

Academic Senate SUMMARY

Monday, April 30, 2007
3:15 – 5:00 p.m.
SCOB 228

Present: Acker, Adelman, Allen, Allison, Anderson, Arredondo, Blasingame, Brock, Broman, Bruhn, Burg, Bush, Campbell, Capaldi, Colbourn, Comfort, Crow, Cruz-Torres, deLusé, Doty, Duerden, Elliott, Espinosa, Farmer, Feldman, Fromme, Gonzalez-Santin, Grace, Guleserian, Gustavsson, Hajicek, Harlan, Ingalls, Johnson, Keim, Kingston, Konomos, Kopta, Koshinsky, Liu, Maris, Mattson, McCoy, McPhee, Mitchell, Moorhead, Roen, Rose, Schultz, Searle, Simon, Smas, Strom, Vandermeer, Verdini, Watson, White, Wiesel, Zhang

Absent: Acereda, Alford, Alpers, Barclay, Bodman, Brewis, Campbell, Cobas, Cook, Crozier, Dorman, Fabricius, Fafitis, Fernando, Fowler, Garcia-Fernandez, Gelb, Gopalan, Guerin, Happel, Henn, Hoffmeister, Ismeurt, Kirkman-Liff, Kommenich, Kurpius, Lafaro, Lai, Margolis, Mathur, Minter, Mossman, Ossipov, Ovando, Schaeffer, Sloane, Stewart, Sullivan, Swadener, Thomas, Trotta, Tsakalis, Turner, Valenti, Weiser, Witt

Substitutes: Bree McEwan for Brian McNamara, Samantha Winter and Liz Simonoff for Ross Meyer

Guests: Herb Sendek, Intercollegiate Athletics; Myles Lynk, Faculty Athletic Representative; and Nick Kopta, guest of Anne Kopta

1. CALL TO ORDER (Duane Roen).

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

2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES (Duane Roen)

The Senate Summary *draft* (March April 9, 2007) was approved as circulated and posted on the Senate Web site at: http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate/documents/Summ040907dr_000.pdf

Send any corrections to darby.shaw@asu.edu and cc: Anne.kopta@asu.edu

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Senate President's Report (Duane Roen)

As an update on the Task Force on Student Success, Betty Capaldi met with that group a week ago, and they have been going gangbusters ever since. We expect that they will be providing detailed feedback soon.

The Task Force on Research Policies has also begun its work. We anticipate that they will take a little longer; they will report sometime in the fall.

With that, I would like to introduce our Head Basketball Coach, Herb Sendek, who will speak to us briefly today. His reputation at North Carolina State is one of being a coach who highly values and highly promotes academic excellence, and as some of you may know; when he left North Carolina State the Academic Senate there passed a resolution thanking him for many things--including his commitment to academic excellence. Everything that I have observed this year during Herb's first year at ASU indicates very clearly that he continues to uphold that tradition. Please welcome Coach Sendek (Applause followed).

Herb Sendek, Head Coach, Men's Basketball

Thank you; it is great to be with you this afternoon. I want to share a few thoughts with you today, and I welcome any questions you may have for me after that. My first year at Arizona State has gone by like a whirlwind and has certainly been filled with great challenges, but also I have been truly enriched this season in coaching this group of young men. I learned a great deal as a leader and a coach paying attention to these guys day in and day out. During that same time, I have really come to have great respect for ASU, and I do not take lightly our responsibility and position in the Athletic Department, particularly with the Men's Basketball program, to advance the image and reputation of Arizona State. I know beyond wins and losses the way we deport ourselves adds value to our institution, and I also recognize that sometimes we can do harm.

When we recruit our young men, we do not compromise on character. We want players who will represent us the way I know that you as faculty members and administrators would want this institution to be positioned. It is a matter of not only philosophy, but of business protocol, that we try to attract young men who are the kind of people who we want to wear our uniforms. As we try to recruit the best athletes, we are looking for guys who can play basketball very well, have great character, as well as caring about their education. We really have to lean on our administration in this process as well as key faculty members who assist us. Dr. Crow and Lisa Love, as well as many other administrators, and several faculty members have consistently taken time out of their busy schedules to meet personally with our recruits. That has made a wonderful difference, and we have now assembled a recruiting class that is in the top 20 in the country. You don't have a great recruiting class because you hire a new coach. You do so because the university community interlocks arms and has a team effort in recruitment, perhaps of unparalleled dimension. To all of you and your colleagues who have helped us in that process, we certainly say thank you.

The buzz acronym in athletics or academics this season is "APR," (Athletic Performance Rate) and I have been involved with APR in the trenches from the beginning—at our conference office, the Atlantic Coast Conference, and with the NCAA. Although APR is certainly known for its mission, it is not calibrated to measure what it intends to measure. By and large, it measures retention rather than academic achievement. Right now our APR is not what it ideally seems to be. We will continue to make improvements as we move forward, as we did this past fall in that area, but to the degree you are interested in mining deeper and knowing more about what this APR monster represents, we would be happy to have in-depth conversations with you about it. I would hope that Arizona State can move forward in being a leader in continuing to massage this model so that we can better measure what we are trying to measure. We will work hard to improve our APR, but let me tell you that it is much more a gauge for retention than it is for academic achievement, although academic achievement certainly is a component. I would like to answer questions from the floor at this time.

President Crow: Coach, you might mention what you did with your APR scores in the first semester.

We had a very high APR at the end the first semester and the cumulative GPA for Men's Basketball was 2.88 for the fall semester.

Q- If the trend now is for the really good students to turn pro, is that incorporated into the APR factor?

It is now. The first year that the APR was in place, the University of North Carolina had four guys go to the pros early. If that rule was not rewritten, they would have lost one point for each of those young men. Since amending the rule, any player who leaves an institution and signs a pro contract does not cause you to lose a retention point any longer. They will still look at us to see whether the athlete was in good standing, but we would not lose retention points, like is the case with transfers. We could have a young man who has a 4.0, triple major in Biology, English and History--and then he decides that he wants to go closer to home, to go where he can play more often. He says, "I am going to transfer to Harvard," so he transfers to Harvard. And as Myles Lynk will tell you, they (NCAA) come here and say knock Arizona State one retention point for that transfer (hypothetically speaking). That doesn't reflect what we are doing academically, and we are fortunate as most of you know that we have a remarkable academic support program in place. It is off the charts. Gene Boyd, who is director, and his staff do an incredible job, and I think they do so because they have staff members who truly care about the students.

