Academic Senate Summary  
Monday, December 8, 2003  
SCOB Room 228  
3:15 – 5:00 p.m.


Substitutes: Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman for Brandon Goad


Guests: Rosemary Renaut, Mathematics and Statistics, Dianne Cripe, Herberger College, Betsy Fahlman, School of Art, Leonor Johnson from African American Studies, and Breandon O'hUllachain of Geography

1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Tony Garcia at 3:16 p.m.

2. Approval of the Previous Minutes (November 24, 2003).

The agenda was sent by email to senators and posted on the Wednesday before the December 8 meeting. The previous minutes and the agenda were posted to the Academic Senate Web site: (http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate) on December 9th. They will be approved at the February 9th Academic Senate meeting along with the minutes of this meeting. Please send any corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu.

3. Announcements and Communications.

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

I want to direct your attention to the December issue of the Academic Senate Newsletter the "Early Edition" on the Senate Web page. As we have been doing in the past, the early edition is posted before the printed edition comes out in the campus mail. Alphagraphics is still working on the December issue and it will be mailed before the break.

The archived September Newsletter had a corrupted file and we will repost that today. Please wait a few days to view it because we had some difficulty with the Web page I understand.
I want to limit my report today to a topic that has been going on since the spring at the national level. As some of you may know, this year there is the Reauthorization for Higher Education Bill and one of the amendments being proposed is **HR 3311**. For those of you that don't browse the internet to follow legislative bills, if you go to [THOMAS](https://thomas.loc.gov), you will be able to search for them. If you type in HR 3311, you will get the latest on this bill. This is something that I wanted to talk about back in September but we did not really have a chance to discuss it due to our business load. This bill is an amendment entitled "To Create a College Affordability Index", introduced by Representative Howard McKeon of California. Some of you may be aware of this bill--it will provide a way for the federal government to identify the fact that tuitions have been increasing in universities and colleges, public and private, much higher than the Consumer Price Index; this bill is being proposed as an amendment to the Reauthorization of Higher Education Bill, and it contains punitive actions for any university that would raise the tuition by twice the Consumer Price Index, for a period of two years. Currently, it was introduced in the House on October 16th and on November 10th the current status is that it was referred to the Subcommittee of Twenty-First Century Competitiveness. Go to THOMAS for all the details.

**President Crow:** We are tracking that bill. Right now we are not eligible to fall under its consideration because we are in the lower quartile for all costs for higher education, so we would be exempt from its clause.

**Tony Garcia:** That is great news. Just three things to note and just to give some background on this bill--luckily, we don't fall under it. My concern is more from a national perspective. There are a few things inherent in this bill that will make it difficult for access to people throughout the United States. The focus is on percentage increases in terms of not allowing universities and colleges to go through percentage increases that are above the Consumer Price Index. I think that "percentage increases" is pretty misleading, because there are a lot of disparity in terms of tuitions between the privates and the publics. That is one problem with the bill. The other problems I see are the fact that the CPI is discussed as a rate of inflation, whereas in the last 10 to 20 years average American households--there are two aspects of this 1) the affordability of the average household and 2) the lower income households, which go through the Pell Grants, and I think that is what the federal government is focusing on in terms of federal costs. Through not just the CPI, household incomes are being diverted to the cost of living, and for the last 10 to 20 years we have had about half of Americans owning cell phones. This did not even exist until 10 years ago. Cable Television over the last 20 years has penetrated about 68% of American households. So, for the average American to look at the Consumer Price Index and say that the costs have been increasing is only part of the picture. One of the things that are not taken into account in this activity is the fact that there are new costs in terms of communications that we are going to be willing to spend, which are in the range of $1,000-2,000 per year. This only refers to the average American household; obviously, lower income households are going to be a lot different. So, if you go through some of the other problems that I see at the national level--we know in Arizona and through the country there is going a huge demand for higher education. So, we do not fall under this clause, but throughout the nation there is going to be a 24% projected national increase in higher education costs. So, in my opinion, price controls, which are what this is in effect, always lead to shortages. We are already seeing some of that across the nation, the idea that people will not be able to go to college, primarily because not so much the cost, as the fact that universities and colleges may not be willing to expand, if they are not able to set prices in order to accommodate and provide a quality education. That is one of the problems. Anybody who is aware of price controls, as one example, with vaccinations for the flu program going on now nationally, we are
seeing a shortage of that vaccine. One of the major issues with that shortage is that the federal government has a control over the vaccine costs, since they pay the freight for many of the vaccines. I am afraid the same thing is happening in higher education. Rather than give the details of the bill in depth, some of the things that we who are in the university life should think about in terms of rather than complaining about bills against higher education or for higher education, is look at some of the things that we can do that are under our control, and one of the things that keeps cropping up that is very relevant to us is being able to educate the public on the many options available for higher education and their true costs. There is a big misunderstanding about the costs of higher education--what it is, plus tuition and fees. There are several surveys published where people have guessed costs that are much higher than the actual costs. The other thing under our purview is the ability to educate the public on all the different varieties of higher education; everything from community colleges through universities and how to negotiate the true costs of higher education. That is something that we could do and we have already started a lot of the outreach at ASU, and we should continue doing that. The second thing that I suggest we do is to work toward productivity gains. In the private sector people talk a lot about the productivity gains--one of the particulars about the economy in this quarter has been the increase in productivity. That is something that we have already done to some extent at ASU. We do this at a better level or a higher level or keep it in our sights when we are going off designing new courses and programs. Such things as--how can a course be more effective and delivered with fewer resources? We have done some of this in the Ira Fulton School of Engineering as well as in other departments. The other aspect of productivity in our lives as scholars is research--how can we make research more productive and less consumed with extraneous things having to do with research, in terms of bureaucracy or any other kinds of impediments. The third aspect of this, which again is under our purview, is the ability--and I see some college and universities doing this at some level--is our partnership with the community colleges in differentiating the products we are selling, for the purposes of looking at costs and looking at the ability of people to pay for these costs. We can differentiate the product as to how we get students involved, at what level are they involved, with what we do at the university, and how we explore different types of pricing. Some schools have been looking at this across the nation--whether an online student or an off site student would pay the same as an in-house student, or should they pay more than an in-house student. We have a lot of pricing structures, depending on out of state, in state, off campus courses as well as programs. I just wanted to make my remarks on this amendment, and again reiterating what President Crow said, it doesn't directly affect us, but I think in a broader scheme it does affect higher education in the country and there are things that if this does not do it, this particular amendment is still going through the House and there are other aspects of higher education reauthorization that will affect us in the near term or the not too distant future. Those are my comments and if you have questions, I will respond.


