Draft Academic Senate Summary

Monday, September 24, 2007
3:15 – 5:00 p.m.

EDC 117 LECTURE HALL

Present:

Absent:
Allenby, Anderson (with prior notice), Blanchard, Brewis, Bush, Campbell, Cobas, Cook (sabb), Crozier, Cruz-Torres, DiFelice (with prior notice), Gopalan, Guerin, Happel, Harp (with prior notice), Henn, Hunnicutt, Johnson, Keinm, Kinnier, Konomos (with prior notice), Kozleski, Lara-Valencia, Liu, Magana, McNeill, Mossman, Restrepro, Schultz, Stewart, Thomas, Trotta (with prior notice), Williams, Ye

Attending by Breeze: Members and Presidents of West, Downtown Phoenix, and Polytechnic campus’ Senates

1. CALL TO ORDER (Bill Verdini).
The meeting was called to order by Senate President Bill Verdini at 3:20 p.m.

Senate President: The meeting is being teleconferenced to West, Polytechnic and Downtown campuses. This is our second attempt to implement technology for our meetings. Dr. Shangraw and Dr. Capaldi will address all campus Senates today.

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES (Bill Verdini)

A. Senate Summary (August 27, 2007).
   • A motion was made by Senator Kopta and seconded by Senator Hoffmeister to approve the minutes as distributed. The motion carried. Send all corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu and judy.grace@asu.edu

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS.

A. Senate President's Report (Bill Verdini)
   • The Graduate College (Maria Allison) has the proposal for Graduate Faculty Initiative posted on her web site now. I encourage all of you to look at it.
   • We may not hear from Rich Gitelson at West today on the University Academic Council, which is composed of the three presidential level people at each assembly—they/we are still working diligently on a University Senate concept that we will be bringing forward to you later this semester.
   • I have charged the University Affairs Committee, chaired by Rojann Alpers, to work on the representation piece— from the Senate’s perspective (ACD 112-01 Academic Constitution and Bylaws revisions).
B. Senate Guest: Rick Shangraw, Vice President for Research & Economic Affairs

- Research Task Force
He let the Senate know that he met with the President and President-Elect of the Senate on July 2 to talk about how to coordinate activities in the research area with the Senate. He followed the Senate’s discussion last year on classified research closely and wants to make sure that there is close communications with the Senate as we implement the intent of the university’s research policy. The work of the Task Force on Research is beginning and we want to coordinate with the Senate, and to understand the will and interests of the Senate on research issues.

- Objectives for this year
Housecleaning--making sure that the systems are working well that report to me—Animal Care, ORSPA -- both of those areas are growing rapidly, because the research is growing, and as a result there are some growing pains, and I am taking time to make sure that we can deliver a mountain of services while you are going about your research mission. The Compliance Offices report to me, IRB and IACUK and we are starting to review some of the procedures and policies there. The minor change we are trying to make not only is that we are in the compliance business, but that also we are service oriented as we see issues coming down the pipeline—making sure we are advising faculty, as opposed to just putting the hammer down on them as we find things wrong. My long term objective is to grow the research enterprise, and my door is open to you, my email is available. I spend a lot of time working with faculty since I have taken office. I encourage you to give me a call or drop me a note.

Senate President: Can you say a word about the Intellectual Property Committee and AzTE?

- The Intellectual Property Committee
The IPC is an organization that was formed out of my office, but has been staffed by the Academic Senate it has focused historically over the last two or three years on conflict of interest. (There may be a faculty member who has a conflict of interest with research endeavors. This is the group to come to and talk about that problem.) The group has been very effective in meeting that need. But it is a slight misnomer that it is called the Intellectual Property Committee because they do not do a lot of work on that. The intellectual property piece has come out as a result of the formation of AzTE, which is the Arizona Technology Enterprise, the independent group that has been asked to do technology transfer activities. As that group emerges and as we have new leadership of that group and new people that are directing the AzTE (Augie V. Cheng, Managing Director and Chief Legal Officer), as we go about revisiting and revamping things we are trying to make sure these people connect with the Senate, and I would encourage you to bring Augie to the Senate at some point as soon as possible to explain what they are doing.

C. University Provost’s Report (Betty Capaldi)
[All campuses could hear this transmission].
Provost Capaldi showed and spoke about her power point presentation on retention that she developed a few months ago and has shown to the deans and a few other groups--today is the first opportunity to show it to the Senate.

- ASU has a unique position in Arizona—we are the only game in town in the valley, and the valley is rapidly growing.
- We have taken on the mission of accommodating the growth of college eligible students in the valley.
- We do not have open admissions, but we do take the upper half of the freshmen class and look at the SAT/ACT score and there are certain competencies required by the Board of Regents.
- Because of the wide diversity of people in the valley we have a very wide diversity of students, which is a real plus for us in figuring out how to deal with a diverse student body with widely different preparation levels and then having them succeed in college.
- The growth in Hispanic, African American, and American Indian populations is just going to get greater, so, we will have an even greater number of minorities as we go forward.

How do we stand on our retention rate?
- Retention is measured for freshmen only, full-time, first time in college (defined as 12 credits or more in
the fall semester) and they are defined as retained if they are back the next fall, regardless of how many credit hours they take. This is the AAU (the American Association of Universities), which is the elite research universities in the United States—we are down here at 78%--the only one beneath us is the University of Arizona at 77%. We are not in the AAU, but it just gives a perspective.

- There are a lot of differences among these universities. These are only the publics. If you looked at privates, their retention rates are through the sky but a private university charges very high tuition, they take only the very top students, they have a 1200 member student body as opposed to our 63,000 so it is not really meaningful to compare us to private universities. And some of these public universities are almost private—the University of Virginia is at the top of the list—97% and they have high tuition, they take only elite students. Part of our issue is the type of students we have and the number of students we have, but part of it is us too.

- When I first came to ASU, I tried to go through the data that we have available and look at what succeeded in the country to improve graduation and retention rates and apply that here. We are now doing more analyses of our own data to understand what is special about us--what we could change to make things work better for the students.

- Our persistence rate has improved—it was 68% in 1994; 73% in 1999; our goal is 90% Freshmen persistence, that is in our strategic plan we filed with the ABOR, but we have a long way to go.

- Graduation rate follows from retention—obviously, if students do not stay, they will not graduate so the first thing we have to work on is getting students to make it through to the sophomore year. The data on a slide on persistence rate by ethnicity shows: The lowest rate is among American Indian students and we are trying to see what we can do to improve that situation. They are an important group for us here in Arizona. The students who don’t come from Arizona have an even worse rate it seems and we are analyzing different factors for students who don’t come from Arizona.

From a former colleague of Betty’s at Buffalo:

- You can look at students in two ways--the mechanical process view that unless something goes wrong, students are going to graduate. If something does go wrong they fall out.
- Then there is the life choice view of students, which says--the student comes in and take a math course and say what is all this, theory? They do not see the point of it. Or the workload is much higher than they expect and unless students find a reason to stay, they leave.

