

**Report of
Senate Leadership Activities
Summer 2013**

Submitted to
Elizabeth D. Phillips
Executive Vice President
Provost of the University

Submitted by
Thomas Schildgen
President of the University Senate
Chair of the Academic Council

On Behalf of

Julie A. Murphy-Erfani - Past President, ASU West Senate

Sandra Mayol-Kreiser - President ASU Downtown Campus

Barbara Guzzetti – President ASU West Campus

Chouki El Hamel – President ASU Tempe Campus

Summer 2013

Table of Contents

Thomas Schildgen, Chronology of Senate Leadership Activities	3
Julie A. Murphy Erfani, Collaborative Study Abroad Summary Report	9
Dr. Sandra Mayol-Kreiser, Summary Report of Faculty and the 2013 Merit Adjustment	18
Barbara Guzzetti , Student Service Issues: A Faculty Perspective	27
Chouki El Hamel, Four-Year Analysis of Constitution and By-Laws	35

Memorandum on Shared Governance at Arizona State University

Summer stipends for campus presidents:

The UAC now serves as the executive board of the University Senate, permitting Senate work to continue through the summer via the UAC. The new (June 1) chair of the UAC will receive a summer stipend that is two-ninths of his/her academic salary. The other new (June 1) campus presidents will receive a maximum of a one month stipend which is negotiable each year, depending on workload. If a campus president is unable to meet the time commitment required for a summer stipend, the president-elect from that campus may be permitted to pursue the workload and receive the stipend. If neither the president nor the president-elect of a campus is able to pursue the workload, the past president from that campus may be offered the opportunity.

The following is a report of Senate Leadership Activities for the Summer of 2013. Julie Murphy-Erfani did not receive funding for last summer and this summer there is no Polytechnic Campus president receiving any funds.

Chronology of Senate Leadership Activities
Thomas Schildgen
May – August 2013

Senate President and Chair of the University Academic Council

May 2013

Attended the ASU Classified Staff Meeting at Poly Campus May 16
University Club Board Meeting -May 21 – discussed the arrangements for the Feb. AFC Breakfast
Meeting with Mark Lussier regarding the transition of office – May 24
Move into the University Senate Office – May 28
Host Lunch at University Club with Tempe campus Senate Leadership, Chouki and Helene

June 2013

Met with Jan Janiczek and Chuck Barbi to layout the University Senate branding and promotion
Host Lunch at University Club with Classified Staff past leadership Bert and Aana Wales – June 3
Committee on Committees meeting –June 4
AFC Meeting Flagstaff – June 12
ABOR Meeting – NAU – Attended June 13
Faculty Representative to speak at Bob Lanes retirement – June 18
Host Lunch at University Club with Barry Ritchie – June 20
Attend the Poly campus Chell Roberts Retirement – June 20
Discussion with Eduardo Pagan AFS and Chair of CAPC– June 25
Host Lunch at U-Club with Senate Leadership, Sandra, Barbara, Julie, and Darby (Staff) - June 25
Furniture Acquisition from University Club to Senate Office – Schildgen and Barbee - June 28

July 2013

Meeting with Michael Mokwa – July 2
Meeting with Randy Gibb – New Director of Aviation Programs at Poly – July 8
Meeting with Frank Timmes and Guy Mullins – ASU Distance Learning Technology – July 11
UAC Summer Meeting #1 – July 15
Meeting with Joseph Comfort – Chair of the Research and Creative Activities Committee- July 17
Meeting with Provost Phillips and Barry Ritchie – July 26
Meeting to Plan Fall Academic Assembly – July 29
Meeting with Maria Allison to discuss Statistics Committee and her new position – July 31

August 2013

UAC Summer Meeting #2 – August 5

Senate Leadership Responsibilities

With the exception of taking a three day holiday weekend on Memorial Day and Independence Day, I have worked in either the Tempe Senate Office or my Polytechnic Campus office, and in many cases both offices each day. Time was spent with Senate President Responsibilities, teaching, research, graduate student oral defenses, speaking at a national conference and community service activities. Some of the responsibilities and activities accomplished during the summer months of May – August 2013.

- Filled University Senate Standing Committee Chairs
- Facilitated in the Development of University Senate Brochure, Door Wraps, and Signage
- Arranged the speakers for the Fall 2013 University Senate Meetings
- Conducted the Summer UAC Meetings – July 15 and August 5
- Development of the Pac-12 Academic and Research Consortia
- Preparations for a ASU Task Force on Ethics and Integrity

Summer Teaching Load

Received summer school pay for one class first six week session, taught the remaining load for free:

40098	GIT 335	Computer Systems Technology	16 / 20	Schildgen	12:00 AM - 12:00 AM	5/20/13 - 6/28/13	iCourse
42936	GIT 335	Computer Systems Technology	4 / 25	Schildgen	5/20/13 - 6/28/13	ASU Online	
45065	GIT 480	Senior Project	2 / 20	Schildgen	12:00 AM - 12:00 AM	5/20/13 - 6/28/13	ASU Online
44177	GIT 500	Research Methods	3 / 10	Schildgen	12:00 AM - 12:00 AM	5/20/13 - 6/28/13	iCourse
44224	GIT 500	Research Methods	3 / 10	Schildgen	12:00 AM - 12:00 AM	5/20/13 - 6/28/13	ASU Online
44683	GIT 584	Internship	1 / 5	Schildgen	7/3/13 - 8/13/13	iCourse	
46725	GIT 584	Internship	1 / 1	Schildgen	7/3/13 - 8/13/13	ASU Online	
46161	GIT 590	Reading and Conference	2 / 10	Schildgen	5/20/13 - 6/28/13	iCourse	
46162	GIT 590	Reading and Conference	2 / 10	Schildgen	5/20/13 - 6/28/13	ASU Online	
46707	GIT 590	Reading and Conference	2 / 5	Schildgen	7/3/13 - 8/13/13	iCourse	
42976	GIT 593	Applied Project	1 / 15	Schildgen	7/3/13 - 8/13/13	ASU Online	
42977	GIT 593	Applied Project	2 / 15	Schildgen	12:00 AM - 12:00 AM	7/3/13 - 8/13/13	iCourse

Scholarship and Research

Presentation at the IGAEA Conference – University of Wisconsin – Stout, July 21-23, 2013

FIB/SEM characterization of carbon nanotube inks for printed electronics - Modification No. 13
Agreement No. 10-10087471 between Nth Degree Technologies Worldwide, Inc. and ASU

NOVA 200 Electron Microscope used for imaging samples – Basement of Physics Building Tempe
Campus from 7:45 to 11:00 AM on the following dates:

May 16, 22, 23, 30

June 3, 10, 14, 18, 26, 27

July 3, 9, 15, 24, 29, 30

August 2, 6

Community Service Responsibilities

Mesa United Way Board of Directors – Summer meeting dates:

May 15 – 2013 Campaign Luncheon

May 20 – Chair of Community Investment Allocation Committee

June 27 – Board Meeting

Mesa Rotary – Director of Club Administration

Meetings – Wednesday at Mesa Hilton 12:00 Noon to 1:00 PM

District Conference – Saturday, June 8th

Summary of the Recent Merit based Salary Adjustment March and April of 2013

- Overall 79% of those eligible (out of all faculty and Staff members received an average merit increase of 3.5%.

