1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Tony Garcia at 3:17 p.m.

2. Approval of the Previous Minutes (September 22, 2003).

The agenda was sent by email to senators. The previous minutes and the agenda were posted to the Academic Senate Web site: (http://www.asu.edu/provost/lsenate) prior to the meeting. Hearing no objections to the September 22 minutes, they stand approved. Please send any corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu.

3. Announcements and Communications.

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

Being that we have some carry over items from our September meeting, if there is no objection, I would like to reorder the agenda so that we will move straight to unfinished business, and do the unfinished business for the Personnel Committee first, beginning with amended Senate Motion #11. Unfortunately we are affected by the fires in San Diego and LA in that Susan Mattson is stuck in Southern California and could not come back to be with us today to finish out this business. So, in her place, I will start our discussion off and Doug Johnson when he arrives, can take over. With your
permission I want to move into place for Susan Mattson and open up amended Senate Motion #11 for discussion. I also wish to limit the discussion of this item to 10 minutes.

4. Unfinished Business.


4.A.1 Amended Senate Motion #11 (2003-2004)

This motion is about revising the ACD 506, 507, and adding a new section 508. The motion is from the Personnel Committee, and it recommends Academic Senate approval of the revisions to ACD 506 regarding promotion and tenure, ACD 507 dealing with annual evaluations of faculty, and ACD 508 pertaining to Academic Professionals. We introduced this in the spring; it was tabled in May; we had a second reading of it in September 22 and extensive discussion--we approved amendments to it at the September meeting, but were not able to take a final vote on it. Now I will open it back up for ten more minutes of discussion from the floor.

Provost Glick: Tony, David Burstein has asked me to clarify a statement that I made at the last Senate meeting. It has to do with the question of the language that says "that tenure and promotion is a cumulative process" and that I said "I don't know what that means." What that means is I don't understand the word "cumulative." I do know what is intended--what is intended is that for promotion and tenure each level makes an independent decision but is informed by prior decisions. So, that is what we are trying to say, and what the committee was trying to say. Although, I don't know why they used that word because I don't think that word says that. I wanted the Senate to know that my interpretation of the process is that each level makes an independent decision but that decision is informed by all the other levels. The word, I think, leaves much to be desired.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: How is this any different from what was presented to us a month ago, when all this discussion around that word eventuated? Is there any change in this, or are we just supposed to vote up or down?

Senate President Garcia: At the September meeting, there were a couple of amendments and those amendments are already incorporated in the motion. There was one amendment to 508-04 that was brought to the floor and that change was made. There was another minor change that I don't recall but it is also in there. My recollection was that we got stuck on a word in point 2, "cumulative." It was really meant to be a clarification rather than a substantive change to the manual. Gail Hackett can clarify that also.

Vice Provost Hackett: Point number 2 is only saying--just drop the word cumulative--this is an attempt to explain a couple of the changes in the ACD rewrite. Number 2 was put in there to include the last couple of words "and the president of the University." We have been arguing about the term "cumulative" when in fact, number 2 is simply saying that new items introduced in the rewrite of ACD 506 and 507 that were not part of the previous approval by the Academic Senate include--number 2, adding "and the President of the University" as the final decision maker.

Senate President Garcia: Thank you that clarifies the point.
**Senator Thomas:** I suppose so, but whether or not you think it is substantive, some of us in this room think that word is important. Milt has just spoken to it being a very confusing term; we have had a lot of conversation on this at the last meeting.

**Senator Burstein:** Well, make a motion to remove that word.

**Senator Thomas:** I have actually wrote a long letter to Susan Mattson, in which I proposed some language and even though I do not have that language up there--we did have some conversation here and I apologize--I do not have my email with me. I am not sure that eliminating that word is what we need to do--I thought that Milt's description of the process was quite accurate and I thought the purpose of this one sentence is to clarify the process, so, if you want to clarify the process, if it were me, I would put in what Milt said because the way he described it was perfectly clear, and ought to be put in place rather than this "cumulative" thing which is really confusing. You know, in the end, should some law suit eventually come up--if this becomes real language and not just language we are thinking about--it becomes language people pin things around--and if this thing is confusing, it seems like this sentence ought to get changed. It seems to me that this is the point, or one of the points, of the ACD Manual rewrite.

**Senate President Garcia:** Do you want to propose that as a motion?

**Senator Thomas:** To eliminate the word "cumulative"? No, actually I don't. Is it reasonable to make a motion to add a sentence after that saying, cumulative process means each level makes an independent decision, informed by all previous ones?

**Senate President Garcia:** That is something that you could pose as a motion.

**Senator Thomas:** I will propose a motion to insert a sentence at the end of number 2--Cumulative process means each level makes an independent decision, informed by all previous levels.

