Academic Senate Summary  
Monday, March 1, 2004  
SCOB Room 228  
3:15 – 5:00 p.m.


Substitutes: George Bell for Marcia Anderson, Dan Canary for Linda Park-Fuller, Filiz Ozel for Maria Allison


Guests: DPS Chief John Pickens, Commander Allen Clark, DPS, Martha Christiansen, Director of Counseling and Consultation

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 (February 9, 2004).

The minutes of the February 9, 2004 Senate meeting have been posted on the web and emailed to senators. Hearing no objections or corrections, we will approve them as written. We have a full agenda to cover so I will be brief with my report. We will hear a presentation on campus safety from Martha Christiansen, Director of Counseling and Consultation, DPS Chief John Pickens, and Commander Allen Clark of DPS.

3. Announcements and Communications.

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

I have one announcement; I would like to point out that we have had a couple of illnesses, so our parliamentarian is being played by George Watson today. Thank you George for stepping in.

Our Senate offices are moving to the Administration Building B-Wing, Room 361, so, tomorrow is packing day and then Wednesday is moving day. Anyone who is going to Dixie Gammage Hall, 116 on Thursday--realize
that we will really be in Admin B-wing 361. Hopefully you will be able to come see our new offices after we get set up.

Senator Karady: Are they nice office spaces?

Senate President Garcia: They were before Jim Rund moved in, so I think it still is. It is a lot more accessible, a lot wider open, for meetings. So, without further adieu, I am going to turn over the mike to Chief John Pickens.

3.B Campus Safety Report

Chief Pickens: Good afternoon everyone. I am Chief John Pickens for those of you who may not know me. The reason that I am here is that last year in December, we gave a presentation to the Senate Student Faculty Policy Committee. There were a number of questions that came from that meeting as relates to disruptive students, active shooting situations, such as the one down at the University of Arizona, post 9/11, and our ability to respond to emergencies. We did the presentation to that group on December 1. President Garcia asked me along with Dr. Christiansen and Commander Clark to give you a brief overview of what takes place from a law enforcement standpoint in the event of an active shooting, so you can understand what actions you can take, and why we do some of the things we do. Before we get to that part of it, we will have Dr. Christiansen do her presentation first because our units partner with one another. Hopefully, if the right things are in place from her end, we can avoid the active shooting road.

Martha Christiansen: Thank you and I am delighted to be here and to have the opportunity to present to the Academic Senate. I have been on campus three years now and in these past three years there have been a lot of pretty intense situations in which we have needed to respond to our students, faculty and staff in the wake of 9/11 and other crises that have affected our campus. Counseling and Consultation is always here to provide a consultative roll to the faculty or to the staff regarding any kind of situation. We have been a part of a very effective outreach panel that has included police services, employee assistance, student life, judicial services, general counsel's office, and to also come to departments various infrastructure groups for the university to get the word out in person about how to be preventive if at all possible, and to provide the support to all of the folks that are working with challenging situations. At Counseling and Consultation, we have a staff of 21, which includes psychologists, social workers, counselors and psychiatrists. We make every attempt to put most of our resources into that first appointment, so that when you refer a student or a student comes in to see us (we only serve directly students) they don't have to wait to come into our service. We also sometimes do have a small wait ongoing when they are getting assigned to counseling. We do provide a "time limit to counseling model" and very limited psychiatric services. We provide psycho-educational programming as well as our individual, couples, and group therapy offerings. A lot of our services are geared toward being available to the campus community. We have a counselor on duty every day Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. In anyone calls, student, faculty, staff, parent, friend, we can consult with them by phone immediately to help them decide what to do in the case of concern or a distressing situation, or certainly to refer them to other resources. We do provide on call services to residential life. We will do after hours, weekends, and vacations, go on to campus to residential life if the need is there. On your desk you should have a card that says Empact--we contract with Empact for Arizona State University to provide after hours, on call services to any student of the campus community; they do not have to be living on campus. Empact if they determine the need is there, will make a mobile team visit to where the student is in the valley. That contract also serves east and west campuses as well even though east and west campus. They have their own counseling service components.

The main message that I want to convey is that we are here to consult, and please do not hesitate to pick up the telephone and call us for any kind of consultative information, especially to refer students. My presentation is on the prevention side, with the goal of trying to tell you something about ways to identify and prepare you and your constituencies as to how we might prevent a situation from escalating to the point that we really have to
call police services and other aspects of the university. About early warning signs--the first disclaimer that I want to make is no warning sign necessarily alone is an indicator or is sufficient for preventing a mental health problem, preventing aggression and or violence, but being aware and looking collectively and certainly communicating in your environment will help perhaps identify a situation that can be deescalated or prevented. So, when presented in combination, signs may indicate the need for documentation, really observing a situation more closely, further analysis to determine a program of intervention, and communication among people who are involved in that situation. Some academic indicators in the classroom--you might notice a pattern of missed assignments, particularly if someone had a previously higher level of performance, some deterioration in the quality of work, whether that is class participation, written work, a drop in grades, repeated absences from class and negative change overall in classroom performance, or even demeanor. Other academic indicators can be verbal aggressiveness in class meetings, a disorganized or erratic performance, continually seeking special accommodations, lots of late assignments, papers, extensions, postponements, essays or creative work that indicate extremes of hopelessness, social isolation, rage or despair. A lot of times people do reach out through the written word, and I think that particularly these days it includes email. Many times we get a call from someone on the faculty that has been interacting with a student through advising or even email and something is indicated. People sometimes feel freer in that medium to say things or be more spontaneous or more impulsive. Some personal interpersonal indicators of concern might be cheerfulness, unprovoked anger or hostilities, outbursts, excessive dependency, expressions of hopelessness or worthlessness, saturated personality traits, more withdrawn or more animated than usual. I think you get the idea that we are really looking at trying to think about how do we know this student? What is the normal way we understand this person's performance and when does it begin to become out of the ordinary? First indicators probably will not be the thing that you notice the most, but all of a sudden you are recognizing an accumulation of things, either in one domain or more than one domain.

Some other interpersonal indicators might be direct statements indicating distress, family problems or other difficulties, and I really recommend trusting your gut, trusting that hunch. That is our intuitive sense that tells us when something is not right and we don't really know why that it is not right--pay attention to those intuitive responses. When you first notice them you are paying more attention, something does not feel right, there is uneasiness, or a sense of discomfort. Again, you may also be contacted by a student, a peer, saying that they are concerned about their fellow student. Visible indicators might be deterioration in physical appearance, physical changes in weight, lack of personal hygiene, or a change in personal hygiene, excessive fatigue, coming to class bleary eyed, smelling of alcohol, and appearing sick or ill. One time is probably going to be a red flag setting off the alarms, but if you are noticing this as a pattern then you need to take some action.