**Student needs that have been shown by research:**

- need to connect to a peer group;
- not to misinterpret failure as due to them;
- to have teaching that fits what they can learn;
- an understanding that college is college level work—different than high school;
- they need to feel that they belong.

- college is demanding and the students who are most in need of support are the least likely to engage in it; and college skills are not easily acquired by those who need them most.
- if you do not know what college is all about, you will have unrealistic expectations. Freshmen all think they are going to get high grades and they think they are going to do well. If they do not do well they tend to think it is their fault and often are reluctant to seek help. Seeking help is a sign of weakness and failure.
- For a lot of these students, it is their first time in college and their whole family is depending on them.

**The key methods of improving retention shown by research:**

- Get students connected and engaged year one.
- Teach the first year student as early as possible how to use college resources successfully.
- The Education Trust summarizes all this material and I can provide with that web link if you want.
- ASU 101 was intended to have purpose for this—to teach how to use college resources.
- The advisors are contacting students about social events, sports. We are trying to build up Sun Devil sports here.
• There are first years seminars, supplemental instruction which helps student who are doing poorly in a class.
• Placement tests to put students in the right level of a class.
• Intrusive advising that is the early warning system that we have--we just tried to improve it but it crashed during PeopleSoft implementation.
• We need to have a genuine emphasis on the quality of undergraduate teaching and learning.
• Require attendance—there is a nationwide tendency for students not to go to class. We might want to talk about requiring students to go to class--if they do not go to class it is hard to learn. This is partly because people put power points on the web and the student says, I can read the power point from my professor on the web. We are doing more in class than just showing a power point obviously.
• We have a lot of commuter students and we want to make a sense of community in the classroom--Talk to the students before and after class—meet them in small groups right near the class. Have every student connect in a meaningful way with a positive role model, like a faculty member. Students today are very motivated to do good—they are called the millennial generation--they want to do something bigger than themselves, help the planet, help the community. We can appeal to that as part of motivating them to learn in college.
• I am going to in my office, and I hope consider this too, to put a lot more emphasis on opportunities for students to work with faculty to work on research. We have some doing that now but we need more. Rick Shangraw and I are working together to put undergraduates in my lab. It is one way they learn that knowledge is not fixed. One of the advantages of ASU is we are a research university. Undergraduates can learn the process of producing knowledge.
• If a program works, make it required. First year students are clueless and have a lot to learn about what they should be doing and by the time learn it, the first year is over. I am working with Adrian Sannier on this aspect, to monitor success—make student success the focus of the entire institution.
• Carol Campbell and others are working on another aspect. Lots of times staff cannot answer the question or they do not help students. Everybody should find an answer for any question they are given, even if they are a staff member—be it a faculty member who asks--or a student—we have a long way to go and this is our challenge to improve.
• We are trying to serve all qualified students seeking a college degree within the region—we are the only available university.
• We have also pledged to give financial access—as a result our entering freshmen class has a wide variety of preparation level. The peer comparison we did gives the ranking for the University of Minnesota.
• The high school rank at ASU—the top 10% of the high school class at ASU is 22%, at Minnesota it is 34%—we actually have 2% in the bottom of the class and that is because they did well on their SATs since we do a combination here. We know that the best predictor is a combination of GPA and SAT, and there is an index — which I gave here of 90—having a 3.0 GPA, and a 860 SAT, or 2.0 GPA with a with 1220 SAT. It is a balance of the two--the higher on the index, the better you are on both dimensions. We are trying to do research and combine this with education access. It is a very challenging enterprise.
• Students in the lower thirty percent of preparedness leave. They have the highest rate of departure. This is the index showing you that—if you have an index under 80, the persistence rate is only 67%, if you have an index over 118% it is 80%. This is one of our issues that we need to deal with. With out of state students we have a high percent, almost 30%--we think they leave for different reasons than in-state students. Students living on campus are less likely to leave, that is the belongingness issue.
• Many of our students come here without an intention to get a degree. Some of these are out of state—they come here because maybe they want to go someplace else? The in-state ones live here and say—go to ASU for awhile, then go somewhere else for awhile—they do not have in their mind that they will get a degree. Obviously we want for them to get a degree. That is for their benefit. When you get a degree you get a higher income and a better life and we want that as a state for our students too. The state is under-producing degreed individuals by vast numbers which is bad for Arizona, bad for the economy, and bad for us as people who live in Arizona.
• Some people think the students do not think well of ASU—but that is just a small effect, and many do think well of ASU—the more you participate in curricular activities, the more time you spend preparing
for class and the less financial aid you receive, the more likely you are to persist. This is a very interesting statistic: the non-residents that leave have high academic standards. They have on average a 2.45 GPA—they are not leaving because they are in academic trouble. The ones from Arizona had to be in poor academic standing. It seems to be more related to social factors. The non-Arizona residents don’t seem to find out how they fit in.

- I am teaching ASU 101 and have talked to other people—there are some students who come here and say, the water in the faucet is hot! When I first came here I thought there was something wrong with the plumbing in my house. It is also very hot here in the summer students say. If you move here from Wisconsin in March and then summer comes, you say, oh, I had no idea it gets this hot. We might want to think about starting school later. I don’t know if this has been talked about yet in the Senate, but it is a real shock for everyone to be here when it is that hot.

- This is a set of stats is about our current retention programs—I won’t go through it in detail but basically they all are not working—Cronkite Village is the only one showing a difference. These data compare participants versus non-participants in our current retention programs. So, obviously we did not find what works yet. That is why we have decided to put the resources where they are most needed.

**Tutoring**

You are not required to go to tutoring if you are at the bottom of the class—I think some of the people that are being tutored are trying to get an A instead of a B. That is a fine goal, but that is not why we are providing the tutoring. What we are looking at is trying to target our resources for the students that need them the most and have them go and get the support they need.

**Mandatory math placement**

We redesigned the first year math courses and are thinking of requiring UNI 100 or some kind of course like that.

**Advising**

We have put a lot of money in tutoring and into advising—we have funded over 25 new advisors on campus. The advising loads on this campus were over 500 students to each advisor before. We are discussing a couple of models on this. This year we tried offering preparatory work on each campus taught by community colleges. Kids did not take it for a couple of reasons—it was not easy to take because you had to go to another place to sign up. The students who needed it the most were the least likely to go to the extra effort. Financial aid will cover it. We are talking about making admission conditional on completing that preparatory work. We do not want to teach remediation but we want the students to catch up. The high schools are not doing the work, we understand that, but that does not mean that we cannot insist that entering students learn what they need to before they come to us.

