

## CLAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

9/15/08

DRAFT

### **Senators in Attendance:**

Tannah Broman, John Chance, Joseph Comfort, Andrew Ellis, Petra Fromme, Abdullahi Gallab, Mariana Maris, Seth Rose, Marta Sanchez, Ayanna Thompson, Jacqueline Wheeler, Eugene Clay, Abdullahi Gallab, Marie Provine, Denise Bodman, Hyaeweol Choi, Timothy Karcher, Marta Sanchez, Otto Sankey, Ayanna Thompson, Leslie Towill, Stanley Williams, Marty Wojciechowski, Cheshire Calhoun, Eric Kostelich, Shannon Ringenbach (Senate Secretary), Ileana Orlich (Chair of Curriculum Committee), Dan Brouwer in for Bob McPhee

### **Senators not in Attendance:**

Richard Burg, Dale DeNardo, Michael Dorman, Roxanne Doty, Ted Guleserian, Helene Ossipov, James Rush, Georganne Scheiner, Edmund Stump, Brandon Yoo

### **I. Call to Order**

Presiding Officer, Andrew Ellis, called the meeting to order at approximately 3:20 p.m.

### **II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the April 7, 2008 meeting were unanimously approved.

### **III. New Business**

Drew began by saying that this agenda was modified due to time constraints for some attending. New business will be first on the agenda this time. First item was a proposal to establish the center for Jewish studies. Deborah Losse gave an overview of the proposal. Proposal was approved unanimously. Second proposal was the request to establish the School of Mathematics and Statistics and to disestablish the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. Quentin gave an overview of this proposal. A question was raised regarding a possible proposal to establish an applied math major in anthropology. Question posed: "Will this be solely in Anthropology"? Quentin answered by saying that there is not an easy answer to this but that it should be bridged between Anthropology and Math. And that they are proposing that a committee be formed. Petra Fromme had a question regarding this subject as well. Eric Kostelich responded that this is an experiment and if it doesn't work out, then it can be disestablished. He also stated that there is a strong collaboration with folks in Engineering. There will be a core of 6 courses. Senator Thompson asked if someone could explain the difference between first year math and the school. Eric said he could give the history. The problems with college algebra are the same here as everywhere else. We tried everything from one time or another. There are 14,000 full time students and 450 sections of classes. 45% of the 14,000 students are first year math. The model for the first year math was to have faculty invested in the university. The model was designed for lecture/instructor format so that in case there is a disastrous budget cut they would not be tenured. The question was asked if this would affect the funding for the school. Alan said that it

would not. Question posed: Who would the director be responsible to? Eric said he doesn't know at this point. Sid Bacon said the Director of first year math will report to the Dean of Natural Sciences. As a faculty member he reports to the director of the school, or what will be the school. Drew then took a vote and the Mathematics and Statistics proposal was approved.

#### **IV. Old Business**

Drew began old business. First item was in regards to our governing document, the bylaws. These were last revised in 1992. Amendments were made in 1996 and 2001. We established a committee last year to address this. The only issue is that some of the committee members are not with us anymore and I'm not sure who is still with us. Tannah Broman said that she is the only one left from that committee. Petra said that Helene from SILC is joining again. Drew stated that at least one more person is needed for the committee. Marie Provine agreed to serve on the committee. They thought that three members should be enough.

Question posed: Because the constitution has changed will that affect the bylaws? Eric said yes there will be some changes. One member said that there won't be a lot of changes because they tried to keep most of the language the same.

Next item was in regards to the establishment of a freshman seminar committee. This stems back to the ASU 101 debate. This goes back to February of last year. The curriculum committee stated that they approved of the fundamental concept of limited freshman seminars however rejected the ASU 101 proposal as it was put forth. That led to a series of events for a two phased program that was recommended. The first phase involved a stop gap for the current year that we are in now so that ship has sailed and no longer a concern. The second phase is the establishment of the freshman seminar committee to examine the issue of establishing a freshman seminar series that is required within the college. Their charge to us is to establish a committee to develop guidelines, standards, compensation concerns and unit involvement in association with this freshman seminar series. We did not establish this committee at the tail end of last year and this is something we need to do today. Drew asked for volunteers from people who have experience with freshman courses or those that have an interest. It is recommended that members of the seminar committee not be members of the curriculum committee because the curriculum committee would eventually be reviewing the proposal put forth. Some of the things that they are interested in incorporating in their recommendation are elements of student success, student integrity, and the CLAS PEER challenge initiative. Drew added that if you are interested in being part of this committee, it needs to be fast and efficient, as we need a proposal by the end of this semester. Drew asked for volunteers. Jacqueline Wheeler and Tannah Broman volunteered. Drew said that if you have colleagues that are interested, that would be good as well. Next up is to add some more members to the committee. Once that is done we will start moving as a committee before it is approved because there is some urgency. The plan is to shoot for four people on the committee.

#### **V. Curriculum Committee Report**

Ileana Orlich reported that the curriculum committee meeting went well. Everything listed on the report was approved.

Eric commented that the requirements for the science and society program are too complicated. He asked if the committee can revisit this and see if this can be simplified. Gerry Corey said that there is an ad hoc committee working on this.

Petra Fromme mentioned that there is a problem with the pre-requisites in the system and it is causing trouble for the students. Eric said that the problem is with the Peoplesoft software. Alan suggested forwarding these types of questions to Dean Gerry Corey.

## **VI. Report from the College Senator-at-Large**

Drew announced that because Richard Burg was not present, the report from the University Senate would be tabled until the next meeting.

## **VII. Deans Report**

Quentin mentioned where the budget situation is. We absorbed a pretty significant hit in our budget and we're working through the process to try to save those without eliminating any majors, programs, faculty or staff. The likelihood is high that there will be another cut this year. That is not definite but it is the buzz downtown and with the legislature. It is unknown as to how much that will be, but we are working on contingency plans in the event there are cuts. It is a virtual certainty that there will be cuts next year as well. On a more positive note, we are trying to crank up the PEER project and Michele Daley has agreed to take leadership on that. For those not familiar, we are trying to get as many students as possible to make a personal commitment to student success and to get involved in whatever way they can. 90% retention is Michael's goal. We are engaging the CLAS ambassadors, the deans circle scholars to help us brainstorm. We want this to be a student owned, student driven activity. The retention rate for ASU went up 2.4% which is really good news but the bad news is that the college was flat. We need to motivate our units to help raise the retention rate. We need our students to feel part of something. The rate now is 78% with the goal of 90%. Alan said we will be announcing, in the next few days, a major investment in advisors in the college with some assistance from the provost and the Dean's office. Alan said that there will be a new Associate Dean of the Office of Student and Academic Programs. Alan said that he will be joining us January 1 and has worked very much on the issue of retention. He knows some of the national experts on retention. We're going to do a workshop/seminar for chairs and directors and one other person from the unit. We're also going to have a round table of successful examples from within our college; such as learning communities. Alan said there are many reasons why students don't come back. We know that the first six weeks are the most critical.

Petra Fromme asked if we could consider getting advisors from within the field, as opposed to general advisors. Quentin said that we need to look at the relationship between the faculty and advisor so that the advisor has as much of a background as possible to be able to answer all questions. Linda Lederman said we do know some of the things that affect retention. For many of the students it is that feeling of being lost and/or disconnected. Some very simple things like taking attendance, making sure that students have a syllabus can make a difference. Petra Fromme mentioned that using the "clickers" helps students to feel more involved and it might be good to encourage more instructors to use them.

Question posed: What will the process be for additional budget cuts? Quentin said we are in the early stages of the contingency plan. Question: When the budget cuts were made they were made on the assumption that they would be for one year. Is there a process in place to review the kind of cuts that were made to see if they brought the departments down below the level of minimal functioning? Quentin agreed that decisions would have been different if we knew these were going to be permanent. Quentin said they are available to work with units to help with funds on some of these things.

Petra Fromme discussed with the Senate her concern regarding the Sponsored Project Officer (SPO) in Chemistry and some other units. She was saying that this SPO was overworked which resulted in things being submitted late which could even jeopardize received grants. Petra believed that there may have been two SPO positions that were not filled. She also added that departmental help was good, but the SPO's needed to submit the material, so more SPO's were still needed.