Please note that safety risk indicators such a written note or verbal statement that has a sense of finality, an indication of suicidal thinking, statements to the effect that a student is "going away for a long time", certainly any manifestations of a severe depression and/or any history of suicidal thoughts or attempts--these collected together would bring about concern and would be part of looking at the risk factor. How at risk is this individual? Should we really be reaching out to the individual, getting help, and consulting others on how to respond? Giving away prized possessions, being self injurious or exhibiting self destructive behaviors and out of control behaviors--this can at times blend into classroom decorum issues as well. Essays or papers--I have already mentioned the written aspect and the use of email. All of these collectively would be risk factors. If you are aware of any of these kinds of problems, it doesn't hurt to call and consult with one of our staff. It is confidential. Please take notes of who the student is and what the concern is, so that through the natural course of things if they come in, you can alert our counselors to address those issues even in a more focused way. Although safety risk and suicide potential are some things that we always assess with all student clients.

Predicting violence and risk of violence is very challenging and very difficult. Prior violence does serve as an indicator of the likelihood of violence if the situation is coming back, the indicators are there. Sometimes feelings, a cluster of feelings may predict the likelihood toward violence, such any internal factor associated with aggressive encounters, such as fear, humiliation, or grief and sense of powerlessness. All those things are a
part of the human experience, and I am aware that we are talking about to some extent normal things, but in a context with certain statements being said, with certain materials being written, or in terms of a pattern of behavior, these can be things that we want to pay a lot of attention to. A risk of violence can occur more likely if there is a lack of sleep, exhaustion, the use of drugs and alcohol, things that would impair impulse control and in judgment, brain trauma. Other situational factors would be access to weapons, having experienced abuse or aggression, feelings of injustice or oppression. These are some things that we do hear from students on campus. Putting it together with other factors determines the risk involved. In managing an interaction with a student that is aggressive and whether it is in a one on one situation, in an office appointment, or even in a classroom, sometimes the best thing to do is to try to not escalate the situation. Try to de-escalate the situation, giving the individual some time to run down, just letting them talk and you listen, letting it kind of wash over you like a wave and using a calm voice try to engage in some problem solving. Sometimes when people feel very oppressed and begin to get very aggressive and really are on a rant, just the fact that someone is willing to listen to them and validate how they are feeling and consider what they are saying and then try to engage in some problem solving can really help de-escalate the situation. Many people just want to be heard and understood. That does not mean that you have to agree with them, or even say that you are in agreement with their accusations or comments. I think trying to move to a written format is good; asking people to put their complaints in writing takes the situation out of the heat of interpersonal interaction. For instance, if you say, I am going to take you seriously, I want you to write it down, and then certainly you need to respond to that written complaint. Stating facts without commenting, if you are talking about policy issues, classroom expectations or departmental expectations, trying to make it a neutral conveyance of fact. Sometimes the best way to end intense aggressive kinds of interactions might be to ask the individual how do they want the discussion to end--rather than trying to cut them off and sometimes it could be very informative, it will help you find out what they want. Seek help, consultation and referral--and if you are anticipating a meeting with someone that you think might be difficult, it is really good to plan ahead and to consult with us, to consult with the Employee Assistance, if it is an employee issue, to plan for that meeting and to set up the circumstances that would minimize it for being an escalated situation, minimize risk, minimize any of your vulnerability to be at risk. It is important to avoid making any sweeping promises of confidentiality, especially if a student represents a safety risk to himself, herself or others. You don't need to say that in order for the student to share what their concern is. It is also very acceptable to stay in the role as a faculty member. You don't have to take on the role of counselor. I think it is very legitimate as you, or as you are advising other members of your faculty to remember that, just say to the person/student, "This is beyond how I want to help you. This is beyond my role and let me tell you where you might get some help in Counseling and Consultation." Also, with those kinds of interactions, plan to consult ahead of time. If you are making a referral to Counseling and Consultation, I think giving a descriptive observation of what your concerns are, trying to be very behavioral in your description, very factual but conveying that you are worried about that individual and concerned about them.

Talking about the problem in labeling it as a crisis is not going to make it worse; in fact it could be very relieving, very validating, to the individual and may give them a sense of hope. Here is a step toward resolving their problem. If you are referring a student to us, sometimes students do prefer that you call ahead and tell us why you are referring them and give us some information. They may want that to be conveyed for them. You can offer that as a possibility. You can also offer to come over with the student and bring them to our office, that does not mean that you will come into the session, but if it is someone who is very distressed and you want to make sure that they are going to get here, do that. We do have a counselor on duty available, and if you call ahead we can be sure that there will be someone available to see the student. We operate on an appointment basis, and do have a large number of appointments available every day that can be obtained by calling at 8:00 a.m. in the morning. They are filled on a first come first serve basis. In any crisis situation, we will find someone and we will respond to the situation whether by phone or in person. This is our contact information that I passed out on our cards. There is the Empact after hours help, and there also is the Safety Page on the Web, which has a number of safety resources, including policies and procedures about disruptive students in the classroom, and a full range of services are available at this web site through the Vice President for Student Affairs web page. Most of you got, I did run out at the end row, a handout about how to refer a student in
responding to distressed or distressing students. It looks like there are a few vacant spots so, if you did not get a handout, please try to pick one up for one of the vacant seats next to you. Are there any questions that I can answer for you now?

A Senator: Is there any cost to the student once you call Empact?

Martha Christiansen: I should mention that Empact's phone number is also a dedicated line for ASU students only; there is another public number. If it is an ASU student and they are responding to an immediate crisis with their mobile team, there is no cost to the student. This is covered by the contract the university pays Empact for these mobile interventions. It operates out of our office. However, if a student is referred to the Empact outpatient clinic, or to receive services via a psychiatrist or nurse practitioner, there is a fee for those services. Likewise our services, the initial evaluation appointment, is at no cost to students and as many crises as they have, they can keep coming back to that free model. Right now, we do offer the next three appointments (as students on this campus they are allowed a lifetime of three appointments) at no charge, then our time limited model is charged at $18 per session for counseling and then after 12 sessions, $25 per session. This is equal to the university student insurance--all psychiatric services are charged at a $25 per visit charge, which is also equal to the university student insurance. Are there any other questions?

Well, please do call me and I am always happy to take phone calls and consult as there are counselors on duty, and I appreciate the opportunity to share that information with you. I am going to turn the mike over to Commander Allan Clark now.

Allen Clark: I am going to present a slide show to you today. I am Allen Clark, a commander with the police department at ASU. A lot of you live in cities around ASU and you have your police department there but while you are at work, for the students, we refer to it as our police department is your police department. Please excuse my raspy voice today and I apologize for that.

What I am going to talk to you about today is what does your police department do if something goes wrong? We are coming up on a two-year anniversary of a very volatile situation in Tucson, and last year when I was asked to discuss this we were asked to come in and tell the Student Faculty Policy Committee what we have in place for assurance to you as faculty that you are safe, and that our police department is well trained in exactly what we do in these types of situations! I have compressed that presentation, about a four hour block of training, into 12 to 15 slides. So, bear with me if it bounces around a little bit, I will try to fill in the gaps and make it flow smoothly, but I am going to try and get through it quickly because I imagine there are going to be some questions at the end.

