areas?
Provost Glick: While I think the dollars may be less in the Humanities and other areas, the opportunities are very real. In fact, I think that if you look at other funding sources, those sources may be very different because they are more likely to not be federal grants. The exciting thing about the Architecture initiative is that it is not a technology initiative, it is a design initiative. I think we have to find new areas of application and we have to do a better job (we as both the faculty and the administration) of identifying sources that we can use to seek funding for these other academic areas. As you may have read, we have just created the Center for Science, Policy, and Outcomes, which has to go well beyond the science areas because it really deals with policy issues. It deals with how we develop an intelligent way to understand the implications of new science and new technology, and to build new policies that maximize the potential for good. Having said that, I think the dollars are bigger in the sciences and technology areas, but the costs are also bigger, therefore we have to find ways to translate the same techniques into the entire university, certainly in the area of education there are going to be more and more dollars available for education, and it is going to be more and more competitive as to how we get that money. From what we hear from all parts of the broad spectrum, including the political spectrum--K-12 education has got to get better. I am not one that believes that the criticisms leveled at education are all valid, but I am one that thinks it should get better nonetheless, and there is going to be investment, there will be investment from the private sector, from the feds, and I believe the techniques will transfer. Are there other questions? If not, then thank you.

3.D President-Elect's Report (Barbara Kerr).

Because it is close to Valentines Day, I thought I might remind you of the great statement by Oscar Wilde, a very tender statement --"Whenever a friend or colleague of mine has a great achievement, a little part of me dies." (laughter followed). I wanted to remind you that there are many opportunities for recognition for ourselves and our colleagues, and that too often we resist supporting our colleagues when they are recognized. I received a note from Milt a couple of weeks ago, saying that if I am not at the Regents Professor's reception, to come on over. I think that it is important that we support the recognition of our colleagues, and I want to mention first of all the Regents Professors. It is not too early to begin thinking about those colleagues that you want to support for next year, as well as really those people who have been named as Regents Professors this year. Send them a Valentine for Heaven's sakes! Nominations are open right now for centennial professors and I think it is important as faculty that we all make sure that there are plenty of nominations, and that the people who receive those get support from their colleagues. Parent's professors, as you know, is another opportunity coming up. Finally, this is the week in which the Wakonse fellow nominations are being accepted. The Wakonse fellowship is an excellent way not just to recognize good teaching that is going on but to also to support it. So, when you get those emails encouraging you to do nominations, do so and provide that recognition. A lot of support is available out there--so when our younger colleagues say, I don't know how to write a grant, I don't know what to do, I want to be able to get one going but I don't know how to do it--the office of Research and Sponsored Programs is providing excellent research, support for people who are learning how to write a grant. Not just how to write it but also how to do the budget. They have wonderful work shops, even if you have a lot of experience already, please attend one of their programs or their upcoming research symposiums. I think that you will find that you may be surprised by what you did not know that later turns out to be very useful. The Center of Learning and Teaching Excellence is providing an excellent spring line of programs. They are not just there to help you improve classroom teaching but to help you with observation in the classroom, if you are having particular problems with a particular student or with a particular format. They are there to help you as well when it comes time to learn how to use teaching technology. For some of you this is just a reminder, but it has been impressed on my mind ever since getting that message from Milt. Let's
support our colleagues and let's be proud of what our colleagues are doing, and not let Oscar Wilde's statement become a truism on this campus. Thanks.

3.E  USG President's Report (Brandon Goad).