I don't have a specific focused presentation today, just an end of the semester update on four issues that I think are important for the Senate to be aware of. A couple of things for you to think about, and a couple informational items and then I hope when that is done, we might have a few minutes for discussion and questions.

What we are calling Campaign 05 is our effort with the legislature this year in the session coming up to advance what I think is the largest budget request increase the University has every made from the legislature. We are requesting core funding and this is to maintain access and to maintain quality. Our request when, all is said and done, is being driven by our student enrollment growth numbers and our request is for $55.4 million. Leading up to the legislature session we have had some progress with the
senior legislative staff, with the legislative budget staff, with the executive budget staff, and with the Governor's staff and the Governor herself. I don't know where we will come out in terms of the actual budget request numbers but we have had some success in advancing this request. The reason why that is important is that this request is being mounted in yet again another year where there is a general perception that the State of Arizona's fiscal health is in the C to C+ range, meaning not so good. That means that this request will be difficult, that our success will be difficult, and we are making it the principle thing that we are devoting our political energies to. We realize at the same time that there is another looming issue that we are not bringing up, so, I don't want senators to believe that these kinds of things escape us, because they don't and that is the fact that our relativistic funding between Arizona State University and the University of Arizona in particular per student has not been dramatically altered in the last 15 years. On average the University of Arizona per student is receiving about $8,000 per student from the state and we are receiving $5,700 per student. This is a major problem. It is a major issue. It is an issue that we will address significantly in Campaign 06, after the election, and it is going to be prominent on our agenda. To put these campaigns into perspective, Campaign 04 was to test the waters on whether or not we could secure no additional budget cuts, which we did, as well as the special funding for the research infrastructure building. We were successful at both of those efforts. Campaign 05 is to secure the support for the additional students that we have had and Campaign 06 will be the means by which we now undertake the notion of equity in funding within the investment being given by students. We have plans for Campaign 07 and Campaign 08, as we try to move forward to basically secure what we hope will be around a 410 to 450 million dollar state investment base from the legislature, as opposed to the 320 million dollar number where we are right now. We are trying to add through these various means 100-125 million dollars in funding to our base support. One Hundred and twenty-five million dollars added to our base support would be profoundly positive. It would allow us a number of means to attack a number of problems that we have. So, we are moving in that direction.

Also related to resources, in the calendar year 03, we mounted several campaigns to secure investment from private donors. We have several more that are in the works right now--and in calendar year 04, we will mount 35 additional substantial proposals. These 35 proposals will be naming proposals for additional schools, investment proposals for centers and initiatives, as well as more generic investments from a range of private sources and so, we are moving this year to go from 5 to 6 proposals to 30 proposals in 2004. I wanted you to be aware of that fact. Also related to resources, we will make a recommendation for tuition and fee adjustments to the Regents in the early spring semester. These tuition and fee adjustments will be complicated in that there will likely be fee adjustments down to the class level for those classes that need additional resources. The Provost is working with the Deans and others to identify those areas but that has not been worked out yet. There will be tuition adjustments in graduate school and professional school graduate training, the areas and details of which are yet to be worked out. We will be working on that through the rest of December and into the month of January. There will be fee adjustments put forward by the students in the form of a student referendum that will be held in February, and we will hear from our student leadership shortly on that, and those student fee adjustments will be something that the students are managing and they are moving forward for the Student Recreation Center and the Memorial Union expansion on the main campus as well as other miscellaneous things, such as the student health fee. Let me just say that the student health fee will not be in the student referendum, and we don't know exactly when we will advance it yet, but let me make note of why it is an issue. Students at Arizona State University right now pay no health fee. Their health center is paid for from state appropriations. That is not an appropriate funding source for an extra service. We will be moving in the direction of having that service on a student fee basis over time. The timing is yet to be worked out. We will be
reprogramming the state appropriation dollars going into the Student Health Service for academic purposes. That is the kind of logic that is also going into some of our fee adjustments and fee structures. Tuition and fee adjustments can be expected to continue. It is likely that we will be well within a threshold that doesn't cause any problems with our tuition increases, and we are working on the details of that. At any rate, both our tuition and our mandatory fees, whatever they are, cannot exceed at the moment, according to Regents policy, the position of what is called the top position of the bottom 1/3 of the states. That is their policy, and that is their trajectory that we are on. It is likely that as we do this over the next several years, we will generate (from that source) tens of millions of new dollars of new revenue for investment on an annual basis. That is the order of magnitude of what the tuition and fee increases might provide.