The first two slides--just to assure you of some of the training experience we have had already--I have been on the police department since 1989. I started then and took over the firearms program in 1993. I have approximately six fire arms personnel that work in the fire arms area. We have trained in the implementation of the less lethal shotguns, the lethal shotguns, 40 mm launchers, air tasers, which are the hot item right now. Above and beyond that my fire arms crew is certified in all these areas. We are post certified, NRA certified, I have been to a lot of active shooter training, luckily none have occurred during my 14 year career. I hope that I make the next 10 or 20 years without having to do that. It is not something that I look forward to doing.

Your police department annually holds four to six fire arms shoots. At these shoots we roll, we run, we fight, we wear gas masks, we shoot behind bunkers, it is not like the old adage, going out on the range, standing in front of a silhouette target and shooting at paper! So, we do a lot of things to prepare if we are ever needed. Why are we here? We are here to discuss an active shooter situation, and how the role of law enforcement has changed specifically since the Columbine incident, and the role of responding officers to an active shooter situation. What you can expect to happen, and most importantly what is the role of faculty and staff. How are you going to help us in this very chaotic situation? You can read the screen above, but I am going to tell you
that an active shooter situation is simply this--somebody intends on doing harm, is in the process of killing people or injuring people, that is pretty much the long and short of those two definitions in the slide. Why is that important to us? The role of law enforcement has changed so that if we respond to an active shooter situation has changed. The old days of us setting up a perimeter, standing on the outside, waiting for the S.W.A.T team to get there, which in our case would be Tempe's or DPS's S.W.A.T Team has changed. We can't do that. Columbine showed us that. We now take the first three officers that we have at that scene and put together what is called a contact team and go hunting for that person. The old days of just setting up perimeters and just being able to stand by no longer exist. I don't know if you are familiar with it, but one of the first active shooter situations that were ever documented was in 1966 at the University of Texas bell tower. A lot of people were injured. No one, until the term active shooter was phrased several years ago, no one really even put it into that category but that is exactly what it was. You had a subject who was on top of the bell tower who was sniping people with different types of rifles, different types of weapons. How was he taken out--a detective who was on the ground finally said we have to stop this person. He created what we would call a contact team today; he went up and basically neutralized the threat. In 96 minutes, you can imagine how many rounds were fired. Approximately ten years ago we started seeing more and more of these active shootings. It is highly publicized, a lot of students, a lot of kids, and a lot of adults know that they are going to get notoriety; they are going to make their niche in history by doing this. This is just a handful of incidents listed here, but it doesn't even scratch the surface of the active shooters in the U.S. or abroad. Four died in the University of Arizona Tucson shooting. What I want you to see here is a correlation of Columbine and the UofA shooting, and your role as we go through this presentation on how you can help us. Columbine went on for a long time in the eyes of law enforcement. An hour, two hours, a long period of time passed when Harris and Klebold were inside the building, and they were actually injuring people and shooting people. We did not know if they had committed suicide at that point, what had happened, so we would classify that as an active shooter situation. In today's society you would get a contact team of three to five officers to the scene and then go hunting for them immediately as a contact team. In Tucson, that was an active shooter situation that quickly turned into a non active shooter situation. He went in; hit is targets, his threats then committed suicide. Once a person commits suicide we go to what we would deem as a shooting scene. It would no longer be an active shooter situation.

Some of the lessons we have learned from these situations are that suspects are going to be heavily armed. They are going to carry rifles but they are not going to carry pistols for the most part, because they want to do as much damage as they can. They will have large amounts of ammunition and as we learned in the Columbine incident, they are going to have devices that will explode. When they looked at the aftermath of Columbine, they said if they would have set off the explosives they had in that building they would not have had to worry about shooting people, because they would have completely demolished the building. We are finding that they had backpacks, booby traps, all the way throughout and we are finding that they are going to try to do as much chaos as they can in a short amount of time. Noise and confusion is self-explanatory, it is going to be a major factor in these situations. We are going to be dealing with a lot of people screaming and yelling, as well as the faculty will. Occupants of the building will be exiting as officers are entering. Some of the things that we are going to look for are which way are the people running. It sounds morbid, but if everybody is running one direction, I am going to be running in the opposite direction--that is just part of our job, we put our life on the line for the students, faculty and staff here, if this ever happens. That is one thing we look for but naturally in a chaotic situation, we have to try to determine is the suspect among all these people that are coming out of this building, has he tried to fit in with them? Where that is important to you is if you were on the telephone giving us a phone call, letting us know what is happening, you are on 911, you need to try to supply as much information as we can to our communications center. Therefore our dispatch center can put that information out to us and we can try and get what we call dynamic information to the field office. It is a common misconception, and this happens frequently, we will have people running by us screaming, we have to medical in there, there are people dying, there are people dying. We know that, however, medics will not go into a hostile environment. That is just the long and the short of it. They will stage until we tell them it is safe to go in. So, you can yell at the officers all you want as you are self evacuating the building, but medics will not go into those types of environments. As I stated before, the first three officers there will initiate a contact team. We will aggressively
hunt the person who is doing the shooting because we will be listening for gun fire. If the gun fire stops the contact team will stop and we will not move until we hear the shooting again. Here is one of the points that we train all of our officers and we will talk to you about in a few minutes. As hard as it is, I train my officers--you have to run by the people who are wounded; you have to go by the people who are injured, because if you stop to extricate one of those people you don't know how many more people this person is killing. It is the same way when you are doing a self-extrication, you may have to step over somebody lying in the hallway because if you stop and the shooter is in the immediate area, there will be two victims at that point. As hard as this is, we have to train that way.

Once a threat has been stopped or eliminated then we move back to our old traditional law enforcement role, we set up perimeters. If they are barricaded in a room, then we are going to go in with our proper equipment, with an attack team and we are going to have a hostage standoff situation, a barricaded subject situation. Then it moves back to your traditional role of law enforcement at that point. It is no longer an active shooter environment. The role of administrators, and I think this is what is the meat and potatoes of it all for you as faculty. First of all, your goal will be to exit the building. Please leave. Your students, the students of your teams and your colleagues are going to be looking to you for support. They will be looking to you for guidance. If you crawl under a desk, they will crawl under a desk for the most part. You have to understand that in these types of environments, some people are going to crawl in closets, they will crawl under desks, they will try to jump out windows, and they will try to do a lot of things because panic is setting in. You are going to have a handful of people who are going to try to go out and find the shooter themselves. Understand that it is not your role to try to stop those people. Your role is to get out of the building in the most orderly fashion as you possibly can, because a lot of students are going to be looking to you and your colleagues for that support.