Performance-Based Increase Analysis by Faculty Title*

Faculty Title	Total Eligible	Total Received	% of Eligible	Average Perf Increase
Assistant Professor	412	320	77.70%	3.60%
Associate Professor	585	507	86.70%	3.50%
Professor	658	561	85.30%	3.30%

Asst Research Professor	55	32	58.20%	2.70%
Assoc Research Professor	26	17	65.40%	3.00%
Research Professor	20	9	45.00%	2.70%

Clinical Asst Professor	55	39	70.90%	3.50%
Clinical Assoc Professor	61	50	82.00%	3.70%
Clinical Professor	16	11	68.80%	4.40%

* Excludes non-tenure-eligible faculty titles (i.e. Post-Doc, Lecturer, Instructor, Visiting designations, Research Scientists, etc) as well as Academic Professionals



Task Force on Institutional Ethics and Integrity at Arizona State University

An institution of higher education is dedicated to the search and dissemination of new knowledge, safeguarded by the integrity, ethics, and value system expected for a community of scholars. To merit the public's trust and to foster mutual respect, institutional ethics and integrity must become the defining part of the culture in which students, faculty, and staff are immersed while they work within the university. In an effort to better define and deliver the message of Institutional Ethics and Integrity at Arizona State University, a University Senate task force has been established.

Membership: Representation of the Graduate College, four campus representatives, International Student Office, Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development, Intercollegiate Athletics, Educational Outreach and Student Services, University Staff, Administrative Advisor, and University Senate Office representation. The Co-chairs for the task force will be from the Lincoln Center for Applied Ethics.

1. Office of Graduate Education – Associate Vice Provost Eric Wertheimer
2. ASU Downtown Campus – Cristi Coursen (Lincoln Center Fellow) – Co-Chair
3. Lincoln Center for Applied Ethics – Jason Scott Robert (Interim Director) – Co-Chair
4. ASU West Campus – Martin Matustik - Lincoln Professor, Director [Center for Critical Inquiry and Cultural Studies](#)
5. ASU Polytechnic Campus – Catherine Skoglund (Staff)
6. ASU Tempe Campus – Michael Mokwa
7. Office of Knowledge Enterprise Development – Debra Murphy
8. Intercollegiate Athletics – Gary Grossman (FAR)
9. Educational Outreach and Student Services – Kevin Cook
10. International Students and Scholars Office – Jennifer Glawson
11. University Staff – Chuck Barbee (Previously employed at West Point Military Academy)
12. Benjamin Freakley – Senior Advisor to the President

Charge: After reviewing the existing policies for ethics and integrity, the previous efforts of the Senate 2004 and 2011 Ad Hoc Committees, and most recently the second section of the 2013 Accreditation Self-Study, the task force will define the desired culture of institutional ethics and integrity at Arizona State University. The task force will define the expectations which embody what is to be the shared understanding of ethics and integrity using the greatest denominator of the existing policies that have been created for different institutional purposes, and identify ways to communicate the message as it applies to all institutional constituents, from faculty research and scholarship, to graduate students, undergraduate students, international students that have varied cultural backgrounds, student athletes, and distance learners that do not come to campus. Issues related to amorous relations between faculty members, staff employees, and students should be addressed as well. Perhaps the ultimate effort and charge for this task force is to define and promote an organizational culture that embraces ethics and integrity specific to Arizona State University brand. This message needs to be communicated to each of

these institutional participants when they arrive for either a program of study or employment. Two senators who are Lincoln Center Professors will co-chair the task force.

Some suggested topics related to ethics and integrity that other institutions address:

- Expectations of faculty members, academic professionals, and staff employees with regard to ethics and integrity in research, avoiding conflicts of interest, modeling ethical and responsible behavior, and properly report the results of scholarly activity.
- Storing and securing research data, including big data issues
- Authorship of publications
- Expectations of graduate students, including appropriate relationships with students they teach, proper attribution of cited work, and ethical conduct related to scholarly activities.
- Expectations of undergraduate students, including the fundamental principles of academic honesty
- Intercollegiate Athletes – ICA Policy
- Addressing differing cultural expectations of academic integrity
- Cultivating this institutional culture with Distance Learning Students who may never come to campus
- Honor Code and Policy on Academic Dishonesty a requirement of all syllabi
- Understanding and respecting copyright guidelines and patent rights
- Incidents involving sexual orientation, sexual or racial harassment
- Faculty expectations with regard to faculty having any amorous relations with students regardless of gender or age.
- Maintaining high standards of ethics and integrity is a requirement for one of the largest public research institutions

Task Force Co-Chairs

Jason Scott Robert, Ph.D.



**Interim Director
Lincoln Associate Professor of Ethics in Biotechnology & Medicine
Associate Professor of Life Sciences**

Jason Scott Robert is Associate Professor of Life Sciences at Arizona State University, where he also directs the Bioethics, Policy, and Law Program, part of the Center for Biology and Society. In addition, he serves as Associate Professor of Basic Medical Sciences at the University of Arizona College of Medicine - Phoenix in partnership with Arizona State University. Professor Robert is extensively published in bioethics and the philosophy of biology, and his research currently focuses on how scientists try to justify controversial research. In 2008, ASU President Crow selected Robert as one of a handful of Promotion and Tenure "Exemplars" who exhibit the characteristics of excellent scholarship, teaching, and service that represent the New American University.

Cristi Coursen PhD, WHNP-BC



Lincoln Fellow for Ethics and Healthcare Innovation

Cristi Coursen is a Clinical Associate Professor with a dual appointment in the College of Health Solutions-School of Nutrition & Health Promotion, and the College of Nursing & Health Innovation. She served as Chair of the ASU Student-Faculty Policy Committee in 2011-2012 that was charged with a focus on academic integrity. In her role as a Lincoln Fellow for Ethics and Healthcare Innovation, and by request from the Arizona State Board of Nursing, she co-authored the curriculum for an ethics workshop series that will be required for nurses whose licenses are subject to disciplinary action, and who have not met the ethical obligations as written in the ANA Code of Ethics for Nurses with Interpretive Statements.

Collaborative Study Abroad Summary Report

August 12, 2013

Julie A. Murphy Erfani, Associate Professor, School of SBS, New College

Past President, West Senate

Report Sections:

- A. ASU's Rank in Study Abroad Students – Top 40 Doctorate Institutions
- B. The Big 10 & Study Abroad Collaboration
- C. Big Ten-CIC Shared Programs Abroad
- D. SECAC Engineering Exchange Program in Italy
- E. Current ASU Study Abroad Enrollment
- F. PAC-12 Potential Collaboration: Benefits & Points of Concern

A. ASU's Rank in Study Abroad Enrollment – Top 40 Doctorate Institutions

The Institute for International Education (IIE) reports that Arizona State University ranked 28th in the nation for the number of students studying abroad among the top 40 doctorate-granting institutions in 2010-2011. [See Table 1]

Table 1 2010/11

INSTITUTIONS BY TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDY ABROAD STUDENTS: TOP 40 DOCTORATE INSTITUTIONS*, 2010/11