Howard Taylor and Sally Ramage are here today, and will speak about the expansion of the SRC and the MU. I want to speak to you about the student led referendum, which will take place on February 18 and 19. I want to emphasize that this is a student led initiative. The students brought it to President Crow directly--a plan to expand the Student Recreation Center and the Memorial Union. We asked the President to allow us to impose a self-tax done by a student vote, and luckily he said that this idea had some merit. He then assigned Vice President for Student Affairs, Juan Gonzalez to help us. That was nine months ago, so for the last nine months we have been working hand in hand with senior administration on a proposal for facility expansion and student fee implementation, but the students brought this to the administration, it was not the other way around. The community aspect of this initiative is very important as well. I feel that right now we have students who are graduating from ASU without a feeling of connection to ASU. This is evidenced by the fact that we have a low number of students who attend the sporting events, who come back for homecoming activities, and who participate in alumni donations. It is very low right now and we need to improve that. I would like to say that the number one group right now, connecting people to the campus are the Greek organizations. The students come to ASU, they get involved and they become connected to the campus, and later they tend to give back as alumni--which is something that right now doesn't occur for the average group of students on campus. If a student feels connected as an undergraduate, as I was saying, I believe that when they graduate they will come back and give back and show their support for ASU. The students deserve a great college experience and a great campus community as part of this college experience, and that is why we want to improve the SRC and the Memorial Union. What will take place in the SRC and the Memorial Union will lead to greater success inside the classroom as well, and this is a proven fact--an expanded SRC and MU will lead to a greater sense of community by allowing the students to socialize together and to recreate together. This is our student vision for the institution, the students brought this idea to the administration, and now I will ask our two administrators to speak briefly about the projects, and the specifics of the expansions.

Sally Ramage: First let me say that there is a student organization that has worked very hard on helping bring the information to the students and that organization is the Get Out the Vote Committee. The students who are members of that committee are doing what they should be doing and that is attending class today, which is why Howard and I have come in their place. We have reduced the student's power point presentation that they developed because we did not want to take too much of your time this afternoon. I can also provide you with a little bit of background, as Brandon said, this is a student led initiative that was based upon not only the group of students this year, but information which has been collected over a number of years on use and demand of the SRC and the Memorial Union, financial viability of these programs and services, as well as information that was comparative from other schools within the PAC-10, Big 12 and Big 10. These initiatives were based upon a broad set of information.

Howard Taylor: Just so you know, we consolidated the power point and we are going to start in the middle of one that is being used to go out and work with the students. One of the questions that were asked is what is going to happen if there is a "NO" vote, and basically if there is a no vote, the fee is going to remain the same, $25 per semester, which is the SRC fee currently and that was voted in during 1985 when the proposal was made to build the very first SRC. There will not be improvements.
to the SRC and MU and there will be a deterioration in the quality of services as prices and expenses go up inevitably. It is going to be difficult to for us to maintain, just like I was hearing the question about facilities renewal funding--our facilities because they are wearing down and that is going to be a challenge without the change and the expansion and the new fees. If the vote is "YES," the fees are going to be phased in over 4 years. Starting next year, the fee would go up $25, the following year it would be $75, then $100, then $155. That is where it would max out, and the projects would both be complete at that stage.

**Sally Ramage:** Currently the Memorial Union does not receive any funding from student fees. The Memorial Union is funded by all the collections from the University tuition allocation as well as revenue generating resources within the Memorial Union itself. If the fee passes and we receive $25, some of the improvements that we would see immediately are added funding for student programming and equipment funds. We have over 500 student organizations, we have many students on campus, so there is a great deal of demand for programs and support of their co-curricular learning experiences. We would enhance technology and wireless within the Memorial Union. We would continue to renovate food services; we have been renovating about every three years on average. We would expand our building hours to try to create a place for students so they can stay on campus and not have to go off campus for activities. Then we would continue to purchase new furnishings and equipment to support the meetings and events for students and the campus community.

**Howard Taylor:** By next fall, the SRC would replace strength and cardio equipment that is outdated. We actually have pieces of equipment that are in there that were purchased in 1989. We would add 20 treadmills and support structure to handle that new equipment. One of our problems right now is that we don't have enough electricity to handle anymore treadmills. We blow the circuits, so we would have to add support structure to be able to expand that capability. We would expand our building hours to midnight on weeknights and Sunday. We would upgrade the outdoor facilities. Right now we have two fields that we run the entire intramural program on and we have one field for our sport clubs. That is what we are using to serve the entire program, and it is way undersized for what we are trying to do with students. Indoors we would add a squash court, refurbish martial arts, replace the lounge furniture, add privacy showers, and add team benches, bleachers and other things to support the programs that are going on within the facility.