Second, we are saying--it is a rhetoric that I use and that others are using--"one university in many places." This is a rhetoric that needs more definition and needs some additional logic put to it. Therefore, we will be putting out early in the next semester a white paper that addresses what that means and what it means to build high quality schools on each of our campuses that will ultimately be competitive on a national basis, and what it means to maintain the ASU brand across all of our campuses. That white paper will be released prior to my response to the Provost's report and recommendations from the University Design Team, just to put that into perspective. It will be a more generic white paper for people to react to.

Third, I would like to talk a little bit about enrollment management issues. Arizona State University, unlike other universities in this part of the United States, is maintaining its admission of qualified students. In the state of California, almost 40,000 qualified students who are already admitted were told after admission they could not attend the public universities in California. We are not in that position and we don't ever hope to be in that position, but we do need to manage our enrollment and I have asked the Provost and the University Vice President for Undergraduate Initiatives, to put forth the plan and strategy that would help us to manage our enrollments to help us to provide an environment where students can be the most successful. We can talk about that as those plans evolve in time, but that is the direction that we are going in terms of enrollment and I will also add that it is unequivocally the case that should we not be unsuccessful in our legislative campaign to secure support for additional students coming to the University, we will then have no choice but to manage our enrollment by cutting our enrollment off--in some way and in some direction, we are not sure how. We are working through those scenarios right now in a way that is the most fair. We cannot continue to move forward with the limited resources that we have, taking unlimited numbers of qualified students and hope that we will do anything other than greatly damage the core competency and core capacity of the University. We believe that we have reached that threshold now; we believe that we can't go any further; that is the case that we are making with the legislature and that is the case that we are making with the Governor because we just have to have this $55.4 million that we are pursuing. It turns out that we had a number of policy conflicts this year--the Regents have policy that makes it almost impossible for the University to control enrollment, regardless of whether or not funding comes for the students. All of you are aware that right now if we took just the numbers that I put on the table, if a student comes and pays in-state tuition. They give the University roughly $3,500 for annual student tuition and fees. The state contributes $5,700--by way of comparison to the more than $8,400 per student state investment, at the University of Washington. Just to put that into perspective. Between that $3,500 and that $5,700, that is the total amount of resources that we have to work with. Every additional student that comes without that state investment stresses the system. We have on the order of 7,500 to 10,000 of them depending on how you count the students in this university right now. That
is the problem we are tackling, and that is why we are moving in the direction of considering enrollment management and why we have to deal with this now.

Lastly--and Tony mentioned the Maricopa Community College district--one of the tools important to the success of the University is to greatly enhance our relationship with the community college district. We are working in real time to do that. We are advancing what we call the Alliance. The Alliance has a long way to go in terms of its implementation, but it will ultimately involve a joint bachelors degree program, some joint admissions, as well as the management of under qualified students for the University, to get them more qualified to attend the University and a range of other parameters. The community college district, which is about to mount a billion dollar bonding issuance will be our ally in these efforts. This is not a formal policy presentation on my part, just four things that I thought that the senators should be aware of. Campaign 05, where we are with regard to that, the one university in many places concept, the enrollment issues that we are facing, and the community college alliance. There might be other things that you would like me to speak on but the Senate President has put me under strict time constraints, so please ask any questions you may wish.

**Senator Guleserian:** You said that students do not pay any health fees now. (Correct.) They do pay something like $700 a year for health insurance. The fees that you are talking about would, I take it, be on top of that and that fee would not be covered by the insurance. Isn't that correct?

**President Crow:** The insurance is, I believe, for major medical. I do not know the details on that insurance. The health fee we are talking about--right now, we have a free health service, for routine screening, flu, colds, and STDs is a big area of concentration of the Student Health Service, and for those services we do not charge a fee.

**Senator Johnson:** As a point of clarification, it is an optional fee that graduate students can elect to pay. It is very difficult because it is not a required fee at present. There was a severe self-selection problem, which then drives premiums very high in that area. It is not great coverage, and it is expensive but it is also optional.

**President Crow:** That is not the same as the health fee that I am talking about. The health fee is necessary to maintain a core set of services for a large student population through a health center.

**Senator Guleserian:** Student Health Insurance would not cover those fees. Right?

**Senator Johnson:** You can design a program with or without a fee for service, but making health insurance part of the package may be a desirable thing, because you could avoid some of the self-selection problems that occur now.

**President Crow:** If we did that, in all likelihood it would be extremely expensive, compared to what students can afford to pay. It turns out that student health fees--at the University of Minnesota and we looked at several universities--have been in place since 1900. The student health fees at most other schools are between $100 per semester and $200 per semester, and we are talking about $40 for our student health fee and the amount of money that would free up for reallocation by the Provost on his academic issues would be 2.5 million dollars per year. That is our logic. The health insurance issue for those students that want to buy insurance, we currently offer that as an option. Most students have health insurance from their families, something on the order of 65 to 70%. International students have some difficulty and the graduate students have some difficulty, because they are beyond the age in
which their family can cover them. The health service does not cover major medical things; it covers a flu shot and other things.