Rank	Institution	City	State	Total Study
1	New York University	New York	NY	3,799
2	Michigan State University	East Lansing	MI	2,577
3	University of Minnesota - Twin Cities	Minneapolis	MN	2,562
4	University of California - Los Angeles	Los Angeles	CA	2,451
5	University of Texas - Austin	Austin	TX	2,350
6	University of Southern California	Los Angeles	CA	2,340
7	Indiana University - Bloomington	Bloomington	IN	2,203
8	University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	PA	2,198
9	University of Wisconsin - Madison	Madison	WI	2,159
10	University of Washington	Seattle	WA	2,152
11	Penn State University - University Park	University Park	PA	2,087
12	University of Georgia	Athens	GA	2,079
13	University of Florida	Gainesville	FL	2,075
14	Ohio State University - Main Campus	Columbus	OH	1,993
15	University of Maryland - College Park	College Park	MD	1,975
16	University of Michigan - Ann Arbor	Ann Arbor	MI	1,946
17	Boston University	Boston	MA	1,928
18	University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign	Champaign	IL	1,907
19	Miami University	Oxford	OH	1,899
20	Brigham Young University	Provo	UT	1,883
21	Texas A&M University	College Station	TX	1,856

22	George Washington University	Washington	DC	1,802
23	Florida State University	Tallahassee	FL	1,693
24	Northeastern University	Boston	MA	1,643
25	Syracuse University	Syracuse	NY	1,636
26	American University	Washington	DC	1,599
26	University of Virginia - Main Campus	Charlottesville	VA	1,599
28	Arizona State University	Tempe	AZ	1,574
29	Georgetown University	Washington	DC	1,562
30	Cornell University	Ithaca	NY	1,478
31	University of San Diego	San Diego	CA	1,457
32	University of California - Davis	Davis	CA	1,448
33	San Diego State University	San Diego	CA	1,441
34	University of Kansas	Lawrence	KS	1,425
35	University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill	Chapel Hill	NC	1,404
36	University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame	IN	1,384
37	University of Delaware	Newark	DE	1,375
38	Purdue University - Main Campus	West Lafayette	IN	1,353
39	University of Iowa	Iowa City	IA	1,347
40	University of California - Berkeley	Berkeley	CA	1,329

Institute of International Education. (2012). "Institutions by Total Number of Study Abroad Students, 2010/11." *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>

ASU's Study Abroad Director Amy Arikan published a report in Summer 2013 that ASU had 1669 students studying abroad for fall 2011 – summer 2012. (See: ASU Summer Study Abroad Enrollment Report, 2011 – 2012) For 2012-2013, Director Arikan estimated that ASU has had about 1,600 students studying abroad.

As Table 1 indicates, nine of the Big Ten/CIC universities are ranked above ASU in students studying abroad. Michigan State tops the list of doctorate institutions with 2,577 students abroad in 2010-11. University of Illinois, UC had 1,907 students studying abroad in the same year.

B. The Big Ten and Study Abroad Collaboration

The Big Ten Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) actually has 15 member universities, primarily based in the Midwest. Some newer members are outside the orbit of the Midwest, including Rutgers and University of Maryland that just joined in 2013.

CIC Students Studying Abroad, Fall 2010-Summer 2011

Undergraduates	18,237
Masters Degree	2,671
Professional (e.g. JD, MD, etc.)	769
PhD Candidates	217
Non-Degree/Do Not Know	89
Total	21,983

Top Destinations:

United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, China, and France

Highest Numbers of Participating Students:

Michigan State University, the University of Minnesota, and Indiana University, had the highest number of students participate in study abroad among the CIC schools.

Source: International Institute of Education (IIE), *Open Doors Survey*, Summer 2012.

C. Big 10-CIC Shared Programs Abroad

The CIC describes its Shared Programs Abroad as follows:

CIC Shared Programs Abroad, CIC SPA, increases opportunities for global learning by opening member university study abroad programs to all member campuses. Students at CIC member institutions can participate in study abroad programs sponsored by other CIC institutions—and co-sponsored by their home institution. Currently, the pool of study abroad offerings includes programs at more than 70 locations worldwide. Students are eligible to apply for study abroad programs which are co-sponsored by their home institution. Interested students should contact the study abroad office on their campus for more information.

CIC Shared Programs Abroad

The CIC provides this list of study abroad programs for informational purposes only. The CIC has no involvement with the individuals programs and has not investigated or reviewed any of the programs. Program descriptions are provided by the sponsoring member institutions and are not verified by the CIC. The CIC expresses no opinion about the safety, quality or effectiveness of any of the programs.

 Expand/collapse all

Continent	Country	City	Sponsor	Program Name	Duration	Co-Sponsors
Africa	Kenya	Nairobi	UMinn	Minnesota Studies in International Development (MSID) in Kenya	Fall, Spring, AcadYear	UIUC, IU, OSU, PSU, UWMad
Africa	Morocco	Fez	UMinn	Arabic Language & Culture in Morocco	Fall, Spring, Summer	UIUC, OSU, PU, UWMad
Africa	Senegal	Dakar	IU	Dakar Summer Program	Summer	UMinn
Africa	Senegal	Dakar	MSU	African Studies in Senegal	Spring Semester	
Africa	Senegal	Dakar	UMinn	Minnesota Studies in International Development (MSID) in Senegal	Fall, Spring, AcadYear	UIUC, IU, OSU, PSU
Africa	South Africa	Cape Town	PSU	Cape Town: South Africa, Parks and People	Spring Semester	
Africa	South Africa	Swartkrans	UWMad	Archeology Fieldschool in South Africa	Summer	
Africa	Tanzania	Arusha	UMinn	Study Abroad in Tanzania	Fall, Spring, Summer	
Africa	Uganda	Jinja	NU	Global Engagement Summer Institute (GESI)	8.5 weeks	
Americas	Argentina	Buenos Aires	UMinn	Language & Culture in Buenos Aires, Argentina	Fall, Spring, AcadYear, Summer	
Americas	Bolivia	Cochabamba	NU	Global Engagement Summer Institute (GESI)	8.5 weeks	
Americas	Dominican Republic	Jarabacoa (Summer), Santiago (fall)	Iowa	Latin American Health, Nutrition and Environmental Issues Program in the Dominican Republic	Summer	UC, UIUC, IU, Iowa, UM, MSU, UMinn, NU, OSU, PU
Americas	Ecuador	Multiple	UWMad	Ceiba Tropical Conservation: Galapagos, Andes & Amazon	Spring Semester (early Jan - mid May)	
Americas	Ecuador	Quito	UIUC	Ecuadorian University Program at Universidad San Francisco de Quito	Fall, Spring, AcadYear, SprFall	PSU