Move away from the shots, move with the crowd flow, do not stop, as we talked about before, please don't stop for the injured, don't try to be a hero, and once outside you need to find a safe place to house yourself, understand it is going to be very chaotic outside, and if you have valuable dynamic real time information grab an officer that you see and say, look, I need to tell something. Give that information to the officer so that we can put it out on the radio. If you are injured, please seek medical in a safe location. One of the things that we are going to come to you for, or your colleagues for, is the fact that after all this is said and done, how many people did you have working in your office? Who are they and are they accounted for? Do we know that everybody is out of the building? This is information that we will want to know. Could someone still be in there? So, please try to find a safe location. If you have not practiced an emergency response or emergency exit maneuvers yet from your building and classroom, please do so soon. Talk to your staff about where you are going to meet if something happens, have a secondary location in case that primary location is not accessible. The most important thing that I want to convey to you all here today (I know that I went through this fast and I can speak about the subject for hours.) is that I have trained myself for it and I have tried to train my officers for it and one of the things that I would stand up here and throw out to all today is that if you would give us a phone call, an email at the police department, or call the chief directly and request that we come over and talk to you and your colleagues about the role of faculty and staff and I or one of my officers will be glad to do that. If our calendar is filled for the next year then we are doing our job because we need to get this information out. Luckily it has not happened here. We do not foresee an active shooting happening incident here. Hopefully we are trained well for it, and when it does happen we will be able to handle the situation quickly, if it happens. By the way, my phone is 911.

Senator Lattouf: I don't mean to sound dismissive, but none of what you said sounds helpful to me. If I am in a classroom, especially because I teach at night sometimes, and somebody locks the door to where none of us could leave and I reach a phone--or if I am in the next classroom and hear gun shots, I cannot say to the students (or myself for that matter) that we should leave the classroom and exit--I don't know if this person is going to be in the hallway and start shooting us as we leave--so, I might be putting my students in danger if I do that.

Allen Clark: Absolutely, I think you raise a couple of issues. First of all, phones--you will have them in your room.
Senator Mattson: Well, the students might have cell phones but we don't have phones in all the classrooms.

Senator Lattouf: I can't really imagine a student sitting very calmly and making a phone call while somebody is shooting a shotgun in the classroom or the hallway.

Allen Clark: We will get the phone call. As far as what you are saying, I am not asking you to run out into the hallway if there is someone outside shooting. That may be a time where you deem it necessary to stay in the classroom. An active shooter, however, is going to move through a building. That is one of the differences. They are going to quickly move from wherever they are at. Again, please don't go running out into the hallway right in the middle of this situation. If you have to stay put, you have to stay put. However, as soon as you can deem that it is safe, you need to self-evacuate out of there. One of the problems being as a law enforcement officer is that if I am coming into that building, I am passing a lot of people. Again, one of the things that concern me is as I am going out of the building, if the person that I am passing may be the shooter, or all of these people that I am passing have the shooter right in the middle of them. Usually the people running out the building, it is a safe bet they are not the shooter(s), though they may be. That just lets us know for the most part that those people coming by us are trying to leave the area and that is what we need to look for. Does that answer your question?

What I mainly wanted you to get out of today's presentation is that in that role, faculty or administrator of a unit should self-evacuate as fast as they can, along with their students/staff, and if you see people that are down as you exit, please don't stop and try to get them out of the area because we don't want more victims. We just want you to leave the area and we will come in and do our job, the best that we can for you. Phones in the classroom are not my issue as an officer and I am sorry about that. If phones are not there in the classrooms and you feel they need to be there--now is the time to say something to the right administrative unit. Are there any more questions. Thank you very much.

Senate President Garcia: Since the Student Faculty Policy Committee on December 1 heard this presentation, they thought it would be a good idea, and I think it is an excellent idea, to keep up the awareness of one of the challenges that we all face these days and how to keep up our awareness to the level that we know what to do and we know the resources available at Counseling and Consultation, as well as trying to inform ourselves and our colleagues of what are the best safety procedures in crisis situations. These things are changing as well, as people learn from these tragic situations and try to find better ways of dealing with them.

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

Thank you, Tony; we took quite a long time last meeting so I will try to be brief today. Thank you, Officer Clark for your presentation.

First, the Promotion and Tenure Task Force Report, we have had that up on the web for 3 or 4 weeks and have received a lot of feedback. By the end of this week, we will be sharing that with you and send out a somewhat revised recommendation that will be mine, which tries to take into account the concerns that were expressed in some of the feedback we received to the web.

Second, we are very pleased that today we announced the new dean of Business, Robert Mittelstaedt, he is the vice dean of the Wharton School (University of Pennsylvania's Aresty Institute of Executive Education), which is the best or one of the best business schools in the country. He is responsible for the entire executive education program, which is probably the largest in the country, and we are very pleased that Bob will be joining us this summer. We had very strong candidates representing three of the top programs in the country, UCLA, Wharton and Michigan, although interestingly the candidate from Michigan was in the College of Engineering rather than the College of Business.
We hope that within two weeks we will be ready to do airport interviews for the Provost at ASU East and we are optimistic that we have some good candidates there. I think we are in the same position with the Dean of Nursing. I can't name the list for you but I am told there are several top performers in that group. We also will be sharing and have already shared with the deans and your Senate leadership, the reviews that we did with an outside consulting team on information technology and the state of affairs in the university, and we will shortly be putting together some planning groups to try to address some of the issues they have raised about the state of information technology on campus. Other than that I will be happy to answer any questions.

Senator Haynes: Can you comment on the search for a dean of COPP.

Provost Glick: We are waiting for the president to announce his recommendations on the design team report. If he isn't ready within the next couple of weeks, we will go forward with the search and we have asked people for names to serve on the committee. If not, we will get that done this week. Are there other questions?


I want to report that the 2004 Sponsor Symposium for Research, presented by the Office for Research and Sponsored Projects Administration was held this week. It was really quite extraordinary. It was possible to meet with HNSF and many other sponsors and representatives. The only sad thing about it was that it was poorly attended by faculty. It was such an outstanding opportunity to learn a lot about the process of going through sponsors, but an opportunity to meet with sponsors themselves. So, I am hoping that for next year, that each of you will talk to your departments about getting particularly the junior faculty to this symposium, because it can be very useful to them and probably will be a help to them in the process of achieving external funding.

Secondly, the nominations for the Wakonse Fellowship are still open, so, again this is another way of supporting your colleagues in teaching, and there are still quite a few other nominations that are open in the teaching area. I believe the Centennial Professorship is still open. (We are not sure that the Parent's Association is still open or not.) I hope to remind you to go back to your divisions and departments and talk with them about these opportunities that are available. That is all from me today, except to remind you that with the promotion and tenure recommendations coming around, we will once again want to interact with you about your concerns about them.

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

Senate President Garcia: Brandon could not make it here today because he had a last minute meeting downtown that he had to attend, but he submitted a report which I will read. On the referendum, you all know it failed and he hopes that the university will still address student life concerns on campus, student fees will not be used to support the MU and SRC, leaving limited resources available. He also wanted to convey that he is supporting a tuition increase and he is asking that part of the tuition revenue be diverted for financial aid, the Department of Public Safety personnel, 24-hour access to Hayden Library, classroom enhancements, specifically language and literature (this is a perennial favorite as we all know), Physical Science and Engineering Center, and more faculty in the areas of freshmen English and Math.


