
Substitutes: Molly McCartney for Peter Crozier, Mary Skorheim for Juan Gonzalez, Linda DeFato for JoAnn Mulvihill


Guests: Patty Feldman (Chair of CAPS) and Gail Hackett (Vice Provost).

1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Tony Garcia at 3:15 p.m.

2. Approval of the Previous Minutes (May 5, 2003).

A package was sent by email with many acrobat files in it, and they were also posted on the Academic Senate Web site. That packet included the previous minutes, and the first order of business will be to entertain a motion to approve the minutes. The minutes of May 5, 2003 were approved by voice vote.

3. Announcements and Communications.

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

I will start off with some brief comments today. We are in a new room (SCOB 228) and are adjusting to that and thankfully we have a lot of help getting started this semester from Mary Aniuk and her staff.

The enrollment picture looks good. On Friday, we released the enrollment statistics for the University. Some of you may have read about that in Saturday’s morning’s paper. I will give a few of those statistics and then talk about what happened in the rest of the nation. Our head count increased to 57,543 students. That is over 2,000 more than last year. It is nice to see that and it is one
of the things that brought me to ASU originally, and I appreciate the way the University continues to find ways to expand the opportunities for students to come here. Our first-year, full-time students at ASU Main increased to 7,698. That figure is up over 1,000 from last year, which was 6,820. A lot of that growth turns out to be from non-resident students. We also had an increase in the number of in-state students. While we are having all these increases, we had very little increase, in fact a slight decrease in the number of faculty. This is quite a challenge, so I will get back to you on that later. In the rest of the nation, recently one of the distressing things that I have read about in the papers was in California--community colleges in California have actually lost 54,000 students. This is a dramatic number and even though the system is quite big, still 54,000 people who don’t have the advantage of starting off on their higher education career is mind boggling to me. At the University of Washington, they have cut back their community college transfers from over 1,900 to 1,100. The University of Illinois cancelled lots of classes; the University of North Carolina shut out about 1,000 students and this list keeps going on and on. A New York Times article from August 24 discusses this in detail. So, for our neighbors and around the country, universities are seeing these unfortunate cutbacks on enrollment. To me it is great to see that we are not moving in that direction. In fact we are expanding. The challenge for us this year is how we continue to survive with all the education that ASU is known for, and to even go further than just a quality education while we have increased in the number of students and have a slight decrease in the number of faculty.

This year, as you know, the voluntary separation plan is in effect and our senior colleagues are talking about retiring. In the midst of this we are seeing at the same time the challenge of what to do if we lose some of our most experienced people, while we are trying to manage ever increasing student numbers. That is what I think overall is our challenge this year—as we have the changing of the guard, as we try to bring in new people next year, and as we try to meet all of our obligations as well to move the University forward. I think that is the challenge for all of us, and a lot of what we are going to be discussing this year in the Academic Senate--how do we meet this challenge in a way that includes everybody’s outcomes.

I want to turn over the meeting now to President Michael Crow who wants to address you today and we have a microphone for you to interact with him from the audience.

3.B University President’s Report (Michael Crow).

Thanks, Tony. What I wanted to do today is talk to you about five things and hopefully we can have dialogue. I want to talk first about the significant challenges that we have in our present working environment, some of which Tony just described. Second, I want to talk about our overall challenge, which is the transition from a great regional university to a national university. There are three things we have to do simultaneously to be able to make that transition. I will also talk about the University Design Team and its report and fifth, the issue that came up at your last Senate meeting, which I could not be present for, that is whether or not I have respect for the faculty and their opinions. We will deal with that item last.

We are meeting the challenge of making this university work on a daily basis with increasing student enrollment and limited resources, although it is fair to say that with the tuition increase, with additional private sector donations and other things that are going on, we have more resources to work with this year than we had resources to work with last year, which is true at only a very small handful of the universities. Most states, 41 or 42, had reductions in their state appropriations in the fiscal year leading up to this academic year. We did not. We were a part of the group that successfully
campaigned with the Governor and with others to make sure there was no reduction in our base appropriations. That came among several years of reduction, from that particular investment partner in the university, the State of Arizona. So, when you match up where we are now with where we were before, we believe that in the near future we will have resources this year for performance based merit increases for staff and faculty, and we will be making some announcements of where we are heading with that. We believe that we have resources to move forward, to continue to invest in new initiatives at the department level, the school level, the center level, and the project level. Last year we launched more than 30 of these. This year we will be continuing to launch some additional new investment areas. We have made new commitments in Economics, we have made new commitments in Anthropology, we have made new commitments in English, new commitments in Psychology, and a range of other areas last year where we were able to get some things going initially, as well as about 30 special project investments. What all that means is that while it certainly is a struggle to deal simultaneously with growth of the University while at the same time trying to make sure that we deliver a quality educational product and a quality educational experience, we are doing that slightly advantaged over our peers right now. This comes at the same time we are suffering, as is everyone else in resources—from losses in the stock market. We are moving our way through a tough fiscal environment that looked large relative to the economy. It is worth noting that due to our increase in financial aid pursuits that our student demands [would change]—there was some speculation that we would see a fleeing from ASU to the community colleges because of your price differentiation as a function of tuition increase. But, I am happy to note that I am seeing no evidence of that whatever. Demand is up from all sectors, all groups, diversity is up, in fact, our freshmen class admitted this year is almost 30% students of color, the highest in the history of the University. We believe that we have weathered the present fiscal storm such as we know as it exists, as well as just about anything else. I think you have your deans to thank for that, the Provost of the University—he is a master at managing the enterprise at the level where we can have resources to invest while at the same time moving forward. Back to Tony’s point about there being fewer faculty members. Tony, I don’t know if your numbers are main campus or all of the university—we had 40 vacant faculty spots on the west campus and they have the resources necessary, and they will be added as they are hired. We certainly had faculty growth in certain areas of the University and stable faculty money in other areas of the University, and I am still trying to run aground the occasional story that I will hear about many departments. I will pick Political Science as an example: someone told me that they are down six faculty positions and that there are no new resources for filling those positions. When I hear something like that, I start running the story down immediately to find out what is really happening. We are working on those kinds of things. Overall, while I don’t think we have an outstanding report of our present status in terms of managing the University that we are, I think that net--net we are doing better than most, in fact, better than many overall. I think that is good news because it keeps us focused on what we really need to do, which is to find a way to transition--moving from being an outstanding, in fact one of the best, if not the best, regional university (and what I mean by that is that a regional university is the one that serves its region well that doesn’t compete against the national universities for faculty, for resources, for investment, etc.) to a national university. We are among the best in that particular arena, as opposed to a national university, which is an aspirational goal, where most of us, possibly not all of us, would like to go. The problem with transitioning from a great regional university to a national university is that we have some other things that are influencing us that are affecting how we move forward, and whether or not we are able to obtain that objective. That would be three significant, simultaneous challenges, and I can’t think of very many other schools that have these same three challenges because either they are more mature than we are from an age perspective, and are stable more so than if they don’t have rapid population growth, demographic
shifts and so forth, or they are fully built out and heavily endowed already, which we are not. We are really still living in the first generation of our campus; so, we have a long way to go.