**Sally Ramage:** Back to the MU again, in the second year when we will be receiving an additional $25, we would begin starting on the actual design plans for an expansion and redevelopment of Memorial Union. We are not just talking about renovating but redevelopment. However, in the interim we are still going to apply directly some student funds to help improve the union so that students will see this progressively over the next few years. We would continue to renovate and upgrade interior and exterior food service venues, renovate our meeting rooms and add furniture and furnishings, and upgrade technology in the meeting rooms. In the lower level lounge, which is where many of our students like to hang out and experience a relaxed environment; it sorely needs improvement. Then we would continue to upgrade our restrooms so that they meet ADA requirements and expand programs, so students can find more things to do on campus on weekends and late nights.

**Howard Taylor:** The SRC improvements will continue with upgrading the outdoor facilities, trying to add some sand and volleyball courts and outdoor basketball; completing the SRC improvements within the existing facility, we would add computer kiosks to allow more access to online signup for programs, and we would have a leisure pool developed at the satellite facility. We are still looking at where that might be, I think the master planners are working on that. One of the locations they are
considering is on north campus where it would be more accessible to commuters for parking in lot 59 and especially since that is where all the expanded parking is taking place. For the SRC, this gives you an example of the expansion, it would go out to the East on top the tennis courts, expand the weight and fitness area, an extension for soccer and possibly inline hockey, and other activities along the center, a two court gym, indoor track, multipurpose rooms, it will be fairly significant expansion. The new facility would have a two court gym, indoor track, an outdoor leisure pool, lounge, multipurpose rooms, locker rooms, and storage. One of the things we have now is that a lot of students are asking us for space, in fact there are actually classes that ask us for space to use for their programs, and we have to turn them away because we have a very limited amount of space and it fills up quickly.

**Sally Ramage:** Some of you may be aware that some years ago there was a projected expansion and renovation of the Memorial Union planned, and that expansion was going to the East. There was a facility that was demolished in order to accommodate it. That project was never funded successfully and the space is still there. The recommendation is that we utilize that space for an expansion of the Memorial Union and the redevelopment of the current facility. Some things in the expansion of the MU are new student lounges and a new ballroom. Our current ballroom is 9,000 square feet and we cannot accommodate any of the programs that this large campus needs--we need to be able to seat 1,000 individuals for events and programs, and we are not able to do that now. Those events have to go off campus. We would want to enlarge the ballroom to add more meeting rooms--we turn away so many people and primarily we turn away students because they are the ones who are the last to be able to get access to the rooms. The students would like to have a multipurpose theatre, classroom, movie theatre, and they are interested in having campus media in the Memorial Union. If there cannot be a full fledged campus media, at least some kind of experience where maybe the radio or tv station could be there. We have shown a 298% increase in the computer lab usage in the MU this year alone, so the demand is there.

**Howard Taylor:** For students this would mean enhanced campus community and campus life, improved facilities for the MU and the SRC, a new look to campus, just a greater opportunity for students to get involved in both the facilities and the programs. Right now a lot of students leave because there is no access and it is crowded. We think when they leave campus that hurts everyone. Also the MU would have better capacity, more retail, better access, which would alleviate the crowded conditions. The operation of the building is an important issue. Right now the SRC has a Board of Governors--it works with me on issues relating to the SRC, the MU does not, this plan would have an option for governance built in so that students would have a voice in what is going on in both facilities and we think that is in the best interest of students and will help them have a say in the operation of the facilities.

**Sally Ramage:** One other point, the SRC and MU are significant student employers. We together probably employ nearly 500 students annually. We see this as more than just a job for students, we see it as a way of developing skills that are translatable in their future careers. We want to continue to support students so that they can have a successful undergraduate experience. Thank you. Are there any questions?

