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1. **Call to Order.**
   
The meeting was called to order by Senate President George Watson at 3:21 p.m.

**President Watson:** I apologize for wearing my dark glasses today. I am supposed to have my new glasses tomorrow but not quite in time for our meeting. I am going to take them off, but now you understand that I can’t see anybody. This is the last meeting of the year and I will try to expedite the business matters so that we can finish everything on the agenda.

2. **Approval of the Previous Minutes (April 28, 2003).**
   
The minutes summary of April 28 will be posted to the Academic Senate Web page and emailed to senators when they are ready.

There are a few changes in the agenda and I will mention them as we arrive at them. Things have been moving quickly over the past week!
3. Announcements and Communications.

3.A Senate President (George Watson).

3.A.1 Academic Assembly Officers:

We announced the results of the election at the April 28 meeting and we are pleased to have with us today, Barbara Kerr, our new President-elect. Barbara, would you please stand and be recognized. I had mentioned erroneously at our last meeting that I thought Barb was the first president from the College of Education since Suzanne Shafer but that is not true, because Arlene Metha from Counseling Psychology was Senate President 12 years ago. We welcome you today and are happy you could join us. Ruth Yabes, will be continuing as Secretary of the Senate. Congratulations to you Ruth. We will come back later and turn the gavel over to the always delightful Tony Garcia a little bit later in the meeting.

3.A.2 Election to Standing Committee Vacancies.

We do still have some vacancies on Senate standing committees to fill before fall. The Committee on Committees must complete a nomination process, and all I will say is if you are not on one of the standing committees, could you please email Ernest Hirata and let him know that, so he might consider you for service on the vacancies on Senate standing committees. That ballot may have to be done in May by either paper ballot or on MyASU, but it is not prepared yet and we are working toward that point.

We are running a bit behind this year, we are running hard and I don’t think we are running in place, but there is just a lot of ground to cover. One thing that Tony will face next year is trying to get us back on schedule on some of these things. You do understand, however, that the strongest consideration for committee assignment will be given to those that do not volunteer for committees!

3.A.3 Recognition of Senate Service.

One other thing that I would like to do at the very beginning, although we have the passing of the gavel later on, is that two meetings ago we very much missed our Executive Assistant in the Academic Senate, so, we were very happy to have her back on April 28 at the Senate meeting. This is Darby’s 20th year of service with the Academic Senate, so, Darby, if you would, ASU has already recognized you for your 20 years of service and we pass this gift along to you (leather folder), and then you and I will get out later at the end of my term and celebrate some more. Thank you for your service for the past twenty years at the Academic Senate Office.


President Watson: There is no report from the University Provost today. I am sad to report that Milt’s mother is very ill so he is on call at the moment and he asked to be excused from the meeting.


3.D ASASU President’s Report (Mike Leingang). No report outside of--Today is my last meeting!
President Watson: Mike Leingang, I think has been a marvelous president—very responsible, very challenging of the administration and of the Senate to do right by the students, and he is very articulate. Mike, we appreciate all that you have done and we appreciate the work you have done with us. Thank you very much.

3.E Past President’ Report (Morton Munk).

President Watson: There is no report from our past president today because he is here in the building attending another meeting, the ABOR Learner Centered Education meeting in La Paz and we may go grab him later, although he has left his proxy with me, to vote on the plus minus issue.

3.F ASU West Senate Report (Jose Nanez or Fran Bernat). No report.


3.H Chief Information Officer and Vice Provost for IT (Bill Lewis).

President Watson: You recall that we left Bill cooling his heels at the March meeting for a couple of hours while we blithely went on our way on other business, and never got to Bill. So, we have asked him to come back and speak to us briefly as Vice Provost of Information Technology, of course, and be available to answer any questions you may have. I know that Senator Leshowitz had questions but he could not attend today’s meeting. However, Clark Presson is substituting for Barry. We will turn it over to you now, Bill.

Vice Provost Lewis: I actually appreciate being given a reprieve last time because things are better than they were last time. Hopefully, there will be fewer stones coming my way! What I wanted to do today was to give you a couple of updates on what has happened in the past semester, actually the early parts of this semester, and what actions we have taken to try to resolve them. We have had two major problems at the beginning of this semester. One had to do with Outlook Exchange—not Outlook the client, it was the server for Exchange. The other had to do with a major file system crash that we had. I will update you on those two things and then I will update you on Black Board.

We went over the Christmas holidays from Exchange 5.5x to Exchange 2000. In doing that, we were trying to accomplish several things. One of which was to go to a newer release of the software, but also to provide us with better resources for things like backup recovery, as well as some additional functionality. We went to it and we started experiencing really a bad slow down, almost to the point of frustration at times. After a few weeks of looking, testing, working with Microsoft, working with a storage vendor that we were using—we found out that the problem was that we had too much I/O activity on a large storage array, which is being shared by many applications. It turns out that Exchange has a tremendous increased I/O activity—that is just how it operates—when we went to Exchange 2000, we got a tremendous increase in I/O activity as a result. The solution for this was sort of overpowering. We brought a new three terabyte disk array and put gig ether attachments from all the Exchange servers directly into it, as a dedicated server for Exchange. It literally had overnight improvement in resources. We did it first on Exchange Server I, to make sure it was getting better and it got better immediately. The next night we did the others. Exchange performance, I believe, is very good. Of course, when it is real bad any improvement makes it look really good. I think it is to the point now where it is the way we expect it to be, and the way that we hope to be able to retain it or keep it. That is the Exchange issue—it was not an Outlook problem, that is your local client, it was a
server Exchange problem. It just took awhile to figure out what the problem was and to come up with a solution and then to get the hardware in here to resolve that.

The other problem is what I would refer to for lack of a better term, a catastrophic failure of a large Enterprise disk array. We have a large Enterprise disk array that was servicing MyASU, it was servicing student email, it was servicing about 15 different applications in all. It has 64 disks in it of which in a 48 hour period, 24 failed. This is beyond the realm of reasonableness, obviously. We finally got to the point on the Friday of that week and we had to take and bring the system down—we had to take all the users off the system in order to just keep up with repairing disks. This is an Enterprise disk array and it is divided up into what we call shelves or logical disk sets, and each one can have up to 2 disk failures—with the 3rd failure you loose data, but at 2 you are alright. We were at 2 on several of shelves when we tried to get this rebuilt. We were rebuilding on them, but we could not rebuild them fast enough to keep ahead of failures. The vendor thought it must have been hit by a forklifter—because we had crashed a bunch of disks—well, that was not the case, because they took a couple disks back and checked them at their laboratory, and we sent one out for an independent test. They were not crashed. I am now convinced that the disks were fine but that the controller just thought they were bad, and therefore they were bad. The vendor had in here by Saturday evening, a totally new disk array for us to start rebuilding and moving everything over to. When you are talking about multiple terabytes of data, it takes time. It does not go real fast having to rebuild them, so, we were able to get MyASU back up, which was number one priority, student email was number 2 priority.

For lack of a better term, looking at hindsight to see what went wrong, and how we could have avoided it—we had some very critical data applications that were on a disk array that we thought was fine and should not have been a problem but obviously it was not fine. As a result of that, we are purchasing a mirror system—the one that went bad—will be real time mirror of that data so that we will not have a delay in that area like we had before.

Like everybody else, we have budget issues; we have not been able to do some of the things we would like to. I am borrowing money to try to solve that and I would like to say that it will never happen again, but that would be folly to tell you that. We will try to at least minimize the probability of that happening again, at least in that area. It is the same technology that we use on our mainframe applications, but mainframe is a little different than open systems as far as how it handles things. The mainframe architecture has been around for about twenty-five or thirty more years than the Windows and the Linnex (sp?) environments—they just have more experience and more tools to help manage files better. That is the story behind the failures that we had at the beginning of this year.