**Critical Tracking**

This is to try and get every student in a major that fits them. We are going to do advisor training—our advisors are too soft in my opinion—they do not like to tell students when they are in the wrong major that they cannot succeed. A lot of the students who did not do well in math placement did in fact take the math remediation—it was because the advisor said to the student, take the test again maybe you will do better. Actually, if you did really poor, the chances of you doing better are not very good – you are not doing the student a favor in telling them to take the exam again—it is involved with raising our ability to tell our students where they belong. This is the advisor’s job—each major has created tracks to tell students what they need to take early, and put the critical courses early in their program, and I appreciate everyone working on that. We did get more advisors. There is more in-person advising going on. This one we have to work on more: the killer courses: which 40 or 50% of the students flunk. For instance, introductory psychology, which is taught mostly to students who want to go on to be a PhD psychologist—it has a lot of hard terms, every single semester, which no one will ever use again. One idea that psychology is talking about currently is having a psychology course for non-majors. In biology we already do that. Art Blakemore, who is teaching Economics is working on that for the business area. There is only a few important concepts that you need to learn in economics—you do not need to know the quantitative material unless you plan to be an Economist. That is for those of you that teach these courses to figure out. If there is a better way to teach students who are not going on in the field as a career.
Social Integration
We have few many social events here for students, and Jim Rund and Virgil Renzulli are working on some social events for new freshmen, even for new faculty we might think about doing some—there is no place to hang out, no coffee room, no place for young faculty to meet and talk with students and other faculty. That is part of feeling a part of the university and we may want to look at that for faculty as well as students. The students have no place to connect with each other and with us. ASU 101 was a part of trying to change that—in the residence halls, we now require all the freshmen to live in residence halls. The availability of student services—Jim Rund and I are working closely together to tie together student support with the academic matters. We lose more students the second year—3-4% more; we also lose juniors—and this is strange to me—Our current tutoring programs are all over the place—we do it in colleges, we do it in the dorms—we do it through university college—we do it through me, and none of it coordinates. So we are going to try and focus this better, tie it to the classes, so it connects directly to what you are trying to teach. We have a lot of work to do with that idea. I asked Bill to set up a task force of faculty who are interested in this topic to help us on this as we move forward.

Senate President: Stephanie says she will make these slides and stats available to us so that we can study them in more detail, and perhaps add our comments or questions at the October Senate meeting.

The next item on our agenda is local business—so, goodbye for now, Rich (at West Senate) and Linda (at Poly Senate).

D. Parliamentarian’s Report/Senate President-Elect’s Report (Phil Vandermeer)

I have one point to make at this time—at our last meeting we were moving hurriedly as the hour was closing, and we had a vote on rules, and a question about how to count the votes. I apologize for an error. It will not happen again. I would like to clarify what is supposed to happen in terms basic procedures at Senate meetings. The parliamentarian offers an opinion and the chair of the body makes the ruling. If there is a question about that the ruling, you as a member can raise a point of order—that is a privileged motion and you can interrupt at any point. The chair’s rulings can also be appealed by a vote, and a 2/3 vote is required to overturn.

E. USG President’s Report (Liz Simonhoff)

Good afternoon. It is a nice new setting here in this room. I am going to update you on what the USG at Tempe campus is doing.

- Voter Registration: We are working with Dr. Rund to distribute some kind of voter education to the residence halls. We think it is really important for incoming freshmen to really get involved within the community. On the state level we are doing a state wide voter registration drive in November for a whole week, we are doing that in conjunction with U of A and NAU.
- Academic Affairs: We had our first coffee with the Times—we had Dr. Martin from the Honors College; he was absolutely wonderful and we had an intellectual discussion about the New York Times. We had free coffee and it was nice to get students together outside the classroom. We will have our next event on October 4th.
- In addition to that, we are working with your Student Faculty Policy Committee now on the right procedure for repeated courses.
- We initiated what we have called the Campus Environment Department. We are doing a lot of exciting things—we have a recycling station on the third floor to encourage student organization to recycle. We are also working on getting prominent people in the valley to invest in an Earth Tub and we are working on having that at our events, and I will keep you updated on that.
- With the help of Dr. Arredondo we were able to initiate a student priority survey. In the next couple of weeks in conjunction with GPSA, we will get some feedback out on what student priorities are for the university.
- We are having a Southwest Student Leadership Conference that will take place October 19-21st and we are inviting not only student associations in Arizona, we are hoping to get some from Oregon and Colorado and have about 200 students talk about student issues and campaigns going on throughout the state, to get students involved in leadership. If you senators are interested in participating, we will open
the doors up and you are always welcome.

- We are working on getting an event bid out for May, and we are trying to get Mae Jemison, the first African American to go into space so we are hoping to have her here.
- Andrew Rigazio is here and he is the president of the ASASU Senate, and I wanted to introduce you to him. The Senate right now is working to appropriate $20,000 to clubs and organizations so they can fund events within their organization by campus.

F. GPSA President's Report (Bree McEwan)

- Liz mentioned appropriations for undergraduate organizations and that reminded me -- GPSA does an ongoing appropriation for its student groups also. One of the things we fund is graduate research grants—last year we funded 9 different symposiums. Juniors are eligible for a grant of up to $2,000. Have your students look into that if they are interested in working in those symposiums, or starting a new one. This has always been one of our primary missions.
- We are in the midst of our research grant program and we reviewing proposals right now. We have had the most applicants that we have ever had to the program and we also have the most money we have ever had, so, we are thinking that the way things are going, we will have a 50% acceptance rate. It is still very competitive but we should be able to fund a lot of projects.
- With that, as soon as our internal affairs office climbs out from underneath the research grant program, we will begin the Teaching Excellence award program next. If you have TAs either that teach class sections or they are assistants, faculty or graduate students can all nominate people for that program and it will open the first round of nominations very soon.
- Other issues we are still working on: I have been complaining for 6 months now that we do not have dental coverage—well now we have it. We are excited about that. The Undergraduate Student Initiative Office has put up some money to fund that and we are very happy—we will have a dental plan for TAs and RAs and even a site you can go to and students will receive their card in a couple of weeks. There is a vision discount payment with that as well.
- We are working with the Student Faculty Policy Committee and intend to bring them a policy for sick leave. In terms of other leaves policies, I am meeting with Dr. Searle soon on that. Last year I talked to you about the need for leave for maternity for graduate students. We do have a leave in place but it is for childbirth only. Some of the problems students can run into in their departments that we also talked to you about last year regard students being told that they have leave for childbirth, there is a policy, but no they cannot use it. We would like you to keep an eye on that. Dr. Searle and I are going to talk about some of the funding issues behind that policy, and how we can help students to be able to utilize this leave.
- Andrew Rigazio, the president of the undergraduate student senate is going to be the co-chair of our search committee to get the next Student Regent. This year we get to choose the student regent from ASU. We will send three names to the Governor and then the Governor chooses one. We are very excited about the student regent position. It is a big deal—they serve one year as a non-voting member, getting to know the Regent process, and one year as an actual voting member of the Board. They represent all of the students in Arizona, but we switch off every year and this year we will pick our ASU student candidates. If you know of any student who would be interested to apply or has the qualifications to be a good student regent we will be putting out the call in the next couple of weeks.

Senate President: I will send an apology to Rich, Linda and George that we had a need to skip their reports as we have our own business items to deal with.