**David Burstein:** It would make sense to remove the word "cumulative" from the previous sentence, and just say, this process includes…That would eliminate the issue of cumulative in the sentence and it explains what is going on. However, do I hear a motion for that?

**Senator Thomas:** I will move that.

**Provost Glick:** I don't want to make a motion, but I would propose a motion and if someone approves they may make it for me--and that is that it says "tenure review is conducted….each of these units or people make an independent judgment that is informed by all the prior judgments" or something like that.

**Senator Keim:** How about if we change the word "cumulative" to "hierarchal" because that is what you are describing--a hierarchy--each level feeds up and then the decision is finally made at the top.

**Senator Carroll:** I think it is easier to go along with what David said, just eliminate "cumulative"--I will make that motion to just eliminate the word "cumulative."

**Senate President Garcia:** So, it would read tenure review is a process that…
Senator Carroll: Yes, just subtract that word.

Senator Burg: I second that motion.

Senate President Garcia: The motion is to remove the word cumulative (he read the point of the motion again.) Is there further discussion of this amendment? Hearing none I will proceed to a voice vote. All in favor? All opposed? The motion was approved by voice vote with one opposed. Is there more discussion?

Senator Park-Fuller: I would like to move that an additional statement be added that says each of these units or people making a tenure decision…what was the rest of that?

Senator Burstein: I have written something down--Each of these units individuals make decisions that are independent but informed by previous decisions.

Senator Park-Fuller: I agree with that wording. So moved.

A Senator seconded the motion.

Senate President Garcia: It has been moved and seconded, is there further discussion? Hearing none, we will move to a vote. We will have another voice vote--all in favor say aye. All opposed? That amendment carries. We will have one more point of discussion. I will reread it. Point number 2, of Amended Senate Motion #11: Tenure review is a process…each of those units/individuals makes decisions that are independent but informed by previous decisions.

So, now, we are at the end of the discussion period and we will vote on this as revised, amended Senate Motion #11. We will vote by raising of hands. All in favor? All opposed? Senate Motion #11 was passed by a vote of hands. (See Appendix A)

The other items of business that I want to handle next are from the CAPC report and Michael Mayer is ill today, so Senator Steve Happel who is a member of CAPC will handle this part.

4.B Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Steve Happel for Mike Mayer).

We have four items to cover. Last May, we passed Senate Motion #10 where we requested on behalf of the AAAC to decrease the hours required in residency at ASU Main and ASU East from 60 to 56 hours--and that was an erroneous recommendation for a variety or reasons--we want to rescind Senate Motion #10 (2002-2003) and we want to pass instead, Senate Motion #2 (2003-2004), on the next page, where it says CAPC requests on behalf of the AAAC to decrease the hours required in residence for graduation with academic recognition from 60 to 56 hours. The first motion did not contain "academic recognition" and it was our intention. We would now like to rescind that motion, Senate Motion #10, and then pass Senate Motion #2.

Senator Burstein: The first order of business is to rescind.

Senator Happel: Does anyone have questions on this?

Senator Komnenich made a motion to rescind. Seconded by Senator Bruhn.
Senate President Garcia: Any discussion? Hearing none we will suspend the rules and go straight to voting by a voice vote. All in favor say aye. All opposed? Senate Motion #10 is rescinded. Now we will consider Senate Motion #2. The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (CAPC) is recommending the Academic Senate approve a request on behalf of AAAC to decrease the hours required in residence for graduation with academic recognition from 60 to 56 hours. There is a point of clarification on this motion to correct a typing error, the motion should read (2003-2004) in the heading. Is there further discussion? Hearing no further discussion, we will move to a vote on this item as well. Please indicate by voice vote. All in favor say aye. All opposed? Senate Motion #2 was passed by voice vote.

Senator Happel: Senate Motion #1 "CAPC recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the implementation of a degree program B.A. Biochemistry." The reasons are given. It is a first reading. We also bring you Senate Motion #3 for first reading, CAPC recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the W.P. Carey School of Business to change the name of an academic unit from School of Health Administration and Policy to School of Health Management and Policy and to change the name of a degree program from Master in Health Administration to Master in Health Sector Management."

Senate President Garcia: There is one more clarification on this. There is a correction noted to add the word Health to the new title. The senators did not have the revised copy in front of them so we will make that correction with their permission.

Provost Glick: As a point of clarification, the new name will be the School of Health Management and Policy.