Americas	Ecuador	Quito	UMinn	Minnesota Studies in International Development (MSID) in Ecuador	Fall, Spring, AcadYear	UIUC, IU, OSU
Americas	Mexico	Cuernavaca	UMinn	Study Abroad in Mexico	Fall, Spring, Summer	
Americas	Nicaragua	Tola	NU	Global Engagement Summer Institute (GESI)	8.5 weeks	
Americas	Venezuela	Merida	UMinn	Study Abroad in Venezuela	Fall, Spring, AcadYear, Summer	IU, PSU, UWMad
Asia	India	Jaipur	UMinn	Minnesota Studies in International Development (MSID) in India	Fall, Spring, AcadYear	UIUC, IU, OSU, PSU
Asia	India	Udaipur	NU	Global Engagement Summer Institute (GESI)	8.5 weeks	
Asia	India	Varanasi	UWMad	UW in India	Fall & Spring Semester, Academic Year	UM
Europe	Austria	Graz	IU	Graz Summer Program	Summer	UMinn, PU
Europe	Croatia	Rovinj	UWMad	Conflict and Culture	Summer	
Europe	Czech Republic	Prague	NU	Prague Summer Program	6.5 weeks	
Europe	France	Montpellier	UMinn	Study Abroad in Montpellier	Fall, Spring, Summer	Iowa, NU, OSU, PSU, PU
Europe	France	Paris	NU	Public Health in Europe: Policies and Institutions	Fall	
Europe	Germany	Berlin	UMinn	Business Studies in Berlin	Spring semester	
Europe	Germany	Freiburg	UWMad	Academic Year in Freiburg (AYF)	AcadYear	PU
Europe	Greece	Athens	PSU	Athens: History, Culture, and Archaeology of Greece	Spring Semester	
Europe	Italy	Florence	UMinn	Study Abroad in Florence	Fall, Spring, AcadYear, May Term	

Europe	Italy	Rome	UMinn	Study Abroad in Rome	Semester or summer	
Europe	Norway	Oslo	UMinn	Scandinavian Urban Studies Term (SUST)	Fall	
Europe	Norway	Oslo	UMinn	Divided States of Europe: Globalization and Inequalities in the New Europe	Spring	UC
Europe	Portugal	Coimbra	UWMad	UW Portuguese Language in Portugal	Fall, Spring, AcadYear	UMinn
Europe	Spain	Granada	UIUC	Spanish Studies in Granada, Spain	Fall, Spring, Summer	UM, UWMad
Europe	Spain	Toledo	UMinn	Internation Program in Toledo, Spain	Fall, Spring, AcadYear, Summer	PU, UWMad
Europe	Turkey	Istanbul	UMinn	Study Abroad in Istanbul NEW	Fall and Spring semesters	
Europe	United Kingdom	London	MSU	Nursing in London	Summer	UM
Europe	United Kingdom	London	UMinn	Study & Internships in London	Fall, Spring, Summer	
Europe	United Kingdom	Northern Ireland: Coleraine & Belfast	UMinn	Northern Ireland: Democracy & Social Change	Spring	
Middle East	Turkey	Istanbul	NU	Turkey Summer Program	6 weeks	
Oceania	Australia	Sydney	MSU	Australia's People, Governmet and Justice System	Spring (Jan-Mid Feb)	
Oceania	Australia	Sydney	MSU	Australian Internships Program	Fall, Spring, Summer	UM
Oceania	Australia	Sydney	UMinn	Study and Internships in Sydney	Fall, Spring, Summer	
Oceania	Australia	Sydney, Cairns	MSU	Summer Sports Program Down Under	Summer	UMinn

D. SECAC Engineering Exchange Program in Italy

The Southeastern Conference Academic Consortium (SECAC) is another dynamic inter-university consortium of 12 universities collaborating to increase study abroad opportunities for US-based students of member institutions and for international students based in Turin, Italy.

In February 2010, the SEC began to formalize a shared exchange program in engineering described as follows. Clearly, this collaboration developed incrementally and came to include a subset of SECAC universities:

The agreement is part of a Southeastern Conference Academic Consortium (SECAC) collaborative initiative among SEC engineering schools. It will allow mechanical engineering students at participating SEC universities to study at Politecnico di Torino (PdT), in Turin, Italy, and PdT students to study at an SEC university, each for one semester.

"The U[niversity] of A[rkansas] is only the first to sign. We expect Mississippi State and Vanderbilt to sign next week. We also anticipate participation from Alabama, Tennessee, and LSU," said Dr. Julie Goldman, Director of SECAC.

Source: <http://www.secdigitalnetwork.com/tabid/473/article/226947/SEC-Engineering-Students-to-Study-in-Italy.aspx>

D. Current ASU Study Abroad Data

Please see ASU's most recent Study Abroad Enrollment Report for 2011-2012 prepared by the ASU Study Abroad Office attached as a PDF.

F. PAC-12 Potential Collaboration: Possibilities & Points of Concern

During summer 2013, the author of this report met with several key administrators involved in study abroad development at ASU. These meetings included Amy Arikan, Director of the Study Abroad Office, Dr. Ajay Vinze, Associate Vice Provost for International Enrollment, Jennifer Malerich, Senior Director of Curricular Activities & Actions, and Dr. Thomas Schildgen, President of the UAC and the ASU Senate. Various potential benefits and some points of concern emerged from these meetings.

The potential benefits to ASU and other PAC-12 member institutions engaged in collaboration on some types of study abroad programming may include:

- Greater leverage in negotiating fees with study abroad vendors.
- Improvement of pricing & access for study abroad students
- Greater input/influence over study abroad policy for member institutions
- Enhanced networking for study abroad directors & administrators
- Greater retention of students

- Greater access & scholarship funding for Pell students
- Incremental agreements: Member institutions of the PAC-12 ARC can opt to participate in some collaborations and forego others.

Several points of concern about consortium collaboration were:

- Big Ten-CIC collaborations have not always been fruitful for all members, such as UW Wisconsin that saw an exodus of students this year to other CIC programs this past academic year.
- The CIC Shared Study Abroad program list is less than completely institutionalized across all member institutions. For example, a student enrolling in a CIC program sponsored by another CIC member must still obtain approval for credit acceptance from her/his home institution.

Possible niches for ASU to contribute to a list of collaborative study abroad programs for PAC-12 partners might include, among others:

- ASU-sponsored programs abroad on sustainability

From the perspective of graduate education at ASU, there was optimism about a PAC-12 collaboration opening up greater opportunities for ASU graduate and undergraduate students to participate in:

- more internships abroad and
- graduate-level exchanges to less common destinations, regions and countries of the world. For example: India, a BRIC country.

1

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Summary Report of Faculty and the 2013 Merit Adjustment

Dr. Sandra Mayol-Kreiser
President ASU Downtown Campus



UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fall 2013


2

Arizona State University
Faculty by Tenure Status

	MALE			FEMALE			TOTAL	
	Number	% of Male	% of Total	Number	% of Female	% of Total	Number	% of Total
<u>FALL 2002</u>								
Tenured	916	63.3%	73.0%	339	36.0%	27.0%	1,255	52.6%
On Tenure Track	185	12.8%	52.1%	170	18.1%	47.9%	355	14.9%
Not On Tenure Track	345	23.9%	44.4%	432	45.9%	55.6%	777	32.6%
Total	1,446	100 %	60.6%	941	100 %	39.4%	2,387	100 %
<u>FALL 2012</u>								
Tenured	875	55.0%	67.6%	420	33.5%	32.4%	1,295	45.5%
On Tenure Track	228	14.3%	53.9%	195	15.5%	46.1%	423	14.9%
Not On Tenure Track	488	30.7%	43.3%	640	51.0%	56.7%	1,128	39.6%
Total	1,591	100 %	55.9%	1,255	100.0%	44.1%	2,846	100 %

NOTE: Excludes administrative faculty (deans and higher)

University Office of Institutional Analysis #7727
July 1, 2013



UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fall 2013

2

Summary Report of ASU Faculty

2002 Comparison Data

- The total number of faculty in 2002 was 2,387.
- Of those, 1,255 (52.6%) were tenured, 355 (52.1%) were on tenure track and 777 (44.4%) were not on tenure track.
- Of the tenured faculties, 73% were male and 27% were female.
- Of the faculty on tenure track, 52.1% were male and 47.9% were female.
- Of the faculty not on tenure track, 44.4% were male and 55.6% were female.