The next thing that I want to talk about is the MyASU environment, particularly the teaching and learning environment, not the Portal part. We are on currently 5.0.xx version of Black Board software for teaching and learning. We need to go to the new version which is 6.0. We need to go to it for several reasons; our file system has grown so large and 5 does not give us the ability to adequately manage the file system. When your file system gets too big, you have to do an awful lot of searching, and it is a lot of overhead time, so, we need to go to 6, which has better disk management tools and other things in order to get adequate performance for us.

Our current schedule is to, on the night of May 21, migrate to 6 version of Black Board. There will be some risk; I don’t know how else to put it. We will maintain the 5.0.X environment in its current state, that is, I have purchased all new hardware for 6 so that we can keep the old one in place and if we do experience a problem, we can then go back to 5.0. That would not be without offering some pain to
the faculty as they move, even if we don’t have a problem. We do not anticipate problems. Those of you that have done things like this before know that you always have to say that—we do not anticipate problems. In preparation, we are watching the sights, the Black Board list serve, which we host at ASU. Unfortunately, just about everybody who has gone this way at other institutions is having problems. So, we are going to try to make sure beforehand—we are switching over during the summer so we can hopefully get some experience under a lighter load before the fall semester starts. This has been worked on with the various academic support groups and in the colleges of business, engineering and some of the others that have people who have helped us work on this, and this is what everybody feels is the right way to move forward.

There was recently an article that I would at least like to talk about a second. The article was titled “Academic Snow Days”—the idea is that we have become so dependent upon technologies that we bet our best beta software, and we sort of bet our farm, on some of these things and we need to as faculty understand that sometimes these things may not be available. They may break. The problem is that when they break in the middle of one of your classes and you are depending upon that technology to teach your class—and I wish I could tell you it won’t happen, but I can probably rest assured that it will happen over time. We do everything we can to minimize the probability of it happening, but it will happen. We have become so dependent upon email, web space, you name it—we would love it to be a utility, like your electric lights or your telephone, but remember your telephone has been around a few extra years and so has electricity. There are always some little things—but how many of you have gone out to do a presentation, and you take your power point slides on a computer and when you try to plug it into a projector you have never used before, and it won’t sync? There is a lot of problems like this in technology. Even the best laid plans sometimes do not work. I wish I could tell you that it won’t happen again, but I can tell you for sure it probably will. We try to minimize that and try to make the outage as little as possible. We need to be prepared in how we do business, to realize that it is not a utility. We have not had this level of computing and the Web, for as long as our telephone has been around. As Milt Glick says, how often have you had to reboot your telephone? Not very often. Maybe if you go with voice over IP, you might start experiencing some of that however. That is sort of the state of the Black Board. We will be moving over to the new software the evening of May 21; we picked that date because it lets everybody get grades done, etc. and then we have a little tiny break. There is not many breaks anymore, and with our schedule with intercessions—so, that was the date that was agreed upon to try to move the system forward. Now I would like to ask you if you have questions.

Renu Sharma: I don’t know if this comes under your job description, but what about the fully mediated classrooms, are those on schedule?

Vice Provost Lewis: It does come under my job description. Our plan is to take occupancy of the Lattie F. Coor Building about November 20 or so. The building is on schedule at this time for that occupancy. There are twenty-five classrooms in that building with about 1700 student seats total. Classrooms range in size from 20 to 300, actually 299 because of fire codes and exit requirements. If I get one more seat in there, I will have to put another hole in the wall. With 300 there is a 3rd exit required; I am learning a lot of stuff I never wanted to know. About half those classrooms will be fully mediated at the student level. All of them will be fully mediated at the instructor level. I think you will be impressed with the technology that is going into the building. We have worked with a furniture manufacturer for a really neat seat/table that will have a laptop embedded in it that is lockable, so that we can lock it down if the instructor does not want to have computers used, or if one semester we need an extra, regular classroom facility. We can lock the computers down so they are not accessible. All
the classrooms will be wired, except for the very large lecture halls with 60 or more student seats, they will all have wireless capability. All 25 classrooms will have wireless. These will be scheduled through Academic Facilities, and I do have responsibility for classroom support for rooms that are scheduled by Academic Facilities. In the College of Business, the College of Engineering and some other classrooms, there are classrooms owned by the units or the college and I do not support those.

We started a process a year and a half ago to try to improve the quality of these classrooms, and I believe we have made fairly good strides in improving the quality of the technology, the reliability of the technology and have made them so they can be serviced—and respond fairly aggressively to any problems. Milt invested quite a bit of money to allow us to put together a program, and I will say that if I look at the number of complaints, they have gone from a lot to none. Nobody can be that good, but I have talked to faculty and their comments were it is hard to complain, at least when somebody comes when you have a problem. I think that is the right attitude. We try to get there within 10 minutes of a call to find a resolution to a problem. But we also try to touch on every classroom--most of them once a day, some a little more, some a little less than that, to see if things are working. We have a staff that works at night, goes around the classrooms and makes sure that there are markers for the boards. We have had some problems with some broken seats that have not been fixed yet, we are working with Physical Facilities to try to address some of those issues. We have problems with thermostats hanging off the wall, like the one in the back of this room, in fact. There are things like that which we have not addressed yet, in part is has been due to the lack of time on the part of Physical Facilities to do that. I don’t do that out of IT, but I do maintain the technology and I do have responders checking the rooms, who are trying to get the things fixed that are critical.

President Watson: May I interrupt here—before you ask questions today, can senators identify themselves, as we don’t have name tags set out.

Senator Karady: In the Business School, I just had my lecture and they have very small TV monitors, so the students really cannot see the TV monitors very well. Bill, I am not sure if this is your responsibility but you may carry this problem forward. These monitors were excellent, when I started to teach here ten years ago.

Vice Provost Lewis: In doing the mediation for these 25 classrooms, we shied away from monitors--each classroom has dual projection systems, so that you can have two images—one straight ahead and one over to the right or left—one will be on diagonal and one will be straight ahead. You are right, those monitors do not work for larger groups. You are just too far away even if you go to large plasma panels, unless you have a lot of them around the room but they are not really very good. I will convey your concern back to the Business College, because they are not in the rooms that we directly support as I have said.

Senator Swan: What is the potential backlog of what problems the students might with the Black Board switch over on May 21? What can we anticipate?

Vice Provost Lewis: There are two remaining issues that we have got to finish up. We have set a May 15 drop dead date for the decision to be made—that is, if we can’t resolve these two issues by May 15, we probably will wait until later in the summer to make the switch. Neither one of which I think are show stoppers, but they are issues and they should not impact the students—one of them is a grade book calculation problem. There are some errors in the grade book calculations.
**Senator Johnson:** Grade inflation?

**Vice Provost Lewis:** I don’t know if it is inflation or deflation, or just random errors (laughter followed). We are trying to resolve those errors, but in testing we have found some errors in grade book calculations that we are trying to resolve. Another issue has to do with power point presentations that sometimes don’t come out right, and we are trying to resolve those working with Black Board. I honestly don’t believe the students will experience much change. Where they will experience a change is in the portal part, if they use the portal part. We have been disappointed in the Black Board Portal software, its lack of versatility, its lack of robustness, its lack of options and ability to do things. We will be moving, and won’t move until sometime during the fall semester on to a new open access portal system, called U-portal. It is a public domain. Its developer is a part of a consortium. We have got it up and running and are testing it. We believe it will offer a lot more services and functionality. There will be a tab on it that says “teaching and learning environment”—just go to that area and it will be very similar to what you have today, but that won’t be changing quite at this point in time. There will be a drop in functionality on the portal part of it, until we get it up there because some of the portal channels are not moving as easy as we thought they would.