Senate President Garcia read the corrected version of the motion that was introduced. He said there is still one more item, an information item, to further clarify Senate Motion #10 from last year--there were some minor additions to the Undergraduate Concentrations, Minors, and Certificate guidelines (checklists), item 4.A.2 on our agenda. The language that was changed was the italicized portions (http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/issues.html)

A senator noted that there needed to be the same correction made to Senate Motion #3 as was corrected on Senate Motion #1; it should say (2003-2004) in the heading.

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

We will return now to our normal order of business and I will start with my report. I wanted to take a little bit of time today and talk about a topic that will be an ongoing discussion this semester and probably into the spring.

This year is our year of looking at our bylaws and we have the University Affairs Committee taking on that task and you will hear from George Watson, the chair of UAC a bit later on that. Before we hear his report, I want to lay out some new ideas for you. What I will ask the Senate to consider this year is a fairly radical, bold move to change the structure of our Academic Senates throughout the university. What I going to ask you to consider, working through the University Affairs Committee, is to consider the idea of moving to a University Senate--taking our current structure which is basically a faculty council, most universities would call it a faculty governance council--UofA has a faculty
council, for example, and we would take what is now the Academic Senate and make it into a University Senate. The other very radical departure that I am proposing that we consider taking in East, West, and Downtown all together, as one University Senate. Let me try to explain before I get into the details, what the motivation is and what some of the advantages are.

We have heard our President talk about the University, ASU being the Arizona State University, also the idea of having one University in many places. It is a theme that we are taking on at a lot of different levels. I thought this would be an excellent way to compliment the President's plans and at the same time focus our energies on things that will make the entire University a place where we will be able to meet a lot of challenges, while at the same time increasing our university wide senate voice as well. The advantage of this would be the ability to raise an awareness of issues; to have a lot more teamwork, a lot more collaboration among the campuses. Right now we operate in some ways without assistance, especially from ASU West. Personally, my experience at ASU is one that was perhaps different from a lot of you, in the sense that I started off in the College of Engineering 14 years ago. At that time we were fairly insulated as a college and reaching out across the university was not considered to be something that we normally did. My college has remained like this for the last decade or so. I would like to try a new approach, which is working together as a University, working with East and West in a more formal way and more structured way, without looking at the campuses as a barrier, without looking at the idea of having an East, Main, West and Downtown campus, and in other directions—at least not to look at this as a means to create a structure that is insular. Instead we need to break down barriers and look at this as a full University and have a parallel University Senate.

If we were to consider such a move, and if we manage to do it correctly—I feel that we can make a case for having greater power with such a structure. So, the idea that we would be able to create a University Senate would mean, for instance, not just having East and West and Downtown and Main all together, but have representation outside of just the faculty rank; having a lot more student representation, adding administrators as representatives (we do have some administrators now) but have the student representatives serve with their administrators; considering also the idea of having other faculty and AP designations. We have a lot of different designations, faculty and pseudo faculty at ASU that we are currently not considering at all for representation in our current structure. That is another area that I think we can tackle, if we are going to go down this road of having a University Senate, which I think we should.

In the University Senate we would deal with university wide issues and look beyond the idea of only looking at the boundaries of Main, working collaterally with East and West and Downtown. This University Senate structure would be advisory to the President. As we all know, ASU East has an Assembly represented by Ernie Hirata; ASU West has a Senate president, Fran Bernat, and she could not be here today but I am hoping to engage her in this discussion. What would go along with the University Senate structure would be the creation of a faculty caucus or council at Main, with the participation of the East and West Senates. I propose to have each campus establish its own academic caucus or senate or faculty caucus or faculty senate—all these words mean the same thing. These structures would report to the campus provost and would deal with campus specific issues. The idea would be to create one larger structure and we will also have a faculty caucus at Main. The East Assembly and the West Senate already exist, and we would just evolve the Academic Senate as we have it right now, into a University Senate by bringing in representatives from East and West and Downtown, bringing in student representatives at a much higher level than we have now (I think we
just have one) and then bringing in other parts of the campus, so that we have voices from administration as well as voices working together from other faculty and related designations.

There are a lot of issues involved in this type of change, and what I am trying to do today is just to give you the idea in a nut shell and talk about some general reasons as to why we should consider moving in this direction. One reason, as a recent example, on the plus minus grading system last year, in our debate we discussed many things within the Senate (repeatedly). The student representatives also had their own forums and their own issues. Even though we had representation from the students and we also had students who visited our meetings in addition to that; we were still talking about, pretty much, two different systems. In a University Senate it would be built in a way that we would have student representatives as well as faculty and administrators at each meeting. My hope would be that if we had a University Senate--an issue such as plus minus grades could evolve much differently than it actually did this past year. For another reason--the tenure and promotion policy would be considered by a University Senate, and not in a faculty caucus or academic caucus, because this would be a university wide issue. Curriculum issues, programs that go across the university, like business or education, would be considered through a University Senate. First starting off with a faculty caucus or council, the faculty caucus or council at each campus would deal with things like the facilities report that the Student Faculty Policy Committee put together last year. To me that would not be a University Senate issue, but an issue for the Faculty Caucus at Main. Curriculum issues that dealt with only programs that were unique to the campus would also reside with the faculty caucus.