Summary Report of ASU Faculty

2012 Current Data

- In 2012 the total number of faculty was 2,846.
- Of that number, 1,295 (45.5%) were tenured, 423 (14.9%) were on tenure track and 1,128 (39.6%) were not on tenure track.
- Of the tenured faculties, 67.6% were male and 32.4% were female.
- Of the faculty on tenure track, 53.9% were male and 46.1% were female. Of the faculty not on tenure track, 43.3% were male and 56.7% were female.



Summary Report of ASU Faculty

Comparison Data of 2002 to 2012

- When comparing the faculty by tenure status from 2002 to 2012, there is a drop of 7.1% in the number of tenured faculty, no drop for the faculty on tenure track and an increase of 7% for the faculty not on tenure track.
- When comparing the faculty tenure status by gender from 2002 to 2012, there was an increase of 5.4% of female tenured faculty, a 1.8% decrease in female tenure track faculty and a 1.1% increase in not on tenure female faculty.



Summary Report of ASU Faculty by Rank

Comparison Data of 2002 to 2012

	MALE			FEMALE			TOTAL	
	Number	% of Male	% of Total	Number	% of Female	% of Total	Number	% of Total
FALL 2002								
Full Professor	634	43.8%	79.9%	159	16.9%	20.1%	793	33.2%
Assistant Professor	183	12.7%	47.5%	202	21.5%	52.5%	385	16.1%
Associate Professor	346	23.9%	61.2%	219	23.3%	38.8%	565	23.7%
Instructor	29	2.0%	47.5%	32	3.4%	52.5%	61	2.6%
Lecturer	99	6.8%	46.0%	116	12.3%	54.0%	215	9.0%
No Rank	155	10.7%	42.1%	213	22.6%	57.9%	368	15.4%
Total	1,446	100 %	60.6%	941	100 %	39.4%	2,387	100 %
FALL 2012								
Full Professor	624	39.2%	75.0%	208	16.6%	25.0%	832	29.2%
Assistant Professor	290	18.2%	52.1%	267	21.3%	47.9%	557	19.6%
Associate Professor	388	24.4%	56.0%	305	24.3%	44.0%	693	24.3%
Instructor	66	4.1%	30.6%	150	12.0%	69.4%	216	7.6%
Lecturer	168	10.6%	42.0%	232	18.5%	58.0%	400	14.1%
No Rank	55	3.5%	37.2%	93	7.4%	62.8%	148	5.2%
Total	1,591	100.0%	55.9%	1,255	100.0%	44.1%	2,846	100.0%

NOTE: Excludes administrative faculty (deans and higher)

University Office of Institutional Analysis #7727
July 1, 2013



Summary Report of ASU Faculty by Rank

Comparison Data of 2002 to 2012

- When looking at the faculty by rank, in 2002 there was a total of 793 (33.2%) of the total faculty that was ranked as Full Professor.
- There was a total of 385 (16.1%) ranked Assistant Professor and 565 (23.7%) ranked Associate Professor.
- Of the non-tenured faculty, 61 (2.6%) ranked as Instructors, 215 (9.0%) ranked Lecturers and 368 (15.4%) had no rank.
- In 2012, 832 (29.2%) of the total faculty that was ranked as Full Professor.
- There was a total of 557 (19.6%) ranked Assistant Professor and 693 (24.3%) ranked Associate Professor.
- Of the non tenured faculty, 216 (7.6%) ranked as Instructors, 400 (14.1%) ranked as Lecturers and 148 (5.2%) had no rank.



Summary Report of ASU Faculty by Rank

Comparison Data of 2002 to 2012

In the period between 2002 and 2012:

- there was a drop of 4% in the number of faculty ranked Full Professor,
- an increase of 3.5% of faculty ranked Assistant Professor,
- an increase of 0.6% in Associate Professor,
- 5% increase in Instructors,
- 5.1% increase in the number of Lecturer and a decrease of 10.2% in the faculty with no rank.



Non-Tenured Faculty by Job Title Groups

	MALE			FEMALE			TOTAL	
	Number	% of Male	% of Total	Number	% of Female	% of Total	Number	% of Total
FALL 2002								
Clinical Assistant Professor	2	0.6%	13.3%	13	3.0%	86.7%	15	1.9%
Clinical Associate Professor	1	0.3%	5.0%	19	4.4%	95.0%	20	2.6%
Clinical Professors	3	0.9%	42.9%	4	0.9%	57.1%	7	0.9%
Faculty Associates	150	43.5%	41.3%	213	49.3%	58.7%	363	46.7%
Instructors	29	8.4%	47.5%	32	7.4%	52.5%	61	7.9%
Principal Lecturer	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%
Senior Lecturer	33	9.6%	58.9%	23	5.3%	41.1%	56	7.2%
Lecturer	64	18.6%	40.8%	93	21.5%	59.2%	157	20.2%
Professor of Practice	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%
Other	63	18.3%	64.3%	35	8.1%	35.7%	98	12.6%
		100.0						100.0
Total	345	%	44.4%	432	100.0%	55.6%	777	%

FALL 2012								
Clinical Assistant Professor	9	1.8%	52.9%	8	1.3%	47.1%	17	1.5%
Clinical Associate Professor	22	4.5%	35.5%	40	6.3%	64.5%	62	5.5%
Clinical Professors	16	3.3%	25.0%	48	7.5%	75.0%	64	5.7%
Faculty Associates	52	10.7%	36.9%	89	13.9%	63.1%	141	12.5%
Instructors	66	13.5%	30.6%	150	23.4%	69.4%	216	19.1%
Principal Lecturer	16	3.3%	59.3%	11	1.7%	40.7%	27	2.4%
Senior Lecturer	48	9.8%	43.6%	62	9.7%	56.4%	110	9.8%
Lecturer	104	21.3%	39.5%	159	24.8%	60.5%	263	23.3%
Professor of Practice	32	6.6%	76.2%	10	1.6%	23.8%	42	3.7%
Other	123	25.2%	66.1%	63	9.8%	33.9%	186	16.5%
		100.0						100.0
Total	488	%	43.3%	640	100.0%	56.7%	1,128	%

NOTE: Excludes administrative faculty (deans and higher); "Other" includes research and visiting faculty.

Non-Tenured Faculty by Job Title Groups

- When looking at the non tenured faculty by job title groups, the data shows that in 2002 there were:
 - 15 (1.9%) faculty ranked as Clinical Assistant Professors,
 - 20 ranked Clinical Associate Professors (2.6%), and
 - 7 (0.9%) ranked Clinical Professor.
- In the group titled Faculty Associates and Instructors, there were:
 - 363 (46.7%) Faculty Associates and
 - 61 (7.9%) Instructors.
- In the group titled Lecturers:
 - 56 (7.2%) were ranked Senior Lecturers and
 - 157 (20.2%) were ranked Lecturers.
- There were a total of 98 (12.6%) non tenured faculties ranked other (includes research and visiting faculty).