3.F ASU West Senate Report (Fran Bernat).

I have a few things. I just want to let you know what we are doing on the west campus. We have pretty active committees; our personnel committee has processed through the changes to the ACDW manual, the change in
the tenure clock from 2nd/4th/6th years to 3rd and 6th years. I am not sure when that will be implemented, so, there are some questions still to answer as to whether it will begin next fall or at sometime thereafter, but it will coincide with what is happening here at main. There have been some faculty discussions about that preliminarily to ask individuals to submit comments to the website, and some of the preliminary concerns that faculty at the west had dealt with were whether or not faculty candidates who are involved in the tenure and promotion process have enough input in the process, i.e. selection of some of the external letters. There was a question about what the advocate was and whether or not a faculty member should be able to choose an advocate from the get go, as opposed to later finding out maybe the department chair is not too supportive. Then another question--how do you go and ask someone to be an advocate when you may not want to put yourself out there just yet. There are some questions about what an advocate is and what that role was. There are also some questions about the ad hoc committee process and whether or not it is too challenging on the local level reviews, the dean's level, etc. These are just questions that are being raised and whether or not, if there is a university ad hoc committee, what the representation from the west, east and downtown faculty would look like. I know it is just preliminary but these are just some of the comments that people have given about a first look at the Task Force Report.

The Teaching Excellence Committee is going to hold a plus minus seminar to help faculty talk about whether to implement their own individual classes plus minus system, what it would look like and what does it mean? That is going to happen this month. The date has not been formalized because they want to make sure that they can get the best possible amount of faculty coming to the workshop as possible. That will happen in March. They are also developing recommendations on teaching grants and developing recommendations on how to evaluate teaching effectiveness and the need to have better annual reviews and better promotional evaluations as well. They are looking at a number of ways to enhance the quality of teaching evaluations.

The Bylaws Committee is also updating and reviewing our bylaws similar to what you are doing here.

We have an ad hoc Salary and Compensation Committee, which was formulated after the November Arizona Faculties Council meeting, to look at whether there is salary compression on the west campus and they are in the beginning stages of the work that they are doing.

The Student Issues Committee is developing syllabi statements that faculty can put into their syllabi in whole or in part with links to the policy and catalogs dealing with these issues, and the issues that they are looking at are creating model statements for our conduct, academic integrity, technology and privacy, disability, religious observance, sexual harassment, and policy dealing with military personnel. A lot of us have those issues on our syllabi but forget to include a disability statement, for example. They will provide model names and certainly it will be a lot more attractive if you have a web based classroom and use black board. Whether or not people want to put a whole statement into their paper version of their syllabi remains to be seen but they could at least indicate what the link is so that students who have issues can take a look at the actual policy.

The administration has proposed amending the policy on smoking, of course it is a no smoking campus, you can't smoke in the buildings and that is being looked at to be revised to include stairwells. We have some faculty and students who have difficulty in breathing and when you are on our campus and going into a classroom building, you have a lot of passage ways that are blocked by smokers that are hanging right outside the buildings. One email that I got from a faculty member says he has a 40% use of his lung and it is really difficult for him to get passed buildings without being effected by the second hand smoke. At the same time, the Faculty Senate response is that we don't want to make it seem like it is illegal or that smokers have untoward behavior, so there needs to be some kind of balance and education on the campus so that while we would like to discourage smoking in particular areas like entrances and egresses to buildings, at the same time we need to provide for adequate space for those who need to smoke, to go outside and smoke and also educate the campus that they shouldn't look with disdain upon those who do smoke.
We are waiting for the Design Team Report conclusions, we will be looking forward to more formalized discussion about the P&T process through the Senate, we are of course very thankful to the president and the provost for the salary merit increases that we saw this year and then we have a number of other happenings on campus--Dr. Forward (sp?) came to our campus, she was here last year to look at gender equity issues and she visited our campus last month. We have many searches underway, including a dean of Human Services, and of course we are gearing up for our second convocation in the university-wide graduation ceremony. Are there any questions?

**Senate President Garcia:** Thanks, Fran, for catching us up on all the events at West. Ernie is not here today so we have no ASU East Senate Report, so, we will move straight to new business.

5. New Business.

5.A Executive Committee (Tony Garcia).

5.A.1 Plus/Minus Grades Overview (1-page handout). You have a copy of the handout and the documents are posted on the Academic Senate website. I want to take the time to walk you through the handout and see if there any questions at this point, because this is a document that has been created by the plus minus grade implementation team. They worked hard and did many revisions to the long version document, which you already have been familiar with and that is posted on our website under issues, and this is a one-page version, which I think will be very useful to communicate with your colleagues on when you go back to your departments and divisions. The first paragraph explains what this document is and in a nutshell it is the grade scale to be implemented and faculty assigned grades will reflect academic achievement. The first paragraph reiterates the idea that the grades are tied to achievement, and particularly that the grade range is at the discretion of the faculty. Then in each section are brief explanations that everyone should be able to digest at department meetings, certainly using it as a reference point. We have heard a lot of people are thinking that plus minus grades were being implemented during this year or this summer. So, we want to let everyone know that this policy is effective in fall 2004, and that everyone except the College of Law which uses a numerical scale will be using this system. The system that you are all most familiar with, we have already gone through many times as we discussed plus minus grades last year. The only other part of this document that needs to be discussed further is #3, which I think is the hardest one to convey. It states that final GPAs are reported based on a 4.00 grading scale, so even though A+s would be given on semester GPAs, the final grades are capped up to 4.00 on external transcripts. Therefore, semester GPAs will have all of the information, but those are internal documents and could reflect up to theoretically a GPA of 4.33 of A+. Having come back from an NSF conference and having reviewed about 100 graduate fellowship applications, I realize again how important this is from two perspectives--one is that universities and colleges around the country use a variety of different systems and I know we talked this to death last year, but you would be surprised how many more systems you learn when you look at 100 different transcripts. The other thing about this is that it is very important that we communicate the fact that here (at ASU) the cumulative grades on transcripts are capped at 4.00, and that allows the student achievement (or their grade) not to be reinterpreted differently by someone else. Schools that do have an A+s on transcripts have a lot of recalibration done to them, if you want to think of it that way.

**Provost Glick:** Tony, I want to make sure that I understand myself. If somebody gets an A+, the 4.33 is calculated into their final cumulative GPA, which we will not record as grade point, if the cumulative grade point would be 4.1, it will only be reported as 4.00. Is that correct?