A couple of issues about this and some background--there are many models of different senates in public universities around the country. Some of them do operate as a faculty senate at each campus on some level; some go through the University, creating a very hierarchal structure, like the University of California, that only meets once or twice a year. There are also university senate models where all parts of the university come together. The biggest issue we would have with that is perhaps the distance issue. How do we get people to come to meetings? How do we feel about the idea of not having a system where people consider Main Campus as the only place to have meetings? One solution for this is to have bus transportation, so that people can attend from the different campuses. Another issue is to have at least one or two meetings a year at the other campuses, but have most of the meetings where most of the people reside. These are simple logistical items, but I know that right off the bat--besides the bylaws issues, besides the representation issues, besides the many issues of making such a radical change--sometimes the logistical things are what people tend to focus on. Another important aspect about this would be the issue of the length of meetings, especially for people who are traveling, and one of the things I think we could do is to parse out what are university issues, what are campus issues, creating a consent agenda, which I will mention in the Executive Committee report later on, to streamline a lot of what we do so that we could possibly shave off one-half hour of the University Senate meeting. As we prepare a little bit ahead of time that time generally would be used for travel.

At this point, I am talking about giving this assignment to the University Affairs Committee and they are also working on the bylaws. I am laying this out today so that during the next month as we will be looking at the Academic Constitution and Bylaws we can concurrently consider a University Senate as we begin to consider the proposed changes to the bylaws. Certainly, we will need to hear from East and West Senates, and all of you in the Senate and in the Assembly at Main. I want to open this up for discussion now.
Senator Sieradzki: I have a question as far as campus personnel committee responsibilities are concerned. Will they stay at the campus level or will they become university-wide personnel committees?

Senate President Garcia: That is a very good question; I would think that we have to go back to the structure of how things work--it starts off with the department, then to the school or college.

Senator Sieradzki: For me it is a big issue, because if you turn us into a university wide personnel committee, I could not easily be convinced to support that.

Senate President Garcia: This would be something that is outside of the University Senate structure. That committee is not a part of the University Senate governance and it is not a part of our Senate structure now.

Senator Sieradzki: Well, right now it is well understood that the UPTP committee is made up of people from ASU Main.

Senate President Gracia: And West people for the West Committee.

Senator Sieradzki: This idea of adding another level of committees, which is what you are really suggesting, and then keeping something more local, as the academic causes/senates within each department, school and college, that all adds up to another whole level of hierarchy.

Senate President Garcia: The University Senate will deal with more policies and issues like that but it wouldn't necessarily deal with tenure cases. That would be something that the P&T II Task Force should address.

Senator Sieradzki: This is all mixed in though.

Senator Crozier: You know it is probably an hour's drive from here--by the time you park, and an hour going back. I don't understand why if we can say that we will transport people, why can't we calculate the cost of a teleconferencing system and modify our bylaws so people can vote electronically. I think it is not feasible to transport people to meetings.

Senate President Garcia: That is a great suggestion; the counter to it is why I said that physical presence is important, because it is a question of face-to-face meetings take on a different character than teleconference meetings. Also, another advantage of the travel is the ability to see what is going on at other campuses and to promote the kind of collegial interactions that would be lost in teleconferencing.

Senator Crozier: What I suspect will happen is that the people from East and West will come here, and there will be other constraints due to travel--they will attend meetings and then be gone afterwards. That will detract from further interaction after the meeting. I understand your point about face-to-face meetings, but I think that some of the modern teleconferencing facilities, while not the same as meeting face to face, are a lot better than some of the things we had in the past. It is trade off but not as hard as trying to encourage people to stay behind after the meeting.
Senate President Garcia: That is a great idea, and the only other thing I would suggest is that other people tend to spend longer times in university systems meetings--but at the same time I understand what you are saying about modern teleconferencing--it has gotten a lot better now, more telepresence than the old teleconferencing equipment.

Senator Komnenich: I am just curious. It seems to me that there is representation from East and the different campuses. People report all the time here. What is the real difference in what you are suggesting; it seems broader only in terms of policy orientation.

Senate President Garcia: Currently from West we still have the ASU West Senate President's report but we don't vote as a group university wide. At ASU East and Main, we do have--our bylaws dictate representation--really West is where we don't have representation.