**Clark Presson:** Is there anything that the University IT level can be doing to help our quality of life having to do with Spam?

**Vice Provost Lewis:** Being as we have already had this discussion—We used to do filtering. The problem is that we filtered out stuff that was good email for people sometimes. About two years ago, I decided we could not afford to do that, in essence be censoring what you get, and opened it back up because no matter what we do we run the risk of deleting or filtering a piece of mail that you want. We are currently looking at some front end software that would sit in front of the post office that would do a SPAM filtering that would be an opt-in activity. That is, you as an individual could say, yes, I want to take and have the filtering done. You and not central IT will assume the risk of losing a good email message. The packages will take any email, for instance—if I opted under lewis@asu.edu, it will take and put that email into a quarantine file, so that I would have a web file to look at and see if I want it or not, but it would be out there waiting for that decision to be made. IT will not make that decision for you. What I assume will happen is that for awhile we will be very good about going out there and looking, but very soon after that you will probably get lackadaisical about going out and looking at it, and what we will probably do is continue to keep messages in that file for two weeks, or some period of time, and then they will be gone. You will have to make the decision to go out periodically and check them and see if it is really what you want, and if you don’t like it you can desubcribe. So, we are looking at that option and hopefully we can have something in place for the fall semester.

**Senator Comfort:** Are there any plans to upgrade the Internet on the campus?

**Vice Provost Lewis:** We upgraded a little bit of it over Christmas break, we updated what is called the core router complex—Milt has funded about $600,000 to start upgrading the core routers. It will not upgrade all of them but it will upgrade a fair number of them, all but two. We need another $300,000 out of next year’s budget to try to upgrade the rest of the routers. That is the core router complex around the campus. There is also the issue of building entrances and wiring within the buildings. I have put together a capital improvement plan document that is into Mernoy Harrison right now, requesting funding to start looking at how we can do several things. We still have a lot of building with shared segment Ethernet, instead of switch teeth and we need to replace that. We still have a lot
of buildings with old Cat 3 wiring, and that wiring needs to be updated in order to get higher quality data transfer. If you want to go to 100 meg, you are alright but if you want to go to Gig ether, you are not going to get there under Cat 3, you will have trouble with 100 meg even. We have a plan submitted, which is about a $20 million package, to go through the buildings and upgrade the wiring in the buildings, etc. but we have at least submitted a proposal to try and get funding for it. By the way, if we can keep Spam reduced on campus, we will probably if we looked at all Spam, which is about half the email that comes into campus--some of us may get more, some of us may get less--it is roughly half the email coming in. If we could cut that down--we get 2 to 3 million messages a day coming into this campus--we could significantly reduce the load on our internal network, but we are upgrading all the routers. The routers are 7 year old Cisco 5500’s, they are being upgraded to the current Cisco router complex. We are also doing some things to improve the security of our networks, adding some additional firewalls. I have had faculty who told me three years ago--don’t you dare put my stuff behind a firewall--who are now saying, please do it. They are getting so many denial of service attacks or other hackers coming in that they want all the protection that they can get on their systems. That answers your question I hope. Are there other questions?

President Watson: Thank you very much, Bill, we appreciate you being here.


Senator Gully: I am rising on behalf of my colleagues today and also the Personnel Committee in the Herberger College of Fine Arts. I have been asked to express our frustration, our confusion and our anger at the tenure and promotion decisions that were made in the President’s Office, and to plead with that office to clarify precisely what the parameters are that are required for promotion or tenure. It is certainly very harmful to the lives of those who have been affected by these decisions. It also makes the work of the Personnel Committee at this point absolutely impossible. So, I think it is incumbent upon the President to clarify his decisions.

President Watson: I have spoken with the Dean of the College of Fine Arts and met with some of the personnel committees and other faculty there as well and I echo your concern. The College of Fine Arts in particular seemed to have a difficult time in terms of the tenure and promotion decisions, and in my mind it raises serious questions about your college in particular. This is an issue that I have already raised with Provost Glick and I will be raising with President Crow as well, and I will be going back to Milt after that. One thing that I am trying to do, in this context, is to take a couple of cases coming from your college, and to treat them as mediation opportunities, that is, what it seems to me is lacking sometimes in our tenure and promotion process is an opportunity for the applicant for tenure or promotion to have any say, once those materials have been submitted at the departmental level to the personnel committee. It goes to the personnel committee and through the chair, the college and the university, with never an opportunity for feedback to the applicant nor from the applicant, until they get the letter of denial of promotion or tenure, to have any input or say back, and even then that is very limited. I am hopeful that we can take a couple of cases to the Provost and give an opportunity for a face to face meeting with the Provost that hopefully will clarify that a little more. I very much agree with you that this is a situation which needs addressed. Would anyone else like to speak to this topic?

Renu Sharma: We don’t have any direct issues, but overall in general there has been a feeling about this—because all the packages were made in July of last year and this year everybody has been told that faculty have a complaint—that they were completely ignoring the rules and regulations that were
in effect when those packages were made up in July. Does the Senate have any feeling on this at all, or are we thinking about doing anything, or is it just the way it is?

President Watson: I don’t know. We hope that is not simply the way it is and that is why I am telling you that one thing I am trying to do is utilize the mediation procedure. I know there has also been people looking at the grievance procedure. The grievance procedure is limited, in that it is constrained by the fact that there must be procedural violations, and although one can define process rather widely at times, nonetheless at times it is more constraining. I know that the President and the Provost have been in considerable discussion with the academic chairs and directors and the deans, and now with Senate leadership as well. So, we are simply hopeful that better things will happen and come about. In the tenure and promotion of the 44 or 45 cases there were decided, some individuals were denied tenure and given terminal contracts. That number was slightly fewer than has normally been the case. What was strange about this round of tenure and promotion cases were other things that happened. Concerns being that in some instances, 4 or 5, promotion was extended but without tenure. That would seem to be in violation with ACD Manual, however, the legal counsel office rules that if both parties agree, then the president has the opportunity to waive that policy requirement, if the individual also agrees to that. And, of course, who is going to deny that opportunity. Either you have the opportunity to be denied tenure and be given a terminal contract, or to be promoted and have an extension on your tenure clock. Big choice (laughter followed). What we want to look at are situations like that, the College of Fine Arts was a particular problem, and the academic professionals had a particular problem and there the problem was similar to what I just mentioned. That is, promotions were given but without continuing status being extended at this time. It is unclear what that means. The Provost has indicated and the Vice Provost Gail Hackett has indicated, that they are simply exploring this and it does not mean that continuing status will not be given, but it does mean that they want to look at things a little bit more closely. Our concern is the one you just mentioned, Renu, that is that policy has already been put in place, these packets already came in and is there anything that can be done about that situation.

Senator Hirata: George, there was another case that you didn’t mention in terms of tenure being denied, but another additional year granted to those who were denied tenure, but they had an additional year to find suitable employment with the university. At the East Campus we had two of those cases, so, I would like the record to reflect also, a third category.

President Watson: Thank you Ernie, that is another strange category, the sense on the part of the President, as nearly as I can understand it, is that these individuals in his mind are misclassified, that they should not have faculty designation as an assistant professor, that they come closer in his mind to being a clinical professor and I am not sure what else he had said, or lecturer, or perhaps a professor of practice if that comes into being. In those cases, once again, the tenure clock was simply extended in those instances. So, these are all matters that need to be addressed.