**Senator Blumenfeld-Jones:** What will happen to the faculty fees for the SRC?

**Howard Taylor:** Right now we don't have any established fees. That would have to be determined just like it was when the original SRC was built. The board of governors would look at that and establish a percentage. I can tell you what makes sense is right now if you look at the fee, the faculty
fee is double what the fee is right now for students, and I don’t think that would be probably out of line considering where the student fees would go, but we would use the board of governors which has faculty, staff, students on it to establish that fee.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: Some of us use the MU for programs—is the cost of that going to go up substantially with these changes? Groups are free at the moment and all the technology is free at the moment.

Sally Ramage: Once again, as Howard said, as long as there is a board of governors that would be overseeing the utilization of the facility, those issues would need to be reviewed by them, who would be faculty, students and staff, in order to make the best case for sound financial liability on that. We have not gone that far yet because that would be the job of the board of governors to make those decisions. As you know, at comparative institutions, there are different ways in which they handle fee assignments.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: I would like to see those fees stay free.

Senator Guleserian: Just a point of curiosity, are the new private showers for the women only?

Howard Taylor: That is a good question and for those of you who are familiar with the SRC, you know that most of our showers are open showers no individual privacy; it would be my goal to get some more privacy in both the men's and the women's shower areas. We are definitely going to do it with the women's side, and we will try and do it—as most new facilities are coming in with that feature, which makes good sense and also in our facility, we plan to add what they would call a family type locker room setting, where if someone has a special need, or if there is someone who brings a child into the facility—for example, a women coming in with their small son who can't go to the men's locker room but there is a concern with bringing him into the women's area. Some of those things would eventually be moved in. As far as the early deliverables, it would probably just be the women's to start off with, but that is now also moved to another phase of the plan, where we will try to make access for more privacy happen.

Sally Ramage: Well, we don't have any showers in the MU, but we do have significant demand for family space in the Memorial Union.

Senator Crozier: I just wanted to thank you for bringing this issue up, the issue of community. I think it is very important for our campus, in fact one of my next door neighbors recently told me that she did not want her son to come to Arizona State University because she wouldn't feel that he would have a sense of community and belonging. As the campus continues to grow to the projections of 70,000 people, we have to really pay attention to this. I know that the Memorial Union used to have a theatre but the theatre is now the credit union. It used to have a nice gallery where there was art on the walls and people could reflect, and it had a grand piano where students could go in and play. It is now an Einstein's Bagel shop. I think it is very important that we try and put some of those kind of spaces back in. I know that you are under pressure to provide food services but we have to watch that the student union doesn't just become a mini mall for people to buy their lunch. It has to be more than that. I commend you for bringing this to us.

Sally Ramage: Please remember though that this gives us the flexibility that alternative sources of revenue can provide.
Howard Taylor: One other thing that I will mention that has us concerned is the potential growth of
the campus. Our SRC students live on campus, it is about 80% of those living in the halls and there is
talk that we will be expanding that by 3,000 to 5,000 students. Honestly, right now, when those
students come aboard it is going to be a real issue and there is not going to be spaces for them, if we
don't do something about it.

A Guest: Some of us get surprised by people who come by and say I want to pay more! I want to
know what happened in the student referendum process, and what other mechanisms exist to get
funding other than just having the students pay more fees? We are still a public university. What
efforts have we made to seek and obtain other types of funding, and how can we guarantee the Senate
and the students who wanted this once it passes that we will get other funding sources?

Sally Ramage: There are a couple of responses to your questions: 1) I think the student vote should
give a fairly clear indication as to whether or not students will support the referendum and that will
take place on February 18 and 19. 2) About alternative sources of funding, at this point at least in the
Memorial Union we are dependent upon, as I have said previously, local collections, university tuition,
and the distribution of student fees. Absent having student fees increased, we would probably have to
turn more to revenue generating plans, for example, food service facilities and banks in the Memorial
Union in order to generate the revenues to sustain the space and the programs. We would have to
probably charge people more to use that space. At least that would be the case for the Memorial
Union. Fund raising and gift dollars are typically raised, and we could look at that situation, to award
scholarships and provide student educational programs.