**University Provost Glick:** International students must buy health insurance.

**Senator Burstein:** And there are some companies that provide it fairly cheaply.

**President Crow:** Because they aggregate across universities. Ok, that concludes my report.

3.C **Executive VP and University Provost's Report** (Milton Glick).

I do not have a report but I will answer questions.

**Senate President Garcia:** Are there questions?

**President Crow:** Is everyone satisfied with the movement of all of the schools to the Downtown that the Provost has put out? (Much laughter here) We thought we might get a question or two on that today.

**Senator Burstein:** The question is--is your office going to move to Downtown Center. (No. We are moving to downtown Mesa.)

**Senator Johnson:** So, you are becoming political then…

3.D **President-elect's Report** (Barbara Kerr). She could not be with us today due to an appointment at another campus.

3.E **USG President's Report** (Sophie O'Keefe-Zelman for Brandon Goad).

I am filling in for Brandon today because he had two meeting that were important. I am the Government Relations Director at ASASU, so he briefed me on what he wanted to tell you. He wanted to relate to you that the Senate last week passed a resolution to create a Gay and Lesbian Studies certificate. They wanted to bring it up this semester because is a very salient issue in that the Gay and Lesbian Coalition is the only coalition that does not have its own certificate program, as well as there have been several incidents of discrimination and hate on campus this semester. They would like to now see a certificate created. That is all he asked me to tell you. I know that Dr. Crow mentioned the fees that we have coming up. The time plan for that is to go to the Board of Regents in January and ask for permission to have a referendum vote, and then I think it is February 16th that the GPSA as well the USG will take a vote and students can vote YES on fees or NO on fees. The fees will be for an SRC and MU expansion. Then if the referendum passes, we will still go back to the Board of Regents and ask for an implementation of fees, and if it fails, it is not what the students wanted. So, that is what we are looking at. Are there any questions?

**President Crow:** I did not have a question but I wanted to add this point. It also is the case that state appropriation dollars are backing up the facilities and the operations of both the Student Recreation Center and the Memorial Union. Those fees will then allow us to move dollars back into their coffers for their program purposes, as well as to provide for the expansion of these facilities for the benefit of everyone, should the students be able to make this case. What you are seeing is partially the
movement of trying to get these state dollars back to where they need to be, and tuition dollars where they need to be, and then special fee dollars to support things like the Memorial Union and the Student Recreation Center.

Senator Park-Fuller: I have a question about the issue of the certificate. There was a proposal for a certificate that came forward last year and that was sent back, I believe, because they were trying to get certificate procedure decided, as to how the certificates would be best put together. Can Michael Mayer address that? Or can someone update us on where that process is now?

Senator Mayer: All of the certificates that were held, and the Gay and Lesbian one was not the only one held in the Provost Office while we were developing the guidelines for certificates. They have been sent back to the people that were proposing them and my understanding is that when they get done with the proposals, they will be sent to the Provost Office, and then they will go to CAPC.

3.F Past President's Report (George Watson) No report. George could not be here with us today.

3.G ASU West Senate Report (Fran Bernat). Fran could not be here today.

3.H ASU East Assembly Report (Ernest Hirata).

I have no formal report--things are going well at East--however, Tony, I do want to ask as far as an Arizona Faculties Council's report, I can give that if you want me to. (Tony reported on that at the last meeting.) One thing that I would like to add is that the AFC meets when the Board of Regents meet, and we attend those meetings and I would like to commend our University President for always making an excellent presentation to the Board of Regents. At the last meeting at the University of Arizona, the President reported the US News and World Report ratings of universities, and again, I thought our President did an excellent job in making the report which really touched on ASU and the question in general. I think that we are well represented there and I wanted to say that although I have criticized him in some of the things he has done, he definitely does a good job in his findings and his presentations, making all of us look good in front of the Board of Regents.

On another matter, at a previous Regent's meeting, as you know, we are represented on the Regents when they meet in the public portion of the meeting--the call to the audience--by one faculty member. This year it happens to be David Camacho from NAU. Two meetings ago, a request was made when the Regents were discussing the committees they have--David requested that there be a strategic planning committee for faculty salaries--that idea was sort of pooh-poohed, however, at the last meeting at the University of Arizona, Regent Bulla, who is in charge of the strategic planning, recommended to the presidents that they include a strategic plan on faculty compensation in the future.

So, I thought I would tell you that we are making some progress.

I don't think you mentioned this, Tony, in terms of an issue for part of the discussion items that the AFC is interested in--entrepreneurial things--the ways in which faculty research projects can be entrepreneurial in some way of increasing their salaries through sponsored research projects. So, that will be something that the AFC will study. Also, on top of that, I would like to mention that ASU is the only university that is receiving a salary increase this year. Our brethren are not, and I think, again, our president should be commended for making us the only institution that is concerned with faculty and staff salaries and putting money forth toward that end.

I have distributed a one-page statistical summary to you entitled "Academic Preparation, Performance and Outcomes for ASU Students and Student-Athletes by Varsity Sports Team". It will be posted to the Academic Senate Web page after this meeting.

Tony has asked me to be unusually brief today because of the number of other issues that you have to consider. I will try to do that and answer questions at the end if there are particular things that you wish to pursue.