Senator Komnenich: The other thing that I was thinking about regarding University Senate meetings (and I was considering teleconferencing also)--could be that one meeting each semester would be held at a different site, and that way we could appoint a certain portion of our senators to attend off-site meetings.

Senator Dwyer: Do you have any sense of the numbers of senators?

Senate President Garcia: We would currently, given the East, Main and West faculty composition, have to include anywhere from another 12 to 20 faculty from West, if we add up the colleges, and I have not done the math on that yet. I would imagine a maximum of 20 would be added, without including the new student representation. Depending on how that is worked out, that model could have student representation from the leadership from each campus, or it could also be done by college, with students from each college, and that would change the membership anywhere from six to 20, depending on how you do it. This is the way our bylaws are currently established but our bylaws could be changed to reduce the total representation in the Academic Senate during this time of transition.

Senator Dwyer: That was my next question, if everybody on the four campus senate caucuses would meet as one University Senate--or would there be some other subset of each membership that meet as the University Senate.

Senate President Garcia: The faculty caucuses or councils could be a subset and those groups would generally be a little bit more nimble in terms of their agendas. It is going to get a lot more streamlined in terms of their agenda. One model would be to take from this body, the University Senate, a subset of the Main representation.

Senator Park-Fuller: In that same regard--I am thinking about what a University Senate would look like in terms of its constituents. You said it would include students and administrators and our current senate has administrators, as opposed to some faculty members. What would we be talking about in terms of how many students members we would have--would be we trying to work for equity--an equal number of students, an equal number of faculty, an equal number of staff, of administrators? Would there be another representation under a University Senate to be considered?

Senate President Garcia: There can be. There are a lot of different models.
Senator Park-Fuller: How would that all be decided? This really is not a faculty governance model.

Senate President Garcia: This is not a faculty governance model but what I am suggesting is that there are many different models to consider and I am asking the University Affairs Committee to look at these different models in terms of coming up with the structure and they would also address what is the structure trying to do. Your question would be the initial question. Then you go back and figure out what would that mean, and how would we get those representatives, and how would they be elected, and how would they be distributed? There are many models. When you call yourself a University Senate it seems like it has the assumption that there will be representation throughout the university. Now in reality, a lot of them act still as predominately faculty governance structures but are informed by students as well informed by other voices in the university, all the way through to the case of creating a very representative model, including all parts of the university. In making the jump to the University Senate, there is a presumption that you are not predominantly faculty.

Senator Park-Fuller: I understand. You did not mention staff. Are there other groups?

Senate President Garcia: There are a lot of other faculty designations, different types of faculty lines and professional lines, who are currently not eligible to vote.

Senator Karady: It seems to me that it is a great idea to extend the participants to different university groups. However, one danger I see is if there are more than 100 people in one room, the effectiveness of the meeting is very much endangered. What I can see is that if we have twice as many people, we will never get anything to go through, because it is very difficult to do anything other than rubber stamp things. Simultaneously, I believe it is a good idea to have more people participate.

Senate President Garcia: And that can be taken care within the level of our representation.

Senator Hirata: This is an issue that came out last year, which I brought up. I am Ernest Hirata from the East Campus. If you look at our membership, we are represented from East Campus. Faculty serve here as senators. West has one representative and she was not able to be here today. The idea in terms of integrating the faculty was proposed last year in Executive Committee--primarily I proposed this to George Watson. This year at the first Board of Regents meeting Tony Garcia and I and Fran Bernat were there with this idea (and President Crow just happened to come by as we were talking and he asked what we were doing. I said jokingly that we were plotting to combine the Senates, do something so we could speak with one voice, against him, which seemed to get his attention!). He knew that I was just kidding, but really when it comes right down to it, we have a Senate at East and we decide personnel and curriculum issues. You never hear about them. We come here as senators and we hear what you are doing in your curriculum, your personnel committee, etc., most of which is of no interest to us. When it comes to certain other issues, such as plus minus grades, changing the Academic Affairs Manual, those things affect us. Those things right now do not directly affect West because they have their own Academic Affairs Manual. But from everything that I hear from the President, they are going to be incorporated, and we will be one university. So, in terms of the things that Tony proposed, we have initially discussed them, and Fran Bernat and I have been working together (because we are the outliers).