Howard Taylor: It is the same for the SRC. We have a challenge with just trying to make specs on
revenue right now. I hear from a lot of faculty and staff who can only work out and use the facilities in
the evenings, that it is too crowded, they don't like waiting, but our ability to go out and sell more
memberships is not the solution. We don't even promote them because it is such a crowded situation in
the evenings. Our ability with the size facility that we have now, and we have to serve students first,
limits that outreach. I think we are doing the same thing, fund raising and so forth, which has typically
been for academics and athletics. If there are no more questions, thank you.

3.F Past Senate President's Report (George Watson).

It would just not seem like an Academic Senate meeting for the past couple of years if I did not talk
about plus minus grades! (laughter here) The plus minus grades implementation group has finished its
work and you will be getting at the department level, in a single sheet that explains plus minus grades,
what we recommend. Then Tony and I will put together something as well that encourages
departments to have discussions this spring about the implementation of plus minus grades coming in
the fall, so that we don't wait and have those discussions in the fall when it really will be too late. That
is something that you can look forward to receiving, and then hopefully you will begin having those
discussions in your departments.

Senate President Garcia: ASU West Academic Senate President, Fran Bernat could not be here
today. Ernest Hirata from East Assembly cannot be here all semester because of a class conflict.
As we have a full agenda to cover, I want to reorder the agenda and allow Michael Mayer to give his
report for the Curriculum and Academic Programs first.
4. Unfinished Business.

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

4.A.1 Senate Motion #8 Fall Session 2003 (Second Reading) was read by Senator Mayer into the minutes: Changes to a Department, Degree Program, and an Undergraduate Certificate: "The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the name change of a department, degree program, and undergraduate certificate from African American Studies to African and African American Studies." Rationale: Recognizing an age of globalization and the increasing importance of Africa and the Diaspora, the African American Studies program joins a growing number of programs by embracing studies of Africa, Caribbean, Latin America, and a general world vision for understanding national and regional issues affecting Blacks in the African Diaspora. Thus, a new program name reflecting this perspective is needed. The proposed name facilitates students viewing the study of African Americans within a global rather than a narrow regional context and thereby deepening the students’ awareness of the complexity of African people in the Diaspora. The names of the program and a corresponding minor will also be changed and do not require Academic Senate approval (which is my information item 1 today).

My guests today are here to answer any questions on this motion; Professors Patricia Neff and Leanor Johnson. Are there questions for them?

Senate President Garcia: This is a second reading and if there no questions, the floor is open for discussion. Hearing no further discussion, we will proceed to take a voice vote. All in favor say aye, all opposed? Senate Motion #8 passes.

4.A.2 Senate Motion #9 Fall Session 2003 (Second Reading) was read by Senator Mayer into the minutes: Request from the Herberger College of Fine Arts for the Establishment of a Graduate Certificate -- Public Art: "The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the Herberger College of Fine Arts for the establishment of a Graduate Certificate in Public Art." Rationale: With the proliferation of government sponsored percent for art programs across the nation, students are seeking courses and programs that will prepare them for managing public art collections and/or apply as artists for public art commissions. Currently, there is no certificate or degree program within the state of Arizona at either the community college or university level that addresses concerns particular to the field of public art.

I have invited Dianne Cripe from the Herberger College to answer questions today. Do we have any questions of her?

Senator Guleserian: I would just like a clarification, are we to understand that one means by "public art," art that is funded by a governmental agency?

Dianne Cripe: We have about 16 pieces of public art, primarily they are the outdoor sculpture collection. It also refers to new line positions that are funded by the percent for our ordinance, which is at this university, as well as at NAU and UofA. So there is a percent for our program used at ASU.

Senator Mayer: I think what you just said means that "x" percentage of the cost of a building needs to go for this program--is that correct?