Duane Roen is chair of CAPC this year and he has some consent agenda items to get through today. To conserve time I am turning the floor over to Duane and let him take care of all the CAPC items and his report.

4. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS
A. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Duane Roen)
Does anyone want to remove any item for further discussion? Seeing none, we will move to a vote. All in favor of the consent agenda items please say aye. Opposed by the same sign (none). Absentions (none). The voice
vote to approve the consent agenda items was unanimous. Each is listed and can be found in the attachments.

**Senate Motion #1 (2007-08)(Second Reading):** A request from the College of Design, School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, to implement a new degree/major: Master of Landscape Architecture (Attachments to agenda, page 1). APPROVED 9/24/07

**Senate Motion #2 (2007-08) (Second Reading):** A request from the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering, School of Computing and Informatics, Department of Biomedical Informatics, to implement a new degree/major: Ph.D. in Biomedical Informatics (Attachments to agenda, page 2) APPROVED 9/24/07

**Senate Motion #3 (2007-08) (Second Reading):** A request from the Graduate College to implement a Graduate degree/major: Ph.D. in Human and Social Dimensions of Science and Technology (Attachments to agenda page 3) APPROVED 9/24/07

**Senate Motion #4 (2007-08) (Second Reading):** A request from the College of Human Services & College of Public Programs, School of Community Resources and Development, Dept. of Recreation and Tourism Management in the College of Human Services to implement a new degree/major: Ph.D. in Community Resources and Development (Attachments to agenda page 4) APPROVED 9/24/07

Senator Roen: Next is the New Business for CAPC, item 7.C on the Senate agenda for today:

**CAPC Agenda Items (9/13/07) Steps of curriculum approval process**

**Information items:**

- **Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering**
  - Department of Electrical Engineering
  - Establishment of a Concentration
  - BSE Electrical Science
  - Electrical Power and Energy Systems
  - CAPC recommendation required
  - Senate Information item

- **College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**
  - Film and Media Studies
  - Establish a minor
  - Film and Media Studies
  - CAPC recommendation required
  - Senate Information item

**Action Items:**

- **For First Reading:** CAPC will ask for consideration of a proposal submitted by the Mary Lou Fulton College of Education for the establishment of a Graduate Certificate – Technology for Teaching and Learning (Attachments to agenda page 8)

- **For First Reading:** CAPC approved on 8/30/07 (Between Senate meetings), a proposal to Establish an Independent Academic Unit from ASU, University College, and the School of Letters and Sciences on the Downtown Phoenix Campus (Attachments to agenda page 9)

Senator Roen: First of all, I want to remind you all to check the CAPC’s agenda on the web site before each Senate meeting. A reminder also that once an item is on the CAPC agenda, it is considered to be a first reading agenda item for the Academic Senate too. There is no action to be taken on the information items presented because CAPC already took action on them. On our action items, there will be no discussion today, but if there are any questions and if representatives from each proposal are present they can address them. Are there any requests for information at this time? Hearing none, we will present our newest CAPC items.
CAPC Agenda Items for September 27, 2007:
(Attachments to agenda page 10)

We will have another meeting on Thursday, September 27, so the items we introduce at that meeting will be on the Senate’s agenda today—please look at them carefully. The purpose again of doing this process is that it gives you an opportunity to contact people on CAPC if you have any questions or concerns. You can also ask your colleagues in your departments to do the same thing. I want to mention one additional item and Bill can decide how to handle this at the next Senate meeting. There was one CAPC agenda item that is not listed here but it is on the CAPC website.

It is a motion that we will vote on in CAPC on the 27th of this month to streamline the process and improve it for Course Impact Statement. In the past when a department wanted to develop a new course, it would first get three statements from other faculty who had an interest in that and there was some confusion about what constituted faculty or departments that had interest in that. Instead, we going to propose that there be built into the ACRES process and many of you know this process well, there are about 10 steps in this process, part of the process where departments are consulted will get into that process, and it will be more automated than it has been in the past. If there are no questions, I will then turn the floor back to Bill.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Executive Committee (Bill Verdini)

Substitute Resolution on ASU 101 Senate Resolution #5 (2007-2008)

• Background
At the end of our last Senate meeting in August you will recall, we had a debate on a first read of a resolution and at the end of that discussion, the motion was remanded to Executive Committee in conjunction with Dr. Comfort to work on the wording of the resolution. We have for you today a substitute resolution. We can handle this a couple of ways: 1) Dr. Comfort could request to withdraw his motion in favor of the substitute motion which would either require the second to agree or require a unanimous approval to go the substitute resolution; 2) propose the substitute as a substitute resolution and have debate on that and vote. So, let me ask Dr. Comfort his preference—Would you be willing to withdraw your original motion in favor of the substitute motion? (Yes.) Would the second agree to that? (Yes.)

Now we have before us, the substitute resolution (Attachments, page 5). You all had this ahead of time and we can debate this or we could move to the Committee of the Whole for 15 minutes which allows discussion, explanation, and presentation without making amendments to this proposal and then after 15 minutes we can go to debate which would include amendments.

Senator McPhee made a motion and it was seconded by Senator Kingston to go to a Committee of the Whole. Is there discussion? (None.)

Senate President: All in favor of moving to the Committee of the Whole please say aye. Opposed? (none) Abstentions (none). I will recognize Senator Comfort to begin our discussion. He has four minutes.

• Explanation of Substitute Motion:
Senator Comfort: We are discussing the substitute resolution on ASU 101 (Attachments to the Agenda page 5). There are two whereas clauses—the first one establishes the long range legal authority for the faculty participation in shared governance of the institution. The second one says that there are policies by which this governance is carried out. If you read ACD 203-01 which deals with the faculty governance—the responsibilities of faculty governance—it repeats a lot of the things that are in the Conditions of Faculty Service, which says that we have a duty to share in the responsibilities and obligations of governance and administration of the university provided for by the Board of Regents in the Conditions of Faculty Service and other policy statements. These include the responsibilities of 1) the approval of course content and the manner of instruction and 2) establishment of requirements for matriculation and degrees. In particular, faculty recommend the
requirements for degree programs, advise when those requirements have been met, and recommend that the President of the Board grant the appropriate degrees. As we look in more detail, there are a couple of issues 1) how are new courses added to the curriculum; under the bylaws of the constitution, there is a subcommittee know at the TCCS, known now as the Tempe Campus Curriculum Subcommittee, which is authorized to decide course curriculum matters presented to it by the curriculum committees of colleges and other instructional units on the Tempe campus. It does not require approval by CAPC or the Senate. According to the bylaws of TCCS, it says the committee shall, subject to the approval of the Vice Provost for academic programs, grant or deny final approval of all proposals for new courses. With regards to CAPC itself, according to the bylaws of the Academic Constitution, it established CAPC with the purpose to serve in the policy forming and advising capacity of matters concerning proposed additions or deletions of academic programs and academic policies concerning more than one college or school, including changes in existing programs. Their purview includes such things as proposed curriculum changes, including programs and degrees, and also the General Studies programs. CAPC recommendations on many of these items will be brought to the Senate for action and vote. General Studies requirements are university wide requirements, so, how were those established. There was an ad hoc committee formed (chaired by Morton Munk who was the Senate President at that time). A report was made to the Faculty Senate in November of 1985. It referred in the report to the Academic Affairs Committee which was what CAPC was called at that time. The policy was approved unanimously in December of 1985 and it included the formation of the General Studies Council. The Senate did retain some oversight of any General Studies Council decisions but I am not aware that it has had to do any of that.