To be a student athlete at the Division I level is a tremendous investment. Even for a home game, everybody always wants to know when you are going to travel—but when you leave for the Pac-10 games on Wednesday and come back on a Sunday, how you accommodate the academic load of those student athletes who are gone from class? Even for a home game, and when a student athlete is sitting in class at 1:00 p.m. and they know that at 7:00 p.m. that evening they are going tip off on ESPN, or they are going to tip off on Fox, it is still a challenge-- it is a heck of a challenge to stay focused, even if they are present in that class at 1:00 p.m. So, the young men and women we have representing Arizona State make a tremendous investment and I never cease to be amazed at what they are able to accomplish. Gene Boyd's group does a great job of supporting their efforts.

Q – You have been in an outstanding conference at ACC, what do we need at ASU to be able to compete at that level?

I think the Pac 10 is comparable to any of the other power conferences. Whether the ACC or the Big East or the Big 10 or the Pac 10 is the best, probably depends on the given year. There is great parity in basketball, but it is just not the power conferences now; it is a sport that everybody feels they could really be good at it. Until we unite and create an infrastructure and a passion and mentality where basketball is really important, the competition is really fierce. It is so easy to boldly proclaim we want to win a championship; we want to be a top-20 program. I think the key is that all through the year every decision we make has to be in alignment with that goal, and philosophically, that is not what we want to achieve, although there is nothing wrong with that, it is simply a value choice. Where you run into problems is when you have one kind of goal but another kind of alignment. Because even if you are perfectly aligned, it is still a very competitive landscape. I think we have awesome potential, but it will take an unprecedented unification of our faculty, our alumni, our administration, our students, our community of Phoenix, everyone has to want basketball to really develop. I appreciate speaking to your today. If we can ever lend assistance, let us know. I know you have tried to recruit the best and the brightest students—if you are recruiting faculty members and if someone ever has a special interest in basketball who applies, and if we have to beat the pants off another school to get him or her, please send them on over to meet with us. If the faculty member wants front row seats and they love basketball, we will talk to them and make an offer they can't refuse. Thank you very much. (Applause followed.)

Senate President Roen: At the end of each year, the Faculty Athletic Representative makes a report to the Academic Senate. So, Myles Lynk is here today to do that. Before he begins, I wanted to say that this year I have gotten to see how hard Myles Lynk works. He is one of the hardest working people at this university and he does so with the desire to make ASU a better place. I have the greatest admiration for this man. (Applause followed).

Report from Faculty Athletics Representative (Myles Lynk)

Thank you Duane. Duane showed his admiration by placing me after Herb Sendek and before President Crow. This will be difficult.

I want to do two things today. I want to talk about what the FAR does--many of you do not really have a full picture of what the faculty athletic representative does, and then I want to spend time talking about the academic indicators regarding our student athletes. To begin with, let me give you my perspective on APR, and I have the greatest respect for Coach Sendek and he has done an incredible job on academic performance of our men's basketball players, but I think that APR is an absolute godsend to college athletics, and I want to tell you why.

Before I do all of those, you are all familiar with the Rutgers University incident, but some of you may not be aware that a number of faculty at this university joined together in sending a letter to *The Arizona Republic* supporting the women at Rutgers. It was signed by 60 faculty at ASU, the *Republic* printed all of their names and titles. This was unprecedented. Charlie Thorn, the Women's Basketball Coach, and I were the principal authors of that letter, but I want to pass around a copy of the Saturday, April 14 edition of the newspaper.

The Faculty Athletic Representative does a number of things:

I work with the Athletic Department and the NCAA on NCAA PAC10 Conference eligibility waivers and appeals. These are waivers and appeals affecting our student athletes. The most important task the FAR does is certify the eligibility of our student athletes to play, and when some student athletes are practicing to compete, and when a student athlete has an injury or issue that affects their eligibility status or their academic performance, it is the job of the FAR to work with the compliance staff at the Athletic Department to prepare waivers and appeals for the athlete. I am very involved with the NCAA enforcement and compliance process. In the nature of doing business and in the nature of running an athletic department, you will run afoul of NCAA rules sometimes. I teach administrative law, and the NCAA is sort of like the IRS. It is just in the nature of things that a coach or a staff person will violate a rule on occasion, and that has to be reported to the NCAA. We have to deal with it as FAR and be involved in making that report as well as the compliance process. Then finally on the eligibility front, literally twice a year I sign off on the academic eligibility of every student athlete at Arizona State (about 500) and I have an assistant called the coordinator of student academic eligibility, and we work through the students GPA, their courses, and we literally have to ascertain that they are eligible to practice and compete, and I have to hand sign the forms that allows them to practice and compete.

On campus, I monitor the integrity of the athletics program. Herb talked about our office of Student Athlete Development, which is the athletics departments program of academic coaches. I work closely with them and I also make sure that if a student athlete has an academic issue with a faculty member, those go

through me. I never contact the faculty member directly. We contact what are called Dean's designees in each department and each college. We avoid any appearance of impropriety in this process. We monitor the academic performance of student athletes; every year I prepare a report for the Intercollegiate Athletic Board and for the administration that reviews the academic performance of our student athletes in detail--team by team, men's sports, women's sports. It is a very detailed report that provides data to the university and the NCAA on how our student athletes are doing as students. In an advisory role I wear a number of caps. I chair the Student Athlete Code of Conduct Committee. This is a committee composed of two faculty, the head of Counseling and Consultation, and the head of Student Judicial Affairs as well, and myself that form the committee that advises the Athletic Director on behavioral issues that arise with our student athletes and what should be the appropriate response. It is advisory and an advisory committee; the Athletics Director is free to make the decision, but it gives her a perspective from outside of the athletic department, which she would not otherwise have. I serve as a member of ASU's institutional athletics oversight board (the ICA Board); I also serve on a committee that is chaired by the Vice President for Administration and the General Counsel. I serve on IACC which is the institutional athletic compliance team, and that team monitors and audits the audits of the athletic department board as well. I represent ASU at the Pac 10 Council. Every school has three people who represent them on this council. We administer surveys and monitor student athlete experience; the NCAA has periodic surveys that they ask us to administer to students as well. We also run our own surveys on how do student athletes feel they are being treated as people here at ASU, and if they feel that this is a worthwhile experience. There is a student athlete advisory committee made up of some of the student athletes and the FAR that meets regularly with that committee, and we conduct exit interviews with student athletes. I am presenting a chart today (PowerPoint) showing the demographic breakdown of student athletes at ASU in 2005-06. This is the chart that I prepare each year for the Arizona Board of Regents and it shows that in 2005-06 we had 532 student athletes. Football has about 20% of our total. That just gives you a sense of the importance of that sport has to the student athlete program. Another chart was prepared for the ABOR internally. They only ask for certain sports to be broken out--football, basketball, and track--and then all other sports, and this chart reflects the cumulative GPA by academic year, 2005-06. Football was 2.52 and Basketball was 2.54 for men. Overall at ASU for men students, the cumulative GPA that year was 2.88. Of note is that a cumulative GPA for women athletes was 3.17 and the cumulative GPA for all women at ASU was 3.07. (If you have questions about the figures and facts presented today, please contact Professor Myles Lynk, directly)