Non-Tenured Faculty by Job Title Groups

- In 2012, there were:
 - 17 (1.5%) faculties ranked as Clinical Assistant Professors,
 - 62 ranked Clinical Associate Professors (5.5%), and
 - 64 (5.7%) ranked Clinical Professor.
- In the group titled Faculty Associates and Instructors, there were:
 - 141 (12.5%) Faculty Associates and
 - 216 (19.1%) Instructors.
- In the group titled Lecturers:
 - 27 (2.4%) were ranked Principal Lecturers,
 - 110 (9.8%) were ranked Senior Lecturers and
 - 263 (23.3%) were ranked Lecturers.
- There were 42 (3.7%) faculties ranked Professor of Practice and a total of 186 (16.5%) non tenured faculties ranked “other” (includes research and visiting faculty).

Non-Tenured Faculty by Job Title Groups

Comparison Data of 2002 to 2012

- When comparing the Non-Tenured Faculty by job title groups in the period between 2002 and 2012, there was a:
 - 0.4% decrease in the number of Clinical Assistant Professors, a
 - 2.9% increase in Clinical Associate Professors, and a
 - 4.8% increase in Clinical Professors.
- In the number of Faculty Associates, there was a
 - 34.2% decrease and an
 - 11.2% increase in the number of Instructors.
- In the job titled Lecturers, there was a
 - 2.4% increase in the number of Principal Lecturers, a
 - 2.6% increase in Senior Lecturer and
 - 3.1% increase in the number of Lecturers.
- There was also a 3.7% increase in Professor of Practice and a 3.9% increase of non tenured faculty ranked other.

The Summary Data for ASU Faculty Merit Adjustment

2012-2013

- Data from Human Resource department demonstrate that 71% of eligible ASU Faculties were recommended to receive a merit pay increase for the academic year 2012-2013.
- Included in the recommendations for merit pay increase were 73.8% staff and 70.6% Administrative staff.



UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fall 2013

13

The Summary Data for ASU Faculty Merit Adjustment

2012-2013

- Data from the 2013 AAUP Faculty Salary Survey demonstrate that in 2012 the average salary at ASU for a Full Professor was \$ 124,800 which ranked above the median salary for a Full Professor in the survey.
- The average salary for Associate Professor at ASU was \$85,800 which ranked below the median salary for an Associate Professor in the survey.
- The average salary for Assistant Professor was \$76,200 which ranked above the median salary for Assistant Professor in the survey.



UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fall 2013

14

The Summary Data for ASU Faculty Merit Adjustment 2012-2013

- The only non-tenured professional salary reported was for Instructors. The average salary of Instructors at ASU was \$39,200 which ranked far below the median salary for Instructors in the survey.
- When comparing the average salary of ASU faculty from 2002 to 2012 there was a:
 - \$36,500 (29.2%) increase for Full Professors, a
 - \$13,400 (26.8%) increase for Associate Professors,
 - \$21,800 (28.6%) increase for Assistant Professors and a
 - \$1000 (2.6 %) increase for Instructors.



The Summary Data for ASU Faculty Merit Adjustment 2012-2013

- In the area of fringe benefits, ASU continue to support its employees by increasing the value of total compensation for most faculty and staff by at least 20%. Some examples of ASU supported benefits include:
 - Dollar-for-dollar contributions to your chosen retirement plan—the Arizona State Retirement System (ASRS), the Public Safety Personnel Retirement System (PSPRS) or the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP).
 - Payment between 80 and 93 percent of the total cost of personal healthcare plan premium (depending on healthcare plan).
 - Employer share of federal-and state-mandated programs - Social Security, Medicare and workers' compensation.
 - Income protection in the form of long-term disability and family protection through life insurance benefits.
 - Tuition discount of \$25 per credit up to nine credit hours per semester for benefits-eligible employees and spouses. Qualifying dependents pay only 25 % of resident tuition for credit hours taken at any state university.



ASU's Current Community of Scholars

- 2 Nobel laureates
- 6 Pulitzer Prize awards
- 1 MacArthur Fellow
- 11 members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences
- 11 members of the National Academy of Sciences
- 65 American Association for the Advancement of Science Fellows
- 9 National Academy of Engineering members
- 2 members of the Institute of Medicine
- 4 members of the National Academy of Education
- 3 National Academy of Public Administration members
- 25 Guggenheim Fellows
- 8 Presidential Early Career Awards for Scientists and Engineers
- 86 Early Career Awards (NSF, DOE, Army)
- 114 Fulbright American Scholar Awards
- 8 American Council of Learned Societies Fellows
- 3 Royal Society members
- 19 recipients of Ford Foundation Fellowships
- 21 IEEE Fellows
- 19 Alexander Von Humboldt Foundation Research Prize winners
- 1 recipient of the Rockefeller Fellowship
- 5 Sloan Research Fellows



Student Service Issues: A Faculty Perspective

Submitted by Barbara Guzzetti, West Campus Senate President

August, 2013

Purpose

This project was undertaken to provide a faculty perspective on issues that undergraduate and graduate students experience with student services provided by ASU. In a May, 2013 meeting with Kevin Burkhard who was hired by the Provost office to conduct research on this issue, I learned that surveys had been conducted with students and staff in spring of 2013 to identify the difficulties that students experience with student services on campus from these two perspectives. Those data were/are currently being analyzed.

As a faculty member, I have also witnessed students' complaints and concerns regarding ASU's student services and resources. I have had my own experiences in attempting to assist students with these difficulties. I anticipated that other faculty would also have had similar experiences and therefore would have unique insights on this issue to contribute. I anticipated providing a triangulated perspective on this topic by querying faculty to obtain their input.

Methods

Sample

To make the project manageable and to reflect the needs and concerns of faculty and students on the campus that I represent, I confined my sample to ASU faculty and instructors on the West campus. In doing so, however, I anticipated that the issues that they would identify would not necessarily be unique to students on one campus. Students tend to take classes across the campuses and use resources that service all of the campuses. Therefore, I anticipated that the issues they identify could address student services provided on or to any of the four campuses.

In selecting the sample, I solicited a purposive sample – those faculty members who could best inform the project. I focused on faculty with direct contact with students and a history of voicing students' concerns with ASU's student services. To locate these individuals, I used a snowball sampling technique. I began by requesting nominations of faculty to query from the two Deans on the West campus, Dr. Marlene Tromp and Dr. Mari Koerner. I also queried faculty leadership from the West campus, including two of most current past West campus Senate presidents and the future West campus president. After receiving responses from these individuals, I requested their nominations of other faculty to query who they perceived could inform the project and then queried those individuals. This process ceased when respondents could not produce additional nominations. In total, I queried 18 faculty members and received 16 responses, an 89% response rate.

Data Collection

All responses were solicited and gathered by e-mail. Each respondent replied to a single open-ended query. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the project and asked to identify the student service issues they were familiar with and to suggest recommendations or possible solutions to those issues, if possible. Since this project was undertaken during the summer months of 2013, I did not expect a 100% response rate due to vacations and travel.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed by matrix analysis. Responses were categorized by type of response (issue or suggested solution) and by the area of concern (e.g., Blackboard, financial aid services, etc.). Repeated concerns were also noted and tallied across respondents.