Here are our three challenges. All of these cause tension in the organization. Most universities would only take on one of them at a time. I would argue and say today that we don’t have time to make that argument but I would be happy to focus on that. I would argue that we have no choice but to take on all three of these at once. Our future challenges in terms of transitioning from regional to national status are the following: To both grow and enhance our quality at the same time. You have heard me talk about this before but just to be clear that means enabling the main campus to actually level its growth out and stop growing—by growing the East and the West campuses dramatically to 20,000 students each—maybe leveling off the Main campus at 50,000 students with a larger number of graduate students within that mix of total students—also these are numbers that approach E numbers, not total body numbers. These are large numbers. On the main campus that would allow us to concentrate on a research intensive mission, not that there would not be research activities on the other campuses, including what would eventually become the Downtown Campus but we have to find ways to grow and enhance our quality at the same time. Very few places have been able to do this. If you look at the University of Washington, the building of their non-Seattle campuses, those campuses already are launched on a trajectory where they will and forever be second tier campuses in the pseudo system called the University of Washington. We cannot move in that direction. We can’t end up with second or below second tier within a pseudo Arizona State University system. Our strategy is one to embark on the building of a single university with multiple schools distributed across multiple campuses, where each school on each of these campuses—be it liberal arts and sciences here or life sciences within liberal arts and sciences or social work or technology or management on the west campus—each school will be defined in a way where it will have national peers against which it is competing and it is measured against, and each school will stand on its own right as a competitive enterprise--a school center as opposed to campus centered model--so that we never end up with a model where we are right now, on the present trajectory, which is a model not worthy of attention and that is a model where we end up with weak replicates of the main campus on satellite campuses which will forever be known as ASU Jr. or ASU-like. We can’t end up there particularly if we end up with distributional trafficking of students in terms of preference of campuses. We would then end up with differentiation in terms of distribution of students based on student socio-economic standing or ethnicity. We need one university, great schools, each school working and striving for national competitiveness and these schools will be spread out across the university on multiple sites. That is the way that I believe we can handle growth, and Tony and others, if you want to talk about this some more, we can talk about what this means a little bit more down the road. That is the first thing that we have to do.

If you say, why us, why do we have to do it? Well, there is no one else. There is no other public university platform that would take the student growth in metropolitan Phoenix. We are going to expand our relationship with community colleges, we are going to be announcing a relationship with them and we are going to be working our way through that in a way that will allow us to use some of their platforms, their ten campuses, their billion dollar bonding issue which is coming up and we will try to capitalize on that, and there are joint baccalaureate programs and other things we can accomplish. But we as the university either have to meet this student demand or other institutions will be built to meet the student demand. If we don’t meet it, other institutions will be built and those institutions will be consuming the same resources that we presently have access to. They will become competitors. Now, I believe it is institutionally too early in this institution’s history to have that type of competition and I believe that in other states, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Missouri, where these four-year state colleges have been evolved very rapidly, the quality of which in almost every case is marginal and that says that
it does not work out. Community colleges drop off, the new state colleges under perform, and the flagship university in the states are then under funded. Our situation is complicated. It is for that reason as well as several others that we believe we have to handle the growth and it will not be easy.

The second challenge that we have is to expand our research activity. We have a lot of reasons for this: 1) the value proposition for public sector investment in this institution was long ago tapped out. The reason that we are not receiving more resources from the state is that they believe that they are getting all the resources that we deserve. The reason that they believe that we are getting all the resources that we deserve is, at least in their collective wisdom which is substantially more manipulative in a positive sense than you might imagine—is that they are willing to listen to arguments, as we tested that out last year and proved it to be successful last year, but they are only willing to invest so much in the institution. We have to increase the value proposition. One way to do that is to increase the number of things that we do that have a direct impact on the social and economic outcomes of this region. We are underpowered as a research institution, but more importantly than us as an institution, we are underpowered as a research active community. Metropolitan areas twice our size have as much as 12 or 13 times the amount of public sector research investment as we have. Metro Phoenix has the 19th most creative of the 20 largest metropolitan areas in the United States, as measured by creativity in the arts, creativity in technology, creativity in business, and creativity in science (92nd among 150, in science and technology specifically). Furthermore, and perhaps even more importantly for some of you, even those of you who are not from extensively funded, research-intensive departments, the university is woefully short on resources. Other universities, the University of Washington, UCLA, the University of California at San Diego, the University of Texas, the University of Minnesota, Ohio State, have on the order of three to five times the research volume that we do. With the resources that they generate from that research volume they are able to fund greater libraries, they are able to fund significant things relative to building repair, building maintenance, building design, graduate students, etc., which frees up state resources that they have in their institution for other things. We haven’t figured that out yet here and I am not exactly sure why that the single most significant financial advantage the University of Arizona has over us—because they receive basically the same state appropriation that we do but they have three times the research volume that we have. That doesn’t mean just the medical school. Their medical school is very young and not that well funded, as medical schools go. So, we need to change our value proposition to the community and we also need to change our ability to raise resources to build the overall institution in that setting. Our challenge is to expand our research activity across all areas and all dimensions, not just science and technology. Along that line, we have launched since July 1, 2002, the building and or acquisition of one million new square feet of research space—all of which will be operational by the mid-point of 2006. That is already underway. That will give us the resources that we need across 25 to 35 disciplines at least, to be able to do a higher volume of research activity, to work at the highest levels of creativity, and to compete at higher levels.

The third challenge is what I have called before social embeddedness, taking the university and increasing its value proposition to the community— if the second one on research was economic embeddedness, this one is social embeddedness. We don’t have time today to go through all the logic behind each of these moves. The Stardust Center for Affordable Homes and the Family is an example of social embeddedness. Direct engagement of the faculty from six schools on trying to find a replacement model for public housing; working with the private sector trying to implement that model; working with the schools to implement that model; engaging new ways to do research and discovering that is an example of social embeddedness. A second example of social embeddedness is Gene Garcia’s appointment as Vice President for Educational Partnerships. The Dean’s job in that
roll is to take all assets of the University, not just the assets of the College of Education faculty and staff, but all assets, and to find ways to directly engage them in successive K-12, in fact pre-K-12 enterprises across the state. He is in the process of doing that, he is working with all the deans, and he will be eventually working with all the departments. He has put forth a number of objectives that he is working toward and you can find these, I believe, articulated on the web site for my office.