The Academic Performance Rate is the first measure the institutions have had that holds the institutions accountable for the academic performance of their student athletes. Myles Brand, a former professor at UofA is now the current president of the NCAA. If he is remembered for anything, it will be because of the APR system. Yes, it could still be fine tuned for us--We all may have chosen to design it differently--but if you are ever asked if you support APR, the only answer has got to be YES, because what it does is to force coaches to think about academic performance in a way that they never had to think about it before. It is a wonderful thing. The score that every team wants to have is 915 (the cut score that means you graduate 50% of your student athletes). The NCAA says if you do less than that you will be penalized. President Crow asked Coach Sendek about the change in men's basketball. If you look at that statistic, in 2005, the score was 784. That was terrible and for a variety factors. The APR score this semester was 979. That is as dramatic an increase as you can imagine after Coach Sendek came on board. In our office we process the appeals and if we have a low APR score, and we have grounds to appeal it, we do appeal it. However, the NCAA can write us back and say that regardless of the reasons for our appeal that we still have exhibited a downward trend and they are going to penalize us for that. We lost scholarships on that round. When you have only twelve members on a team and lose one scholarship, that represents a significant percentage.

Two last things I want to mention are that some of our teams with the latest APR did so well they were recognized by the NCAA--Men's Golf for a score of 1,000, Women's Basketball for a score of 994 and Women's Tennis for a score of 1,000. We still have four teams that are at risk, and we are working with the Athletic Department to make an academic improvement plan for each of those sports and the coaches understand how important it is for them to not get penalized. They get it that the environment has changed and they need to place more emphasis on academics as well. This is the first year we have had improvement plans in effect, and I am very excited that we have gotten that done--but we will have to keep checking on improvement with these sports and with these plans.

I want to say it is an honor to serve in this capacity, as Faculty Athletic Representative. Duane was very kind, and I will return the favor. Duane and Bill are following in the footsteps of Susan and other Senate Presidents who have served on the ICA Board, and they have been intimately involved in our activities. They

were signatories on the letter that I passed around to you, and it has been a pleasure to work with them this year. Thank you very much (Applause followed Myles' report).

Senate President Roen: One quick announcement before we have the University President's report—I want to commend those who prepared ASU's response to the tragedy at Virginia Tech. I particularly want to mention the work that Student Affairs (Patricia Arredondo) did and Counseling and Consultation (Martha Christiansen) did; I thought the response offered many helpful materials for faculty and students. This brings us to the report from the University President.

B. University President's Report (Michael Crow)

Let me bring you up to speed on a number of matters and hope we will have some time to entertain questions. Let me start off by suggesting that we close out this semester on track, in terms of our overall objectives.

There are bumps in the road that we have encountered in attempting to launch a particularly complex Oasis software system, which is an effort to enhance our student information system and our human resources system. Most of the bumps we are past now, and our team was made up of people from Human Resources, Student Affairs, and the University Technology Office--The UTO believes that we will meet the objectives of the system and that it will be deployed successfully. That may seem obvious, but it is not the case that all such systems are deployed successfully—sometimes they encounter difficulty that makes their deployment quite challenging. There has been some hard work going on these last few months to implement the Oasis system by this team of people, while at the same time dealing with thousands of applications, financial aid requests, and a range of other things.

The reorganization launched by Provost Capaldi is well underway, and the heart of that reorganization is a simultaneous decentralization of the university's college and school organizational structure (that is all colleges and schools led by deans) and those deans now report to the University Provost regardless of their address. Regardless of the campuses that these colleges and schools are located on, all colleges and all deans have the same expectations and they all work as part of a team. We are decentralizing our support services--financial aid, accounting, facilities, residence halls, and other functions. That team is dispersed and not all located at the Tempe campus, and there is a savings involved for the Provost to reinvest in academic purposes.

Faculty hiring is continuing and we realize this is an intense focus for us, and that focus is to remind everyone that as we acquire new resources in the institution we realize that we have to put substantial resources into hiring more tenured and tenure track faculty, particularly in certain units. At some units we are ahead of our overall strategy, such as in the English department at the Tempe campus, and there are a few others where we are making large scale commitments to replace a reduction in tenure and tenure track faculty.

On the student side, I feel we are making good progress in the deployment of a range of student retention tools. One of these tools is being developed now under the leadership of Provost Capaldi, an advising assistant computer system that allows students to have a much more robust tool available to them via the web that will allow them to make enhanced decisions without necessarily having to talk with an advisor. This would allow time to talk with advisors and focus on academic planning discussions, as opposed to more routine assessments.

On the research side, I think one thing I will note for the Senate is that our research environment is maturing in many ways—for one indicator of that, maturation is that Professor Ann Kinzig of the School of Life Sciences Administration and Faculty has won a \$4 million grant from the MacArthur Foundation, and this is a great thing for the university as well as the unit.

On the legislative front, we hope to see out of the State Senate, a very positive budget bill. The governor as you recall from the last time that I spoke to the Senate had given the university 80% of our requests in her budget recommendation. That was a significant achievement. By all indicators, our senate will support full enrollment growth funding, full student success funding (in four \$15 million increments) for academic investment. We have a short structural shortfall that we are attempting to remedy. Also, the Senate numbers we believe are 3% salary adjustment number as well as a range of other things, including doubling of the state's investment support for our new department of Biomedical Informatics that is opening up in downtown Phoenix in its new facility next month, right next to TGEN on 5th street.

Financial aid for the university has just gone through its biennial review by our two bond rating agencies, but we do not have written reports yet. We will share them with this body when they are available. The bond raters come and look at all aspects of the university, our performance, our revenue projection, our indebtedness,

the relationship between our indebtedness and our performance and on all of these indicators we thought the bond raters left favorably impressed. This is not a debt issuance item, this is an overall analysis. They also do it on each issuance of debt—make a specific credit evaluation from each individual issuance.