### **VIII. Joe Comfort to address the Senate on behalf of UAC**

Joe Comfort gave some information regarding the University Academic Council. He said that there is one academic assembly, and under that one university senate. Senators from across different campuses can meet together if they want to for their own campus issues but it's not likely to happen on the Tempe campus. Above that is the University Academic council which consists of the three layers of presidents from each of the four campuses. And then there is the executive committee which consists of the UAC, the provost, committee chairs and some student representatives. Above that is the Arizona faculty's council which is equivalent to the UAC from all three universities. One of the things that is going to happen this year is that members of the Arizona faculties council will be attending various sub-committee meetings of the board. Among the subjects that the committee here will be considering will be faculty participation and shared governance. Our goal in the UAC is to have the UAC and the faculty be more active in working with the administration in formulating policies. Senators will need to come to the meetings prepared. You will have to bring the documents with you. You will have to read them in advance. You will need to be prepared to discuss the issues. One of the big issues is academic restructuring and we've had recent discussions on that. ACD manual revisions will be completed this year. There will be revisions of the grievance processing. There will be some committee restructuring. There will be a Services and Academic Facilities Committee formed and a Financial Committee formed. There was a motion to form a research committee and I expect that will be adopted at the next meeting. At the higher levels, I've been to a couple of board of regents meetings. I was introduced to some big state issues. One big discussion was regarding the crisis in education, particularly within Arizona. Arizona is below the national averages. In order for the state to be better economically we need more people with advanced degrees. There is a strategic plan to be formed and the main goal is to double the number of baccalaureate degrees from all of the universities in the state by a factor of two by 2020. For more information, refer to the website. It is [www.highereducationsolution.com](http://www.highereducationsolution.com). The initiative is called The Solutions for Higher Education.

Joe wanted to go back to the issue of shared governance between the faculty and the administration which is an idea that UAC is really committed to. He said that many people believe that all of the authority that the faculty has comes from the president. Joe quoted the laws and policies of the University of Washington as an example of such a governance model. In Arizona, state law and ABOR policies give some authority directly to the faculty, with a duty

to participate in the governance and administration of the university. What the UAC wants to see is an enhanced role of faculty participation in the governance of institution. Faculty do participate in committees but we are having trouble getting enough people interested in serving on these committees. We are going to add more committees which means more work. This is part of the responsibility as elected representatives of the faculty. It is also part of the duties that all faculty have.

Regarding the earlier question about the first budget cut, the council has been talking about this. We are thinking about finding ways to set up structures so that there is communication from the faculty since they are responsible for the curriculum. I urge that you pick up the ball and participate at the senate level here and in your departments/units as much as you can.

## **IX. Adjournment**

Next meeting is Monday October 20<sup>th</sup>. Presiding Officer, Drew Ellis, adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:45 p.m.

## **CLAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

10/20/08

DRAFT

### **Senators in Attendance:**

Denise Bodman, Anthony Brazel, Tannah Broman, Richard Burg, John Chance, Hyaeweol Choi, Dale DeNardo, Andrew Ellis, Petra Fromme, Timothy Karcher, Mark Lussier, Mariana Maris, Helene Ossipov, Marie Provine, Shannon Ringenbach, Marta Sanchez, Otto Sankey, Georganne Scheiner, Leslie Towill, Jacqueline Wheeler, Quentin Wheeler, Stanley Williams, Cheshire Calhoun

### **Senators not in Attendance:**

Eugene Clay, Michael Dorman, Roxanne Doty, Abdullahi Gallab, Ted Guleserian, Eric Kostelich, Robert McPhee, Ileana Orlich, Seth Rose, James Rush, Edmund Stump, Ayanna Thompson, Marty Wojciechowski, Brandon Yoo

### **I. Call to Order**

Presiding Officer, Andrew Ellis, called the meeting to order at approximately 3:15 p.m.

### **II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the September 15, 2008 meeting were unanimously approved.

### **III. New Business**

Drew stated that there was no new business.

### **IV. Old Business**

Drew stated that the issue of old business is to follow up from the senate meeting which took place at the last meeting, last year. That was the establishment of the freshman seminar committee to investigate the business of freshman seminars within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Drew explained that these are the small 19 or less student population seminars that stem from the ASU 101 initiative and what the senate voted down in terms of the ASU 101 proposal. The curriculum committee subsequently charged us with forming a committee to address this issue. That discussion was on the 15<sup>th</sup> and we had two senators volunteer for that, Jackie and Tannah. We didn't have a lot of people tripping all over themselves volunteering but we did discuss the idea of including some people from outside the senate, as well as we had a

couple of senators representing us and we had some folks within the college that are very familiar with the freshman seminar idea, and so one week later, on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, we found ourselves with a committee of five. That was Jackie Wheeler from English, Tannah Broman from Kinesiology, Jennifer Fay from Kinesiology, Camille Newton from English and then Todd Stricherz. Todd is with the college's undergraduate program who understands the mechanics of what's involved here. So that was the five member committee on September 22<sup>nd</sup>. At this point Drew turned the meeting over to Jackie. He told Jackie that this is not a formal report coming from her but an update because the protocol of what they're putting together goes to the curriculum committee that requested this information. Drew explained that the proposal goes to the curriculum committee and then they digest it. Drew thinks that their plans are to do that at the November meeting and we should have that back to us for our November college senate meeting upon which we can vote.

Jackie said that they were nervous about meeting because they had no idea how they would address this issue, however, she said that they had a very productive meeting and made a proposal which essentially asks very little of the college except to slightly re-jigger some existing freshman seminars which already exist and do a good job, and so their task was easier than anticipated. This was mainly due to Todd who knew the numbers and the projected enrollment. Jackie said that they prepared a report and sent it to the Dean and have not heard back yet. Drew said that he had seen it and echoed that there was not any large burden being placed on faculty. Drew asked Shannon Keen if the curriculum committee was aware of the report. Shannon said that they do have it in their hands and it will be on their agenda for their next meeting which will be in approximately two weeks. Drew gave thanks to the committee. Mariana Maris asked if the recommendation is to use the freshman seminars that are currently on the books. Jackie said that yes that is it in a nutshell with very slight re-jiggering. Tannah stated that everything they are using is currently on the books. She said that she has heard that there are rumors with the Learning Communities and that could change things a little bit, but we have all of these seminars on the books so we really didn't need to introduce anything new. Drew thanked them again and asked them to pass on thanks to the non committee members.

Drew reminded everyone that there is only one other ad-hoc committee that is currently out there. This is the Bylaws and Constitution Committee. This hasn't been engaged yet but the committee still exists and it is down to a three person committee given that we lost some people from last year. Drew said the train was pretty far down the tracks as of last year, so hopefully at the end of this fall (if not the November meeting then the first meeting in the spring) we can get some documents in front of the senate for approval.

Drew concluded the old business.

## **V. Curriculum Committee Report**

Leslie Towill spoke on behalf of the curriculum committee. She said that everyone has a copy of the minutes before them that lists the changes that were approved. Leslie commented that some further clarification was requested in regards to the Japanese courses and the term co-requisite. Some of the committee felt that instead of the term co-requisites, they should be prerequisites. It

seemed that, as an example, Japanese 310 should have 309 as a prerequisite rather than a co-requisite. Leslie said that they are just asking for clarification.

## **VI. Report from the College Senator-at-Large**

Richard Burg did not have anything to report. He said that everything is on line and that there are no issues to add.

## **VII. Deans Report**

Dean Wheeler says that they have been immersed with plans for another round of budget cuts for the state, although happily the governor is gunning for us. She is doing her best to argue that the educational institutions are not the place to do this, but in the current climate it's impossible to believe that something won't reach us, so we are aggressively looking at options.