Senator Witt: I believe that there was at least one example of giving this choice—of tenure or promotion without tenure because they successfully negotiated to a full tenure and promotion. I am not free to discuss the details of it.

President Watson: I have heard rumors of one instance of that occurring, and so, that sort of reinforces that, although. maybe I heard it from you initially.
A Senator: In the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, if they are putting things together to try not go to cases--of the original 9 cases we had, the exact opposite of the university’s statistics was the case, where 7 out of 9 cases were denied and one of those was reversed. Therefore, that means 6 out of 9, or 67% were denied, whereas, the rest of the university it has been said had 64% of the cases for P&T approved. The concern there is that they talk about the burden of evidence, the burden of proof and documentation. If there was not an understanding of the discipline, then it is up to the candidate, the chair and the deans to explain those disciplines, but I really think with a reverse of percentages, it does show that there is not an understanding of some of the disciplines, and that cannot be explained away by the lack of evidence nor the burden of proof.

President Watson: We are not giving up and we are going to pursue this as much as we can.

Senator Park-Fuller: I wondered if there isn’t something, with all due appreciation of what you are doing, George, but is there something that the Herberger College and other colleges would want to send forward, would it be something that the Senate could as a body to indicate that we are concerned about changes in procedure, or in outcomes, for the good of personnel committees who are going to be making decisions in the coming year. They are going to need to know what are they recommending for. Can they recommend for tenure and promotion and what are their options? Can we in some way say that it is a sense of the Senate that there is concern about these issues, which are tenure and promotion.

President Watson: Clearly that is the sense of the Senate, and it is the sense of the Academic Assembly, for that matter, and I do believe that the Provost and the President are quite aware of this concern and they are becoming increasing aware of it as more deans, chairs and directors and the Senate leadership talk to them. I am thinking that we are doing what we can, and I am not sure that a resolution would help to that extent but I will simply tell you that we will continue to press on this matter. I am confident that we have the support of the Academic Assembly and the Academic Senate. I don’t think there is any question about that. It is just a matter of making them know how much it is hurting and what that is doing to the President’s leadership. Any other questions on the open forum, or other items? Thanks very much for bringing that issue forward. Let’s move ahead to unfinished business.

5. Unfinished Business.

5.A Executive Committee (George Watson).

5.A.1 Senate Motion #15 (2002-2003): This is a motion to repeal or rescind any +/- system resolutions, that would include resolution #2, which we passed earlier this year and it actually includes the resolution that was passed in 1992 as well, because the intent of Senate #15 is maintain the current grading system, which does not permit plus or minus grades. If Senate Motion #15 passes, a yes vote on motion #15 would repeal Senate Resolution #2 that we introduced and was passed on February 24, 2003 and it would also repeal Senate Resolution #23 passed by the Senate on March 23, 1992. If Senate Motion #15 passes, it makes moot Senate Motions 16 and 17, which tinker with the plus/minus grading system.

I have distributed, and I believe many of you had the opportunity to see, the kind of arguments in terms of pros and cons on plus and minus grades. The feedback that I received from that communication was that it seemed to be fairly comprehensive and someone suggested that I number them, so that if we had
discussion, someone could simply stand up and say number, 1, 4 and 7, and somebody else could argue, I’m sorry, but number 17, 18, and 19--and that would really facilitate discussion. It is not my intent, however, to have much discussion on this today because we have had in fact considerable discussion already on this issue. What I would like to hear from you, first of all, let me recognize that we do have a number of students who are here and they continue to be interested in this issue, but is there anyone here that wishes to “listen” to any further arguments than we have already had with respect to Senate Motion #15. I take that to mean that you are ready to vote on Senate Motion #15, is that correct?

Senator Comfort: Point of clarification.

President Watson: I am asking if anyone else wants to “listen”—I know a lot of people like to speak—I am asking if anyone really wants to listen to other arguments on Senate Motion #15, and I am getting the sense that Joe would like to hear more, and so would a couple of other people. Joe, what would you like to hear more about?

Senator Comfort: I would like to hear some justification for converting grades to numerical status.

President Watson: But there isn’t anything that would convert grades to a numerical status. That is not part of our motion. It is for a plus minus system of A, A-, B+, B-, C+, C, D and E. Or the earlier 1992 Senate Resolution #23 which has A down through D-. That is the current motion on the floor, that is what we are ready to do anything on. Does anyone else need to hear anything further before we vote?

Senator Jacobs: What has changed since we passed the original resolution to make us rethink our position?

Senator Witt: I will respond to that—this is just my take on it, Bert, but it seems to me that we passed Resolution #2, which is A- through C with plus/minus grades but while we were doing that, the students really didn’t like plus/minus grades. They rethought the issue, however, and made a very compelling argument in favor of A+ through in fact D-. So, when our resolution and the students’ resolution went to the President. He wanted to have some reconciliation; he wanted the faculty and the students to get together on this. That is why we are revisiting this issue.

A Senator: Did our resolution ever go to the President?

President Watson: No, not yet. He has discussed it with us.

Senator Witt: So, we will keep voting until we get the right answer?

President Watson: No, I don’t think that is the case. Let me only add to what Tom said, and that is, I was reluctant to accept this Senate Motion #15 from the floor because it seemed to me that we had already passed that point, that the Senate had already expressed its will fairly substantially, however, upon reflection it seemed that it is a valid motion—somebody can make that motion, so the motion is on the floor. Do I hear a call for the question? Yes and seconded.

Senator Comfort: There has to be an opportunity for debate of the motion.
President Watson: What else would you like to hear?

Senator Comfort: Whatever people may wish to say, which is permitted.

President Watson: Exactly. We have had a call for the question, I have heard a second, all in favor of the question please say aye, all opposed say no (several no’s). A simple majority was declared in favor of that question.

Now we can move to the vote on Senate Motion #15. Motion #15, once again, a yes vote means that we would repeal any plus/minus system that had been previously passed by this Senate, and the sense of the Senate would then be that we simply maintain the current grading system, which has no plus/minuses. A no vote means that resolution #2, which we have already passed remains in effect with its plus/minus grading system of A through C with plus/minuses along the way. Are you ready to vote? All those in favor of Senate Motion #15 please raise your hand (11 in favor). All those opposed to Senate Motion #15 please raise your hand (52 against). The motion fails. I am in possession of 9 proxy votes, which are added to that vote, and the motion still fails, most of the proxy votes were no on SM #15.

5.A.2 Senate Motion #16 (2002-2003).

President Watson: This motion is to amend Senate Resolution #2 (2002-2003) supplementing the plus/minus system envisioned by adding an A+ grade of 4.333 since we carry it out to three places. You have seen the arguments for and against the A+ and I am willing to listen to a little bit more on this because we have not really discussed this issue specifically per se. Who introduced that motion?

Senator Keim introduced it--do you wish to speak to that motion initially, Bob?

Senator Keim: I will just add the fact that the University President was interested in the issue the students raised. It comes to the point that if they can get a A-, why can’t they get a A+, and I would think that the standards can be set by the individual faculty members in assigning grades and this grade of A+ is such that it would be a very rarely awarded grade and would only be available to truly outstanding students.

President Watson: Thank you very much, Bob. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in favor of the A+? Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to the A+?

Senator Burstein: I will make the point I have made before, which is any grading system has a top and a minus and a scale. We are going to be judged, the students will be judged, on what the top grade is and the bottom grade is and I suggest that we will give out many more A’s with respect to A-’s than we would ever give out A+’s with respect to A’s. So, I think that if the students get their A+ grades it is going to hurt them not help them.