**Senate President Garcia:** Yes. Each individual grade will show up on the transcript but it will not be recorded as 4.01 or 4.02, it will be truncated at 4.0. The other parts of the document explain the effect on student records; pass/fail will not be affected. All again is reiterated in this document. This document is meant to be a good communication tool for you to bring back to your department. It states things in a little bit of a repetitive fashion but it does keep everything on a blow by blow basis. Academic standards in #9--some important things
to remember, are that the numerical equivalent of that grade is going to be used and not the grade itself. This is one thing that has to be cleaned up in all the catalog references and all the documentation. For example, here the grade B-, 2.67 will not meet the requirements of "B or higher." So, again, the numerical equivalent of that grade should be used in order to clarify all this, and that is what the implementation team is in the process of doing and the catalog folks are in the process of doing. Another nice thing about truncating the GPA is that the standards for requirements of graduation with academic recognition are not going to change as a result of this implementation. Then the catalogs will all be updated to show this. The transfer student wording seems to be the trickiest because you are dealing with transcripts and systems from lots of different schools. You can read 13) I won't attempt to go through it in detail. Just be aware that for completeness, they have to explain everything from a 4.33 and A+ to an E or an E+ of 00.00. Don't go crazy over that, it is simply a way of making sure that we have a system for transferring grades into ASU that is not our grade system. That is what #13. So, for anybody that wants to know the details of the plus minus grades project, all the detailed information is given on our website. This is meant to be a one-page overview, and it is also on the website if you need to access it there. Are there any questions?

Senator Siferd: I have a question on #1--are we saying we will be able to give a grade of C-minus or we will not be able to give a grade of C-? I did not understand that.

Senate President Garcia: Maybe George can clarify this portion--the transfer grading part was a specialized part of the discussion. My interpretation of it is whatever it is will continue to be that way. I will make a note of it, and we can contact the implementation team.

Senator Butler: In reference to #6 in multi-section classes, who makes this determination or are you going to allow each instructor to decide?

Senate President Garcia: This has come up in a couple of different contexts and I think the idea behind getting this one page handout to you from the implementation team is so that you can have a dialogue in your departments. I think what we will see around campuses are different approaches. The danger of having different systems is that students will then jockey for the right section to get an A+ or whatever grade they think they might want to get. That is the danger. The drawback of stipulating ahead of time is that you may have sections where students are more deserving or have achieved a certain level, whereas in other sections people may feel that they didn't. Stipulating percentile may not be appropriate depending on the numbers. Part of this is for you to bring this back to your departments and to have an active discussion on how to debate the system before it is implemented in the fall. It will be faculty or colleagues assessing student achievement so, you need to discuss how that would be handled in multiple sections. Yes, each instructor can decide the grade range to be used in their classroom.

Senator Butler: The same with graduate assistants does the faculty member in charge make that decision or does the teaching associate make that decision?

Senate President Garcia: That will be even more important as we transition that we know what the grad assistants and the TAs are going to be doing in terms of assigning the grades. Hopefully there will be some training over the summer, that's another reason to have this document out now so you can plan for that.

Senator Mattson: How are you going to disseminate this--are we supposed to take it back individually or is this coming out in some central location and to whom?

Senate President Garcia: We are going to disseminate this as often and as much as possible. We have it on the website, and I am sure that the chairs and directors will also disseminate it, and we are hoping that you keep the dialogue going so that we can talk about it between now and May 15th. That is the intent of the implementation
team. We don't want the whole summer to go by and then when August hits, all of a sudden people are wondering what to do. We don't want that to happen.

**Senator Bernat:** Are the categories of summa and cum and magna cum laude then changing or will they remain the same? I have heard mixed comments on that.

**Senate President Garcia:** At this point, with this document, we are not anticipating any changes as a result of this. There may be other things going on, but as a result of this plus minus implementation there is no recommended change that I am aware of. I don't know if George may want to add something here?

**Past President Watson:** There was a proposal that had come forward last year to change that, and we simply tabled it and it did not go anywhere. There is no change anticipated yet. I believe the sense was that we would wait and see how the plus minus plays out before suggesting any changes in the honors.

**Senator Haynes:** On that issue, wasn't it reasonable to project that, out of the 5% of the people that receive 4.00? Now, under the new system, a person who has anything less than 4.00 will have an opportunity to counteract it with an A+. I would expect there would be more students with 4.0s in the future, and therefore your question about honors has some import.

**Senate President Garcia:** I agree with you, but the students disagree with us. They think that there will be more A-s as a result of this system being implemented.

**Senator Watson:** Almost nobody has this system and so we don't have much to go on. If there weren't an A+ of 4.33, we would certainly see fewer 4.0's and grades dropping. I just don't know how many A+s there is going to be out there.

**A Senator:** I am new to this body, so I am probably coming to this debate far too late, but two things that worry me are that the error margin of awarding a grade is too high, at least for me, to start making these fine distinctions and I see a vast number of grades for A and B in the system and no fine degradations of D. What I think is going to happen is that the students will say, oh, ok, we have got nine grades here, so the middle is a B. The B is our midpoint and that is what we expect for the mean of the class, not the C.

**Senate President Garcia:** The great thing about our website that George designed last year is that all of this rich discussion and debate is cataloged in the minutes as well as a study of all the different systems out there that was really well done by the committee. The only anecdote that I will give you is that upon reviewing about 100 transcripts a couple of weeks ago in Washington, D.C., I read two Columbia University professor's letters for their students, and each of them pointed out how good the student was that he or she got a 3.8 out 4.00 and then a 3.7 out of 4.00, and I went back to look at the transcript and in fact Columbia goes up to 4.33! The interesting thing is that when you write letters of recommendation, I hope that all of us here know what our system is. It won't do us any good if we don't know our system.

**Senator Siferd:** That is a question that I have in #3 in the first sentence. ASU will continue to report grades based on a 4.0 grading scale. Is that for external reporting or is that reporting to the student when they send their grades in.

**Senate President Garcia:** We call it on the technical side of things; they consider the official transcript as the report. So, on the official transcript there is listed a grade point average that the student achieved. That is what they consider the report. The individual grades will be marked as such.

**A Senator:** Hopefully from following this familiar story, it seems we have a problem, what should we report in writing these letters on our students that you mentioned. If I have a student who has a 4.0 but it is really on a
4.33 scale, they might have a 4.33 but they are only going to count a 4.0 on the transcript. Do I then report in my letter that it is really a 4.33 or a 4.2, but it is only a 4.0 on the transcript?

**Senate President Garcia:** The transition is going to be tricky in the short term, but in the long term I think ultimately the easiest thing to do is just talk about them, what most letters do and what most forms do, rate the student as compared to other students in a class.

**A Senator:** In the meantime, if anyone has any ideas about what to do about how to talk about a student with a 4.2 and it is reported as a 4.0--how to write that up that would be helpful information.

**Senate President Garcia:** That is a challenge.

**Senator Bernat:** Tony, is that going to be on the transcript, the information on how GPAs are recorded?

**Senate President Garcia:** Yes, typically the way it works at least at most on the ones that I reviewed, I am assuming ours is the same, is that on the back there is plenty of room to explain the system in gory detail.

**Senator (Lisa) Anderson:** Using this plus minus scale is optional correct?

**Senate President Garcia:** I would not say optional--in the one page handout it explains that it is at the discretion of the faculty.