Quentin gave his thanks for the freshman seminar. He said that he was sorry that he missed the report but that the news was fantastic. Quentin said that must be a record for efficiency. He said that was great all around and for the students. He said that we have our new schools, and the various affected units have voted so the foundations of those are in place. The faculties of the affected units will have a lot of work to do now obviously to define them. The faculty own those and will determine in detail what those look like from the inside. Quentin said that we have, for the first time since he has been Dean, an active strategic planning committee. What he is trying to do is get out ahead on the planning process. He would like to hear from the faculty, not only through the committee but through this body as well, and through any other source, the best ideas for planning for the future of the college and grappling these financial issues among other things. Quentin said that the strategic planning committee is going to be very important so that we don't end up in the same situation as we did with these schools, of sort of railroading it through after the fact, but rather let's try to get well ahead so that when the time comes, these are the directions we want to go, this is the type of thing we want to be doing. Quentin is very hopeful that this body will be useful but he thinks the senate should be playing that role as well, to advise the college on where they see opportunities for directions that we ought to be moving as we plan for the future. Part of that is this exercise that's ongoing to grand challenge questions. There will be a capital campaign of sorts by the university that will focus around grand challenge questions that are at the intersection of various disciplines where we can bring the intellectual power together to tackle really complicated and large issues facing either the academy or as much as possible facing society. Quentin said that he thinks that this is really exciting and it's another opportunity to intellectually define where the leading edge of the college is, both within individual units as well as the college as a whole. He said that those are ideas that you should be talking to your colleagues about and then passing advice back to him as to where you see those opportunities. Quentin has asked the heads of all the units to give him ideas. He got some ideas and forwarded 135 ideas upstairs. He stated that he is not sure of the process that the Foundation is using to prioritize those but at some point they will come back. He said that if there are others



that they have missed, that come up from the faculty, he would like to know about those as well. Quentin then opened up the meeting for questions.

Mariana Maris commented that her department (Mathematics) already has the notification that there will be promotions or that the promotion to the principle lecturer will be available to senior lecturers. However, the lecturers that applied for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer (some of whom were notified last year) still haven't been promoted. Mariana said that they were notified that their promotion went through from lecturer to senior lecturer but it is not on the books and their rank is still at lecturer right now. Then there were people that applied last August and still haven't been notified if the promotion went through or not. Some of Mariana's colleagues were asking when they will find out. Quentin said that he will investigate this.

Mariana posed another question. She asked when the rolling contracts kick in? Quentin said that he thought that issue had been dealt with. Mariana said that they have 30 people that opted to switch from a 3 year contract to a rolling contract and they don't know if that is happening or if they have to do a two year review or what is going on. Mariana said that some of them are in their last year of their 3 year contract. They don't know if it's going to roll over or if there is something they need to do. Quentin said that he will have to check on that as well.

Mariana had another question to add. She said that since they lost 10 instructors last year, they still have a few left over and they are wondering if there are any opportunities for them to be promoted to lecturers, or because of budget cuts that is not an option. Quentin said that with the budget cuts, that is going to be tough. He said that they are talking to Wayne and Fabio and others about whether there's a way to increase the capacity in (at least) the first year math classes. Our hope is that we will be able to avoid losing any lecturers. Quentin said that (of course) our needs in the fall are greater than they are in the spring, so we really don't want to lose people that are very good at what they're doing and that we need in the fall. So there may be a chance of delivering some of the math, even on other campuses, as an alternative to actually losing someone. He said they they are looking into that right now and it's still early in the process. Mariana said that class sizes have already gone way up. She said that this semester she has 5 classes at 40 a piece. For spring they are up to 60. Quentin said that they may be larger before they're done. He said that they are looking at that. Quentin said that he was told that the class size is not the determining factor. Mariana said that it is assessing the level that they're at that is more difficult with large class sizes because multiple choice exams are ineffective in Mathematics. She said that she spent 30 hours grading exams last week. Quentin said that if they can be convinced of the pedagogical reasons then they can go to bat to defend whatever the right size is, but he is being told by outside sources that this is not the primary limitation. Quentin said that English is a more difficult process to deliver because you can't do essays with 200 in a class and grade them. Quentin told Mariana that the more information she can feed to Fabio and Wayne, the better. Mariana said that Fabio is collecting information.

Hyaewool Choi asked Quentin if he could give a little more information on the reorganization. Quentin said that Religious Studies voted to join History and Philosophy as a new school. Film and Media Studies did not. Quentin said there will be more information on that shortly.

## **VIII. Announcements**

Drew announced that the next meeting is November 17<sup>th</sup>. He said that this should be a significant meeting from the standpoint that we hope to have something back from the curriculum committee on the freshman seminar issue. Therefore, we may be voting on that particular issue.

**IX. Adjournment**

Presiding Officer, Drew Ellis, adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:00 p.m.

## **CLAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

11/17/08

DRAFT

### **Senators in Attendance:**

Denise Bodman, Anthony Brazel, Tannah Broman, Cheshire Calhoun, John Chance, Eugene Clay, Dale DeNardo, Andrew Ellis, Petra Fromme, Abdullahi Gallab, Timothy Karcher, Mark Lussier, Mariana Maris, Robert McPhee, Ileana Orlich, Helene Ossipov, Marie Provine, Shannon Ringenbach, Seth Rose, Marta Sanchez, Otto Sankey, Georganne Scheiner, Leslie Towill, Stanley Williams

### **Senators not in Attendance:**

Hyaeweol Choi, Michael Dorman, Roxanne Doty, Eric Kostelich, James Rush, Edmund Stump, Ayanna Thompson, Jacqueline Wheeler, Brandon Yoo

### **I. Call to Order**

Presiding Officer, Andrew Ellis, called the meeting to order at approximately 3:15 p.m. Drew reminded everyone that this is the last meeting of the fall and that we will reconvene in the spring.

### **II. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the October 20, 2008 meeting were unanimously approved.

### **III. New Business**

Drew stated that Karin Ellison was joining us. She is from the Center of Biology and Society and also a Dean's fellow. As part of this program, she was charged with developing an academic integrity policy for the college. She attended meeting to provide some information and to take any questions regarding this. Drew let everyone know that the printed information was also available on the table.

Karin explained that she has been working with Barb Colby and others within the College. She explained that the Student Integrity Policy is not new, and it is University wide. Karin said that they were looking at how the College implements it because the broad policy is implemented by each academic college. She said that they spent some time looking at what other colleges at ASU are doing, what some of our peers are doing, and they talked to chairs and directors. They came to three main conclusions:

- 1) The critical importance of faculty as setting the tone in the matters of academic integrity. Most of these issues are in the classroom. The faculty makes the decisions about sanctioning. Faculty members have the authority to change the grade to an assignment grade or a course grade. If they wish to assign the XE, which is a specific failure due to academic dishonesty, the faculty member requests that and it's reviewed at the college level. None of that has changed. They want to clarify what the various rules and responsibilities are. This can be seen on the back of the handout.
- 2) The second need is the need for good resources for faculty members when they work with students and for students as they are trying to learn how to appropriately use sources and other things that seem harder than they should. They will be posting on the website, some syllabi statements that people can use. Several will be aimed at different types of courses; lab, writing, and test based dishonesty. There are examples for faculty on where to start thinking about an appropriate sanction for an incident in a class. They are going to put up links for students to good resources on student integrity matters.
- 3) The final area is the issue of what to do with students who have had academic integrity issues in one class and they have it in a second class, and at this point there's no way to know that. They have looked at a number of peer institutions who have reported systems and they are going to try one within the college so they're asking faculty who have sanctioned a student, reduced a grade, that you go on line and fill out a very short form that says what happened, and this will go to Barb. If Barb gets more than one on the same student, she can request additional sanctions because of the repeat issue. Barb explained that those will go before the College Grievance Committee. These will go through standard processes. Question posed: Do we only have to report cases where we assign an XE, or also minor cases? Karin says that what they're proposing is that faculty members report any actual sanction. If you have a heart to heart talk with a student and send them off, they don't need to hear about it, but if you change their assignment grade or course grade or recommend the XE, then go ahead and report that.

Karin reviewed some of the information on the handout. She said that most of it is clarification of existing practices. She said that they formalized the part about the ability for a student to meet with a unit representative. Sometimes students are uncomfortable talking to faculty members, or they don't want to go to the Dean's office. The idea is that they can meet with a chair or the director of undergraduate studies or whoever is appropriate. If that meeting takes place, that information can then go back to Barb. If there is, ultimately, a hearing on the case, the reflections of the unit/representative get fed into the hearing process. Barb also said that the reporting form will go to Barb and also to the chair or director of the unit, so that person can be informed of the activity of the student. The appeal and hearing process are a continuation of how we've been operating. Question posed: Is this available as an electronic document? Karin said that it will be, but it's not right now. Robert McPhee asked: If a grade was lowered in an assignment, would he need to let them know? Karin said that yes they would like that to be reported. Barb said that this part of the revision comes from the faculty so that one student doesn't go from class to class doing this. In addition, Barb said they are discussing whether our college should report a case of academic integrity to a student's college, because we have students at other colleges taking our classes. Petra asked...what happens when this comes to the attention of the faculty member after the grade has been assigned? Petra explained a similar situation that a fellow faculty member has recently encountered. Barb said that they have

something called an “academic record change” for prior semester. Barb also suggested that they make plans to speak about that particular case.