In summary, there are three challenges: quality and growth, research expansion, and social embeddedness. We can talk about each of these individually if that would be useful to the Senate. We have launched a number of initiatives in each of these areas in order to get underway. One of the initiatives is the Provost’s University Design Team initiative. The team is an 18-faculty member group that came together to create a starting point for a discussion. Some of you, I don’t know how many of you, looked at the University Design Team report—and that is meant to be a discussion catalyst. It is not a policy document; no policy documents have come forth yet. It is a discussion catalyst in the sense of asking the question, how do we build an entire university? I believe and I know that Milt Glick believes, and Pete Likins at the UA believes it, that right now the success of the state of Arizona’s universities system including ASU Main and UA Main is dependent upon our ability to build the East and the West campuses. If we cannot do that then we have a very stark choice—we either do that or cut off our enrollment, as has been done in the California State University System, where 30,000 qualified students in the upper 1/3 of the high school graduating class in the State of California were told you cannot come to the Cal State System. Notwithstanding whom they do not invite to attend the University of California system. It has never been done in Arizona for qualified students—they have never been turned away. Either we must find a way to take these qualified students or we must turn them away. That means doing something that we haven’t done before because we have been accepting them without resources. We have been taking them and basically educating them through the hides of the faculty, through the hides of the staff that is, by people working extraordinarily hard to make this happen. Well, we can only make this go so far and we believe that we have reached that limit. In looking out over the next several years, the University Design Team, believe it or not, is throwing out ideas about how you could make an entire university work. You certainly don’t make it work if what we do is to say ok, let’s move every marginal program that we have on the main campus, the people on the main campus that we don’t want—and why don’t we just move those all to the east campus—we will see how the east campus does. Well they won’t do very well if that is the logic. Or let’s take a series of individual faculty members that we don’t want, and move them to the west campus and we will see how they fare there. We can’t work like that either. We have to have logic to what we do. The downtown campus, if we try to build that to 10,000 or 11,000 or 12,000 students, what programs might logically best be located on the downtown campus? What we are looking for more than anything in the University Design Team is creative thinking that goes beyond the end of one’s nose. Beyond the selected interest of an individual faculty member, and beyond the selected interest of an individual department because some of us here have to build an entire university that works across this spectrum of social, demographic, and economic forces, which are all around us. So, what we are looking for is maximum creative engagement. The process will work, and as the Provost can take public comments, the Provost can take the best ideas that we have received, box those up and give a series of recommendations to me, then I will take those recommendations and we will start thinking about what we can do, what we can’t do, what is feasible, what is not feasible, what can you do in one year, what can you do in five years, what can you do in ten years and we will start thinking about how we are going to roll out this university, as a university. That is the purpose of the Design Team.

One last thing, on respect for the faculty—I was not able to attend the last Senate meeting, so I did not hear the note, but certainly there are none of you here that suggests that somehow respect and
agreement, in all cases, mean the same thing. I respect the faculty at this university immensely and signed on to your team with every ounce of energy that I have. I am devoting every ounce of energy I have to helping this team and this university be successful, and I do that out of respect for this faculty, out of respect for what this faculty is committed to, out of respect for what this faculty has devoted its lives to, out of the kinds of things that we can do here that we can’t do at other places because of the kind of faculty that are here, and out of a willingness not to turn students away. It is exactly what Tony said, in Illinois they turned them away, and in California they turned them away. Here we said nope, we don’t want to turn them away, we really need to but we are willing to eek out a little bit more out of our own efforts. We can take a few more students and give them the chance that they need. Therefore, I have immense respect for the social engagement of the faculty, I have immense respect for the creativity of this faculty, the ability of this faculty to adapt to immense pressures and to perform with limited resources and to stretch every nickel as far as it can possibly be stretched to get the enterprise to work for the collegial environment that has been developed here. I am here because I respect the faculty and what they stand for. That does not mean that we will agree on every single issue—I love my wife immensely but I do not agree with her on every single issue. Believe me; we cannot argue in public anymore, because people say, did you see what those people are doing? Let me pick a particular case, the plus minus grading system—I know that it was considered by this body for a long time. It was a close split and opinion by this body, and we saw something that I believe that we all should be proud of, unbelievable engagement by the students—thousands of students signed petitions, groups of students organized to argue this case or that case. So, without wanting to get into the details of it today, it struck me that in considering this body’s recommendation, and in considering the recommendation of the student body together, I tried to find ways to blend and balance and to recognize the hard work of everyone, but particularly to recognize the amazing transformation of the student body in the last year—we had 85% of the student body supporting a 40% tuition increase last year. We also have had no demonstrations, no riots, and no takeovers. We managed that process last year because the students were willing to listen, they were willing to engage, and they were willing to be constructive. We said to them, tell us what you want. Well, for the job that I sit in and from the job that Milt Glick sits in, we have got a lot of things to balance in our job. We have a lot of groups to listen to. So, it is out of no disrespect that I didn’t take lock, stock and barrel, 100% of the recommendations from this body. We tried to be as creatively engaged with all of the individual parties, interested in something like this, and we set it forth as an experiment, nonetheless, and we will be looking at it again in 3-5 years. If disrespect was felt by some of you in my decision in the matter, I did not intend that to happen. I have an immense respect for this faculty and for the people that I came here to work with. Just one thing that I will say is that there are a lot of people running around this campus. There a lot of interests and the students have tremendously stepped up to try to be a constructive force. By the way, the Arizona State University students would not join the University of Arizona students in their lawsuit against the tuition increase because they supported a tuition increase. At the tuition hearings, the Arizona State University students stood up and argued for the tuition increase, in every case, including for the additional $500 fee for the Business School. Those same constructive engaged students also wanted to say something on the plus minus issue, so with that I will open the floor, if that is all right with the Senate President for comments or questions.

Senator Dorman: One of the things that I hear in talking to my conservative Republican friends, who worked hard to get a degree, they say that letting in more students is not a good thing! They don’t think that is the way to go to be a great university. We have a public relations issue with a lot of people out there who busted their backside to go to what they thought was really a good university, and they see in the newspaper this notion that our admission is very open and they don’t necessarily
see that as a good thing. This is an issue I think that some segment of the population would need to be convinced of that our standards are not less than the standards that they had to reach.

**President Crow:** What you are saying then is that our standards have changed. However, they have not—they remain graduation within the upper 50th percentile of a high school class in Arizona. It turns out that all of significant indicators are up and the university has already substantially assumed a spectrum of a much greater quality than when those people attended the university. What people do not understand is the demographic force that is upon us—this year 95,000 new residents will move and stay in Maricopa County. It is that force, they are coming with their families, they are coming from other places, they have expectations, they have qualified students, and so it is not as if we are lowering the standards. If anything, the standards on a school basis—our expectations are that the standards for individual schools will go up dramatically. We may have a number of students who can be admitted to the university but cannot be admitted to a school. We have to figure out how to deal with all of those students. The folks you spoke of, at least as you have described them, would also in all likelihood be predominately white. It turns out that the state will not be predominately white—it is not now, and it won’t even be a majority white after 2018. The world is changing rapidly, unbelievably quickly. There is no desire on our part to go the path of the City University of New York or the City College of New York. We have no wish to go to open admissions. We will not see that happen, we will not go in that direction because you have to have some chance of success at the University. We hope to find ways to work with those students who are not qualified, to help them get qualified but not at the University. The issue is really getting people to understand growth.

**Senator Dorman:** My point is that there is a larger number graduates from this university who have a stated opinion of what we are trying to do, and what they hear is more students, not necessarily higher standards and that disturbs them. They are aging, male geezers, but they are voters and have a lot of money. That segment of the population would like to see high standards.