• Similar to General Studies

How about changes to the General Studies Requirements? What happens there? We know about the freshmen composition requirement which first appeared in the catalog in the 50’s but it has been modified along the way. At the October meeting of the Senate in 1986, Len Gordon was the chair of the General Studies Council at that time and said there would be no changes in the curriculum for graduation purposes without the Faculty Senate’s approval. In the September 1991 Senate meeting, CAPC reported that a subcommittee of CAPC is currently studying a composition enrollment proposal from the Department of English. There was a change in the requirements for freshmen English that went into effect about 1986 and I do not have those details. Finally in March 1999, through a meeting of the Senate a motion was introduced which was adopted in April of that year to disregard the N-1 requirements of the General Studies Council. There was a nice discussion in the December 1999 minutes regarding certificate proposals that come from CAPC—Senate president that year said- “…This is a part of the curriculum, and the faculty controls the curriculum—or would you prefer we do it by fiat?”

• The second part of the resolution says--The procedures with regard to the course as well as the requirement were not followed, and the next part says—nevertheless instruction is underway. So, what do we do now?

He shared an experience in an email he received about this course; comments included that students started off with a bad attitude, a number of students are already failing, some of the topics they did not like at all, and with regard to student success, they said, well, that is obvious. In the resolution and this is based on causing the least harm to the students – we have to continue to have the course through the fall of 2007--so that we will have provisional approval for this course, as an elected course for first time freshman students, and for one credit hour in Fall of 2007. You cannot take away the promise that was made to students that they will have credit if they take the course. For those who have not taken the course yet, they may elect not to choose it, if we adopt this resolution.

The second part also says that this course should go to the curriculum committees of the campuses, in particular that is CAPC on this campus, and that it should solicit input from the various colleges and curriculum committees, which involve the faculty, before bringing anything back to the respective senates for action.

Q - I just wondered whether we should not have a more explicit reference to the committees, rather than just “the curriculum committees of the various colleges”—that statement says is that there has to be some input from faculty of the various colleges and schools but it does not refer any particular issue or course, just to the curriculum committees of the colleges. I feel that it would be useful to put that in. I am wondering if that could not be accepted as a friendly amendment? (No amendments can be proposed yet.) I still raise the point.
Q- I have a question of clarification. Given the historical language that was just presented to us, it seems to me that CAPC and Tempe are being seen as “the University,” and it is clear that with the reorganization we have a university-wide structure now, and so it is not clear to me what the approval process is for a university-wide course. We cannot assume that the Tempe CAPC committee is the main body; is there technical language that talks about this somewhere, or is it in the process of being developed that explains what a new university-wide process might look like. It is not clear at all to me from anything that I have seen here.

Senate President: We have opened up membership of the CAPC with our Senate to other campuses but they also have their own committees. This will not be resolved until we get a University Senate in place. You will find out more on that when we deal with the Grades for Repeated Courses in October—two of the campus’ senates have already voted on that. Last May we tabled it and sent it to a committee to look at it, and we will be debating it in October and it is possible that we will say something different from the other campus senates. However, you cannot have different policies on repeated courses just because you happen to be at one location. So, it is a challenge.

University Provost: I wanted to make a clarification, ASU 101 is not a degree requirement, it is not required of transfer students, it probably best called an orientation requirement for freshmen.

Senate President: Is there further discussion?

Q - My first question is, if a student took the course at any one of the three offerings periods during the fall semester, would they earn one credit hour. I am wondering why we need a term “provisional approval” if the student takes the class wouldn’t they just get the credit for the course? I am suggesting that perhaps the word provisional could be removed, as a friendly amendment, because that only confuses the issue—if they take this course, maybe I will get credit or maybe I won’t? I understood you to say if the student takes the course, they get the credit. My first comment would be to remove the word “provisional.”

Q - If I may make a second suggestion, there is also the issue that I did not make at the last Senate meeting, if we make this an elective course rather than a required course, it could in fact have some negative fallout for students perhaps not understanding that their financial aid now requires that they be enrolled in 15 hours, they run out, drop the class, and then lose their financial aid, and whether or not we have started this class as a required course, we are going to get the credit, and it is for the fall semester only as I understand it—I suggest that we may wish to consider leaving the course on the terms that the students originally signed up for, which was a required course, although when we do come to the point of making amendments, I may decide to make one or both at that time.

Q - The word provisional just happened to come in – in terms of editing along the way. It does not make too much difference to the originator, whether it is in, or out. With regards to the issue of financial aid, no knowledgeable student is going to lose financial aid by dropping the course; he or she would want to stay with the course and get the credit for it. I do not see that as an issue. With regards to the curriculum committees, the standard CAPC process is that CAPC requires contact with all of the units that a new proposal may impact tuition policy or fees, etc. It is hard to know what that process is for each unit. But I understand your point.

Q - I would like to take issue with the points that talked about the “value” of the course. I taught a section of ASU 101 the first five weeks of this semester, and although my students at the end thought that there were some items that they would tweak a little bit, they found it overall valuable in helping them become oriented to ASU in particular, and being more successful as college students.

Q - With the regard to the comment about provisional, I think that as I read it the reason that provisional is in there--is that it is provisional, for this specific time--when we get to the actual time of discussing potential amendments to that language, I would suggest that we keep the word provisional in there, it is provisional to be an elective course, until we see it as number two, all of these other committees have actually reviewed it.

Senate President: Any other comments in Committee of the Whole, if not, as we move out of the committee of
the whole, and resume debate, which is similar to what we are doing now, you will propose amendments and there will be a limited number of times you may speak.

Comment: I solicited comments from my colleagues in the English Department regarding their experiences with ASU 101 and I received a comment that may be relevant. One of the persons is teaching a course and said that course almost replicates the content of ASU 101, LIA 294, which is exclusive to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and a student went so far as to present the syllabus which had the exact same topics, diversity and academic integrity, among others. The students were very frustrated that they were receiving a lot of duplication.

Comment: I would like to make a suggestion that we have had to make provision on achieving feedback on this course as taught this semester—considering that we are only dealing with anecdotal examples at this point and we really no method of assessing the success of those courses before it is referred back to the body.

University Provost: Feedback is mandatory for both the instructor and the students, and we are very interested in improving the course. Also in response to the duplication of colleges, we are free to design all of the course content except the first module, so, the colleges should have checked that. It is a new experience, and I think we are all learning.