On a different note, Barb said that something that students are befuddled by is “inappropriate collaboration”. And, we need to remind faculty to be very clear about what kind of collaboration, how it gets reported, and what’s expected. Petra asked if this counts for written assignments, or class participation? Barb said that it is Petra’s class, so it is her call. Karin said that if grade points are taken away, then they would like to know about it. Barb said to please direct any ideas or questions to herself or Karin via Outlook.

#### **IV. Old Business**

Drew stated that there wasn’t any old business to report.

#### **V. Curriculum Committee Report**

Ileana Orlich asked if there were any questions regarding the report. A Senator asked if Ileana could explain some of the context of the discussions. Ileana said that the Freshman Seminar Report is self explanatory, based on the handout provided. She said that there was a request to disestablish the American Indian Studies Certificate. She then said that there was a request to modify the Creative Writing Curriculum. Ileana said that most of the issues were voted upon unanimously. There were new courses and they are listed on the handout. School of Global Studies is offering new courses. This is the second time the committee looked at these materials and they felt good about it. The School of Justice and Social Inquiry was very well substantiated. Question posed: Are syllabi required for all of these new classes? Ileana said yes there are always syllabi. Ileana said that there was a very long list for the School of Life Sciences and only one was approved.

Petra Fromme expressed her concerns about the modified curriculum for life sciences. She is concerned that they removed the “or its equivalence” and the “instructor approval” option. She said that this will pose a problem for students transferring from a community college. A senator suggested that these courses are cross-listed in the GEC so that any community college course that is comparable would be cross listed, and the student would be able to get into the course without any problem. Petra said that she doesn’t think so. Petra said that removing this will cause problems for the students trying to get into these courses. Dale DeNardo commented that this is a very valid point and may have been an oversight. He added that one of the problems was that all of the prerequisites were lost or we had changes in course names, which led to school wide updates of the prerequisites. Gerry said that when SOLS redid these, they did them with great care. There was thought, but it’s always possible that a detail was overlooked. Gerry said she would find out. Also, she said that historically our local schools articulate so DARS and the system read the prerequisites for all the schools that we articulate with. Gerry said that for those schools that are out of state that have transferred, her guess is that when the student sees the advisor and they send them to the department to look at the courses, they can have them okay’d to go into DARS and those issues shouldn’t be there. Gerry said that she is not certain about this and asked if it was alright with everyone if she finds out process wise if there are going to be any difficulties. Petra said that she is reluctant to approve this at the moment. She said that she would like to have the problem solved before they vote on it. Drew said that the prerequisites listed by the school are those they know they can get into PeopleSoft. He doesn’t think the school has any intention of eliminating instructor approval or equivalent courses. He

thinks that maybe you can't put that in PeopleSoft. Currently none of it is listed in PeopleSoft. He doesn't feel that the intent of the school is to be restrictive.

Drew asked if the Freshman Seminar was approved by the committee. Ileana said yes it was approved. Denise Bodman asked if this means that we are going to require all freshmen to attend a seminar class. Tannah Broman explained that this shouldn't be a problem because all of these courses are on the books already. Denise said the issue is that this has not always been a requirement and can be a problem for students. Tannah said there are a lot of classes to choose from. Gerry Corey said that there will be 2400 seats available in academic clusters. Denise asked... if a student already has 120 hours, then they will now have 121? Gerry said she will check on that. Helene Ossipov expressed her concern. She said that given this economic situation with lines being slashed and people losing jobs, she wonders if this is a good idea to make a requirement now. She added that we could strongly recommend it, but if we require it, it could tie our hands. Tannah said that it's easier to find students to teach these than faculty. They didn't want to ask for more from the faculty. They thought that if we rely on the students, it's good for the students teaching and the students learning. Question posed: How were the peers selected? Tannah said that she couldn't speak for all departments, but in her academic success clusters, faculty provided names of students they recommend. Gerry said that there is an interview process, training, and oversight, so that they're not on their own. Tannah said that the peer teacher does get credit for teaching the class. Petra asked if all students have to declare a major when they come and if not what happens to students who do not belong to an academic unit. Tannah said that she doesn't know about that. Tannah said that there are enough free standing courses to accommodate all students, including those that have not declared a major. Gerry said that the students that have not declared a major are in the University College and they have the courses provided to them. Marie Provine asked...how many credit hours are there? Tannah said they left it broad for a reason. She said that everything is currently a 1 credit course but that they left it out on purpose so that it left them some wiggle room in case a course comes up in the future that is potentially equivalent. Question posed: Does that imply that they only meet for part of the semester or not very often? Tannah said that the classes that her department offers are meeting once a week, for one hour, for the whole semester. Alan said that there are some that do not meet all 13 weeks...some are 5, 7, or 9. Robert McPhee asked...what happens if a student signs up for a section of this and after the second or third week drops out of it, and yet completes other credits? Gerry said they have 10 sections scheduled for spring for students who need to retake it. Question posed: What is the deciding factor on the 5, 7, 9 weeks? Alan said it depends on what people want to do. Mark Lussier said that, in English, it's easier to staff and pursue 5 weeks. Gerry said that the 5 week and the hybrids came into play to make the ASU 101 happen that first semester. Gerry added that it is a bad idea to have a 5 week section at the end of the semester because it is too late to be introducing some of these things. Question posed: Does the option exist to do 5 weeks, no hybrid? Tannah said yes, they left it broad. Tannah said that the students in her department that take these classes like them. She also added that these are graded courses. Robert McPhee asked if they can repeat this course. Tannah said yes.

To try to prevent busting the curriculum committee report into a couple of pieces, Drew asked if we can agree that the School of Life Sciences did not purposefully modify prerequisites to exclude those that have taken equivalencies and, in the meantime, have Gerry look more deeply

into that and bring it back to us as an information item. Drew then asked for a motion to approve the curriculum committee report. It was approved unanimously.

## **VI. Report from the College Senator-at-Large**

Richard Burg could not be here and on short notice did not have someone to fill in regarding the last meeting. Drew said that he understands that there was a lot going on in the last meeting and that it became quite contentious, so if you have questions, you can email Richard in the interim. Drew said that hopefully Richard will double up in February, but for now you can email him at [burg@asu.edu](mailto:burg@asu.edu).

## **VII. Deans Report**

Alan reported on behalf of Quentin, who was out of town. Alan thanked everyone for a successful homecoming weekend. Alan said it went great and we had a good crowd. The Deans have been spending a lot of time addressing budget issues. They've been instructed, by the senior administration, to do a variety of plans to achieve certain goals in terms of our expense side of the ledger. Alan said that they submitted these and have not heard back yet. Alan said that it's virtually impossible to do a budget cut midyear, although that's what they've been asked to do. He said that they anticipate that there will be a second budget cut in the next fiscal year, starting July 1. Alan said that as soon as they know anything they will pass that on through chairs and directors to all the units. They are also working hard to look at the resource side of the ledger, such as tuition and enrollment. Alan thanked the units that participated in the summer session courses. He said that enrollment went up about 22 percent. Alan said that is very good news since that money comes directly to the college and a portion to the units. He said that we're trying the same thing with winter session. Enrollment is under way. We've already exceeded the numbers we had last year. Our goal is to reach 3000 enrollments for winter session. Alan said that as our online options grow, our summer and winter sessions will continue to grow as well. Alan said that the other fundamentally important part of the resource size is retention. For our college last year, retention was flat. The goal is to get ASU, across the board, to hit 90 percent. Our numbers are still in the high 70's or just at 80%. Alan said that this is one of the best ways to generate resources. We spend money attracting students, we bring them here, we put on first year classes at great expense, and then if they leave, that investment is lost. Retention is a very important focal point for every one of the faculty and staff. We continue to invest in the areas where we think that retention can be helped. With some contributions from the provost office, we have a net addition of advisors in the college of ten this year. We're trying to work on a number where every 300-350 students has a full time professional advisor. Alan said that advisors are trained to know what all of the options within the college are. He also said that retention is not keeping a student in your major...retention is keeping a student at ASU. Even if you advise them to go to another college, that's still good for ASU. We continue to invest in advising, both in terms of new positions and professional training for them. We're also working with front office staff and other staff in all the units because their interactions with students is part of the impressions that students form about Arizona State and about whether they're willing to stay here and pursue their education. We also have an excellence committee that we've established with representatives from across the college. Our goal is to start, internally, in our own college, to insure that all of us know what a great college we are. We have incredible points of pride that we need to be able to recite to others, and we need to have our