**President Crow:** Well, we have just received a $50 million dollar donation from that segment of the population, from Mr. Ira Fulton, who also is a member of many conservative groups including the Goldwater Institute. So, in that particular case the point is that there are some who actually do put up their money here, and Mr. Fulton wants to see the College of Engineering dramatically improved from its already significant achievements that it has had over the last 20 years. I think we are doing an adequate job of convincing the majority of the people that made these kinds of decisions that this has been the reward of investing. When we took the first vote on the research infrastructure bill in the Arizona House of Representatives, on whether or not to invest hundreds of millions of dollars into the universities for research initiatives, we got a supermajority vote, 41 members of the Arizona Legislature’s House voted for us, including some conservatives. We had 17 specific individuals who voted against us. Our campaign relative to those individuals in terms of concentrating our focus on education, and bringing them up to speed and trying to understand their issues and so forth has been intensified. We believe that this year we will have a better case to make and that we will do better with those folks. At the same time, I understand that there is a knee jerk reaction—they are just going to let everybody in, people did not work to earn their way in, and it is important that everybody here understand that we are not lowering our standards at all. The thing that we are not doing is raising them dramatically outside the school level; we will be raising them dramatically at the school level, as each school grows to a size, but we are not doing that yet. That is something that we will have to spend some more communication and energy addressing.
Senator Martinez: Regarding the University Design Team report, we have an open period for feedback, we have until this Friday (September 26th), and then as I understand it, all feedback goes to the Provost and that the report will be presented to you in January?

President Crow: If you are asking that as a question, there will actually be additional periods for feedback and there will be public forums.

Senator Martinez: Right. However, in conversations with some of my other senators and other people on campus, we have to say that there seems to be a bit of rush on this, it seems like we are talking about big issues that take a lot of time to digest, a lot of time to think through, and the January 1 deadline seems to be too fast. I think that there is a certain level of anxiety that so much is being reconsidered that the actual feedback, the input by the faculty, is going to be less than we might want it to be than if the period of response and engagement would be a little bit longer.

President Crow: While I think that is a legitimate concern, I want to say that we will have to see how it goes. There is certainly no intent on my part on receiving these recommendations to rush to a decision because that is another phase. What we are after now is to produce recommendations, which then go into consideration and the consideration process will depend upon what the recommendations are. If the Provost comes and suggests that the east campus should be moved to Apache Junction, or something that is wild or radical, then that might take more time to consider and so it depends on what those recommendations are. I can say that I don’t know how long the process will take. I do hope that while being careful and not rushed to judgment, there may be some things that can be decided relatively quickly, while other things can’t. Things that involve movement, personal lives, etc., are more complicated and those will obviously take more consideration. Also, we have the new feasibility assessments. It is one thing for the Provost and the faculty to recommend X or Y, it is another thing to be able to afford it. We are just in the recommendation phase now. We are not going to rush unnecessarily beyond that point, although I will tell you that the university is under substantial pressure right now to solve the East and West design problem. We have about 10,000 new students in the last four fiscal years that we did not have before, against a total number of new students at the University of Arizona and at NAU, which is probably fewer than 2,500 between those two schools together. We have gotten to the point now where our average investment per student in state resources is now more than $2,000 less than the University of Arizona. Additionally, as we grow that is getting worse and worse. We have to find a way to figure out where we are going before we can get there. It also the case, and I hesitate to belabor this group with the political complexities of growing a multi-school university on multiple campuses, we do not have sufficient engagement of local constituent groups to build the east and west campuses because we don’t know what we want the East and West campuses to be. Therefore, we do not have the political force power we need to deliver the resources that we need to move forward, so, the sooner we have the plan, notwithstanding not wanting to rush, the sooner we have the plan the better off we are, but we do not want to rush unnecessarily.

Senator Park-Fuller: Just as a follow up to that time wise, you did indicate in your answer that there would be consideration of the expenses of moving schools. Certainly that would be a big expense in terms of the buildings and the offices that would need to be built but also would it be phased out in time, I guess my question is, or phased in, because I am thinking that students and faculty alike probably live in certain parts of the valley and moving or changing major living arrangement--would there be financial assistance for people who had to move from one area to another, or how would we assist them?
President Crow: If it got to the point where school X was going to move from the main campus to the downtown campus--we would obviously, and Milt and I have talked about this—we do not want any movement whatsoever that doesn’t advantage whatever unit would be asked to move. So, if they do not end up with better facilities, better resources, better than what they have, then it is not worth doing it because we are not looking to disadvantage some groups, so that they can perform worse at their new location compared to where they are presently located. That is point number one. Point number two—if it turns out that people were disadvantaged somehow in the present generation (because you know that in the future generation that is thirty years from now there would not even be anybody around that was a part of all this)—anybody that was personally disadvantaged, we will look at all of that and be thinking about all of that in this process. We don’t know how yet, but it is on our minds in terms of what we are asking individuals to do. We are waiting until we see the recommendations.

Provost Glick: I have a couple of comments to make. I think that the concern about time is a very legitimate one. On the other hand, I think that concern goes both ways. For those departments that might end up with a major decision affecting them, waiting a year or two puts them into somewhat of a difficult position also. If I were a faculty member in unit X, where there might be a series of considerations of changing my structure or location, I would want to know sooner rather than later, especially if I am out recruiting colleagues and I don’t know where I am recruiting them to. So, it is a very delicate balance that you raise. There are some decisions that we don’t have enough information to make a recommendation on in January, which we should delay, but I still think that we should still look at January as a viable date.

President Crow: We are already building a whole new facility with the University of Arizona in downtown Phoenix; we have already made that decision.

Provost Glick: I believe the point is what is feasible in the short term and what is feasible in the long term. These are very good points, and I would like to believe that we can have over the next few months the kind of open exchange where we can at least all agree on the facts, even if we don’t all agree on the decisions. I think we will agree on most of the decisions if we all have the same facts. I am rather optimistic about that. I think that it is a big decision to move a program. It is not a decision which is inherently a negative decision. It is a decision that can be very positive, or it can be very negative, or in some cases will not have a great impact. Our goal is to make decisions that have a positive impact on the university as a whole, and for whom individual faculty and staff who will be affected. Now, sometimes what is good for one is not good for the other. That is, we aren’t choosing between good and bad. Those decisions are easy. We are choosing between good and good and therefore on some decisions there will need to be some very difficult choices in the end. However, I hope you all will be pulling for me, while we approach those choices and that means both you and me will be coming to the forums.

President Crow: I think the only thing that I would add to that, is that at the University of Arizona they just went through a process where they attempted to go through program elimination calculations, which we are not thinking about doing. We are in a program growth and expansion mode notwithstanding the concerns that people have about our growth. We believe that means that we are trying to find places where programs can be, where they can either catalyze the success of a particular campus or a school can be given the resources that it needs. There might be schools on the main campus that are held back because of their limited resources, but if they were on another campus, they would have brand new facilities designed just for them and they would have this and that. We are in negotiations with a range of potential funding sources, not just the state of Arizona, on how to build
out our campuses, how to make them successful. We are going to be looking for how to be positive and creative, not negative. It is also the case that a group of faculty could come along and say, we are absolutely and intellectually embedded in this university’s community on campus A or campus B and if you pull us out of here we will weakened beyond repair. Somebody could actually make that case, if it is not just emotional histrionics, if it is actually based on facts. I would say to them, show me your joint publications, show me your joint teaching, show me this--then why would one want to break up a happy, successful family? People don’t want to do that--that is not what we are about and that is not what we are going to do.

**Senator Dorman:** Do you imagine that students will go back and forth between campuses for courses?

**President Crow:** Not very much. Certainly on the margins yes, and individual, aggressive students are already doing that. We have some students taking courses on all three campuses right now but the hope is that on the east campus, west campus, and main campus and the downtown site that you can get the full education you need on any one of those campuses, just as you can now. But that will grow and there will some programs that overlap by design because they want to. That is the hope. For example, applied psychology is emerging nicely on the east campus; there is a connection to the main psychology department, some graduate students are moved back and forth, etc. But that would evolve bottom up rather than by design.