Senator Johnson: I will speak against the 4.333 on the grounds that it will contribute to grade inflation demands, and that it will encourage outside parties to discount ASU grade point averages relative to the highest possible grade.

ASASU President Leingang: I spoke against the original proposal because the original proposal actually inflated the grades, if you look at those grades, the distribution is bimodal, B+ and C+, so, actually with the current proposal right now we are not mitigating grade inflation we are actually
increasing grade inflation. So, the 4.333 will do nothing because obviously it will be rarely given. I would also question the validity of the statement that outside parties would devalue our grades because Stanford uses a 4.333, and I don’t think Stanford is looked down upon poorly.

**Senator Guleserian:** I think that it is by and large recognized throughout the nation that 4.0 is a high grade, the highest grade, and that we would be making our system incongruous with most of the other institutions, therefore, I am against the motion.

**Senator Jacobs:** We have no control over how often an A+ will or will not be used. It is there, it is a possibility, we have to assume that it will be used frequently.

**Kevin Jones** (a student): I actually am one of the students pushing for the A+; I feel that (but this is something that we are going to have to discuss with Dr. Crow) there needs to be a motivating factor for students at the highest levels. I am a student within the Honors College and we feel that there needs to be a motivation for students to push for the highest level, because as the system currently stands, earning that level of achievement that would be worthy of an A+, merits you no reward over somebody who earns a simple A. We don’t feel that a system like that is going to deliver a fair representation of student grades to the students. They will not receive the kind of feedback they need. Also, in terms of how this might hurt the students by having an A+ because then we are not making a 4.0 be top standard, for students on scholarships the chance of getting A+ and thus counter balancing A-‘s would be vital, especially to those on scholarships requiring a 3.5. The sheer opportunity of having an A+ to balance out with A-‘s means a greater chance to get a scholarship and to maintain one’s status at the university. I personally have enjoyed my time here and I wouldn’t want to lose the opportunity to do my studies, simply because I was not able to achieve and A+ grade to balance that A- I might receive.

**Senator Siferd:** An A- grade is a 3.667 and I believe it does not keep anyone from maintaining a 3.5 average, if you had straight A-‘s. Just a point of clarification.

**President Watson:** Are you ready for the question? Question is called. I see no objection and without objection, we will move to voting on Senate Motion #16. A yes vote would have the action of adding the A+ to Senate Resolution #2 and that A+ would be worth 4.333. A no vote will defeat that and then Senate Resolution #2 will maintain an A as the highest grade, on the proposal that we send forward to the President. All those in favor and who would vote yes, please raise your hand (18 in favor) and those opposed raise your hand (36 against). In addition, there are 2 yes proxy votes and 6 no proxy votes on this motion. The no's have it, and Senate Motion #16 is defeated.

5.A.3 Senate Motion #17 (2002-2003): Establish a C- grade of 1.667, along with grades of D+ and D-. Mike is that a motion that you made?

**Senator Mayer:** Yes. I made it earlier, because some of my faculty said that if there were an A+ they also wanted the extension down at the bottom. I want to withdraw that motion now. Who seconded that motion originally, because we must have the second approve withdrawing the motion. Dick Burg did, and he is not here today.

**Senator Mattson:** This motion does not add an A+ it only adds down to a D-.

**President Watson:** It adds a C-, D+ and D- to a system that lacks an A+.
Senator Guleserian: A point of clarification. This adds C- and we already have a C+? (Yes.) So, we have a C+ and a C but we don’t have a C- (or below).

President Watson: That is correct. Is everyone clear on this? Does anyone else wish to speak? Does anyone else wish to hear anything?

Senator Jacobs: Are the students in favor of this proposal?

(Second student): I will try to answer that. The students entire intention was to have a full range of grading scale options—from the A+ as representing a pinnacle of achievement above the A level, down to the D-. Both provide the faculty with the widest array of options for assigning grades, as well to provide students with the widest range of feedback. Quite frankly, I feel that the system marking for the grade of A+ will be limited in and of itself. The addition of the C-, D+ and D-, I feel do offer a valid mechanism of feedback to the students as well as valid options to the faculty. While I do wish there was a wider array of options available, at this stage I feel that the students would back a more accurate grading scale in this regard.

President Watson: Mike did you want to say anything? Mike Komenda is the president of the ASASU Senate.

Mike Komenda: Yes, the consequence of introducing the C-, the D+ and the D- was largely due to that. We were looking at any particular measuring device we felt that was appropriate, in that it has regular intervals at every point, for example, a ruler would not have inch marks, then have ½ inch marks and then back to inch marks. We felt that there needs to be some sort of cohesiveness within the entire system. While students in general would not be happy to hear student leaders advocating for minus systems, because that would mean that they could get lower grades in particular classes. We felt that if we were going to be honest with the principle of our argument, which was more accuracy in the levels of all grading, we felt it was appropriate to do so.

President Watson: Does anyone want to hear anything or wish to speak? Then, without objection we will move to a vote on Senate Motion #17, a yes vote would have the effect of adding the C-, D+ and D- grades and the C- of 1.667 grade point value. A no vote will defeat that motion and Senate Resolution #2 will go forward to the President as we initially passed it. All those in favor of Senate Motion #17 please your hand (23 in favor) and no votes (28 against). There are also proxy votes to be added to that, 7 no votes and 1 yes vote. So the final vote is 35 no and 24 yes votes and Senate Motion #17 fails. Thank you all very much for your patience with this and I also appreciate how seriously you have taken the issue and discussed it. Thank you.

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

5.B.1 Senate Motion #9 (2002-2003) (Second Reading):

The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the W.P. Carey School of Business for the Reorganization of an Academic Unit from School of Accountancy and Information Management to the School of Accountancy and the Department of Information Systems.
Rationale: The W.P. Carey School of Business has submitted a request for the reorganization of the School of Accountancy and Information Management into two new units: the School of Accountancy and the Department of Information Systems.

While the two units separately will have the same relationship to the Mission and Scope statements adopted by the Board of Regents as does the existing School of Accountancy and Information Management, as separate units they will be able to more freely enhance synergies with other units within the W. P. Carey School. The proposed academic reorganization will enable Information Systems to effectively fulfill the important role that it plays in the W.P. Carey School’s curriculum, programs, and course delivery.

My understanding is that Doug Johnson is here to answer questions on this motion.

President Watson: Are there questions?

Senator Thornton: What will that do to the administration of those two units? Will there be a new chair or dean? Is it costing us money is my question.

Senator Johnson: I don’t anticipate any new faculty lines. The reality is that there will be an additional administrator. The intent is to provide a greater focus on research agendas.

President Watson: Any other questions?

Senator Hirata: We now have a School of Accountancy and then the Carey School of Business. Normally we have a school and departments or a college and departments—that discrepancy just occurred to me.

Senator Johnson: You object then to the School (Squared) concept?

Senator Hirata: Yes. I mean, no, I am not objecting to it, I am just questioning it.

Senator Johnson: There are precedents at many of our peer institutions for schools within schools of business, so it is not a particularly unusual event.

Senator Karady: I feel this is an increase in administration, because now that means there will be two school heads or two deans or whatever that is. It seems to me nothing happening just more administration.

Senator Johnson: I guess that what I would like to see would be an administration that is more responsive to faculty needs.

President Watson: Are we ready for a vote? Are there any other questions? If there is no objection we will move to a vote. All those in favor of Senate Motion #9, please signify by saying aye, all opposed no (one no) with one abstention duly noted. The motion passes.