We agree that the University Senate should not meet on campus specific issues. If we meet on University issues separately, and then are of the same mind it goes to the University Senate, but if we are different in terms of our opinion, what we should recommend to the President, etc, then we go
back to our individual senates, and see if we can come to some resolution, some consensus. If we cannot, then my thought is, Ok, while we are one university, a body still has different parts. Sometimes the head does not agree with the stomach, and then we go separately if need be, if we cannot as a body come together, and ultimately the President decides what to do, so why spend any more time on it. If we have three different recommendations on plus minus grades, we would let him decide whether he is going to agree with any one campus or the students. Now graduate students have their own GPSA association and will be separate from the undergraduate students. We at East want to be included in your discussion, and thank you for including us, but most of the things that we discuss here related to curriculum, etc., really do not affect us and we really don't need to be here. We need to have another body in which issues that affect all of us at the three or four campuses can be discussed. Perhaps we can come to some consensus, and if we can then our recommendation will go to the President and if we can't it goes back to our senate.

**Senate President Garcia:** Here is where I differ from Ernie and Fran markedly. We have discussed this, but I think it is an unwanted, untenable model because we never have to come to any kind of conclusion, and that violates the very idea of shared governance when people are talking at each other and are not working toward a solution. The danger that I see in having three separate bodies trying to resolve something is that the ability to come to fruition in that model is lost. People are going to be talking in their own camp and coming armed with their opinions, then throwing them at the other camp(s), even though that is not our tradition and I know that is a worst case scenario. The second problem is that all of our campuses are growing markedly and to have a system whereby one campus is much bigger size than the other, and having one of the campuses having 2/3 of the vote on some issue that is affecting 95% of faculty and probably 90% of students (and I don't know how much of a percent that would be on the rest of the campuses)–to me it would be untenable as well. I don't understand the idea of having three separate bodies and then having them fight it out over issues. Instead you work from the ground up--you have colleagues, we have a collegial atmosphere, we have students, we are interested in making sure that they graduate and that they receive the best experience possible of the entire university--that we have faculty who can have colleagues throughout the entire university and work effectively together within the three colleges of education or four colleges of education or whatever is going to be as we grow. So, we feel differently on this issue, and I am glad Ernie has a chance to discuss this model because that is part of what I see happening this semester, that we need to discuss this in more detail. I will accept one more question.

**Senator Alozie:** You began by talking about when we are ASU, and it seems to me it is a little early about talking about the East and West model. I work in a program that is moving Downtown, for example, and I never heard Downtown mentioned.

**Senate President Garcia:** I mentioned Downtown.

**Senator Alozie:** So, when we get to that point, where we have 40,000 students on this campus, 20,000 students on the West campus, 20,000 on the Ease campus, and 12,000 students in Downtown, that would be greater than what we have at Main now. As for me, I accepted the original offer that was made, that the University President has said, one University in many places, but I think it is much too early for us to begin working on a governance model, because the University is not even sure what the university model is. It seems to me that we should move slowly and look to the evolving system as to when that will happen. I am not sure that at this point discussing a model for a University Senate would be as useful as trying to understand where the new University system is going.
Senate President Garcia: I think we are talking about the same thing only we are approaching it differently. Currently you have no representation at Downtown, but units are being moved downtown as you said. So, what I am suggesting is that if a model is built, which takes into account anything that can happen, which is a representative based model, thinking about how all the campuses integrate together at one senate, then as things grow in this model—it is built in automatically. The people will have voices at those new campuses and those groups will be represented. I know that I took a lot of time on this today, but let's move on to the University Provost Report next.


Thanks Tony, we had extensive reports last time we met, so, I will try to be brief. First, we have three major searches in progress—Dean of Nursing (Barbara Durand is retiring); the Provost at East (Chuck Backus will retire next July); and the Dean of the W.P. Carey School of Business (Larry Penley has been gone since July).

A second item, in the newspaper, reporting upon the new alliance that we are forming with the community colleges—there was a statement in there that said one of the possibilities is that the university would transfer 90 credit hours from the community colleges. Nobody has ever said that in discussion; we don't see how the university faculty would delegate its responsibility for more than half the degree to a community college. So, I don't know who said it but it certainly has never been on the table or discussed.

Third, there is a Homecoming this weekend and to the extent you can, our goal to try to use this as a way to have more engagement between the community and the university and between our alums and the university.

We have had our first of what will be one half dozen forums on the report of the University Design Team. I would guess about 75 people attended, which was I thought a very good representation considering we had to actually move it at the last minute because it overlapped directly with the President's Town Hall. I thought it was constructive and positive and open and I hope that to the extent you have issues you will join us at the next one.

On the web site, for those of you that don't read your email, there is Phase II of the University Design Team report. It is probably less provocative than Phase I but there are still some important issues to discuss. We hope you will read it and think about it or give us your comments. In addition, there is both a summary of the input we received in Phase I as well as a display of all of it, so you can go in and read it, have your own reactions, and give us feedback beyond that.