**Senator Dorman:** How many faculty do you think would be required to do that?

**President Crow:** We are 1,500 faculty, short right now for the size that we actually need to grow to. It is basically a doubling of the size of the faculty. That is our calculation and like I said before, there are 40 vacant slots on the west campus. There are 300 faculty on the west campus now, there are 140 tenure track faculty, and so, it is going to go up by 40. At the east campus, Ernie, I don’t know how many, you were there at the forum—70--so it is small number there but the growth has really got to be on the east and the west campuses and then some faculty growth here to manage, to get the student to teacher ratio to a more appropriate level.

**Provost Glick:** One point that you should be aware of is that any student who is registered here and making progress toward a degree will be able to complete that degree on whatever campus they are on. There may be work done with individual students, but we are not going to all of a sudden tell them certain majors will be moved.

**President Crow:** We are not going to say, oh, too bad you are all juniors in applied psychology, now you will need to report to the west campus next Thursday.

**Senator Haynes:** Obviously there are dramatic policy changes; we have had changes in the promotion and tenure policies, the design team report options, all of which have dramatic effects on the faculty. I applaud your desire for discussion and engaging the faculty. However, I have been asked by my faculty—what is the second involvement—what is the Senate’s part in the inputting of recommendations, and what might the Senate be doing in the future with these responses? Could you tell me from your perspective how you see the Senate being involved constructively in these obviously complex challenges?

**President Crow:** That is a very good question. First on the matter of promotion and tenure—there has been no policy established yet related to promotion and tenure. There is a task force that may
recommend something, but I believe those recommendations must come back to this body at some point should they make it that far for consideration. There have been implementation differences because you have a different implementer, and that is me. I am meeting with every school and have met with several already to talk about that in great detail. I was at the School of Fine Arts last week and it was the beginning of a dialogue. As to the Academic Senate, overall I view it as the single consultative, recommending, and approving body in those matters where they are given approval authority in academic matters at the university. I view the relationship, as I said last year when I proposed the design imperatives—I stated repeatedly that this was a proposal and that I welcomed input on that proposal. I am not a unilateral decision maker but a person seeking input. The input can be formal, it can be in the form of recommendations, it can be in the form of specific proposals, it can be in the form of critique, any or all of those and this body has the position to speak for the university community as a whole, and I think it is the only body that can do that.

Senator Haynes: So, I will be asking the same question.

President Crow: I am certainly open to that and I have no issue or concern on that.

Senator Haynes: I think we need to respond not only as individuals, as departments, and projects, but this body does speak for the university and can give supplemental and valuable input if we had the opportunity.

President Crow: And that is why I suggested to Tony that there are more details in some of the areas that I talked about today, that the Senate may decide they need a more detailed briefing on them. We have already talked about that and we will be talking about what we are calling our comprehensive development plans, our physical self, our identity that we are beginning to work on, we will be having some open forums on that. We will meet with every school this semester about ten individual academic departments, as well as different groups. I have met with—Gail, we had one meeting, two meetings with untenured faculty, and their mentors and their chairs; there is one more of those meetings coming up to deal with promotion and tenure issues, so, we are trying to get as directly engaged as we can. With this body, my hope is to direct engagement. Are there no more questions because direct engagement means that when I am standing here, that is the time to ask questions? There were no further questions at this time and Dr. Crow’s ended his remarks here.

3.C Provost of the University’s Report (Milton Glick).

I will be brief but I want to comment on two things. One is what we did with last year’s money that is what we did with the new tuition money, and the second is what we are asking the state for. When we met with the students last year, they understood as the President pointed this out, that it was in their best interest to pay more tuition, provided that they could be assured that among the things we did with that tuition, we would improve the quality of education and the access. The first and most important commitment we made and what is now in Board of Regents policy, is rather than setting aside 8% of the budget of the tuition for need-based financial aid, we would assess 14% which generated about 14 million dollars in new financial aid on a need basis. In addition, the students asked that we expand the library hours. The past president of the Senate met with the Library Dean and me and we worked out what would be the most cost effective way to expand Library hours—so the Library hours have been expanded about 12-14 hours. We will also see how well that meets the students’ needs and if that is not sufficient, we will take another look at it in the future.
On the topic of improving classrooms, we will bring on board 25 new classrooms in the Coor Building and we will also bring on board new classrooms in the Brickyard; all of those will be very high quality classrooms. They will all be publicly scheduled. They are not just for residents of the Coor Building; they will have full use by the campus. In addition, we have improved something like 30 to 40 classrooms in terms of their technology and sound systems, and we had just bought 400, which is not enough, new chairs for Languages and Literatures classrooms. Students are bigger than they were in 1960! We literally had to make sure they could fit in the chairs—we spent $400,000 dollars to get all new chairs. We will this year work on revamping classrooms and spend about one million dollars. That is not enough. We should be spending 2 to 2.5 million dollars. But remember, you have to know that we had no building renewal funds from the state for three years. They understood that all the tuition money would not go entirely to their list, but they were interested in improved compensation for faculty and staff and especially for TAs. So, for TAs we have gone from a 25% in-state tuition reduction to 55%, and for RAs we have gone from 0% to 55% and it is our intention to have some general merit-based salary improvements for faculty and staff sometime this year and we are working on that. They were also interested in having a wireless campus. There are three issues with that in considering going wireless: 1) Are you at the point where the protocol is stable enough so that you don’t use a protocol that will be obsolete in two years? I think we are at that point. 2) Where are you at on the price curve? It is harder to know if we are at the right point there. We are talking about 2 million dollars to make the campus wireless. 3) Whether you can find the money and is it more important than other things? We are going to the Board of Regents for permission to bond a number of improvements in our information technology infrastructure. Our pipes are too small, as many of you found out that the system has become unstable. We will be spending: we will be bonding 22 million dollars to improve the basic IBM; included in that 22 million dollars is making the campus wireless. Ideally we would have, and we are talking to the City of Tempe on how we can work it out, so that we make the campus plus Downtown Tempe the same continuous wireless system but that would require that you have enough people throughout this university district able to use wireless. The students are also interested, as you are, in a lower student to faculty ratio. We will not make progress on that because our student body is much more than we could hire faculty, since we had no new money other than the student tuition, and recognizing that other state factions lost dollars—we lost dollars in the two previous years ourselves. Finally, class availability concerns students--and we like to do our very best on that, and many of you in your colleges help us to do that in fact.

We have a very simple budget request this year. First, we don’t have any “decision packages.” What we want is that we want the state to fund the mandates that they did not fund this year that were put on us, that means the increased cost of health insurance, ERE that was passed on to faculty and staff, that was the state’s decision, it was a good decision, but a costly one. We have to take the university’s share of the increase in retirement, as you know those of you that are on the state system also saw a personal increase. Those things and others total 11 million dollars. Second, is funding our enrollment growth. We will say that if the legislature will fund our enrollment growth, fund the core of the institution, we will find the dollars to help on other things, such as faculty and staff salaries. If you don’t fund it, there is no way we can continue to take this influx of students. Our request for enrollment growth is 38 million dollars, and third, to fund the support of the new facilities we opened without any support. That is 9.5 million dollars. We are going to the state with a request for 58.6 million dollars; we are not going with any other decision packages. We believe if they fund the core of the university, we can do the other things. If they do not, then we cannot even do the basics.