Senate President: Will results of the surveys be generally available? (No decision has been made yet on that.)

Comment: I would like to support what was said—if the aim of this exercise was to improve retention, it would have been a lot more rational not to require it of everybody, but to do an experiment on a small group and then actually analyze and see whether it had met its objectives.

Q - In light of the fact that provision is limited to fall 2007, I wonder if we should add once amendments become possible, some part of provision that would suggest rapid review, etc. by the relevant committees and the relevant senates?

Comment: With respect to the duplication issue again, one of the problems in Kinesiology is, that we have a student in a class Kinesiology 200, which we have recently revamped to cover a lot of the same issues that are covered in ASU 101, and the problem is that people who are teaching our Kinesiology students who are in ASU 101 are not Kinesiology people, so they don’t know that they are not duplicating everything—a student came to ask me about what research do you do when your ASU 101 professor asked them to talk about what research we do in our department. Another issue with ASU 101 is that it would be more effective if taught by people within the department itself, so we knew there was not that duplication. They need to look at what is being taught already, the courses that are already out there, rather than adding more burden to us.

Senate President: Seeing no more hands raised, and fifteen minutes being up, I will entertain a motion to move back out of the Committee of the Whole so we could move into debate of this substitute resolution.

A motion was made by Senator McPhee and seconded by Senator Elliot. If we are in favor of moving out of the Committee of the Whole, signify by saying aye. Any opposed? None. Any abstentions? None. The motion carries. So, we are now ready to debate the resolution.

Parliamentarian was asked to take the floor over.

Comment: I would like to now offer a friendly amendment, a specific suggestion, in the part two of the resolution, where we say—with instructions to solicit input from faculty at different schools and colleges, that we insert “including the appropriate curriculum committees,” In other words, the campus curriculum committee may be a university committee here and not a college committee and I want to make sure that the course is reviewed by college committees and any other appropriate units.

Senate President: An amendment has been proposed...is there a second to this amendment? (Seconded by Senator Rush) Any further debate on this amendment?
Q - Can we find out if this is considered a friendly amendment? Would the originator of this motion consider this a friendly amendment?

Senator Comfort: I would accept the amendment—if I could use the words I used at the last meeting, instead of what Senator Guleserian has said, but I think that is similar.

Senate President: Does the seconder accept this? (Yes).

Q - Point of Information: I get involved in a lot of curricular review matriculations with college committees and as a point of clarification, sometimes curriculum committees can take four to five months to review a curricular process and clearly, it seems to me if we are talking about fall 2007, if we are going to send it to every curricular committee at this university, if that is the intent, I would be surprised if it could happen in 8 months. But the reality is that we are talking about perhaps as a friendly amendment, because we do not want to create chaos for the students, if we keep it in place for fall 2007 and spring 2008 as a curricular process for students, --we are not even talking with West and Poly campuses, their telecommunication processes have turned off, so, I don’t even know where their process is—I know that is involved in all this. It seems to me if we are talking university, we need to talk to university and not just this problem.

Senate President: Is there an amendment to offer?

Senator Allison: Let the course continue as is Fall 2007 and Spring 2008, and that we keep it in place until all of this is figured out, because it will only hurt the students.

Senate President: An amendment has been made to item one, to expand the time frame from Fall 2007 to Spring 2008. Is there a second to that motion? (Senator Roedel seconded).

Q - Is this just an extended time, or is it also to make it required rather then elected?

Comment: We are leaving it as required. There are students who are already signed up for this now and this would create chaos. We wish to keep this as it is while curriculum committees go back and campuses go back and debate even how this is going to happen.

Parliamentarian: Was your amendment to change from Fall to Fall and Spring? Or was it to do that and to change from elected to required?

Comment: The reality is that the language says it should be elective for all incoming freshmen.

Senate President: The amendment is change the time from Fall 2007 to Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. Let’s do that first. (The Second was withdrawn after that). So noted. Do we have further discussion on that amendment?

Comment: I do not support it. In my opinion, the course is not authorized period, it should not be given now and we are agreeing to give it now because of the commitment made to students, namely that they have been promised that if they take it they will get a credit hour, and I think that is should only be a promise that is implemented for the Fall 2007 semester. There is no need to go beyond that, if the review committees can do things quickly maybe it can be authorized for spring, but at this point if it takes longer than that it will just take longer than that.

Senate President: Is there discussion on the amendment?

Comment: I agree with the previous comment that curriculum committees do take a lot of time and the reason for that is that they need to be thorough in researching the course and the appropriateness of the course for students.

Senate President: Further discussion on the amendment to change from Fall 2007 to Fall 2007 and Spring 2008?
Comment: I can see we have a commitment to our students in the Fall semester but they have not started registering for the spring semester yet, so, I don’t see how this makes sense, if we don’t decide to have this course in the spring semester, and we are started registering for that. I agree it should just be kept for the Fall semester but Spring is not yet an issue.

Comment: I am concerned about the message that will be sent to students, the ones who have taken this in the Fall, suddenly it is rescinded for the spring, then reinstated again, it just gives them the impression we do not know what we are doing. It may cause resentment among those who have taken it in the Fall. To the extent that we have already gone ahead and done it in the fall, one more semester, there are pros and cons on that, but one pro might be a sense of continuity and we do not want to bounce the students around.

Comment: If we pass this as being elective, and if we do that in the second set of five weeks of classes, this will create confusion.

Senate President: As you know, all Senate resolutions go to the Provost and the President for final approval. There will be that decision aside from what we decide today. What we do today will not necessarily change things on that issue.

Comment: I have just finished teaching my ASU 101 section and I asked my students—why are you taking this course and they said because it is required. I said, what would have happened if you hadn’t taken it? They did not know—would they have been off track—would they not been retained—would they not graduate? They did not seem to know. So they are doing what they are told to do. They did not know why it was a requirement or understand the notion of the requirement when it is tied to whether they stay in school or graduate.

Comment: About this date issue, this is only to be for incoming first time freshmen, so it would not be taught in the spring anyway, so, I don’t know why the date is an issue.

University Provost: There are 300 students coming in the Spring Semester as incoming freshmen.

Senate President: We are still considering the amendment on the date.

Comment: My comment in favor is—in so far as this is an experiment and we are trying to gather data, if we extend this to spring we would have more data. My question is for Senate President—I was very grieved by what you said because if we passed this and for instance it is not accepted by the Provost or the President, does that mean that they have taken control of the curriculum, because at that point there would still be an ASU 101, a required course, even without having gone through the routines we hoped to have it go through.

Senate President: We already agree that we are going to run this through CAPC—and the issue here is one of timing.

University Provost: As I explained last meeting, there is no clear process I should have followed on this. I met with CAPC and discussed the course with them. We met monthly with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. It is unclear how you do an orientation requirement university-wide for freshmen. I was not intending to do this without the consultation of the faculty. The faculty created this and if there was some way I could have known everybody would be upset because I did not to do something, I would have done it obviously, because we were trying to do the right thing both by the faculty, the university, and the students.