recruiters aware of that. Alan said there are a number of efforts going on, on that front. We are also going to be focusing (in the coming years) on more recruitment efforts in California. The California state system has put a cap on enrollment...they're not going to fund any new student growth in that system. There's going to be a lot of otherwise very talented students that won't be able to go to school in California. Alan said that the UC system is much more expensive than we are, so they feel that this is an area where we can attract some exceptionally good students with the double bonus that they'll pay out of state fees and help our tuition revenue even more. Alan said that the president and provost made a commitment that there are absolutely no plans to touch any tenure, tenure track, faculty positions. He said they're looking at all of the other areas as a way to conserve our resources. Alan said that he doesn't know what the level of the next cut will be. There is a proposal before the academic affairs committee of ABOR, which will be discussed the week of November 20<sup>th</sup>, to create three new schools in the college 1) The School of Social Transformation 2) The School of History, Religion, and Philosophy 3) The School of Politics, Government, and Global Studies. It does not need to go back to ABOR because the academic affairs committee has authority to make decisions of that sort. After that decision is made, the new schools will be more formally announced, steering committees will be created to plan how they will function in their new situation. Alan said that they expect those reports to be completed at the end of the academic year.

Marie Provine asked this question: As we bring new students in, are they a net revenue producer or a drain as we lose state funding? Alan said that what we've been working very hard at and we finally achieved this year (although the money wasn't behind it) is that there was a formula for how much money the state gives you per full-time equivalent. The formula was one that Arizona got more money than we did. Crow convinced ABOR and the state to move to a formula that would bring in additional revenue of some 40-50 million dollars, but then that was cut. Alan said that our college, this year (because of enrollment growth) got new revenue, just under 2 million dollars from the provost. Alan said we got new money and then had to give it back because of the budget cut. Alan said that the answer is yes...new students do bring in new money, and the amount varies across the University. Alan added that it helps that we're trying to add fee structures across the college to try to compensate for some of the additional costs in labs with high equipment costs. Petra had a suggestion to increase retention. She suggested that when submitting the 'early warning form', that there be an extra box on the form where the professor can put some encouraging words. She has been doing that and has seen improvement with the students. Alan said that one of the most critical components as to whether a student comes back the second year, is direct contact with the faculty. Mariana Maris commented that the increased class sizes are going to back fire because her classes (Math 210/211) were capped at 40 with 5 sections. That's 200 students. She has 5 office hours per week and she makes appointments. With all of that she has had situations where she's had 15 people during her office hour with different questions. They would wait 40 minutes for their turn and she wouldn't get to answer their questions. They would leave frustrated, and then after failing the exam, they would drop the course. They would say that there was no point in going to office hours because she didn't get to help them. Mariana also said that in a large class you're working with a limited amount of time and can't answer everyone's questions. Alan said there's no easy answer to this and it is a challenge. Alan agreed that these are very valid points. Alan believes that the success cluster idea is a good one. We're looking at the scale ability of doing that more broadly across the college. Alan said that we will have 25 seats this fall. The value of that is that the students



move around to classes of different size, but they have a cohort that they get to know in one of those groups, so they know 18 other students. So, even if they go to a class with 200 in it, they know some other students in that class and probably studied and worked together. Mariana said that she encourages her students to study together and with classes of 40 she was able to put them into groups. She said she won't be able to do any group work with a class of 75. Alan said our problem is always scale ability and that any ideas are more than welcome.

A question was raised as to whether there is a hiring freeze for faculty positions or any part of CLAS. Alan said no there is no freeze nor will there be one. Question posed: To what extent are these seminars taught by faculty? Tannah said that it varies but that most of them are going to be taught by peers; junior and/or seniors. Tannah thought that maybe 40-45% courses on the books were taught by faculty, but she wasn't sure about that. Alan thought that it might even be higher. Seth Rose said that some nine senior faculty were in the ASU 101 program in his department.

### **VIII. Announcements**

Reminder: next meeting is February 2<sup>nd</sup>.

### **IX. Adjournment**

Presiding Officer, Drew Ellis, adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:00 p.m.

## **CLAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

02/02/09

DRAFT

### **Senators in Attendance:**

David Altheide, Denise Bodman, Anthony Brazel, Tannah Broman, John Chance, Hyaewool Choi, Eugene Clay, Dale DeNardo, Andrew Ellis, Abdullahi Gallab, Ted Guleserian, Timothy Karcher, Mark Lussier, Mariana Maris, Helene Ossipov, Shannon Ringenbach, Seth Rose, Marta Sanchez, Otto Sankey, Ayanna Thompson, Leslie Towill, Jacqueline Wheeler, Marty Wojciechowski, Brandon Yoo

### **Senators not in Attendance:**

Michael Dorman, Roxanne Doty, Petra Fromme, Eric Kostelich, Linda Lederman, Deborah Losse, Robert McPhee, Ileana Orlich, James Rush, Georganne Scheiner, Edmund Stump, Stanley Williams

### **Deans in Attendance:**

Alan Artibise, Quentin Wheeler, Paul LePore

### **I. Call to Order**

Presiding Officer, Andrew Ellis, called the meeting to order at approximately 3:15 p.m.

### **II. Approval of Minutes**

Drew asked if anyone had any corrections or changes to make regarding the minutes from the November 17, 2008 meeting. Ted Gulesarian had a request for a change. He asked that his name be stricken from the absent list because he was on sabbatical and had a department approved substitute, Cheshire Calhoon. For the same reason, Marty Wojciechowski also asked for his name to be stricken from the absent list, although he didn't have a department appointed replacement. Ted said that there was a comment attributed to him on the last page (of the minutes) that he did not say.

Drew said that we would make some changes to the reporting of attendance and make it a little more detailed. Rather than have 'in attendance' or 'not in attendance' we will have some room on there for "proxies" and "excused absences". Drew said that we would talk more about this a little later in the meeting.

Drew asked for a show of hands. The November 17, 2008 meeting minutes were unanimously approved, pending the corrections.

### **III. New Business**

Drew stated that a couple of senators from the last few meetings who were not here but had either sent a proxy or gotten approval for not being here, recommended that the executive committee take a look at providing a little more detail in terms of the minutes...who's in

attendance, who's not. The executive committee has discussed this very briefly so if you have suggestions between now and the next meeting, which is only two weeks away, certainly send them along. At this point we have decided to come up with four categories: 1) present 2) absent with proxy 3) excused absence 4) absent. We plan to implement this at the next meeting. This will hopefully clear up any problems that were just mentioned.

#### **IV. Old Business**

Drew stated that the only thing on the agenda of Old Business is from the Bylaws Committee. Helene Ossipov said that there have been revisions made. They have discussed them and passed them around. Tannah Broman said that they are at the end point of revisions from their side and that Shannon is putting everything together for them and they should have something soon. Shannon said she still has a couple of questions for the committee in terms of changing some language. Shannon said the only big issue would be the selection of the presiding officer and said that the goal is to have something out to the senators within the next week. Drew said that they are hoping to put this to bed by the end of the semester. Shannon added that once the senate approves the bylaws they still have to be sent out to the faculty for a vote. She would like to have them sent out, if possible, with the spring ballots for the selection of committee members.

#### **V. Curriculum Committee Report**

Shannon announced that the Curriculum Committee hasn't met yet this semester, but that they would have a report this Friday. Drew asked if we will have it at the next meeting, February 16, and the answer was yes.