Senator Siferd: Could that expression also mean publicly owned galleries? (Yes.)

Senator Mayer: Are there other questions?
Senator Siferd: What students would take this certificate?

Dianne Cripe: Primarily they will be from the School of Art and College of Architecture students, but it is not limited to those students. Primarily those are the students who go into the field of public art, but there are a number of other students who are for instance in environmental design or environmental studies who will eventually go into public art.

Senator Mayer: Are there other questions?

Senator President Garcia: The floor is open for discussion of Senate Motion #9. Hearing no further discussion, I will move to a voice vote. All in favor please say aye, all opposed? Senate Motion #9 passes.

4.A.3 Senate Motion #10 Fall Session 2003 (Second Reading) was read by Senator Mayer into the minutes:
Request from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the Implementation of a New Degree Program -- MAS in GIS. "The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the implementation of a new degree program, MAS (Master’s of Advanced Study) in GIS (Geographic Information Systems)." Rationale: The GIS program is a program for which there is currently a workforce need in the state. GIS professionals earn substantial salaries and perform many valuable functions in both private industry and in public service. Geography has surveyed both its internship sites and a number of business and public sector sites in the area that make use of GIS expertise. It has found an overwhelming demand for many more well-trained professionals in this field of growing importance to the national economy and an avid interest in ASU’s establishing a professional master’s program that would produce well-trained professionals with expertise in GIS. The proposed degree will meet important educational needs of working professionals and recent graduates seeking to improve their career standing. This compact, one-year, non-thesis degree will foster advanced study in management and the use of technology in public and corporate environments.

I believe we have guests for this motion, please introduce yourself. (Robert Balling, Talbot Brooks, and Breandan O'Huallachain of Geography).

Senator Mayer: Are there any questions for them?

Senator Guleserian: How does this differ from an M.A.? In other words, why would we need a new type of masters called "Master of Advanced Studies?"

Senator Mayer: The question is how does this differ from an M.A., and why do we need an M.S.

Breandan O'Huallachain: This is a non-thesis degree program where we replace the traditional thesis option with hands on work experience. Students participating in this program will actually complete a summer long apprenticeship where they would be charged with specific projects in the field.

Senator Guleserian: Why is it called a masters degree? How long does a person study to get this degree?

Talbot Brooks: This is a one year degree program and the name was set forth by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. They are choosing this option for this naming convention as the first of what will be a series of professional degrees to distinguish them from the traditional Master of Arts and Master of Science degree.

Senator Guleserian: Do we have existing masters degrees of this general type that require just one year? Or is this a new animal?
Breandon O'hUallachain: Yes, it is pretty much a new animal.

Senate President Garcia: Nationally, are there any counterparts?

Talbot Brooks: Yes, there are several, and they were a part of the program proposal that we submitted.

Breandan O'Huallachain: Particularly at the University of California.

Senator Mayer: I can get a copy of the proposal and we can get more specific with the list of them if necessary.

Past President Watson: Did the committee discuss that particular aspect of the proposal?

Senator Mayer: As I recall, we saw it as being more intended to be an internal thing rather than being a research degree where someone would go and have a Ph.D. Therefore it seemed like this was intended to take non-traditional students that are already working in the field and bring them back for an intense experience that would assist them in career development, and as were demonstrated, there were a number of job opportunities that were available, I think in about the range of 50,000 to 90,000, if I recall correctly.

Talbot Brooks: Yes, and even upwards of that.

Senator Guleserian: One more question. Is there a prerequisite for getting this degree of having either a B.S. or B.A.? (Yes.)

Senator Mayer: Are there any other questions?

Senate President Garcia: Hearing no further questions, we will open the floor for discussion of Senate Motion #10. Hearing no further discussion, we will move to vote. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye, all opposed? Senate Motion #10 carries.

Now we will return to the report from Executive Committee.

4.B  Executive Committee (Tony Garcia).