Also, separate from the budget request is the building renewal request, which is a formula and that formula generates 19 million dollars for building renewal that is a two-year budget request.
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Finally, each year we submit what it would take to bring our faculty and staff salaries to market. Everybody in the state does that, and the state has the salary package which we will be part of. To give you an idea of what it would take to bring ASU’s faculty and staff salaries to market, that figure is 81 million dollars. That is how short we are, and that is in spite of the fact that we have reallocated close to 40 million dollars for other uses in the faculty and staff salaries over the last six years. But our fundamental request, the part that gets voted on for ASU as opposed to the part that the State does—whether they do a state compensation package or they don’t, it is very simple: it is just “fund our core.” Fund our enrollment growth, fund running our new facilities, fund the unfunded rate increases for this year. Now to give you some idea of why fighting for the core is advantageous for ASU, it is because we have all the enrollment growth—to give you an idea, our core funding is 59 million dollars. NAU’s is 5 million and the UofA’s is 21 million. We will fight for funding the core for all three universities, we will be together on that—that is the responsibility of the state, and then we will pledge that if we can get our core funded we will leverage that with other funding and we will address many of the things that we have historically asked the state to fund and the state never does. We feel it is the best and rational way to say, give us a fundamental core funding that allows us to handle the students and with that funding we will handle research growth, we will handle salaries, but we also want to be part of any state salary package (don’t misunderstand me on that) but our fight will be to—give ASU core funding, give NAU the core funding they deserve, and give UofA the core funding they deserve. We will need your help, every one of you as a taxpayer, every one of you is a voter, and every one of you who knows a legislator. We have to make the case on every corner because it is a good case and I believe that there are a lot of sympathetic ears down at the legislature. We would have had enrollment growth funding this year but we did not—because if the state could have found any way to balance their budget, they would have let us have it I believe. I will close with that and I will be happy to answer questions. By the way, Main, East and West, right now each have separate budgets. We will be selling this budget as a university budget; we cannot afford to let them do what they had to do last year, which is fund enrollment growth at Main and ignore East and West, which are growing even faster. They have to see this as “a university” budget.

Senate President Garcia: This week the ABOR meets at ASU. I was reading the board book that came out last week and it really spells out where we are in terms of our peer groups, in terms of our total compensation packages, in the 10th percentile. So, 90% of our peer group is ahead of us in compensation packages, and what is even more dramatic is that when you look at ASU West’s salary comparison, while it is well into our peer group, it is at the 5th percentile. We are getting a grade of “D” in terms of meeting our goal there. It is all spelled out pretty well in the personnel report that ABOR is supposed to be looking at, dated June of this year and the executive summary of that is also to the point. That is all I will say on that and we will have the President-elect report now.

3.D President-elect’s Report (Barbara Kerr).

I have been asked by friends and colleagues what a president-elect is and I realize that many of you may have asked that question too. My task as President-elect is to learn the job and I will be working over the next year with Tony and George to learn the job. I should also say that I am learning the job by going to the Dean’s meetings and the chairs’ meetings, and some have been very exciting, to learn how this university runs. The other thing that has happened or the other experience that I have had in the last few weeks, is that I have walked into rooms in which there are meetings in the various organizations on campus and I have had people tell me about their alarm, or an alarm, about the ASU changes or programs, particularly junior faculty have talked to me in various tones of stress, of fear.
What I try to do, because I have been able to go to many of the meetings and I was there as the University Design Team unveiled their ideas, and I attended meetings when the promotion and tenure recommendations have begun to evolve--because I have been able to attend those meetings, as I said, when I encounter a group of people who are alarmed and are fearful about the future, and are concerned about their jobs, concerned about their salaries, concerned about their promotion and their tenure, what I have been telling them is this: that these are the birth pains of a new university; there will be stress, there will be conflict, there will be both advocacy and adversarial action on the part of this Senate. But these are the birth pains of a new university. We can reduce the pain of this new birth with shared governance. This is something that I am going to work very hard with our administrators on, now and in the future, to work toward a new vision of shared governance and that means a priority of involvement. I know that I and I know that many of you want to be involved in the ideas that are occurring—whether it is the design of the university, or the promotion or tenure proposal. We would like to be involved from the beginning, not in an adversarial mode. We want to be able to assist, to make it smoother. That is we, as the Academic Senate, can be the midwives for this new university? It is obvious that this is an administration that moves fast and thinks big. I think that it is time for us to do the same. When things are moving fast, it is important to anticipate what might be happening and to position oneself in such a way as to advantage not only those stakeholders who we have the most involvement, but to position ourselves to understand the ways in which our interest controls the interest of the whole. When it is important to move fast and to think big, it is also means that you need to respond quickly. Sometimes plans will be moving ahead at such a pace that we have to be nimble—to be able to respond quickly, and so I am thinking that is what our task is going to be. Over this next year, I am going to be learning the task and I know that Tony has already encouraged so many faculty members, and George has been doing this a long time too, to come and visit us in the Academic Senate Office. I only want to say that I only hope to be there to assist you. We are there—and before our people fire off letters to the governor or letters to the regents, or letters to the president’s office, we really want to suggest that you or the faculty members in your area come and see us because we can work together and we can create a new vision for shared governance, just as we will be creating the new vision for the university. Thank you.

Senate President Garcia: This last year, the student government reorganized into two groups, one is the Undergraduate Student Government Association and the other is the Graduate and Professionals Student Association. Until we visit our academic constitution and bylaws, we will only have one of those presidents' reports at our Senate meetings. Brandon Goad from USGA is with us. Do you have a report today?

Brandon Goad: No report today, except to say I am glad to be here and I look forward to be working here and with the Senate Executive Committee this year.

3.E Past President’s Report (George Watson).

I just mention this for those of you who are new. I think everybody knows generally what happened with plus minus, but that is where we finished our session last May. Our proposal went forward with a top grade of an A and 4.0. The students came forward to Michael Crow with a request for an A+ of 4.33. Also a C- and D+ and B- grades which we did not have in our proposal. So, I sent our letter of transmission, talked with Michael, talked with Milt. In fact, I told Michael that he had no choice but to accept our decision or turn it down En Toto. That was not true, but that is what I told him, in part on your behalf, but it turns out the attorneys told him that he did not have to do what we exactly said, that he was free in fact to due exactly what he did, which I would have done had I been President as
well. I think it was a decision that not only everybody can live with but also perhaps the best decision as it turns out. You may not feel that way and if you don’t then you might want to talk to Tony or you might talk to me about the way the decisions are made in terms of—it is not an unending, iterated process. That is we can put forth a proposal but Michael needs to make a decision and move on so we don’t necessarily get to say, well, just a minute if that is going to be your choice then we want to say something else and so forth, and keep going back and forth. But that is how that decision came out and we are now in the phase of implementing that decision—Tony and I are serving on the plus minus implementation team and we are trying to figure out how all of this will take place. If you have concerns and questions about the implementation of the plus minus, please feel free to get in touch with me or to get in touch with Tony. Just some other things real quickly, I am also serving on our behalf on a Memorial Union Expansion Committee and dealing with issues of the MU expansion and renovation, so, if you have some concerns about that, or questions about that, I would be happy to talk with you. Finally, I did some updating on the ASU Academic Senate Blackboard site trying to get that ready to go. My own committee, University Affairs Committee, is having trouble meeting in real time. I think we will probably do some meeting through the blackboard site. That will be available to others of you as well. I don’t have the new members of the Senate updated, but we will shortly then the entire Senate can converse in the bylaws. Thanks.