Last year, when we were together, I indicated that the NCAA put together an academic reform agenda and I can now report that the first phase of this agenda was in fact implemented last year. So, as we began this fall semester, a total of 14 core courses (rather than 13) are now required of students in order to be classified as an "NCAA qualifier." A qualifier is allowed to practice, get athletically-related financial aid and compete as a freshman. Partial qualifiers who do not meet the full standard are allowed to practice and to get financial aid; but are not allowed to compete. Those who are classified as non-qualifiers are permanently ineligible for competition according to PAC10 rules (unless they meet one of the exceptions to the rule).

In addition to the increase in the number of high school core courses, NCAA has imposed GPA requirements for the first time: after one year (as you can see in my notes) students must have earned a cumulative GPA of 1.80. We have had no end of first year GPA requirement established by the Arizona Board of Regents, and so this represents a significant increase in standards. In the past, the Board of Regents has required a 1.80 after two years but now the NCAA has taken that to 1.90. And, in the past, Board of Regents has required a 1.90 after three years and now the NCAA has imposed a 2.0 requirement. These rules become effective for the students who are entering on or after August 1 of 2003. So, I will continue to administer two sets of rules until all of the students are covered only by the lower GPA standards have left the university. Also, for years the Board of Regents has required that we administer their GPA rules on a semester by semester basis, and when the NCAA adopted this package last year they also required a term by term certification rather than a single time at the beginning of the year.

The third piece of the academic reform agenda was to increase the progress towards degree rules. As indicated in my outline, the NCAA has increased the requirement after two years from 25% of degree completion to 40% of degree completion. After three years the increase is from 50 to 60 percent, and after four years the increase is from 75 to 80 percent. I believe this is going to have the biggest impact on two year college transfers who will now be required to have 40% of their degree completed (that is, 48 out of 120 hours) in order to be immediately eligible for competition.

Finally, the NCAA has, for the first time, implemented the term by term requirement in terms of the number of credit hours passed. The standard is not a significant one at this point (6 hours in one term to be eligible for competition in the next regular term), but it does impose some discipline in sports like men’s and women’s basketball, for example. This is the case because this sport spans the fall and spring semesters. If a student is certified as eligible in the beginning of the fall, and then in fact does not pass 6 hours during the fall semester that student could in fact utilize a season of competition by playing in the fall semester and then be ineligible under the 6 hour rule for the spring semester. I think the NCAA membership probably had basketball in mind primarily but the rule does apply to all other...
sports. In effect, we have 4 different components of the academic reform package, all passed, and all in place at the present time. Only the six hours per term rule is being applied to all student-athletes, with the other rules being applied to those who began their collegiate enrollment on or after August 1, 2003.

In addition to these measures, other components of the academic reform program are in progress but have not yet to be legislated. Many of these proposals will be voted on by the NCAA this spring. The first is the development of an academic performance measure that calculates one point is retained for the following year, one point if the individual is eligible to compete the following year and two points if the student actually graduates. This measure is going to be calculated every team, every year. The NCAA Board of Directors has yet to determine what the threshold cutoff values are going to be, but sanctions for teams that do not score well are going to include loss of revenue sharing dollars from the NCAA, the loss of scholarships that are allowed to be awarded in that sport and perhaps denial of access to NCAA championship events. So, the teeth in that measure will be substantial. Those rewards and sanctions are yet to be determined but are very much a part of the package. The NCAA is setting up the committee and the machinery this year to actually establish what those cutoffs will be, what those rewards and punishments are going to be for individual teams or institutions.

Finally, after years of criticism of this Department of Education's graduation rate, the NCAA is going to develop a new "academic success rate" that will include transfer students coming in, for example, to Arizona State University but will not count against us student athletes who leave here, transfer to another institution and would have been eligible for competition had they remained at Arizona State. This will be an alternative measure of academic success in terms of graduation rates. I have seen some simulations to demonstrate the differences between the current Department of Education graduation rate methodology and what this new methodology would produce. There is little correspondence between the two rates. Schools that score very high under one measure may score very low on the other one, because of the composition of transfers in and out and the academic circumstances of those students.

The other point that I want to make today about the academic reform movement is that the NCAA leadership has broadened its focus to include groups other than their presidents, faculty athletics representatives and athletics directors. In particular, the focus now includes the academic senates and AAUP members at the sixty or so institutions that comprise the Bowl Championships Series (BSC) conferences. They also have involved the National Association of Governing Boards. This will be the first time that the NCAA has endeavored to go outside of its own structure and directly involve academic senate leaders.

The second part of my report today relates to the campus specific matters, the first of which is the report that I provide to you each year on the academic preparation of semester performance, graduation rates. This year I have added a column for persistence rates as well. My general comment here is that there are not many changes from a year ago. I have converted once again the ACT scores to SAT equivalents and the numbers that appear in column two (see the Academic Senate Web page for that) are very similar to those that I reported to you one year ago. These are four year averages so now I have added the 2002 class and dropped off one at the other end. The largest declines in average SAT scores occurred in men’s basketball (a decline from 1013 to 962) and women’s basketball (a decline from 1012 to 967). Women's golf has increased from 986 to 1049. There was an increase in softball from 918 to 963 and in nearly every other case the change was less than 30 points. There are hardly any changes overall in the GPA values--a year ago in the fall semester for all student athletes the value
was 2.62 and you see it 2.60 this year. There is some decline in the spring semester values, from 2.67 a year ago to 2.57 this year 2.57. I have a particular concern in football with the fall GPA of 2.0 and with wrestling with the same value. The spring average GPA in wrestling also is down this from, from 2.37 one year ago to 2.05. I will ask the Academic Committee of the Athletics Board to look more closely at these changes.