Comment: Yes, I seconded the motion to extend this to Spring 2008, because I thought that it would be helpful not to have to rush the review process. We are going to be starting pre-scheduling and pre-registration for spring in about four weeks. Whether we reasonably believe that we can get quality input to make a decision would be a question I would ask. I am not sure that we should have different standards for fall and spring and that is why I supported the amendment to allow this class to receive credit for both fall and spring. Hopefully the university machinery can move in such a way to do a thoughtful review and either then the Senate approves it because they think it is a good thing, or, there has been a fairly careful, thoughtful review of the content and the mechanisms—maybe what we have learned from the fall could help in the spring—that seems to me a more
thoughtful outcome than just simply cutting it off and either forcing all the work to be done in four weeks, or not at all.

Senate President: Can we move to a vote on this time change from fall 2007 to Fall 2007 and Spring 2008—may I call for a vote here? Is there further discussion?

Q- Does this remain an elective course or is that word deleted?

Senate President: Only the time change is being considered. Is there further discussion on the time frame? Hearing none, we will be voting on whether to add spring 2008 to this resolution. If you are in favor, signify by saying aye. All opposed? -- the count was not determinable by voice vote – so there was a show of hands next. The final count was: 32 in favor and 19 against and 4 abstentions duly noted.

The motion carries (amendment to add Spring 2008 to the resolution). The other campuses are actually doing this same thing today--voting. We have no clue how they are amending this resolution, so what is going to happen after today is that three different proposals are going to be approved or sent on and this happened to us two years ago when we were voting on a new promotion and tenure process—what happened there was that the senates came up with different processes and could not resolve them, so the previous Provost picked which one to implement.

Comment: It seems to me one of the things that got us into trouble before was the fact that there was not a clear requirement for approval by a certain body for things—there did not seem to be a clear need for a vote on an orientation requirements, so, I would amend that at the end of item two—before submitting reports to their respective Academic Senates for approval by general vote—then gives us as a deadline, by May of 2008. Otherwise it seems like we are just writing ourselves again into a corner where there is no clear decision that needs to be made or action that needs to be taken.

Parliamentarian: We need a second to that motion?

Senate President: Is there a second to this? (Seconded by Senator Romero).

As a point of information: There is some desire to create a task force to figure out how we really need to do these things.

Parliamentarian: It seems as though we have several different things going on here: 1) the question of ASU 101, right now this semester and for whatever we think about how it happened, it does seem to be working—students are taking this and the question is whether we should change the requirements once they have already signed up for the course with a set of understandings. 2) How do we go about creating or evaluating this kind of course under the kinds of mandates and the expectation that faculty are supposed to be involved in the shaping of the curriculum. It seems to me to be to separate things. My preference and a suggestion would be that we have a task force that comes back in January or February with recommendations both for procedures, how to evaluate course such as this on a university wide basis, that we also have another task force that figures out how to construct a course and consider all the different elements and that task force also deal with questions of having to do with assigning faculty to that but it seems to me we should do that separately.

Senate President: We have a motion to amend and a second. Any further discussion?

Comment: Is May 2008 really a time frame, if we are looking for data or collaboration or dispute of all the achievement of learning outcomes, we will not be able to gather that material by May 2008. Whatever committees we have will be working at a disadvantage—how about August of 2008 instead?

Senate President: Can you amend an amendment (Yes.) Are you then suggesting an amendment to an amendment? (No.) Are there other comments? Is there further discussion on this amendment?

Q - What happens if it is not voted on by May 2008? Is there going to be a consequence to that?
Parliamentarian: I question May 2008 and suggest that a day be chosen relative to scheduling and pre-registration events—if a decision is made in May, the great majority of the students are already scheduled for the following semester, so if there is an intent that there be no further confusion sent to the student body—we should coordinate this date with scheduling rather than just arbitrarily making it at the end of the semester.

Senate President: Our meetings typically end at five o’clock. We have hit that. I am willing to continue but I know that some people have to leave. I don’t want people who have to leave feel that they are no longer involved.

Q - Can we call for the question now? (No, you can call for the question on the amendment but before that…)

Q - Point of information: With E-advisor, the students who will be freshmen next fall will be able to register online beginning in March.

Parliamentarian: I would like to amend the amendment and make that February instead of May (it is a friendly amendment—is that accepted--(Senator Romero accepted as seconded.) So, now it is February. Is there further discussion on this amendment? Hearing none, all in favor of this amendment to the resolution, please say aye. Any opposed? (some—President ruled that the ayes have it). Now we are back to the amended resolution.

Comment: I would like to move to remove the word provisional from item one.

Senate President: Is there a second to that amendment. Discussion on just starting with the word “approval”—Any discussion on this? Senator Comfort, would you accept this as a friendly amendment without discussion? (Yes.) Does the second accept removing the word provisional (Yes.) That amendment is made and approved by the original people.

Comment: When I raised the question about fall and spring, I have raised the notion that it should since it is defacto now that it is required for fall, we should allow it to also be required in the spring for clarity until all of this is decided. At some later point when the students have processed this and we as a university have figured out what to do—that could be changed, but it seems to me that we need to allow it to be required as it is right now for both semesters.

Senate President: So, is the amendment to change the word elective to “required” in the first point? (Yes.) Seconded by Senator___. Is there debate on this amendment?

Comment: To help mitigate my students’ confusion, I want to know what “required” means for them—is this a graduation requirement, is this a progress requirement, will they be kicked out of ASU if they do not take it, what does required mean?

University Provost: It is a part of their requirement for graduation.

Comment: So they cannot graduate if they have not taken that class.

University Provost: I call it an orientation requirement, it is not a degree requirement because it is not required of all students, the words I am using are orientation requirement. Do we have written procedures for what that means, no but that is we are talking about today. Now that we are really focusing on how we need to orient our students and you saw my data—freshmen have to be mandated to do that. There is national data on this—we have to decide how do we mandate things, so, that is the way it is right now.

Comment: So, it is a graduation requirement, and for freshmen it is a part of the major map. But the bottom line is, for freshmen to graduate they must take this class. Is it a requirement, just like English 101 is a requirement? (Yes.)

Comment: I always thought requirements had to be in the catalog, and printed there for everyone to see. It is like a contract. I never remember seeing this in any catalog.
Comment: The Catalog is online now.

University Provost: The major maps are online also and we don’t do printed catalogs. It is in the major maps, it was added as a supplement when this was all done.

Senate President: We have a motion to change that to say “required,” is there further discussion?

Comment: As I understand it right now, we have a certain number of credits that students can take, 120 credits for their degree, if we adding to this number, we are beyond being incorrect.

Senate President: It may add to some, it may not add to some, depending on the elective structure in their program, and it is ok to go beyond the 120.