**Past President Watson:** Grading is always optional. You can give all A's, you can give all B's; you say I never give C's, so, this system does not change that. Your grades are your option.

**Senator (Lisa) Anderson:** If a faculty chooses to use the old system and not use pluses and minuses that is going to affect the 4.33 scale. If not everyone is using it then it is not the same scale for every student for every class.

**Senate President Garcia:** There are all kinds of combinations, I know, my colleagues have said they will only give two As no matter how big or how smart or how small the class is. Some will say, I will never give a D because I don't understand what a D is. I know what a C is, I know what an E is, but what is a D? Some kind of twilight zone?

**Senator Komnenich:** But it is correct to say as we are conveying this to the faculty, because I know that question is going to come up. That the system is not optional, this is the system, and the choice of grades is optional. (All agreed).

**Senate President Garcia:** Yes, but in the expanded system, those are the possible grades you can enter. In simplest terms, whether you choose to assign those grades, and in what proportion, where, why, those are based on what you feel is the right way to measure achievement.

**Senator Lattouf:** On transfer policy #14 I believe this only applies for undergraduates because for graduate students it would be 3.00. Therefore, if a student received a B- in another institution, that could not be transferred in.

**Senate President Garcia:** Yes, some of the shortcomings of the one-page format are that a lot of the details just do not show up. Again, we have to go back and review things--whatever we did before on transfer of grades, the existence of this policy will not be changed by the implementation of the new system.

**Senator Lattouf:** It has changed because B- used to be acceptable.
Senate President Garcia: I will give that to Leeann and see if she can improve it. She has gone through it about 5 or 6 times but we can always get it better.

5. New Business.

5.A Committee on Committees (Ernest Hirata). No report.

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

CAPC brings one information item today. The importation of an ASU main masters degree in Curriculum and Instruction to ASU East--importing means that the degree as it exists on this campus will also be offered on the East Campus. This masters degree will also be offered at ASU main.

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

We have begun our look at student cheating and honesty and hope to have a report on that before the end of the semester. We have set up a subcommittee on this to expedite this issue because there is a lot of information on this out there, but we will try to get as far along with it as we can before the school year ends. Also, last week members of our committee met with Facilities Management staff to talk about priorities for a half million dollars in new classrooms funding. Our committee had done a study on classrooms last year, and we recommended that the money go to Languages and Literatures and the Nursing Building. Those were our priorities for the money.

5.D Personnel Committee (Susan Mattson). No report.

5.E University Affairs Committee (George Watson).

5.E.1 Senate Motion #12 (2003-2004) (First Reading) Proposed Bylaws Changes: You have in the documents before you Senate Motion #12 and it proposes 30 changes to the Academic Constitution and Bylaws (ACD 112-01). Three of those changes are relatively significant changes, another 5 could be deemed as somewhat significant, and the remaining twenty-two are relatively minor changes. What you have in front of you then are two different documents--one constitutes the motion itself, which is followed in order by 30 changes to the constitution in order, and to the bylaws, that is about three pages long right after the motion and after those three pages is a document on analysis of changes to the constitution. It orders the discussion of the changes in order of significance. On the analysis sheet, you have the 3 of those 30 changes that the committee deemed significant or major changes, and then you have the relatively minor but nonetheless substantive changes in about 5 of those, then you have the remainder of the changes which follows. We have on the screen up front the actual bylaws themselves, and all of this is on the Senate website under issues, and under proposed revisions to the Academic Constitution and Bylaws. So, you would be able to follow through there and see those particular changes yourself.

The first change, for example, is in Constitution section I, B.3.c., you can see the strike out there of the president of the academic assembly serving on the president's working group. It will now say that the president of the academic assembly will serve on President Crow's ASU ACADEMIC COUNCIL for a one year term and the rationale is given for that. So, it goes through with the various changes; strike outs indicate deletions, all caps indicates additions and new language or wording. The procedure for this is that the Academic Senate must give approval by a majority vote of those voting. That paves the way for this to go to a mail ballot that goes out to all members of the Academic Assembly. A two thirds approval of those voting is required for that to pass. If approved by the Senate and approved by the Academic Assembly then it goes forward to President Crow for final approval. Then it is placed in the ACD Manual once the president approves it. Let me go through this...
very quickly for you, I am going to go to the analysis page—although, if you have questions feel free to interrupt and ask at any time.

On the analysis of changes, just to mention then the three most substantive changes. (Correction to I.B.3 duly noted "ASU Academic Council..." On page one of four; the first substantive change comes in item I.B.7, in the constitution. That involves the faculty ombudsperson. That traditionally has been an elected position—is there a question?

**A Senator:** What does consent of the Academic Senate mean, how is that solicited and how is that approved?

**Senator Watson:** I think the committee's assumption is that in changing this from an elected position it would become appointed. The president of the Senate, if this were the case right now that would be Tony, would appoint with the advice of the Senate Committee on Committees. In other words, Tony or whoever is president would go through the Senate Committee on Committees to look at candidates and come up with the nominee that the president would put forward. The consent item would involve the approval of the Academic Senate.

**A Senator:** What does that mean, a vote? (Yes.) Ok.

**A Senator:** So, is this a way of screening candidates?

**Senator Watson:** The committee felt that since the ombudsperson requires special skills in a sense, sometimes it is difficult enough to recruit and it is difficult to go through the nomination process in the way that we need to, to get a good qualified person to consent to do run. The sense was that this position would be better as appointed with the committee and the president trying to find somebody who would be first of all well qualified to do the job, and would be willing to do the job than putting it to the Academic Assembly as a whole to vote on it.

**A Senator:** I want to make a couple of comments. I am always for more democracy, not less. Because in my estimation is that this is less democracy. I wonder why there isn't perhaps a way to provide post hoc training for elected ombudspersons.

**Senator Watson:** We do have training for the ombudsperson.

**A Senator:** Then I don't see why we need to appoint as opposed to elect an ombudsperson. Let me put it this way, what is broken that needs fixing?

**Senator Watson:** If I may speak for the committee, what the committee felt was that it is often hard enough to get one good person to consent to serve in a position, let alone get two people to run for the position, and the feeling of almost relief, and I know there are others who have been in different positions of finding candidates, to find a good qualified person that you think can do it and would be a good person to do it, is considerable work and then you turn around and say, now I have got to go find yet someone else who is both capable and willing to run for this position. I do say there is training, but the ombudsperson really requires a lot beyond that. I don't think if we drew randomly, for example, and said, ok, you are going to be an ombudsperson and we are going to send you to a training session. I don't think that would work out very well.

**A Senator:** Well, why is it that you would have to have two candidates, if you do this canvassing, and you should end up with one candidate, then you would simply end up with one candidate.

**Senator Watson:** We did not think of that as an option of having a one candidate race.
A Senator: We have that all the time in political systems. No one is running against a person so they get elected. I don't see how this fixes any of that. Do our bylaws provide for a write in candidacy?