A few new things, most of you are probably aware of the fact that construction is fast and furious on the downtown campus relative to the Journalism School. Progress will be made shortly relative to the student center and public civic space also. We are about to resolve issues relative to the Nursing School on Phase I of the Nursing School. Two residence halls on the downtown campus will begin construction shortly, for about 1200 students including dining facilities, and those also will be adjacent to the Nursing and Journalism facilities on Taylor Street in downtown Phoenix. On Apache here in Tempe, you may have noticed across from the main part of campus is land that has been leveled for construction, and on that site about 1500 new upper class and graduate student apartments are ready to be built. That apartment complex will include a recreation center built in, retail businesses built in, as well as a parking stile built in for our students. That is under construction as we speak. We are also at the Polytechnic campus about 15% of the way done with a construction project, associated with the building of a new core of facilities on that campus. We have made the bulk of the decision to advance a facility that we call ISTB 4, Interdisciplinary Science and Technology Building #4. This building based on our present trajectory, we are within a few weeks of making a final decision on that building. We are also accelerating our planning on the facility that we now generically refer to as the numberless building, hoping that gives us the opportunity to name it for somebody. The numbering system is not my favorite thing but it is supposed to be done. The ISTB 6 is the late planning stages at the moment. We are planning this facility for the train station, the light rail station that will be adjacent to the Biodesign facility in that general area. In that facility if we move forward, we need a pending act out of the legislature, we need some private sector fund raising, and we need to make a big decision about how big to make the building. If we go small, it will house the School of Construction out of the IRA Fulton School of Engineering, as well as some retail spaces. If we go larger, it will provide for substantial expansion for that school as well as for other elements of Engineering.

Let me talk a little bit about safety and security. Some of you probably read some messages that we sent out following the sad incident at Virginia Tech. Let me assure you that we have spent a large amount of time since those incidents but a lot of time before those incidents as well trying to hone and enhance our security at various campuses of the university. In FY 2003 we were spending about \$5 million dollars on security. In FY 2007, the year we are in right now, we are spending just under \$12 million dollars. So, we have move a relatively large amount of resources into the expansion of policy aid, expansion of sworn officers, expansion of facilities, and we have also launched and have under construction right now a new Department of Public Safety Headquarters on Apache. We just made the decision last week when we realized that our radio systems could not speak with all the other municipal radio systems in the valley and we needed to be able to do that. That is \$8.2 million expenditure, and that is on a highly discounted rate piggybacking on top of the City of Phoenix.

A few things we have done to be noted are that we have greatly enhanced our security in the residence halls. We now have single point of access and controlled cameras on other entrances, uniformed police aids in the residence halls at the center entry position during critical moments of the weekend and at other times, we have additional security in these facilities and we are continuing to expand that in the residence halls to make sure that our environment for our students stays as safe as possible.

Things that we know we need to put more attention to, more energy to, more resources to, are retention, retention, and retention. It is perhaps our most challenging issue and all of us could fill the blackboard and fill books with what we think are the reasons. What we have now is Provost Capaldi and her team getting in place, the deans coming in line, the communications with the faculty and others, we are making progress on our issue of how to advance retention. It is not just hiring more faculty, it is a whole range of things and we are working very hard on that. We also know that on the Tempe campus we have to upgrade a number of our class rooms which we find wholly inadequate. That is a major undertaking. One hope is that facilities like ISTB 4 and ISTB 6 we will be able to put some classrooms in these facilities and that will help us some. We also know that we have to go back to older facilities and work on those. Of course, we realize that we have to expand the faculty. Back to the financial side of things, we will break \$500 million in our endowment in the not too distant future, and that is up from \$200 million in 2002, our endowment last year was growing at the first percentile; we are in the 99th percentile for our rate of growth and change in our endowment. This is due to the changing of our investors for our endowment, large gifts that were made to our endowment, and a range of other things.

Are there any questions?

Q- Is that 3% proposed increase from the legislature a merit pool or is that a raise?

We don't know yet. The executive committee of the university will be ready as we learn of this number. We have a growing problem that I want senators to be aware of—we have hidden by absorbing the costs of all adjustments in either retirement or health care for every year that I have been here. There have been huge additional costs beyond what most of you may imagine. We are reaching the limit of what we can continue to do as the employers paying all of these additional costs. We have received amounts from the state to help us, but never have we gotten what we needed. This has been financially challenging to us, we have not made a decision on this yet, but it is on the table and something that we are thinking about. These numbers run as high as \$10 million in a year for the institution, just the additional costs, and they are associated largely with health care. It also turns out that our employee contribution to health care among peer institutions is relatively low now. That is because historically salaries have been lower and we are going to look at all of this very carefully and Betty will be talking with the deans, and with the Senate and others as we decide these matters. I don't know if this proposed increase will be merit based or general salary increase as yet.

Q-Do you know what the state's contribution will be for this coming fiscal year? Also, how much of that will go to servicing the debt. I also want you to explain something that I see on my financial statements for "participation" in it. I am really ecstatic about the legislature setting aside 3% for salary adjustment. I did an analysis last night, and I found that between 2002 and 2006 my pay has dropped 4%, and maybe now, I will be only minus 1%.

The individual's pay is a function of an individual's rank, and many other things. I am not sure of your interaction with your department but going to the root of your question, the university was ranked tenth in our average salaries in 2002 in the Pac10. We are now ranked 5th among all universities in the Pac10. That is a calculated difference in our present salary position from where we were. I would have to look at your particular circumstances to understand what happened, but having said that, the percentage of the universities budget that goes into debt retirement is somewhere in the neighborhood of 7-8%. Actually our budget is substantially higher than that. There are some caps that we have to live within—a cap that is set by the Regents, and one cap that is set by the State, and we are not meeting either of those caps right now. In fact our position relative to these caps changes as the university's financial budget increases. If our budget increases, the math changes those percentages.

Q- Can you explain the certificate of "participation?"

On the dollar amount, a certificate of participation, is basically a legal entity associated with the selling of bonds, so, it is a relationship between us, the bond issuer, and the credit provider. It is a standard legal term.

(Applause followed President's Crow's announcements.)

Senate President Roen: I want to thank President Crow for spending time with us today and sharing with us, and for frank discussions throughout the year. We have a few more reports yet to go.

C. Senate President-Elect's Report (Bill Verdini)

I do have a report today, and that is to report this is my last report as the President-Elect. Thank you all. (Applause followed Bill's report).