Finally, tonight somebody decided to play a football game—it was not I—it appears to have been decided in the athletic department. It is going to cause some problems with you and your colleagues and usually when we have an evening game, which we occasionally do, we have plenty of advance notice and we try and make accommodation. All I can tell you is that it shouldn't have happened without us having a chance to make accommodation, and I hope you will encourage your colleagues and make sure that whatever they do, they try to accommodate the students. We don't want to have students take the cost of this. Some of them will not be able to park; some of them may be late to class because of the traffic. This is just one pro football game with 70,000 people in attendance and the tickets are free. We could have said—this is not a problem—but this game is a big issue, and I am very concerned about making sure the students are protected, because they are the customer who is
most directly affected by this event tonight. We will deal with the administrative decision making process separately.

I will be happy to answer your questions, or hear your thoughts and comments.

**Senate President-elect Kerr:** Did we or could we have an email sent to the faculty who would have classes tonight. I emailed you about this.

**Provost Glick:** I doubt that I received it because we only started in the morning on this issue--I have been in meetings since 6:30 a.m. today, so, I don't believe one was sent to the faculty.

**Senate President-Elect Kerr:** Perhaps if an email could be shot off now.

**Provost Glick:** I will be happy to do that, but it is a little late for faculty notice at this hour. I am not very happy about this situation, but I don't believe that anyone did it in bad taste. I just feel that there needed to be in place and we will put in place, a process that avoids these things happening without a chance to at least mitigate the consequences. Are there any other comments or questions?

**Senator Schaeffer:** How many phases on this Design Team? (2). Is that it?

**Provost Glick:** Yes, that is it for the Team. As we have said many times, and I will say one more time, no decisions have been made--we are now involved in iterative discussions and open forums, etc. but there are not going to be more Phases. The Design Team has fulfilled its charge and while we may consult them informally, and some of their members are here to answer questions at the forums, there will not be further reports by the team. We hope that these reports will be the recommendations of a constructive discussion as to how to build a university that is located in many places without creating one University with first and second class campuses. I know how to build a model that says the Main campus will strive to be Berkeley, the others will strive to be Cal State. However, our goal for ASU is to create a model of campuses with similar quality and similar success, but not with identical missions and programs, and that is much harder to create. We need lots of faculty advice on how to do this.

**Senator Dwyer:** I have a question about tuition. Is there a formula in mind in which the tuition increases slow down, like when we get to the top the bottom one-third?

**Provost Glick:** First, the President has not made any statement on tuition increase yet. We have not made a recommendation, but there is a Board policy adopted last year that we will move towards the top of the bottom one-third. There is a policy that you cannot go above the top of the bottom 1/3. Now, to me, the questions that we have to ask (as we make recommendations to the Board and as the Board makes its own decision) include: 1) How much money does the University really need in order to have quality programs and have true access, which means enough financial aid to help those people who cannot afford to go to the university. That is question one: How much money do we need? And as you have heard President Crow say, it is more than we have. 2) What is a fair share to be born by the students? The taxpayers? What part is to be contributed by private donors and what part by grants and contracts? 3) How long does it take you to get that money? (that is if we agreed on how much money we need and if we agreed on what is the fair share that the student should pay) We would still have to decide if it realistic to get there in one fell swoop. However, the point is that the cap is the top and bottom—that is a policy cap, but there are other things that have to be brought into to play on this
item next year. I think that President Crow would like to see if we could put together a multiple-year plan, so that students could have more years to plan, and we would have more years of knowing our budget, but at this point all we are doing is determining the needs of the institution and discussing the philosophy. We have made no recommendations at all but we will be making recommendations sometime in the next few months. Thank you.

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

In the interest of time, I have nothing to say. Historians take note!

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

He could not attend today.

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

Just a few things, since Brandon Goad is not here, let me mention to you that the students will be voting on a measure that will increase student fees in order to fund improvements in the Memorial Union and improvements in the Student Recreation Complex. That fee structure would take place presumably in 2006 or at some time when the improvements are complete. It is a very aggressive move in terms of virtually doubling the size of the MU and having substantial improvements there and also making substantial increases in the SRC. I am serving on that committee so I will try to keep you posted. Brandon will also be talking to us about this as well.

The only other item that I wanted to mention under the past president's report is up on the Web right now: it is the fourth annual Faculty Diversity Conference. I believe that I sent an email out to most of you about this—it is this Thursday and, unfortunately, it coincides with the Stardust Conference going on at the Downtown Center. It is too bad about the scheduling but I hope as many of you as can will attend some aspect of that conference—at 1:00 p.m. we have Michael Crow scheduled to talk about the role of teaching and the New American university. We will have groups meeting after that and responding to Michael on those issues. That evening is also a rather unique event, a Chautauqua. If you are not familiar you can ask Donald Blumenfeld-Jones or Barb or Tony about it, but if you have not heard Tony do Louis Armstrong, it is really worth coming too. So, we hope we will have a good turn out for that as well. Thank you, Tony.