4.B.1 Senate Motion #11 Fall Session 2003 (Second Reading) was read by Senate President Garcia into the minutes: Request from the Senate Executive Committee to approve the concept of a consent agenda for the Academic Senate: "The Senate agrees to introduce a consent agenda. Consent agenda items will be so noted on the regular Senate agenda. A Senator may remove items from the consent agenda at such time between when the meeting agenda is posted to when the Academic Senate President calls upon the Senate during a Senate meeting to identify any item that must be removed from the consent agenda. Items removed from the consent agenda will become part of the regular Senate agenda." Rationale: A consent agenda item is not deliberated or discussed on the floor. The consent agenda in its entirety is voted on by the Senate. The purpose of the consent agenda is to streamline Senate meetings with items that likely do not need further debate and discussion on the floor. It is expected that more time would become available for reporting, debating, and legislating during Senate meetings.

Senate Motion #11 is open for discussion.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: There is nothing in there about at what point you close people from removing things from the consent agenda, like a 24-hour period.

Parliamentarian Burstein: It says deliberately that you can remove items up until when it is discussed.
Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: Like at the meeting here? (Yes.)

Senate President Garcia: We discussed this last time on the first reading. We thought it was the best thing to do in terms of timing to leave it open right up until the last minute.

Senator Haynes: I think this is covered in the motion, but does it only take one senator to remove an item from the consent agenda?

Senate President Garcia: It says a senator. Was there another question?

Senator Gustavsson: Have you ever done a time study in the two and one half hour meetings that we have, how much time is actually spent talking about senate motions?

Senate President Garcia: We have not done a time study. Part of the impetus of this really stems from the time of the semester, there can be a whole flood of motions, last year for example, we had quite a number of certificates coming up all at once in a bunch. Another impetus to this was the idea that the UofA Faculty Senate has a consent agenda model along these lines, and they typically put their curriculum items in their consent agenda. We never did a time study though.

Senator Mulvihill: Should a senator want to have an item removed before the meeting, the day before, is that action anonymous?

Senate President Garcia: I think that all of the actions we do as senators during the floor are not anonymous. It never came up as to whether that would be anonymous away from the floor. Does anyone have any thoughts on this?

Parliamentarian Burstein: The question is why would we want it to be anonymous?

Senator Mulvihill: I don't know if I do, I just wanted to know if somebody wanted something removed then would it be at the Senate meeting or how would that be handled?

Parliamentarian Burstein: Our actions as senators are public. So that any action we take as senators is public and I don't think that we can be anonymous in that sense.

Senator Haynes: You must have a record anyway.

Senate President Garcia: Yes, that makes sense.

A Senator: Was the question more in the nature of do you have to tell us, because if you are sitting here and saying that, it is not anonymous.

Senate President Garcia: If it is not done during the meeting, obviously it would have been done by email.

Parliamentarian Burstein: It basically will be in the minutes. It won't be publicized here in the Senate, but it will be in the minutes so we have a record.

Senate President Garcia: There are two aspects, I think I addressed one--while it can be asked for ahead of time, it should be reflected in the minutes because it is by action of the Senate.

Senator Park-Fuller: I think there could be political ramifications of that, and are there or should there be--to removing something from the consent agenda?
Parliamentarian Burstein: There should not be any political ramifications. The whole idea of a consent agenda is that reasonable people would consent to it.

Senator Park-Fuller: But the agenda is set by a particular number of people, right? Isn't it set by the membership of the Executive Committee? (Yes.) So, there probably are political ramifications.

Parliamentarian Burstein: There is political ramifications in everything that we do as professors.

Senate President Garcia: I don't see it necessarily that way, maybe there could be ramifications in the sense of some kind of peer pressure of having people not to do that, because the worst thing that happens in removing something from the consent agenda is that it has to be read.

Maria Allison: Sometimes our guests that we invite to answer questions on the motions--will they still be invited if the item is on the consent agenda? If there is some chance that the item may be removed before the meeting, I presume they will still be invited as resources.