D. USG President's Report (Liz Simonhoff).

D. USG President's Report (Liz Simonhoff).

Good afternoon, everyone. It is the last Senate meeting of the semester and I wanted to update you on what we are doing right now. First, Sam, the Centennial Professorship Committee, and I have worked really hard on the Centennial Professorship, and we have awarded two \$10,000 scholarships to professors. The two professors were Pamela Stewart, Department of History, and Jennifer Brougham, School of Social and Family Dynamics. Another thing that I know Dr. Crow touched on was the Town Hall on safety held on campus, and we have been very involved in that as well. In terms of the Senate Motion #40 today, we have been working with the Student Faculty Policy Committee, and we are in support of the drop extension, and we think students will benefit from that. Finally, we are just wrapping up the year and transitioning from Ross Meyer as president to myself, who will be president next year. We have just hired our staff and will have a first staff meeting on

Wednesday. It is finals week, so, I asked to be excused now, but I appreciate having worked with you this year and I look forward to working with you all again next year as President of USG. Thank you. (Applause followed Liz's report).

Senate President Roen: Given that Liz has to leave now, I want to express how much respect I have for the Undergraduate Student Government leaders on this campus. I have worked very closely with them this year, and I really have come to admire their commitment to students, also, their commitment to working with faculty. They have come to the Senate meetings all year; they have also attended the Executive Committee meetings, and the Student Faculty Policy Committee meetings. Thank you for this. (Applause followed.)

E. GPSA President's Report (Bree McEwan)

We are also, like USG, going through our leadership transition period right now. By this Friday we hope to have all but four seats filled. GPSA appreciates the support departments have given to students who serve on GPSA. With that, we have some new things that we are really excited about: the new T.A. training for the fall will be a modular system that different departments can utilize and GPSA has done a ton of effort in testing this system for the fall. Departments may still choose the standard TA training, but there will be more modules to supplement that if they wish. We are thrilled to be a part of this as it will help the university as a whole. Other things that we are working on: I have reported to you earlier that when we went through the health insurance RFPs--we had got some health insurance, which is very important to graduate TAs and RAs, but we did not have prescription coverage, and we also wanted some dental coverage. I now have heard Jim Rund say, three times, that we will look for new dental RFPs over the summer, and while we realize that pursuing is not the same thing as getting dental insurance, we are excited about the prospect of looking into dental coverage. We are hopeful on that issue. One other thing that we are trying to look at as an organization, and it will be one of our big projects next year, is graduate student funding and financial aid for the whole university. The different ways that will be considered are the traditional assistantship model, whether it is due to financial aid programs, or to go to work for a company and the company is funding it, and one thing that we are particularly interested in working on, at the state level, is loan forgiveness plans. There is a plan being talked about at the state community college level. We are also looking forward to working with the Arizona Students Association on all sorts of public service sector issues, whether it they are related to K-12, health careers, or law school. These were some of the issues, and we want to look at different aspects of funding around the university until we figure out how graduate students are being funding, and how people are available to access that information. The other things I want to do. . .at GPSA we have recently had funds available to us for conference travel, and with our new constitution in place there is be a mechanism for all ASU campuses to participate. (hopefully all campuses will be able to participate in that). We have had several conversations with the Poly and West campuses and will be having conversations with the Downtown Campus on how we can expand this program so that we can help students who are the other campuses to have conference travel and professional development travel opportunities. Are there any questions? Then, I also have to leave now too. (Applause followed Bree's report.)

Senate President Roen: What I said about Liz also applies to Bree and GPSA. We have been fortunate to have such strong student government leaders this year. John Brock is here--do you have a report?

F. University Academic Council Report (John Brock)

G. ASU at the Polytechnic campus Report (John Brock)

I will do my dual report. First, the University Academic Council is looking at the university senate we will be creating, and that will take the council members plus volunteers from the different campuses for the task force over the summer, and what we want to do is review the structure of other campuses to see how they handle things. The target date for this is probably, if I am being optimistic, July 1st. Then next year we hope to soon announce that the chair of the University Academic Council will be Richard Gitelson from ASU West.

For my Polytechnic campus report, one of the big things is that our three buildings are going up out there. In watching their progress I have finally seen the machine I want to run as a construction worker—it is the float that mixes concrete.

The Polytechnic campus Senate will consider on Friday its resolution for a university senate. I can share from emails I am receiving that people at Poly are concerned about the campus reorganization and the new structure the schools and colleges, and how that will be worked out. And, I am not going to leave to go study for an exam today. Thank you.

H. ASU at the West campus Report (Gary Anders) No report.

I. ASU at the DPC campus Report (Susan Mattson)

J. Past Senate President's Report (Susan Mattson)

At the DPC we are still conducting our election for a new president-elect for next year and voting begins tomorrow. I will be handing over the presidency to George Watson and we are having a meeting this Tuesday. We had a very nice Assembly lunch on April 20th. There was a very good discussion of the survey that we had sent out to the faculty downtown about this year at the DPC—working, living, and playing at ASU, and what we can do to strengthen the positives and how to address the concerns and the issues that will be the foundation for the governance council's work next year. As far as being past president here this year, I would just like to say thank you and goodbye, because this is my last Senate meeting although I will be working with the UAC in developing the university senate this summer. (Applause followed Susan's report.)

Senate President Roen: That brings us to the consent items. Is there anyone who wishes to remove from the consent agenda any of the listed items? Hearing none, we will vote. All those in favor of the consent agenda items below as listed, please indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Abstentions? There were none. The motion to approve Senate Motions #43, 44, 45, 46, and 47 was passed by a voice vote of those present (see items below)

4. ADOPTION OF ALL CONSENT ACTION ITEMS, INFORMATION ITEMS, AND REPORTS

A. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Barbara Acker)

Senate Motion #43 (2006-2007) (Second Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the Mary Lou Fulton College of Education, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, to establish a Graduate Certificate: An Overview of Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) **(Attachments p. 1) PASSED**

Senate Motion #44 (2006-2007) (Second Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering, School of Computing & Informatics to Change the name of an Undergraduate Certificate From: Certificate In Information Sciences To: Certificate in Informatics **(Attachments, p. 2) PASSED**

Senate Motion #45 (2006-2007) (Second Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, School of Human Evolution and Social Change, for an implementation proposal to establish a PhD in Environmental Social Science (ESS) **(Attachments, p. 3) PASSED**

Senate Motion #46 (2006-2007) (Second Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, School of Social and Family Dynamics, for an implementation proposal to establish a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) in Infant Family Practice **(Attachments, p. 4) PASSED**

Senate Motion #47 (2006-2007) (Second Reading): The Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee recommends Academic Senate approval of a proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, School of Social and Family Dynamics, for an implementation proposal to establish a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) in Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) **(Attachments, p. 5) PASSED**

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Executive Committee (Duane Roen).