In terms of graduation rates, we are reporting a 4 year average of 53% for student athletes; this rate was 50% in my report to you a year ago. I do want to point out that there have been some significant increases in the sport of baseball, because those of you who have been here and heard my reports before may remember baseball graduation rates ranged as low as 0 and 5% in the past. Two years ago the graduation rate in baseball was 57% this last year it was 43%. I think that we are doing much better there. We do have some low values in men's basketball. I want to remind you, though, that these numbers cover the 1993 to 1996 entering classes and do not reflect the current leadership of our men's basketball program.

In terms of the final column--the persistence rates--these are forecasters of future graduation rates. What I have done here is to take the students who entered in 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 and check to see if they were still enrolled in 2003. In some sense the graduation rates that I report for these teams, three or four or five years from now may be much lower, but they are not likely to be much higher because many of the students who are persisting here this year could still might not persist all the way to graduation. But, this measure does give us things to start to watch and begin to monitor in individual sports to try to improve graduation rates overall.

There are two other comments that I want to make today. I want the Senate to know that I will be stepping down from this position as of June 30th and my successor will be appointed, I think sometime in the next month or two. I certainly am committed to helping that person in every way that I can to prepare for the responsibilities that I have had. I also wanted to express today my appreciation for the generous resolution that the Academic Senate passed last spring thanking me for the work that I have done. So, I do not know who will be giving this report next year but I certainly want you to know that I have appreciated the supported of the Academic Senate over all these years. Thank you and I will be glad to answer any questions.

**Senate President Garcia:** As there are no questions for Dr. Kingston, we will move to the unfinished business portion of our agenda.

**4. Unfinished Business.**

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

**4.A.1 Senate Motion #4 (2003-2004)** was read into the minutes:" The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the name change of a degree program from MS in Computational Biosciences to: Professional Science Masters (PSM) in Computational Biosciences." Rationale: The content of the program remains unchanged. The name change is requested to best reflect the national picture and to also recognize the professional status of this program of study for its future development and success.
Senator Mayer: Dr. Rosemary Renaut is here to answer to questions you may have on this motion before we vote.

Senate President Garcia: Hearing no questions we will have a voice vote on Senate Motion #4, all in favor please say aye. The motion carries with one no vote.

4.A.2 Senate Motion #5 (2003-2004) was read into the minutes: "The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for the establishment of an undergraduate certificate - Geographic Information Science." Rationale: This certificate will show the student has achieved competency in the concepts and applications of Geographic Information Science (GIS) through the successful completion of 19 credit hours of focused study and capstone project. The certificate is cross disciplinary and designed: (a) for undergraduates wishing to pursue a GIS related career; (b) to meet the requirements for educational certification of professionals working in the fields; and (c) as a professional development basis for agencies such as Arizona Bureau of Land Management, USDA – Forest Service and local park, planning and recreation departments. The goal of the new certificate is to give students sufficient exposure to the changing fields of Geographic Information Science (GIS) to improve their employment opportunities.

Senator Mayer: Dr. Breandon O'hUllachain is here to answer questions you may have on this motion before we vote.

Senator Ismeurt: This is a question of the Senate--Last year we tabled a number of undergraduate certificate programs didn't we--we were waiting for the development of criteria for the undergraduate certificate programs? What is the status of that?

Senator Mayer: Ok. We have received one of those back and we turned it down as being too narrow. We have not received the one back on Gay and Lesbian Studies. I actually don't know if we have seen the third one yet.

Senator Ismeurt: So, there is now a set of criteria by which we are comparing these things and this one meets those criteria?

Senator Mayer: Yes. We voted on the criteria last spring, and those have been applied to all the undergraduate certificates that the committee has seen this semester.

Senator Ismeurt: Was this request one of those, or was this a new request this year?

Senator Mayer: I don't really know, maybe Breandon can say more about that.

Senator O'hUllachain: This was held up by the change of the rules last spring. So, we basically followed the new rules.

Senator Mayer: Are there other questions?

Senate President Garcia: We will move forward. On Senate Motion #5 we will have a voice vote. All in favor please indicate by saying aye. Senate Motion #5 carried with one no vote.
4.A.3 Senate Motion #6 was read into the minutes: "The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal submitted by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences for the establishment of a Graduate Certificate in African and African Diaspora Studies." Rationale: African American Studies proposes to offer a graduate certificate in the field of African and African Diaspora Studies. The aim of this certificate program is to provide interdisciplinary training in four areas of emphasis: African Studies, African Diaspora Studies, Women and Gender in Africa and the African Diaspora Studies, and Comparative Studies. As our communities become more diversified and our interest with the world outside of the U.S. becomes more intertwined, there is a greater demand to understand the intricate complexities of diverse cultures both within and outside our own geographic boundaries.

Senator Mayer: Dr. Leonora Johnson is here to answer questions you may have on this motion before we vote.

Senator Goldinger: How does the student earn the certificate? It doesn't specify credit hours or structure.

Senator Mayer: The four that are one here--those are areas, correct? I will let Dr. Johnson address them.