5.B.2 Senate Motion #10 (2002-2003)(Second Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee at its meeting of March 12, recommended Academic Senate approval of a request on behalf of AAAC to decrease the hours required in residence at ASU main and East from 60 to 56 hours.
Rationale: To better accommodate students transferring from two-year institutions, specifically from Arizona community colleges, who are allowed to transfer a maximum of 64 hours and therefore may only need 56 hours to complete their degree requirements.

President Watson: Are there any questions? If there is no objection we will move to a vote. All those in favor of Senate Motion #10 please say aye and all opposed say no. Thank you very much, the motion passes.

Items are taken out of order at this point.


Rationale: The graduate certificate program in Institutional Research is needed because there is a paucity of graduate degree programs focusing on preparation for the field. The potential market is very large. Every institution of higher education in the United States has policy and data analysis support services for administrative decision-making and strategic planning. The term institutional research is generally used to refer to these services.

I believe Bob Fenske is here to answer questions. Are there questions?

A Senator: Did we skip motion #12? (Yes, we are taking these out of order.)

Senator Mayer: Are there any questions on Senate Motion #13, if not we will move to a vote. All those in favor of Senate Motion please signify by saying aye and all opposed say no. The motion passes.

I would like to do Senate Motion #14 as well now.

5.B.4 Senate Motion #14 (2002-2003) (Second Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee at its meeting of April 23, 2003, recommended Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Committee on Linguistics, to establish a Graduate Certificate in Linguistics.

Rationale: The field of linguistics has grown rapidly since the 1960’s. Interest in the analysis of language and the application of this knowledge to the solution of real problems (i.e., language teaching, translation, artificial intelligence), has brought about the creation of graduate programs in linguistics in over 120 institutions in the U.S. and the establishment of departments of linguistics in large research institutions.

This proposed interdisciplinary graduate certificate in linguistics would offer students in several fields the opportunity to gain an understanding of the way in which languages are structured, how they are acquired and how they vary over time, space, social distance and situational contexts.

I believe that Barbara Lafford is here to answer questions.
President Watson: Are there any questions?

Senator Thornton: Is there an MA in Linguistics?

Barbara Lafford: There are several masters in Linguistics at departmental levels, so this is the first interdisciplinary one. The purpose of this certificate is to help prepare people that are not in linguistics as their undergraduate major. For example, we had an undergraduate major in English. People from computer science may also want take this certificate because they want to work with Microsoft and create lexicons and speech synthesis—and they will need more courses in linguistics. Then people in the field may want to come back and take advanced courses.

Senator Thornton: Is this more of a professional degree? Would it be accredited?

Senator Mayer: I believe that right now there are a number of graduate certificates that are intended or partially created for returning students, as a separate add on to the BA, BS or MA.

Barbara Lafford: Yes.

President Watson: Are there any other questions? If there is no objection we will move to a vote on Senate Motion #14. All those in favor of motion #14 please signify by saying aye, all opposed say no. The motion passes.

5.B.5 Senate Motion #12 (2002-2003) (Second Reading):

Senator Mayer: A motion from CAPC regarding certificates, concentrations and minors (a five page handout was distributed to senators on April 28 at the Senate meeting and a few copies are up front).

President Watson: To answer your question Bob, which was a good one, Senate Motion #12 is focusing on undergraduate, whereas our other ones were dealing with graduate programs.

A Senator: Can you tell me if there are other changes that have not been provided today?

Senator Mayer: I don’t believe so, but this proposal also has to go to the AAAC and they have made some changes, or rather are recommending some changes, to the documents that include statements such as “concentrations may have higher numbers of hours required.” They also have residency requirement related to certificates. It is something that I received this afternoon and then I ran it off.

President Watson: What I would like to see in this situation, is for us to proceed and then we can do a reconciliation between the AAAC version and the Senate version, and if there are differences that seem non-trivial then we would bring it back.

Senator Hirata: We have a program, in which we probably granted 1,000 certificates that were not “cross disciplinary” and I guess that I would like to ask for the removal of that wording, because it does it not meet any other criteria.

Senator Mayer: At least what we passed at this time does not have implications that current certificates have to meet those requirements, although there is a five-year review period. I can explain the reason why we wanted the process—for example, a certificate in Life Sciences was created and it
brought together Plant Biology, Microbiology and Biology—that would be cross disciplinary because it has three separate things that were associated with it. One of the difficulties that the committee has struggled with over the years is how to differentiate concentrations from certificates. We also have in there that concentrations typically belong within a single unit while certificates ought to have something that is in addition to that. The rest of the document does read that in addition to being cross disciplinary, the certificate leads to a professional degree such as in Public Affairs, or that it be certified or accredited by some outside agency or non-profit organization.

President Watson: Ernie, what program were you referring to?

Senator Hirata: Hazardous Waste Management Program that is really not a minor, it really started as a non-degree/non-credit program, where a student had the option of taking the course for credit or taking the course for non-credit. After completing 21 hours—if they took it for non-credit, they were given a certificate which basically said you completed the courses—if they took it for credit it could be used for their degree program. So by passing this as it reads, we will in five years, assuming that it is grandfathered for five years, have eliminated that program because we cannot meet those guidelines.

Senator Mayer: Do they have a major?

Senator Hirata: It is a concentration within a degree program in Industrial Technology. It is not considered a major, the major is Industrial Technology and it is a program that has concentrations.

Senator Mayer: But it is within some concentration.

Senator Hirata: So, as a concentration it would be permitted then under these guidelines? (Yes.) But all of them are not admitted as students to ASU, in other words, it is possible that they could take the courses not-for-credit.

Senator Mayer: This does not apply to non-credit certificates because that goes through extended education.

Senator Hirata: But they can take the courses for credit as part of the concentration? (Yes.)

Senator Humble: A number of our technical areas require certificates for people to be considered for being certified in a particular area, and they are typically not cross disciplinary and we feel that this proposal would really hamper us from going forward with certificates we have already proposed in our department.

President Watson: Those would not be covered by the exception for certifying by accredited organizations?

Senator Humble: Some would not necessarily be attached to a certain organization. If we had a proposal for a certificate in quality management, and all the courses in quality management that we propose for our certificate are in one discipline; there is no need to go outside the discipline of quality management.

Senator Mayer: Yes, but would that be considered a professional degree?
Senator Humble: No. The certificate has approximately seven classes.

Maria Allison (substituting for Senator Bernstein): How about modifying that language to include something like—advanced professional preparation? My sense of that second option where you say accreditation, they are really talking about focused professional specialization in an area. That is really what it means. It may not be accredited or have an accrediting body, but it is focused professional specialization.

Senator Mayer: That is right. “Degree” actually was pointed out last time that it was not appropriate.

Maria Allison: Call it professional specialization, I don’t know if that is acceptable? (Yes.) Clearly leads to advanced professional specialization in lieu of professional degree.

President Watson: Is that an amendment proposal? So moved, and seconded. May we vote on that amendment? All those in favor of adding that particular language, “The undergraduate certificate programs—the whole section says—is cross disciplinary or certified by professional or accredited organization/governmental agency or clearly leads to an advanced professional specialization in lieu of professional degree.

President Watson: Do we understand the amendment? All in favor please say aye and opposed say no. The amendment passes. Are we ready to move to the main motion #12 as amended, please signify by saying aye, opposed say no. The motion passes as amended.

5.C Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

The Personnel Committee brings to you Senate Motion #11 for second reading today. The motion is to propose revisions to the ACD manual sections 506 and 507 in response to ABOR 6-201. This is a proposal to create Professors of Practice and Research Professors, and modify the enabling language at the Board of Regents level.