3.F ASU West Senate Report (Fran Bernat). (Tony Garcia). Fran could not be with us today, so we look forward to hearing from her in October.


4. Unfinished Business.

4.A Personnel Committee (Susan Mattson).

Doug Johnson was the chair of the Personnel Committee last year and did a lot of work on these two motions so I have asked for his assistance today. From what I understand, the first order of business is that I would like to put before the Senate the motion to rescind Senate Motion #18 (2002-2003), which reads—“The Personnel Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of the consolidation of ACD Personnel sections pertaining to Academic Professionals from ACD506/507 into a single section, ACD 508, with the subsequent renumbering of sections such that the current ACD 508 becomes ACD 509, ACD 509 becomes ACD 510, and continuing sequentially until ACD 517 becomes ACD 518. This new motion is going to be incorporated as an amendment to Senate Motion 11, so, instead of having them separate, we would like you to rescind Motion #18 now, then I will make a motion to amend Senate Motion #11, which is going to have a second reading today.

Senator Johnson: Just a little background, the process of modifying promotion and tenure guidelines is a very long drawn out process. Three years ago in the Promotion and Tenure Task Force I, the recommendations for updating our policy manual, were sent the following year to the Senate Personnel Committee and they evaluated those recommendations. This Senate voted approval of the report from the Personnel Committee. Over the course of the last year, the Provost’s Personnel Advisory Committee converted those recommendations into the new language for the ACD manual. That new language is now what we are to approve. These changes are—the biggest point is that it produces a rational document that is readable and useable for all faculty. We have taken a document that had been amended numerous times, inconsistent and imprecise in its wording and hopefully made it into a document evolved by the committee and understandable to live by. These recommendations
from Promotion and Tenure Task Force I predate the current Task Force II that is underway. They are in the process though of clarifying guidelines for promotion and tenure and for annual reviews. Sections ACD 506 and 507 pertain to faculty. We have taken the sections that pertain to Academic Professionals and renumbered those and put them in ACD 508. There has been a new task force appointed to deal with those issues; the intention is that all the existing provisions that apply to academic professionals be retained and in this temporary holding section ACD 508 until such time as the task force that has been appointed can make more specific recommendations. This is where we are today; we are now have received the revised language for the ACD manual and we are going to have the provisions that pertain to academic professionals now in section 508, and we would like to make that motion and move forward.

**Senate President Garcia:** At this point what we are going to do is consider the motion to rescind Senate Motion #18, which does not require a second because it comes from a committee. It goes straight to a vote. Let me just reiterate that the reason we are doing this is that it will come back as an amendment to Senate Motion #11. At this point we will vote on rescinding Senate motion #18. All in favor say aye, all opposed? The motion to rescind Senate Motion #18 passed unanimously by voice vote.

**Senator Mattson:** I would now like to propose an amendment to Senate Motion #11 which incorporates the language you have on your agenda in front of you. The proposed amendment should be on your desk as the amended motion, which I will read for the record: “The Personnel Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of the revisions to ACD 506 regarding promotion and tenure and ACD 507 dealing with annual evaluations of faculty.”

As I said previously, when the changes were made to 506 and 507 all of the language pertaining to academic professionals were just moved verbatim to a new section 508, which is one of the charges to the task force now for academic professionals, who are going to attempt to streamline and codify and clean up some of the language that is in there regarding continuing status and the review that has to do with Academic Professionals that were in the old sections. We felt it was a cleaner revision of the manual to separate these out so that things could stay clearer to everyone that is involved in the process. I will talk about the other parts of Senate Motion #11 when we get to that but basically the amendment is just to approve of the changes to 506 and 507, as well as 508 to original Senate Motion #11.

**Senate President Garcia:** The floor is now open to discussion of the revision to Senate Motion #11. You reviewed this by email I hope, because we did not want to bring long copies here of the extensive documentation. I can display certain sections if needed on the screen.

**Senator Mattson:** We did ask the academic professionals to make comments about this and send them to us. We received some from Senator Bartlett and from Patty Feldman, who is chair of the new task force. Both of them have made comments on what was in the old 508 and how it got moved. What we were trying to avoid was the idea that these got lost, which is one of the reasons why we wanted to take it out as a separate motion to show we had not lost all the information about academic professionals. It just was in a holding pattern in a new section.

**Senator Bartlett:** The amendment to clarify that (probationary review) for academic professionals does not contain the full paragraph on notification of consideration for continuing status promotion and retention. This is the paragraph from the old 506 section 04 and it is the paragraph that concludes with, “at the time that academic professionals are informed of the retention decisions, they must also
be given a copy of the written reviews headed by each level, in the probationary second and fourth year review process.”

Therefore, the text of the new section 508-04 should read: "Academic Professionals who undergo probationary reviews will be informed of the results in writing by their deans or department chairs no more than 30 days after the deans have received written notification of retention decisions from the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. At the time that academic professionals are informed of the retention decision, they must also be given a copy of the written reviews submitted by each level in the probationary second- and fourth-year review process, e.g., department chair, college personnel committee, and college dean."

Senator Mattson: I believe that Patty Feldman had the same comment about that but it some how did not get to the printer.

Senator Danzig: We talked last year about continuing appointments; the point was getting some recommendations for five-year continuing appointments, which was then amended to a three-year continuing appointment. What is the relationship of that motion that was passed last year and this discussion?

Senator Mattson: Didn’t that have to do with the new Professor of Practice, Research and Clinical Professor titles—it was a different category of faculty and it was not relating to academic professionals at this point.

Senator Burstein: It deals with lecturers and instructors; it doesn’t deal with either the regular tenure track faculty or the academic professionals. It is a separate issue.

Senator Danzig: A lecturer or instructor is not considered in the same category as the academic professional? (Correct). The lecturers and instructors had access to three-year rolling contracts and the academic professionals do not. (Yes, they have different classifications.)

Senate President Garcia: Let me reiterate, David, correct me if I am wrong. Right now we are going to be considering the amendment to the amendment to Senate Motion #11, resurrecting this paragraph that says that academic professionals are informed of retention decisions and they must also be given a copy of the written review submitted by each level of the probationary review process. That is the amendment to the amendment on Senate Motion #11. So, I will call for a vote on this item. All in favor say aye, all opposed? The amendment to the amendment to Senate Motion #11 was unanimously passed by voice vote.

Senator Mattson: Now we will then vote on the amendment.

Senate President Garcia: Now we will consider the amendment to Senate Motion #11 for revisions to ACD 506/507 with the inclusion of the new section 508 that has been amended. All in favor, indicate by saying aye; all opposed? The amendment to Senate Motion #11 was passed unanimously by voice vote.