Dr. Johnson: There are two types of certificates 1) a certificate attached to a degree and 2) a free standing certificate, and both require 18 hours. Therefore, a student doesn't have to pursue a degree in order to take advantage of the certificate, but they do have to be admitted, using the standards of the Graduate Admissions--if they are getting the freestanding certificate, or if they are admitted to a degree program, they have to declare that also.

Senator Mayer: Any other questions?

Senate President Garcia: We will now vote on Senate Motion #6, those in favor please indicate by saying aye. Senate Motion #6 carries unanimously. Thank you, Michael.

5. New Business.

5.A Executive Committee (Tony Garcia).

5.A.1 Senate Motion #11 (first reading): At its meeting of December 1, 2003, the Senate Executive Committee approved the concept of a consent agenda for the Academic Senate: "The Senate agrees to introduce a consent agenda. Consent agenda items will be so noted on the regular Senate agenda. A Senator may remove items from the consent agenda at such time between when the meeting agenda is posted to when the Academic Senate President calls upon the Senate during a Senate meeting to identify any item that must be removed from the consent agenda. Items removed from the consent agenda will become part of the regular Senate agenda." Rationale: A consent agenda item is not deliberated or discussed on the floor. The consent agenda in its entirety is voted on by the Senate. The purpose of the consent agenda is to streamline Senate meetings with items that likely do not need further debate and discussion on the floor. It is expected that more time would become available for reporting, debating, and legislating during Senate meetings.
I mentioned this item a couple of meetings ago, the idea of a consent agenda, and through the Executive Committee we felt the best way to proceed was to have a motion for first reading. Are there any questions?

**Senator Guleserian:** I don't quite understand how something gets on the consent agenda.

**Senate President Garcia:** Although we did not specify that in the motion itself, the way it would work is as it works currently in the bylaws and constitution, the Executive Committee recommends to the Senate President what the agenda will be for the Senate meeting. During that time, in the Executive Committee which this year has met a week before the Senate meeting, will place items that are identified as consent agenda items on a consent agenda. The Wednesday before the Senate meeting, or about 5 days before, those items go out on the web or by email to the senators. The idea behind this motion is that up to the time of the beginning of the Senate meeting, these items will be part of the consent agenda unless one senator would want to remove an item, and then it must be removed and put back into the general agenda.

**Senator Guleserian:** It would only take one senator then?

**Senate President Garcia:** One senator would be the intent of this motion.

**Senator (?):** I would like to suggest that if we move to a consent agenda that you don't do it on a Wednesday before the meeting. Don't count the weekend as work days. Give us enough time to read it, and I don't think that Wednesday is enough time to read the consent agenda. I think that we want a week in advance.

**Senate President Garcia:** What we can do in that case, unless we change our Executive Committee meetings, we would have to on the day that Executive Committee meets, email and/or post just the consent agenda items. That would be one possibility.

**Senator Siferd:** As a point of clarification, in other committees that I am on, I think it is not a big deal that we don't have five days, because if we want to discuss something one person can take it off the consent agenda.

**Senate President Garcia:** Your point is well taken, and we have talked about what would be the lead time. So, whether it is five days or seven days, it would just be a logistical issue. I have no strong feelings one way or the other on how to get that to the senators in a reasonable time.

**Senator Johnson:** A procedural question--should this be a motion, or should it by a bylaw change?

**Senate President Garcia:** In the Executive Committee we talked about it as a motion. The bylaws currently stipulate the content of the agenda; it does not explain anything beyond that. So, it does not specifically say that there should be a consent agenda item or not. The way we can operate, and we have been doing that is adding things to the agenda as we wish. At least my interpretation and David's as parliamentarian, is that we don't see any inherent problems with putting this in as a motion rather than making it a bylaw change.

**Senator Burstein:** Doug, I think we can do it either way and if we do it this way it is fine.
Senator Crozier: Can you give some examples of what you would see typical for the consent agenda, and can I assume that the things you put on the consent agenda are things that you feel we don't really need to discuss? Also, what would amount of time do you think we can save by doing this?

Senate President Garcia: Looking at what the UofA Senate does, and looking at what we do over the last however many years that I have been involved in the Senate here, I would say that the curriculum action items seem to be the most appropriate things to place on a consent agenda because they go through quite an extensive review--through CAPC, through review at the Provost Office, and college reviews. Those types of items have been extensively looked at, and while there have been times when people have wanted to debate those, typically they don't.

Senator Park-Fuller: I was just wondering what kind of a vote would it take when it says the senate agenda in its entirety is voted on by the Senate, would that be a voice vote, a hand vote, or it require a certain number, what is the usual procedure?

Senator Burstein: It is the typical vote of the majority.

Senator Park-Fuller: It would be a majority vote? (Yes.)

Senator (?): Does the appearance of something on the consent agenda preclude the opportunity to ask questions or ask for clarification on that item?

Senate President Garcia: Yes, it would have to be removed from the consent agenda. That is my understanding of the protocol.

Senator Mayer: This is also used by the CAPC's subcommittee, MCCS and this is what is done.

Senator Siferd: I would think that a consent agenda by its name implies 100% consent. So, if you have ten items and we take one off, then the other 9 left will have to be voted upon together with a simple majority passing the entire agenda?

Senator Mayer: In the Main Campus Curriculum Subcommittee we ask if anyone wants to remove any of the courses from the consent agenda to either debate them or ask questions. Then we vote on that item separately from any other things we have. Whatever anybody does not take off the consent agenda, we vote on in bulk.