President Watson: Let me interrupt you please, there is a change that I made on the agenda that is consistent with what the Personnel Committee was talking about—what is on the screen differs slightly from what is on the printed agenda, because the Personnel Committee is going to recommend holding this motion over, as it says on the screen. Doug will explain.

Senator Johnson: As the Senate President points out, it is the recommendation of the Personnel Committee to table this motion until the first meeting in the fall, with the intent of allowing more ample discussion, clarification and the ability to consider this with motion #18, which deals with revisions of ACD 506 and ACD 507 that pertain to academic professionals, all at the same time.

President Watson: There is a motion to table until the first meeting in the fall. Does that need a second or require discussion (No.)—all those in favor of tabling and holding this motion over until the first meeting please say aye, all opposed say no. The motion to table Senate Motion #11 until the first fall meeting passes.

6. New Business (Committee Reports and New Motions).

6.A Executive Committee (George Watson).

Just in the past week, it has come to my attention that the Faculty Athletic Representative, Jerry Kingston, will be serving in his last year as the Faculty Athletic Representative for ASU. He has served in this position for 17 years. I have had some discussion with Jerry and with others that suggests that there may be some reconsideration of certain policies with respect to faculty governance and oversight of the intercollegiate athletic program, and especially regarding compliance and enforcement. Senate Resolution #5 is designed to address that. You have a hard copy of the resolution and I will put mine on the screen. There are a number of whereas clauses.

The policy that is currently in effect goes back to 1982, and came about because of some problems with athletics at that time and it is suggesting that the principles that were set forth in 1982, which also provided for the Faculty Athletic Representative and placed certain responsibilities in his hands be reaffirmed--it is recognizing Jerry Kingston for his long years of service. I think he has served us quite well, with “great commitment, diligence and integrity,” as the resolution says. It also suggests that the President and the Provost have long supported this program by providing necessary assistance, both to ICA and to the Faculty Athletic Representative, in terms of a fiscal contract because much of that work needs to be done over the summer, reduced teaching and research demands are included, also the administrative support necessary for the Faculty Athletic Representative to carry out his responsibility. Then recognizing that our compliance and enforcement program we have here, as well as many other aspects of our institutional support of the athletes, is widely recognized around the country as being a model that many universities would like to follow. There is a lot of ferment now in the South East Conference, in the Big 10 and even in the PAC10, to adopt procedures that are much closer to ASU than exist at other universities. There is a very long 7 items here, and the Executive Committee is hoping that we will consider this today, that is move it beyond first reading. That is in part because of the exigencies of the situation. The President is ready to name a new faculty athletic representative soon to replace Jerry Kingston, the idea being that Jerry would be able to work for this coming year with whoever is appointed to replace him, and the possibility then that there are changes already occurring within ICA that may in fact diminish some of the resources, as a part of cost cutting that is going on in ICA.

The active part of the resolution you can read before you, and I won’t read it all to you except to point out the individual items--thanking Professor Kingston for his dedication as the University’s Athletic Representative, recognizing that the Faculty Athletic Representative has been the final authority for this university in determining issues of academic eligibility for student athletes. It indicates that we would like to see the current role of the current Faculty Athletic Representative in preparing and distributing various detailed reports to us, as well as to other bodies be continued. That his or her role as an advocate for the counselor of student athletes be continued. That the faculty reporting role of the Faculty Athletic Representative, in presenting written reports to us and in person, will continue. That the President and Provost continue to provide support, both to ICA and to the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and to the Faculty Athletic Representative. We indicate that any changes or proposed changes in policy and procedures and level of support, a reduction in personnel that will effect the items listed in this resolution, be reported to the Academic Senate in a timely enough manner that we might in fact participate in decisions about whether or not these changes should take place.

This is a rather lengthy resolution and I apologize for that. I am sorry that it comes with almost no notice to you but as I told you, I learned about this only in the past week, and feel like it is important
enough for us to act on rather quickly. This comes to you as both a first read and I have reported to you what it is about. There is a motion from the Executive Committee that we move to waive the rules and move to a second read and that is not a debatable motion. Is there and debate that might be carried out on a first read that people may wish to address?

**Senator Burstein:** That can be carried out after the prior motion.

**President Watson:** So, the motion is to grant permission to move to a second read status for this meeting. Is there a point of order?

**Senator Dan Landers:** It sounds like a lot of this is because you suspect that there are changes afoot in terms of changing things around—would you elaborate on that a little bit.

**President Watson:** I think that was a driving force in a sense in terms of driving this, but in the resolution itself I have tried to frame in a way that basically does not make assumptions, that is, that we continue what we have been doing, and says that we think what we have been doing is good. So, it is trying to affirm what we have done and to suggest that we continue doing it. I tried to avoid language that would suggest anything that might yet be rumor, since I have not verified that certain things have happened. I guess I would prefer to leave it at that. I have heard rumors, but I really do not want to speculate about the rumors. Are there any further questions? All of those in favor to move to a second reading, which will permit us to debate the issue by the way, and therefore it could be tabled at that point or defeated or approved at that point—all those in favor of moving to a second reading, please raise your hand. We need a 2/3 vote in this, and all opposed raise your hand. The motion passes. So, it is moved to a second reading now and it is open for debate from the floor. Are there any other questions? Dan’s question was appropriate. Without objection we will move to a vote. All those in favor please say aye, all those opposed say no. Senate Resolution #5 passes unanimously.

6.B **Committee on Committees** (Ernest Hirata). No report, because I made my report at the last meeting a week ago.

6.C **Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee** (Michael Mayer).

These are information items that the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee approved on April 30, 2003:

**Information Items**

On April 30, 2003, the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommended approval of the following:

**College of Engineering & Applied Sciences**

**Herberger College of Fine Arts**

**Establishment of Concentrations**

- Department of Computer Science & Engineering
  - M.S. Computer Science
  - Arts, Media & Engineering
Ph.D. Computer Science  
Arts, Media & Engineering

Department of Electrical Engineering  
M.S. Electrical Engineering  
Arts, Media & Engineering

Ph.D. Electrical Engineering  
Arts, Media & Engineering

School of Art  
M.F.A. Art  
Digital Technology

Department of Dance  
M.F.A. Dance  
Interdisciplinary Digital Media & Performance

Department of Theatre  
M.F.A. Theatre  
Interdisciplinary Digital Media

School of Music  
M.M. Music  
Interdisciplinary Digital Media & Performance  
D.M.A. Music  
Interdisciplinary Digital Media & Performance

I might add that these are indicated as concentrations rather than certificates, which is what CAPC had originally recommended. This is largely because they want to keep ownership of the concentration within each of the particular units rather than having it go cross-disciplinary and being called a certificate. All of these programs are associated with a large grant request.

Maria Allison (substituting for Senator Bernstein): They are stand alone, but they are also part of a larger branching foundation effort to link media arts and engineering.

6.D Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson).

6.D.1 Senate Motion #18 (2002-2003) (First Reading): Regarding a proposed renumbering of the ACD Manual sections 508 through 517, to 509 through 518 respectively, while compiling and reordering existing ACD 506, 507, and 510 sections and paragraphs dealing with Academic Professionals into ACD 508. In addition, Senate Motion #18 petitions the President and the Provost of the University to create a task force to recommend changes to the 5xx sections of the ACD Manual regarding Academic Professionals.