Senate Resolution #38 (2006-2007) (Second Reading): *UAC Resolution to form a Unified University Senate and Campus Caucuses* (Attachments, p. 6) PASSED

That brings us to Resolution #38 concerning the formation of a One University Senate and campus caucuses. Are there questions?

Q- A number of people are concerned because there is no plan in place that we can discuss in the departments.

Senate President Roen: There are a couple of things to share. We have been discussing this for well over a year to a year in a half among the leadership of the four campuses; we have also been discussing this with the administration, so, there have been lots of conversations but even though you have not heard those conversations, after we have voted on this resolution #38, and if it passes, I will then ask for people to volunteer to serve on the committee that will plan what the university wide senate will look like, and there will be people from all of the campuses participating, in addition to the University Academic Council members working throughout the summer to develop a plan.

Q- Then from what you have just said, if we vote yes today, it will go forward as something that will be done.

No, the planning will occur. This resolution simply authorizes the planning process, and then once the plan is developed, it will be brought back to this senate as well as the senates on the other campuses' and it will be voted on in the senates, and I assume it will go to the full Academic Assembly for a vote after that. There will be discussion on this throughout the fall.

Parliamentarian Vandermeer: If the plan comes forward and should get voted down, something else has to happen.

Past President Mattson: I would also suggest that when the Task Force presents some proposals to the Senate that you as senators go back to your faculty and talk about them, and perhaps what the implications can be, so that you can then present that to the task force, or to this body when it is discussed and voted on. Individuals who are not part of the Senate cannot say that they have not heard anything about it previously. That is part of the role of the senator to represent the faculty here, and to represent the university senate at the unit level.

Senate President Roen: Is there further discussion? All those in favor of Senate Resolution #38 signify by saying aye. Opposed by the same sign. (1) Absentions (1) duly noted. Senate Resolution #38 was passed by voice vote of those present.

That brings us to business from the Student Faculty Policy Committee. Rojann cannot be here today so Jerry Kingston will give the report.

B. Student-Faculty Policy Committee (Jerry Kingston).

Before I turn to the three resolutions that we will be considering, I want to amplify the comments that Duane has already made about our student participation on the Student-Faculty Policy Committee this year. Samantha and Bree, in addition to attending the Executive Committee meeting and other meetings, have attended all SFPC meetings this year. They are always prepared, and they understand that most of the work is done outside of the meetings; they come to the meetings prepared and we have made those decisions together. They are roll models for faculty and I just had to take this opportunity to say that.

We have three things to come before you this afternoon, and the first one is on page 7 and it relates to a possible change in the undergraduate comprehensive examination—the CLEP policy.

Senate Motion #39 (2006-07) (Second Reading): *Undergraduate Comprehensive Examination (CLEP) Policy* (Attachments, p. 7). PASSED

This comes from the Department of Languages and Literatures to the SFPC, as a request for relief from the current limitation that a student who has earned 100 credit hours and would no longer be able to take advantage of the CLEP program, even if in fact they are pursuing a second undergraduate degree. The one hundred hour requirement would be removed, and the departments could impose any additional degree requirements on the CLEP policy, but the DLL ran into a university constraint and that is when they brought this

matter to us. We are proposing that students be allowed to be able to take advantage of the CLEP program even if they have earned more than 100 hours.

Senate President Roen: Is there any discussion on Motion #39? Hearing none, we will vote. All in favor signify by saying aye. All against by the same sign. Abstentions? There were none. Senate Motion #39 passed by a voice vote of those present.

Senate Motion #40 (2006-07) (Second Reading): Drop/Add Deadline (Attachments, p. 8) PASSED

The second motion for your consideration this afternoon is a change in the Drop/Add deadline. We spent quite a bit of time in the SFPC discussing the advantages and disadvantages of allowing students a longer period of time at the beginning of each academic term to make a decision about whether or not they remain in the class, whether they can add the class at a later point or how long they could wait before they could withdraw and still not have their registration not appear on their transcripts. After a lot of consideration the committee concluded that we did not want to change the add deadline, because in fact faculty wished to get started earlier; they wish to give assignments right away and they want to get students working in their classes. (Therefore, we did not see a need to extend the period of time that students could withdraw.) Last month we had a first reading of the resolution that would extend the period in which the student could drop at the end of the semester by one week. It is currently six days and if this motion is approved that would go to a 13 day period.

Senate President Roen: Is there discussion?

Q- I think this change would be very awkward in several circumstances. I am certainly in favor of changing the drop by one week, but there may be other cases where this happens once in a while, to consider. A student in one section of a course may want to transfer into another section of the same course. They may not realize that until the second week of the course, and I think that should be a fairly simple thing to do without having to do what is indicated here. Another situation happens in graduate courses, where a student comes into the university and they start a particular course thinking that is suitable, or they are advised to take that course, and then they later realize that they may need something else in the way of preparation. Again, it may take a couple of weeks before they realize this. What we have always done in the past is to submit petitions and they are almost always granted as far as I know for good reasons. I think that if you extend both of these periods that would help students in these situations.

The committee considered the points that you are raising here, and they have merit; we also considered the possibility that if you extend the add period for one more week that means that if students could shift automatically, and in large numbers, without any constraint, because it is still the open drop and add period. As an example they will be able to add a class--and they discover that there are two or three homework assignments behind and before they ever get started in the class, we felt that this began to be burdensome on faculty. It might in fact be unfair to students as a generality, to just allow anyone to be adding two weeks into the semester. We do have as you pointed out, a policy or procedure that allows you to go through the undergraduate or the graduate dean's office in your college. It may be a little bit more paper intensive but it is not prohibitive, and for students who reasonably and legitimately wish to late add to a class, we received no input that this is not a viable option for the examples you have given.

Comments:

As you know students are expected to work as teams in many learning environments. Allowing students to withdraw after two weeks would delay formation of effective teams and really limit the amount of work we can get done in that style. I have concern about that. I also suggest that this may encourage students to shop for easy classes and over enroll, assuming that they are going to withdraw and perhaps the university has to bear the cost of unused capacity.

Adding one week to the drop policy would not encourage this.

To draw a clearer picture, this motion is not addressing withdrawals but rather drops. The distinction is that if a student drops the course there is no financial penalty for the student.