Findings

Faculty identified eight areas of concern students have voiced regarding ASU services. In order of reported frequency by the sample, these issues were: (1) the University Technology Office's (UTO) technical services, including Blackboard and MY ASU; (2) financial aid; (3) student resource centers, including the Disability Resources Center and the Writing Center; (4) intervention programs, including Early Start, the PASS Program, and other ASU's services for those underprepared for college; (5) courses; (6) campus climate; (7) accommodations; and (8) communication - delayed responses to students' inquiries. Other issues represented students' personal concerns, such as increasing costs for tuition and fees; students' legal problems; lack of on-campus career counseling; and competing demands of work and courses, particularly experienced by veterans.

These issues addressed problems with extant student services, as well as ones that are not currently in place. These issues are explained below. If any suggestions were provided for addressing these issues, their accompanying suggested solutions are also described.

Issue 1: Technical Services

Students frequently become disconnected from assignments or exams in the middle of their work in Blackboard. Often, individuals are unable to access the site because of outages. One professor remarked, "Some students comment that Blackboard and MYASU get very bogged down during the first two weeks of class. The online system works very slowly or goes down altogether." When attempting to resolve these problems, students also have experienced difficulties in obtaining competent technical assistance or trouble shooting when accessing UTO services. The initial contact person from the ASU Help Desk is often unable to answer questions, must refer the question to a supervisor, or provides incorrect information.

Recommendations/Suggested Solutions for Issue 1: There were no recommendations or suggested solutions identified aside from providing additional training for Help Desk personnel handling Blackboard issues and considering changing online platforms.

Issue 2: Financial Aid Services

There were several issues faculty identified that concerned the Office of Financial Aid. First, staff members at the financial aid office do not thoroughly explain options to students for financing their education. One faculty member stated, “It is challenging to find someone who can adequately explain their financial aid and help them in a way they can understand.” Other faculty reported that often students do not understand how dropping a class will impact their financial aid that they have already received (i.e., if students will need to pay it back or will be eligible for financial aid the following semester). Students often stay enrolled, but do not attend, fail their classes, and then are placed on academic probation.

Second, students complain that it is very difficult for them to meet with a financial aid advisor. The student must first meet with a student at the counter. Unless students repeatedly request and insist on meeting with an advisor, they are not able to meet with a counselor.

Third, the hours the financial aid office is open are very limited. Many of the students, particularly those who are intern teachers have difficulty getting to the office in person due to their K-12 placement in the schools.

Finally, faculty reported that students complain that their financial aid payments are often delayed and therefore they must wait to purchase books for their courses. Sometimes, it is three to four weeks into the semester before students receive their funds. Their inability to procure the necessary books has meant that professors have to make arrangements to have that material placed on library reserve which can be inconvenient for students to access prior to the class.

Recommendations/Suggested Solutions for Issue 2: There were no suggestions offered for ways to address these issues.

Issue 3: Student Resources- Student Disability Services and the Writing Center

Disability Resource Center (DRC)

Faculty reported that students experience numerous issues with DRC. Students with disabilities are not provided with appropriate class materials in a timely manner, especially materials for visually impaired students. Students are told to drop out of the class until the materials are ready. Students find it is difficult to get DRC to return their telephone calls or provide support. When a student switches campuses, the accommodations do not follow and the student is told to reapply.

Some faculty reported that students with physical disabilities have expressed frustrations with obtaining access to campus facilities. This is especially the case on the Tempe campus. There are particular problems with adequate door width and access to bathrooms.

The Writing Center

Faculty reported students' concerns regarding the Writing Center that were related to its scope and structure. The Writing Center is not fully integrated with courses that have writing assignments. In addition, the Writing Center has limited hours and closes each semester before grades are due causing difficulties for students and impacting their final grades in their courses. Students also complain that a 30-minute appointment at the Writing Center is not sufficient assistance in writing an academic paper.

Faculty also reported that the Writing Center is unable to meet the needs of international students from countries like Asia whose language skills are quite poor. These students typically cannot read and understand an argument or put ideas together into coherent sentences. Often, these students need remedial reading help which is not offered at the Writing Center or the campus library as those tutors only assist students with math and science. This is a student need that is outside the scope of the Writing Center for which there is no student service.

Recommendations/Suggested Solutions for Issue 3:

Faculty recommended that a more centralized process be established for DRC support and services. When students are referred to a different person or department, the person making the referral needs to follow up to ensure that the student did actually connect with the appropriate person or department. There needs to be more follow through in responding to students' queries.

Faculty members offered several recommendations for addressing issues related to the Writing Center. First, the Writing Center should become more fully integrated with those courses that have numerous required writing assignments. One model for doing so has been in place at other research extensive universities, such as the University of Georgia, with a Developmental Skills program in which Ph.D. faculty in literacy education consult with professors, attend students' classes, and work with individuals to assist them with their writing assignments. Writing Center staff also should work with professors and hold writing workshops for specific papers and assignments. In addition, faculty requested that professors be enabled to track the Writing Center tutor's recommendations to determine how a student's paper has changed between drafts. Those changes should be indicated by Writing Center tutors in various colored highlighters for ease of comparison across drafts and to allow students to learn from their mistakes.

Second, the Writing Center should have students complete an evaluation after meeting with a tutor. The evaluation form should be designed in such a way that it will help the student realize what he or she has learned from the meeting. The form should also provide productive feedback to the tutor and the Writing Center.

Third, there were suggestions regarding the Writing Center's schedule and methods of outreach. Writing Center staff should conduct a survey to determine if students need evening or weekend appointments. The Writing Center should offer extra contact hours during mid-term and final exams and not close for the semester before grades are due. Writing Center staff should send information about these extra hours to faculty so that faculty can forward the information to students. At the beginning of each

semester, the Writing Center should e-mail their schedule to all faculty members. In addition, there should be more outreach to students as well to encourage them to use the tutors at the Writing Center.

Issue 4: Intervention Programs and Services for Underprepared or At-Risk Students

There were several issues with intervention programs that faculty identified. Faculty who direct academic services reported receiving the most number of student complaints about the quality of the Early Start program. This program is directed at those students who are admitted with low CI scores. They are required to arrive two weeks early in August and enroll in UNI 120.

Faculty also reported that students resent the requirement to participate in the Pathways for Achieving Student Success (PASS) program designed for those on probation. This program requires students to attend an all-day workshop and enroll in UNI 220. Although some students have reported this course was helpful, others have reported it was a waste of time.

Recommendations/Suggested Solutions for Issue 4:

More needs to be done to make freshmen and transfer students aware of what will be expected of them as ASU students and the amount of time they will need to spend studying. Students need personal assistance in strategizing and planning how to be academically successful. To accomplish this goal, there should be a reasonable description of the workload expected of students for the course load they are taking and for individual courses. ASU websites do not reveal how many hours each week students are expected to study outside of class per credit hour.

Students also need direct advisement on their academic work load and how many classes to take at one time. Although students can take many classes at once or the 8 week sessions to graduate more quickly, this may not be advisable for some. Due to financial reasons, students want to and are often encouraged to graduate as quickly as possible. Therefore, they take too many classes or too many challenging classes together which causes them to drop classes or drop out because they cannot handle the workload.