Senator Burstein: It remains to be seen how much it streamlines issues for us. If everybody asks for everything to be taken off the consent agenda, then it is not a consent agenda any longer. We will see what happens, but it is worth an experiment.

Senator Mayer: The point is, nobody objects to what has been left on the consent agenda, therefore, it is a moot point to consider how many vote in favor of adopting the consent agenda.

Senator Hirata: My question was, and you have answered it, do we get to vote on the consent agenda items and the point made was that we vote in bulk on those items remaining on it.

5.B Committee on Committees (Ernest Hirata). No report.
The request for faculty to respond to the Academic Preference Survey did result in more responses, volunteers for committees, so, I thank you all.

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

5.C.1 Information Items.

Establishment of a Minor in the College of Education, Division of Curriculum & Instruction - Early Childhood Education.

Establishment of Undergraduate Concentrations in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry - B.S. Chemistry: Environmental Chemistry and B.S. Biochemistry: Medicinal Chemistry.

Establishment of a Minor in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry - Biochemistry.

5.C.2 Action items (First Reading):

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

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

Senator Mayer: I have invited guests for this motion. Betsy Fahlman of the School of Art, and Diane Cripe of the Herberger College are here to answer questions about this item. Do we have questions?

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

**Senator Ismeurt:** What is meant in SM #10 by a "crying need…?” (Much laughter here). Is that the right way to make the case? Is there perhaps a objective way to say that?

**Senator Mayer:** How about a substantial need?

**Senator Ismeurt:** What need? Can we quantify it at all?

**Senator Mayer:** I did dismiss Senator O'hUllachain already. He's left, but the proposal reads market demand. In their search for open GIS jobs it revealed more than 500 vacant positions in the US and more than 40 in Arizona during the week of September 21, 2003….these positions require both advanced study and work experience…there are 10 that are listed with salaries that range from $38,600 up to $135,000 (two of them). In addition, there has been interest expressed in the degree program through ASU, GIS users group, the Arizona chapter of Geospatial Information and Technology Association, and local engineering firms (two were mentioned but not audible on the tape) and the American Society of Civil Engineers.

**Senate President Garcia:** It sounds like there is a work force need and a professional society need.

**Senator Mayer:** We can change this before we meet again. "Workforce need" then? (Yes.)

**Senator Mattson:** My question is why the title "Master of Advanced Study?" If this is just a master's degree, if that is what they are saying they are giving and I guess I have a concern also about the non-thesis degree thing. They are either saying it is a masters degree, but it is one year--I don't care how long it takes them to take it, but don't all masters programs have some kind of a capstone project? It does not have to be a thesis but isn't there some kind of a capstone project?

**Senator Mayer:** I believe that the one we passed earlier today, the PSM in Computational Biosciences, also is a non-thesis degree.

**Maria Allison:** These did go through the Graduate College Council and do have capstone experiences as part of the requirement.

**Senator Mattson:** It isn't that they don't have something then.

**Maria Allison:** A masters of advanced study is a label that has become quite predominante in the professional field of the GIS, it is not that unusual and a lot of our peer institutions have adopted that to distinguish it from the traditional research.

**Senator Mayer:** Is it thought of as a terminal degree?

**Maria Allison:** No. Not necessarily. It is very professional driven, by the professional associations.

**Susan Mattson:** It seems like Nurses are bad enough, we have a lot of different degree names.

**Senator Burstein:** Well, if you permit nursing to have them…..
Senator Mayer: From being on the committee for a number of years (CAPC), there are trends that things go through in terms of names that are applied to them, and in many of the curriculum proposals have heard a base line argument that says the discipline is changing in such and such a way, whether it is the name or the type of degree that is applied to it, or whatever, and as a result of that we end up as a committee (CAPC) approving that. He gave an example from the Law School JD degree.

Senator Hirata: Now the use of the one year term, is that common in our masters degree?

Senator Burstein: It is not a master's degree.

Senator Mayer: It is not an M.A. degree. It is intended to be an accelerated course of 36 hours.

Maria Allison: They decided to have a very intense highly specialized cohort program.

Senator Hirata: So, it is a cohort program?

Maria Allison: Yes, it is very intense.

Senator Mayer: It is not listed as a bachelor of arts or a master of science but instead is a master of advanced studies.

Senator Blumenfeld-Jones: Has the Senate ever approved this as a category?

Senator Burstein: It will with this.

Senator Mayer: The professional science masters that we approved earlier today in Computational Biosciences is also termed that--it is at this point not very frequently used. There is national expectation, and has meaning to the people who are within the discipline, and in any case have also been trained in a particular fashion. Are there any other questions?

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

Last week our committee began a discussion on classroom security and protection policy. There was quite a bit of interest in the presentation we heard from campus DPS and Counseling and Consultation. We may move to have the entire Senate hear that presentation next semester.

5.E Personnel Committee (Susan Mattson).

I just wanted to let you all know that if you have not already seen it, the report from the Task Force II on Promotion and Tenure is now posted on the Provost Web site under reports. Please go there and read the report and make your comments as directed on the web site, directly to the Provost. We have started looking at it in the Personnel Committee and will make our comments back to the Provost, and he will make it an official recommendation to the Senate, which the Committee will consider again before we bring it to a vote here for the proposed changes in the process.

5.F University Affairs Committee (George Watson). No report.

Senate President Garcia: I would like to wish everyone a great break and safety in their travels. We are now adjourned.

6. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.