Senator Mattson: Now we need to vote upon the motion as amended. I want to point out that on the motion, and it was on the original motion—there were some changes from the original recommendations that we approved from the first P&T Task Force after it went through some of the
Personnel Committee reiteration, that are here now, that were not included before. They are part of this motion. I just want to read them to you. They came out during the rewrite—a change in probationary reviews from two (in years 2 and 4) to one (in year 3); that tenure review is a cumulative process conducted by the personnel committee in the academic unit, the head of the academic unit, the college personnel committee, supervising dean, campus personnel committee, campus provost, University provost, and the president of the University; removal of the statement on workload distribution from the P&T Task Force section, which was ACD 506, and it was left in the annual evaluation piece which is in ACD 507; and requiring the Provost of the University to notify each dean in writing whether the faculty member will be retained conditionally, or given a terminal contract. Those were changes that were discussed but were not in the original proposal but are in the ACD manual changes. This is the motion that we are asking you to approve today as amended—that should read as I read previously, “The Academic Senate Personnel Committee recommends the approval of the revisions to ACD 506 regarding promotion and tenure, ACD 507 dealing with annual evaluation of faculty and the new ACD 508 pertaining to academic professionals as well as the amendment to add the paragraph.

**Senate President Garcia:** This motion comes from the Personnel Committee, therefore it requires no second.

**Senator Bloomenfeld-Jones:** What is the meaning of the use of “cumulative process?”

**Senator Mattson:** I would imagine our interpretation of that was that it should begin at the unit level and continues through the different levels retained—based on everything that is included at each level.

**Senator Burstein:** I was on the original task force and there is a separation between cumulative and summative, and cumulative here means all that you have done as a faculty member. It is not the year to year workload that you have, but it is all you have done as a faculty member and all you have contributed to the University, to the community, and to your field.

**Senator Bloomenfeld-Jones:** It has a numerical import because when you add stuff up and if you get the right score—that is what that word means to me and I don’t understand the process to be that at all.

**Senator Burstein:** It has nothing to do with the score. It has to do with cumulative, and that means literally the sum of what you have done as a professor.

**Senator Mattson:** But I can see the Senator’s point.

**Senator Johnson:** Let me try to comment my understanding of this. In the past, faculty have gone through an annual review process and they receive a thumbs up or a thumbs down type of feedback. If you had favorable reviews in your second and fourth year, there may not necessarily be an expectation of tenure to follow that. It is cumulative, but we have to be processed on all of the work throughout that cumulative process.

**Senator Karady:** What is their thought in reducing the number of reviews—instead of having second and fourth year evaluations, now only having one in the third year? Generally, the young faculty are advantaged if they have two reviews because that way you can guide them. The advantage is that the review of the personnel committee can guide the faculty member as to which way they should go and
what is missing. Now, as an example, they will be reviewed, the guy did not get any guidance in the second year, he gets some guidance only in the third year. I think that it should stay as it is, that they should receive guidance in the second year, and then in the fourth year. It will serve the young faculty better.

**Senator Mattson:** One of the blocks that we discussed in my college and I am sure in other colleges this goes on, that the second year review is really conducted after one year that the faculty has been here, and that is too soon to have a good feel for the direction that the faculty member is going in and that the fourth year, when they only one year left, is almost too late to give guidance. Negative comments and substantive suggestions need be moved back to the third year in order to provide time to have movement towards change. I understand your feelings about having two reviews being beneficial. Gail, you wanted to say something.

**Vice Provost Hackett:** If you go back and read the actual policy, what senator Mattson just said is the rational for moving from second and fourth year reviews to third year is because people were finding the second year review not useful and they thought the third year was the time to get a full review that went all the way to the Provost Office, however, if you go look at the language it also asks departments to give yearly feedback about progress towards tenure to tenured faculty. So it adds actually more feedback to the process.

**Senator Mattson:** I forgot about that and that certainly is a provision that I can see as being very helpful.

**Senator Danzig:** Yes. If the Senate approves the motion, when will it be implemented because if someone starts this year as their first year, will they have to follow a second and fourth year if the policy is approved this year—can we make it that so people can choose to have a third year or a fourth year as the case may be.

**Vice Provost Hackett:** It will go into effect, if the Senate passes this, as soon as we get it into the ACD Manual, which would be in the next couple of months. Therefore, it would be effective next year and what we have talked to junior faculty about is that we really need to let the junior faculty decide which sequence they want to be on, and that they should do that in consultation with the senior faculty and the department chair in their unit. So, new faculty would be required to start on this, but for faculty who are in the middle of reviews, we will try to work out the best sequencing for their case with their chairs and senior faculty.

**Senator Mattson:** That is what we had thought about.

**Senator McDermott:** I was on the Task Force I as it is called, and there was a great deal of review and re-review and then the Personnel Committee did the same things to certain components of those recommendations. Two of the things the Task Force I was dealing with were the rather piecemeal way that the ACD Manual had fallen together. Because of that, I am very concerned about these additions that have not, as far as I can tell, not gone through the same process of understanding by the faculty and reviewed by the faculty as far as the whole picture. I have no individual objection to these things, but I still don’t understanding the wording “cumulative process” – the wording I am reading here is not what I am hearing. I have a hard time voting on something that appears to be offered at the eleventh hour—to add to a well thought out series of recommendations, and one that we really don’t understand.

---
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Senator Mattson: This is the second reading of this motion and these items were in the original motion that was presented last spring for the first reading. As far as where they came from—they are the recommendations from the Task Force I and the Personnel Committee, which were approved by the Senate last year and went to the Provost’s Personnel Advisory Committee to make the actual changes in the ACD Manual, and that is where these other ideas came from, and I believe they also came back to the Personnel Committee before we put this into the motion.

Senator Johnson: Last spring, the recommendations from the PAC 20 group did come back to the Personnel Committee, were approved after considerable discussion, and were part of the motion on the floor that was discussed in the spring. So, it has received considerable attention.

Senator Burstein: Senator McDermott, if you remember, our chair, Anne Schneider defined cumulative and summative in our discussions, so, they were discussed during our task force.

Senator McDermott: I believe we discussed cumulative records, and this is the summary that it talks about here in the process—a cumulative record of excellence is different from a cumulative process.

Vice Provost Hackett: I have to comment that I think although there may have been some discussion about cumulative or summative—I think number two actually was made in the ACD proposed changes because of the initiative of the President as the ultimate decision maker, and my interpretation is that this refers to the recommendations going to the President now as opposed to the Provost.

Provost Glick: As some of you have not seen this at all, it almost seems like the word used should be “sequential” because cumulative is the right word to say if you are looking at the cumulative record, which I think you said that before. I don’t know what a cumulative process is and it scares me.

Senate President Garcia: It looks as though we do not have a quorum at this hour, so our business portion of the agenda is finished. Can we table this motion until the October 27 meeting?

Vice Provost Hackett: I just wanted to say that there have been minor changes but frankly, the only substantive thing that was not discussed by the task force or the year long debates with the Personnel Committee, and another year-long debate with the PAC-20—the real substantive changes only removed the 2nd and 4th year reviews to being one probationary review in the 3rd year. The other changes are rather minor and number two really is just clarifying that the President is the final decision maker.

Senator Komnenich: I think we should not use cumulative and summative—they have totally different meanings. I do think sequential might be the appropriate term—it may be a matter of editorial comment, but I do make the motion to table.

Senate President Garcia: The problem right now is that we do not have a quorum. If we did vote to table, we would not have a quorum to carry it over.

A quorum call came from the audience (not debatable).

5. Adjournment.
The meeting adjourned for a lack of a quorum at 5:25 p.m.
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