Students also need advisement and encouragement to be proactive about their studies. They need assistance in using a calendar to schedule and plan for all their assignments and outside activities. Doing so will help them to relieve feelings of being overwhelmed and unable to meet deadlines. Students should be encouraged to track their own grades via the Grade Center to enable them to determine when their grades are in jeopardy and lead them to take action. If students wait too long, they cannot get back on track and drop courses. Such failure is discouraging and can lead them to drop out.

Students also need to be made aware of and urged to take advantage of ASU resources. They should be encouraged to meet with professors during their office hours. Students should be encouraged

to use the Writing Center tutors. Individuals need help in locating resources available to them, such as counseling and library assistance, and assistance in locating faculty offices. Faculty members can be of assistance by not only including information on their syllabi regarding the counseling center for the depressed or struggling student or the writing center for the student who needs extra help, but also by talking with students about these resources.

Issue 5: Courses

Faculty identified several of students' concerns related to issues with courses. First, there students complain of the lack of availability of courses that they need. Students become frustrated in attempting to coordinate their classes and balance their academic schedules with their work schedules which often cause them to drop out. There is not enough variety of courses offered. Students are perplexed that tuition and fees continue to rise rapidly, but the availability of courses and faculty do not appear to increase proportionally.

A surprising number of students drop largely populated online classes. One of these was identified as the required 110 math class. There is a large attrition rate in these large online math classes. In addition, students complain that the mathematics placement test is too lengthy and cumbersome.

Third, faculty report students' additional concerns about online courses. Some students take so many online courses that they encounter difficulties in finding professors who know them personally and can write them letters of recommendation. Those taking online courses may miss the face-to-face intellectual and social interaction with faculty and other students in classroom settings.

Recommendations/Suggested Solutions for Issue 5:

Faculty provided a suggestion for addressing this issue by encouraging students to be on campus for face-to-face courses. One faculty member reported, "When class sizes are reasonable and I know my students by name, I find that I have a better chance of catching those students who stumble and could easily fail out of the class or the university."

Issue 6: Campus Climate

Several faculty members reported students' complaints regarding the climate at ASU, both across campuses and on individual campuses. One faculty member stated, "Although creating one university in many places offers students tremendous opportunities to access the resources of various campuses at ASU, it may also cause students to feel like they don't have a home." Faculty reported students perceive they lack a presence on a home campus.

Other student complaints reported by faculty concerned the atmosphere on the West campus. Students need a physical space to form community and identity as West campus students. Although special events are enjoyable, West campus students need places to socialize on campus.

Other faculty identified particular subpopulations that have reported climate issues. Some students, especially graduate students, feel quite isolated, particularly when living on the West campus. Those

taking online courses also report feelings of isolation. In addition, there is a relatively low level of support for international students.

Recommendations/Suggested Solutions for Issue 6:

One solution a faculty member suggested to address feelings of isolation was to provide expanded transportation services with busses that come back later to the West campus. Another faculty member suggested that since ASU's graduate programs are attracting a growing number of international students, better housing and culture immersion support should be provide for these students. Surveys of international students should be conducted to identify their needs and their reactions to the support they have received at ASU.

Issue 7: Accommodations

One faculty member described the food situation on the West campus as "bleak." Students report that the food options are very limited and expensive. Students want more options.

Student housing contracts and moving between campuses present additional difficulties to students.

Recommendations/ Suggested Solutions for Issue 7:

No suggestions were provided by faculty for addressing these issues.

Issue 8: Communication

The final issue with student services that West campus faculty identified was a lack of communication. Students have reported waiting a week or more for a response to an inquiry from ASU offices, such as Housing, Parking, and Tuition Services. Delayed responses result in students' frustration.

Recommendations/ Suggested Solutions for Issue 8:

There needs to be an increased commitment to student service. One faculty member stated, "If a commitment is made to call a student back within 24 hours that promise needs to be kept even if there is no immediate answer to the student's query."

Personal Concerns:

The final category of responses was personal concerns. These issues typically did not address extant ASU services to students. These concerns included students' legal problems that interfere with their ability to concentrate on their classes with the suggestion that a resident attorney be assigned for a few hours each week to each campus for advisement. Faculty also reported that veterans appear to have personal problems that are not financially related, but interfere with their ability to finish their courses.

Recommendations

Results from this project suggest that faculty do have their own unique perspectives to bring to bear on the issue of identifying student service issues. In addition, faculty members have demonstrated the

capability to offer suggestions or recommendations for addressing those issues. Therefore, it is recommended that a large sample of faculty across the four campuses be surveyed to provide further input.

Four-Year Analysis of Constitution and By-Laws

Chouki El Hamel, 2012-13 Task Force Chair

It seems that our constitution provides the most comprehensive framework for understanding and establishing shared governance at ASU in comparison with most of PAC 12 constitutions. Some of the major points of difference revolve around membership and the connection the university has with State policies. One major point that we are adding to the constitution, and which most of the other universities already have, is the position of Vice Chair or Vice President of the senate. It is now Senate Motion 2013-54. We added a new section "h" under Article II. B 1: "By the end of the fall semester the UAC shall elect from among its membership an individual to serve as President-Elect of the University Senate, who will succeed to the position of President of the University Senate and Chair of the University Academic Council on June 1. The specific duties of the President-Elect, like those of the current campus Presidents, shall be determined in collaborative discussion with the current President." But the great part of ASU constitution shares many commonalities with other PAC 12 constitutions.

INSTITUTION	Membership	Officers	Meetings	Standing Committees	Functions
Arizona State University	1. All faculty in a tenure-eligible or tenured position. 2. All academic professionals with full-time multi-year, probationary, or continuing appointment positions. (The Academic Assembly)	ASU Senate chair functions are not clearly outlined. Lack of details. No Vice Chair yet.	A majority of the University Senate membership shall constitute a quorum.	Similar details.	
University of Arizona	a. Half-time Faculty members are included b. Half-time Academic professionals are included (The General Faculty)	Serves as a member of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee and the Shared Governance Review Committee. Elected for a term of 2 years and eligible for election. Vice Chair performs duties as delegated by the Chair.	5% constitutes a quorum	A useful description of 9 Standing Committees. For instance "The Shared Governance Review Committee."	
University of Colorado Boulder	Appointments are fifty percent or more	It is the vice president of the Faculty Senate shall preside at meetings of the Senate.		A useful description of Standing Committees. For instance "Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Issues Committee."	Extensive details on principles of participation.
University of Oregon	5 students are included in the Senate	President and Vice President			Details on constitution provisions in connection with State Law. Details on the President's functions.
Oregon State University	Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of the Oregon University System of 8 universities. No unit constitution except for Senate bylaws.				
Stanford University	No clear constitution, only the senate bylaws.	Minimum details			
University of Utah	No clear constitution, only the senate bylaws.	Minimum details			
University of Washington	No clear constitution, only the senate bylaws.	Scattered details			
Washington State University	Total number of permanent college faculty minus 50 divided by 25. Eight additional members shall be elected by and from the temporary faculty.	Chair and Chair-Elect. The Chair Elect shall assume the duties of the Chair in the absence of the Chair.	50 % plus 2 shall constitute a quorum.	Details on the principles and functions of standing committees but no example is provided.	