Senator Watson: I don't think this envisions that would be the case, in terms of having a write in candidate. I think this envisions the president will appoint and the Academic Senate will confirm that appointment.

A Senator: My point is that when you have one person races you usually have a ballot system.

Senator Watson: That is the proposal that has been put forth and this is first reading, so, what I recommend is an amendment at the next meeting when this comes forward for a second reading, if you want to make one.

Senator Acker: How would you define their job and special skills that they might need?

Senator Watson: Ombudspersons--perhaps the closest word to that would be "mediator." That is to say that they need the kind of personal skills to be able to interact with individuals on two sides of an issue, sometimes who are both fervent and deep seated in their belief that they are right on a particular issue. The ability not to take sides, the ability to look at both sides and be able to articulate and look for areas of compromise and areas of agreement that could be reached and resolved, before the dispute goes to more severe alternatives, in terms of grievances or lawsuits.

Senator Acker: Is this between faculty and faculty and administration?

Senator Watson: Both or even students. Each College has an ombudsperson. The university has an ombudsperson. Then the staff has ombudspersons, so there are altogether 20 or so at various levels. You can go to any of them and request their assistance. It is a very useful program. The sense of our committee was that it would be easier to recruit and easier to select good people by going to an appointive rather than the elective process. You are certainly welcome to propose a change on that particular aspect, if you wish. So, I guess that was a major substantive issue after all.

The second major substantive issue that we see is allowing the president of the Academic Senate to appoint the chairs for the Senate committees, rather than having committees themselves appoint a chair from the committee. The rationale presumably behind that was that often the committees do not in fact appoint their own chairs and fail to do so. What happens is that the president ends up appointing a chair anyway or the committee comes together in the fall and attempts to find a chair. This was the sense that the Academic Senate president then could make sure that a team is on board, and also a team that the president could work with presumably chairing those particular committees. That is a second item.

Senator Haynes: I certainly understand the logistics of having a chair in place when we start meeting in the fall, but why does this have to be the presumptive chair? What would happen if the committee pressed the president to appoint a new chair if it happened that they could not work with the appointed chair?

Senator Watson: Nothing would prevent that from happening.

Senator Haynes: So, as long as people agree it would work, but if the committee had problems with it they could request another chair be appointed then.

Senator Watson: Correct. The third major substantive change is redrafting the responsibility of the University Affairs Committee. There are some things that would stay the same but there are some also some additions to that particular category of items that would be covered by the University Affairs Committee. The rationale behind these particular changes was that the committee saw a difference between--in the constitution there is a section in Sec. II.D that lists the authority of the Senate--the Senate shall have power to act for and represent the
Academic Assembly under existing regulations, in all matters including but not limited to--that portion is displayed up on the screen--what the UAC noted was that there are a number of items on here that were not in fact covered by any of the Senate committees currently. A number of those items they felt would fall within the purview of what might be the University Affairs Committee, and the changes that were not included within any of the Senate committee mandates came in the area of salary policy. Financial affairs, item D. No Senate committee had responsibility for covering the salary policy area. That has been assigned by the University Affairs Committee, under the Senate Personnel Committee. Some of these others as you can read there on page 2 of 4 are then placed within a purview of the University Affairs Committee.

A Senator: While looking at this list it seems to be an awful burden on the University Affairs Committee. I was wondering if appointing any new committees was on the slate.

Senator Watson: It was in fact. We proposed a change later on that was considered a non-substantive change, a minor change, and I will scroll down to that. Originally we had thought of creating a new committee and ultimately decided that this could go within the purview of the University Affairs Committee. Where that came up is in the bylaws under Senate committees, and you see the section under B where it has Senate committees and committee structure, and it has A. Administrative Committees, B. Academic Affairs Committees, and then C. University Affairs Committee. We changed that to read "other committees" and then put the University Affairs Committee under that as one of those other committees, to pave the way for the possibility of later creating additional committees that might deal with some of these issues. Once we looked it over and we saw the lists of items for Personnel, Student-Affairs, and for the Curriculum Committees, we decided that this list was probably not too lengthy for the University Affairs Committee. Once again, that is certainly open to change.

A Senator: But it seems a bit of duplication here when you have technology transfer, and then computer services…

Senator Watson: I am not sure where we have done that. You understand that the list that was up there earlier was not a list of committees. It was a list of tasks. So, that is a list of functions, not of committees, although it certainly sets up the basis for a list of committees because we do have a personnel committee, a student faculty policy committee, etc. The academic affairs items list involves much of what the CAPC committee does. The university services tasks involves some of what we do on the University Affairs Committee, but we weren't seeing some of those other things. In the IT area, there is an IT faculty committee, outside of the Senate that really deals with a lot of the IT issues but what we did include under there was dealing with policy issues, things that were non-policy oriented. You are certainly welcome to propose changes you may want to make for that. That is why we have a first reading. Did you want to comment further?

In summary, major substantive changes elicited some comment, the minor substantive changes--let me make sure then that we are not anticipating anything where there might be a difficulty when we vote. This is where we changed the Academic Senate president from being in the University President's Working Group to the ASU Academic Council that is on page 2 of 4 in the analysis section. That is item number 1. Change number 8 in the constitution is to include the open forum as a part of the Senate agenda, which we did not have on today's agenda, but at least leaving that open as a possibility. Item number 9, which changes the requirement of mail ballots to be distributed in the Academic Assembly for voting on amendments, to allow electronic ballots as well as mail ballots. Then doing the same thing on number 24, on page 3 of 4, for electronic balloting and Senate elections. Then I skipped over the one that I mentioned already, item #18, which adds the salary compensation review policies to the responsibilities of the Personnel Committee. Are there any questions on those? Then finally the ones that we felt were largely procedural changes, and you certainly will want to check those and make sure that our assessment is correct. It is adding, for example, the immediate past president of the Academic Assembly as a member of the Arizona Faculties Council. The past president already is a member but we never said that anywhere in the constitution. We are basically adding some words in here throughout the
bylaws to implement things that have already been in existence for quite some time but were never formalized. A few of these things reflect changes in reporting processes--some of the grievance committees, the Board on Equal Opportunity, the Governance Grievance Committee, Academic Professional Grievance Committee, and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure were asked to report in a manner that sounded like they were being asked to report on specific grievance cases and recommendations that they made on those cases and we took that language out and replaced it with "reporting a summary of the caseload" rather than its recommendations on individual cases.

We reduced the number of election tellers from four to three--we were unable to get all four of them together sometimes, so, we have in fact proceeded with fewer than four, in actually doing the tally.

A Senator: Have they ever failed to appear to carry out those duties, unless due to illness?

Senator Watson: I don't really know but it does not take a lot of tellers to count these ballots in that sense. The fact of having four was probably a way of insuring that we would have three present. I hope that by changing it to three it doesn't mean that we will only have two there! We will hope that it is easier to get three people together at a particular time than it is to get four people together at a particular time. Are there other questions?

Thanks very much, George. It is great that we got through the first reading of this.

6. Adjournment.

There being no further items of business the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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