#### **VI. Report from the College Senator-at-Large**

Drew announced that we no longer have a College Senator at Large. Richard Burg, who was serving in that capacity, can no longer serve. Shannon said that History has not yet provided a replacement but that the Senator at Large position doesn't exist anymore. Drew said that the University Senate no longer recognizes a Senator at Large in their body from any of their colleges. The only issue that this brings up, in the short term, is reports from the University Senate. Drew asked if anyone who was at the meeting had anything to report. Ayanna Thompson stated that President Crow spoke about the budget/furloughs and we've all received word about that. Ayanna also said that there were a bunch of CAPC motions that all passed. She said that she takes notes at the meetings and offered to bring them with her to our next meeting. Quentin added that one of the CAPC items is that we now have a School of Mathematics and Statistics as opposed to a department. Quentin said that it took some effort to get that through.

Drew said that on the March 23rd meeting, he will be in Las Vegas for an annual conference so he won't be able to attend that meeting. Drew said that maybe we will have the constitution and bylaws ready for a discussion and a possible vote on that particular day. We can entertain the idea of the Bylaws Committee running the meeting in his absence. Drew mentioned that the next meeting is February 16 and then we have the March 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

#### **VII. Deans Report**

Quentin reported that the most difficult thing about this process is trying to manage our way through uncertainty. We're still anxiously awaiting clarification of what the cuts in 2010 will be.

Quentin thanked everyone that has been involved in the fantastic successes we have had in the last year. Last summer our enrollments went up by better than 20 percent...about 22 percent. Winter enrollments were up more than 30 percent. Quentin added that there will be some additional clarification from HR about some of the implications of the implementation of the furlough. Quentin said that there is another option where you can opt for a reduction in pay. The distinction being...if you opt for a reduction in pay, then you can work during the time when you're not being paid, as opposed to a furlough which under federal guidelines suggest that if you are on furlough you are not to be working. The best option depends on an individual's particular circumstance. David Altheide brought up a concern regarding vertical cuts. Quentin said that the best guess is that probably within the next couple of weeks we will know if the stimulus package is coming through, and if so, hopefully, what Arizona's share will be. Alan said that there is one deadline in terms of the calendar and that is April 1<sup>st</sup> because for everyone that is on a year contract (which is virtually all staff), we are obligated by law to inform them on or about April 1<sup>st</sup> about what will happen to their contract for the next year. At the very least we have a budget cut of 25 million next year. Ayanna Thompson asked if the furlough is a one-time option. Alan said no, it can be done again. Alan said that Michael has reiterated over and over again that the University is absolutely committed to protecting its core operation which are all tenure and tenure track faculty. Even if we were to close a campus, we wouldn't lay off tenure and tenure track faculty. A senator asked if lecturers are included in faculty. Alan said no, only tenure and tenure track faculty are the commitment. The best tangible evidence to the commitment to staff is the reason that we're all doing this furlough because the alternative was for staff to lose their positions immediately. The University decided that rather than to inflict that upon the staff, this was a better way of coping with it. Jacqueline Wheeler mentioned that Vice President Searle has frozen their multi-year contracts. She said that another point about lecturers that is often overlooked, is that they often run programs in addition to teaching programs, so they have taken that load off of track faculty for many years now. Anthony Brazel asked how U of A is coping with this. Quentin said that we should all thank Michael for forcing us to make plans. It has been a full year that we have been pre-occupied with dealing with the budget, but because of that we were ahead of the curve (as painful as it was) and we had already accounted for most of the savings this year and nearest we can tell U of A is just now sort of coming to hard grips with reality. Ayanna Thompson asked if there was ever a consideration to shut down the University for two weeks during spring break. Alan said that it was considered but the problem with that is that if you shut down for two weeks then you get no pay for that time period. You would lose a whole pay check and a lot of people can't afford to do that. Doing it over five months allows you to spread it out. Secondly, the impact that it may have on students was considered. Dale DeNardo asked what kind of thoughts are going towards controlling the students increased tuition rates. Alan said that the freshman classes are the only ones that we've not made a commitment to. Dale asked what kind of percentage they are thinking about. Quentin said that he hasn't heard a percentage but that a range of options are under consideration and it will be governed by ABOR as to what the final number is. Quentin said that we can compete with peer institutions that charge substantially more and the advantage of doing that is that you can plow a lot more money back into financial aid for students so that we wouldn't be turning away students for financial reasons. Alan said that one of the key fundamental misunderstandings is that the legislators look at the total ASU budget, 225 million of which is externally funded research and they take the percentage out of that total number. They don't understand that we have commitments to spend every one of those dollars in a

contractual way based on the granting agency that provided those funds. A senator asked if there is any plan to rebut. Alan said yes, Michael and the team of people that deal with the state are in the middle of this and they are contacting through the Coalition for Solutions in Higher Education. If you are not on that list serve, then you should get on it. Quentin said that it is not an overstatement to say...had we not engaged in that rebuttal to the legislature this present cut would have been 100 million more. Helene Ossipov had a question regarding the stimulus package. She said that she has read that there will be strings attached. Does that indicate that they may turn it down? Alan said that the strings attached would almost certainly be very reasonable.

Alan introduced Paul LePore. He stated that Paul is the new Associate Dean for the Office of Student and Academic Programs. He is joining us from the University of Washington where he had a somewhat similar position.

Alan said that one of the other reorganizations that has now been approved is the School of Planning. It is moving from the former College of Design into our School of Geographical Sciences.

Timothy Karcher asked for clarification on the furlough issue. Alan said that Academic Professionals have to take a minimum of 4 hour blocks. Timothy asked if there is going to be a publication coming from HR that describes this in good clarity. Alan said yes, there should be three things coming out this week; an updated Q&A from HR on furloughs, a new communication on taking a reduction of pay in lieu of furloughs, and we are trying to work with HR to have a management tool for senior staff and chairs and directors to get all this down so you can figure out when people are there and when they're not there. Tannah said that there has been some concern that the pain of the cuts that we've made are not going to be readily apparent to the legislature. Tannah asked if sending them a message has been a consideration. Alan said that yes, that has been discussed in great length. The most important thing we can do is to talk to a lot of people out there and get them to have a better understanding about what we do. David Altheide said that it would be worthwhile to try to provide a way to flood the media with information. He asked what impact the furlough is having on the quality of administering the students and teaching. Alan agreed by saying that advisors don't have as many hours. David said that this is an important message to get out because the last thing that we want to get out is that we did all these cuts and we're still doing the same high quality job. Alan said that he can assure him that our Public Relations office is thinking very seriously about that and trying to do some messaging about it. Quentin said that while he agrees that we should find these messages to the outside world (to the public) about the dangers of these cuts, at the same time, internally, it's important that we message with each other that we haven't lost sight of why we're here. We have to keep our eyes on the prize because as painful as this is, two or three years from now things will look brighter and we can't allow ourselves to weaken the fundamentals of the institution or lose sight of our goals.

Timothy Karcher asked if it is possible for the University system in the state to sue the legislature because they're not following the constitution. Alan said there is a paper out there (provided by Michael) about whether or not the state of Arizona is meeting its constitutional obligations for higher education. .

### **VIII. Announcements**

We are doubled up with senate meetings this month. The next meeting is February 16th.

.

**IX. Adjournment**

Presiding Officer, Drew Ellis, adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:00 p.m.

## CLAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

02/16/09

DRAFT

**Senators in Attendance:** David Altheide, Denise Bodman, Anthony Brazel, Tannah Broman, Hyaewool Choi, Eugene Clay, Dale DeNardo, Andrew Ellis, Ted Guleserian, Timothy Karcher, Eric Kostelich, Mariana Maris, Ileana Orlich, Helene Ossipov, Seth Rose, Marta Sanchez, Ayanna Thompson, Leslie Towill, Jacqueline Wheeler, Marty Wojciechowski

**Excused:** Mark Lussier, Shannon Ringenbach, Otto Sankey

**Excused with Proxy:** None

**Senators not in Attendance:** John Chance, Michael Dorman, Roxanne Doty, Petra Fromme, Abdullahi Gallab, Robert McPhee, James Rush, Georganne Scheiner, Edmund Stump, Stanley Williams, Brandon Yoo,

**Dean's Office Attendance:** Quentin Wheeler, Paul LePore, Gerry Corey, Shannon Keen, Kelly Goers

### I. Call to Order

Presiding Officer, Andrew Ellis, called the meeting to order at approximately 3:15 p.m.