If a student simply drops a class it does not appear at the end of the semester on their transcript, but if the student withdraws from the class after the tenth week then it still appears that they were enrolled in the class. So, it is not clear to me how a distinction between a drop and a withdrawal would really impact the team approach that you are talking about.

I have been teaching large courses for a number of years but there are some people that get overrides and wait for someone to drop the course and it seems like this would just draw out that process longer.

That is correct; if the student withdrew two weeks into the semester, rather than within one week, the student who had wanted to get into the class would not be able to use the regular enrollment add process, because that process would have terminated at the end of six days. It doesn't prohibit the student from ever getting into class but it would not be an automatic thing of going online and registering. Again, the same issue holds if we don't distinguish between withdrawals and drops. This goes back to the point will there be a behavioral shift among students if they are now allowed to drop as opposed to withdraw in that seven day period.

Often in large courses there is a laboratory course which brings up another related problem. They often do not meet in the first week of class. So, the student is not going to know what the lab is about until the second week.

They (labs) should meet in the first week then.

There are all sorts of scheduling problems involved that would prevent that.

We already know that some students who add in the first week are already behind and they expect their instructors to go over what they missed the first week. Some never catch up. Some fail the course. I really don't want students to be able to add the second week. It is enough of a problem now.

Senate President Roen: All those in favor please say aye. Those opposed? (8) Abstentions (1)? Request to vote by a show of hands: In favor (22) Opposed (8) Abstentions (1). Senate Motion #40 Drop/Add Deadline was passed by majority vote by those present.

Senate Resolution #42 (2006-07) (Second Reading) (revised): Textbook Cost (Attachments, p. 9) PASSED

Senator Kingston: The second motion before us is Senate Resolution #42, and I want to point out that it is a revised resolution from what was presented a month ago. I will point out the differences and hope that you will accept the substitute resolution from the committee. The one presented a month ago said, in part, resolved: the faculty carefully select a minimum number of essential books and consider supplementing texts with online articles, etc. We had some feedback from senators that day, and we have had additional feedback since that time that in fact the resolution should relate to the costs, and not to the absolute essentiality of materials and trying to push people out on the Web.

In the reconsideration of this by the committee, we dropped that resolution and we also dropped the portions of the original resolution that said the faculty should consider the significance of change when selecting the new edition of the book. We think that also sounded a bit restrictive, so, what we did is drop those portions of the resolution and substituted "we resolve that faculty consider the cost of textbooks and other course related materials when evaluating them for possible adoption in the classes." We are trying to be less restrictive on what people select but are encouraging them to be cost sensitive instead. I would hope that we can consider the alternative resolution without having to amend the former resolution.

Senate President Roen: Is that acceptable?

Q- I am a little confused by the part that says faculty should consider negotiating with booksellers for reduced costs...does that mean we have to do that?

I do this all the time for my large sections. He gave a specific example.

Comment: Some of us would not be that successful in doing that. I think the university should do this.

But that would mean the university would be prescribing what books and materials we are using in each of our classes, and I guess I would be concerned about that. I think that as an individual faculty member if I had an opportunity to do something like this because I have the larger buying power than my students, I don't think that is inappropriate to do that.

Senate President Roen: Keep in mind that this resolution does not indicate that faculty must do anything; it encourages them to do this. All in favor of this resolution please say aye. Opposed? Abstentions? There were none. Senate Resolution #42 was approved by a voice vote of those present.

6. NEW BUSINESS (Reports and new motions - from Senate committees)

A. Executive Committee (Duane Roen).

Final Reports are due by May 30th in the Academic Senate Office for all Senate related committees.

B. Committee on Committees (Marcia Anderson).

A Mini-Preference Survey form was distributed to the members of the Senate, in order to solicit their preferences for service on Senate standing committees next year. Please fill it out and return it to Darby Shaw at the Senate Office, Mail code 1703. The form will also be sent to senators that did not attend the meeting, and the form will be posted on the Senate Web page. The data received will then be organized into a report by the Committees on Committees, and forwarded to the incoming Senate President. Thank you.

Senate President Roen: I want to commend Marcia and Judy and the other members of the Committee on Committees; they worked very hard this year. That reminds me that we also need people to serve on the task force on forming the one university senate. They will begin working right away so please email me if you are interested at duane.roen@asu.edu. That brings us to the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee report.

C. Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (Barbara Acker).

(All new CAPC proposals are available on the CAPC website (www.asu.edu/provost/CAPC))

These items were announced:

Information Items:

The Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering, Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering is establishing an Undergraduate Concentration: Energy and Environment within the Mechanical Engineering Major. (CAPC recommendation required/Senate Information Item).

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry is establishing a concentration in Medicinal Chemistry under the Master of Science (MS) in Biochemistry (CAPC recommendation required/Senate Information Item).

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences & the Herberger College of the Arts, Department of Psychology/Arts Media and Engineering is establishing a Graduate Concentration: Cognition, Action and Perception in the Arts, Media & Engineering within the Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology (CAPC recommendation required/Senate Information Item).

Action Items: There were no further action items.

Senate President Roen: I also want to thank Mary Kihl and Barbara Acker for lots of hard work this year and to their committee members, and to say thank you, Barbara, for stepping in as chair, in the middle of the year.

D. Personnel Committee Report (Doug Johnson)

The Personnel Committee had their final meeting of the year on Wednesday, April 25, 1:40 to 2:40 p.m. in ADM B 365. I would like to give you an update on some Personnel Committee issues: First, the discussions on merging ACD and ACDW manuals are pressing forward, Mark Searle and others are hard at work on a regular basis. It is a very detailed and tedious process, and it is one that it is essential to get Senate approval of by next October. This document will try to highlight issues that have been considered controversial. The intent is not to make major policy changes, but to make the document more useable, to take policies and to separate them from procedures in a way that you can use the final document more effectively.

In the retirement area, we can report that we are working towards a tri-university task force to seek enhanced retirement benefits including health insurance for retirees. We were not successful in getting legislation introduced for the current session on this, but we would hope that the three universities would have consensus on accomplishing that next year. The health insurance discussion is much more problematic; we have had a significant change in the Department of Administration in the way that they approach negotiating health insurance. Their advisory committee, which I have served on for the last ten years, has been expanded they are behind closed doors negotiating contracts now. The rumors that we have heard so far suggest that they are doing very reasonable things. They are proceeding with the issues that we have raised in the past, such as having a third or fourth tier of rates for employees--an employee plus one rate, a couple plus one rate, and provide a little more economical cost for those services. They have taken a position that they do not want to talk about these issues until they receive money from the legislature, and they are seeking additional funding to allow a multiple rate structure.