Senate President Garcia: As an Engineer so I always try to have a backup, so I would recommend always having people regardless if it is on the consent agenda.

Senator Siferd: I think that once an item is taken off the consent agenda, it does not mean that we don't consent to the item, it just means that we want to have it discussed for clarification.

Senate President Garcia: Exactly. There may be too many items there, and people did not get a chance to carefully look them over, so they can ask for an item to be removed from the consent agenda. It would be something like that.

A Senator: Who decides what is put on the consent agenda?

Senate President Garcia: By our bylaws, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate is charged with putting together the Senate Agenda, so we would adopt a similar path with a consent agenda.

Parliamentarian Burstein: It could be that at a particular meeting there is no consent agenda items, or maybe one or two items. It just permits us when we have a lot of similar proposals that we basically think are non-controversial to say vote for all of them at once rather than read them all separately and vote separately.

Senator Guleserian: At some point you will have to say, does anyone want anything removed from the consent agenda? Will you say it for each item, or the entire agenda?

Senate President Garcia: You would say it up front with the expectation that someone already has an item in their mind that they would like removed.

Senator Gulserian: So it is one request for the entire agenda?

Senate President Garcia: That is correct, that is the procedure. If there is no more questions, we will open the floor to discussion of Senate Motion #11. Hearing no further discussion, we will move to a vote. Please indicate agreement by saying Aye, opposed? Senate Motion #11 passes.

5. New Business.

5.A Executive Committee (Tony Garcia).

In the interest of time I am going to have no report.
5.B Committee on Committees (Tony Garcia for Ernest Hirata).

Ernie wrote me an email and said that he regrets that he could not make it, but he has a class conflict this spring. He wanted me to read the following: The Committee on Committees will begin, this week, matching the results of the Academic Preference Survey and the need for Senate offices and committees, and university boards, committees and councils.

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

As an information item, we have the Name Change of a Program and Name Change of a Minor, in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences - from African American Studies to African and African American Studies. (refer back to the last sentence in Senate Motion #8--item 4.A.1 in the minutes).

5.D Student Faculty Policy Committee (Craig Allen).

The Committee has finished its work on campus security and we are beginning a discussion on academic integrity and student cheating issues.

5.E Personnel Committee (Susan Mattson).

We sent our comments from the Committee back to the Provost Office on the Promotion and Tenure T.F. II report that came to us recently. Our comments are going in with everybody else's and then Milt will send an official recommendation to the Senate and to the Personnel Committee. Doug, do you want to say anything about health insurance?

Senator Johnson: Health insurance continues to be uncertain in its future. Cigna is lobbying very hard against the self-insured proposals, the Department of Administration is still seeking to have them approved. It is a battle of the legislature right now. I have been appointed by the President to work with the Department of Administration in trying to negotiate a better health insurance package for the universities. There has been a kind of long dance of confidentiality agreements, and we will have our first meeting this Wednesday (2/11).

Senator Haynes: Are you involved with the discussions on insurance for retirees?

Senator Johnson: There are three bills in the legislature on retiree health insurance. They have not gone anywhere yet. I have not been directly part of these efforts. There is also a bill in the legislature that would allow the sick leave be transferred directly into a retirement program, rather as it is now, a cash payout in capital, and that does seem to have strong support in the legislature.

Senate President Garcia: I want to recommend to senators who want to know more about what is going on in legislature, as well as the ADOA to email Doug Johnson because he is our point person and the ASU Retirees Association has also been following this quite closely. I attend their meetings and they have a newsletter. We have a lot of boots on the ground on this issue following it pretty closely.

5.F University Affairs Committee (George Watson).
I will be ready for a first reading on the bylaws changes at our next Senate meeting (March 1). Assuming the Executive Committee sends them on through. However, it will not end up on the consent agenda! (laughter here).

**President Garcia:** Ok, we have one already that won't go the consent agenda.

**6. Adjournment.**

There being no further business the Senate meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.
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