### II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the February 2, 2009 meeting were unanimously approved

### III. New Business

Drew opened up the meeting to discuss the Bylaws Document. The sole purpose is to have a month to digest this document and then the committee can go back and take any recommendations coming from the Senate. Presumably, we can bring this to a vote at the March 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

Helene Ossipov started the report for the bylaws committee. She said they met several times to discuss various changes. She said that they cleaned up the language, took out the redundancies, and took out some references that were too precise. Tannah said that they worked on this document from the point of view that this is an advisory body. Ayanna Thompson brought up her concern about removing Article 8, which would take out any guidelines about Chair and Director terms. Tannah said that they avoided putting in specific language about terms. Jacqueline Wheeler suggested having a clause that says "including but not limited to". The point was made that it is good to have guidelines and we should create the guidelines, even if we are advisory. The Senators agreed to that the wording should be included. Helene asked for

suggestions on the wording and Shannon said that she would take the article being discussed and insert it into the Rights and Privileges of the College Assembly section, then send it out to the Bylaws committee for their review. A concern was raised regarding the wording of the membership of the assembly. Tannah said that this was written prior to personnel/administrative changes and therefore will need to be changed. Marta Sanchez commented that there is an inconsistency in voting. She said that the bylaws give lecturers a right to vote but that some departments do not allow them to vote. Suggestions were made to re-examine this and to improve the language.

Marty Wojciechowski commented that the document states that membership requires faculty members to hold at least a 0.5 FTE tenure track position in the College, yet there are several people in his department with less than that. He said that they reside in SOLS but are mainly in Biodesign. He asked what would happen to them. After discussion, it was decided to add "faculty members whose tenure home is in the College with the rank of assistant professor or above".

A discussion was brought up as to whether clause "C" should remain or be taken out. The clause states that "membership in the college assembly includes individuals who hold the rank of assistant professor or its equivalent in the Departments of Aerospace Studies and Military Science and whose appointments are 0.5 FTE or greater." These departments are not recognized at the University Senate level as having representation, although they do have voting rights. The question was posed as to whether this clause should remain. After further discussion, it was decided and voted upon to keep the clause in until which time as the departments representatives have had a chance to respond to this. Drew stated that if necessary, an amendment can be made at a later time.

Drew brought up the need to propose language to define the method of selection for the Presiding Officer to-be. It was agreed that adding language such as "the Presiding Officer will serve a two year term with the first year being the Presiding Officer Elect" would better define selection. Additional language was added further defining the role of Presiding Officer and Presiding Officer Elect, "in the event the Presiding Officer cannot serve, the Presiding Officer Elect serves as Presiding Officer. If the Presiding Officer Elect cannot serve, a special election will be called."

Drew said that you can still make suggestions or raise questions between now and next month's meeting. If possible, we can vote at that meeting. If there are still issues to discuss, then we will vote at the final meeting in April.

#### **IV. Old Business**

Marty Wojciechowski proposed that the minutes of these meetings include a list of all people that are present in the room. This was agreed upon.

#### **V. Curriculum Committee Report**

Ileana asked if anyone had questions regarding the Proposal to Revise the Science and Society Requirement. Marta Sanchez asked for clarification of reading the proposal. Ileana explained that the information at the bottom of the page (under #1) supersedes the information at the top of the page. A Senator asked if there are two specific courses that need to be taken, or are there several classes to choose from. Ileana said that there is a list of classes.



A question was asked as to why these two courses cannot be used to satisfy other major requirements at the same time as counting for Science and Society. Ileana said that had not been addressed.

During the discussion, there was interest for the language requirement to be re-examined. There was also a suggestion that we approve the proposal to move things forward, and then the committee can look at the Science and Society requirements and possibly loosen the requirements a little. Drew then asked the senate to vote on the approval of the traditional Curriculum Committee report. This was approved unanimously.

Drew then asked the senate to vote on the Proposal to Revise the Science and Society Requirement, with the understanding that the committee will listen to the suggestions being made and re-examine this. This was accepted by the majority vote.

#### **VI. Report from the College Senator-at-Large**

Jacqueline Wheeler and Ayanna Thompson spoke regarding the University Senate Report. Jacqueline said that there was a discussion by the Provost regarding the impending changes. The Provost said that they needed greater flexibility with the budget and that's why they're doing away with the three-year renewable contracts. They reported that all of the curriculum items passed and that the ACD changes are coming up for a vote. They urged everyone to take those revisions to the departments to discuss them.

#### **VII. Deans Report**

Quentin said that at the next meeting we should have a better sense of what 2010 is looking like. This is because we are not sure what the stimulus package means for Arizona yet, and we're not sure how the state legislature will handle what they are given.

#### **VIII. Announcements**

Drew announced that the next meeting is March 23, and the last meeting for the semester is April 20<sup>th</sup>.

#### **IX. Adjournment**

Presiding Officer, Drew Ellis, adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:00 p.m.

## CLAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

03/23/09

DRAFT

**Senators in Attendance:** David Altheide, Denise Bodman, Tannah Broman, Hyaeweol Choi, Eugene Clay, Dale DeNardo, Ted Guleserian, Timothy Karcher, Mariana Maris, Ileana Orlich, Helene Ossipov, Seth Rose, Marta Sanchez, Ayanna Thompson, Leslie Towill, Jacqueline Wheeler, Marty Wojciechowski, John Chance, Mark Lussier, Shannon Ringenbach,

**Excused:** Andrew Ellis (Tannah Broman sat in for Andrew)

**Absent with Proxy:** Netra Chetri - proxy for Tony Brazel

**Senators not in Attendance:** Michael Dorman, Robert McPhee, Roxanne Doty, Petra Fromme, Abdullahi Gallab, James Rush, Georganne Scheiner, Edmund Stump, Stanley Williams, Brandon Yoo, Eric Kostelich, Otto Sankey,

**Dean's Office Attendance:** Quentin Wheeler, Paul LePore, Gerry Corey, Shannon Keen, Kelly Goers

### I. Call to Order

Tannah Broman called the meeting to order at approximately 3:15 p.m.

### II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the February 16, 2009 meeting were unanimously approved, pending the following modifications:

Marta Sanchez asked for her statement to be revised regarding voting inconsistencies. She also asked for her statements to be identified by her name rather than "A Senator".

### III. New Business

No New Business to report

### IV. Old Business

The discussion opened up regarding the Constitution and Bylaws. Quentin explained that he was proposing alternative wording to page 3, paragraph IV. D. 2. He provided a copy of the proposed new paragraph. Ayanna Thompson asked if this means that he doesn't want the voting. Quentin explained that this is less restrictive as to how the units want to provide the input. Ileana suggested some clarification language to be added. Quentin agreed with that. Ted Guleserian said that people in a unit can be easily intimidated and that a vote (by secret ballot) would allow you to get peoples thoughts. Ted said that if you don't have a vote from them, then you don't know what a department really thinks. Quentin said that, before an appointment or a reappointment, the Dean's ask for candid input from everyone in the unit. Ayanna stated that junior faculty and lecturers do not give candid feedback because these people feel vulnerable. Quentin said that this input is secret. He wants to emphasize, when they solicit input, that this is

for the Dean's eyes only and it won't be shared with the candidate. Quentin said that he wants to be sure that the information that goes out makes it very clear as to why they are getting that information, what they're going to do with it, and who they won't share it with. Denise Bodman said that she had the understanding that when they chose a chair it was like they were out there choosing who they wanted to lead them. She said that it feels like faculty centered governance is getting further and further away. Quentin said that it is not in the Dean's interest to force someone upon them that they don't want. They are going to listen to all of the concerns very carefully, but there may be circumstances where they need to extend an appointment for a year or two years for some other practical reason. Mark Lussier raised a concern as to whether the unit's bylaws would be in conflict with CLAS's new, more specific bylaws. He thought that there would be pressure, in their revisionary process, to mirror the new language. He added that since this discussion would take place in a meeting, some people would not be willing to speak in that open forum. It was suggested that verbiage be added that would address these concerns. After much discussion, it was unanimously voted on to change the paragraph to the following wording:

Chairs and Directors are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Dean of the College. The typical appointment in the College is for a five year term, with an initial appointment of three years, review at three years, and continued appointment for two years with satisfactory performance. Decisions regarding appointment, reappointment, or extension will be determined by the Dean utilizing actively-solicited recommendations from the department, including votes, anonymous evaluations, and/or other mechanisms outlined in the unit bylaws.