Senator Johnson: The Personnel Committee recommends Senate approval of Motion #18, which calls for a renumbering of provisions pertaining to academic professionals in ACD 506 and 507, reclassifying those in a new section 508 to consolidate and make that document more useful. This is a
first reading; the intent on placing this on the agenda today is to make it possible for this to be consideration very early in the semester next fall. There will be a committee appointed of academic professionals to refine and clarify the requirements, and we hope that this is the best vehicle for addressing the concerns of academic professionals and the University to the extent that their policy for personnel actions is clearly stated and well thought out.

**President Watson:** Are there any questions of Doug?

**Senator Dwyer:** Would the committee that is appointed be made up of academic professionals?

**Senator Johnson:** Over the last three years, we have had a series of task forces and committees that have looked at ACD 506 and 507 and proposed recommendations for faculty. Those were the issues of Senate Motion #11 that we considered earlier, and we are holding those on the basis of your earlier vote to be considered along with similar divisions for academic professionals, which will be prepared by a committee working over the summer and into the fall as necessary, to provide the policy statement that group would like.

There are two other items that I was hoping to be able to announce to you. We have activities this year where we have been trying to improve our health insurance and there is also been an effort in order to create a plan for incentives for early retirement. I cannot provide specifics at this time. We expect more information to be available very soon, and would ask you to stay tuned to your email and the Insight for more specific disclosures. I can tell you that the Department of Administration has decided to renew the Cigna contract for health insurance for a full year, so, as of October of 2003 we will renew that contract. We expect the Department of Administration to announce rates for employees sometime later this week. The bad news is that they are asking for a big increase and the state legislature is not ready to put more money into the system right now. So, a littler sticker shock may present itself here. The tri-university committee on self-insurance has been attempting to develop a separate university health insurance plan, as an alternative to the Department of Administration. We have received very strong support for the administration; we have now achieved some buy-in from UofA and NAU. We have hired a consultant and are proceeding to develop a blue print, for developing a separate health insurance plan. It is a huge amount of work. It has the potential of creating a plan that better meets the needs of our employees. Again, I can’t give you more specifics, but we are hoping that this would be available on October of 2004, when the state would be offering a self-insured plan as an alternative to the current Cigna fully insured health insurance plan. It is not clear at this time that we would offer as a separate university plan, a self-insured or a fully insured model, but we would design it to meet the needs of our employees that the Department of Administration has been reluctant to address.

**Senator Rice:** Will the alternative to ASU also potentially lead to a lower cost, or does it simply provide greater flexibility?

**Senator Johnson:** I guess what I would promise is greater flexibility. I think it is perhaps the only way, long term, that we will be able to decrease our cost increases. Whether or not we will be able to achieve immediate reduction is yet to be determined. I would say that we have informational pricing from Blue Cross/Blue Shield on the NAU PPO plan that would not present an increase for next year, whereas Cigna is probably asking for over 20% increase.
On the issue of retirement incentives, many of you know that at the last Board of Regents meeting there was an enabling legislation approved for universities to offer early retirement incentives. It has very general language, no specifics involved. ASU has been a driver on this. There is a proposal that is circulating around that would provide significant benefits to those who might choose to retire early. That is still being hammered on, and parameters are being changed but we would expect this to be available soon. We had a little fly in the ointment, however, the Board of Regents is now asking for the ASU Plan to come back to them for approval. That is going to make it very difficult for this to be available for people that retire this year. Provost Glick is trying to expedite and we are hoping that we have an announcement in time that would allow those who are contemplating retirement for July 1 to take advantage of it. Again, we will try to keep people informed by email, etc.

6.E  Student-Faculty Policy Committee (Craig Allen).

Last week we generated numbers on our classroom facilities study. We had 63 good things said about the classrooms (and 170 students and faculty said) that 50 classrooms were identified as good and 119 identified as bad. The top good classrooms were BAL 131 and ECA 219. The top bad classrooms were NUR 101, NUR 110, LL Room 2 and LL “ALL”. We will be working on this report over the summer.

6.F  University Affairs Committee (Karen Dwyer).

President Watson: Karen has asked that I go ahead and deliver the report of that committee. The proposals for bylaw revisions remain on the Web site, we haven’t got the motion to come forward to you yet but that will come forward to you by the first fall Senate meeting. There are considerable revisions and they are posted on the Web site under the Issues :: section. Please read them over before we cover this at the first meeting in the fall.

6.G  Faculty Ombudsperson Report (Kathleen McCoy).

My report will be briefer than Craig’s. I have dealt with 8 people this year—2 health related issues, one had to do with health insurance that was missing. Another had to do with insurance issues after termination. There were three inquiries regarding termination issues that were fairly light, there was one inquiry regarding grants rights and termination, then two people contacted me, one of which I had to refer elsewhere.

President Watson: I do think that there may be a future here in the mediation process, with respect to tenure and promotion, and we may in fact open that up as a possibility, which we have not done before.


I have submitted reports for both the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure and on the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee to the Senate President.

6.I  Governance Grievance Committee Report (Norbert Samuelson and Carlos Vallejo, co-chairs)

President Watson: A report has also been submitted from the Governance Grievance Committee and I indicated that this would be sufficient.
Senator Dan Landers: Could you give us a clue on how many cases we have on each of those two committees?

Senator Burstein: There were 2 CAFT hearings that were held in the fall. One was found in favor of the grievant and one was found in favor of the university.

President Watson: Were those the decisions of CAFT or of the University President?

Senator Burstein: Both the decisions came forward in the committee reports and the President agreed with both reports.

President Watson: Good, that is what I was trying to get at. Are you familiar with whether or not the Governance Grievance Committee had cases this year?

Senator Burstein: The Governance Grievance Committee had no hearings this year.

7. Passing of the gavel.

President Watson: I hope that as we come to an end here, I will not simply be known as the Senate President that had long meetings! That is going to be a terrible legacy to have and the only way that I can overcome that is by what I hope will be remembered as my greatest legacy—but you will not see that until next year, because I think my greatest legacy will be known as having recruited Tony Garcia to be our next president of the Senate, so at this time, I am really very happy to turn over the gavel to Tony.

Senate President-Elect Garcia: Thank you, I think. Before we adjourn, I would like to make a couple of comments and a couple of presentations to George. I guess many of you know George. I went back and looked at the record. He has been at ASU for 34 years, which in 2004 begins his 35th year. We have been really fortunate at ASU, and I have been very fortunate to spend the year as incoming President-elect, to watch George in action, watch how he goes about and cares deeply about the University and cares about faculty, he cares about how things are done and the voices as well—as with the students through the plus/minus grades issue. The other thing I had prepared, and it turned out that I did have to change it—I was thinking about Grading George for this year—I had decided I was going to give him an A+, but it is not an option, so, you have to settle for an A!

I also learned a couple of things about him and I want to show you by illustration one of the things I learned—I have a couple of gifts for him, and if you will open this up, George, maybe it will be a little bit explanatory—George is taller than I am by about four inches. I managed to find this basketball shirt, and hopefully it is big enough for him. It says on it “Watson 2002 ASU Academic Senate” because he plays basketball several times every week and he has always been a team player. The other shirt was selected by Maryann (nice casual ASU shirt) and so we hope you like that too. There is one more gift—the heavier gift, for his leadership and the traditional present for all past presidents, and he has only 25 days left in office--The gavel and a plaque inscribed “In appreciation to George Watson, President of the Academic Assembly and Senate 2002-2003, for strong leadership that sparkled and for technological prowess and vision. Thank you for advancing the Academic Senate Web page and its newsletter, also, many thanks for enhancing self-governance and strengthening our ASU Community while serving as Senate President.” (Applause followed).
With that we are adjourned.

8. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:14 p.m.
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