This is my last Senate meeting. I am retiring and will be the president of the Retirees Association next year. (Applause followed Doug's report)

Senate President Roen: I want to thank Doug for his service on the Personnel Committee this year and for his many years of service and long negotiations on behalf of the Senate, as well as all faculty at Arizona State University.

I also want to ask Jerry Kingston to respond to any questions about the report and the resolution related to plus/minus grades. This is a first reading and an introduction. No debate will take place today because that will take place in the fall.

E. Student Faculty Policy Committee (Jerry Kingston).

The Student Faculty Policy Committee had their final meeting on Tuesday, April 24, 8:00-9:30 a.m. in ADMB 365.

***Revised Report to the Academic Senate of the Evaluation of Plus/Minus Grading* (Attachments, pp. 10-11) INTRODUCED.**

Resolution to Executive Committee -- Plus/Minus Grading (Attachments, p. 12) INTRODUCED

Senator Kingston: Please watch for the publication of the committee's final report on this topic at the Academic Senate Web site. Right now we have provided you with a two-page summary thinking we might have time to go over it today, but we don't really need to do that. The full report will be able online this summer but the recommendations will be unchanged. We will have recommended continuing our plus/minus grading system. That is the only thing that needs to be placed on the table today.

Q-Is part of the report going to look at the analysis of the affects of the plus/minus grade system on the final graduating GPA—how much that changes?

What we have done at this point is to document the utilization of plus/minus grading. We have surveyed the students and asked them a number of questions about the present system and possible enhancements to it; we also surveyed the faculty (broadly defined now to include teaching assistants, and anyone who is a part of the instructional personnel) and we have their feedback on plus/minus grading--and the consensus of all of that is that we should continue with that program. That was our charge at the beginning of the year, to do an assessment as to whether or not the plus/minus grading system as implemented three years ago should be continued in the present form. And, if the Executive Committee of the Senate wishes to give us a more complicated charge in the fall, we could probably carry that out next year, but we have not done any of that this year.

Q-The original report that was introduced several years ago has analysis of data among other institutions regarding the effects on GPAs and now that we have some experience, I would think it would be important to have that information regarding our own experience. The data of the original report was rather sketchy and ambiguous as to whether this makes any sense at all. I would like to at least see the numbers regarding the effects on final grade point averages. If it is .01 or .02, I think that is meaningless.

Thank you.

F. University Affairs Committee (David Burstein). – No report.

Senate President Roen: At this juncture, I want to offer some thanks to all the members of this body for thoughtful discussion here today and throughout the year:

I want to thank all the members of the Academic Assembly, especially those who accepted the nominations to serve.

I want to thank the members of the Executive Committee for sage advice and their collective sense of humor-- our meetings were very enjoyable.

I want to thank the Academic Senate standing committees and the faculty grievance bodies for diligent attention to some very challenging issues this year: the Personnel Committee, the Student Faculty Policy Committee, the University Affairs Committee, the Committee on Committees, the Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, chaired by Jere Humphreys who is not a member of the Senate, and the Governance Grievance Committee, chaired by Senator Barbara Guzzetti--I want to thank all of the committee chairs for leadership and countless, sometimes hundreds of hours, of work on their committees.

I want to thank the University Academic Council, the governance leaders of all the campuses at ASU for good faith efforts to move us toward one Senate, to speak with one voice to the administration.

Also, to thank the body that some in the room may not be familiar with, the Arizona Faculties Council, the governance leaders from the three state universities. We have had a wonderful working relationship this year; we have had collegial dialogue on very many issues from those leaders, as we met each time the Board of Regents had their meetings at the three institutions.

The task force on Classified Research deserves our thanks—last summer when they worked very hard grappling with some difficult issues—they also had to work very hard to come to agreement on some of those issues.

I thank our guest speakers throughout the year for keeping us informed.

I want to thank Betty Capaldi, Executive Vice President and Provost, for addressing us every month and providing funding and technology for the Senate Office that was very helpful.

I want to thank Mark Searle for collaboration on a variety of academic personnel matters and for a relationship was also very mutual.

Thanks to President Crow again for the frank conversations that he and I, as well as other Senate leaders had this year.

I have already thanked the undergraduate and graduate student government leaders, they have been phenomenal.

Thanks to David Burstein, our University Faculty Ombudsperson for years of dedicated service to the faculty, he was not able to be with us today.

I want to Anne Kopta the outgoing secretary of the Senate, for years of service to this body.

I want to thank Doug Johnson again for among other things, for years of long negotiations that have benefited all of us.

I want to thank Past President Susan Matson and George Watson who will be leading the charge of the Downtown, Phoenix campus and for being good mentors and role models for me.

I want to thank Phil Vandermeer as our Parliamentarian, for whispering in my ear throughout the year, providing great advice and guidance on procedures in this body.

I thank Bill Verdini for his popular monthly reports and for attending scores of committee meetings that I was unable to attend.

I want to thank Darby Shaw, Executive Assistant to the Senate for thousands of dedicated hours of support for all of us; she helps to make this body function.

(Applause followed each person mentioned today.)

Senate President Roen: Although I don't have a gavel present today, I am now turning this meeting over to Bill Verdini.

7. PASSING OF THE GAVEL & ADJOURNMENT

Senate President-Elect Verdini: It is rumored that past presidents suffer gavel withdrawal, so, in honor of all you have done for us, I present you with this gavel, and then a plaque that is from all of us: "This is in appreciation to our President, Duane Roen: Thank you for being: One Academic Assembly Senate President in Many Places; A True Interdisciplinary; A Scholar; An Advocate of Teaching and Learning; An Administrator and Mentor to Us All, especially me. Thank you. (Applause for Duane followed.)

Senate President Roen: Just one comment: I have really enjoyed working with all of you. I have the greatest admiration for all of you, and all of the wonderful work that you do for faculty at Arizona State University. Thank you for letting me work with you this year; I appreciate that. (Applause followed Duane's remarks.)

Senate President-Elect Verdini: I will do my first official duty and ask for an adjournment of this meeting. So moved.

Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Recorded and Edited by:
Darby Shaw, Executive Assistant

Final Editing by:
Anne Kopta, Secretary of the Senate

Note: See attachments file for all action Items that were approved by the Senate on April 30, 2007. They will be posted on the Academic Senate Web page at <http://www.asu.edu/provost/asenate>