No report. No parking problems tonight!

Senate President Garcia: We have finished the unfinished business already.

5. New Business.

5.A Executive Committee (Tony Garcia).

My only item of new business is a consent agenda. We talked about this in the Executive Committee. Basically a consent agenda will streamline a lot of what we do in the course of our meetings and what we talked about doing would be to begin this at the next meeting of the Senate. A week before our
Senate meeting we will post the consent agenda on the Academic Senate Web site and notify you by email that there are items on the consent agenda. What I want to do is if you agree with those items, you do not have to do anything. In the general meeting, it will be on the agenda but we will not discuss it. Generally these items would be curriculum items, school names changes and other items dealt with in the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (CAPC). If you do have an objection—in terms of keeping it a consent agenda—and would like to discuss it, you would then have until Thursday at the close of the business day to respond to either Darby Shaw or myself and we would then take that item or items off the consent agenda and place them in the regular agenda.

**Senator Guleserian:** What if you just have a question about some aspect of it, and you do not want to raise an objection to it; you don't want to hold up anything, you just want to get some answers.

**Senate President Garcia:** That is a good point.

**David Burstein:** You still remove it from the consent agenda because the consent agenda is an agenda that you say--fine, deal with it. If you have a question it is taken out of the consent agenda.

**Senate President Garcia:** If there is any question at all it is taken out. ABOR operates this way; the UofA Faculty Senate also operates under this approach. We have never had this as a custom, but our bylaws do not preclude it and again, it is an attempt to streamline a lot of curriculum matters, predominately. We will begin this at our meeting next month, and you will be able to respond to that.

5.B Committee on Committees (Ernest Hirata).

The Committee on Committees met twice and we are coming out with the *Preference Survey* very soon for Academic Professionals and Faculty. So, please when you receive the notice by email, look the form over on the Academic Senate Web page. You may fill it out the survey on the Web site and send it back automatically to us. We hope you look it over and make a selection, in terms of what committees you would like to have us consider your service on, and please get your colleagues to return the survey to us as well! Thank you.

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

There was one additional information item--Mike Mayer is not here--so, I just call your attention to that item on the agenda.

5.D Personnel Committee (Doug Johnson for Susan Mattson). No report.

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

Our committee is looking into policies on disruptive students and plans for A+ monitoring.

5.F University Affairs Committee (George Watson).

Is this the last item on the agenda? (Yes.) I will only be an hour (much laughter here). It has to do with bylaws and constitution change and actually we will make it fairly brief. The University Affairs Committee has been looking over recommendations for changes to the Academic Constitution and Bylaws; proposed revisions are up on the Academic Senate Web site. What we are going to do is
make those available to the University community for the next 30-day period for an open forum and we invite people to look over those proposed changes. There will be three documents up there. One is the proposed changes (already posted) and another document will summarize those changes, in order, so that you can follow down in the constitution and bylaws and see what those changes are. A third document will talk about the changes in terms of substance, a ranking of the most significant to the least significant change. Let me just mention that there are about (4) major items that I will call your attention to: 1) changing the Faculty Ombudsperson from an elected position to an appointed position. The Senate President, in conjunction with the advice of Senate Committee on Committees and with the consent of the Academic Senate, would appoint the ombudsperson rather than have that as an elected position. The Academic Senate President would also appoint the chairs of the Senate committees rather than have the committees elect the chairs themselves at the end of each academic year. The responsibilities for the University Affairs Committee have been redefined, to bring back some items that have been left out since the committee was done away with a few years ago--which left many items of university affairs uncovered by any of the committees and so we are trying to recapture those items that are listed as Senate responsibilities that are not covered by any committee. You can see those changes, and we have also added salary and compensation policies to the responsibilities of the Personnel Committee. Those are really the major changes. There a few more changes that are really housekeeping in a sense. Student government has divided itself into Undergraduate Student Government (USG) and the Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA), and we are recommending that the presidents of both those organizations then attend Academic Senate meetings. One thing that we have not done is we have not tackled the issues that Tony brought forward. So, that is a set of issues that might be taken up by the University Affairs Committee as well. There are a number of other little housekeeping things, but I encourage you to look at those, to report those out to your department and to make them aware of changes that are coming forth. The proposed revisions are available right now. The other two documents I mentioned that summarize the changes will be available beginning tomorrow. Any questions? Thank you very much.

6. Adjournment.

Senate President Garcia: If there no objections, we will move to adjourn. The meeting concluded at 4:36 p.m.
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