Marta Sanchez brought up the concern that "affirmative action" is used in one of the paragraphs and suggested that the wording of "affirmative action" be replaced by "diversity". This was agreed upon. Jacqueline Wheeler brought up a concern regarding paragraph VI. B. 8. It was agreed upon that the wording following the word "diversity" was unnecessary and should be removed. This motion was approved. A Senator asked when a fully finished, revised version will be available. Shannon said that she will revise this document and then send it back to the Bylaws Committee to make sure that all of the changes have been captured. She said that it will be distributed to the units fairly soon. It may take a little longer due to limited staff. A Senator asked if this will be on the web and Shannon said that they can make it available on the web. As soon as it is available, Shannon will send out the link to everyone so they can reference it.

#### **V. Curriculum Committee Report**

There were no questions or concerns raised. Report was unanimously approved.

#### **VI. Report from the College Senator-at-Large**

There has not been a University Senate meeting since the last CLAS Senate meeting.

#### **VII. Deans Report**

Quentin thanked the Senate for their work on the Bylaws. Quentin said that they hope that they are finished with the 2009 budget cuts but that there are no guarantees until we know what the legislature is going to do with the stimulus package. The Dean's are spending much of their time working on the projected cuts for 2010. The amount of the cuts are still uncertain.

Quentin said that he is hoping that people will be informed by the end of March. A question was asked if any of the money from the Federal Stimulus package comes directly to the University, rather than through the legislature. Quentin said no, not that he is aware of.

**VIII. Announcements**

The last meeting is Monday, April 20<sup>th</sup>. Chairs and Directors evaluations are going to be distributed to the unit faculty via the Senators very soon. Shannon said that she will try to have these ready the first week of April.

**IX. Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45.

## CLAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

04/27/09

DRAFT

**Senators in Attendance:** David Altheide, Denise Bodman, Anthony Brazel, Tannah Broman, John Chance, Andrew Ellis, Timothy Karcher, Mark Lussier, Mariana Maris, Helene Ossipov, Shannon Ringenbach, Seth Rose, Marta Sanchez, Otto Sankey, Ayanna Thompson, Leslie Towill, Jacqueline Wheeler, Marty Wojciechowski

**Excused:** none

**Absent with Proxy:** none

**Senators not in Attendance:** Hyaeweol Choi, Eugene Clay, Dale DeNardo, Michael Dorman, Roxanne Doty, Petra Fromme, Abdullahi Gallab, Ted Guleserian, Eric Kostelich, Robert McPhee, Ileana Orlich, James Rush, Georganne Scheiner, Edmund Stump, Stanley Williams, Brandon Yoo

**Dean's Office Attendance:** Quentin Wheeler, Paul LePore, Shannon Keen, Kelly Goers, Roxann Gonzales

### I. Call to Order

Drew Ellis called the meeting to order at approximately 3:15 p.m.

### II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the March 23, 2009 meeting were unanimously approved

### III. New Business

Drew explained that the Senate needs to determine a Presiding Officer and Presiding Officer Elect for the 2009/2010 academic year. Drew said that this is a unique situation because the CLAS Senate does not have a Junior Senator at Large because the University Senate no longer recognizes this role, therefore the structure has changed. Drew said that we didn't have one this year and obviously didn't put one on the ballot, as in previous years. Drew said that there had been someone in the role of Senior Senator at Large but he had to resign during the year. This is unique because we don't have anyone in this role and because we are technically in-between the old bylaws and the new bylaws, which were passed at the March meeting. The new bylaws represent a shift toward a procedure of electing someone from this group. Drew said that the Presiding Officer would start right away. The Presiding Officer Elect would serve a year as sort of an apprenticeship and then in year two would come up and take the Presiding Officer position. Drew said that technically we are bound by the current bylaws which don't make sense given the non-recognition in there of Senators at Large. Drew stated that this Senate group approved (in the revised bylaws) the procedure of electing from this group, nominating, and then voting. Drew asked if there is any opposition to jumping ahead to what we approved in the revised bylaws. Drew took a vote and everyone was in favor. Drew then opened up the discussion for votes. A Senator asked Drew to give some information regarding the responsibilities of the

position. Drew said that the largest responsibility is to manage the meeting. Secondly, you will serve on the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee consists of the Presiding Officer, Presiding Officer Elect, and the Dean. The EC meeting is two weeks prior to this meeting and you will set the agenda for this meeting, talk about any issues that come up that need to be put on the agenda, and there may occasionally be a need to entertain other issues that need a judgment, as to whether it's appropriate for this body. Marty Wojciechowski asked if the terms for each person in the CLAS Senate coincide with the terms for the Academic Senate. Shannon said that it depends upon the unit. Some units do not have set term limits. Drew asked for any nominations. Denise Bodman nominated Tannah Broman for Presiding Officer Elect. Tannah Broman nominated Helene Ossipov for Presiding Officer. A vote was taken for Helene as Presiding Officer. The vote was 18 (unanimous). Next, a vote was taken for Tannah as Presiding Officer Elect. The vote was also 18.

#### **IV. Old Business**

The constitution and bylaws passed this body on March 23<sup>rd</sup> and it's on the ballot at the assembly level. The deadline for the vote is May 1. Drew said that if you have not alerted your constituents to the fact that the document is on the CLAS website, please spread the word around by Friday. It is listed under the shared governance section of the website.

#### **V. Curriculum Committee Report**

Due to time constraints, the Curriculum Committee Report was circulated electronically. It was voted on electronically and passed unanimously.

#### **VI. Report from the College Senator-at-Large**

Ayanna Thompson reported on the University Senate meeting from April 20<sup>th</sup>. Ayanna said that all of the five motions, regarding the reorganization, passed. She recommended that you go on-line, to the University Senate website, to look at the specifics for the motions.

#### **VII. Deans Report**

Dean Wheeler said that they are still waiting to find out what the budget situation is going to look like in 2010. This Friday ABOR will decide whether we get the surcharge on the tuition that's been proposed. If so, it would be \$1,200 per student. He said that they are being very optimistic that the cuts that they are making, in anticipation of the 2010 budget, will be the last. Dean Wheeler said that they put out a call last November for ideas from the faculty for high-profile challenge/research areas that are usually transdisciplinary; things that would have a big impact on either the academic world or the real world. They submitted 137 ideas from across the college. It is now time to refine that process, so they sent that list back out so people could reconsider, add, delete, or modify ideas. Dean Wheeler added that this will be a dynamic process going into the future, so just because something isn't on the initial rollout at homecoming in the fall doesn't mean that we can't add it later. He stated that this is a great way to package all the wonderful things we're doing in a way that the foundation will find useful, and it will be useful for us at the college level along with the development activities of raising money. It will also help the public to understand all of the relevant, impactful things that ASU does. He asked the Senate members to encourage the faculty to play an active role in indentifying those things we want to highlight in the challenges.

Dean Wheeler thanked the Senate, Drew, and Tannah for a remarkable year.

Marty Wojciechowski posed this question: If the surcharge passes, what is the expectations/impact on enrollment? Dean Wheeler said that they believe that there will not be a serious impact on enrollment. Jacqueline Wheeler said that there is anguish among the instructors of the writing programs. The instructors were told that they would hear, by last week, whether they had contracts for next year. They haven't heard anything and morale is terrible. Dean Wheeler said that he will check on that right away and move it along as fast as possible. Ayanna Thompson brought up a concern regarding the standardized time slots for classes and the fact that the English department is having a difficult time offering graduate classes in the daytime, and also their large lecture classes with break-out sections. She said that there is a great need for larger flexibility from the English department and the faculty is expressing great dismay about how constricted they are in those time slots. Dean Wheeler asked if Ayanna or someone within the department would capture this information in writing and then he will take it to the Provost office.

### **VIII. Announcements**

Drew announced that if you are continuing on (with the CLAS Senate) you will receive an email from Shannon sometime late in the summer.

### **IX. Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00.