Comment: I oppose this as an amendment. It is clear to me that the faculty control the curriculum. This course is part of the curriculum and never received authority from the faculty as required by all the processes. It is not a legitimate course in my mind and it cannot be required. I do not see that there are any serious glitches with regard to students by keeping this as elective instead of changing it to required. I don’t see that raising problems. They get to choose whether they take it or not, they get the credit hour is they do, if they choose not to, they do not get the credit hour, but because it is the faculty who control the curriculum, the graduation requirements—we have just learned that is now a graduation requirement—although that does not appear in any writing or any catalog, that refers to that because it is a new thing, but the faculty have to control the class. It just has to be elected at this point.

Comment: I just had a question, but I am not a voting member--should a student have slipped through the cracks this year as a freshmen, not have taken this course, but they are a part of this freshmen class, it is a required course, correct me if I am wrong Dr. Capaldi, they need to have taken it to graduate on track?

University Provost: All entering freshman are in a class.

Q - Could a student have come in as a hypothetical and not have taken it and in their senior year realize they have not taken it?

Q - What if they fail the class?

University Provost: Every student is an individual and is treated as an individual by E-advisor. The advisor can waive any requirement, if it does not make any sense for a student. If a student failed this class I think it would require serious attention on the part of the advisor, as to why the failed and deal with it. That is the whole point for our advisors to deal with the students as individuals. We are not rigid on any requirement, we give waivers all the time on all requirements, including English 101.

Comment: If we suddenly stop requiring class after we forced thousands of people to take it, there will be a huge outrage among the students for reclaiming the money that they paid for a class that no longer means anything toward their degree. Some did pay for it.

Comment: I am sympathetic with Senator Comfort’s entire project here but there is just one point I have to say, realistically we have established a de facto course. What we need to do is to specify traditions under which this course will be approved by the faculty or disapproved in the future…we should not put anything into this now that threatens the status of it as it exists for the students. I am in favor of keeping the word “required” in this, so, it will be a required course as of now, but when the faculty really look this over, they may decide not to approve the course, but that is for the future. I think we owe it to the administration who has started this in good faith trying to raise retention levels, to go ahead with this for the time being. That does not mean that we do not have a right to assert faculty control.

Comment: I am not in favor of requiring a course that has a lot of unanswered questions. There are a lot of
issues with this course, who is teaching it, who should be teaching it, should it be required, should it not be required, which freshmen have to take it. There just seems to be a lot of unanswered questions with this course—I would have a difficult time with requiring a course that we have so many unanswered questions on—I would not be in favor of requiring this course at this point.

Comment: I would be in favor of requiring it this year and waiting for the review to take place. I think that the faculty need to understand that we were not as vigilant as all this was being discussed last year. I think it is the case that we had pretty knowledgeable faculty members serving on the Executive Committee, serving on CAPC last year—but no one said at that time--wait a minute, you are taking away the prerogative of the faculty—no one ventured into this and certainly representatives of the faculty were at the table when this was being discussed. I think we had a plan in place to review this with new and improved procedures so, I am very concerned that we get the first triad of students through this class. It seems to me that we should stay with the original plan and then really try to make sure this does not happen again.

Comment: It seems to me that this is defacto now-- the course is required in the fall and in all likelihood it will be required in the spring, I don’t see why number one is necessary at all. We did not approve it, why do we need to approve it, take number one out and let it stand for the entire year and look at the data and go make number two the amendment and look at it. Seems like we are never going to resolve this because we did not approve it, and there is no way to go back and pretend we approved it.

Parliamentarian: We have an amendment first to deal with on “required”. You are out of order. You could convert it into an amendment to take out “required” by deleting that whole part number one. Who seconded that as a friendly amendment—do you accept that amendment to delete number one? (Senator Allison accepted this as a friendly amendment, Senator Kingston spoke to that as the seconder?--If you delete it you leave it open ended beyond the spring semester and I am not sure that this is the intent.)

Parliamentarian: We need to vote on this change, and then you can vote on whether to eliminate number one.

Senate President: Is there further discussion on the word “required.”

Comment: I would like to speak in favor of this--A good point was made that it has already happened and we have to live with it. Now we should see it through but the issue is that we have to find a process by which the faculty will not let this happen again. It could have been handled differently but it was not but at this point I would support leaving it in place.

Senate President: At this point I will entertain a call for the question on putting in the word “required” in place of the word elective. All in favor please say aye. Any opposed? (some). So we will now vote on the resolution as amended to replace the word elective with the word required. All in favor of that amendment, let’s signify by raising your hand now. The final count was: 19 in favor and 18 opposed—the motion carries. Are there any abstentions (none noted). Now, we have a motion on the floor and we have successfully amended it three times:

Is there a call for the question on the resolution on the floor—All in favor of calling for the question signify by saying aye. Opposed (one nay). Absentions (none). The question has been called.

The resolution on ASU 101 as you read it here (amended) is now before you for a vote. All in favor of this motion please signify by raising your hand. The count was 27 in favor, one against, and 8 abstentions duly noted. Amended Senate Resolution #5 (2007-2008) was approved. (See page 20, Senate Summary)

6. New Business (Committee reports and New Business Items).

A. Executive Committee (Bill Verdini) See Announcements and Communications.

The Student Success Task Force Report was made available (See Senate Agenda, pages 6-7) so that can be studied in preparation for discussion of Senate Resolution #23 (2006-2007), repeated grades resolution, at the October 22 Senate meeting.
B. Committee on Committees (Tory Trotta) – no report
C. CAPC report see item under announcements.
D. Personnel Committee (Chair to be appointed). No report
C. Student Faculty Policy Committee (Jerry Kingston). No report
D. University Affairs Committee (Rojann Alpers). No report.

7. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m..

Recorded and edited by:
Darby Shaw, Executive Assistant

Final editing by:
Judy Grace, Secretary of the Senate
Senate Resolution #5 (2007-08) on ASU101

As amended and passed at the Sept. 24, 2007 meeting of the Downtown/Tempe Academic Senate

Whereas Governance policies established for ASU by ARS 15-1601, Arizona Board of Regents policies including the Conditions of Faculty Service 6-201, the ASU Constitution and Bylaws, and other policies provide for shared governance by the faculty through their elected representatives in matters of academic policy including the curriculum; and

Whereas written policies provide for faculty participation in changes to the curriculum and academic programs through the curriculum committees of colleges and the Academic Senate; and

Whereas the creation of ASU101 as a University-wide course required of all first-time Freshmen was not appropriately reviewed by the relevant curriculum committees nor referred to the Academic Senate for its recommendation; and

Whereas instruction in ASU101 has nonetheless been implemented in the Fall 2007 semester;

Be it hereby resolved that

1. Approval for ASU101 as a required course for first-time Freshmen students be granted as a one-hour credit during the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters;

2. ASU101 as a University-wide course and degree requirement be submitted to the respective campus curriculum committees for review with instructions to solicit input from faculty in the different schools and colleges, including the appropriate curriculum committees, before submitting reports to their respective Academic Senates for approval by general vote by February 2008.